EVALUATION REPORT

Advocating for Up-scaling for Local Climate Solutions as

EcoVillage Development

as a mean to

Strengthen Pro-Poor Climate Agenda in South Asia

Dr. Avanish Kumar

Professor of Public Policy & Governance

Management Development Institute, Gurgaon

Email : avanishkumarprasad@gmail.com

TABLE OF CONTENT

PAGE NO.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY **2-8**

1. BACKGROUND **9-11**

1.1. Eco-Village Development Project
1.2. Project Objectives
1.3. Success Criteria

2. END TERM PROJECT EVALUATION **12-14**

2.1. Scope of Project Evaluation
2.2. Methodology Adopted for Project Evaluation
2.3. Questionnaire
2.4. Field Visit
2.5. Analysis

3. OVERALL PROJECT OUTCOME **15-22**

3.1. Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, and Sustainability
3.2. Performance Across Stakeholders
3.3. Summary

4. PROJECT OUTPUTS AND ASSESSMENT **23-39**

4.1. OBJECTIVES AND OUTPUTS

4.1.1. Objective 1 and Outputs
4.1.2. Objective 2 and Outputs
4.1.3. Objective 3 and Outputs
4.1.4. Objective 4 and Outputs
4.1.5. Summary

4.2. ADVOCACY AND ACTORS

4.3. Policy Advocacy, System Advocacy and Advocacy for Attitude & Behavioral Change
4.4. Stakeholders and Advocacy Outputs Mapping
4.5. Summary

4.6. VILLAGE AND HOUSEHOLD

4.7. Adaptation of Local Solutions
4.8. Summary

5. LEARNING AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS **40-44**

5.1. Evidence, Engagement, and Empowerment
5.2. Advocacy activities and Assessment
5.3. Advocacy Capability and Assessment
5.4. Recommendations

6. ANNEXURE **45-54**

6.1. CSO Questionnaire
6.2. Consultant Questionnaire

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In April 2017, a 15-month Eco-Village Development (EVD) project commenced advocating and upscale solutions that are low-cost, pro-poor, replicable, income generating, climate resilient, and with low emissions. This project to advocate for EVD policies and practices was an outcome of successful project implementation of EVD practices with community members in villages of Bangladesh, India, Nepal, and Sri Lanka. The project, "Advocating for up-scaling for local climate solutions as Eco-Village Development (EVD) as a mean to strengthen pro-poor climate agenda in South Asia" was built on the first EVD project called *"Evidence-based advocacy for low-carbon, pro-poor sustainable "Eco-Village Development in South Asia*". The project was coordinated by DIB, Denmark and supported by the Climate and Environment Fund of Civil Society in Development (CISU), Denmark. There were six project partners; two regional network partners were; the International Network for Sustainable Energy (INFORSE) and Climate Action Network South Asia (CANSA); while four national implementing partners in the respective countries were; Grameen Shakti (Bangladesh), Integrated Sustainable Energy and Ecological Development Association (INSEDA, India), Centre for Rural Technology, Nepal (CRT/Nepal), and Integrated Development Association (IDEA, Sri Lanka).

The evaluation of EVD project demonstrates that policy advocacy is a long and multi-directional process, thus, causal and linear output assessment may be difficult. Therefore, the evaluation adopts a holistic assessment framework to capture the outputs and outcomes of the EVD project at policy, Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and the community of users and decision makers. It is evident from the evaluation study that substantive advocacy activities were initiated by the CSOs with multiple impacts for upscaling EVD solutions has resulted in a change at the village level practices, in local government plans and national policies. The evaluation thus adopted "advocacy" as strengthening on pro-poor climate agenda processes by supporting policymakers, the CSOs and community partners through evidence-based local climate solutions as EVD.

The success of EVD depended upon the capability of the CSO partners in evidence-based advocacy. What matters most in influencing policies and programmes of the government was the demonstration of EVD solutions to break the existing nexus between policies and practices that perpetuate poverty in the realm of climate change with limited technology based sustainable choices. Thus, the evaluation adopted five DAC evaluation criteria of assessments, namely relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. Relevance was assessed using validity of EVD project and activities in the backdrop of evolving local context. Efficiency was used to assess maximizing value or gain and minimizing cost, especially in terms of human resources and financial benefits. Such as low-cost mitigation; cost-efficient activities adopted in the project, and gain to the EVD users. Effectiveness was done with the assessment

of the project's performance in light of the specified objectives and success criteria. The question answered was "does the set of activities resulted in outputs and sum total of outputs accumulate to stated objectives? The impact was assessed at three levels; Community level was to assess access to EVD solutions, replication of EVD solutions, increase in income, gender mainstreaming, reduction in migration, mitigation health and etc. CSO level was to assess the capacity, network, evidence; funding, generated on EVD, and policy level to assess the impact on decision makers and in policies. And sustainability was assessed on the viability that the project activities at community and CSO level will last after the completion of the project. The inclusion of EVD in policies and programmes was considered an important indicator of sustainability.

Methodology Adopted for Evaluation

The evaluation started with the review of material provided by DIB, project partners, such as progress reports and materials on EVD. The literature reviewed helped in identifying key areas of intervention and impact at three levels; policy/decision makers, among CSOs and at the community. A questionnaire was designed to assess the five DAC criteria, namely, *relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability.* The draft questionnaire was discussed with DIB and piloted among all the partners. And detail follows up discussion was conducted with DIB representative and representative of the network partners, especially the EVD project coordinators. Based on their feedback two questionnaires (one for self-reporting by the CSOs and another for the Consultant) were designed and finalized for final evaluation[1]. The field visit was conducted in Bangladesh, India, Nepal and Sri Lanka. Observations and interviews of CSO members, Government officials, and community members were conducted using consultant questionnaire. The evaluation adopted a participatory method of assessment. Finally, the analysis was presented to all partners, including DIB in Sri Lanka. The draft report was circulated and feedbacks were incorporated in the final report.

Key Findings

The project has done extremely good on all five parameters of assessment at household and community level, and it has also succeeded in influencing CSOs, district, and state level government plans. Though overall impact at national level policy is low, success in Sri Lanka (Blue Green Policy) is an indicator of the high value of EVD solutions. The success suggests twin fold approach; a sustained effort of mobilization and demonstration on the ground and evidence-based advocacy efforts to engage with government by senior CSO members (including board members) to influence policies and practices. The success of EVD inclusion in local government plan in Nepal is another example that partnership has

[1] See for details Annexure 1 and 2

potential to upscale through the inclusion of EVD solutions in policies and plans. While adoption of EVD solutions by villagers across project areas in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, and Sri Lanka demonstrates EVD as an inclusive and sustainable option, EVD selected as a case in Talonao Dialogue at COP23 suggests potential to advocate for its inclusion in an international framework.

Relevance

At household and community level with the rise in awareness and demand for the EVD technology-based solutions suggest very high relevance. The Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) finding suggests the high relevance of the EVD solutions across South Asia. The community-based solutions such as hydraulic ramp pump in Nepal, solar street lights and solar water pump in Bangladesh. INSEDA in-house developed low carbon, affordable green technologies implemented in the Tehri Garhwal, India. The learning from IDEA in Sri Lanka on improved kitchen and not the unit intervention of hybrid cook stove suggests that integrated intervention accelerates the value of the outcome. Community-based bio-mass dryer in Sri Lanka suggests low-cost intervention with high-value return compared to the individual household-based solar dryer. These interventions are sustainable based on the availability of local resources and market demand. For an example, drying of organic turmeric is successful by INSEDA in India while drying jackfruit by IDEA in Sri Lanka. However, these community-based interventions require community-based management system to promote sustainability in long run. The project partner needs to develop a strategy of creating decentralized community-based technology solutions providers to upscale.

Efficiency

Efficiency in EVD is captured as low cost-high gain. The cost-benefit analysis of the intervention suggests financial and multiple development gain. Return on Investment (RoI) or Social Return on Investment (SRoI) to the community members is extremely high. The cost-benefit analysis of the development of technology and its implementations suggests that the initial costs of development of EVD technology-based solutions are higher than the competing product. For an example, the cost difference between a hybrid cook stove compared to the existing stove (maybe not environmentally friendly) in the market is extremely high. However, if community-based skills (like in the case of Sri Lanka open market-approach adopted in the production of cook stove) can enable scale up. EVD to improve efficiency require the creation of local service providers to install and repair the technology, this would drastically reduce the cost of production.

Effectiveness

Effectiveness in terms of the advocacy outputs across the partners at the households and community level are at the best, while outputs at the regional government, national government, and international level are relatively less. Though there are substantive sign of success in the case of CRT efforts in Nepal with inclusion of EVD by the Local Government plan; CANSA engagement with smart village initiative in Madhya Pradesh at Sub-Regional Government in India; Grameen Shakti Green Climate Fund (GCF) approved project on EVD in Bangladesh, and National level policy outcome in Blue-Green policy and Village Development Plans (VDPs) in Sri Lanka. The continued effort of CSOs partners in rendering EVD solutions through partnership with government will be critical to accelerate the desired policy outcomes. In International Forums, dissemination of EVD in CANSA and INFORSE jointly organized by INSEDA side events and EVD selected as a case in Talonao Dialogue at COP23[2] to showcase evidence models suggests the extremely high value of EVD. The success of advocacy in terms of technology extension and readiness to adopt is also reflected by other agencies and CSOs interested in installation of different EVD solutions, such as HEERA stove by INSEDA[3] in Cameroon, IDEAs' Anagi stove in Sri Lanka.

Sustainability

The project outcomes are sustainable with the adoption of EVD solutions in community practices and policies. Some of the examples of inclusion of EVD solutions are local government plan in Nepal, Green Climate Fund (GCF) proposal in Bangladesh, Blue-Green in Sri Lanka, while widespread adoption of various EVD solutions by the households has promoted sustainable practices. The outreach and capacity building of CSOs and CBOs part of a network of CANSA, INFORSE and to the respective partners has promoted EVD as a sustainable option beyond project area. However, the project to achieve the scale of sustainability should develop an inbuilt mechanism for repair and maintenance of EVD solutions through community-based models. Develop EVD characteristics that define core EVD principles as technology solutions for a sustainable future. Currently, EVD solutions are adopted based on utility, availability and

[2]UNFCCC side event proceedings, policy briefs, launched publications at the event, Document submission to Talanoa dialogue, and Talanoa-Story speech at SB48, Bonn.).

[3] Two Socio technical staff of INSEDA have been sent to Cameroon, (West Africa) to transfer EVD technologies with a focus on training on Heera Chula (Hybrid Improved Hybrid cook stove) with appropriate modification to fit into the cultural and cooking habits of the local inhabitants.

positive green effect. By defining the EVD technology core principles, the project partners can upscale a large scale model for advocacy that can determine the choice of EVD solutions beyond the project area.

Recommendations

EVD project to improve effectiveness and the efficiency of the technological solutions can adopt the followings:

Individual CSO partners to upscale individual solutions to village development:

1. Adopt ecosystem (holistic) approach i.e. shift from individual solutions i.e. stove to space such as the improved kitchen.
2. Design co-financing/community-based management system.

Identify strategic policy issues and areas within the existing national policy framework, collect and collate evidence for regional, national and local advocacy, and recommend EVD based policy alternatives.

Network Partners to upscale EVD practices into policies

1. To upscale at South Asia or International level EVD framework can be developed. To develop the framework project needs to identify unique and complementary policy priorities based on common concerns across South Asia. The evidence-based framework should ideally be applicable across partners and linked to specific sources for policy influence. For an example, there is a shift towards EVD based village plans and policies across South Asia. Though the scope and scale may vary, in principle, there is thrust on EVD solutions for the village by all the government and CSOs. Therefore with the robust experience and evidence partners can develop and propagate EVD framework. Similarly, bilateral or trilateral issues between the partners can be identified and advocated. The strength of regional advocacy lies in systematically established and documented "evidence" and the engagement of stakeholders. Experience an event based advocacy effort will have transitory effects. To achieve network outcomes, the project partners may adopt the followings:

Overall, all the project partners

1. Delineate experiences (anecdotes) with evidence for the transformative outcome.
2. Design specific activity-outputs based roles of network partners for the collaborative outcome to incubate EVD solutions in policies.
3. Define and disseminate EVD distinct characteristics/principles for effective policy advocacy.

Summary

EVD advocacy is an attempt to change people, practices, and policies to a predetermined desired state that is built on evidence and experience. The difficulty arises in translating experience into institutional

practice, however, with the success of EVD project there is increased readiness of the decision makers, partners. Apart from developing and documenting systemic linkage of the policy-practices and successful demonstration of practical solutions, partners should conduct a comparative analysis of the impact of EVD solutions where policies and plans are being implemented with areas without EVD. And comparing with the cost of inaction i.e. negative consequence of non-EVD plan and policies will enable partners to influence policy and scale-up impact among people outside the project area. To upscale impact from household to village level, the project must identify core EVD solutions within households and community level to solve common village concerns by reaching a substantive population of the village. The household to the village, a strategy to enrich the collective strength of community and CSO partners is required to upscale South Asian experiments.

1. BACKGROUND

Eco-Village Development (EVD) aims at the use of solutions that are low-cost, pro-poor, gender sensitive, replicable, income-generating, and climate resilient. The concept includes adapting solutions to local needs and circumstances while including a bottom-up, multi-stakeholder approach, gender mainstreaming and, technology transfers where appropriate[4]. According to UN *Partnership for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)*, 'eco-village communities are among the most sustainable of communities on the planet. They typically use locally sourced materials, create green buildings, rely on sustainable infrastructure and appropriate technology, focus on restoring and protecting the natural environment, and adopting resource efficient practices'[5]. To testify and upscale the decentralized sustainable EVD practices and policies, DIB, INFORSE, CANSA, CRT, INSEDA, IDEA, and Grameen Shakti partnered up with the support of CISU.

1.1. Eco Village Development Project

The project "Advocating for up-scaling for local climate solutions as Eco-Village Development (EVD) as a mean to strengthen pro-poor climate agenda in South Asia" was built on the first EVD project called *"Evidence-based advocacy for low-carbon, pro-poor sustainable "Eco-Village Development (EVD) in South Asia*". The project to advocate for upscale EVD policies and practices was an outcome of the successful implementation of EVD practices in villages of Bangladesh, India, Nepal, and Sri Lanka. Both the EVD projects were coordinated by DIB, Denmark and supported by the Climate and Environment Fund of Civil Society in Development (CISU), Denmark. There were six project partners; two regional network partners; the International Network for Sustainable Energy (INFORSE) and Climate Action Network South Asia (CANSA); while four national implementing partners in the respective countries; Grameen Shakti (Bangladesh), Integrated Sustainable Energy and Ecological Development Association (INSEDA, India), Centre for Rural Technology, Nepal (CRT/Nepal), and Integrated Development Association (IDEA, Sri Lanka).

1.2. EVD Project Objectives

The project had two objectives; development objective and intervention objective.

1. *Development objective* of the project was to strengthen development for reducing poverty in ways that limit greenhouse gas emissions (mitigate climate change) and adapt to climate change in South Asia by better including local climate mitigation and adaptation solutions in

[4] See for details EcoVillage Development as Climate Solution Proposals from South Asia, 2016 available at http://www.inforse.org/asia/pdf/Pub_EVD-SouthAsia.pdf

[5] See for details https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/partnership/?p=11943

the implementation of the Paris Agreement and relevant SDGs, and as well as in proposals from South Asia for international negotiations such as within the UNFCCC, and

2. *Intervention objective* of the project was to influence national decision-makers, including climate negotiators, to be aware of and better include local climate mitigation and adaptation solutions in their national implementation plans of the Paris Agreement and relevant SDGs, and as well as in their proposals for and documentation to international negotiations such as the UNFCCC.

1.3. EVD Project Success Criteria

The project had identified four success criteria, they were as follows:

1. Strengthened evidence base of advocating for EVD solutions and methods. The documentation to explain; how EVD and its solutions drive sustainable local development with poverty reduction and at the same time include climate mitigation and adaptation, and how institutions and policy practitioners can act to scale up EVD in their working framework. *To be verified with the availability of the strengthened evidence-base in publications, in public forums and on the websites of partner organizations.*

2. Make up-scaling of local climate and development solutions, including EVD, better known as a way to meet national climate commitments as Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs,) among people and organizations, including CSOs and officials, to act as an agent of change and influence the national decision-makers and negotiators. *To be verified with reports of presentations and dialogues with the target people and organizations, as well as with relevant information from them, such as statements, proposals, publications and information about their events.*

3. Make national decision-makers and climate negotiators better aware of solutions that combine climate action and fulfilling of development objectives, including EVD, as well as the policy instruments for upscale of these local solutions to a level where they contribute substantially to meet national climate commitments, including NDCs. *To be verified with reports of presentations and dialogue with the relevant decision-makers and negotiators.*

4. Have up-scaling of solutions that combine climate action and fulfilling of development objectives, such as EVD, included in national priorities for climate negotiations and in the preparations implementation of the Paris Agreement and NDCs as well as in the implementation of relevant SDGs, and in the countries' National Communications to UNFCCC. *To be verified with reports from meetings with decision-makers and negotiators as well as speeches, positions*

etc. from them and reports from discussions on national climate actions, including actions in NDCs, climate financing as Green Climate Fund (GCF), and climate programmes.

The project objectives were reframed for operational direction to achieve the two objectives and four success criteria into the followings:

1. Object 1: Repair/maintain/improve/showcase EVD evidence base and capacity build end-users if needed.
2. Object 2: Expand and deepen network to promote EVD.
3. Object 3: Engage decision makers and climate negotiators, and
4. Object 4: Inclusion of EVD in local, sub-national, national policies and priority.

2. END TERM PROJECT EVALUATION

The assignment to conduct end term evaluation was given to Dr. Avanish Kumar, Professor of Public Policy and Governance, Management Development Institute, Gurgaon. The duration of project evaluation was July-September, 2018.

2.1.The scope of Project Evaluation

1. To conduct an independent assessment and documentation of the project in relation to the stated objectives, expected results, and outreach of the intervention against the DAC criteria including key lessons learned and recommendations for adjustments to future similar projects', and
2. To assess project initiatives that influenced nationals/regional/local/policies/decisions by the project partners, and draw on national and local trends on the concept of EVD of the intervention.

2.2. Methodology Adopted for Project Evaluation

The evaluation recognized that policy advocacy is a long and multi-directional process, thus, causal and linear impact assessment rather may be difficult but not impossible. It was evident from the project reports and case studies that substantive advocacy activities were initiated by the CSOs with multiple impacts for upscaling local climate solutions as Eco-Village Development (EVD). The evaluation thus adopted advocacy as strengthening on pro-poor climate agenda processes by supporting policymakers, the CSOs and community partners through evidence-based local climate solutions. The evaluation assessed all the objectives and all the four success criteria initially laid down in the project. It reviewed reports, published documents, case studies, training materials and conducted fieldwork and interviews with select decision makers, experts, CSO partners and EVD users in the respective countries.

Following steps were adopted in the study.

1. Desk review of the key project documents to design of questionnaire for data collection.
2. Interviews in person project team using a questionnaire, discussions with the head of the NGO partners, senior professionals of the NGO, their board members, and experts. And members of CBOs, community mobilizers, and EVD users.
3. Interviews with decision makers and climate negotiators, relevant CSOs, and other stakeholders, such as Local Self Government representatives in Nepal, District, and National Level experts and officials in Sri Lanka, India, Nepal, and Bangladesh.
4. Interviews with project staff in Denmark from DIB and INFORSE through Skype. The final analysis was presented to all the partners in the final project meeting in Kandy on 28th August 2018. The draft report was prepared and feedbacks were incorporated in the report.

2.3. Questionnaires (CSOs and Consultant)

Two detail questionnaires designed to evaluate the project were; the CSO questionnaire to be filled by all the six EVD project partners (See for details, Annexure 1) and a questionnaire for consultant to guide in collecting information and collating insights from interview, discussion and observations based on fieldwork (See for details, Annexure 2). Both these questionnaires were designed in accordance to DAC criteria for evaluation developed by OECD. The CSO questionnaire (Annexure 1) was sent to all the partners prior to the field visit. Except for INFORSE, all the partners' organizations and their respective areas were visited by the consultant for evaluation. The CSO questionnaire was administered by the project team as a *self-reporting collective and reflective* method. During the field visit, using consultant questionnaire (Annexure 2) interviews of decision-makers, experts, and end users were conducted, while at community level Focus Group Discussion (FGD), observations and interviews were conducted with EVD users. After the field visit, the CSOs were given 15-30 days to finally submit the filled questionnaire to the consultant. The CSO questionnaire had three broad sections; Section A and Section B was retrospective analysis while Section C was prospective analysis. Section A was to assess the project on overall five evaluation of DAC criteria; Section B was to assess the objectives, activities, outputs & impact. Section C was to assess and analyze project-based learnings of the EVD project partners. Section A and B had a closed-ended response based on a Likert scale, while the prospective section was open-ended.

The condition laid down for CSOs reporting was as follows:

1. All fact reported are correct and supported by evidence.
2. The reporting is a not individual opinion/experience; it is an outcome of team collective views based on facts.

2.4. Field Visit

To assess the four success criteria of the project, field visit to the EVD project was conducted using consultant questionnaire (pl refer to Annexure 2). Field visit included all EVD villages, EVD user households, and the local and Sub-regional government offices, experts in the respective countries. Along with the villages of Grameen Shakti, IDEA, INSEDA and CRT, schools, Madarsa (local education centers), Mahila Mandal Center (Women Collective Village Center), Local Government and District Government Departments were visited to interview the decision makers. All the project implementation villages were visited, i.e. 3 villages in Bangladesh, 5 villages in India, 3 villages in Sri Lanka, and 2 out of 3 villages in Nepal, one village in Nepal could not be visited due to a landslide. Village, CSOs and

sub-regional government visits helped in better understanding of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability.

A typical field visit was organized as follows:

1. 1st Day: Understanding the Project and Progress (Sharing of data/information/insights with CSO Team/CSOs senior members). Followed by explaining the purpose and process to be adopted by the CSO to respond to CSO questionnaire. And a review of documents, materials, policy papers, case studies were done to correlate evidence with experience on EVD.
2. 2nd Day: Field Visit: (Village/Stakeholders/Government/CBOs): It was conducted at two levels; Interviews with local decision-makers, Local government and District level officers was conducted. The visits were made to district government offices and Local Government to understand decision makers' perspective and prospects of EVD in policy and practices. These interviews were conducted to validate the acceptability of EVD solutions as a potential sustainable option and to assess the degree of incorporation in the policy and programmes of the government. The EVD village visit was conducted using an interview with the village experts and EVD users. Focus Group Discussions was conducted with the users to understand the degree of adaptation of EVD solutions and its relevance, impact, and sustainability.
3. 3rd Day: Field Visit (Village/Stakeholders/Government/CBOs): the Third day was focused on understanding the effectiveness and efficiency of the EVD solutions. After village and local government consultation, final consultation with EVD CSO partners was organized to review and share observations on success and gaps of the project.

2.5. Analysis

The analysis was presented to all the six CSO partners and DIB representatives in Sri Lanka on 27th - 28th August 2018. A consensus arrived on the key findings and suggestions. The findings of the evaluation study were also used during this meeting to steer the discussion and design of the new project by the partners.

3. OVERALL PROJECT OUTCOMES

The EVD project has impacted at three levels;

(1) At *the community* level, it has established adaptation of affordable green technologies as alternate and value-added solutions. The immediate impact of EVD has added value in terms of economic and environmental benefits to the users. For an example hybrid cock stove in India and Nepal while modified kitchen[6] in Sri Lanka has reduced negative climate impact by a reduction in wood consumption, pollution, and drudgery of women for the collection of firewood. Apart from health benefits, less black smoke reduce darkening of utensils; including the fireplace, resulting in a lesser amount water consumption on cleanliness. Similarly, an introduction of the solar dryer in India and bio-mass dryer in Sri Lanka has accelerated income from pulses, mushroom, spices, and jackfruit. Organic farming and kitchen garden is spread across all project areas and is being considered as an environmentally viable and financially sustainable option. Almost all EVD solutions are gender neutral (not masculine) and equitable in benefit distribution.

(2). At project *partners* level, the CSOs working in the respective areas with a successful demonstration on the ground, EVD has evolved from an *option to a viable alternative for sustainable adaptation* and *mitigation village based solutions*. CSO partners have gained experience and credibility with evidence. CSOs are valued as knowledge partners in their respective government departments, among CSOs and funding agencies. Based on the project learning, CSOs are seeking funding opportunities to further upscale EVD solutions in their respective areas.

(3) The project has enabled CSOs to contribute to *policy-making* and *decision-making processes*. EVD solutions are acknowledged and incorporated at National, Sub-Regional and Local levels. The Blue-Green policy in Sri Lanka, Smart Village policy in Madhya Pradesh, India, and inclusion of EVD in Local Government plan of Bethanchok Rural Municipality (BRM), Nepal, is a testimony of inclusion of EVD solutions in policies and programmes of the governments. EVD as a policy discourse has also up-scaled through invited talks, side-events, exposure visits, consultations at national and international forums in Bangladesh, Nepal, India, Sri Lanka and in international platforms.

Overall, the village level EVD experiments and evidence have culminated into the real-life laboratory as exposure visits for the government and CSO members. However, all these successes in the project have a varied impact in terms of degree and form of inclusion in policies and practices across partners. The varied impact is a consequence of the choice of EVD solutions by the partners (EVD solutions offered by

[6] Modified Kitchen is a model that converts stove along with kitchen lighting, ventilation as an integrated space, while intervention in India and Nepal focus on efficient stoves.

CSOs varies across partners), the government-CSO partnership and strategy of CSOs on demonstration, documentation, and dissemination. Most importantly adoptions of EVD solutions are directly influenced by the readiness of the respective government. The scale of impact also varies with the unit (Household/Village) of EVD technology/solution intervention. Overall all EVD solutions are gender, age, social/spatial inclusive, and natural resource and environment-friendly.For an example, the impact of integrated EVD kitchen in comparison to the introduction of a cooking stove has a differential impact; similarly, a domestic stove vis-à-vis a commercial stove. While integrated kitchen benefits are an overall ecosystem, whereas multiple function hybrid cock stove, such as HEERA provides environmental friendly fuel, lighting, and mobile charging facility enabled with a solar panel. These solutions may vary in scale but remain consistent with core EVD benefits.

3.1. Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, and Sustainability

The five DAC criteria were adopted and defined to suit the EVD project evaluation, namely (1) *Relevance was defined as*, the extent to which the objective of a project conforms to the target group's needs, as well as to the country's and partner organizations' strategies. To evaluate the relevance of the project, *Pareto* criteria were also used to assess at least a few families are better off and no person or family is worse off as a result of EVD intervention. (2). *Efficiency was defined as* the extent to which optimal value for money has been obtained in the spending of project funds and value created as a direct outcome of EVD project advocacy efforts. A cost-benefit analysis was used to assess the direct and indirect impact of project outputs and outcomes on EVD users. (3). *Effectiveness was defined as* the degree to which the project has succeeded in meeting its stated objectives. Some of the questions used to assess effectiveness were, 'does the set of activities resulted in outputs & does sum-total of outputs achieved accumulate to success criteria and objectives as specified in the project document?'. (4). *Impact* on policy and plan was assessed on modification of short-lived current strategies and adoptions of EVD by the government into long-term sustainable initiatives. The lasting changes – positive solutions adopted and negative (unfriendly environmental practices) halted or reduced. Planned as well as unplanned outcomes – arising from the project was also used to assess the impact. The overall impact was assessed at levels of policy/plans, EVD partners and community/household level. (5) Finally, *Sustainability* was assessed as the degree to which the activities started and resulted are expected to remain/survive in place after the project completion. The key question evaluated was, 'will the project activities at community and CSO last after the completion of the project? Evidence of EVD inclusion in policies/plans of government was classified as an indicative process resulting in a sustainable outcome. EVD partners' initiatives to upscale EVD initiatives through seeking funding from different agencies and government and incorporation of EVD as core to their future strategy was assessed as an indicator of sustainability. While motivation

among other than EVD users in the community and among CSOs to take it forward through self-initiatives was considered an indicator of sustainability.

The participatory self-assessment of EVD project by CSO partners on the five parameters was done as an overall rating (Table. 1) and to priorities in order of achievement among the five parameters ranking was done (Table 2). The question used Likert scale[7] to rate out of 5, namely very good, good, average, not so good and low. The rating was based on evidence and experience of all the members of CSO partners working in the EVD project. Table. 1 below suggests that aggregate of rating relevance and efficiency was very good and good, making the two as better than rest of the three parameters. Whereas effectiveness, impact, and sustainability were rated between good and average indicating lower than expected. Impact witnessed varied rate of success across the levels, at community and partner level project impact was very good, whereas policy level impact, except in Sri Lanka and local plans in Nepal, rest of the countries though there is buy-in by government officials on EVD as sustainable options, inclusion in policy is yet to achieve desired success.

Table 1: EVD Project partners rate on the 5 parameters

S.No.	Overall Performance Parameters*	Rate (Based on Experience + Documented Evidence)				
		Very Good	Good	Average	Not So Good	Low
1	Relevance	1, 2, 4 & 5	3& 6			
2	Efficiency	2 & 4	1,3, & 6	5		
3	Effectiveness		1,3,4 & 6	2 & 5		
4	Impact 4.1 Community Level	1	2,4 & 6	3 & 5		
	4,2 EVD partners Level		1,2,4 & 6	3 & 5		
	4.3 Policy/Programme Level	3	2	1	4,5 & 6	

[7] It's an agreement or disagreement scale was respondent respond to question based on the degree of agreement/disagreement, often between 5 points.

5	Sustainability	1	2,3,4,5&6			

EVD Partners	Grameen Shakti	CRT	IDEA	inseda	CANSA	INFORSE
Code	1	2	3	4	5	6

To identify the order of success on all five parameters, the closed ranking was used as the technique. The CSO partners were asked to score only one parameter as 1 for the best and 5 as the least. Table 2 below suggests that relevance was ranked as the best, while efficiency was collectively scored as the least. Effectiveness could not evolve a consensus, indicating varied outputs across the partners. Impact scored between 3rd and 4th across partners, whereas sustainability also had a varied response.

Table 2: *EVD Project partners closed rank on the 5 parameters*

S.No.	Overall Performance Parameters	A rank between 1 to 5 (*It is a closed ranking, only 1 as the best, and 5 is the least)*				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Relevance	3, 4, 5 & 6	1 & 2			
2	Efficiency	2	4			1, 3,5 & 6
3	Effectiveness		5	3	1 & 6	2 & 4
4	Impact			1, 4, 5 & 6	2 & 3	
5	Sustainability	1	3 & 6	2	4 & 5	

EVD Partners	Grameen Shakti	CRT	IDEA	inseda	CANSA	INFORSE
Code	1	2	3	4	5	6

The cumulative assessment of CSOs response and consultant review suggests that undoubtedly relevance of EVD is extremely high. The improved CSOs capability with evidence and conviction with the success of EVD project in community and government is expected to accelerate efficiency and effectiveness. Though the impact of EVD on community and CSOs is extremely high, to achieve the goal of policy inclusion, a continuation of evidence-based advocacy will be critical. The project has established a high impact, however, it would be required to continue and upscale EVD innovation, and instill community-based management strategy of the project in the future.

3.2. Performance across stakeholders

After the evaluation of the five criteria, performance across key stakeholders on the five DAC criteria was assessed. The five key stakeholders identified for project evaluation were, (1) Household, (2) Community, (3) CSOs (4) Sub-Regional Government and (5) National Government (Table 3). The CSO members were asked to assess and respond on 3 points Likert scale, i.e. High, Medium and Low impact. All the responses were collated by converting High to the highest value of 10, Medium to 5 and Low as Zero. Then the value scored was converted into the percentage of sub-total value on the respective criteria. For example, relevance at household level was calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Household Score of Relevance}}{\text{Sub Total of Relevance}} \times 100$$

The last column and row as SubTotal was a percentage of total value (calculated as % of total value =1010). The percentage is converted into category reflecting the degree of success of EVD project across the stakeholders' i.e. above 20 % reflects very good, while a score between 20-15 % depicts average success, success below 15 % indicating not so good impact. Overall, impact at household and community level is extremely good on all 5 parameters; the cumulative impact at level national level depicts the lowest success (See Table 3 below for details).

Table 3: Overall Performance of Stakeholders

S. No.	Overall Performance Parameters	Stakeholder Mapping					
		Household	Community	CSO/ NGO	Sub Regional District/State	National Level	Sub Total
1	Relevance	(60) 23.07 %	(55) 21.15 %	(50) 19.23 %	(50) 19.23 %	(45) 17.30 %	260 25.74 %
2	Efficiency	(40)	(40)	(35)	(30)	(25)	170

		23.52 %	23.52 %	20.58 %	17.64 %	14.70 %	16.83 %
3	Effectiveness	(45) 24.32 %	(45) 24.32 %	(35) 18.91 %	(40) 21.62 %	(20) 10.81 %	185 18.31 %
4	Impact	(55) 28.94 %	(45) 23.68 %	(40) 21.05 %	(30) 15.78 %	(20) 10.52 %	190 18.81 %
5	Sustainability	(55) 26.82 %	(45) 21.95 %	(40) 19.51 %	(40) 19.51 %	(25) 12.19 %	205 20.29%
6	Sub Total	255 25.24 %	230 22.77 %	200 19.80 %	190 18.81 %	135 13.36%	1010 100%

Pl Note: Above Average < 20%; Below Average 20-15 & < 15%,

The above table suggests two important learnings; despite the success of the EVD at household and community level on almost all 5 parameters; the scale of intervention has to substantially increase horizontally in the village[8] (as the gap between EVD households and non-EVD households are very high despite its demand to achieve an outcome at "EVD Village") and within the household (an integrated household intervention, so as to achieve an outcome on overall "EVD household"). Secondly, the project should expand vertically in other than EVD intervention villages. The CSO partners need to integrate EVD evidence with potential programmes and policies at the district, state, national and regional level.

3.3. Summary

The project has done relatively well on all five parameters of assessment at household and community level. It has fairly succeeded in influencing CSOs, district, and state level government plans. Though the degree of impact at national level policy is low in absolute terms, the relative impact at the national level with the scale of intervention at national level success in Sri Lanka (Blue Green Policy) and Nepal (Sub-Regional Plan) is an indicator of the high scope of EVD solutions. A sustained effort with the combination of demonstration on the ground and evidence-based advocacy efforts by the network partners (INFORSE and CANSA) and the CSO members (including board members) has the potential to influence the policies in future.

At household and community level and among the decision makers with the rise in awareness and demand for the EVD technology-based solutions suggest high relevance. The interviews and Focus Group Discussions finding suggests high relevance and realization of the EVD solutions across South Asia. The

[8] For detail, pl see Table 12

learning from IDEA in Sri Lanka on improved kitchen and not cooking stove suggests integrated intervention accelerates the value of the outcome. Multipurpose EVD solutions, such as Hybrid Improved Cook Stoves (HICS) and HEERA developed by INSEDA indicates preferences with benefits of cooking, lighting and charging mobile. The community-based solutions such as hydraulic water supply in Nepal, solar street lights and solar water pump in Bangladesh; community-based bio-mass dryer in Sri Lanka suggests low-cost intervention with high-value return compared to individual household-based interventions. However, these community-based interventions require community-based management system to promote sustainability in long run. The project partner needs to develop a strategy of community-based technology solutions to upscale. Efficiency in EVD is cited as low cost, cost-benefit analysis of the intervention suggests financial and multiple development gain, Return on Investment (RoI) or Social Return on Investment (SRoI) to the community members is extremely high. The cost-benefit analysis of the development of technology and its implementations suggests that the initial cost of development of technological solutions are higher, however, if community-based facilities and services created to install and repair technology, the cost of production can be reduced drastically. While the market-based approach adopted in the case of Sri Lanka has resulted in mass production of the stove.

Effectiveness in terms of the scale of outputs at the households and community level are at the best, while output at regional government and national government is relatively low. Effectiveness to influence plan and policies will depend on the quality of integration of *evidence* with policy alternatives and constant *engagement* with the government. Though there is a sign of success in the case of Nepal with inclusion of EVD in local plan by the Local Government, introduction of smart village in Madhya Pradesh at Sub-Regional Government in India and National level policy outcome in Sri Lanka on Blue-Green policy, continues effort by CSOs in rendering skills and solutions will be critical to achieving the desired state and scope of policy shifts. The success in terms of technology extension is also reflected by other agencies/CSOs interested in installation of EVD solutions, such as HEERA stove by INSEDA[9] and transferred to Cameroon through the South-South cooperation, involving NGOs from both the countries. EVD outreach at International Forums, CANSA and INFORSE did organize side events[10] to showcase evidence models.

[9] Two Socio-technical staff of INSEDA have been sent to Cameroon,(West Africa) to transfer EVD technologies with a focus on training on HEERA Chula (Hybrid Improved Hybrid cock stove – HICS) with appropriate modification to fit into the cultural and cooking habits of the local inhabitants.

[10] EVD also got recognized in the UNFCCC Talanoa dialogue, (Evidence: UNFCCC side event proceedings, policy briefs, launched publications at the event, Document submission to Talanoa dialogue, and Talanoa-Story speech at SB48, Bonn.).

To accelerate the policy advocacy, rich experience and evidence of EVD project can be developed into national *policy position papers*. The project to achieve the scale of sustainability should develop an inbuilt mechanism for repair and maintenance of EVD solutions through *community-based models*. The current EVD users can become business solution providers to the non-users by creating income and awareness on EVD solutions. EVD partners for universalization of EVD solutions need to graduate from *designing products to defining principles of EVD solutions*. This would require to develop EVD characteristics that define *EVD principles* as a technology for a sustainable future. Currently, EVD solutions are developed or adopted based on utility, availability and positive green effect. By defining the EVD technology principles, the project partners can develop a large scale *model for advocacy* that can determine the policy choice of EVD solutions beyond the project area.

4. PROJECT OUTPUTS AND ASSESSMENT

The EVD project had two broad objectives; *development objective* and *intervention objective*. The *development objective* was to strengthen development for reducing poverty in ways that limit greenhouse gas emissions (mitigate climate change) and adapt to climate change in South Asia by better including local climate mitigation and adaptation solutions in the implementation of the Paris Agreement and relevant SDGs, and as well as in proposals from South Asia for international negotiations such as within the UNFCCC. While the *intervention objective* was to influence national decision-makers, including climate negotiators, to be aware of and better include local climate mitigation and adaptation solutions in their national implementation plans of the Paris Agreement and relevant SDGs, and as well as in their proposals for and documentation to international negotiations such as the UNFCCC. These two objectives were further reframed to improve operational clarity. The four operational objects were: 1: to 'repair/maintain/improve/showcase EVD evidence base and capacity build end-users if needed'; 2.to 'expand and deepen network to promote EVD,; 3. to engage decision-makers and climate negotiators; and the last, and 4. to 'inclusion of EVD in local, sub-national, national policies and priority.

4.1. Objectives and Outputs

In the CSO questionnaire, a question was used to assess and rank the objective in order of success based on outputs. It evaluated outputs, measured in terms of two categories; *process & outcomes with measurement indicators.* The *process* outputs were assessed as - *what the project /CSOs did to achieve the objective*? and *outcomes as what changes occurred?* The process and outcomes were assessed based on measurement indicators and source of evidence. This was to assess which object in accordance to outputs has relatively done better than the others. The responses on the CSO questionnaire were further validated by the consultant during the visit. The object wise assessment is as follows:

4.1.1. 1 and Outputs

Table 4: Summary of the assessment of object 1 and outputs

Object 1	Outputs[11]		Measurement Indicators (Sources of Evidence)
	Process	Outcome	
Repair/maintain/improve/showcase EVD *evidence* base and *capacity* build end-users if needed	• Need Assessment, Training/Awareness conducted in Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, India & Nepal • Solar Street Light, Solar water pump and Retained Heat Cooker in Bangladesh, Slurry pit in Bangladesh, India, Rainwater Harvesting and Stove/Kitchen in India, Sri Lanka & Nepal • Organic Farming adopted and improvised in India, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh & Nepal • Women in Villages organized into Mahila Mandal (women collectives) by INSEDA in India • Training of Trainers (ToT) Manual INSEDA as a lead, developed collectively by EVD partners • White Paper: *Climate Mitigation and Adaption with Eco-Village Development (EVD) Solutions in South Asia*	• Capacity building of the community (HH); Govt. District Officers, CSOs on EVD developed in all four project areas. • Adoption of renewable energy technologies (RET) in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, & Sri Lanka. • Effective utilization of space/resource by all the EVD users. • Standardization and dissemination of knowledge and skills on EVD in all the project areas	• Case Study of Bangladesh, India, Nepal, & Sri Lanka printed. in INSEDA Newsletter • Baseline study and Progress Reports of all the partners. • Sustainable Energy News Letters covered cases of EVD • CAN ECO Newsletter on EVD solutions • Short publication and distributed in the Environment Fair and events in abroad • #interviewed by Germany's international broadcaster Deutsche Welle: http://p.dw.com/p/2nQ8Y • #Electronic Media "Channel I" interview: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BgODNzlh1_E&t=563s

[11] See for details Section 4.3 Household and Community level

2.1.1. Object 2 and Outputs

Table 5: Summary of the assessment of object 2 and outputs

Object 2	Outputs		Measurement Indicators
	Process	Outcome	
Expand and deepen network to other CSOs and officials to promote EVD	• Collaboration with Gramashakthi in Sri Lanka, Engagement of external consultants and experts working on EVD technologies/techniques in India, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh & Nepal • Exposure visits to EVD field by government and CSO in Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, India, and Nepal • Presentation in National Steering Committee/District Planning/Review Meeting in Bangladesh and Sri Lanka.	• Awareness among EVD partners increased • VDPs made by Development officials trained in the ToT in Sri Lanka • National level Consultations with Government, CSOs & Media in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, and Sri Lanka • Biogas on wheels at Najafgarfgarh, Delhi by INSEDA • EVD villages are established as exposure and exchange visit for learnings by experts, CSOs in India, Nepal, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka	• 11% rise in overall membership and 8% rise in members working on the renewal energy among CANSA network partners • Requests by District council to provide resources to awareness meeting- Gramashakthi • Invited by local wards as a resource person for sharing EVD concept among villagers of their respective wards in Nepal

4.1.3. Object 3 and Outputs

Table 6: Summary of the assessment of object 3 specific key outputs:

Object 3	Outputs		Measurement Indicators
	Process	Outcome	
Engage decision makers and climate negotiators	• Side events in COP23 and SB 48 attended by all Partners to share EVD as future solutions • Participation in Government planning /CANSA Partners meeting • Disseminated EVD in Asia-Pacific Summit on Sustainable Development • Contributed to Blue-green policy in Sri Lanka, Smart Village in Madhya Pradesh, India • Collaboration with local government to implement the project in Nepal.	• INSEDA invited by Chief of Energy Department, UN-Habitat Centre, Kenya to capacitate and facilitate implementation of EVD in Kenya • Shared and created awareness about EVD solutions to a group of representatives from Sri Lanka Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment, Climate Change Secretariat, Ministry of Sustainable Development and Wildlife, Matale District Secretariat • Participated and shared EVD findings at UNFCCC COP23 and SB 48 Side-Events and Exhibitions, and launching Publications and Policy Briefs as well as UNFCCC Talanoa Dialogue Platform Submission and Story Session at SB48, 6 May 2018. Weightage to our project activities (training and events) in Nepal.	• Publishing *Sustainable Energy News* (2000 copies), distributed during UNFCCC negotiations COP23 Nov. 2017, and SB48 in May 2018 and via mail (1200 copies), email (1000 contacts), internet as pdf. Issue No. 81, 82 and earlier issues http://www.inforse.org/s_e_news.php3, • EVD Policy Brief at UNFCCC (SB48, COP23) • ASFSD 2018 Round-Table SDG7:http://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/APFSD_Roundtable_SDG_7_Report_Final.pdf • Publishing, launching publication: *"WHITE PAPER*: *Climate Mitigation and Adaption with Eco-Village Development (EVD) Solutions in South Asia"* (45 pp), May 2018.See http://www.inforse.org/doc/Pub_EVD_White_Paper_Mitigation_Adaptation_May_2018.pdf - • CAN ECO Newsletter 10/5-18, article *"Let the N*DCs *fly",* http://eco.climatenetwork.org/sb48-eco10/ • Notes from UNFCCC APA3 negotiation *notes and* di*alogues with APA3 negotiators*

4.1.4.Object 4 and Outputs

Table 7: Summary of the assessment of object 4 and outputs

Object 4	Outputs		Measurement Indicators
	Process	Outcome	
The inclusion of EVD in local, sub-national, national policies and priority.	• In Bangladesh, applied for Green Climate Fund as a project of EVD in help from the Ministry of Planning • State consultations organized in UP, Odisha, Sikkim, Madhya Pradesh, and Kerala, India (UP and Odisha) to integrate EVD solutions into the ongoing plans and schemes • "EVD model" in one-house one farm in Bangladesh • Linking with Gramashakthi people's movement in Sri Lanka • Contribution in developing guidelines in the Blue-Green policy of Sri Lanka • Coordination and collaboration with local government in Nepal with technical inputs and support of one staff in local government.	• GCF project proposal on EVD model has been short-listed in the Ministry of Planning • Rolling out of Smart Village in MP/Carbon neutral Panchayat programme • Promotion of off-seasonal farming and micro-irrigation techniques under the plastic tunnel in Nepal • Bangladesh Renewable Energy Association and Grameen Shakti, GCF proposal focusing on EVD – Bangladesh • Acknowledgment by the Sri Lankan government of IDEA's contribution in Blue Green policies and Gramashakthi movement. Developing guidelines etc. • The inclusion of EVD component in local annual plan of the rural municipality, Nepal.	• http://erd.portal.gov.bd/sites/default/files/files/erd.portal.gov.bd/npfblock/Bangladesh_GCF-CP_Draft.pdf • Reference of EVD is made (Ref: 1, Page 3 & 10; http://www4.unfccc.int/ndcregistry/PublishedDocuments/Bangladesh%20First/INDC_2015_of_Bangladesh.pdf) • In Nepal, the policy adopted " 1 house, 5 trees program/1 house -1 improved hybrid cock stove" • Expert Consultation meeting organized by IDEA with the Ministry to develop guidelines for • Contribution in Blue-Green policy guideline Sri Lanka • EVD National Dialogue organized by IDEA with Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment, Ministry of Sustainable Development and Institute (NERD) - Sep 2018. • Panelists at the National Bluegreen Village at Sri Lanka NEXT "A Bluegreen Era" Conference, Oct 2018. • GCF concept proposal on EVD submitted in http://erd.portal.gov.bd/sites/default/files/files/erd.portal.gov.bd/npfblock/Bangladesh_GCF-CP_Draft.pdf.

4.1.5. Summary

Overall both the project objectives and four success criteria were addressed. These can be classified into four operation objects that had distinct logic, the 1st object had an intervention logic; the 2nd object had inter and intracommunity and CSOs (NGOs) collaboration logic; 3rd object had policy (government) collaboration logic and 4th object had transformation logic. The outputs assessment of all the 4 objects suggests that the project has achieved intervention logic as its best, followed by the collaboration with the inter-intracommunity and CSOs collaboration. While the collaboration at policy and government level needs to be strengthened based on success, such as Blue-Green in Sri Lanka, Climate Smart Village in Madhya Pradesh, India, and the inclusion of EVD in the local plan by the Local Self Government in Nepal indicates potential policy shifts in future. The outputs on object 3rd and 4th reflect limited success, however, the acknowledgment of EVD as an alternative solution by the decision makers and experts indicates the potential for a significant rise in outcomes in future. The demonstration of intervention and collaborative engagement with decision makers, it is expected to influence the inclusion of EVD solutions at National and Sub National levels policies and plans.

The EVD project partners can also be categorized as CSO, such as IDEA, CRT, Grameen Shakti, and INSEDA, while INFORSE and CANSA as Networks. The objectives-output ratio can further be analyzed between CSO partners' outputs and network as collective outputs. Objectives and outputs within the control of CSO are better in terms of success than objective/s dependent on collaboration. The output of CSO partners reflects substantive success on the ground. The project shall accelerate outputs and outcomes if *intervention* outputs are designed for CSO partners, and *collaborative* outputs are defined with specific roles and responsibilities between the two network partners, namely INFORSE and CANSA. The EVD outputs can be separated between the inclusion of EVD in government programmes and inclusion in policies.

4.2 ADVOCACY AND ACTORS

The EVD project evaluated advocacy initiatives and its impact at three types, policy level, organizational system level (within and with CSOs) and community level. *Policy level advocacy evaluated* initiatives that targeted changes in policies, plans or legislation. It assessed the impact that targeted members of the administration, legislators, and elected officials making decisions related to EVD in related programmes in the departments and ministries. The evaluation at the policy level aimed to understand the creation of new policies or amendment in the existing policies and practices in government programmes. *Organizational systems level advocacy* was evaluated on initiatives aimed at bringing about positive change in programs and practices at the CSO's organizational level. It evaluated internal

organizational/intra-organizational (CSO partners) systems and initiatives. And the third level was evaluated as *Advocacy for attitude and behavior change.* It evaluated initiatives/programs that mobilize/target households/communities, sub-regional and national level decision makers in government and CSOs. The desired outcome in terms of EVD technology adaptation and behavioral or attitudinal change towards EVD solutions as a choice at household and community level is extremely high. Decision makers and CSOs also find EVD as a sustainable option.

4.2.1. Policy Advocacy, System Advocacy and Advocacy for Attitude and Behavioral Change

Table 8: Assessment of Policy, System and Behavioral Advocacy

Advocacy Type	Key Outputs
Policy Advocacy	• Developing guidelines for the National 10000 Blue-Green village development in Sri Lanka • Facilitating Government of Madhya Pradesh, India in the launch of Smart Village • The inclusion of EVD solutions in Municipal plan Nepal. Engagement of CRT and support of one CRT employee for a year with Local Self Government in Bethanchok Rural Municipality (BRM) in Nepal, helped in influencing adoption of EVD solutions and allocation of the budget on EVD in the municipal level plan. • White Paper: Climate Mitigation and Adaption with Eco-Village Development (EVD) Solutions in South Asia • Participation and dissemination of EVD solutions in Forums/Workshops; Training of CSOs at National Level • Engagement with experts and dialogue with decision makers and exposure visits to EVD villages for Decision Makers
Systems Advocacy	• Participation and EVD solutions dissemination by the CSO project team in International/National/Sub Regional Forums helped in internalization of EVD within the CSOs. • Extension knowledge of EVD solutions and adoption among the CANSA and INFORSE Members • Training Module (ToT) for capacity building on EVD solutions shall further transform capacity of CSOs on EVD solutions • EVD CSOs partners improved collaboration with government and funding agencies. For e.g. GCF proposal has been submitted and shortlisted for funding in Bangladesh.

	Similarly, all the partners are working towards the extension of a new project on EVD lines.
Advocacy for attitude and behavior change	• Adaptation and utilization of EVD solutions, such as solar water and hydraulic water pump, hybrid cook stove, street light, organic farming, stove, kitchen garden, biomass, grating, solar and biomass dryer, rooftop water harvesting unit. All these experiments in villages have resulted in adaptation and increased demand for EVD solutions by the users. • The acceptability of these solutions as a sustainable option has influenced decision makers in government and like-minded CSOs (NGOs) and CBOs in the respective areas to include EVD solutions within the existing government programme. Several funding agencies have shown interest to support EVD, such as GTZ in Bangladesh, Oxfam in Sri Lanka, etc.

4.2.2. Stakeholders and Advocacy Activity Assessment

The project has fairly well succeeded in the installation of EVD solutions to demonstrate it as a policy alternative. It was critical to evaluate the practices supported and adopted by four levels of stakeholders, namely national, sub-regional (state/district) government, and community members. Summary of policy and adopted practices by stakeholders are summarized in table 9 below:

Table 9: National Level Government

Stakeholders	Activities Undertaken	
	Policy Addressed	Practices supported and adopted by stakeholders
National Government	Local Adaptation Plan and Environment-Friendly Local Governance Framework (EFLG) 2013 in Nepal INDC of Bangladesh 2015, NDC Implementation and Five-Years Master Plan (2015-2020) and Renewable Energy Policy 2008 in Bangladesh	Improved energy access in off-grid areas and remote high lands of Nepal and poor communities in Bangladesh Advocacy of biogas technologies in waste to energy segment in India and Bangladesh Reduction in indoor air pollution by advocating for cleaner cooking solutions in Nepal and Seri Lanka .

	Blue Green village development programme, Sri Lanka	Developing guidelines of 10000 Blue-green village development programme- Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment. Gramashakthi People's movement- Presidential Secretariat, Sri Lanka.

The success of IDEA, Sri Lanka in Blue-Green policy suggests evidence on the ground with proven solutions and engagement of CSOs senior members, including board members establish credibility and enables policy advocacy. This is a result of policy gap analysis and convergence with workable solutions to bridge the gap. Current policy paradigm with high acceptability to introduce climate-sensitive solutions, suggests stakeholders engagement with evidence-based alternate solutions that have potential to upscale and sustain at low cost has a high probability of policy inclusion.

Table 10: Sub-Regional /Provincial Government Level

Stakeholders	Activities Undertaken	
	Policy Addressed	Practices supported and adopted by stakeholders
Sub-regional Government	Gramashakthi People's Movement- Presidential Secretariat, Sri Lanka Local Planning Process in Sri Lanka and Nepal Climate Smart Village Programme in Madhya Pradesh; Carbon Neutral Menangadi Panchayat and Carbon Neutral Wayanad in Kerala (UP and Odisha), India The inclusion of EVD solutions in local plan and allocation of budget in Nepal	ToT for Gramashakthi officials on climate change, EVD, and Participatory village Development planning. More than 80% of the trained development officials in Matale district have developed VDPs for their respective villages. CRT employed a professional for a year to facilitate newly elected and established Rural Municipality. The inclusion of EVD component in the annual local plan for the Municipality and for each 6 wards

At Sub- Regional level, the strategy of CRT Nepal has been to engage with newly established Local Government by providing human resource support initially, paying the salary for one year of one person. Along with engagement of Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) and local resource persons in the area, the partnership with the local self-government office is an extremely good strategy to establish the network and incorporate EVD solutions in the local plan. This partnership was further strengthened with the engagement of local network partners who have credibility at the local level.

Similarly, engagement of a local CBO by CRT, Nepal, and IDEA in Sri Lanka has also worked for EVD technology extension with increased presence and partnership with community and government. The partnership with CBOs improves efficiency by reducing the cost of mobilization and increase effectiveness with their established rapport with the community. It also promotes sustainability through the creation of local human capital of the CBOs on EVD. Extensive engagement with district officers in Sri Lanka, while intensive engagement through support professional in local government in Nepal is a good strategy to create and sustain local capability of a government agency on EVD solutions.

Table 11: Community and Households activities are undertaken[12]

Stakeholders	Activities Undertaken	
	Policy Addressed	Practices supported and adopted by stakeholders
Community	Community-based Village Development Planning using Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) skills, Sri Lanka Bangladesh Climate Change Trust Fund Project	Government officials trained in the district on PRA as resource personnel Adopted Organic Farming & Kitchen garden in every household in the project area. Grafting and scientific intervention in Sri Lanka Livelihoods (Solar/Biomass Drier) Domestic/Commercial Stove in India and Sri Lanka & Biogas in Bangladesh

[12] For details on community and household-based initiatives, pl see section 4.3

Household	One House-One Farm, Bangladesh, Almost every household of Bangladesh, India and Sri Lanka adopted Kitchen garden.	Improved Cook Stove (Kitchen) in Sri Lanka, green playhouse in Nepal, biogas plants in India, solar street light in Bangladesh

Summary

Policy Advocacy: At the international level, the White Paper developed by INFORSE in collaboration with CSO partners and the side events in COP have potential impact in extending EVD knowledge. The engagement of IDEA with the Government of Sri Lanka on designing of Blue-Green policy is exemplary. CANSA engagement with the State of Madhya Pradesh in India and CRT engagement with Local Self Government for the inclusion of EVD in local plan and IDEA engagement with Sub-Regional Government illustrates potential partnership for the inclusion of EVD and large-scale impact in the respective policies.

Systems Advocacy: All the EVD CSO partners because of evidence and experience of EVD project have built their capability and conviction on EVD solutions. The sense of ownership among the CSO team is further strengthened as some of these solutions are also 'indigenous creation', *HEERA* in India and *Anagi* in Sri Lanka. The technical expertise of the CSO partners for technology extension are well in place, however, the capability to establish evidence (causal explanation) for policy alternatives can be strengthened with policy analysis through evidence-based knowledge network.

Advocacy for attitude and behavior change: The project partners have made an impact at the community level, especially at the beneficiary level in attitude and behavioral changes. The CSOs other than EVD project partners have gained insights on EVD solutions. A preference to adopt EVD technologies and techniques are evident from organic farming, kitchen garden, cooking stove, biogas, solar dryer at the household level, whereas at community level organic farming, solar street light, hydraulic water pump, biomass dryer, and institutional eco-friendly hybrid cooking stoves have established demand. The strength of household and community-based EVD solutions lies in technology/technique based environmental friendly local solutions. EVD is often used as complementary solutions replacing the unfriendly old unsustainable methods. For an example traditional wood stove replaced with energy efficient stoves has complimentary benefits, it is cost-efficient, healthy and environmentally friendly.

More importantly, the demand among the important community members to adopt EVD solutions is evident among the non-EVD users and decision makers in government are established.

4.3. VILLAGE AND HOUSEHOLD ADAPTATION OF LOCAL SOLUTIONS

Since the project was initially designed to demonstrate evidence and advocate in the first project and designed in the second project to upscale EVD solutions based on evidence and experiences at households and village levels for policy advocacy, it was important to assess EVD at the village and household level. Adaptation of EVD solutions as effective local solutions helped evaluation to understand the scale, size, and sustainability of impact. The four implementing partners, Grameen Shakti, Bangladesh; INSEDA, India; CRT, Nepal and IDEA, Sri Lanka field of operation varies from 3 to 5 villages. The introduction to EVD solutions is varied as it is based on local need and viable options. For an example, solar street lights, groundwater solar pump in school in Bangladesh, biomass solar dryer in Sri Lanka and hydraulic water pump in Nepal are EVD solutions at the community level. While hybrid cook stove, kitchen garden, organic farming, mushroom cultivation, solar dryer are adopted in India, Nepal, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka as a household-based intervention. Some EVD solutions are common across the partners, such as kitchen garden while few are distinctly suited to the local habitat. EVD intervention also varies in the scale of impact and scope of benefit distribution in terms of the number of people benefited, income generated along with environmental gain towards sustainability. Such as solar dryer in India is household-based and provides income opportunity to one family, while biomass dryer in Sri Lanka provides income opportunities to community members, both vary in the cost of installation, running cost and livelihoods generation. Overall, the Return on Investment (RoI) or Social Rate of Return (SRoI) to community members' makes bio-mass dryer higher value of return, making it more low cost than the household dryer. Similarly, hydraulic drinking water facility in Nepal and solar water pump in Bangladesh and solar street lights in Bangladesh is extremely high on Social Return on Investment (SRoI). Water supply after the Nepal earthquake has helped the community in multiple ways to recover, while street lights installed in Bangladesh apart from lighting has created social security and a collective platform for women and children. Similarly, solar water pump installed in a school in Bangladesh provides safe drinking water to children as well as in and around villages. The Kitchen Garden and hybrid cock stove initiatives across the partners have resulted in fulfilling immediate need and has created an effective source of kitchen waste-water utilization.

Though household based initiatives may be low in SRoI ad RoI, it possesses less survival (sustainability) risk due to individual benefits and ownership. While the community-based solutions remain under the survival risk due to community-based return with limited ownership, it may lack community ownership for repair and maintenance. Therefore, the community-based EVD solutions impact is extremely high on a scale with gain for more number of community members; it possesses a risk of sustainability due to the lack of community-based operation and management. It would be critical to establish a community-based

sustainable strategy for repair and maintenance with equitable sharing of profit. The EVD technologies would also require corpus to sustain repair and maintenance.

Table 12: Summary of EVD solutions-based initiative by respective partners is as follows:*

Village Level EVD Solutions	HH Adaptation to local solutions and its impact					
	No./Country of the Village	Total No. of HH in Village	No. of HH Adopted Solution	No. of HH do not have access to EVD Solutions	Direct benefit (Social/health Impact) on Women & Children	Direct Environmental Benefits at Village Level
Roof Water Harvesting	5/I	420 (-1)	47	373	Water Storage/Reduction of a burden on women Risk of water scarcity Water available for Home Garden/Toilet	Water conservation practices Climate Adaptive Strategy
	3/SL	227	6	221		
	1/N	37	24	13		
			77	607		
Biogas/slurry pit (Repair/Construction/Maintenance)	4/1	420	3	417	Less pollution in the environment. Reduce expenditures on fuel	The slurry used as the fertilizer Renewable Energy Reduce Emission
	1/B	80	10	70		
	1/N	45	2	10 (23 already have)		
			15	497		

Village Level EVD Solutions	HH Adaptation to local solutions and its impact					
	Name of the Village	Total No. of HH in Village	No. of HH Adopted Solution	No. of HH do not have Access to EVD Solution	Direct benefit (Social/health Impact) on Women & Children	Direct Environmental Benefits at Village Level
Solar Dryer	4/1	420	3	417	Color and essence of the dried items are retained Additional Income through SL	Productive utilization of local resources and lowered wastage of local fruits, vegetables, and spices, biomass waste
Biomass Dryer	1/SL	58	5 BD (community Access) 1 SD (1)	Communit y Access		
Organic home farming /kitchen garden	4/I	420	400 320	20	Health Sustainable Farming	Organic Farming Reduce Chemical
	1/B	80	10	70		
	3/SL	227	55	172		
			465	262		

Village Level EVD Solutions	HH Adaptation to local solutions and its impact					
	Name of the Village	Total No. of HH in Village	No. of HH Adopted Solution	No. of HH did not Adopt Solution	Direct benefit (Social/health Impact) on Women & Children	Direct Environmental Benefits at Village Level
Cookstove Inst HH	4/I	420	15	405	Reduce Firewood 2 meal at a time, Less waste heat/smoke Mobile Charging Multi-purpose simultaneous benefit Decrease health risk Improved safety	Less pollution Lower Carbon emissions
	3/N	108	108	0		
	2/SL 3/SL	169 227	2 78	N/A		

			205		Additional income to the household	
Poly Green House Plastic tunnel (off-seasonal vegetable farming)	4/I	420	8	412	High-value organic crop sapling Off-seasonal vegetable production,	Climate adaptive technology
	3/N	108	33	75		

Village Level EVD Solutions	HH Adaptation to local solutions and its impact					
	Name of the Village	Total No. of HH in Village	No. of HH Adopted Solution	No. of HH do not have Access to EVD Solutions	Direct benefit (Social/health Impact) on Women & Children	Direct Environmental Benefits at Village Level
Improved Water Mill	2/N	71	71	0	Generate Income	Replace the diesel mills
Hydraulic Ram Pump	1/N	26	26	0	Better Water Access	Zero external energy required for lifting water Alternative for the diesel pump
Solar Home System	2/N	71	53	8 (Already Have)	Better Light, reduce kerosene	Reduce pollution/emission
Wastewater/micro irrigation	2/N	71	18	53	vegetable production, More Income	Reuse/utilization of water
Fish Pond	1/N	45	10	35	Nutrition/Income	Water conservation
Cow Shed Mgt	2/N	71	43	28	Clean Hygiene	
Toilet Construction	1/N	37	9	28 (Already Had)	Health/Hygiene/Sanitation	Less Soil Pollution

Village Level EVD Solutions	HH Adaptation to local solutions and its impact					
	Name of the Village	Total No. of HH in Village	No. of HH Adopted Solution	No. of HH do not have access to EVD Solutions	Direct benefit (Social/health Impact) on Women & Children	Direct Environmental Benefits at Village Level
Solar Water Pump	1/B	70	Installed at School (255 students + Villagers)		Clean water (arsenic and iron free) for the local community and school	Reduce use of Diesel Less exploitation of water
Heat Retained Cooker	1/B	50	15	35		
Solar Street Light	1/B	50	50	0	Social Security Effective use of time after sunset	Reduction of Kerosene oil
Betel, Ginger Turmeric Plantations	3/SL	227	60	---	Improved income	Income without the use of chemical
Bee Keeping	2/SL	169	5	---	Pollination improved Yield, Health, Income	
Mushroom	3/SL 1/I	227 255	4 1	----	Improved Income	
Traditional Ola leaf products	1/SL	110	10 Trained 2 Adopted	--	Locally available Skills/Resources Income	Decrease polythene use and promote the use of biodegradable products.

*Pl Note: B stands for Bangladesh, I stands for India, N for Nepal, and SL for Sri Lanka

Summary

The EVD technology solutions as a choice are driven by environmental benefits; some are indigenously developed while others are ingenious to suit the local needs. Overall the project has successfully worked with the select households to demonstrate EVD solutions and demonstrate its effect. However, with the rise in awareness and increased realization of benefits, large numbers of households are unattended with EVD technologies. The success of EVD lies in horizontal upscale within the community and vertical upscale in the policy and government programmes. The horizontal community based upscale will depend upon financial and human resources available and in some cases such as cook stove may require market-based strategy to upscale for EVD solutions.

The project has the potential to advocate technological solutions that have both adaptation and mitigation benefits, however, causal and comparative explanation on EVD evidence and the knowledge-based network will be required to upscale policy advocacy. Causal and comparative evidence-based explanation will enable the network advocacy partners INFORSE and CANSA to capacitate the CSOs across South Asia on potential policy shifts and IDEA, CRT, INSEDA, and Grameen Shakti can capacitate decision makers at the district and national level government agencies. The national partners will also gain with trend analysis of the impact, CSOs can adopt case-control method (compare EVD impact between the user and not users) to illustrate the impact group and its influence in national level policy shifts. Overall, EVD technology or EVD technical know-how has improved environmental and equitable benefits.

5. **LEARNING AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

EVD is an extremely good sustainable alternative. Its co-benefits on the environment and economic gain with a user-friendly adaptation are evident on the ground. It is best understood as a low-cost technology with triple gain, socially acceptable, environmental suitable and gender neutral. The project is ready with field-based tested technology (scientific) solutions. Different technologies have a differential scale of impact and are at different stage of innovation and implementation. The EVD concept is the village level, while the unit of intervention is mostly at household. Some of the initiatives are at the community level and its scale of impact is higher than the household level interventions. The community-level intervention though has a higher impact, but possess sustainability challenge without inbuilt community-based repair and maintenance mechanism. Overall, the village or household level impact of EVD are extremely high but possess risks of sustainability due to the high focus on innovation and installation and less on institutionalization at the community level. To upscale and advocate for inclusion in the international policy framework, it requires operational EVD framework that entails engagement and empowerment along with scientific evidence. Scientific evidence for advocacy should be methodologically established causal explanation of EVD intervention and its impact. Advocacy efforts based on a set of anecdotes limits the scope and speed of policy changes.

5.1. Evidence, Engagement, and Empowerment

The advocacy impact at policy and programmes of local government is a consequence of evidence created, engagement established and empowerment achieved through EVD solutions. The capability of the CSOs to understand how evidence can contribute to pro-poor policy advocacy, availability of evidence, its dissemination in policy forums and communication to policymakers make policy advocacy successful. The learning also suggests that advocacy for attitude and behavioral change at the community as stakeholders, who influence policy decisions and who get impacted by policies as users on the ground is critical. Demonstration on ground accelerates the attitudinal change of users as well as local decision makers, while exposure visits by the policymakers to EVD villages influence local government, policy papers can make a dent among the larger audience.

Overall, the EVD project assessment suggests different levels of success on the three advocacy parameters of evidence, engagement, and empowerments. The cumulative score by the CSOs and the consultant's review suggests the EVD project score as follows:

Table 12: Score on Evidence, Engagement & Empowerment

S.No	Key Parameters of EVD Partners Performances	Score*				
		1	2	3	4	5
1.	*Level of Evidence:* identified and established causal links between alternate solutions and desired policy shifts on EVD					
2.	*Level of Engagement*: encouraged decision makers/policy makers/facilitators to speak on pro-poor local climate solutions					
3.	*Level of Empowerment*: supported the poor to practice and propagate sustainable local climate solutions practices					

*NOTE: 1 is low and 5 as extremely high)

The CSOs responses[13] and field visits suggest that the EVD project has relatively performed better on empowerment of the CSO partners and EVD users in the villages. Though engagement with community members, specially targeted families is extremely good in all project areas, engagement with local and regional government authorities and national policymakers varies across partners. While engagement with local government is best, engagement with the sub-national or district level government and the National government is relatively less than desired for policy change[14]. Success in Sri Lanka[15] is with Blue-Green policy and engagement with local government in Nepal bestows possibilities and potential of enriching this partnership across project partners in Bangladesh, India, and Nepal. Relatively low engagement with decision makers is an outcome of both, lack of documentation of systematic policy evidence on EVD gain and loss due to ongoing non-EVD policies/programmes. The unit of intervention being relatively small in the size in comparison to the target population for policy shift also reduces universality of its application as a model village.

5.2. Advocacy and Action Centric Assessment

Ultimately the success of the project lies in the capacity of CSO partners to advocate. The cumulative assessment of all 6 CSOs and consultants evaluations on the four critical policy advocacy activities are stated below in table 13.

[13] See Annexure: Evaluation presentation for details.
[14] See Table 3 for details
[15] IDEA engagement in Blue-Green Policy is exemplary

Table 13: Advocacy activities and Assessment

S. No.	Advocacy Activities	Overall Assessment
1.	CSOs *understand better* how evidence can contribute to pro-poor policy advocacy	The partners understand the relevance of the evidence.
2.	Evidence on EVD and how this evidence (skills) contributed to pro-poor advocacy is *available* to CSOs	Though there are several cases, newsletter documentations, including white paper. Success such as inclusion in Blue-Green in Sri Lanka, Sub-Regional Plan in Nepal and India suggests EVD can further be included in National Policy framework if evidence is established on EVD practice-policy as policy alternatives.
3.	CSOs *disseminated* evidence in policy forums to promote pro-poor local solutions.	Partners leveraged existing Energy & Climate Change Network, INFORSE and CANSA and organized and disseminated EVD solutions. EVD solutions as an alternative were also showcased in COP. The engagement was directed to like-minded CSOs and community members though reach to negotiators and government representatives established, it can be further strengthened.
4.	CSOs collected, collated, communicated evidence to policymakers.	Partners with experience and expertise focused more to demonstrate EVD solutions.

5.3 Recommendations

Overall, the project has strengthened CSOs organizational capacity and credibility. The project has strengthened the partnership of CSOs with EVD users. The partnership with government various across the partners, however, it is best at the local government and subsequently declines at Sub-regional government and National government. The project in future can leverage with vast CSO network partners of CANSA and INFORSE with a systematic analysis of EVD practice –policy.

Learning from the overall performance of the EVD project on essential three key policy outcome parameters; evidence, engagement and empowerment and four essential CSOs capacity to advocate suggests that CSOs can adopt an EVD framework in future to upscale solutions.

Table 14. Suggested EVD Operational Framework

Essential Policy Advocacy Outcome	EVD Policy Advocacy
1. Evidence identified and established causal links between alternate solutions and desired policy shifts on EVD (a case-control or randomized control trial can be adopted) 2. Engagement encouraged decision makers/policy makers/facilitators to speak on pro-poor local climate solutions 3. Empowerment supported the poor to practice and propagate sustainable local climate solutions practices	
Essential CSOs Capacity to Advocate	
1. CSOs understand better how evidence can contribute to pro-poor policy advocacy 2. Evidence on EVD and how this evidence (skills) contributed to pro-poor advocacy is available to CSOs 3. CSOs disseminated evidence in policy forums to promote pro-poor local solutions. 4. CSOs collected, collated, communicated evidence to policymakers	

EVD project to operationalize the above framework for improving effectiveness and the efficiency of the technological solutions can adopt the followings:

Individual CSO partners

3. Adopt ecosystem (holistic) approach i.e. shift from individual solutions i.e. stove to space such as the improved kitchen.
4. Design co-financing/community-based management system.
5. Identify strategic policy issues and areas within the existing national policy framework for advocacy, and analyze activities-outputs as policy alternatives.

Network Partners

2. To upscale at South Asia or International framework, identify unique and complementary evidence across partners and link it with specific sources for policy influence.

Overall, all the project partners

4. Delineate experiences (anecdotes) with evidence for the transformative outcome.
5. Design specific outputs based roles of Network Partners for the collaborative outcome to incubate EVD solutions in policies.
6. Define EVD distinct characteristics/principles for effective policy advocacy.

Summary

EVD advocacy is an attempt to change people, practices, and policies to a predetermined desired state that is built on evidence and experience. The depth of experience and evidence with systemic linking of the policy-practices and successful demonstration of practical solutions will enable partners to influence policy and upscale impact among people outside the project area. To demonstrate EVD impact at the village level, the project must identify core areas of EVD solutions at the community level and try to solve common concern through common endeavors across South Asia. This would enrich the collective strength of South Asian experiments.

ANNEXURE:1

CSO Evaluation: Guideline for **Self Reporting Collective Reflective**

(To be filled by Team Members of Partner CSO)

A. Questionnaire

3. All fact is **correct and supported by evidence**.
4. The reporting is a **not individual opinion/experience**, it adopts the participatory method for collective views/data from team members. The core value **evaluation adopts is participatory assessment and learning's methods.**
5. The Questionnaire has three sections:

Retrospective Analysis

a. Section A is Overall Evaluation
b. Section B is to establish an association with Objective, Activities, Outputs & Impact.

Prospective Analysis

c. Section C is to analyze project based on Learning for future.

Field Visit

6. The response will be collectively (consultant + Partner) triangulated with stakeholders/report/other sources and forms of evidence during the field visit.
    a. 1st Day: Understanding the Project and Progress (Sharing of data/information/insights with CSO Team)
    b. 2nd Day: Field Visit (2 Village/ Stakeholders: Interview and Focus Group Discussions)
    c. 3rd Day: Field Visit (2 Village/ Stakeholders: Interview and Focus Group Discussions)

NAME & ADDRESS OF THE ORGANISATION

NAME OF THE REPORTING (CONTACT) PERSON:

NAME OF THE TEAM MEMBERS WHO WERE PART OF THIS REPORT:

SECTION A: OVERALL PROJECT OUTCOMES

1. **How has the project improved?** (It intends to change project has made on critical advocacy enabling parameters)

S.No.	Key Parameters	Score*				
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1.	*Level of Evidence:* identified and established causal links between alternate solutions and desired policy shifts on EVD					
2.	*Level of Engagement*: encouraged decision makers/policy makers/facilitators to speak on pro-poor local climate solutions					
3.	*Level of Empowerment*: supported the poor to practice and propagate sustainable local climate solutions practices					

*NOTE: 1 is low and 5 as extremely high)

2. What project has advocated and made a change at policy, process, and people level?

S.No.	Advocacy Type	Initiative*	Impact*
1.	***Policy advocacy:*** Actions/initiatives that target changes in policies or legislation. It target members of the administration, legislators, and elected officials. It aims to create new policies or change in the existing policies for the benefit of disadvantaged communities.		
2.	***Systems advocacy:*** Initiatives aimed at bringing about positive change in programs and practices at the organizational level to benefit the marginalized population. It targets internal organizational/intra-organizational (CSO partners) systems.		
3.	***Advocacy for attitude and behavior change:*** Initiatives/programs that mobilize/target households/communities. The desired outcome is technology adaptation, behavioral or attitudinal change towards EVD at the beneficiary/community level.		

*NOTE: Provide evidence/link to evidence for your response.

Q 3. Rate your project on the 5 evaluation parameters.

S.No.	Overall Performance Parameters*	Rate (based on experience supported by evidence)				
		Very Good	Good	Average	Not So Good	Low
1.	**Relevance** (at least one family is better off and no person is worse off as a result-Pareto criterion used in selection)					
2.	**Efficiency** (Low-Cost Mitigation; Cost efficient activities adopted in the project)					
3.	**Effectiveness** (Does the set of activities result to outputs & total outputs achieves stated objectives)					
4.	**Impact** **4.1 Community Level:** Access, Replication, Income, Gender, migration, mitigation health; etc.					
	4,2 CSO Level: Capacity, Network, Evidence; Funding, etc					
5.	**Sustainability** (project activities at community and CSO will last after the completion of the project)					

*PL NOTE:

1. Relevance: The extent to which the objective of a project conforms to the target group's needs, as well as to the country's and partner organizations' strategies
2. Efficiency: The extent to which optimal value for money has been obtained in the spending of project funds
3. Effectiveness: The degree to which the project has succeeded in meeting its objectives
4. Impact: The lasting changes – positive as well as negative, planned as well as unplanned – arising from the project
5. Sustainability: The degree to which the processes started and results obtained can be expected to remain in place after project completion

Q 4. Rank the overall parameters in the order of performance/outcomes (*This is to compare the level of success on the 5 parameters*)

S.No.	Overall Performance Parameters	Rank them in the order of highest success to lowest between 1 to 5*				
		1	2	3	4	5
1.	Relevance					

2.	Efficiency					
3.	Effectiveness					
4.	Impact					
5.	Sustainability					

*Pl. NOTE: *It is a closed ranking, 1 as the best, and 5 is the least. YOU CAN GIVE ONLY ONE RANK for one parameter, i.e. there cannot be two parameters ranked as 1. I indicate best while 5 has least.*

FOR EXAMPLE : CSO XXXX

S.No.	Overall Performance Parameters	Rank them in the order of highest success to lowest between 1 to 5*				
		1 (Best)	2	3	4	5 (Least)
1.	Relevance	1				
2.	Efficiency				4	
3.	Effectiveness					5
4.	Impact		2			
5.	Sustainability			3		

Q 5. Rate the performance of your project across the stakeholders* *The above gives an understanding of scope and scale of intervention outcomes by the COSs.*

S.No	Overall Performance Parameters	Rate based on experience & evidence				
		Household	Community	CSO/NGO	Sub Regional (District/State)	National Level
1.	Relevance					
2.	Efficiency					
3.	Effectiveness					
4.	Impact					
5.	Sustainability					

*Pl NOTE: Rate as high, Low and Medium

FOR EXAMPLE CSO XXXX

S.No	Overall	Rate based on experience & evidence

	Performance Parameters	Household	Community	CSO/NGO	Sub Regional (District/State)	National Level
1.	Relevance	Low	low	High	medium	High
2.	Efficiency	Low	low	Medium	low	Low
3.	Effectiveness	Low	low	High	Low	Low
4.	Impact	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
5.	Sustainability	Low	Low	High	Low	Medium

SECTION B: OBJECTIVES AND OUTPUTS MAPPING

Q 6. Objectives and Outputs Mapping (Pl give the details)

S.No.	Your Project Objectives as per ToR	Outputs		Measurement Indicators (Sources of Evidence)
		Process (What You Did)	Outcome (What changes Occurred)	
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

Q 7. Objectives and Outputs Ranking

S.No.	Your Project Objectives as per ToR	Rank* (1,2,3,4)
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		

*NOTE: Rank **1as the best**-achieved objective within your project, 2,3,4 in descending order of success. It is **not an overall** ranking of the all partner project.

FOR EXAMPLE CSO XXXX

Q 7. Objectives and Outputs Ranking

S.No.	Your Project Objectives as per ToR	Rank* (1,2,3,4)
1.	Objective 1: Repair/maintain/improve/showcase EVD evidence base and capacity build end-users if needed	3
2.	Objective 2: Expand and deepen network to promote EVD	1
3.	Objective 3: Engage decision makers and climate negotiators	2
4.	Objective 4: Inclusion of EVD in local, sub-national, national policies and priority.	4

*NOTE: Rank **1as the best**-achieved objective within your project, 2,3,4 in descending order of success. It is **not an overall** ranking of the all partner project.

Q 8. Stakeholders and Advocacy Activity Mapping

S.No	Stakeholders	Activities Undertaken	
		Identify Policy that You addressed	Practices supported and adopted by stakeholders
1.	National Government		
2.	Sub-regional Government		
3.	Civil Society Organizations		
4.	Community		
5.	Household		

Q 9. Village Initiative and Household Adaptation of Local Solutions Mapping (Implementing Partners)

S.No	Village Level Solutions (What your project initiated)*	HH Adaptation to local solutions and its impact					
		Name of the Village	Total No. of HH in Village	No. of HH Adopted Solution	No. of HH did not Adopt Solution	Direct benefit (Social/health Impact) on Women & Children	Direct Environmental Benefits at Village Level
1.							
2.							
3.							

***For example** Improved Cocking Stove in Sri Lanka, Green Playhouse in Nepal, Bio-Gas plants in India, etc

Q 10. Advocacy and Actor Centric Mapping

S.No.	Advocacy Activities	Ratings				
		Excellent	**Above Average**	**Average**	**Satisfactory**	**Could have done Better**
1.	CSOs **understand better** how evidence can contribute to pro-poor policy advocacy					
2.	Evidence on EVD and how this evidence (skills) contributed to pro-poor advocacy is **available** to CSOs					
3.	CSOs **dissiminated** evidence in policy forums to promote pro-poor local solutions.					
4.	CSOs collected, collated, communicated evidence **to policymakers**					

FOR EXAMPLE CSO XXXX

Q 10. Advocacy and Actor Centric Mapping

S.No.	Advocacy Activities	Ratings				
		Excellent	**Above Average**	**Average**	**Satisfactory**	**Could have done Better**
1.	CSOs **understand better** how evidence can contribute to pro-poor policy advocacy					
2.	Evidence on EVD and how this evidence (skills) contributed to pro-poor advocacy is **available** to CSOs					
3.	CSOs **dissiminated** evidence in policy forums to promote pro-poor local solutions.					
4.	CSOs collected, collated, communicated evidence **to policymakers**					

Q 11. Advocacy capability and overall outcome

S.No.	Advocacy Capability (As part of the project)	Rate				
		Excellent	Very Good	Good	Not so Good	Below Expectation
1	Strengthened our Organizational Capacity					
2	Increased Evidence: data and analysis on EVD					
3	Strengthened partnership with Community					
4.	Strengthened partnership with Government					
5.	Strengthened partnership with CSOs (Network)					

FOR EXAMPLE CSO XXXX

Q 11. Advocacy capability and overall outcome

S.No.	Advocacy Capability (As part of the project)	Rate				
		Excellent	Very Good	Good	Not so Good	Below Expectation
1	Strengthened our Organizational Capacity					
2	Increased Evidence: data and analysis on EVD					
3	Strengthened partnership with Community					
4.	Strengthened partnership with Government					
5.	Strengthened partnership with CSOs (Network)					

SECTION C: PROSPECTIVE ANALYSIS

Pl responds in bullet points with evidence.

Q 12. What is/are the **most valuable** (Max.3) contribution/s your project has made? Pl illustrate with evidence.

Q 13. What **helped** you to accelerate (achieve) that happen?

Q.14. What was not possible for your CSO to achieve **without the EVD network partners**?

Q 15. What is the **situation** you could not change through the project?

Q 16. What **obstructed** (impede) you to achieve the desired change? (With reference to Q.15)

Q 17. What is the **change** in the project you would like to make in future? (if given an option)

Q.18. What has changed due to your project with reference to the "**baseline" on EVD**? Pl, give reference/source of information to substantiate your response.

ANNEXURE 2:

Consultant Evaluation Questionnaire

Name of the Organization:

A. RELEVANCE (Objectives-Activities-Outputs)

1. To what extent are the objectives of the programme still valid?
2. Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with society and state (policy)?
3. Are there key activities unaddressed to achieve impacts and desired effects?

B. EFFECTIVENESS (Aid attains objectives)

4. To what extent were the objectives achieved?
5. What were the major factors influencing achievement?
6. What are factors that may accelerate to achieve the objectives better?

C. EFFICIENCY (Utilisation of financial resources in comparison with possible alternatives)

7. Were cost-efficiency taken into consideration while selecting activities?
8. Were objectives achieved on time?
9. How does it compare with alternate options?
10. Does project adopt a strategy of integration with internal and external resources?

D. IMPACT (Policy and Practice [community & CSO Level])

11. Which policy has the project made an impact?
12. What are the practices (real differences to the beneficiaries) the project has made?
13. What difference has it made within (internal to) the CSO partners?
14. What are the critical outputs unattended (related to the objectives of the by the project)?

E. SUSTAINABILITY (Activity likely to continue after the project is over)

15. What are the key activities that will continue on its own at the community level?
16. What are the activities that will be adopted in policies?
17. What are the activities that CSO adopted as a consequence of the project may continue after the project is over?
18. Impact (Outcome) of a project that resulted/can result in sustainable solutions?