

Final Review Report

The Fund for Climate and Environment

September 2017

List of contents

LIST OF ACRONYMS LIST OF ACRONYMS	ii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 METHODOLOGY	1
2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLED FCE PROJECTS	2
3. RESULTS ACHIEVED IN THE FCE	2
3.1 FOCUS OF THE RESULTS IN THE FCE	2
3.2 MATRIX ON PROJECT ACHIEVEMENTS	3
3.3 RESULTS IN ADVOCACY	4
3.4 RESULTS IN CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT	8
3.5 RESULTS IN RELATION TO CIVIL SOCIETY STRENGTHENING	10
3.6 PARTNERSHIPS AND TARGET GROUP PARTICIPATION	11
3.7 RESULTS IN RELATION TO POVERTY ORIENTATION, SOCIAL INCLUSION AND RIGHTS	11
3.8 OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF RESULTS	12
4. SUSTAINABILITY OF THE INTERVENTIONS	13
5. RELEVANCE	13
5.1 RELEVANCE OF INTERVENTIONS	13
5.2 RELEVANCE IN RELATION TO FCE APPLICANT ORGANISATION	16
5. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE FCE IMPLEMENTATION	17
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	18
ANNEX 1 LIST OF SAMPLED PROJECTS	22
ANNEX 2 TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE REVIEW	23

CISU	Civil Samfund I Udvikling (Civil Society in Development)
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DKK	Danish Kroner
FCE	Fund for Climate and Environment
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
IP	Indigenous Peoples
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs Denmark
NAP	National Adaption Plan
NDC	Nationally Determined Contributions
NEC	Natural Resource, Environment and Climate (Strategy)
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NRM	Natural Resource Management
REDD+	Reduced Emission from Deforestation and Degradation
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

The Fund for Climate and Environment (FCE) supports climate change and environment interventions of Danish civil society organisations in partnership with civil society organisations in the Global South. The political rationale for establishing the FCE in 2013 was to mobilise civic involvement in advocating for climate and environment themes at national, regional and international levels. This is reflected in the FCE Guidelines by stipulating that the aim of FCE is to promote cooperation with partner organisations, networks and alliances in developing countries to advocate for climate and environmental themes. The FCE is administered by CISU under an agreement with the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) who is providing the finance for the FCE. It has existed since 2013 and financed or committed finance to 24 different projects with a total value of around DKK 89 million. The latest grants funded under the present agreement will be finalized no later than 30 June 2018.

In order to extract learning from the four years of administrating the fund, CISU has initiated a review of the fund to take place during June-September 2017. The objectives of the review are:

- Insights into and assessment of FCE results in relation to the stated objectives at fund and grant level.
- Assessment of current and possible future FCE relevance for users based on the above mentioned insights into and assessment of FCE results.
- Assessment of FCE's possible relevance in relation to the new development policy and humanitarian strategy and the objectives of the Danish climate envelope based on the assessment of FCE results and relevance to users.

The ToR of the review can be found in Annex 2.

1.2 Methodology

The review is carried out as a desk review consisting of documentation review and review meetings with the Danish project organisations, with CISU and with CISU assessment consultants. The review has selected a range of projects supported by the FCE (11 in all) to be part of the sample. The selection is considered to be representative and constitutes around 60% of the projects, which have been finalised or have been implemented for at least 18 months. All relevant documentation on the projects as well as supporting documents such as guidelines, policies and strategies have been reviewed, and all organisations in Denmark responsible for the interventions have been visited and interviewed. Participation in experience exchange workshops with project organisations and a debriefing workshop have been part of the review. The assessments undertaken in the review are based on documentation and interviews in relation to the sample of 11 projects (see Annex 1 for the sample of projects). They are assessments made by the consultant, some of the projects are not finalised and no field review has been undertaken. It is a review of the FCE across the different FCE supported projects, and not a review of each of the specific sampled projects.

The review team consisted of Martin Enghoff, external consultant to CISU. The views and recommendations contained in this report are those of the review team only. They are not necessarily shared by CISU, the partners interviewed or the MoFA.

2. Description of the sampled FCE projects

In the following, a general description of the sampled projects is presented, not in detail, but to get an overview of the characteristics of these projects.

Geographic focus is wide with a focus on Sub-Saharan Africa. Geographically, the projects are addressing a wide range of poor countries in the South with an overweight of Sub-Saharan African countries. The eleven sampled projects are implemented by six different Danish partners and by a host of different partners working together in smaller or larger networks in the South. Thematically, all projects are on climate change and/or environment advocacy and capacity development at multiple levels.

Overall objectives of the interventions focus on securing improved living conditions or respect of rights of the poor and marginalised. The FCE projects assessed in the review all have the objectives of promoting the voice and solutions to climate and environment issues that are based on and promote the interest of the poor in the South. Typically, the projects have one overall objective and two to three immediate objectives. A common theme for the overall objectives is to contribute to the betterment of the lives of the poor through ensuring that climate change and environment actions are supportive of the poor and more vulnerable part of the population. Also at the level of overall objectives a good number of the projects are seeking to promote the rights or respect of marginalised peoples or their representatives in national and international climate change or environment processes.

Immediate objectives focus on capacity development, advocacy, local learning and enhanced networking. For the immediate objectives, the common themes include: Capacity development of stakeholders (primarily CSOs, communities and some duty-bearers) in climate change and environment understanding and advocacy; Influencing through advocacy on climate change and environment policies, plans, guidelines and processes at national, regional and international level; Influencing and learning from local community actions on climate change and environment; Enhancing networking and information sharing.

The strategies of the projects have much in common and use locally relevant solutions in capacity building and in advocacy at different levels. The strategies of the projects have much in common; they are all seeking to promote locally relevant solutions and approaches to climate change and environment issues through a process of capacity development and advocacy at multiple levels. Using of cases and developing standards, guidelines, principles and policy messages are a common feature in the various projects.

3. Results achieved in the FCE

3.1 Focus of the results in the FCE

Overall, the results are found within advocacy, capacity development, civil society strengthening and support to local case studies and actions. The results achieved in the FCE fall within the overall areas of advocacy, capacity development and civil society strengthening. The results are found at many levels from local, to national, regional and international. Some projects include results at local community level in the form of support to cases/studies and local actions.

Results are within climate change and environment, and adaptation results are featuring strongly. Most of the project results are related directly to some aspects of climate change (some 75% of the sample), whereas the remaining is more focused on environmental issues per se. The projects are, in relation to climate change, supporting a variety of adaptation and mitigation activities. Overall, there is more focus on adaptation (with more than 50% of the sample focused on adaptation). Some can be considered to be covering both adaptation and mitigation and in reality there are important linkages between adaptation and mitigation in many of the interventions.

The results are in thematic areas that are in line with the FCE guidelines. The results in the sampled project are within thematic areas that are in line with the FCE guidelines and cover most of the areas stressed in the guidelines. They include such areas as climate adaptation, disaster risk reduction, climate mainstreaming, climate mitigation, low-carbon development, REDD+, climate financing and climate change implementation monitoring. In environment the results of the sampled project include thematic areas such as natural resource management (fisheries, forestry), agriculture and monitoring of environmental management. These are also in line with the FCE guidelines.

Giving a voice to the poor is central, whereas addressing aspects of social inclusion is more mixed. All projects have a strong focus on addressing the conditions and voice of the poorest whether it is in climate change adaptation, mitigation or environmental management. This is a focus that is being specifically stressed by the FCE interventions. Few projects are addressing social inclusion aspects such as gender, whereas indigenous peoples are relatively well addressed. Rights are addressed, but few projects are directly applying a HRBA in their approach. The FCE guidelines are not specific about addressing inclusion and HRBA in its guidance to projects.

3.2 Matrix on project achievements

The below matrix is based on an assessment by the review team of the sampled projects. The achievement of objectives is an assessment of the combined achievement of all intervention/immediate objectives in each of the projects. The achievement of targets in relation to advocacy and capacity is based on achievements against the expressed targets in the individual projects. Several of the advocacy targets are rather ambitious or rather broadly defined, hence also difficult to achieve. The targets on CSO strengthening and support to local cases/actions are often not directly formulated in the project document, but form an important part of the projects, hence, they are assessed in terms of actual results achieved. To be noted as “achieved”, a target has to be met substantially (or some 80-100%). To be noted as partly achieved the achievement has to be relatively good (or some 60-80%). None of the projects and project targets are found to be not achieved.

Project sample number	Duration	Status of progress	Objectives achievement (general)	Advocacy – policy targets	Capacity targets	CSO Strengthen targets	Local Cases/ Actions targets
No.1	36 months	Ended-limited delay	80% (assessed)	Partly Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved
No.2	25 months	Ended – on time	70-80% (assessed)	Partly Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Partly Achieved
No.3	33 months	Ended – on time	70-80% (assessed)	Partly Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Partly Achieved
No.4	24 months	In process – on time	70-80% (likelihood)	Partly Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	N/A

			assessed)				
No 5	24 months	Ended – on time	70-80% (reported and assessed)	Achieved	Achieved – at one level – Partly Achieved at other level	Achieved	N/A
No. 6	24 months	In process – on time	60-70% (likelihood assessed)	Achieved	Partly achieved	Partly achieved	N/A
No.7	36 months	In process – on time	80-90 % (likelihood assessed)	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved
No.8	24 months	In process – on time	70-80% (likelihood assessed)	Partly achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved
No.9	35 months	Ended – on time	100% (reported and assessed)	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved
No.10	36 months	In process – partially delayed	80-90% (likelihood assessed)	Partly achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved
No.11	36 months	In process – on time	80-90% (likelihood assessed)	Partly achieved	Achieved	Achieved	N/A

3.3 Results in advocacy

Achievement of advocacy objectives has been relatively good. Achievements of results at objective level within advocacy are generally in line with the described results at grant level. There is, overall, a relative good level of achievement in terms of the described advocacy objectives, with some 75 % of the sampled projects being able to partly (but importantly) achieve their advocacy objectives and some 25% fully achieving their intended goals in terms of advocacy. A common feature is that a majority of the projects have been too ambitious in terms of their ability to influence decision-making at higher levels either nationally or internationally. Also, the time it takes to influence such higher-level decisions has been underestimated in a number of cases. Creating advocacy results has also been dependent on progress in international processes related to climate change and environment, these processes have taken longer than foreseen and hence have been slow in creating the right incentives for national level policy changes. That said, the advocacy processes, which the projects have facilitated, have all been of significant importance and includes influencing policies and process related to climate adaptation, climate finance, fisheries policies, forest management and REDD+ at the national and international level.

Achievement of advocacy results at output level is good. Achievement of results at output level within advocacy is in the order of 80-100% of the planned results being achieved. The results created at output level are typically related to: Gathering of knowledge and cases based on local realities; Development of documentation; Development of standards/best practises; Participation in processes and providing inputs to policies and plans; Developing policy positions and inputs; Networking and exchanging at national, regional and international level; Development of advocacy strategies and communication material; Monitoring policy implementation and holding duty-bearers to account. Generally, there is good linkage between the results at output level and the results at objective level, but in a number of projects the linkage is not very direct and outputs can be achieved without that necessarily leading towards objective achievement.

Advocacy that promotes the voice of the poor are key results in all projects. All the reviewed projects have been implemented with a focus on advocacy in relation to climate change issues or environmental issues, and the advocacy results obtained are related to getting a more poverty focused and locally relevant agenda into climate change and environment negotiations, policies, plans, financing and/or implementation. The projects have contributed to how national stakeholders are addressing various thematic issues and how they are being brought forward in the national, regional and international processes. Hence, all projects are promoting the voice and insights of the local and often more marginalised communities. Good examples include the promotion of local communities approach to and needs in climate adaptation and the advancement of indigenous peoples' positions and needs in forest management and REDD+.

Advocacy results are found at local, national and international level with a focus on results achieved in relation to the national level. A wide variety of climate change and environment issues are covered. The results within advocacy includes getting local adaptation and mitigation needs, solution and approaches on the national and international agenda, contributing to increasing finance for climate adaptation, contributing to international negotiations, agreements and guidelines in relation to climate within the Paris Agreement, on REDD+, on adaptation guidelines and finance, on fisheries policies and on forest management. The projects have especially contributed to the national processes on how adaptation, mitigation and natural resource management (forest, fisheries, agriculture) should look like (input to NDCs, to NAPs, to NRM plans) and are being planned for by the national and more decentralised duty-bearers. The advocacy activities are linking different levels and have contributed to a more inclusive and open debate about a range of these important issues. They have promoted that CSO networks are able to monitor how climate and environment related agreements, policies and plans are being implemented. In Uganda, the FCE-supported faith-based network on climate change is an example of how a network with good access to decision makers has been able to influence national and local level adaptation planning and finance in a more locally relevant direction.

Linking international, national and local level in advocacy creates important results. A good number of projects are linking international, national and local level in the advocacy. This is considered to be an important aspects of the advocacy process and is related to how advocacy results are created at the different levels. The review finds that those projects that have a very clear link to the local level advocacy are generally more successful in influencing at higher level. Overall, the national and local level linkages are crucial to get the advocacy evidence-based and focused, and key results in advocacy are especially found when the local and the national level are linked in a chain of evidence based advocacy. In addition, the international level is also bringing important input into the advocacy. Generally, the experiences of the projects stress that the international level is important to have, partly to influence internationally but also to inspire the national and local level advocacy. It should be recognised that FCE is a facility that facilitates the international involvement more so than many other avenues for support. This is important and highly appreciated. With the experience of the project, it should, however, also be recognised that the local level advocacy, cases and constituency building and linking this to higher levels should also be stressed as of central importance in possible future FCE funding.

Advocacy has created important results at international level. Key advocacy results at the international level include such examples as: Getting IP/customary rights into REDD+ in international agreements, influencing international agreements (Paris/UNFCCC) in terms of how

adaptation is being approached, securing human rights of small-scale fishers in international fisheries guidelines, promoting additional finance for adaptation in international funds and agreements, and promoting new and more community friendly standards for forest certification. The attainment of observer status and opportunities to promote the rights of indigenous peoples at the Green Climate Fund for an indigenous peoples representative organisation (IWGIA) is an example of how the FCE has been able contribute to international advocacy.

National level advocacy results are of significant importance. Key results at national level includes such examples as: Direct influence on various national adaptation and mitigation debates and processes including the National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) and National Determined Contributions (NDCs); A significant level of engagement with national duty-bearers in relation to climate change and environment; Influencing climate change and environment policies and decision making through developing and presenting evidence from local communities; Securing local realities are including in national level policy and planning; Strengthening common advocacy within national networks; and Bringing international exchange, best practises and networking to influence national networks and practises. The key inputs on national level adaptation policy and planning processes found in the work of ALAP, Southern Voices and the faith-based work of the ACT Alliance/DanChurchAid are good examples of national level influencing.

Local level advocacy results are important contributions to the overall advocacy achievements. Local level advocacy results have also been created in a good number of the projects. They include: Input to province/district planning; Influencing local politicians and decision makers; Impacting finance flows to the communities; Creating awareness on good climate change and environment practises; Informing locally on national and international experiences, policies and processes; Building good practises/cases locally; Ensuring that local voices are heard and brought forward in the system; and Building local constituencies for continued advocacy. The work on climate change partnerships and REDD+ found in the projects of IWGIA and Forest of World are examples of how local level advocacy are contributing to how climate change adaptation and mitigation is influenced at local and higher levels.

Advocacy and capacity results are interlinked. The results in relation to advocacy are interlinked with the capacity development results of all of the projects in the sense that capacity development targets to a significant degree are about capacity to do advocacy.

Focus and shared interests in the advocacy are important and tend to create better advocacy results. From the assessment, it appears that advocacy has the best options to create results if it is rather thematically focused and if it is carried forwards by groups with shared interests or shared values. Large, broad networks can be more challenging in terms of creating advocacy results, although their potential outreach are larger. A majority of the projects have been organised along rather focused and interest-based lines, and the advocacy processes supported have been rather well targeted. This includes examples such a those projects addressing indigenous peoples in adaptation, in REDD+ and in forest certification, those addressing adaptation in agriculture, those addressing small-scale fisheries, and those addressing faith-based organisations in climate change advocacy. The thematically focused networks are generally also more based on common interests and they are stronger in building on and linking to a local constituency.

Advocacy is somewhat constrained by short project timeframes. Advocacy (and capacity building) is a long-term endeavour. The FCE projects are relatively short, and with relative

ambitious objectives to be achieved by in some cases rather complex networks. Hence, some of the projects have only partly achieved their advocacy objectives. Some projects have seen additional phases, which is positive in terms of creating advocacy results. Timeframes should be further considered in possible future FCE funding.

Grant level indicators for advocacy have largely been met, although also difficult to monitor. The projects have largely met their defined advocacy indicators at grant level. There is a wide variation in terms of how indicators for advocacy are formulated, organised and monitored, but overall there are relatively good and a reasonable number of indicators for how advocacy is linked to climate change and environment policies, processes, plans and guidelines. The FCE guidelines give priority to advocacy objectives reflecting how decisions have been influenced and less to actual changes on the ground, and the guidelines have been developed before Theory of Change was emphasised. Therefore, how the FCE projects actually contribute to changes for the target group of poor people and how it impacts on the environment are only substantiated in the projects to a limited degree.

Political economy and change opportunities are generally not sufficiently analysed and followed up. In the projects, it is somehow taken for granted that finance, plans, policies, guidelines and capacities in support of climate change and environment translate into real changes for people, but that is not necessarily a given. Looking at the political economy and the change opportunities and change agents as well as having some form of monitoring on how the project achievements are contributing to change for the target group is somehow missing in all the projects and as mentioned above also in FCE guidelines. The problem is then that a wide range of organisations assumes that the work they are doing in advocacy is having these desired impacts.

The common FCE quantitative indicators for advocacy are being met at high level. The quantitative indicators for the FCE that are commonly collected and reported on by the projects and which in relation to advocacy relates to number of advocacy strategies/policy briefs and number of policy process interactions and communications are being met by all the projects and also show an over-achievement as compared to the targets set. These indicators were developed by the MoFA and, as a way of trying to measure across all the FCE projects, provided to the FCE after a year of its implementation. CISU was not part of their development. These indicators are useful at the level of checking that activities are undertaken. However, they have a more limited value in terms of understanding the quality and usefulness of the associated activities and results. And it is important to note that the interventions are primarily measured against targets and indicators approved in each application and which live up to the guidelines of the FCE and as such are considered to give a relatively good picture of project achievements.

Projects are effective in delivering advocacy results. All the projects are considered to be or have been effective or relative effective in terms of creating advocacy results. The projects are relatively small, but have all created impacts through their advocacy far beyond the project boundaries. So even if some of the project activities are considered relatively expensive, it has proven effective to include these in the advocacy efforts.

Advocacy on climate change and environment management is of central importance for the poor of the World. Advocacy on climate change and environment is of central importance especially for all the people in the poor countries that are very directly impacted by climate change, by the responses to climate change and by the way natural resources are being utilized. Therefore it

is a crucial theme in relation to advocacy, and an area where civil society advocacy is essential, and therefore the FCE focus is considered to be of key importance. The space for climate and environment advocacy created for the organisations receiving funding from the FCE is of significant importance in order for this to happen.

3.4 Results in capacity development

Capacity development is addressed towards a variety of stakeholders and has a focus on abilities to support and undertake climate change and environmental management.

Developing capacity in relation to climate change and environment management and advocacy is part of all projects. Capacity development has been targeted at CSOs, government authorities at different levels, local leaders and at local communities. The results in capacity development are related to how well the various stakeholders are able to understand, organise and advocate for climate change and environmental management that is pro-poor and supportive of poor people exposed to climate change and natural resource challenges. The results created in relation to capacity development are importantly contributing to the strategic focus of the FCE.

Capacity development objectives are being achieved. The achievement of results at objective level within capacity development is good (90-100%), with nearly all projects fully achieving their capacity development objectives. The results achieved are in line with the results described at grant level and strengthened capacity is found in all projects.

Achievement of capacity results at output level is significant and above the expected results. The capacity development results at output level are being achieved at a significant level and nearly all the capacity development results are assessed as being delivered. The results created at output level are typically related to: CSO capacities in adaptation, mitigation and environmental management; CSO capacities in linking, networking and representing; CSO capacities in undertaking advocacy; CSO capacities in communication and knowledge management; Institutional capacities and membership capacities of CSOs; Capacities at local level for understanding and advocating in relation to national/international policies on climate change and environment; Capacities at local level for adaptation/mitigation in agriculture; Capacities at local level for resilience and for forest management; and Capacities of a range of national and local duty-bearers in understanding and promoting locally relevant solutions to climate change and environmental management. It is however, important to note that developing capacities of duty bearers is not significantly in focus in the described outputs in the various applications. The fact that it has been undertaken is a good achievement and is related to the fact that it is intricately linked to the process of doing advocacy towards duty-bearers. The results at output level and at objective level in relation to capacity development are assessed to cohere well.

Good fit between the implemented capacity development themes and the advocacy themes. The capacity development results relate first and foremost to how well the partners, alliance and networks are able to undertake advocacy in support of the poor. In order to do this capacity development has been undertaken to promote understanding of what it entails to have climate change and environment actions that are supportive of the poor. The thematic areas covered in the capacity development include more or less the same thematic areas as those targeted in advocacy. Combined, the interventions in capacity development supported by the sampled projects cover most of the activities targeted by the FCE.

The ability to be accountable towards a constituency is an area with variable capacity development achievements across the sampled projects. One area of capacity development that is relatively weak in some of the sampled projects is the capacity development aimed at the organisations/networks ability to represent and be accountable towards their respective constituencies. Although the focus of all the projects is to bring the voice of the poor and the more marginalised into the climate change and environment agenda, and although this is done well in all the projects, it is only some of the projects that in their capacity development are including aspects of how the CSOs can ensure continued legitimacy and accountability towards their constituencies. Some projects have a direct focus on ensuring this accountability, whereas others take it more for granted that the CSOs are representing a constituency. It appears that the more interest-based and focused networks are better in addressing accountability. Added focus on constantly ensuring accountability towards the target groups and aiming capacity development on this in practise is needed in future possible FCE funding.

Capacity development results are to be found at local, national and international levels, focus of results at national level, but also important results at local level. At international level several of the projects have through communication, information campaigns and input to best practises been able to build some capacity that is supportive of local-based solutions to climate change and environment issues. However, the main results in capacity development have been the development of capacity at the national level among CSOs and government stakeholders – results that all projects have created. In around 75% of the sample, there are also important capacity development results created at the more local level (province, district, community).

Linkages in capacity development are important and create good results. The way that the projects have been organised and implemented has in majority of cases created good linkages between the capacity development, which is taking place at local and national level, as well as to some extent also to regional/international level. The networking and sharing of experience found in all the projects has ensured inspiration and created improved capacities among the networking/alliance members.

Grant level indicators for capacity development have been met. The projects have met their defined capacity development indicators at grant level. Generally, the indicators used for capacity development have a good relation to achievement of results. By and large, the project has monitored the capacity development indicators. As for many other projects and programmes, it is relatively difficult to monitor how the improved capacities are being put into action and used in support of the goal of improving livelihoods for the poor and environment conditions.

The common FCE quantitative indicators for capacity development are being met at high level. The quantitative indicator for the FCE, which the projects are collecting data on and which relates to capacity development is: the number of workshops/training sessions conducted aiming at building capacity on climate and environment in developing countries. The projects are showing an over-achievement as compared to the targets set out initially. This indicator is useful at the level of checking that capacity development activities are taking place, however, as also mentioned in relation to advocacy, it has a more limited value in terms of understanding the quality and usefulness of the associated capacity development activities and results.

Delivery of capacity development targets is assessed to be effective. All the projects are considered to be or have been effective in terms of creating capacity development results, and has

been able to reach a significant amount of people. With the topics of climate change and environment being made relatively concrete and tangible by the project partners in terms of how it is related to important livelihoods of the targeted poor communities, most of the capacity development efforts have been focused rather effectively. This has overall impacted the effectiveness positively.

3.5 Results in relation to civil society strengthening

Projects are showing good achievement in relation to civil society strengthening. The project performance is positive in relation to the general aspects of strengthening of civil society, with all projects achieving important targets in relation to civil society strengthening. The targets of civil society strengthening are in many cases not directly expressed in the results framework, but are to be understood as an integrated part of the strategies and the objectives on advocacy and capacity development.

Working in networks has contributed positively to a stronger civil society, but some networks have also been too complex and demanding to run. The projects are contributing to building stronger CSO institutions, and the individual organisations are benefitting from working in networks, which in many cases has proven to be an effective way of working together. Several of the projects have been instrumental in creating and/or facilitating important civil society networks related especially to climate change issues, but also to some extent in relation to environmental management issues. Participation in networks has proven to contribute to strengthening civil society collaboration and common positions as well as being supportive of each of the participating organisations. This networking includes the linkages forged in the national, regional and international networks. As described previously, networking can also be rather complex and demanding, if the networks are big and broad, and therefore they are not so supportive of each of the partners. Hence, in some of the projects, the networking appears to have a more limited and less sustainable impact on civil society strengthening. The more interest-based and focused networks are likely to be stronger in strengthening of civil society. The indigenous peoples focused networks promoted in a range of different projects related to climate change and forest management are seen as good examples of networks that contribute effectively to a stronger civil society.

FCE projects contribute to strengthening of civil society in line with the organisations' general approach. All the proponents of the projects in the FCE are clear that the projects are supportive of the general work of their organisations, and therefore help to overall strengthen their work and organisations. The organisations that have received funding for FCE projects are all organisations that are experienced in working with a strong and dedicated approach to civil society strengthening. The way the projects has been implemented largely follows the same approach and modalities in relation to institutional strengthening that the organisations are using in their general work.

FCE projects are performing well in relation to the basic pillars of work for strengthening civil society. In terms of strengthening of civil society a number of key pillars are considered important in CISU and in the Policy for Danish Support to Civil Society. Accordingly, the performance of the projects in relation to “promoting a vibrant, inclusive and open debate” is considered to be significant. All projects have contributed towards getting climate change and/or environment more openly debated nationally and internationally, but also for a good part of the

projects, open debates have been supported more locally in the countries. The performance of the projects in relation to “promoting a representative, accountable, and locally based civil society” is relative good, several of the projects are supportive of the civil society organisations and their opportunities to be independent and legitimate. Many of the projects are contributing to civil society’s legitimacy in relation to duty-bearers and as a way of attaining sustained impact in terms of policy/plan changes. Some of the projects are also addressing legitimacy in relation to representing a constituency, but, as mentioned previously, this aspect is not featuring strongly in a number of the other projects. The performance in relation to “promotion of capacity development, advocacy work and networking opportunities” is strong in all the projects; these are key aspects of the projects, and results created are significant. Lastly the performance in relation to “promotion of rights and promoting the rights to association and assembly, enabling environment and space for civil society” is good, the projects are creating space for civil society and civil society engagement in policy processes and are promoting the rights of the poor.

3.6 Partnerships and target group participation

Partnerships are being used and developed in the projects. There is variation in the form and quality of the partnerships. The project performance is assessed to be relative good in terms of partnership development, and all projects are basing their approach on partnerships between the participating partners in the South and a partner in the North. The projects are predominantly using existing partnerships as the implementing approach, some newer partnership are being developed. The partnerships are of varying forms and influenced differently by the various types of networks that is promoted in the projects. The closeness or direct engagement in the partnerships is less so in the more complex network projects where many partners are involved. Wide networks with important achievements are seen, even if the traditional partnership relations are less strong.

Network approach requires a flexible approach to partnerships. With the focus on networks, the partnerships can at times be rather complex and the traditional partnership approach between a Danish and South-based partner has to be approached in a flexible way. In some of the projects, the traditional approach of having one South partner being the nexus for all the network participants in the South, have proven not to work in the best way, and therefore multiple nexus partners with a direct partner relation with the Danish organisation has been developed. This is something that any future FCE guidelines should consider to include.

Target group participation is addressed directly in most of the projects. The nature of the projects (ensuring local voice) is contributing to the promotion of target group participation. Overall, it is assessed that the projects have a reasonable good level of target group participation. Most projects have a very direct approach to target group participation, and have been able to apply sound involvement of the target group in project activities.

3.7 Results in relation to poverty orientation, social inclusion and rights

Poverty reduction is addressed and results indicate positive contributions. All FCE projects are designed to address poverty reduction through promoting locally relevant solutions to climate change and environment issues. The themes addressed and the approaches taken are supportive of poverty reduction to a significant degree. The actual performance of the projects in terms of addressing poverty reduction is assessed to be good. This assessment is based on indications, as no projects are making real attempts at assessing contribution to actual poverty reduction, and as it admittedly is difficult in practise to assess what contributions are being made to poverty reduction.

Rights are addressed, HRBA less so. Rights are being addressed in all the projects, it takes different forms, and although it is generally aligned with a HRBA, there are few projects that as such are being implemented in line with a fully operational HRBA.

Gender has a good focus in some of the projects but has a more limited emphasis in many of the other projects. Gender equity is addressed directly in less than 50% of the projects and less directly in good number of the other projects. The reported progress in terms of addressing gender is only provided in relative few projects, but in these there are positive progress in terms of gender equity. Gender and social inclusion are not directly targeted in the FCE guidelines, and this is probably contributing to the facts that few projects are directly addressing gender issues as well as some of the other aspects of social inclusion.

Indigenous peoples rights is an important focus area in projects. An important aspect of inclusion relates, however, to indigenous peoples rights. This is being addressed directly in some 50% of the projects, which is considered to be significant, and the results created are contributing positively to how indigenous peoples are being impacted by climate change and environment agreements and processes.

3.8 Overall assessment of results

Significant achievement of objectives. Overall, the results of the FCE projects are considered to be significant and there is an assessed combined achievement of objectives of around 80% in relation to the grant level objectives. Achievements are highest in terms of capacity development and civil society strengthening, but are also good in terms of advocacy and support to local cases/action.

Results of projects are in accordance with the FCE guidelines. The results created in the FCE projects are fully supportive of the objectives of the FCE. The good achievement of project results in relation to advocacy, capacity building and civil society strengthening tallies well with the direction given in the FCE guidelines. The thematic focus within climate change and environment of the results achieved is aligning well with the FCE guidelines. Addressing poverty orientation and partnerships are also strong aspects in the projects as well as in the FCE guidelines. Giving voice to the poor in the processes around climate change and environment is a specific goal of the FCE and one where the project results are clearly supportive.

Results are supportive of the Danish policies and principles. The results of the projects are supportive of all the key aims of the Policy for Danish Support to the Civil Society. The results of the FCE projects have a strong focus on climate resilience/adaptation and poverty. This is fully supportive of the Climate Envelope resilience outcome. This is important to recognise, as this outcome has otherwise received limited emphasis in the rest of Climate Envelope portfolio, where there is a markedly higher focus on mitigation in the projects supported, even if the overall aim of the Envelope is a 50/50 division between mitigation and adaptation.

Projects are generally on time. Projects are, generally, on time and delivers within the agreed timeframe. Some projects have seen delays mainly due to bureaucratic issues with contracts and start up formalities, but most projects are managing to make an important contribution to the achievement of their intended objectives within the given timeframe or during short no-cost extensions.

Effectiveness in delivering results is good. Overall, the review finds that the projects are effective in terms of delivering their objectives and outputs. Effectiveness of the projects is assessed to increase with thematic focus in the advocacy and in the associated capacity building as well as with a relative focus in the institutional set ups (more complex set ups take time to mobilise). With the FCE projects, there is a significant outreach to a wide array of stakeholders in relation to climate change and environment issues and this is done for a relatively limited amount of money. Combined, the FCE projects are in this way an effective mechanism for addressing key issues in climate change and environment at a global scale.

4. Sustainability of the interventions

Overall good sustainability of advocacy and capacity development efforts. Sustainability of the interventions is considered to be good in relation to the advocacy and capacity development activities being undertaken. All projects are assessed to be doing well in terms of bringing the capacity development and the advocacy to a point where it is likely to continue to influence how climate change and environmental management is being implemented in the future. This is also because there appears to be a high degree of appreciation by the various stakeholders of the importance of the topics.

Institutional sustainability is good, but not all networks are likely to be sustained. Institutionally, the partners significantly own the interventions and the projects have contributed to some of the partners taking on climate change as a new focus area in their organisations or further integrated climate change or environment work in their organisations. This is contributing positively to the sustainability. Although, the civil societies are being strengthened and as such create a good foundation for sustainability, there are mixed opportunities for sustaining the actual network activities. It appears that some, but certainly not all the networks are likely to be sustained in the future, this is so, even if these networks could play an important role in monitoring implementation regimes for climate change and environment agreements. Seeking funding for future activities has also been addressed in a number of the projects and is likely to influence the future of network activities.

Sustainability takes time and some projects would benefit from additional phases. Undertaking advocacy and doing capacity building and ensuring lasting impacts often takes time. There is a tendency, in the assessed projects, that more time for the projects would give further results and better option for sustainability. As such, considerations of opening more up for funding second phases of the FCE projects should be given if a new round of FCE funding becomes available.

5. Relevance

5.1 Relevance of interventions

High relevance of projects in relation to FCE strategic focus and objectives. The projects assessed are to be highly relevant when compared to the FCE objectives, and at grant level, the various interventions comply well with the guidance and criteria given in the FCE guidelines. Although, the projects assessed are very different in scope, all of the reviewed projects are

considered relevant in relation to the FCE key strategic focus on climate change and environment advocacy and the objectives of promoting civil society strengthening, capacity development, partnerships and local participation, poverty orientation and local communities voice. The relevance of the projects can be illustrated by a project addressing advocacy on climate change adaptation in networks of CSOs among several different countries (Southern Voices), that aim at building capacity and strengthening civil society and which seek to enhance local communities voices and promote a more participatory and poverty oriented approach to climate change adaptation.

Projects are relevant in relation to regional and international processes. Project relevance is also significant in relation to national processes, an aspect that the FCE guidelines have only emphasised to a limited extent. Project relevance is considered good in relation to the strategic focus in the FCE guidelines to work primarily related to regional and international policy, strategic and professional development processes and negotiations on climate and environment. Further, the various projects have focused on the national level advocacy to a varying degree and have interpreted the importance of the national level in different ways, but there is good reason for the added focus on the national level processes, which are deemed highly relevant in bringing the agendas closer to people and to the actual decision making processes and for ensuring that advocacy is based on national realities. The FCE guidelines' focus on the regional and international level with less emphasis on the national level has its root in the wish to influence international climate change policy processes, and the FCE guidelines could have been clearer in terms of the importance of ensuring that the national level advocacy processes are part of the projects.

Significant relevance of the FCE and the projects in relation to the Climate Envelope objective, impacts and outcomes. The FCE objectives and approaches and the actual projects at grant level are in good support of the aims and principles of the Climate Envelope. This means specifically that the FCE and the projects are relevant in relation to the three objectives of the Envelope namely: (1) Assist in adaptation, (2) Assist transition to low-carbon economy, and (3) Prepare countries to enter and implement global climate agreements. At impact level the projects are relevant for mitigation, with primarily the forest management and agricultural aspects addressed in the projects having potential to contribute to mitigation, and they are specifically relevant for adaptation as they are contributing to the second major envisaged impact of the Climate Envelope, namely: Increased climate resilience especially for vulnerable and marginalised groups. At outcome level the FCE and the projects are relevant specifically for the outcome 1 on strengthened national and community-level climate change policies, planning frameworks and information systems, and for outcome 2 on more consolidated, effective and ambitious international climate architecture.

Overall a high degree of relevance of the FCE and the supported projects in relation to Climate Envelope outputs, activities and principles. The FCE projects are relevant in relation to a long list of outputs and activities listed in the Climate Envelope, they are: Training and capacity building for policy makers, Supporting enabling environments, Supporting communities to plan for climate change and hold officials to account, Promoting climate friendly technologies and solutions, Promoting the implementation of the international climate agreement, Making policies and procedures of key institutions more transformational, Aligning institutional agendas, including lessons learning and knowledge transfer, And specifically on supporting marginalised voices and ensuring accountability to the most vulnerable. In terms of the Climate Envelope principles, the FCE and the projects are especially relevant in relation to the principles of:

Alignment - activities to be funded must be based on demand from recipient countries, Balance between mitigation and adaptation, Adaptation should be focused in poor countries – mainly in Africa, Poverty orientation and target group participation, Added value to the international climate architecture.

The FCE and the projects are highly relevant in relation to the Policy for Danish Support to Civil Society. FCE supports in its design and scope the four aims of the Policy namely contributing to a strong, independent, vocal and diverse civil society, promoting a vibrant, inclusive and open debate, promoting the rights to association and assembly, enabling environment and space for civil society's participation in national legislation processes and cooperation, and promoting a representative, accountable, and locally based civil society. The actual implementation of the FCE projects and the objectives and outputs at grant level are highly relevant in relation to these key aspects of civil society development.

The relevance in relation to the overall Danish Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Response is considered to be significant. The FCE objectives and approaches and the projects at grant level were relevant in relation to a wide range of areas of emphasis in the former Strategy for Development Cooperation (The Right to a Better Life) and is, as well, relevant to important selected areas within the recent (and current) Danish Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Response (The World 2030). This applies to the following strategic aims of the Strategy, namely:

- Security and development – Peace, stability and protection. - The FCE and the projects are relevant to this strategic aim through its focus on promoting increased resilience and climate adaptation in a wide range of poor countries. Improved resilience among the poor has important impact on security and development.
- Migration and development. – Relevance towards this strategic aim is through building stronger local communities that are more resilient and with better futures also in an climate impacted world. This is impacting on development opportunities in the targeted areas and potential have impacts on migration.
- Inclusive, sustainable growth and development. – The FCE and its projects relevant in relation to this strategic goal through its promotion of inclusive and sustainable development in areas related to energy, water and land/agriculture, and again through promoting solutions that are relevant for the poorest.
- Freedom and development – democracy, human rights and gender equality. – Relevance in relation to this strategic goal is clear through the activities that strengthen civil societies, address human rights and gender and promote advocacy for more democratic solutions to climate change and environment issues.

The geographical focus of the FCE and that of the Strategy have a relative good fit at the global level. The geographical focus of the Strategy fits relatively well with the de facto focus countries of the FCE. So globally, there is a good fit. There is however, a more limited fit between country focus for SDGs in the Strategy with that of the FCE geographical country focus. This is because the relevant goals of climate and sustainable energy as well as the goal on land/water are, according to the Strategy, not focused on poor stable or poor fragile countries but on middle-income countries, whereas the FCE so far has focused on poor countries. It should, however, be

noted that MoFA has requested CISU to increase the number of countries eligible for funding and will as from 1.1.2018 provide funding for all countries on the OECD/DAC list.

Timing and role of FCE projects are considered to be of significant relevance. The FCE projects have been operational at a time where there have been significant needs for civil society voices especially in the international climate change negotiation processes, but also in other environment related negotiation processes. The CSOs in Denmark and in partner countries have been following these processes and have been able to provide important input to these processes. Further, it is assessed, that there are important roles to play for the organisations to do follow-up and holding duty-bearer to account on these processes, and specifically in climate change, there is a key role to play for CSOs in the follow-up at country level on how the NCDs and NAPs are further defined and actually implemented. This is a key role that a possible future FCE could contribute towards.

Assessment and award system functions well. Considering the high degree of relevance of the FCE projects, it is found that the CISU assessment and award system has been professional and effective in its guidance and competitive selection process.

5.2 Relevance in relation to FCE applicant organisation

FCE is highly relevant for the applicant organisations. The FCE is a highly appreciated facility from where the various project holders have been able to undertake important work, which reportedly would have been difficult to access from other sources. The FCE is an opportunity to have CSO work in climate and environment, something that otherwise have become increasingly difficult within the UM financing landscape. Generally, all project applicants finds that FCE has been crucial for their advocacy and capacity work on climate change and environment at multiple levels.

Important emphasis of the FCE and good complementary of the projects. Specificity of the FCE is considered to be very relevant. Future FCE opportunities will remain complementary to the organisations and be of significant importance. FCE is a strong support to the CSOs and its emphasis on advocacy, network and linkages to multiple levels including the international is considered of specific importance. It allows funding of activities that are important, but can be difficult to finance from other sources (including multi-country, travels, meetings). Considering the nature of and the needs in order to do climate change and environment advocacy at multiple levels, it not the type of activities that the applicant organisations easily can fund from their other on going programme work. All of the applicant organisations and their partners find that it is complementary to the other work they are engaged in. The fact that it is a specific facility with a specific aim and scope on climate and environment is considered as important by all the applicant organisations. Without it being a specific facility with a specific climate and environment focus or a specific defined window with the same aims, there is a general consensus that it would have been difficult to ensure that such type of focus would be maintained in the general work of the organisations. FCE has been a strong facilitator for the organisations to undertake complementary and needed advocacy work related to climate change and environment. Having FCE as a specific facility has enabled organisations to work on these advocacy issues, even if several of them are not the traditional climate change and environment advocacy organisations. This has broadened the scope of involvement and has been an important part of the achievements of FCE. This is also likely to be an important feature of a possible future FCE. Some of the FCE

work is likely to be taken up within the organisations general work. However, given the many competing demands within the organisations and given the still developing nature of such advocacy work, it is not likely that the important advocacy work and especially the follow-up and monitoring at national level of the implementation of climate change agreements will be continued and strengthened to the same extent without the opportunities given in a future specific facility such as the FCE.

Relevance of FCE modalities is significant but widening the scope for type of project support could be considered. The FCE has been used for stand-alone projects, for follow-up projects and for project contributions to bigger programmes. All is considered relevant, but it is worth, in a possible future of the FCE, to consider more how FCE projects can be used as catalysers or contributors to larger programmes.

5. Lessons learned from the FCE implementation

The thematic focus and modalities of FCE have resulted in a range of projects with committed partners and with a focus on a range of important issues in relation to climate change and environment. Implementation has been focused on poor countries in the South and with a strong focus on promoting the voice of poor people. This is in line with the FCE guidelines.

The results achieved in the FCE have been an important contribution to advocacy and capacity development in relation to climate change and environment. A majority of the FCE projects have been contributing to the process of making climate change adaptation pro-poor.

Advocacy results are relatively good and with potential important impacts, and such results are further facilitated by focused and interest-based advocacy. There has been a tendency to be too ambitious in terms of the ability to influence decision-making at higher levels either nationally or internationally. Also, the time it takes to influence such higher-level decisions has been underestimated in a number of cases.

Project implementation has shown, that advocacy and capacity development activities is especially relevant at national level with national and local stakeholders, so this level is more dominating in the projects than foreseen in the FCE guidelines.

Those projects that have a very clear link to the local level advocacy are generally more successful in influencing at higher level. Overall, the national and local level linkages are crucial to get the advocacy evidence-based and focused, and key results in advocacy are especially found when the local and the national level are linked in a chain of evidence based advocacy. The international level is important in its own right but also to inform and inspire advocacy at lower levels.

Defined outcomes in terms of policy influencing have to a large extent have been achieved. Impacts of advocacy are difficult to monitor and few attempts at this are undertaken, so how advocacy is actually contributing to change for the target group is not really known. It is somehow taken for granted that finance, plans, policies, guidelines and capacities in support of climate change and environment translate into real changes for people, but that is not necessarily a given. Looking at the political economy and the change opportunities and change agents as well as having

some form of monitoring on how the project achievements are contributing to change for the target group is largely missing in all the projects, but would be useful in the future.

The ability to be accountable towards a constituency is an area with variable capacity development achievements across the sampled projects. Added focus on constantly ensuring accountability towards the target groups and aiming capacity development on this in practise would be useful in future possible FCE funding.

Linkages in capacity development are taking place at local and national level, as well as to some extent also to regional/international level are important and create good results. The networking and sharing of experience found in all the projects has ensured inspiration and created improved capacities among the networking/alliance members. Working in networks has contributed positively to a stronger civil society, but some networks have also been too complex and demanding to run.

The partnerships are of varying forms and influenced differently by the various types of networks that is promoted in the projects. The closeness or direct engagement in the partnerships is less so in the more complex network projects where many partners are involved. A network approach also requires a flexible approach to partnerships.

The FCE has proven to be highly relevant in relation to Danish policies, strategies and guidelines. The relevance of the FCE is mirrored in the relevance of the FCE funded projects. A robust assessment and award system has facilitated the high relevance of the FCE projects. The timing and the modalities of the FCE have contributed to the relevance.

FCE is highly relevant for the applicant organisations and their partners, it is complementary to other work of the organisations and the thematic focus on climate and environment, the approach emphasised and the specificity of the FCE is considered by the applicant organisation to be crucial for its relevance. The FCE is also crucial in establishing and nurturing support in between countries. The FCE has given opportunities and paid for cost that would otherwise not be easy to access.

6. Conclusions and recommendations

Introduction. The Fund for Climate and Environment (FCE) supports climate change and environment interventions of Danish civil society organisations in partnership with civil society organisations in the Global South. In order to extract learning from the four years of administrating the fund, CISU has initiated a review of the FCE with a focus on assessing results and relevance. The review is carried out as a desk review consisting of documentation review and review meetings with the Danish project applications.

Description of the sampled FCE projects. The development objectives of the interventions focus on securing improved living conditions or respect of rights of the poor and marginalised. Immediate objectives and outputs focus on capacity development, advocacy, local learning and enhanced networking. Geographic focus is wide but have more focus on Sub-Saharan Africa. The strategies of the projects have much in common and use locally relevant solutions in capacity building and advocacy.

Results achieved in the FCE. There is significant achievement of objectives. Results are supportive of the Danish policies and principles. Projects are generally on time and effectiveness in delivering results is overall good. Overall, the results are found within advocacy, capacity development, civil society strengthening and local cases and actions in relation to climate change and environment issues. Adaptation results are featuring strongly. The results are in thematic areas that are in line with the FCE guidelines.

Results in advocacy. Advocacy that promotes the voice of the poor are key results in all projects. Achievement of advocacy objectives has been relatively good and achievement of advocacy results at output level is good. Advocacy results are at local, national and international level, with a focus on achieving results at the national level. A wide variety of climate change and environment issues are covered in the advocacy. Advocacy has created important results at international level and national level advocacy results are of significant importance. Also, local level advocacy results are important contribution to the overall advocacy achievements. It is found that linking international, national and local level in advocacy creates important results and that focus and shared interests in the advocacy are important aspects in terms of creating results.

Monitoring advocacy. Grant level indicators for advocacy have largely been met, but also difficult to monitor. How the advocacy actually contributes to changes for the target group of poor people and how it impacts on the environment are only substantiated in the projects to a limited degree. Political economy and change opportunities are generally not analysed and followed up. The common FCE quantitative indicators for advocacy are being met at high level. These indicators are useful at the level of checking that activities are undertaken. However, they have a more limited value in terms of understanding the quality and usefulness of the associated activities and results.

Effectiveness in advocacy. Projects are effective in delivering advocacy results. Advocacy on climate change and environment management is of central importance for the poor of the world. Advocacy is somewhat constrained by short project timeframes.

Results in capacity development. Capacity development is addressed towards a variety of stakeholders and has a focus on abilities to support and undertake climate change and environmental management. Capacity development objectives are being achieved and achievement of capacity results at output level is significant and above the expected results. There is a good fit between the implemented capacity development themes and the advocacy themes. The ability to be accountable towards a constituency is an area with variable capacity development achievements across the sampled projects. Capacity development results are to be found at local, national and international levels, focus of results is at national level, but also important results at local level. Linkages in capacity development are important and create good results. Delivery of capacity development targets is assessed to be effective.

Monitoring capacity development. Grant level indicators for capacity development have been met. The common FCE quantitative indicators for capacity development are being met at high level.

Results in relation to civil society strengthening. Projects are showing good achievement in relation to civil society strengthening. Working in networks has contributed positively to a stronger civil society, but some networks have also been too complex and demanding to run. FCE projects are complementary and seek to strengthen civil society in line with the organisations general approach.

FCE projects are performing well in relation to the basic pillars of work for strengthening civil society as expressed by CISU and in the Policy for Danish Support to Civil Society.

Results in relation to partnerships and target group participation. Partnerships are being used and developed in the projects. There is variation in the form and quality of the partnerships. Network approach requires a flexible approach to partnerships. Target group participation is addressed directly in most of the projects.

Results in relation to poverty reduction, social inclusion and rights. Poverty reduction is addressed and results indicate positive contributions. Rights are addressed in all the projects. Gender has a good focus in some of the projects but more limited in many of the other projects. Indigenous peoples rights is an important focus area in projects.

Sustainability. Overall good sustainability advocacy and capacity development efforts. Institutional sustainability is good, but not all networks are likely to be sustained. Sustainability takes time and some projects would benefit from additional phases.

Relevance of interventions. There is high relevance of projects in relation to FCE strategic focus and objectives. Projects are relevant in relation to regional and international processes but have an added focus on national processes that was a more limited part of the original FCE strategic focus. There is significant relevance of the FCE and the projects in relation to the Climate Envelope objective, impacts and outcomes and overall a high degree of relevance of the FCE and the supported projects in relation to Climate Envelope activities and principles. Environment issues addressed in the projects are relevant in relation to the NEC Strategy. The FCE and the project are highly relevant in relation to the Policy for Danish Support to Civil Society. The relevance in relation to the overall Danish Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Response is considered to be significant and the FCE and the projects are relevant in relation to the global goals of Denmark's international engagement. The geographical focus of the FCE and that of the Strategy have a relative good fit at the global level.

Relevance of FCE timing and focus. Timing and role of FCE projects are considered to be of significant relevance. FCE has been operational at a time where there have been significant needs for at civil society voice especially in the international climate change negotiation processes, but also in other environment related negotiation processes. The CSOs in Denmark and in partner countries have been following these processes and have been able to provide important input to these processes. Further, there are important roles to play for the organisations to do follow-up and holding duty-bearer to account on these processes, and specifically in climate change, there is a key role to play for CSOs in the follow-up at country level on how the NCDs and NAPs are further defined and actually implemented. This is a key role that a possible future FCE could contribute towards.

Relevance in relation to the FCE applicant organisations. FCE is highly relevant for the applicant organisations. The emphasis of the FCE is important and there is good complementary of the projects with other work of the organisations. Specificity of the FCE is considered to be very relevant. Relevance of FCE modalities is significant but widening the scope for type of project support could be considered.

Recommendations:

1. Given the good and important results achieved in the FCE and the significant future challenges and need for CSO follow up on climate change agreements and processes, opportunities for accessing future FCE funding should be keenly followed up. This is also of importance due to the unique and complementary role of FCE in the Danish architecture on CSO development funding.
2. For a future FCE, the focus should remain on climate change advocacy and capacity development. It should include international and regional activities but it should also further emphasise national and local advocacy and capacity development, and it should include the linkages between the different levels of advocacy and capacity development. The principles behind the current modalities are seen as matching specifically several of the principles, outputs and activities contained in the Guiding Principles for the Danish Climate Envelope. They also support more generally the objectives and priorities in the 2030 Strategy. The modalities in a possible new FCE should be adjusted with respect to:
 - Consider how to further emphasise the need for partner CSOs to work based on their linkages to local constituencies and promote their accountability and representativeness towards their respective local constituencies.
 - Consider how to make room for longer time frames for the various supported projects, either in terms of phases or longer duration of the individual projects
 - Consider how the approach to working in networks is to have a focus on networks that is relatively thematically focused and interest-based and not too complex with too many participating organisations. Also ensuring a flexible approach to networks where several direct partners with the Danish CSO can be included should be considered.
 - Consider how to promote that project partners are further assessing the political economy and the change opportunities and change agents in order to have a better theory of change, where it is better explained how the advocacy and capacity development activities are actually contributing to changes for the target groups. This should also be related to monitoring/assessment on how the projects are doing in terms of contributing to such changes.
3. Given the important knowledge that the FCE applicant organisations have within the field of climate change and given that each of the partners could learn importantly from the other implementers of FCE projects, a new FCE should continue to facilitate further thematic sharing of experience among these organisations.

Annex 1 List of sampled projects

Below is a list of the FCE projects sampled in the review (in alphabetical order):

Adaptation Learning and Advocacy Project – CARE (j.no 1564)

Bridging political REDD+ negotiations with everyday life in the rainforest – Forests of the World (j.no 1388)

Climate Change and Ethnic Minorities in Northern Vietnam – ADDA (j.no 1382)

Climate Change Partnership with Indigenous Peoples in East Africa – IWGIA (j.no 1571)

Delivering social and environmental benefits through involvement of communities in the FSC system – Forests of the World (j.no. 1568)

Demand the realization of the Human Rights Based Approach to fisheries through the implementation of the SSF guidelines – Afrika Kontakt (j.no 1683)

Securing Community land and forest rights in Thailand and Myanmar – IWGIA (j.no 1686)

Securing Environmental Justice for African Fisher Peoples – Afrika Kontakt (j.no 1383)

Southern Voices on Adaptation to Climate Change: From Principles into Practise – CARE (j.no 1687)

Southern Voices on Adaptation to Climate Change: Setting the Standard for Pro-poor Adaptation – CARE (j.no 1381)

Strengthening of local climate change advocacy –making local voices heard in the climate debate - DanChurchAid (j.no 1566)

The Fund for Climate and Environment Review 2017: Terms of Reference

Basic information

The Fund for Climate and Environment (FCE) for Danish civil society organisations' interventions in partnership with civil society organisations in the Global South supports Danish popular organisations' cooperation with partner organisations, networks and alliances, primarily in developing countries to advocate for climate and environmental themes primarily at regional and international levels. The FCE is financed by the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DMFA) and has existed since 2013. The latest grants funded under the present agreement will be finalized no later than 30 June 2018. Users have indicated that a continuation of the fund would be welcomed and the DMFA has indicated that if future financing would be provided, this would have to be under the umbrella of the Danish Climate Envelope. In order to extract learning from the four years of administrating the fund CISU has initiated a review of the fund to take place during the summer 2017.

Objectives

- Insights into and assessment of FCE results in relation to the stated objectives at fund and grant level.
- Assessment of current and possible future FCE relevance for users based on the above mentioned insights into and assessment of FCE results.
- Assessment of FCE's possible relevance in relation to the new development policy and humanitarian strategy and the objectives of the Danish climate envelope based on the assessment of FCE results and relevance to users.

Output

Report (max. 18 pages) which reflects the above mentioned objectives based on the scope of work defined below.

Scope of work

- Assess the achieved results in the supported interventions against the described results in the intervention documents and assess other not foreseen results
- For on-going interventions, assess the likelihood of achieving the expected results
- Ensure that results are assessed in relation to their relevance, sustainability and effectiveness
- Compare the achieved and expected results with the overall goals of the PKM and assess how the interventions together contribute towards the goals of PKM with regard to:
 - based on relevant national actions to promote engagement of civil society organisations in regional and international policy processes related to climate, environment and sustainable development

- the relevance of organisational and institutional arrangements including networks utilised in the interventions
- strengthening of civil society capacity for advocacy
- how poverty orientation are being addressed by the interventions and how social inclusion and a Human Rights Based Approach is being addressed
- how partnerships and target group participation are being approached and managed in the interventions
- Assess the complementarity of the PKM interventions with other activities/interventions of the CSOs including other interventions funded through CISU civil society pool
- Assess the functioning and relevance of PKM for the applicant organisations
- Based on the performance of the interventions assess the relevance of the PKM and its funded interventions in relation to the most recent Danish strategies for support to civil society and for support to development, humanitarian action and to the expected Danish Climate Envelope
- Develop overview of main lessons learned from the interventions and recommendations related to the review

Methodology

- 3,5 weeks of work – from June to August 2017
- The review will be based on:
 - 1) Desk review of:
 - Key documents e.g. Funding Guidelines, monitoring visit reports.
 - 11 interventions representative of the different FCE support modalities, covering different geographic areas and types of Danish organisations.
 - Review of status reports and the track record (applications and reporting) of completed grants
 - 2) Interviews of users – 7 organisations in Denmark
 - 3) Participation in a Peer review workshop with users of the fund
 - 4) Identification of relevant parts of the Danish strategy for humanitarian and development work and the Climate Envelope.
 - 5) Interview of one representative of the FCE assessment committee and/or one of the external consultants in the assessment system

Schedule

Week 22-32 Desk review and interviews

Attendance in the following meetings:

- 8 June: Meeting with CISU advisor and grant manager at CISU's, Århus: Planning and preparation of review and peer review workshop
- 28 June: Peer review workshop at Vartov, København
- 5 September: Debriefing of CISU based on the draft report

8 September: Final report