Final Evaluation of

Next generation low carbon, climate resilient Eco-Village Development in South Asia (EVD IV)

Dansk International Bosætningsservice (DIB)
International Network for Sustainable Energy (INFORSE)
Climate Action Network South Asia (CANSA)
Centre for Rural Technology (CRT/N)
Integrated Development Association (IDEA)
Integrated Sustainable Energy and Ecological Development Association (INSEDA)
Grameen Shakti (GS)

February 2024
Kris B. Prasada Rao

PEM CONSULT
PEOPLE • ENVIRONMENT • MANAGEMENT

Table of contents

Executive summary

1.1 The evaluation

The final evaluation was carried out in October 2023 – January 2024 to assess and document programme achievements vis-à-vis the stated objectives and expected results, review overall budget performance, assess the effects of the different implementation and upscaling strategies, draw out the impact of the programme, and provide recommendations on strategic adjustments for further collaboration among the partners. The evaluator reviewed available programme documentation, interviewed stakeholders, and visited programme sites in India, Nepal, and Sri Lanka.

1.2 The programme

Next generation low carbon, climate resilient Eco-Village Development in South Asia (EVD IV) was funded by a grant from CISU of DKK 4,316,431 and implemented from 15 June 2020 to 31 December 2023. Completion was originally scheduled for 15 December 2022, but extended mainly due the COVID-19 pandemic. The grant recipient was DIB, and implementation was carried out by an NGO partnership comprising DIB, INFORSE, CANSA, CRT/N (Nepal), Grameen Shakti (Bangladesh), IDEA (Sri Lanka), and INSEDA (India). The overall objective of EVD IV was to *achieve improved standard of living of climate vulnerable rural communities in South Asia by integration of local sustainable solutions that contribute to climate change mitigation, adaptation, and resilience building*. The immediate objectives were to 1) improve the lives in rural communities in Nepal, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and India through the establishment of EVD model villages, 2) provide local communities and stakeholders additional market access and business opportunities contributing to improved livelihood, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and 3) disseminate EVD and have EVD recognised by a broader audience from local to international level.

1.3 Conclusions

Relevance: EVD IV responded to global climate change processes, while targeting specific vulnerable communities and addressing their needs, in particular those of women. The programme sought to promote the EVD concept of implementing community-driven local solutions to address global climate change mitigation and adaptation objectives. Communities themselves identified their priorities and needs, based on which technologies were identified and implemented. This led to an integrated approach addressing mitigation, adaptation, and livelihoods, as these are intertwined at the local level. The communities targeted had a generally poor socio-economic status and were vulnerable to climate change; with the community in India being particularly marginalised. EVD IV specifically targeted and empowered women, who in particular benefitted from improved and cleaner cooking technologies, and most direct beneficiaries of livelihood support were women. The programme engaged local government actors and to varying degrees local civil society, but it proved challenging to engage the private sector. The experiences at the local level were linked to advocacy and communication efforts at sub-national, national, regional, and global levels (in particular UNFCCC COPs) to raise awareness of the value of local solutions and to promote further upscaling and replication of the EVD concept.

Coherence: The EVD partners achieved some synergy with other interventions. The mobilisation of significant WWF co-funding for installing a water supply system was instrumental for the successful engagement with the model village community in Nepal, and the WWF project also allowed for an extended field presence of CRT/N. Similarly, EVD IV unlocked local government funding for the installation of 100 rainwater harvesting systems in the model village in Bangladesh. Furthermore, the COP accreditation of INFORSE enabled COP participation by the EVD national partners.

Effectiveness: Overall, EVD IV was well implemented and demonstrated the viability of the EVD concept – but the objectives and targets were only partly achieved, as the scope of the programme was overly broad and overambitious. Overall, the programme was successfully implemented with good results in the model villages and considerable engagement in awareness raising at various levels. The dissemination of improved cookstoves in all villages and provision of improved access to water in Nepal and Bangladesh widely benefitted the communities, in particular women. The improved cookstoves were the primary reason that the climate change mitigation targets were achieved, and the improved water access was arguably the largest contribution towards achieving the adaptation targets. The agricultural and alternative livelihood activities, including the social enterprises, contributed to varying degrees to improving the livelihoods and enhancing the resilience of the direct beneficiaries. However, only a small proportion of the community members were reached by the livelihood activities, due to budget constraints, as the budget was spread out thinly to cover activities in four countries as well as at regional and global level. Market access constraints as well as a relatively short time available to build beneficiary capacities (the chosen model villages were new to the EVD partners) are other reasons for the adaptation and livelihood targets only being partly reached. Furthermore, there was a disconnect between field implementation and regional advocacy activities.

Efficiency: The programme was largely implemented in a timely manner and within budget – but transaction costs were high due to an overly complex programme design and an overambitious scope. Appropriate measures were made by the EVD partners in response to COVD-19 as well as local challenges, and the activities were delivered. The programme budget was largely executed albeit somewhat behind schedule. However, with the overly broad scope of the programme with several partners and countries and a small budget, transaction costs were high, which a significant proportion spent on salaries and fees.

Impact: EVD IV led to reduced greenhouse gas emissions and contributed to resilience and improving beneficiary lives in the model villages – but there has only been limited upscaling and replication. The programme achieved tangible reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, mainly achieved due to the improved cookstoves; which reduced the beneficiaries' use of firewood for cooking by 28-49 pct. The year-round access to drinking water contributed to an enhanced resilience to climate change and water scarcity. It is reasonable to assume that the improved cookstoves as well as the provision of clean drinking water led to improved health for the communities, especially for the women with the significantly reduced exposure to indoor air pollution. The improved cookstoves and the water access also reduced women's workload. The direct beneficiaries of agriculture and livelihood support obtained to varying degrees increased incomes, new income opportunities, reduced spending on agricultural products, and/or improved access to food and/or nutrition. However, upscaling and

replication of EVD solutions by local actors was limited due to financial and capacity constraints, despite a good level of interest. Similarly, there is limited evidence of EVD replication by other organisations. CRT/N and to a lesser extent IDEA were able to engage with other organisations and donors to implement EVD activities in other villages. The advocacy efforts did not lead to significant policy influence more broadly, although IDEA was able to influence Sri Lanka's National Climate Change Policy.

Sustainability: The results achieved in the model villages are not yet fully sustainable as beneficiaries and local actors are not able to continue with EVD due to remaining capacity and financial constraints – consolidating the results would require further support for the model villages and local authorities. The EVD partners had not worked in the four model villages prior to EVD IV and the communities had little prior experience with working with NGOs. The communities still face significant capacity constraints and are not yet fully empowered to maintain all programme gains without further support, yet alone to further upscale EVD. Some, but not all, solutions appear to be feasible for beneficiaries to maintain without further external support, but local authorities are not fully able to provide this. Sustainability to a significant extent hinges on a continued presence of the national EVD partners (although some activity types can be maintained and continued by the beneficiaries), but it is uncertain that the EVD partners will have access to financial resources for supporting the model villages and further implementation of the EVD concept.

1.4 Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Develop a strategy and approach for further deepening and expanding the EVD concept in the four model villages.

Recommendation 2: Engage systematically in fundraising for the EVD strategy for deepening and expanding EVD as EVD partnership and as individual NGOs.

Recommendation 3: Develop a plan for ensuring that the scope and level of ambition match the resources available.

Acronyms

CAN	Climate Action Network
CANSA	Climate Action Network South Asia
CISU	Civilsamfund i Udvikling/Civil Society in Development
COP	Conference of the Parties
CRT/N	Centre for Rural Technology
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CTCN	United Nations Climate Technology Centre & Network
DCRP	District Climate Resilience Plan
DIB	Dansk International Bosætningsservice
EFICOR	The Evangelical Fellowship of India Commission on Relief
EVD	Eco-Village Development
EVD IV	Eco-Village Development Phase IV: *Next generation low carbon, climate resilient Eco-Village Development in South Asia*
FCRA	Foreign Currency Regulation Act
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GS	Grameen Shakti
HH	Household
IADF	Integrated Agriculture Development Foundation
IDCOL	Infrastructure Development Company Limited
IDEA	Integrated Development Association
INFORSE	International Network for Sustainable Energy
INSEDA	Integrated Sustainable Energy and Ecological Development Association
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MFI	Microfinance Institution
NABARD	National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NLC	New Life Centre
RWH	Rainwater Harvesting
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
ToT	Training of Trainers
UN ECOSOC	United Nations Economic and Social Council
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UN HLPF	United Nations High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development
VoIP	Voice of Internet Protocol
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

2 Introduction

2.1 Evaluation objective and scope

The objectives of the evaluation of the "Next generation low carbon, climate resilient Eco-Village Development in South Asia" programme (EVD IV) were to:

1. Carry out an individual assessment and documentation of the programme achievements in relation to the stated objectives, the identified EVD-indicators, and expected results
2. Conduct an overall review of budget performance
3. Assess the effects of the different implementation and upscaling strategies used by the partners and the learnings hereof
4. Provide recommendations on strategic adjustments for further collaboration among the partners
5. Conduct a sampling of most significant changes to draw out some of the impacts of the programme

2.2 Evaluation methodology

The evaluation was carried out in October 2023 – January 2024. A combination of methods was used to gather information, and to triangulate information/data to ensure its solidity, drawing upon a review of available documentation for the programme (see annex 12), stakeholder interviews (see annex 11), and site visits and beneficiary focus group discussions in India, Nepal, and Sri Lanka.

Limitations: The evaluator could not visit Bangladesh due to budgetary constraints, nor could he visit Kandy (IDEA office), New Delhi (INSEDA office), Orissa (CANSA coordinator), or Aarhus (DIB and INFORSE offices). Hence, remote interviews were carried out using internet applications (VoIP). A small number of stakeholders was unavailable during the country visits. Due to financial constraints, no national consultants were engaged, and the evaluator relied on programme staff for translation, except in Nepal, where a student was mobilised by CRT/N for translation during the field visit. EVD IV outcome and impact data (e.g. the planned impact studies) were not available at the time of the evaluation, with the exception of calculations of carbon emission reductions. Similarly, financial audit reports were not available at the time of the evaluation.

2.3 EVD IV basic information

EVD IV was funded with a grant of DKK 4,316,431 from the CISU Civil Society Fund, administered by Civil Society in development (CISU) and financed by the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The programme commenced on 15 June 2020 and is scheduled for completion by end December 2023. Completion was originally scheduled for 15 December 2022, but the programme was extended three times (until June, October, December 2023), mainly due the COVID-19 pandemic.

The grant recipient was Dansk International Bosætningsservice (DIB), which was responsible for overall programme management, coordination, oversight, reporting to CISU, planning of partner meetings, and livelihood-related training for the implementing partners. The International Network for Sustainable Energy (INFORSE) was responsible for global advocacy activities, incl. facilitation of participation in UNFCCC COPs, development of a database on EVD

technologies and solutions, and development of publications in cooperation with other implementing partners (incl. a report on mitigation impacts and a publication describing EVD), and technical advice on EVD solutions and mitigation-related training workshops for the implementing partners. Climate Action Network South Asia (CANSA) was responsible for regional advocacy activities (incl. case studies), and adaptation-related training workshops for the implementing partners and other CANSA members. In-country field implementation of the EVD concept and advocacy was carried out by Centre for Rural Technology (CRT/N) in Nepal, Integrated Development Association (IDEA) in Sri Lanka, Integrated Sustainable Energy and Ecological Development Association (INSEDA) in India, and Grameen Shakti (GS) in Bangladesh.

The overall objective of EVD IV was to *achieve improved standard of living of climate vulnerable rural communities in South Asia by integration of local sustainable solutions that contribute to climate change mitigation, adaptation and resilience building*.

To reach this objective, the programme aimed at delivering three immediate objectives:

1. At the end of the programme rural communities in Nepal, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and India have improved their lives through the establishment of Eco-Village Development (EVD) model villages.
2. At the end of the programme local communities and stakeholders have additional market access and business opportunity to appropriate solutions contributing to improved livelihood, climate change mitigation and adaptation.
3. EVD has been disseminated to and recognized by a broader audience reaching from local to international level.

3 Evaluation findings and analysis

3.1 Contextual developments and the programme

The COVID-19 pandemic significantly affected programme delivery, causing major delays, but due to appropriate measures and a no-cost extension, the planned activities were generally delivered. Activity implementation was still significantly delayed by lockdowns and movement restriction associated with the COVID-19 pandemic, which led to periods of hiatus and significantly delayed start-up of field implementation, e.g. in the case of Nepal, where field implementation was postponed from 2020 to 2021. Appropriate measures were implemented in response to the challenges associated with lockdowns and social distancing restrictions imposed by Governments in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. To the extent feasible, virtual meetings were held, and in Sri Lanka and India, some implementation could be carried out by local CSO partners. Moreover, due to the six-month extension of the programme completion date, the planned activities were largely implemented, and the programme budget executed. Due to COVID-19 and the associated lockdowns, Grameen Shakti had to reduce its expenses and close some local offices, including the office in Barisal, which had served the programme, and since Grameen Shakti did not have a local partner, this meant that the programme had to be implemented directly from the headquarters in Dhaka. Some programme partners implemented COVID-19 support measures in the programme villages, e.g. CRT/N requested and received additional funding from the programme's budget

margin for COVID-19 emergency support, e.g. supplying medicine, and INSEDA provided health kits (incl. masks, soap) with funding from other sources.

Some country-specific issues affected programme implementation and the model villages, but appropriate measures were generally implemented and abated the negative impacts. In Nepal, the model village had a need and strong demand for improved access to clean water, and the community was unwilling to engage in EVD activities unless the water issue was solved. CRT/N mobilised funding from WWF Nepal and also allocated some EVD IV funding to provide drinking water. This helped building a positive relationship with the community and enabled the implementation of EVD energy, agriculture, and livelihood activities. During the programme, India passed a new Foreign Currency Regulation Act (FCRA) which prevented INSEDA from passing on programme funding to its local CSO partner (NLC). In response, INSEDA hired a local consultant to work in the field. CRT/N in Nepal postponed some activities that involved local government till after local elections had been held in 2022. In Sri Lanka the model village was affected by floods, and IDEA provided flood relief support through the programme, handing out emergency dry ration and cleaning a water well that had been contaminated (pumping out contaminated water and chlorinating the well). The economic crisis in Sri Lanka after COVID-19 led to fuel shortages, which made it difficult for IDEA to travel to the model villages, but implementation could still continue through the local CSO partner.

3.2 Programme strategy, coherence, and synergy

EVD IV contributed to the achievement of several SDGs. While the programme document did not explicitly spell out which SDGs EVD IV was intended to contribute to, the EVD approach took the partnership between the six implementing NGOs well beyond its initial focus on poverty reduction with improved standard of living (SDG1), clean energy (SDG 7) and climate change mitigation (SDG 13). Traditionally, the four national partners (CRT/N, Grameen Shakti, IDEA, INSEDA) as well as INFORSE focused on clean energy, technology, and climate change mitigation, whereas the mandate of CANSA was more broadly related to climate change and DIB focused on facilitating "self-help" to build strong and resilient communities. While SDG 13 (Climate Action) was the backbone of EVD IV, addressing both climate change adaptation and mitigation, and SDG 7 (clean energy) remained a key focus are of the programme, the integrated and community-driven approach, and the focus on improving livelihoods meant that the contributions were made to different degrees (and with variation among the four countries) towards achieving several other SDGs (see Box 1).

Box 1: Contribution of EVD IV to the SDGs
• SDG 1 (No Poverty) and SDG 2 (Zero Hunger) – through the provision of livelihood options (e.g. handicrafts) and agriculture, horticulture, livestock • SDG 3 (Good Health and Well-being) – through reduced exposure to smoke and indoor pollution with the provision of improved cookstoves, and improved access to clean water • SDG 4 (Quality Education) – through skill development for women and farmers • SDG 5 (Gender Equality) – through specifically targeting women, e.g. with livelihood interventions and improved cookstoves • SDG 6 (Clean Water and Sanitation) – through improving the access to clean water (piped water, rainwater harvesting) • SDG 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy) – through various clean/improved energy interventions,

such as improved cookstoves, biogas, solar lanterns, solar street lights, induction burners
- SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) – through the provision of livelihood options (e.g. handicrafts, agricultural production), entrepreneurial skill development
- SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure) – through construction of water infrastructure, and improved kitchens
- SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities) – through targeting poor and climate change vulnerable communities, including indigenous communities
- SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production) – by improving energy efficiency, promoting more sustainable agricultural solutions (e.g. organic fertilisers and pesticides), waste management
- SDG 13 (Climate Action) – by reducing carbon emissions through the provision of improved/clean energy solutions and reducing the vulnerability to climate change (drought, floods) through improved agricultural practices
- SDG 16 (Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions) – by strengthening the ability of communities to advocate for their needs toward authorities, and demonstrating to authorities appropriate solutions to meeting communities' needs
- SDG 17 (Partnerships for the Goals) – by engaging in UNFCCC COPs to create awareness about the EVD approach and locally appropriate solutions

EVD IV deliberately engaged in vulnerable and poor communities. The four model villages were specifically selected due to their vulnerability to climate change. In Bangladesh, Majherchor village is located on a small island in the Ganges-Brahmaputra Delta in the coastal region and is prone to floods and cyclones. Margul village in India is located in a hot, fairly arid and water scarce area in central India, which is vulnerable to droughts and extreme heat and the population belongs to a marginalised and highly poor indigenous peoples of Bhil ethnicity. In Nepal, Bhalumara village is located in a water scarce area vulnerable to drought and is mainly populated by indigenous peoples of Tamang ethnicity as well as a small number of marginalised Dalits (people in the lowest strata of the caste system). Kottawatte village in Sri Lanka is located near the Southern Coast in an area prone to floods and extreme rainfall.

However, while the majority of women/households in the model villages would receive improved cookstoves, only a small proportion of the women would receive livelihood-related support (other than tree saplings), due to the financial and time constraints of the programme. These would be selected based on their interest, commitment, and capacity to engage successfully in the livelihood's activities, but generally not based on their income level. This selection of "first movers" was an appropriate strategy vis-à-vis successfully introducing new skills and demonstrating the potential of new practices and technologies. However, those with the interests and capacities are not always those most in need, and the programme did not have the financial means or sufficient time to expand most livelihood support beyond the first movers and reach community-members more broadly, including those with less capacity. Nonetheless, the majority of beneficiaries visited were poor, even if not necessarily among the poorest in the community.

Moreover, some specific activities specifically targeted particularly vulnerable households within the community. In Nepal, the small number of landless Dalit women in the village were specifically targeted and provided with seed funding for engaging in goat rearing. In Sri Lanka, IDEA provided support for a small number of highly vulnerable households (e.g.

households affected by alcohol abuse) providing support for livelihoods, as well as (outside the programme) supporting the provision of extra classes after normal school hours for their children. In Bangladesh, three particularly poor and vulnerable women were given solar-powered sewing machines.

The ecovillage and social enterprise model concepts were not entirely clearly defined in the project document and results framework. While the overall understanding of what comprises an ecovillage is intuitive, essentially indicating that a village embraces environmentally sustainable and climate friendly practices, there were no parameters, criteria or indicators established in the programme document for defining when a village would be considered as being an "ecovillage". When EVD indicators were introduced, a model village was defined as fulfilling at least five of the indicator targets, but these indicators mainly consider climate change and livelihoods and not fully the environmental sustainability aspects one would normally associate the "eco" term with (see table 1 in section 33.1 and table 2 in section 3.3.2). Moreover, the social enterprise model (SEM) concept was not entirely clear from the programme document and a clear definition was never developed. The specific elements of SEM were not explained, nor was it explained how SEM differed from other EVD IV income-generating activities, how it would be different from existing social enterprises or small-scale enterprise development practices applied in community development in general, or why there was a need to develop a new model for social enterprises.

The strategic choice of testing t"e EV' concept in new villages with different climate conditions compared to the previous phases was rational but created challenges in terms of having enough time to achieve sustained change and providing evidence for the advocacy elements of the programme. Due to a wish among the EVD partners to test the wider applicability of the EVD concept in different contexts, it was decided after EVD II to work in new villages in generally more vulnerable contexts in all four countries. The decision was also partly to meet CISU's requirement of bringing in new elements and not simply continuing the activities of previous phases. Under EVD III, each national partner conducted feasibility studies and identified new programme areas, where they had either not worked before, or where they had not implemented the EVD concept before. New model villages were identified, and all partners engaged in villages they had not worked in before. This choice was rational, insofar it enabled the partners to test the EVD concept in different climatic contexts, thereby generating new lessons and testing the adaptability of the concept.

However, the geographic change also created challenges. Rural development and sustained change usually take a long time (10-20 years presence by NGO/CSO partners in a village are not uncommon); as it takes time to build local capacities, especially in villages that have had limited exposure to development projects and community-based approaches. None of the model villages supported under EVD I and II are currently receiving support to further consolidate and expand the EVD concept, although the implementing partners still maintain some contact with them. For the four model villages established under EVD IV, the programme has introduced the EVD concept, but with only a few years of implementation, the results have not yet been fully consolidated (see sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.4).

Another implication of the engagement in new villages was that it was challenging to link field implementation to the case studies and advocacy element of the programme, as the results (lessons, outcomes, impacts) that the case studies and advocacy activities could draw

upon only began to materialise towards the end of the programme. Regional level advocacy activities and studies (e.g. those implemented by CANSA) mainly drew on lessons from other locations in South Asia, including lessons from other CANSA members. As such, there was a disconnect and limited synergy between field level implementation in the model villages and the regional advocacy and outreach.

In some cases, EVD IV implementation was linked to other engagements of the EVD partners. In Nepal, Sindhuli district was chosen, since CRT/N already had a project (energy-based development) in the district, albeit in different village. CRT/N mobilised funding from WWF Nepal (funded by BMZ) to respond to the community's demand for improved access to drinking water. This was facilitated by EVD IV, since the co-funding strengthened the proposal. At the same time, the WWF support enabled CRT/N to address a key demand from the community, without which the community would now have agreed to participate in EVD IV. The WWF support also covered the costs of having a CRT/N Field Coordinator posted in the model village for eight months, thereby considerably strengthening the field presence and interaction with local stakeholders, but thereby also reducing the role of CODEC, the local NGO partner. In India, additional INSEDA salary costs associated with the programme extension were partly covered by INSEDA's carbon trade programme. In Sri Lanka and Bangladesh, the improved cookstoves disseminated were of existing and nationally accepted designs, and in Bangladesh, the programme tapped into an already established market and supply chain of cookstoves. In the four model villages, there was little engagement of other NGOs or projects, and none of these worked on sustainable energy, agriculture, or livelihoods. Hence, there was no risk of overlap, no scope for synergy, and no need for coordination with other actors.

CANSA relied on the Evangelical Fellowship of India Commission on Relief (EFICOR), a member of CANSA, vis-à-vis the implementation of activities related to influencing district climate resilience plans. Moreover, CANSA and INFORSE members outside the DVD partnership contributed to the online database on EVD solutions developed by the project. The global component of EVD IV, i.e. the participation and side events in the Conferences of the Parties (COPs) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) to promote the EVD concept and lessons was possible because of INFORSE's and INSEDA's COP accreditation. INFORSE cooperated with other COP accredited NGOs, which increased visibility at the UN level and UNFCCC website. Moreover, INFORSE used its United Nations Economic and Social Council (UN ECOSOC) accreditation to organise a side event in cooperation with Grameen Shakti and other NGOs at a virtual United Nations High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (UN HLPF) conference.

3.3 Programme results

3.3.1 Immediate objective 1: At the end of the programme rural communities in Nepal, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and India have improved their lives through the establishment of Eco-Village Development (EVD) model villages

Table 1 at the end of this section provides an assessment of the achievement objective 1 programme indicators as well as the related ECD indicators *(note: EVD indicators related to entrepreneurship and income are assessed under objective 2)*.

A broad range of technology options were implemented but with a focus on a) renewable energy and energy efficiency, b) climate resilient, sustainable, and productive agriculture and horticulture, c) alternative livelihoods, d) water supply, and e) communal infrastructure. Immediate objective 1 was the largest component of the programme as it concerned the establishment of the four EVD model villages and the implementation of most of the on-the-ground activities. A broad range of technology options were implemented in the villages and with considerable differences between the technologies implemented in each village, with most interventions being related to energy, agriculture, alternative livelihoods, water supply, and communal infrastructure. Nonetheless, there were some common features, such as:

- Energy:
  - Provision of improved/fuel-efficient two-burner cookstoves (different designs for each country, which consume less firewood than traditional stoves, to a large proportion of the households (all model villages)
  - Installation or rehabilitation of a small number of biogas plants (all model villages)
  - Provision of various solar-powered equipment, mostly in small numbers, including: solar water pumps (Bangladesh, Nepal), solar dryers (India, Nepal, Sri Lanka), solar home systems (Bangladesh), solar lanterns (India, provided to most households)
- Agriculture:
  - Implementation of a range of horticultural solutions, each reaching a small number of households (all model villages) – technologies commonly implemented include: organic kitchen gardens, poly-greenhouses, drip irrigation, vermicompost, liquid bio-fertilisers and liquid bio-pesticides
  - Production of vegetables (all model villages), rice seed paddy (Sri Lanka), mushrooms (Sri Lanka) – as cash crops and for home consumption
  - Planting of trees, mainly fruit trees (all model villages)
  - Provision of livestock (goats, poultry) for a small number of households (India, Nepal)
- Alternative livelihoods:
  - Support for handicraft livelihood options for a small number of households, including: provision of sewing machines (Bangladesh), training in production of improved cookstoves (India, Sri Lanka), curd processing (Sri Lanka)
- Water supply:
  - Rainwater harvesting (rooftop, ponds) for a small number of households (Bangladesh, India, Nepal)
- Communal infrastructure:
  - Construction of infrastructure that benefitted the communities broadly: installation/upgrading of piped water supply system incl. installation of solar pump (Nepal), installation of solar street lights (Bangladesh, India), construction of bamboo bus stand (India), rehabilitation of community wells (Nepal)

The promoted technologies aimed at contributing to climate change mitigation, adaptation, and/or improved livelihoods. Each of the promoted technologies contributed to improvements in at least one of three overarching dimensions (as per the overall objective of EVD IV): a) reducing greenhouse gas emissions and/or sequestering carbon (climate change mitigation, b) reducing vulnerability/increasing resilience to the impacts of climate change

(climate change adaptation, and c) increasing incomes and improving the wellbeing of the beneficiaries (livelihoods). A set of EVD indicators was established under EVD IV for measuring change in each of these dimensions.

Four model villages were established and supported based on the communities' interests as expressed in their village development plans – the related targets were largely achieved. A model village was established in each of the four countries. Village Development Plans (VDPs) were developed or revised in each of the four model villages and guided the specific technology options rolled out in each village. In addition, CANSA provided recommendations for district climate resilience plans for six districts in Madhya Pradesh (India), so the indicator of having local communities defined and presenting their development needs can be considered as being exceeded. However, it is unclear whether the EVD target of having at least 50 pct. of the community members participating in village development planning in each village was met, but a participatory approach was generally applied by the EVD partners in all four model villages. Moreover, the objective 1 target of monitoring the EVD indicators was only partly achieved. The mitigation indicators were monitored, the achieved greenhouse gas emission reductions were calculated, and EVD partners were trained on adaptation assessment. However, the monitoring of the adaptation and livelihood indicators was patchy with limited collection of information of impacts in terms of enhanced climate resilience and improved livelihoods.

EVD IV led to greenhouse gas emission reductions, mainly due to the provision of improved cookstoves – the mitigation targets were largely achieved. The target of 50 pct. access to clean (or rather, cleaner) cooking solutions was exceeded in all model villages, with the provision of improved cookstoves. The target for improved access to electricity and reducing the consumption of fossil fuel was not achieved, since the chosen technologies mostly did not focus on household electricity provision and the focus was on reducing the use of firewood rather than reducing the use of fossil fuels. There was no specific target set for the indicator on reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, but the energy technologies introduced led to 28-49 pct. emission reductions compared to the technologies that were replaced. These reductions were primarily associated with reduced use of firewood for cooking, in Bangladesh 94 pct. of the reductions achieved came from the use of improved cookstoves at household level, in India this accounted for 84 pct. of the reductions. In Nepal, improved household cookstoves led to 60 pct. of the reductions, while cooking of products for selling and of livestock fodder accounted for 35 pct. Furthermore, in Sri Lanka 82 pct. of the emission reductions came from household cookstoves, whereas cooking of products for selling accounted for 14 pct. Not all mitigation could be quantified, e.g. emission reductions from the vermicompost and organic farming were not included in the emission reductions reported, but would in any case have been modest considering the small scale of these interventions.

EVD IV contributed to enhanced climate change resilience for villagers to varying degrees, as the proportion of the community members reached by agriculture and alternative livelihood activities was relatively low, whereas improved access to water benefitted communities in two model villages more broadly – the adaptation targets were partly achieved. There is some uncertainty regarding improvements in climate change resilience due to the limited availability of data on changes in vulnerability. The most concrete example of

enhance resilience is the sustainable paddy rice cultivation practices introduced in Sri Lanka; the rice crops in neighbouring fields were destroyed by floods in 2023, while the rice saplings grown in nurseries introduced by EVD survived, as the transplanting was postponed till after the water had receded, hence saving the season's crop. Overall, the relatively low number of people supported in the adoption of organic horticulture, agriculture and livestock production and the apparent limited replication (based on field observation by the evaluator) by other community-members did not reach sufficient numbers of people to achieve the overall target of adoption by 30 pct. of the model village communities, even if every individual supported have continued with the promoted practices (no data is available on continuation). Nonetheless, the number of farmers supported in rice cultivation in Sri Lanka grew from five to 12.

The target of 30 pct. having access to clean water was overall achieved, due to a) considerable EVD IV investment made in water supply in the model village in Nepal, and b) EVD IV catalysing significant local government investment in water supply in the model village in Bangladesh. No target was made for the indicator on tangible/visible reduction of climate vulnerability and there is no data on changes in vulnerability, but it is reasonable to assume that the direct beneficiaries of various EVD solutions have become more resilient due to better year-round water access, climate-smart horticulture and farming reducing risk of crop loss, and livelihood diversification (e.g. handicrafts, livestock rearing, cash crops, mushroom cultivation) reducing the dependency on agriculture. Beneficiary interviews support this assumption. Moreover, increases in income related to the introduced agricultural practices and alternative livelihoods, would contribute towards increased resilience, although income increases achieved vary considerably among the beneficiaries. However, in most cases, the number of beneficiaries of these EVD solutions were low, and the overall contribution to enhanced resilience in the model villages is thus also limited.

EVD IV specifically targeted and empowered women – the gender participation target was exceeded. Programme activities in the model villages specifically targeted women, and most of the direct beneficiaries/recipients of household-level support such as improved cookstoves, agricultural and horticultural production, handicraft production (e.g. sewing, production of coir mats, production of improved cookstoves), livestock production, and loan and savings groups, each providing women economic opportunities. Hence, the target of 50 pct. of the capacity building participants being women was exceeded. Moreover, the installation of solar street lights has increased safety and thereby the mobility of women after sunset. Hence, EVD IV contributed towards improving women's health through reduced exposure to smoke indoor pollution, reducing workload collecting firewood and time spent cooking (most stoves distributed have two burners whereas traditional stoves have a single burner), and providing income opportunities and improved access to food and nutrition. In a number of cases, programme activities provided women, who had not before engaged in economic activities, with an income. Stakeholders in the three countries visited reported a change in the attitudes and confidence of women participating in the programme.

Awareness on climate change was increased, but overall climate change awareness still appears be low, and community-members and local authorities mainly viewed EVD from a livelihood and immediate needs perspective – the target on awareness of climate change solutions appears to have been partly met. There is no data available on whether the target

of reaching 50 pct. of the villages with education on/awareness of climate change solutions was reached, but reportedly awareness on both climate change and environment was enhanced among community members. However, interviews with beneficiaries and local officials indicate that climate change awareness remains low and that the programme is mainly viewed by communities and local authorities from a livelihood/immediate needs perspective.

Villagers and other local actors showed an interest in EVD solutions, and there was some investment, but replication and co-funding were limited by financial constraints as well as perceptions – the replication and co-funding targets were partly achieved. Some model village community-members as well as neighbouring villagers showed interest in engaging in EVD solutions. In Sri Lanka, some farmers showed interest in applying the sustainable paddy rice practices introduced under EVD IV and there have also been sales of improved cookstoves. It should be noted that the Sri Lankan village appears less poor than the other villages visited and has better market access. Replication by community members and other villagers has been low, despite interest shown, particularly due to financial constraints, but seemingly also due to mindsets and expectations of governments or NGOs covering the costs. Neighbouring villages in India and Nepal requested support from INSEDA and CRT/N. In most cases, the beneficiary contribution was in-kind (labour, local materials), although there were some cash contributions (for cookstoves, kitchen improvements, rice cultivation, and vermicompost in Sri Lanka, and livestock insurance in Nepal), but there seems to be only few examples of beneficiaries investing financial resources in further upscaling/expansion of the EVD solutions. Replication by other villagers also appears to be very limited or non-existent for the different EVD solutions.

Similarly, local government partners in the four countries showed an interest in replication but also face financial constraints. Moreover, some local government actors interviewed expressed that they could not roll out the full EVD model in specific villages, as they were obliged to support all villages in their jurisdiction in an equitable manner. Rather, they would be interested in rolling out specific EVD solutions, especially those related to agriculture, across all villages. Local authorities provided an in-kind contribution to EVD IV in the form of staff time. The most prominent example of replication and cash co-funding from local government was Bangladesh, where the local authorities installed 100 rainwater harvesting systems in addition to the ten installed by the programme. In Nepal, the municipality provided a processing machine for the leaf plate making SEM (see section 2.3.2) and it also covers the electricity costs of the water supply system, when the solar pump is not operating. The municipality is also committed to covering more complex maintenance of the system (beyond the day-to-day maintenance handled by the community). Moreover, for replication of climate smart agriculture, the local government conducted training of farmers while the project provided high-quality seeds for vegetable farming.

In Sri Lanka, IDEA provided support to the Matara district branch of the Central Bank of Sri Lanka, which under its Green Village programme replicated EVD IV's stove component and installed 50 improved cookstoves and provided horticulture support in Dematahettigoda village. Subsequently, IDEA provided 50 additional stoves for the same village. Moreover, IDEA provided initial guidance on horticulture (home gardening) for the Green Village programme.

Under the EVD IV programme itself, there was also some investment in replication, although this was also limited by budgetary constraints. For example, ten local CSOs in India were trained by INSEDA on improved cookstoves but they did not engage in replication due to financial constraints. With EVD IV funding, IDEA provided 100 improved cookstoves in ten villages in Matara district and trained ten villagers on cookstove installation for a project coordinated by the local government.

Table 1: Achievement of Objective 1 *(programme and EVD indicators)*		
Indicator	***Country/partner status***	***Achievement***
Objective 1 (programme indicators)		
1. Local communities have defined and presented needs and asks for development	B: VDP prepared	Exceeded
	I: VDP prepared CANSA: recommendations provided for 6 District Climate Resilience Plans (DCRPs) (level of actual influence unclear)	
	N: VDP prepared	
	SL: VDP revised (supported with HH, livelihoods, and environment surveys)	
2. Model villages established in each country / EVD indicators have been monitored	B: Model village established: Majherchor	Partly achieved
	I: Model village established: Margul	
	N: Model village established: Bhalumara	
	SL: Model village established: Kottawatte	
	CANSA: Publication on adaptation assessment (but does not capture EVD IV adaptation results)	
	INFORSE: Emission reductions calculated and published	
	All: Only some (mainly mitigation) EVD indicators monitored, little data on adaptation and livelihood impacts	
3. Other stakeholders and villagers replicate or co-fund EVD activities/solutions	B: Local gov. installed 100 rainwater harvesting (RWH) systems	Partly achieved
	I: Interest from neighbouring communities but too poor to engage (requested INSEDA support); 10 CSOs/local NGOs trained but lack funding to implement	
	N: Interest from neighbouring communities (requested CRT/N support); Municipality interested in replicating elements of EVD across municipality, especially agricultural activities; municipality provided processing machine for leaf plate SEM; municipality covers water supply system electricity costs and is responsible for covering more complex maintenance	
	SL: Interest from some community members in sustainable paddy rice practices; some villagers have bought improved cookstoves; Central Bank of Sri Lanka (Matara branch) with support from IDEA replicated improved stoves in the "Green village" programme in 1 village (100 stoves); IDEA supported local government in the installation of improved stoves in 10 villages in Matara district (10 per village)	
Mitigation (EVD indicators)		
50% of households (HHs) has access to clean	B: 69% (150 of 218 HHs) given improved stoves, 3 HHs provided with biogas plants	Exceeded
	I: 78% (83 of 106 HHs) given improved stoves, 3 HHs	

cooking solutions	provided with biogas plants	
	N: 72% (64 of 88 HHs) given improved stoves, 25% (22 HHs) given induction stoves, 4HH biogas plants rehabilitated	
	SL: 55% (80 of 146 HHs) given improved stoves, 1 HH given a biogas plant	
25% of target group has improved access to clean electricity / 25% reduced consumption of fossil fuel	B: 3 solar home systems installed, 1 solar pump reduced use of diesel pumps	Not achieved *(Irrelevant indicator: limited engagement in electricity provision and fossil fuel replacement)*
	I: 102 solar lanterns provided and 6 solar street lights reduced use of kerosene and batteries, improved stoves reduced use of LPG in some HHs	
	N: Improved stoves reduced use of LPG in some HHs	
	SL: Improved stoves reduced use of LPG in some HHs, 30 solar lights provided	
Reduced GHG emissions from EVD solutions vs. emissions from replaced solutions	B: Emission reductions (CO_2e/yr): total: 68, HH cooking: 64, solar electricity 2.7, tree planting 1.3 Total 28% reduction: reduced use of firewood for cooking, reduced use of diesel for water pumping, 3 solar insect traps replace battery traps, 300 trees sequester carbon	Achieved
	I: Emission reductions (CO_2e/yr): total: 190, HH cooking: 159, solar electricity: 9, tree planting: 22 Total 35% reduction: reduced use of firewood + dung+ LPG for cooking, solar lanterns replace kerosene and reduced battery torch use, trees sequester carbon	
	N: Emission reductions (CO_2e/yr): total: 197, HH cooking: 118, cooking for selling or fodder: 69, tree planting: 10 Total 43% reduction: reduced use of firewood + LPG for cooking, 450 trees sequester carbon, improved farming practices (mulching, composting) reduced methane emissions + increased soil carbon sequestration	
	SL: Emission reductions (CO_2e/yr): total: 50, HH cooking: 41, cooking for selling: 7, tree planting: 2 Total 39% reduction: reduced use of firewood for cooking	
Adaptation (EVD indicators)		
30% of target group has organic kitchen gardens and practise off-season gardening	B: 9% (20 persons) trained on climate-smart farming; 300 fruit trees planted	Partly achieved
	I: 25% (26 HHs) produce vermicompost, 19% (20 HHs) use compost basket, 3% (3 HHs produce fertiliser from slurry, 2% (2 HHs) have poly-greenhouses, 2% (2 HHs) have green net nurseries – used in organic farming/horticulture; up to 61% (52-64 women) engaged in poultry production; fruit trees planted	
	N: 21% (19 persons) engaged in vegetable farming in poly-greenhouses, 9% (8 persons) use bio-fertilisers and pesticides, 13% (11 HHs) have improved cowshed management collecting urine and dung; 4 % (6 women) engaged in goat rearing; 200 fruit trees planted	
	SL: 26% (40 HHs) engaged in home gardening (10 HHs use shade net houses, 6 women produce liquid bio-fertilisers from vermicompost), 8% (13 women) engaged in sustainable	

	rice cultivation, 1% (2 persons) engaged in mushroom farming	
30% of target group has increased access to clean water (irrigation, potable)	B: 50% (110 HHs) have RHW systems (10 HHs from EVD IV, 100 HHs from gov.), solar water pump under installation to supply 100% (218 HHs)	Achieved – In particular for drinking water, irrigation water benefitted less people
	I: 6% (6 HHs) have RWH tanks – each tank serves 5-10 HHs	
	N: 100% served by piped domestic water supply; irrigation: 6% (5 HHs) have RWH ponds, greywater reclamation (unknown number), 6 community wells restored, 3 community portable pumps	
	SL: Drip irrigation in poly-greenhouses *(area not water scarce)*	
Tangible/visible reduction of climate vulnerability with EVD solutions	B: Reasonable to assume that resilience has increased for direct beneficiaries of better year-round water access, climate-smart farming (income, food security), and livelihood diversification (3 sewing machines)	Likely achieved – for direct beneficiaries of water, agriculture and livelihood interventions
	I: Reasonable to assume that resilience has increased for direct beneficiaries of better year-round water access, horticulture and poultry (income, food security)	
	N: Reasonable to assume that resilience has increased for direct beneficiaries of better year-round water access, horticulture and goats (income, food security)	
	SL: Reasonable to assume that resilience has increased for direct beneficiaries of horticulture and rice farming (income, food security), and livelihood diversification (handicrafts). The rice cultivation practices introduced proved resilient to floods in 2023.	
Raised awareness on adaptation for development officers/beneficiaries	B: *No data available*	Likely partly achieved
	I: *No data available* – interviews suggest low/modest levels of climate change awareness	
	N: *Insufficient data available* – interviews suggest low/modest levels of climate change awareness	
	SL: *No data available*	
EVD development (EVD indicators)		
50% of participants in capacity building and activities are women	B: Most direct beneficiaries were women (e.g. cookstoves, sewing machines)	Exceeded *(No data available on no. of women and men participating in training)*
	I: Most direct beneficiaries were women (e.g. cookstoves, poultry, solar drier)	
	N: Most direct beneficiaries were women (e.g. cookstoves, vegetable farming, goats, handicrafts)	
	SL: Most direct beneficiaries were women (e.g. cookstoves, vegetable farming, paddy rice, handicrafts)	
50% of villagers reached by education/awareness on climate change solutions	B: *No data available*	Likely partly achieved
	I: *No data available* – interviews suggest low/modest levels of climate change awareness	
	N: *Insufficient data available* – interviews suggest low/modest levels of climate change awareness	
	SL: *No data available*	
	B: In-kind contributions (labour, local materials)	Partly achieved

Beneficiaries co-fund the solutions	I: In-kind contributions (labour, local materials)	– mostly in-kind contributions made, limited investment in upscaling + replication
	N: In-kind contributions (labour, local materials – value NPR 500 per improved stove, NPR 5,000 per poly-greenhouse, NPR 4,500 per cowshed management), NPR 2,500 cash per induction stoves, 6 women paid for insurance of goats, 2 women invested in upscaling (greenhouses)	
	SL: In-kind contributions (labour, local materials), LKR 300 cash per stove, 6 vermicompost beneficiaries covered 25% of the costs (LKR 5,000), coir producers covered 50% of material costs, 5 rice beneficiaries reimbursed costs incurred by IDEA and IADF at end of season, either in cash or by returning portion of the harvest	
EVD plan developed with over 50% community representation) prior to activities	B: VDP prepared	Likely achieved, EVD plans made *(No data available on no. of community participants)*
	I: VDP prepared	
	N: VDP prepared	
	SL: VDP revised (supported with HH, livelihoods, and environment surveys)	

3.3.2 Immediate objective 2: At the end of the programme local communities and stakeholders have additional market access and business opportunity to appropriate solutions contributing to improved livelihood, climate change mitigation and adaptation

Table 2 at the end of this section provides an assessment of the achievement objective 2 programme indicators as well as the related EVD indicators.

EVD IV led to tangible livelihood improvements for a relatively low number of community members achieving varying levels of economic benefits – the business and income generation targets were partly achieved. The field visits by the evaluator and available documentation indicates that a small number of direct beneficiaries of agricultural and alternative livelihood support have achieved tangible improvements in incomes and/or access to nutrition, although there is no data on the socio-economic impact on the direct beneficiaries. However, the field visit findings also suggest that the income increases for most direct beneficiaries are below the 30 pct. target. Moreover, only some beneficiaries were able to bring their engagement in EVD livelihood options to an entrepreneurial level, for example, of the 19 persons supported to engage in horticulture in poly-greenhouses in Nepal, only four produced enough vegetables to sell, whereas the remaining 15 persons only produced for home consumption. This illustrates that while efforts were made to link the beneficiaries to markets and to enhance their business skills, market access as well as a lack of entrepreneurial mindsets among beneficiaries was still a limiting factor for a number of producers, albeit with differences among the model villages and their proximity to markets. In India, community-members were trained on using bamboo for construction of different infrastructure and equipment, such as compost baskets, bamboo frames for cement structures (e.g. water tanks), and the bus stand. However, these skills were only put in use for the infrastructure constructed with EVD IV support, and the potential for turning these skills into income-generating opportunities was not explored.

Social enterprises were initiated, but the level of operationalisation varied and the number of villages covered was lower than planned – the social enterprise model (SEM) targets were partly achieved. In Bangladesh, community-based biogas plants as a social enterprise were piloted in two villages in the vicinity of Dhaka; GS has collected data on the impact, but an analysis was not available at the time of the evaluation. Moreover, another SEM concept is currently under development in Bangladesh, an integrated solar water pump drinking water, drip irrigation, and powering productive use appliances/crop processing. In India, four persons from three villages were trained in the production of JWALA improved cookstoves as a business. They constructed 18 stoves, for which the payment made by INSEDA on the condition that the beneficiaries would repay in instalments. In Nepal, a cooperative was formed in the model village to collect leaves from Sal trees in the community forest and produce disposable plates (an eco-friendly alternative to plastic and paper plates); the groups was provided with a plate processing machine by the municipality, but the cooperation is currently not operating, as the person responsible for processing the plates has left the group and a replacement is yet to be found. Moreover, one beneficiary of the poly-greenhouses who had demonstrated good entrepreneurial potential was supported in enterprise registration and in expanding her business; in one year she sold produce for NPR 50,000 (DKK 2,550), invested in five additional poly-greenhouses, and intends to take a loan to further expand and invest in more greenhouses. In Sri Lanka, the five women engaged in sustainable rice farming were supported in marketing; due to the good quality of the produce, the sold their first harvest as seed paddy at a premium price. Overall, social enterprises were piloted in seven villages, whereas the target was to roll out social enterprises in 12 twelve villages. Moreover, the target of social enterprises giving beneficiaries additional market access and income opportunities was only partly achieved. There is no evidence of any replication of the piloted SEMs, although some farmers in the model village Sri Lanka have shown an interest in applying the sustainable paddy rice practices introduced under EVD IV. In addition to the SEM piloting by the four national EVD partners, CANSA carried out a case study on organic agriculture in Bundelkhand (India).

Table 2: Achievement of Objective 2 *(programme and EVD indicators)*

Indicator	***Country/partner status***	***Achievement***
Objective 2 (programme indicators)		
1. Min. 1 SEM of EVD solution(s) developed and rolled out in 12 villages	B: Community-based biogas plant SEM piloted in 2 villages near Dhaka; integrated solar water pump for drinking water, drip irrigation, productive use appliances/crop processing SEM under development	Partly achieved – SEMs established in model villages, but limited roll-out in villages
	I: SEM: JWALA improved cookstove in 3 Indian villages (18 benefitting families)	
	N: Commercial vegetable farming SEM: 1 poly-greenhouse beneficiary supported in enterprise registration and expansion; Leaf plate making SEM: Woman cooperative formed in model village to produce disposable plates from leaves. Poly-greenhouse vegetable farming rolled out to 15 farmers in Nakali village (unclear whether they produce commercially or for home consumption)	
	SL: SEM: sustainable paddy rice farming (13 female farmers) in model village	

2. SEM gives additional market access and business opportunity	B: Data collected for impact assessment but not yet analysed	Partly achieved – market/business opportunities not achieved for all SEMs
	I: JWALA stoves well received in 2 villages people reportedly willing to pay for stoves *(no data on actual sales, seems not to have happened)*	
	N: Vegetable SEM producer sold for NPR 50,000 in 1 year (built 5 more greenhouses and plans to take a loan to build more), 3 vegetable producers sold for NPR 10,000-20,000; leaf plate SEM currently not operational	
	SL: 5 rice producers sold harvest as seed paddy at premium price (due to good quality), with 13 producers there is scope for selling paddy nursery trays to other growers, IDEA plans to link group to Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) gov. prg.	
3. Other stakeholders and villagers replicate or co-fund EVD solutions	B: No evidence of SEM replication	Not achieved vis-à-vis SEM *(Other EVD solutions covered under objective 1 indicator 3)*
	I: No evidence of SEM replication	
	N: No evidence of SEM replication	
	SL: No evidence of SEM replication; number of rice producers increased from 5 to 13 during EVD IV, interest in EVD rice farming approach from some villages	
	CANSA: Case study on organic agriculture SEM in Bundelkhand (India)	
EVD development (EVD indicators)		
Increased number of women entrepreneurs/self-help groups	B: Climate smart farmers may sell produce, sewing machine recipients may likely to sell products, 1 biogas SEM model established	Likely partly achieved – no. of entrepreneurs + self-help groups appear low
	I: Women members of 6 self-help groups get income from poultry production	
	N: 1 woman sold for NPR 50,000 in 1 year (built 5 more greenhouses and plans to take a loan to build more), 3 farmers sold vegetables for NPR 10,000-20,000 (1 built 3 more greenhouses) (*other farmers produce for home consumption)*; 6 women rearing goats have sold animals + milk	
	SL: 13 women sell rice saplings at a premium price; handicrafts (5 coir producers and 4 slipper producers), 15 women sell cash crops (papaya, banana, betel, black pepper, yam, mushrooms, nursery saplings), 1 woman sells dehydrated products, 2 curd producers improved business profitability with improved stoves, 1 woman produces and sells improved stoves (enhanced HH's existing pottery business). Producer groups were formed for rice farming, cash crops, coir products, slippers)	
30% increased income generation/cost savings for target group adopting EVD solutions	B: Farmers may sell produce, sewing machine recipients likely to sell products, income status unclear for biogas SEM, reduced time spent on firewood collection + cooking, reduced spending on diesel (1 water pump) and batteries (3 insect traps)	Partly achieved – income increased to varying degrees for a modest number of beneficiaries
	I: Some women sell poultry + eggs, reduced time spent on firewood + dung collection (dung can be used as fertiliser) collection + cooking, reduced spending on LPG (cooking) and kerosene + batteries (lanterns)	

	N: 4 women sell vegetables, 15 HHs save food costs with vegetable production, 6 women sell goats, reduced time spent on firewood collection + cooking, reduced spending on LPG (cooking)	
	SL: 5 women sell rice seed (30-40% rice yield increase achieved); women sell handicrafts (5 coir producers, 4 slipper producers, 1 sews clothes+bags); 16 women people sell cash crops (papaya, banana, betel, black pepper, yam, mushrooms, nursery saplings), 2 women sell curd (1 increased production), 1 woman sells string hoppers, 1 woman sells improved stoves, reduced time spent on firewood collection + cooking (HHs + curd production); 1 man increased his ornamental fish production (EVD IV supported installation of additional fish tank):	

3.3.3 Immediate objective 3: EVD has been disseminated to and recognized by a broader audience reaching from local to international level

Table 3 at the end of this section provides an assessment of the achievement objective 3 programme indicators.

The EVD concept and experiences were shared widely – the related target was achieved. The partners engaged in promoting the EVD concept and sharing experiences at local, national, regional, and international level, through different channels, including:

- Webinars (e.g. for provincial CSOs and 2 district environment offices in Sri Lanka, six regional webinars and post-COP webinars organised by INFORSE and CANSA in cooperation with partners)
- Workshops and meetings with stakeholders at sub-national and national level (e.g. a national stakeholder workshop and meetings with MFIs in Bangladesh, awareness workshops with different regional level public entities in Sri Lanka, meetings with CSR staff from companies in India, meetings with international NGOs and the National Planning Commission in Nepal)
- Trainings for CSOs (e.g. 10 CSOs in India), private enterprises (e.g. 15 MFIs in Nepal, Matara district branch of the Central Bank of Sri Lanka, journalists (who wrote more than eight national newspaper articles) in Sri Lanka), local government staff
- Study visits to the model villages (e.g. for 11 international NGOs in Nepal, for the National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD), local government entities) and other locations (for state policymakers in West Bengal, India)
- Involvement of local authorities in the implementation and monitoring of activities
- Development of an online database on EVD technology options and solutions (led and hosted by INFORSE, inputs on specific technologies/solutions from all EVD partners)
- Articles and blogs on website, in newsletters, and on social media (mainly by INFORSE and CANSA)
- Publications (e.g. regional outreach publication, policy briefs, mainly led by INFORSE and CANSA)
- Videos (thee in India, two in Nepal, others are still under production)
- Hosting and presenting at side events at high-profile global UN meetings (UNFCCC COP,

UNFCCC subsidiary body meetings, UN High-Level Political Forums on Sustainable Development, UN High-Level Dialogues on Energy)
- Presentations at other events (e.g. CANSA Strategy Meeting and General Assembly)

While participation and outreach for each outreach and sharing activity implemented by the partners reportedly has varied (limited quantitative data is available for most EVD partners), INFORSE's data generally indicate a fairly good interest and outreach, for example: a) 1,700-2,500 printed copies and 850-1,028 website downloads of each INFORSE newsletter; b) a total of 260 participants in six regional webinars (average 44 participants per webinar) on EVD database and COP27 reflections. Moreover, INFORSE's figures suggest a fair large number of website visitors for the different EVD reports and videos uploaded.

There are a few cases of uptake of the EVD concept by others – the related targets were partly achieved. As described in section 2.3.1, the replication of EVD solutions by local actors was limited. Similarly, there is only a few documented cases of uptake of the EVD concept by other organisations. The most prominent evidence of policy influence is Sri Lanka, where IDEA, despite being a small NGO, had good access to Sri Lankan senior policymakers (COP delegates) as a result of participating in the UNFCCC COPs with funding from EVD I-IV. For example, the National Project Manager was a member of the National Expert Committee for updating the National Climate Change Policy, and reportedly, several of IDEA's recommendations were included final draft policy. During discussions with Sri Lankan COP delegates, the Project Manager promoted the incorporation of EVD in Sri Lanka's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) to UNFCCC and the Ministry of Environment suggested IDEA submit a concept note for this. Moreover, the Ministry of Environment and the Department of Samurdhi Development sent official letters to their local officials to introduce them to EVD interventions. Similarly, CRT/N has used the COPs as an opportunity to meet high-level Nepalese government representative. In Nepal, Renewable World Nepal has included EVD on their strategic plan and has engaged in fund mobilisation for implementing EVD. Two of the 15 MFI (Manushi Microfinance Institution and Women-help Saving and Credit Cooperative Ltd.) trained in Nepal, subsequently provided funding to CRT/N for small-scale EVD implementation in two villages. CRT/N has also carried out pre-feasibility studies for three other microfinance institutions. Moreover, CRT/N mobilised funding from UNDP for the implementation/replication of the EVD concept in two more villages (the two projects are completed). In India, CANSA, through the Evangelical Fellowship of India Commission on Relief (EFICOR) engaged with state, district, and lower-level government actors in Madhya Pradesh state vis-à-vis providing recommendations for the district climate resilience plans, although the tangible influence on the plans appears modest. Similarly, CANSA and partner NGOs worked with Bihar State Disaster Management Authority to draft district climate resilience plans for four districts. In Bangladesh, GS is a member of the civil society's Energy Transition Platform (ETP).

INFORSE reported that nine new members had joined INFORSE after participating in regional EVD webinars. Moreover, CANSA reported that new members with experience in rural energy and agriculture had joined and indicated that EVD IV has contributed towards reaching grassroot organisations. The UN accreditation of INFORSE and INSEDA and their ability to host sides events at UNFCCC COPs and other UN high-profile meetings show that that these

organisations have clout, but this cannot be attributed to EVD I-IV, nor does it necessarily indicate that the EVD concept is prominently on the radar of international bodies.

Table 3: Achievement of Objective 3 *(programme indicators)*		
Indicator	***Country/partner status***	***Achievement***
1. Knowledge of EVD shared with other CSOs and local and regional governments	B: National Stakeholder workshop held in Oct. 2023; agreement signed with DeVPro Partners to assist in advocacy	Achieved
	I: 10 CSOs trained on EVD solutions + visited model village, webinars with local + national CSOs and local gov. entities, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD) visited model village	
	N: Local ward + municipality involved in each intervention, workshop jointly held Manushi MFI for 15 MFIs in Jan-Feb 2023, 1 video documentary broadcasted on national TV, EVD learning sharing workshop, excursion visit to model village for 11 international NGOs/donors, brochures published	
	SL: Central Bank of Sri Lanka (Matara branch) supported vis-à-vis improved cookstoves and home gardening; division and village level gov. participated in EVD IV activities and monitoring; 5 awareness workshops/meetings with divisional village officers (Kandy), Ceylon Electricity Board (Kandy), Central Bank of Sri Lanka (Matara), village officers (Thihagoda), Dept. of Provincial Housing (Central Province); presentations at 2 webinars for provisional CSOs and 2 Ministry of Environment webinars for district environment offices; recommendations on biomass energy for Ministry of Power and Energy + meeting Minister; Capacity building workshop on biomass energy for journalists – led to 4 TV interviews, 7+ island-wide newspaper articles	
	CANSA: Advocacy tour for West Bengal State policymakers to Sundarbans	
2. Increased INFORSE and CANSA membership and participation due to prg. outreach	CANSA: New members with experience in rural energy and agriculture, EVD IV contributed to reaching grassroot organisations	Likely achieved
	INFORSE: 5 new members from Nepal, 2 from Bangladesh, and 2 from India joined after participating in regional EVD webinars	
3. EVD concept taken up by other stakeholders and networks (incl. EVD approach or publications) e.g. in: - Local development plans and budgets	B: Biogas plant SEM financial model shared with MFIs; integrated solar water pump SEEM further developed and application for USAID funding (proposal shortlisted, under review); biogas plant SEM concept presented to GS biogas dept; GS member of the regional Energy Transition Platform (ETP)	Partly achieved – EVD concept promoted, some replication by EVD partners, but only few examples of uptake by others
	I: NABARD asked INSEDA to submit proposal for replication in 1 village; India Climate Collaborative (ICC) asked INSEDA to submit documents to place EVD on Climate Solution Platform (CSP) for CSR funding; application to OakNorth Bank for installing 3,000 biogas plants in Haryana (CSR, carbon credit); negotiations with B&G manufacturing unit to install	

- CSR plans (for private sector) - Documents from national planning bodies - Replicating or co-financing activities	5,000 biogas plants annually (carbon credit)	
	N: EVD implemented by CRT/N in 2 villages with UNDP funding and at small scale in 2 villages with funding from 2 MFIs; Renewable World-Nepal has included EVD in its strategic plan	
	SL: Project Manager member of National Expert Committee to update National Climate Change Policy, several IDEA recommendations included in the final draft; discussions with Sri Lankan COP delegates on incorporating EVD in NDC, Ministry of Environment rep. positive if a concept note is submitted; Ministry of Environment and Department of Samurdhi linked their local officials to EVD interventions through official letters; Central Bank of Sri Lanka (Matara branch with CSR funding) installed 100 improved stoves in 1 village with support from IDEA	
	CANSA: CANSA + partner NGOs worked with Bihar State Disaster Management Authority to draft DCRPs for 4 districts; proposal submitted for preparation of 2 DCRPs in Haryana; Inputs from other CANSA members provided to EVD solutions database (agriculture, waste management, soil/moisture conservation); EVD approach + database promoted in webinars, CANSA website, CANSA newsletters, mailing list, social media, policy briefs; CANSA + national partners conducted regional webinars on EVD database, SEM, upscaling of local solutions; regional outreach paper published with partner inputs and launched virtually, key messages in used for social media messaging; EVD IV presented during CANSA Strategy Meeting and General Assembly with CSOs from 7 South Asian countries	
	INFORSE: Led development of EVD solutions online database on INFORSE website (with partner inputs); 3-5 regional webinars on EVD; led 2 UN policy briefs; led EVD outreach publication launched on social media (July 2023); Articles on EVD in 3 INFORSE newsletters (1700-2500 printed copies, 850-1028 downloads per newsletter); reports that INFORSE website statistics show steady interest in publications on EVD and COP side events where EVD was presented	
4. EVD concept and value of local initiatives using local resources recognized as climate solutions by int'l climate bodies and negotiations	INFORSE: arranged side events at 2 UNFCCC COPs and subsidiary body/intersessions; promoted/mentioned EVD in policy briefs for COPs and subsidiary body/intersessions; led side events at UN High-Level Political Forums on Sustainable Development and UN High-Level Dialogues on Energy. Webinar proceedings available on INFORSE website. Proceedings and video of UNFCCC COP side events available in UNFCCC web archive and climate channel. EVD ToT manual available on CTCN website. Continued dialogue with CTCN.	Seeming partly achieved – EVD promoted, but level of international recognition is unclear
	ALL: Promoted EVD IV at INFORSE COP side event, other COP side events, subsidiary body/intersessions/pre-COP meetings, and post-COP webinars and regional webinars arranged	

	by INFORSE/CANSA; contributed to EVD IV publications, EFVD database, and videos (some still under production).	

3.3.4 Overall objective: to achieve improved standard of living of climate vulnerable rural communities in South Asia by integration of local sustainable solutions that contribute to climate change mitigation, adaptation and resilience building

EVD IV led to tangible non-monetary improvements to peoples' lives, which reached community members broadly, in particular related to improved health and reduced workload of women. The reduced consumption of fuelwood and the access to two burners instead of the single burner on traditional stoves, reduced the time spent collecting firewood and cooking for women, freeing up time for other activities. Moreover, the improved cookstoves (and to a lesser extent the induction cookers and biogas plants) and improved kitchens (in Sri Lanka) significantly reduced the exposure of women and also children to indoor pollution, thereby having a tangible positive impact on the health for the majority of households in the four model villages, arguably the single largest impact of EVD IV. Similarly, the provision of drinking water access in Nepal (at village scale), Bangladesh (at small scale and indirectly at village scale) and India (at small scale), reduced the time spent by women on fetching water and contributed to reducing exposure to waterborne diseases, and in Bangladesh, rainwater harvesting may also have contributed to reducing the exposure to arsenic from well-water. Solar street lights in Bangladesh and India and solar lanterns in India were highly appreciated by community-members, and in particular by women, as they allowed for movement and outdoor activity after dark. In Bangladesh, the fishermen report that theft of fishing boats stopped after the street lights were installed. Similarly, the roofed bus stand in India, was much appreciated for providing shade from the sun and cover for the rain during long waits for public transport.

Overall improved living standards and enhanced climate resilience were achieved to varying degrees. The community members in the model village broadly enjoyed tangible improvements in their lives from the above-mentioned non-monetary benefits. However, economic benefits were only achieved by a relatively small proportion of the villagers, namely the direct beneficiaries of agricultural and handicraft-related support, and among these, the level of income generated varied considerably, as described in section 2.3.2. Similarly, changes in the vulnerability to the impacts of climate change varied considerably, as described in section 2.3.1. Improved year-round water benefitted the model village communities broadly in Nepal and Bangladesh. On the other hand, agricultural and handicraft activities reached a much smaller proportion of communities, albeit doing so in all four villages. For these, increased resilience was achieved by introducing more resilient agricultural practices as well as opportunities for livelihood diversification; and for some, increased income would also contribute to reduced vulnerability.

EVD IV led to tangible greenhouse gas emission reductions while also reducing the pressure on ecosystems. As described in section 2.3.1, EVD IV led to significantly reduced greenhouse gas emissions, primarily due to reducing the use of firewood for cooking (mainly stemming from the introduction of improved cookstoves) by 28-49 pct. At the same time, the reduced consumption of firewood reduced the pressure on ecosystems, not least in Nepal, where the firewood was gathered in the forest. It is not possible to assess the significance of

this, since collection of ecosystem data was beyond the scope of the programme, but fire-wood collection is generally a major cause of ecosystem pressure and degradation.

The broader contribution to improved standards of living in South Asia beyond the model villages appears limited. Indirect contributions to broader improved standards of living in the region are difficult to assess, but so far, replication has been modest and policy influence limited, as described in section 2.3.3.

Sustainability of the results achieved is not fully ensured – some, but not all, solutions appear feasible for beneficiaries to maintain without further external support – the communities still face capacity constraints and local authorities may not be able to provide the required support. Some of the technologies introduced are fairly inexpensive and/or should be fairly easy to maintain for the beneficiaries, such as the improved cookstoves or continued rearing of goats and poultry. The ability to maintain other technologies would depend on market access and achieving a sufficient income from the solution, such as maintenance of the poly-greenhouses, for which some beneficiaries (e.g. in Sri Lanka and some in Nepal) are making sufficient money to maintain, whereas this is doubtful for others (e.g. in Nepal and India), unless their capacity to make a viable business out of horticulture is enhanced. Moreover, some of the groups formed, e.g. women's self-help groups, still face capacity constraints and may not continue functioning without further support. Moreover, even the groups with more capacity have only existed for a relatively short period and may thus not yet be adequately consolidated to remain functional in the longer run. Moreover, the incentive to maintain the groups is ultimately linked to the future socio-economic benefits that the members can achieve and is thus also linked to market access and entrepreneurship. Given that community development takes time and usually required a sustained presence from the development partners over several years, it is unsurprising that the model village communities are not, yet fully capacitated after just two-three years of cooperation with the EVD partners, not least since a) the communities have only received little support and capacity development from other organisations, and b) the COVID-19 pandemic significantly restricted the direct engagement at village level. Maintenance of the communal infrastructure put in place would require a certain level of community organisation or government commitment. The water supply system in Nepal is metered and there is a well-established community committee and bylaws for the operation and tariffs, as well as a clear agreement with the municipality on roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis covering more complex and costly maintenance needs. Hence, it is the impression of the evaluator that, adequate structures are in place, not least since this is a top priority for the community.

3.4 Popular engagement and development education

The EVD approach implemented was participatory and took departure in the communities' priorities. The EVD approach was flexible and responded to the interests of the community members. The departure point was the elaboration (or revision) of VDPs to identify the communities' priorities. The choice of technologies that were rolled out took departure in these needs. A particularly prominent example of this was the investment in the water supply system in Nepal, which was initially outside of the intended scope of EVD IV but was the highest priority of the community. Beneficiaries participated in the implementation of the various activities, receiving training and providing contributions (mainly labour and local materials).

Moreover, various community groups were formed, such as self-help groups for animal rearing in Nepal and India and a paddy rice cultivation group in Sri Lanka.

Community committees and local leaders played a key role in EVD IV implementation in Nepal and India. The installation of a water supply system in Nepal was done in close cooperation with the already existing Drinking Water Committee, which is also responsible for the operation and maintenance of the system. Moreover, the programme supported the formation of the Bhalumara Agricultural Committee (Bhalumara Namuna Krishi Sanstha), which was engaged in the mobilisation and implementation of the various livelihood activities, as well as the provision of improved cookstoves. In India, INSEDA worked closely with the above-mentioned Village Development Committee (VDC), which in addition to the four local government members had six female members from the community. Moreover, a community volunteer (who in the later stages of the programme was paid) and a female mobiliser were actively engaged in the programme. In Sri Lanka, IDEA supported local teachers in setting up and conducting extra classes for illiterate children from vulnerable families (not funded by EVD IV).

Stakeholders report that the participation in EVD IV led to increased awareness and changes in attitudes of community members, with women becoming more confident and community representatives (rights holders) being more vocal and proactive vis-à-vis local authorities (duty bearers) in terms of expressing their needs and requesting support. For example, in India, the VDC is engaging with local authorities to mobilise support under various government schemes, e.g. to expedite the installation of a water supply system, which has been pending for almost a decade.

The EVD partners engaged local civil society to varying degrees. The inclusion of local civil society was particularly prominent in Sri Lanka, where IDEA collaborated closely with the local NGO Integrated Agriculture Development Foundation (IADF). IADF was responsible for the day-to-day interaction with the community and local stakeholders and played a pivotal role in the delivery of trainings and follow-up with beneficiaries. The partnership with IADF also enabled follow-up and implementation of some activities during COVID-19 lockdowns as well as during the period of fuel shortages. Initially, a similar model was applied in India by INSEDA, which partnered with the NGO New Live Centre (NLC), which is based in Ratlam town,29pprox.x. 30 km from Margul, and which had previously implemented organic agriculture activities in Margul. However, as described earlier, the new Foreign Currency Regulation Act (FCRA), made it impossible to implement through NLC, so INSEDA hired a local consultant to handle day-to-day implementation, with a headquarter-based (Delhi) INSEDA staff member overseeing implementation and periodically visiting the model village. NLC still participated to some extent in the programme, e.g. towards the end of the programme a female staff member of NLC would monitor some of the EVD IC deliverables through a gender lens. Moreover, training was provided to ten local civil society organisations in Ratlam district on various EVD technologies, but due to lack of funding access, none of these NGOs have applied the skills imparted. In Nepal, there was less use of local civil society organisations, as a CRN/T staff member was posted in the village for eight months to facilitate implementation; this cost was financed through the above-mentioned WWF Nepal grant for improving the water supply. The local NGO partner, CODEC, was mainly engaged in the promotion of improved cookstoves, in which they played a key role (e.g. vis-à-vis selection and design of

stove models, training on stove construction, and training on their use), as one of their core team members is an internationally recognised expert on rural energy and improved cookstoves. Moreover, CODEC had a role vis-à-vis the coordination with local authorities. In Bangladesh, Grameen Shakti did not engage with local NGO partners, but relied on its own staff, initially staff located in the Barisal office, but when this office was closed, the programme was implemented directly from the headquarters in Dhaka.

The EVD partners engaged local government actors. Subnational government entities at the lower levels were involved to different degrees in the four countries. In general, meetings were held with local authorities to keep them informed about the programme and its progress. Moreover, sub-national authorities at different levels were consulted in the selection of the four model villages. Moreover, the local government (village level) was involved in the selection of beneficiaries for the different activities, field visits, most of the trainings conducted, as well as in monitoring and follow-up. In Sri Lanka and Nepal, local government staff also participated in some of the community trainings and technology demonstrations implemented by the programme. In Nepal, ward (the lowest level of government) chairperson participated in most trainings, whereas municipal staff would participate occasionally to monitor the implementation. Local government technical staff were also mobilised to conduct agricultural/horticultural trainings for beneficiaries, e.g. in Bangladesh, Nepal and Sri Lanka, as well as monitoring and providing technical advice to end beneficiaries. Moreover, in Nepal the local government helped resolving issues related to reaching agreement on using private land for communal water infrastructure ad ensure free access for community members. In India, INSEDA engaged local government through the Village Development Committee (VDC), which is not a formal government entity, but includes four panchayat (second-lowest level of government) members including the Sarpanch (panchayat leader). The VDC was strengthened with support (e.g. organisational training) from EVD IV and was responsible for providing recommendations for the selection of beneficiaries, for mobilising community members to participate in meetings and trainings, and for identifying locations and organising official authorisation for communal infrastructure e.g. bus stand, solar street lights, and rainwater harvesting tanks. As a result of engaging in the programme, the VDC became more active, e.g. approaching government authorities to mobilise support for the village from various government schemes (e.g. projects for rural infrastructure, agriculture, water supply, erosion control), and the VDC also supports the panchayat in making cost estimates for such projects.

Private sector engagement proved challenging and was more limited than envisaged. It was planned to target the private sector with advocacy activities to make them aware of the EVD concept and engage in the implementation of EVD. However, this proved difficult in practice. Nonetheless, in Sri Lanka, IDEA successfully supported the Central Bank of Sri Lanka in the implementation of EVD cookstoves and horticulture in another village (supported with CSR funds from larger cooperations). Similarly, two MFIs in Nepal have funded the implementation of EVD by CRT/N in two villages. In India, it was the intention to tap into corporate social responsibility (CSR) funding (it is mandatory for companies in India to invest two pct. of their net profits after tax in social activities) for the implementation and upscaling of EVD, but such funding has not materialised. A challenge vis-à-vis mobilising CSR funding is that companies generally prefer engaging in the vicinity of the company's premises and/or working with large NGOs. Furthermore, it was the intention to link beneficiaries of

agriculture and livelihood activities to private buyers and suppliers. However, such market linkages have only been established to a limited extent, and no private sector funding has been mobilised for EVD implementation.

EVD IV enabled the national EVD partners to participate in COPs, which also provided an opportunity for two EVD partners to engage with national policymakers. The COP accreditation of INFORSE and its access to arranging official side events, enabled CRT/N, GS, IDEA, and DIB to also participate in the COPs. Moreover, the CISU grant provided the needed financial means for all the national EVD partners to participate. While INSEDA is COP accredited, it was only able to cover the travel costs and participate in COPS due to access to EVD IV funding. As described in section 2.3.3, the COP participation provided IDEA and CRT/N an opportunity to engage with high-level officials from their respective countries.

3.5 Results framework, M&E, reporting, and knowledge management

The results framework was not entirely consistent. No theory of change (ToC) was elaborated for EVD IV. The results framework an overview of the approach and intended results of EVD IV. However, there are several inconsistencies in the results framework (see table 4), especially at the higher levels, such as:

- Overlaps and repetitions of different objectives
- Different elements which in reality are at different levels being merged together in single objectives
- No outcomes being defined (although the objectives partly cover the outcome level, as does some of the outputs specified)
- No underlying assumptions identified – and thus the results framework does not capture the key external factors outside the control of the programme, which need to be in place to achieve the intended results
- Output 2.1 was not entirely clear

Establishment of model villages was a broad output, which in essence encapsulated most of the programme, and breaking it down into more specific outputs could have been beneficial.

The stated activities were insufficient for ensuring the achievement of the intended outputs vis-à-vis replication by financial institutions and local stakeholders, uptake of the EVD model by other CSOs, and private sector engagement. Such results cannot be expected to be achieved only through documenting experiences, communication materials, meetings, and exposure visits, as they would hinge on several external factors (e.g. interest and willingness, capacity, access to funding) outside the control of the programme. However, the underlying assumptions in this regard were not identified.

Table 4: Analysis of programme results framework

Item	***Comments***
Overall objective: to achieve improved standard of living of climate vulnerable rural communities in South Asia by integration of local sustainable solutions which contribute to	The objective is a composite of different elements at different levels: - *Improved and climate resilient livelihoods* are a high-level impact - *Climate change mitigation* (emission reductions) is a separate impact - *Integration of local sustainable solutions* is a step before/level below the impact (at the intermediate state level)

climate change mitigation, adaptation and resilience building.	The objective is highly ambitious in its geographical scope, and its achievement would depend on numerous factors and large-scale investments far beyond the reach of the programme and the implementing partners. However, the programme design does not identify the underlying assumptions of what would be required beyond the programme itself for the objective to be achieved.
Objective 1: At the end of the programme rural communities in Nepal, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and India have improved their lives through the establishment of EVD model villages.	Overlaps with/duplicates the overall objective, except for the much narrower geographical scope (focusing on EVD model villages). A composite of two different levels, which should have been separated: - *Improved lives* are an impact - *Establishment of EVD model villages* does does not indicate a tangible change/improvement in itself, but is an indication of the approach taken
Objective 2: At the end of the programme local communities and stakeholders have additional market access and business opportunity to appropriate solutions contributing to improved livelihood, climate change mitigation and adaptation.	A composite of different elements, which should have been separated: - *market access and business opportunities* are an outcome – in essence this contributes to objective 1 (improved lives) - *Improved livelihoods, mitigation (emission reductions), adaptation (resilience)* are impacts and duplicate the overall objective, and the livelihood part is a repetition of objective 2
Objective 3: The EVD concept has been disseminated to and recognized by a broader audience reaching from local to international level.	A composite of different elements, which should have been separated: - *Dissemination* is an activity, not a result - *Recognition by a broader audience* is is an output, which will only become an outcome if the EVD concept or parts hereof, are adopted by others
Output 1.1 Programme preparations	*Programme preparations* are not a result and thus not an appropriate output to include in the results framework. *Programme preparations* are essentially a part of programme management.
Output 1.2 Village Development Plans for each selected village	An appropriate output
Output 1.3 Establishment of one Model EVD village in each of the 4 countries and capacity building of local beneficiaries	Composite of two elements, which should have been separated: - *Establishment of model villages* is a broad output, which in essence encapsulates most of the programme - *Capacity building* is generic and unspecific and in essence at the activity level
Output 1.4 Development of communication and advocacy material	Phrased as an activity, rather rather than as an output, and is a repetition of activity 1.4.1 (*Develop advocacy and communication material for stakeholders*)
Output 1.5 Advocacy for Model Village for further upscaling of the EVD Model Village in neighbouring	Phrased as an activity, rather than as an output.

villages involving other local stakeholders (NGOs, MFIs, private companies, local government authorities)	
Output 2.1 Establishment of the Social Enterprise Model (SEM) of EVD solution(s) in all four countries	The linkage between SEM and EVD solutions is not entirely clear from the phrasing of the output. Activity 2.1.3 (*identify villages at value chain*) is not entirely clear. Activity 2.1.4 (*Capacity building for partners in marketing, promotion, value*) chains and 2.1.5 (*Capacity building for stakeholders on EVD solutions and SEM strategies, involvement of stakeholders in dissemination*) are largely duplicating the activities under output 1.3 (1.3.1 *Trainings and capacity building of local beneficiaries on the EVD solutions*, 1.3.2 *Establish EVD model village with market linkages for income generation*).
Output 2.2 Involvement of financial institutions and local stakeholders for replication	Phrased as an activity, rather than as an output. The activities (*documenting SEM experience, communication package, advocacy meetings*) appear insufficient for effectively ensuring the involvement of financial institutions and local stakeholders in replication, and would depend on several external factors, but no underlying assumptions are identified. Activity 2.2.3 (*advocacy meetings for engagement of stakeholders in replication*) appears to overlap with output 1.5 (*Advocacy for Model Village for further upscaling of the EVD Model Village in neighbouring villages involving other local stakeholders*).
Output 3.1 Outreach and strengthening the networking with CSOs	Phrased as activities, rather than as an output. The intended output or outcome appears to be that other CSOs adopt the EVD model. However, the activities (*outreach and networking meetings, bimonthly seminars/webinars*) appear insufficient for effectively ensuring uptake and would depend on several external factors (e.g. interest, capacity, funding), but no underlying assumptions are identified.
Output 3.2 Local and subnational, national level advocacy, including private sector engagement	Composite of two elements, which should have been separated: - *Advocacy* is an activity, not an output in its own right. - *Private sector engagement*, would depend on several external factors (e.g. interest, willingness to invest), but no underlying assumptions are identified.
Output 3.3 Presentations and dialogues at international level	Phrased as an activity, rather than as an output.
Output 4.1 Programme management, monitoring and joint meetings	*Programme management* is not an output in its own right.

The indicators were not entirely conducive for results-oriented monitoring. Two sets of indicators were elaborated for the programme; the programme document contained indicators for each of the three objectives, whereas an additional set of EVD indicators were developed during the programme. No indicators were specified for the outputs, but at the country level, each of the national EVD partners specified their own set with a large number of

output indicators, which often were listing intended activities rather than being defined indicators for measuring results. This led to an excessive number of indicators, and a single set of programme indicators would have been sufficient. The objective indicators were mostly activity- or output-oriented and did generally not capture the objectives (intended outcomes and impacts). Some EVD indicators were appropriate for measuring the objectives outcomes and impact), but others were output focused or not entirely relevant considering the nature of the interventions implemented. The EVD development indicators mainly focused on the economic side of development and did not reflect non-monetary contributions to improved lives, e.g. in relation to health, and food/nutrition security. Table 5 provides a detailed assessment of the objective and EVD indicators.

Table 5: Analysis of indicators	
Indicator	***Comments***
Objective 1: At the end of the programme rural communities in Nepal, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and India have improved their lives through the establishment of EVD model villages.	
1. The local communities have defined and presented their needs and asks for development in their community	Output related, not a measurement of improved lives.
2. The EVD Model villages have been established in each country and the agreed EVD indicators have been monitored	Composite of two different indicators: - *Model villages established* – output (not an indicator), not measure of improved lives. - *EVD indicators monitored* – programme management (not an indicator), not a measure of improved lives.
3. Other stakeholders and villagers are replicating or co-funding EVD activities or solutions	Indicates interest and appropriateness of EVD activities, an indirect measure of improved lives (but not a direct measure).
Objective 2: At the end of the programme local communities and stakeholders have additional market access and business opportunity to appropriate solutions contributing to improved livelihood, climate change mitigation and adaptation.	
1. Minimum one Social Enterprise Model of EVD solution(s) has been developed and rolled out in 12 villages in India, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh	Not a direct measure of market access or business opportunities.
2. The SEM is giving additional market access and business opportunity	In essence a repetition of objective 2.
3. Other stakeholders and villagers are replicating or co-funding EVD activities or solutions	Duplication of indicator 3 for objective 1. Indicates interest and appropriateness of EVD activities, may indirectly indicate market access or business opportunities (but not a direct measure).
Objective 3: The EVD concept has been disseminated to and recognized by a broader audience reaching from local to international level.	
1. The partners have shared their knowledge of EVD to other CSOs, local governments, and other regional governments	Output (duplicated first half of objective 3), does not provide information on recognition.
2. The INFORSE SA, CANSA have increased in membership and participation due to participation in programme outreach	In practice difficult to attribute specifically to recognition of the EVD concept.

4. 3. Other stakeholders and networks have taken up the EVD concept by including the EVD approach or publications e.g. in: - Local and municipality development plans and budgets - CSR plans (for private sector) - Documents from national planning bodies - Replicating or co-financing activities	Relevant indicator, but in practice be a bit difficult to measure, unless the concerned entities have interacted directly with the EVD partners.
4. The EVD concept and the value of local initiatives using local resources are recognized as climate solutions by international climate bodies and negotiations	Relevant, but recognition by international climate bodies and in negotiations appears overambitious.
Mitigation (EVD indicators)	
50 % of the HH in the community have access to clean cooking solutions (ICS, biogas, electric cookstove)	Appropriate indicator.
Improved access to clean electricity by 25 % of target group /reduced the consumption of fossil fuels by 25% of the target group	Composite of two different indicators: - *Access to clean electricity* – limited relevance as electricity provision not a significant area of intervention. - *Reduced consumption of fossil fuels* – limited relevance as the focus was on reducing use of firewood, fossil fuel mainly used in model villages for transport and through use of grid electricity. Firewood is the main source of cooking energy in South Asian villages.
Reduced GHG emissions from EVD solutions installed vs. emissions from replaced solutions	Appropriate indicator.
Adaptation (EVD indicators)	
30 % of target group are having organic kitchen gardens and are practising off-season gardening where applicable	Appropriate output indicator, but not capturing impact (i.e. not capturing benefits in terms of income increase or diversification, food and nutrition access, reduced vulnerability to climate change).
Increased access to clean water by 30 % of target group (for irrigation, potable water)	Appropriate indicator, although not directly capturing impact (i.e. not capturing benefits in terms of improved health, reduced prevalence of disease, reduced time spent gathering water).
Tangible/visible reduction of the climate vulnerability with EVD solutions	Relevant but generic/unspecific indicator.
Raised awareness on adaptation for development officers/beneficiaries	Relevant output (or outcome) indicator, not capturing impact (i.e. not reflecting a tangible improvement in climate resilience).
EVD development (EVD indicators)	
50% of those receiving capacity building are women / involved in activities are women	Relevant activity/output indicator, not capturing livelihood impact

Tangible increase the number of women entrepreneurs/ Self Help Groups in the community	Output indicator, not capturing livelihood impact
Education and awareness on climate change solutions have reached out to 50% of the villagers	Output indicator, not capturing objectives or impact – and largely duplicating EVA adaptation indicator 4
30% increased income generation or cost savings for the target group adopting EVD solutions/approach	Appropriate, but composite indicator: - *Increased income* - *Cost savings*
Co-funding of the solutions from the beneficiaries	Not a measurement of improved lives.
EVD plan is developed with the involvement of the community (over 50% community representation) prior to implementing activities	Output indicator, not a measurement of improved lives.

The reporting on programme outcomes and impacts has so far not been systematic, with the exception of greenhouse gas emission reductions which were comprehensively covered. Considering the above-described issues with the results framework and indicators, as as well as the lack of sufficiently clear definitions of ecovillage and SEM (see section 3.2), it is not surprising that the progress reports mainly captured outputs and activities. The documentation of achievement of the objectives, outcomes, and progress towards impact was considerably less consistent and mainly comprised general and qualitative statements. Nonetheless, the reporting on greenhouse gas emission reductions achieved was systematically and comprehensively done. Nonetheless, this shortcoming appears at least in part related to the fact that the planned impact assessments at the model village level were not yet available at the time of the evaluation.

Risk monitoring was not entirely systematic. The programme document appropriately indicated that many risks would be country specific, while specifying three risks that are generally applicable for the South Asia region and the four programme countries: a) national and local elections (or their outcomes) causing delays or hindering continuity of some field activities, b) extreme climate events and natural hazards/disasters disrupting implementation, and c) changes in government programmes, e.g. vis-à-vis rural electrification, which could affect the appropriateness of some of the promoted energy solutions. The programme document stated that individual risks assessments and risk monitoring would be conducted during the implementation, however, there is no evidence of systematic risk assessments at the country or local level. Risks were captured in progress reports to varying degrees among the implementing partners, but the three risks identified in the programme document were covered in a couple of reports prepared by CRT/N. Risk reporting mainly focused on COVID-19 and the measures implemented in response, although INSEDA's reports also reflected the reaching implications of changes to the NGO legal framework in India, which now prevents the pass on of international funding to other national and local NGOs and CSOs, and IDEA's reports briefly touched on the economic crisis in Sri Lanka but did not report on its implications for the programme, such as travel constraints due to fuel shortages and significant price increases (e.g. for the improved cookstoves). Nonetheless, risks, the impact of contextual factors, and mitigation measures were discussed among the EVD partners in various meetings.

EVD IV had a focus on learning and several technology options were tested, some worked well, whereas others proved unsuited for the local context. Several technologies and

options were tested in the different model villages. Some worked well and gave good results broadly (e.g. improved cookstoves), whereas others proved less successful or suited for only few people and not broadly applicable solutions (e.g. biogas), and yet others had little traction overall (e.g. solar dryers). Based on the lessons, the EVD partners would abandon some technologies and modify their approach to others. The design of a given technology would be context specific. For example, in each country, a different design of improved cookstoves would be provided, depending on what was nationally available and endorsed. Moreover, the success of a given technology would be specific, for example, vermicompost had a better uptake in Sri Lanka than in Nepal. Similarly, poly-greenhouses led to good results in Sri Lanka and Nepal but did not work well in India due to the hot climate.

The context in India proved particularly challenging due to the climate and the scarcer access to water as well as well as a seemingly higher degree of poverty and marginalisation of the indigenous community compared to the other villages. Partly, as a result of these challenges, but also related to use of unsuited technology designs and challenges with follow-up, several setbacks were experienced, such as vermicompost bags and poly-greenhouses being damaged by strong winds, vegetables dying from heat stress in the poly-greenhouses, and lack of use and maintenance of bamboo composting bags. Two independent audit visits carried out found several examples of installations that were not operational. Nonetheless, when the evaluator visited the model village in November 2023, the broken vermicompost bags had been replaced with more robust cement structures and greenhouses had been repaired and modified to allow for better ventilation.

EVD IV provided an opportunity for the national EVD partners to further broaden their scope to include climate change adaptation, agriculture and income generation and obtain new competencies – they successfully engaged in new areas of work, often through partnerships. Prior to engaging in EVD, CRT/N, Grameen Shakti, IDEA, INFORSE, and INSEDA had primarily worked in the (rural) energy sector and thus mainly engaged in climate change mitigation, although CRT/T also had experience with other technologies, such as water supply. However, through the implementation of EVD I and II, the partners had learned that a community-driven approach, addressing multiple challenges experienced by the communities, was more conducive for community ownership and engagement. Furthermore, adaptation to the impacts of climate change is a need of poor South Asian communities, e.g. vis-à-vis agricultural production, the main livelihood strategy and thus a key priority for communities. At the village level, the partners successfully engaged in agriculture and other livelihood and adaptation activities. This was often done through partnerships with local and national actors, such as mobilising local public extension services (e.g. local government staff) and public technical institutions in the training on agriculture. Grameen Shakti to some extent drew on the expertise of other organisations in the Grameen family, e.g. vis-à-vis micro-finance.

EVD IV provided capacity development support and some opportunities for South-South learning for the national EVD partners. INFORSE provided mainly mitigation-related support to the national EVD partners, including an online training session on greenhouse gas emission calculations, guidance on the EVD database, and editing of inputs to joint publications. CANSA provided mainly adaptation-related support, incl. an online training session on adaptation assessment and some advocacy and communication advice. DIB provided an online training session on livelihoods, as well as feedback and guidance on monitoring, progress

reporting, financial reporting, and CISU requirements. Experience-sharing meetings for the EVD partners were held in Nepal (April 2022) and Bangladesh (October 2023), providing opportunities for experience sharing. Moreover, an inception meeting was held in India under EVD III. In Nepal in 2022, a field visit was arranged to the village supported under EVD I-II.

3.6 Financial resources, administrative capacity, budgets, and cost effectiveness

Financial management generally appears to have been satisfactory albeit with issues in one country, whereas spending appears somewhat behind schedule. As of 15 October 2023, 2.5 months before the programme completion date, DKK 3,788,885 of the DKK DKK 4,316,431 CISU grant had been spent, leaving an unspent balance of DKK 527,546. Hence 88 pct. of the budget had been executed at the time of the evaluation. As of July 2023, the EVD partners (excl. DIB) had the following execution rates for their respective budget allocations: CANSA: 100 pct; CRT/N: 92 pct.; GS: 81 pct.; IDEA: 86 pct.; INFORSE: 101 pct. INSEDA: 87 pct. Actual spending on each budget line has generally been well aligned with budget allocations. Overall, a full execution of the budget is expected once the final financial statements are available. The EVD partners expressed satisfaction with the financial and administrative guidance received from DIB. As per the grant agreement with CISU, the EVD IV accounts of each EVD partner will be subject to external audits, but these reports were not available at the time of the evaluation, but for the larger part, the evaluator did not come across any evidence that raised any concerns about the financial management. However, external auditors were engaged to assess spending by INSEDA. The auditors found a number of financial issues, such as invoices from different suppliers seemingly being written by the same person, some invoices being inflated compared to market prices, errors in some bills, and incomplete logbooks for use of motorbikes. The above-mentioned auditors found some administrative issues with the concerned EVD partner, such as lack of signed employment agreements, and non-availability of company policies (e.g. for human resources, accounting, cash and bank management, procurement). Rectifying measures applied by INSEDA include reimbursement of the concerned expenses, whereas the staff member responsible for the concerned invoices had already been replaced for other reasons. Moreover, spending and disbursements of programme funds were put on hold until the issues were solved. However, INSEDA pointed out that the auditors had not adequately considered that prices fluctuate, and different types/species of bamboo have different prices. The evaluator found no evidence that suggests that the other EVD partners were affected by similar issues.

An overly broad scope compared to the budget resulted in considerable transaction costs, and the small budget available for each EVD partner was a significant limitation. With field level implementation of a broad range of activity types in four countries as well as regional and global learning, advocacy and outreach activities, and seven EVD partners involved, the budget was spread quite thinly. One implication of this was that the resources available for field implementation in in each model village was quite limited, which is one reason for only a relatively small proportion of each model village community receiving livelihood support, hence limiting the impact/transformational potential in each model village. Another implication was that the proportion of funding spent on salaries and activity-related wages was quite high, as also noted by the CISU Assessment Committee that reviewed the programme proposal (budgeted at 29 pct.), although the nature of the programme and the related activities, also required significant staff time vis-à-vis community mobilisation, capacity

development, planning, and oversight. It also made programme management and oversight complex and a tall order for a small organisation like DIB. Despite the significant proportion of the budget allocated for staff time, the resources available were not entirely adequate compared to the need, and several of the involved personnel had to put in extra time.

It is uncertain whether there will be access to financial resources for further implementation of the EVD concept and for ensuring post-programme sustainability in the model villages. As described earlier, sustainability of the results is not yet ensured (see section 2.3.4) and the ability of villagers and local actors to ensure sustainability on their own is limited by financial constraints and fund mobilisation has been modest (see sections 2.3.1, 2.3.3, and 2.3.4). Hence, continuity in the model villages, as well as for the further application of the EVD concept more broadly, hinges on the EVD partners and their ability to mobilise funding for post-EVD IV continuation.

However, the funding situation is currently unclear. Whether DIB would be successful in mobilising CISU funding for a fifth phase of EVD remains to be seen; firstly, there is competition among Danish NGOs for CISU funding and secondly, donors are often reluctant towards funding several phases of the same programme, as they often have an interest in seeing something new and innovative. It is a common challenge, that while lasting community development usually requires a sustained presence over an extended period, donors are rarely willing to continuing investing in the same programme in the same village for such long periods. Moreover, a single CISU member cannot receive more than DKK six million the same year, and DIB also has other programmes funded by CISU. Overall, CISU is DIB's primary donor. For IDEA, CISU is also the primary/largest donor and discontinuation of the EVD programme could thus significantly impact on IDEA's operations, although IDEA is in the process of mobilising funding from other donors, incl. funding from Germany for continuation of the EVD programme. INSEDA covers a significant proportion of its budget through carbon credits but has limited opportunity to access international NGO funding within India given the FRCA, and mobilising CSR funding has also proven challenging, although NABARD requested INSEDA to submit a proposal for EVD replication in one village. CRT/N, GS, CANSA and INFORSE all have access to funding from other donors and are thus not dependent on CISU funding, but neither have other ongoing or planned projects in the model villages. So far, CRT/N is the only EVD partner, which has mobilised funding from other sources for EVD projects (see sections 2.2 and 2.2.3). Climate change mitigation and climate change adaptation are often treated as two distinct and separate issues by donors. The EVD partners find that this poses a challenge vis-à-vis fund mobilisation, as donors are not entirely geared to finance integrated mitigation-adaptation initiatives like EVD, despite the fact that at the local level in a rural context, the two are in practice interweaved. For example, CISU now focuses its climate funding on adaptation (as response to the fact that mitigation overall receives significantly more funding than adaptation) and will only to a limited extent fund mitigation and only if there is a clear link to adaptation.

4 Conclusion

Relevance: EVD IV responded to global climate change processes, while targeting specific vulnerable communities and addressing their needs, in particular those of women. The programme sought to promote the EVD concept of implementing community-driven local

solutions to address global climate change mitigation and adaptation objectives. In the four model villages, a participatory approach was taken, where the communities themselves identified their priorities and needs. Based on the specific interest and context of each model village, a range of technologies were identified and implemented. This led to an integrated approach where mitigation, adaptation, and livelihoods were all addressed, acknowledging that at the local level these are closely intertwined. The model villages covered by the programme were already vulnerable to climate conditions, being exposed to drought (India, Nepal) and floods (Bangladesh, Sri Lanka), a vulnerability expected to be further exacerbated by climate change. The communities targeted had a generally poor socio-economic status and the communities in India and Nepal comprise indigenous peoples; with the community in India being particularly marginalised. EVD IV specifically targeted and empowered women, the dissemination of improved and cleaner cooking technologies in particular benefitted women, and the majority of direct beneficiaries of livelihood support were women. Moreover, the programme engaged local government actors and to varying degrees local civil society, to ensure that EVD IV was well anchored in the local context; however, it proved challenging to engage the private sector. The experiences at the local level were linked to advocacy and communication efforts at sub-national, national, regional, and global levels (in particular UNFCCC COPs) as an attempt to raise awareness of the potential and value of local solutions and integrated approaches as well as to promote further upscaling and replication of the EVD concept in climate change policies and investments.

Coherence: The EVD partners achieved some synergy with other interventions. In some instances, synergies with other initiatives strengthened the implementation of EVD IV and enhanced the results that were achieved. In particular, the mobilisation of significant WWF cofunding for installing a water supply system was instrumental for the successful engagement with the model village community in Nepal, and the WWF project also allowed for an extended field presence of CRT/N. Similarly, EVD IV unlocked local government funding for the installation of 100 rainwater harvesting systems in the model village in Bangladesh. Furthermore, the UNFCCC COP accreditation of INFORSE enabled COP participation by the EVD national partners.

Effectiveness: Overall, EVD IV was well implemented and demonstrated the viability of the EVD concept – but the objectives and targets were only partly achieved, as the scope of the programme was overly broad and overambitious. Overall, the programme was successfully implemented with good results in the model villages as well as a considerable engagement in awareness raising at various levels. In particular, the wide dissemination of improved cookstoves in all villages and provision of improved access to water in Nepal and Bangladesh widely benefitted the communities, in particular women. Moreover, the improved cookstoves were the primary reason that the programme largely achieved its climate change mitigation targets, and the provision of improved water access was arguably the largest contribution towards achieving the adaptation targets. The agricultural and alternative livelihood activities, including the social enterprises, contributed to varying degrees to improving the livelihoods and enhancing climate change resilience of the direct beneficiaries. However, these only reached a relatively small proportion of the community members in the four model villages due to budget constraints – the allocation for each model village was limited, as the programme budget was divided between seven partners and covered activities in four countries as well as at the regional and global level. The small budget available for

each partner was a significant constraint. However, other reasons for the adaptation and livelihood targets only being partly reached also appear to be market constraints as well as the relatively short time available to build beneficiary capacities (further exacerbated by the fact that the chosen model villages were new to the EVD partners), e.g. vis-à-vis entrepreneurship and climate change awareness. For example, not all social enterprises became fully operational during the course of the programme. Furthermore, since the model villages were new, there was limited evidence to inform advocacy and as a result, there was a disconnect between field implementation and regional advocacy activities.

Efficiency: The programme was largely implemented in a timely manner and within budget – but transaction costs were high due to an overly complex programme design and an overambitious scope. It is unsurprising that the COVID-19 pandemic significantly impacted programme delivery and caused delays, and as a result, CISU granted an extension of the programme implementation period. Appropriate measures were made by the EVD partners in response to COVD-19 as well as local challenges in some countries, and the activities were delivered. The programme budget was largely executed albeit somewhat behind schedule. However, with the above-mentioned overly broad scope of the programme with several partners and countries (see conclusion on effectiveness) and a small budget, transaction costs were high, with a significant proportion spent on salaries and fees. Moreover, the results framework had several inconsistencies, which in combination with a large number of indicators (which were not always appropriate), as well as unclear definitions of ecovillages and SEM, made programme monitoring and reporting complicated.

Impact: EVD IV led to reduced greenhouse gas emissions and contributed to resilience and improving beneficiary lives in the model villages – but there has only been limited upscaling and replication. The programme achieved tangible reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, which were mainly achieved through the provision of improved cookstoves; which reduced the beneficiaries' use of firewood for cooking by 28-49 pct. The year-round access to drinking water contributed to an enhanced resilience to climate change and water scarcity. Moreover, it is reasonable to assume that the improved cookstoves as well as the provision of clean drinking water led to improved health for the communities, especially for the women with the significantly reduced exposure to indoor air pollution. Moreover, the improved cookstoves as well as the water access reduced the workload of women. Similarly, the direct beneficiaries of agriculture and livelihood support obtained to varying degrees livelihoods and resilience benefits in the form of increased incomes, alternative income opportunities, reduced spending on agricultural products, and/or improved access to food and/or nutrition. However, while tangible impacts were achieved for the direct beneficiaries, upscaling and replication of EVD solutions by local actors has been limited due to financial and capacity constraints, despite a good level of interest. Similarly, there is limited evidence of EVD replication by other organisations. Nonetheless, CRT/N and to a lesser extent IDEA were able to engage with other organisations and donors to implement EVD activities in other villages. Moreover, the advocacy efforts did not lead to significant policy influence more broadly, although IDEA was able to use the COP participation to establish a link to senior policymakers and influence Sri Lanka's National Climate Change Policy.

Sustainability: The results achieved in the model villages are not yet fully sustainable as beneficiaries and local actors are not able to continue with EVD due to remaining capacity

and financial constraints – consolidating the results would require further support for the model villages and local authorities. The EVD partners had not worked in the four model villages prior to the programme (beyond the feasibility studies under EVD III). Moreover the communities had little prior experience with working with NGOs. The model village in India is particularly marginalised and poor. Considering this starting point and that EVD IV only ran for 3.5 years, which were interrupted by COVID-19, it is unsurprising that the communities still face significant capacity constraints and are not yet fully empowered to maintain all programme gains without further support, yet alone to further upscale EVD. Some, but not all, solutions appear to be feasible for beneficiaries to maintain without further external support. Moreover, local authorities are not fully able to provide the required post-programme support. As such, sustainability to a significant extent hinges on a continued presence of the national EVD partners (although some activity types can be maintained and continued by the beneficiaries). However, it is currently uncertain that the EVD partners will have access to financial resources for ensuring post-programme sustainability in the model villages as well as for further implementation of the EVD concept.

5 Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Develop a strategy and approach for further deepening and expanding the EVD concept in the four model villages, including:

a) Clear definitions (incl. parameters and criteria) of the ecovillage and SEM concepts
b) A theory of change with a focus on:
    - ensuring sustainability of the EVD IV results
    - upscaling livelihood support to a larger proportion of the beneficiaries in the four model, incl. the most vulnerable households
    - further increasing the focus on building entrepreneurship skills and market access
    - further enhancing climate change and environmental awareness in the model villages
    - further developing the capacities of local authorities and actors to engage in EVD and support the model villages (and other villages)
c) A realistic and consistent results framework with appropriate indicators based on the theory of change

Recommendation 2: Engage systematically in fundraising for the EVD strategy for deepening and expanding EVD (see recommendation 1) as EVD partnership and as individual NGOs, including:

a) Preparing a realistic proposal for CISU, while ensuring that scope and geographical coverage, incl. the number of partners and countries, match the resources available
b) Providing fundraising capacity development for national partners, with a focus on supporting the partners with a highest degree of dependency on CISU funding
c) Mapping funding opportunities in Denmark and the four South Asian countries
d) Elaborating and submitting proposals as EVD partnership and as individual organisations
e) Forming strategic partnerships and cooperation with larger NGOs that can adopt and upscale the EVD model

Recommendation 3: Develop a plan for ensuring that the scope and level of ambition match the resources available – prioritise partners and countries based on the following criteria:

a) Model villages with the highest levels of poverty, marginalisation, and vulnerability
b) National partners with the highest level of dependency on financial support from CISU
c) National partners with the highest level of interest in continuing in the partnership

Annexes

Annex 1: Evaluation Schedule

Date	Activity
22 Sep 2023	Signing of evaluation contract
30 Oct 2023	Dept. Copenhagen
31 Oct 2023	Arr. Colombo Drive Colombo-Matara
1 Nov 2023	Meeting IDEA + IADF Site visits, Kottawatte
2 Nov 2023	Site visits, Kottawatte Meeting Kottawatte Grama Niladhari Division Meeting Pahalavitiyala Grama Niladhari Division Site visit, Pahalavitiyala Meeting IDEA + IADF
3 Nov 2023	Report writing
4 Nov 2023	Day off
5 Nov 2023	Drive Matara-Colombo Dept. Colombo Arr. Kathmandu Meeting CRT/N Drive Kathmandu-Mulkot
6 Nov 2023	Drive Mulkot-Bhalumara Meeting drinking water committee, agriculture committee, youth club Site visits, Bhalumara Drive Bhalumara-Sindhuli Meeting Sindhuli Municipality
7 Nov 2023	Meeting CODEC Meeting Sindhuli Ward no. 3 Drive Sindhuli-Kathmandu
8 Nov 2023	Meeting CRT/N
9 Nov 2023	Dept. Kathmandu Arr. Indore
10 Nov 2023	Drive Indore-Margul Site visits, Margul Drive Margul-Ratlam Meeting INSEDA
11 Nov 2023	Drive Ratlam-Margul Meeting VDC + panchayat + community members, Margul Meeting NLC + consultant + volunteer Drive Margul-Indore Meeting INSEDA
12 Nov 2023	Dept. Indore Arr. Hyderabad

18 Nov 2023	Arr. Copenhagen
21 Nov 2023	Online meeting GS
22 Nov 2023	Online meeting CANSA
22 Nov 2023	Online meeting DIB
30 Nov 2023	Online meeting INFORSE
29 Dec 2023	Submission of draft report
12 Feb 2024	Comments on draft report
14 Feb 2024	Submission of final report

Annex 2: People Consulted

Organisation	Name	Position
Sri Lanka		
IDEA	Dumindu Herath	Project Manager
	A.G. Ranasinghe	Project Coordinator
	H.R. Lochanie Madurangi	Project Officer
IADF	L.H. Palihakkara	
Kottawatte Grama Niladhari Division	Nirosha Priyadharshani	Grama Niladhari (Village Official)
	Diana Nilanthi	Economic Development Officer
Kottawatte village	Community members, beneficiaries	
Pahalavitiyala Grama Niladhari Division	Chamila	Economic Development officer
Pahalavitiyala village	Community members, beneficiaries	
Nepal		
CRT/N	Anzoo Sharma	Deputy Director
	Sanubabu Pandit	Field Coordinator
CODEC	Neeru Shrestha	Treasurer
	Bikram K.C.	Chairperson
Marin Rural Municipality	Bimarsa Moktan	Municipal Chairperson
	Jit Bahadur Shrestha	Ward Chairperson, Ward no. 3
Bhalumara village	Community members, beneficiaries	
India		
INSEDA	Sanjiv Nathan	Senior Specialist Cum Advisor
	Bajrangi Prasad Keshari	Field Coordinator
	Raymond Myles	Chairperson
		Consultant
NLC	Deepali	
Margul Gram Panchayat		Sarpanch
Margul village	Community members, beneficiaries	
Bangladesh		
Grameen Shakti	Abdul Arif	Manager, Programme Development
Global and regional		
CANSA	Santosh Patnaik	Program Coordinator
INFORSE	Gunnar Boye Olesen	Coordinator
	Judith Szol	
DIB	Lykke Valentin Kristiansen	Head of Secretariat
	Camilla Sternberg	Programme Manager
	Simon Iversen	Programme Manager and Administration

Annex 3: Documents Consulted

Ashok Maheshwary & Associates LLP: Inspection Report (2022)

CANSA, CRT/N, DIB, Grameen Shakti, IDEA, INSEDA, INFORSE: Low-Carbon Climate-Resilient Eco-Village Development in South Asia (May 2023)

CANSA, CRT/N, DIB, Grameen Shakti, IDEA, INSEDA, INFORSE: Programme implementation plans/timelines

CANSA, CRT/N, DIB, Grameen Shakti, IDEA, INSEDA, INFORSE: quarterly financial statements (2021-2022)

CANSA, CRT/N, DIB, Grameen Shakti, IDEA, INSEDA, INFORSE: signed contracts (2020)

CANSA, CRT/N, DIB, Grameen Shakti, IDEA, INSEDA, INFORSE: various power point presentations

CANSA, CRT/N, DIB, Grameen Shakti, IDEA, INSEDA, INFORSE: websites (accessed in Nov-Dec 2023)

CANSA, CRT/N, DIB, IDEA, INSEDA, INFORSE: Climate Mitigation Effects of Eco-Village Development Projects (Nov 2023)

CANSA, CRT/N, Grameen Shakti, IDEA, INSEDA, INFORSE: Final narrative reports (2023)

CANSA, CRT/N, Grameen Shakti, IDEA, INSEDA, INFORSE: half-yearly narrative reports

CANSA, DIB, INFORSE: video recordings of training sessions on mitigation, adaptation, livelihoods

CANSA: Social Enterprise Model in Organic Farming and Marketing in India – A Case Study

CISU: Assessment Committee Note (Aug 2019)

CISU: Development Intervention (*programme document*): Next generation low carbon, climate resilient Eco-Village Development in South Asia (Jan 2019)

CISU: Revised programme budget (June 2018)

CRT/N, IDEA, INSEDA: Feasibility studies (July 2020)

CRT/N: Request to CISU for COVID Response Support to Nepalese Rural Community under EVD Project Area Bhalumara Village of Marin Rural Municipality, Sindhuli district

DIB: EVD partner meeting minutes (2020-2023)

DIB: Final Narrative Report (October 2023)

DIB: Programmes for joint meetings in Nepal (2022) and Bangladesh (2023)

DIB: Progress Report (October 2021)

Grameen Shakti: Social Enterprise Model (June 2020)

INFORSE: EVD Database (Apr 2022)

INFORSE: Policy briefs for UNFCCC SB56 (June 2022) and COP27 (Nov 2022)

INSEDA: Baseline Survey Report

Tino Sood and Company: Financial Audit Report (2023)