

# Environmental Considerations in Sida's Evaluations Revisited

A follow-up and analysis six years later

Tom Alberts  
Jessica Andersson

With assistance from:  
Inger Ärnfast  
Susana Dougnac

Department for Evaluation  
and Internal Audit



# Environmental Considerations in Sida's Evaluations Revisited

**A follow-up and analysis six years later**

**Tom Alberts  
Jessica Andersson**

**With assistance from:  
Inger Ärnfast  
Susana Dougnac**

**Sida Studies in Evaluation 03/02**

**Department for Evaluation and  
Internal Audit**

This report is published in *Sida Studies in Evaluation*, a series comprising methodologically oriented studies commissioned by Sida. A second series, *Sida Evaluation*, covers evaluations of Swedish development co-operation. Both series are administered by the Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit, an independent department reporting directly to Sida's Board of Directors.

Reports may be *ordered* from:

Infocenter, Sida

S-105 25 Stockholm

Telephone: (+46) (0)8 506 423 80

Telefax: (+46) (0)8 506 423 52

E-mail: [info@sida.se](mailto:info@sida.se), Homepage <http://www.sida.se>

Reports are also available to *download* at:

<http://www.sida.se>

Authors: Tom Alberts, Jessica Andersson; with assistance from: Inger Årnfast, Susana Dognac

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the author's and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Studies in Evaluation 03/02

Commissioned by Sida, Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit.

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Registration No.: 2002-0972

Date of Final Report: January 2003

Printed by Elanders Novum

Art. no. SIDA2499en

ISBN 91-586-8514-6

ISSN 1402-215X

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Sveavägen 20, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

Telegram: [sida.stockholm](mailto:sida.stockholm). Postgiro: 1 56 34-9

E-mail: [info@sida.se](mailto:info@sida.se). Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

## Preface

In 1996 UTV commissioned a study of how environmental impact had been addressed in Sida's evaluations ("The Environment and Sida's Evaluations", Sida Studies in Evaluation 96/4). The 1996 study concluded that Sida's evaluations to a large extent had ignored environmental effects.

The present report is a follow-up of the study made in 1996. The purpose of the study is to assess whether there has been any improvements with regard to the incorporation of environmental impact. An additional purpose is to explore explanations in case improvements have not materialised. The study uses the same methodological approach as the previous study in order to facilitate a comparison between the results of the two studies.

According to Sida's "Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in International Development Cooperation" of 1998, it is mandatory to carry out an *ex ante* EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment) before project start, as well as an *ex post* EIA as part of the evaluations.

Contrary to the hypothesis that the incorporation of environmental considerations had improved since 1996, the present study concludes that there has been no general improvement. Both *ex ante* EIAs and *ex post* EIAs have only partially been carried out, and other aspects such as environmental side-effects are missing as well. Among the possible reasons for this lack of improvement, the report suggests that the heavy workload of Sida staff and the lack of incentives for its employees may be part of the explanation. The report also raises the question whether the shortcomings found in this follow-up study may even apply to other cross-cutting issues that are supposed to be included in Sida's evaluations.

Eva Lithman  
Director  
Department for Evaluation  
and Internal Audit



# Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2 Methodology</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>3 Main findings</b> .....	<b>9</b>
The inclusion of the Terms of Reference in the evaluation report .....	9
The importance of the environment in the evaluations .....	10
Question 1a: was an EIA carried out before project start? .....	11
Question 1b: is an EIA carried out in the evaluation (ex post EIA)? .....	11
Question 1c: does the evaluation point out that an EIA is missing? .....	12
Management response to the evaluations .....	12
Question 2a: are any environmental aspects mentioned in the project objectives? .....	12
Question 2b: are environmental objectives assessed in the evaluation? .....	12
Question 3: are environmental side-effects considered in the evaluation? .....	13
Question 4a: are long-term impacts of the project/programme assessed in the evaluation? ..	13
Question 4b: is the long-term environmental impact included in the assessment? .....	13
Question 5a: is sustainability discussed in the evaluation? .....	14
Question 5b: is environmental sustainability included in this discussion? .....	14
Question 6a: is a financial analysis included in the evaluation? .....	14
Question 6b: is an economic analysis included in the evaluation? .....	15
Question 6c: are environmental costs and/or benefits considered in the economic analysis? ..	16
Question 7a: was a monitoring system set up for the project? .....	16
Question 7b: if no monitoring system was set up for the project, does the evaluation recommend it? .....	16
Question 7c: are environmental indicators discussed in the evaluation? .....	17
Question 8a: does/do the evaluator(s) have competence in assessing environmental impact? ..	17
Question 9a: are any references made to material concerning evaluation methodology? .....	17
Question 9b: is there a methodological discussion of evaluating environmental issues? .....	18
<b>4 Some conclusions and further reflections</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>5 Why no EIAs and what to do?</b> .....	<b>20</b>
Introduction .....	20
Is Sida's policy on Environmental Impact Assessments sufficiently clear? .....	20
<i>Environmental Policy</i> .....	20
<i>Evaluation Policy</i> .....	22
<i>Management Response</i> .....	23
There is a lack of knowledge regarding the environment within Sida .....	24
Sida staff are overworked and cannot digest all the information .....	25
Lack of incentives to ensure that Sida policies are implemented .....	27
<b>6 Conclusions and Recommendations</b> .....	<b>28</b>
Introduction .....	28
Implementation of Sida's policy in general .....	28
<i>Conclusions</i> .....	28

Sida's EIA policy .....	29
<i>Conclusions</i> .....	29
<i>Recommendations</i> .....	29
Workload of Sida employees .....	30
<i>Conclusions</i> .....	30
<i>Recommendations</i> .....	30
Lack of incentives to ensure that Sida policies are implemented .....	31
<i>Conclusions</i> .....	31

## Tables and figures

Table 1 Summary assessment of the evaluation .....	7
Table 2 Questions posed regarding Sida's evaluations .....	8
Table 3 Geographical focus and departments responsible for the evaluations .....	9
Table 4 Distribution of the evaluations between Sida departments .....	9
Table 5 Number of environmentally important projects, i.e. scoring 3 or 4 .....	10
Table 6 Environmental competence required in ToR .....	10
Table 7 <i>Ex post</i> EIAs 1996 and 2002 .....	12
Table 8 Environmental objectives in project objectives 1996 and 2002 .....	12
Table 9 Environmental objectives assessed .....	12
Table 10 Environmental side effects 1996 and 2002 .....	13
Table 11 Long-term impact assessments 1996 and 2002 .....	13
Table 12 Long-term environmental impact assessment .....	13
Table 13 Discussion of sustainability in the evaluation, 1996 and 2002 .....	14
Table 14 Environmental sustainability 1996 and 2002 .....	14
Table 15 Financial analysis in the evaluation 1996 and 2002 .....	15
Table 16 Economic analysis in the evaluation 1996 and 2002 .....	15
Table 17 Environmental costs and/or benefits considered in the economic analysis 1996 and 2002 .....	16
Table 18 Was a monitoring system set up 1996 and 2002? .....	16
Table 19 Was a monitoring system recommended? .....	16
Table 20 Environmental indicators discussed 1996 and 2002 .....	17
Table 21 Environmental competence 1996 and 2002 .....	17
Table 22 Evaluation methodology 1996 and 2002 .....	18
Table 23 Methodological discussion of environmental issues 1996 and 2002 .....	18
Table 24 Sida courses on environment .....	24
Figure 1 Urgency and importance .....	26

## Appendices

Appendix 1 Terms of Reference .....	32
Appendix 2 Summary assessment of the evaluations .....	35
Appendix 3 Questions posed regarding Sida's evaluations .....	36
Appendix 4 Environmental Impact Assessment in International Development Cooperation .....	37
Appendix 5 Documents consulted .....	41
Appendix 6 Evaluations in 2002 .....	43
Appendix 7 Evaluations in 2001 .....	47
Appendix 8 Another cross-cutting issue – Gender .....	50



## List of acronyms used

BPM	Bedömningspromemoria (Assessment made for a Sida decision)
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
SASDA	Secretariat for Analysis of Swedish Development Assistance
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
ToR	Terms of Reference

### Sida Departments

AFRA	Africa
RELA	Latin America
ASIEN	Asia
SIDA-ÖST	Central and Eastern Europe
SAREC	Research Co-operation
DESO	Democracy and Social Development
INEC	Infrastructure and Economic Co-operation
NATUR	Natural Resources and the Environment
SEKA	Co-operation with Non-Governmental Organisations and Humanitarian Assistance
UTV	Evaluation and Internal Audit



## Executive Summary

In 1988 the Swedish Parliament adopted a fifth development co-operation objective: *The sustainable use of natural resources and protection of the environment. Sida's policy is that this objective shall be an integral part of all Swedish development co-operation – only then can it contribute to sustainable development.*<sup>1</sup> Evaluations are important because they should provide knowledge and experience for improving the quality of development co-operation.

In 1996 Sida commissioned a study whose main objective was: *to assess the extent and manner in which Sida's evaluations in recent years have assessed the environmental impact of Swedish development cooperation projects and programmes.*

The report, **The Environment and Sida's Evaluations (Sida Studies in Evaluation 96/4)**, prepared by Tom Alberts and Jessica Andersson concluded that the evaluations of Swedish international development co-operation had not considered environmental effects to the extent recommended by Sida. The report contained a series of recommendations and was used as a pilot case in the new Sida's policy to prepare Management Responses for every evaluation undertaken. Sida implemented a large part of the recommendations, including the recommendation to carry out a similar study in a few years' time. In March 2002 Sida commissioned this study, aimed at assessing the extent to which improvements had been made since 1996 and at providing the basis for further discussion and analysis of ways of improving the use of environmental assessment in evaluations. The study was also intended to serve as a learning component for Sida.

Since 1996 Sida has launched several environmental training programmes for its staff, involving about 500 employees. Sida's policy on environmental impact assessments (EIAs) has been further developed and clarified. The hypothesis for the present study, therefore, was that this work had been reflected in the evaluations and that consideration of the environment had been improved. It was decided to test this hypothesis and, in the light of the results obtained, to construct a basis for further discussion and analysis.

The methodology from the 1996 Study was applied to a random sample of 40 out of a total of 79 Sida evaluations published during the years 2000 and 2001. The results showed that the environmental considerations in the evaluations had not improved since 1996.

- The evaluations showed no general improvement in terms of considering the environment, even for environmentally important projects and programmes;
- Environmental competence, not in itself mandatory, was hardly ever a required qualification of the evaluation team;
- *Ex ante* EIAs are mandatory within Sida, and yet very few references to *ex ante* EIAs were included in the evaluations;
- Only about one-fifth of the evaluations contained any kind of *ex post* EIA;
- According to Sida's evaluation policy, the exclusion of an *ex post* EIA, or other development goals and cross-cutting issues, *should be explicitly stated in the evaluation report*. This has rarely been done;
- Long-term overall impact assessments, a mandatory requirement, were made only in about half of the evaluations (in the case of long-term environmental impact only about thirteen per cent);

---

<sup>1</sup> **Guidelines** 1998, p. 1.

- Basic financial data and analyses were available only for about 40 per cent of the evaluations, with the result that cost effectiveness analyses (mandatory) were very few and far between;
- Only one study out of the 18 environmentally important projects/programmes evaluated included a discussion of environmental benefits and costs;
- Adequate monitoring systems rarely existed, making the evaluation of the effectiveness of the projects next to impossible to assess in most cases; and
- Out of the 40 evaluations only ten cases could be identified where a Management Response had followed. Many desk officers did not even know that such a response was mandatory.

The result was surprising and puzzling. One tentative conclusion is that several mandatory policies are not being implemented. This suggests an overall problem in translating policy into operations and practice, and a need to probe deeper into this problem, which one way or another, is presumably of a structural nature. This, however, exceeded the ToR for the present study.

Mandatory Sida policy is not always implemented. From the material assessed by the consultant it could with certainty be concluded that very few *ex post* EIAs had been conducted. With respect to *ex ante* EIAs, depending on the material studied, there were somewhat varying results. At least more than half of the projects and programmes supported by Sida were not subjected to an *ex ante* EIA, and the actual figure could be as low as one-fifth.

The *ex ante* EIA provides the basis for subsequent follow-ups and evaluations, and when not easily accessible it inhibits the performance of *ex post* evaluations of the impact on the environment. The persistent lack of information regarding *ex ante* EIAs should be of concern to Sida.

The basic, and important, question is why have EIAs not been carried out? The following hypotheses emerged from discussions with Sida staff and the consultant's reflections:

- Sida's policy on EIAs is not sufficiently clear;
- Sida is short on environmental knowledge;
- Sida staff are overworked and cannot digest all the information; and
- There is a lack of incentives to ensure that policy is implemented.

In terms of required conduct, Sida's EIA policy is clear, but its varied and recurrently changing policies are hard to digest. A few years ago Sida's policies were contained in a large number of different documents and decisions, running to almost 2,000 pages. In recent years these have been compressed to about 70 pages (**Sidas Regelverk** – Sida's Rules and Regulations). Although Sida's EIA policy as such seems clear enough, this is not to say that Sida employees consider it important enough to warrant the effort of fully understanding it, including its implications for their own programme areas of responsibility.

The question of responsibilities emerged during the course of work. Who is responsible for ensuring that EIAs are carried out? There is no clear answer to this question, and in many cases responsibilities have been assigned to different elements of the organisation. In the case of *ex post* EIAs, for example, the main responsibility apparently devolves at least on the following:

- Sida Controllers, because of their assigned roles of ensuring that **Sidas Regelverk** (Sida's Rules and Regulations) is being implemented;
- NATUR, because of the EIA policy; and
- UTV, because of Sida's Evaluation Policy.

The lack of knowledge could be an important reason for the absence of EIAs, but about five hundred Sida staff members have received some environmental training, and Sida has also produced a great deal of environmental documentation. Expertise is available to Sida staff within Sida, through advisory help-desks at the University of Agricultural Sciences in Uppsala, at the University of Gothenburg and from various government agencies.

Lack of knowledge or the availability of it can hardly be termed a major problem, and accordingly cannot be a significant reason for the lack of EIAs.

In interviews with Sida staff, excessive workload was the reason recurrently given for poor performance in terms of EIAs. In such a situation, urgent matters tend to be given priority. Important, but not urgent matters, including many of strategic importance, are often not addressed. For many Sida staff members the inclusion of an EIA might seem peripheral in relation to important project/programme objectives.

Sida's incentive scheme for its employees is an important part of its organisational culture. One conclusion seems to be that there are few incentives, if any, for carefully applying Sida's policy compared, for example, to disbursing funding allocations for new projects and programmes.

The study recommends:

- that the major conclusions and recommendations of this Study be made available to Sida senior management, to the Controllers and to the Internal Auditors;
- that, with respect to the heavy work-load, Sida consider revising its courses with a view to including new courses and training to enhance the productivity of its staff;
- that UTV make specific reference to all cross-cutting issues, and with respect to the environment clearly establish that it is mandatory to carry out an *ex post* EIA. The mandatory nature of this activity should be reflected in the wording both of the Evaluation Policy and of the templates (e.g. those for ToR) supplied to Sida employees;
- UTV prepare an updated Evaluation Manual soonest, including instructions on how to deal adequately with cross-cutting issues;
- that UTV consider preparing a checklist for evaluators. This might include checking whether an *ex ante* EIA was actually made and that an *ex post* EIA – at least a few lines – has to be made;
- that NATUR revise the regulation on EIA in **Sidas Regelverk** so that an *ex post* EIA is made clearly mandatory during evaluations; and
- that NATUR commission a study to review the extent to which *ex ante* EIAs have been carried out.

# 1 Introduction

This study is a follow-up of the evaluative study **The Environment and Sida's Evaluations** (Sida Studies in Evaluation, SSE 96/4) carried out six years ago<sup>2</sup> and for present purposes referred to as the 1996 Study.

In 1988 the Swedish Parliament formulated a new objective for international development co-operation, namely sustainable use of natural resources and the environment. The gender objective was added in 1995.

It is sometimes argued that the environment objective conflicts with the primary objective of economic growth. At the same time, it is becoming more and more apparent that without sustainable use of natural resources, long-term economic growth will be hard to achieve. The ultimate objective of economic growth is not growth *per se*, but human welfare – which obviously depends on the quality of the environment.

The 1996 Study developed a methodology to assess how and to what extent Sida had considered the environment in its evaluations. The Study surveyed all 66 evaluations commissioned by the various public development co-operation organisations – Sida, SwedeCorp, BITS and SAREC – and published during 1994 and 1995. In mid-1995 these four bodies were amalgamated to form the new Sida.

The initial screening of the projects showed dismal results with regard to the assessment of environmental performance. Most evaluators gave little if any attention to the environment objective. The findings were summarised as follows<sup>3</sup>:

- Of 66 projects evaluated, 37 were judged to have a significant environmental impact. However, as judged by the respective ToR, Sida considered only 14 of them to be environmentally important;
- Almost 60 per cent of the evaluations assessed or discussed the long-term impacts of the projects, but only 13 per cent made specific mention of environmental impacts;
- About half of the evaluations included a discussion of sustainability, but only three included a discussion of environmental sustainability; and
- The financial analyses were poor throughout. None of the evaluations included an assessment of benefits and costs.

The 1996 Study also highlighted that the evaluations' lack of focus on environmental performance partly reflects insufficient attention paid to the environment objective by project management:

- None of the projects had an effective monitoring system or provided adequate indicators to measure environmental impacts; and
- Although Sida requires environmental impact assessments (EIAs) to be carried out in all projects prior to implementation, this was done only in three cases.

Since the Study also assessed how the environment had been considered in the evaluations, the evaluations were searched for references to evaluation methodology. The result was discouraging, showing as it did that the environment was poorly considered at many stages of the project cycle. One recommendation made was that a similar study should be undertaken a few years later to assess how far the situation had improved. The present study stems from that recommendation.

---

<sup>2</sup> Carried out by Tom Alberts, PhD (Econ.) and Jessica Andersson, who is studying for a PhD in environmental economics.

<sup>3</sup> The summary is taken from **Sida Evaluations Newsletter 5/97**.

The Terms of Reference for the 1996 Study noted as follows: *In recent years, the need for developing mechanisms and methodologies for monitoring and assessing the environmental impact of Sida's development cooperation programmes has become increasingly apparent. In evaluations, the environmental impact of projects, like other cross cutting issues, are not always followed up to the extent or in the manner they should be.*<sup>4</sup>

The 1996 Study came to the very strong conclusion that: *... evaluations of Swedish international development cooperation generally have ignored environmental effects.* All parties seemed to agree that the environment is important, but that it is not properly considered. Since then Sida has implemented a number of activities to inform and train its staff and others about environmental impact assessments (EIAs). In addition, Sida policy on the environment has been further clarified and the mechanisms for implementing the policy have improved. The intention with the current study was accordingly to assess to what extent these activities had resulted in an improved consideration and assessment of environmental effects. If there had been only minor improvements or none at all, the intention was to explore these deficiencies further and to make recommendations on how to rectify them.

To enable a comparison of the results from the 1996 Study with those of the present one, it was decided to use the same methodology. The material used for the comparison comprised a random sample of 40 out of a total of 79 evaluations from 2000 and 2001.

An **Interim Report** was prepared in May, summarising the main empirical findings, which were subsequently discussed with Sida in June 2002. It was concluded that:

*The main conclusion from 1996 remains: 'The sustainable use of natural resources and the protection of the environment' is a stated objective of Swedish development cooperation. ... it can be stated that this development objective has not been translated into policy with regard to Sida's evaluations.*

The result was surprising, and it was decided to probe deeper into some of the possible causes and to make recommendations on how to proceed.

The Report, henceforth called the 2002 Study, is organised on the following lines.

The section on the **Methodology** summarises the methodology used in the 1996 Study. A few minor changes were made for this Study and are explained in the text.

The section **Main Findings** systematically compares the empirical data from the 1996 Study with those obtained for this Study. Comments and analyses are given in several cases. Readers who are pushed for time can skip this section and go straight on to the next one. The **Main Findings** are summarised in **Some conclusions and further reflections**.

The following section, **Why no EIAs and what to do?** focuses on the fact that, contrary to Sida's policy, *ex ante* and *ex post* EIAs have been only partially carried out. A few hypotheses are presented and discussed. This Report concludes with **Conclusions and Recommendations**.

---

<sup>4</sup> In 1994 SASDA concluded that only 15 per cent of the evaluations dealt adequately with environmental issues while more than 70 per cent contained no analysis of environmental aspects at all. From the Terms of Reference for the 1996 Study.

## 2 Methodology

The methodology developed for the 1996 Study was also used for the 2002 Study, with a few minor modifications to highlight special issues. These minor modifications will be explained later.

Altogether 79 evaluations were carried out during 2000 and 2001. To review all of these studies would have been time-consuming and it was felt that the time would be better spent analysing ways of improving the present system. Hence the decision to make a random sample. Sida still had the option of surveying the whole population if the results obtained from the sample proved inconclusive. The sample size was 40 studies, which ought to be large enough to draw general conclusions.

It was also decided to make a comparative study, comparing the results from the 1996 Study with those obtained from the survey of the 40 randomly selected evaluations.

For each evaluation a **Summary Assessment** was made.

Three basic questions were posed<sup>5</sup>:

- **The importance of the environment as stated in the Terms of Reference.** This is the consultant's assessment of the importance allotted to the environment in the ToR. A 4-point scale was used, with 1 as the lowest score and 4 as the highest.
- **The presumed environmental impact of the project.** This is the consultant's assessment of the project's environmental impact. Here again, a 4-point scale was used, with 1 denoting no impact and 4 a major direct impact.
- **The importance of the environment in the evaluation.** This is the consultant's assessment of how important the environment is in the evaluation report. Again a 4-point scale was used, with 1 indicating that the environment is not mentioned and 4 that it is considered in detail and at several levels.

Early on it seemed as if another cross-cutting issue – gender, for example – was better addressed than the environment. A number of gender-related questions were therefore added; see Table 1, below, for details. *No definite conclusions could be drawn, and the result of the analysis is therefore not included in the main report, but it will be found in Appendix 8.*

One of the questions raised, but not addressed, in the 1996 Study concerned the evaluators' environmental competence. It was decided to include one question on this subject, namely: Is environmental competence required in the ToR?

---

<sup>5</sup> See Table 1 for a more detailed description of the questions. The detailed results will be found in Appendix 2.



Table 1, below, presents the questions posed. The results are given in Appendix 2.

**Table 1 Summary assessment of the evaluations**

<b>Do Terms of Reference (ToR) exist in the report? (Yes or no)</b>
<b>Importance of the environment as stated in the ToR</b> 1. No reference or reference only to Swedish development co-operation objectives in general 2. Reference to environmental objective 3. Specific or detailed reference to environmental issues 4. Special focus on environmental problem areas
<b>Importance of gender issues as stated in the ToR</b> 1. No reference or reference only to Swedish development co-operation objectives in general 2. Reference to gender objective 3. Specific or detailed reference to gender issues 4. Special focus on gender problem areas
<b>The presumed environmental impact of the project</b> 1. No impact 2. Secondary impact only 3. Little direct impact 4. Major direct impact
<b>The importance of the environment in the evaluation</b> 1. Not mentioned 2. Mentioned briefly in a section or incorporated into other sections 3. Amply covered in a section 4. Considered in detail and at several levels
<b>The importance of gender in the evaluation</b> 1. Not mentioned 2. Mentioned briefly in a section or incorporated into other sections 3. Amply covered in a section 4. Considered in detail and at several levels
<b>Is environmental competence required by the ToR? (Yes or No)</b>
<b>Is gender competence required by the ToR? (Yes or No)</b>
<b>Year of evaluation</b>
<b>Department within Sida responsible for the evaluation</b>
<b>Region covered by the evaluation</b>

In addition, a series of specific questions was asked: **Questions posed regarding Sida's evaluations.** These are listed in Table 2. Most of them required purely negative or affirmative answers, but in some cases "partly" was also used. The marking "n.a." means either that information was lacking or that the question is not applicable in this particular case. For example, assessment of whether an EIA was made or not before project start hinges on the information contained in the evaluation report. If the evaluators did not make an *ex post* EIA, it cannot be known whether an *ex ante* EIA was actually made before project start, hence the notation "n.a."

**Table 2 Questions posed regarding Sida's evaluations**

<p><b>Environmental Consequences</b></p> <p>1a Was an EIA made before project start?</p> <p>1b Is an EIA made during the evaluation (ex post EIA)</p> <p>1c Does the evaluation point out that an EIA is missing?</p>
<p><b>Achievement of objectives</b></p> <p>2a Are any environmental aspects mentioned in the project objectives?</p> <p>2b Are these assessed in the evaluation?</p>
<p><b>Side effects</b></p> <p>3 Are side-effects considered in the evaluation?</p>
<p><b>Impact</b></p> <p>4a Are long-term impacts of the project/programme assessed in the evaluation?</p> <p>4b Is the long-term environmental impact included in the evaluation?</p>
<p><b>Sustainability</b></p> <p>5a Is sustainability discussed in the evaluation?</p> <p>5b Is environmental sustainability included in this discussion?</p>
<p><b>Cost-effectiveness</b></p> <p>6a Is a financial analysis included in the evaluation?</p> <p>6b Is an economic analysis included in the evaluation?</p> <p>6c Are economic costs and/or benefits considered in the economic analysis?</p>
<p><b>Monitoring and indicators</b></p> <p>7a Was a monitoring system set up for the project?</p> <p>7b If not, does the evaluation recommend it?</p> <p>7c Are environmental indicators discussed in the evaluation?</p>
<p><b>Choice of evaluators</b></p> <p>8a Does/do the evaluator(s) have competence in assessing environmental impact?</p> <p>8b Does/do the evaluator(s) have competence in assessing gender issues? (new question)</p>
<p><b>The methodology of evaluating the environment</b></p> <p>9a Are any references made to material concerning evaluation methods?</p> <p>9b Is there a methodological discussion of evaluating environmental issues?</p>

The detailed results will be found in Appendix 3.

The 1996 Study was based on 66 evaluations carried out during the period between 1994 and 1995.<sup>6</sup> The 2002 Study surveyed 40 randomly selected evaluations drawn from a population of 79 evaluations carried out in 2000 and 2001.<sup>7</sup>

*In addition it was decided to probe deeper into the question of how the environment has been treated in Sida's every-day work. This work was carried out by Inger Ärnfast assisted by Susana Dougnac and a Desk Study, **Skrivbordsstudie avseende miljökonsekvensbedömningar i Sidas utvärderingar**, was attached to the Main Findings from May 2002.<sup>8</sup>*

<sup>6</sup> On 1 July 1995 the four Swedish aid organisations, SIDA, SwedeCorp, BITS and SAREC were amalgamated to form a new organisation, Sida.

<sup>7</sup> The reports were divided into two groups, covering the years 2000 and 2001. It was decided to select every second study and a coin was tossed to decide whether the first or the second should be initially selected. There were 81 studies altogether, but since there were duplicates, involving translations, only the original versions were considered. Since Tom Alberts has participated in a few evaluations, it was decided that in the event of one of them being selected the assessment would be made by Jessica Andersson. The 40 studies selected were distributed equally between Tom Alberts and Jessica Andersson. In addition a few studies were made jointly to develop a common approach when reading the different evaluations. For some of the questions posed the work needed was relatively simple, and so for these questions it was decided to include the whole population. This work, involving 39 studies, was carried out by Susana Dougnac in consultation with Tom Alberts and Jessica Andersson.

<sup>8</sup> Inger Ärnfast is a former senior employee of Sida with a degree in social anthropology. Susana Dougnac has an MA in political science and worked as an assistant to the evaluation team.

### 3 Main findings

Some general information is discussed first, and then follows a more detailed presentation of the results of this Study as compared with the results from the 1996 Study.

**Table 3 Geographical focus and departments responsible for the evaluations**

	2002		1996
	Total	Per cent	Per cent
Africa	22	28%	45%
Eastern Europe	20	25%	9%
Asia	16	20%	26%
Latin America	12	15%	12%
Others	9	11%	8%
	79	100%	100%

There has been a significant decline in the evaluations involving Africa and a rapid increase for Eastern Europe, due mainly to the rapid expansion of Swedish aid to Eastern Europe. For the remaining regions there have only been minor changes.

The different departments involved can be seen from Table 4.

**Table 4 Distribution of the evaluations between Sida departments**

	Total	Per cent
Sida-ÖST	20	25%
DESO	14	18%
NATUR	12	15%
INEC	7	9%
ASIEN	5	6%
SAREC	5	6%
AFRA	4	5%
RELA	4	5%
SEKA	4	5%
UTV	2	3%
UTV-AFRA	1	1%
NATUR-INEC	1	1%
	79	100%

Most evaluations have been performed by Sida-ÖST, DESO and NATUR, which between them accounted for 58 per cent. No comparisons with the 1996 Study were possible, since what is now Sida was formerly SIDA, SwedeCorp, BITS and SAREC.

#### **The inclusion of the Terms of Reference in the evaluation report**

Sida's past policy regarding the inclusion of the Terms of Reference in the evaluations has been somewhat ambiguous. *Sida's Evaluation Policy* from 1999 does not specify any such inclusion.<sup>9</sup> The template for evaluations and the *Sida Evaluation Report – A Standardized Format*, on the other hand, clearly state that inclusion of the ToR in the evaluation report is mandatory. In the 1996 Study, 21 per cent did not contain the ToR. In the present Study the situation had improved significantly, with the ToR included in all evaluations but one.

<sup>9</sup> Approved by Sida's Board of Directors on 24 September 1999 and by the Director General of Sida on 7 October 1999.

## The importance of the environment in the evaluations

The importance of the environment as stated in the ToR is expected to reflect how much weight Sida's desk officers assign to the environment when commissioning the evaluation. A 4-point scale was used, with 1 indicating the lowest rating and 4 the highest.<sup>10</sup> In the 1996 Study the average result of this rating was 1.6, and in the present study it is 1.5. In other words, the importance assigned by Sida officers to the environment has remained practically the same.

Next, a general assessment was made of how much weight the evaluators had assigned to the environment. On the same 4-point scale as previously, the average in the 1996 Study was 1.8 while the present study showed a slight increase, to 2.0. In conclusion, the increase is probably not statistically significant and the result is fairly stable. What is interesting is that the environment is again considered more important (2.0) by the evaluators than by the desk officers (1.5).

Finally, the consultant's assessment of the environmental impact (also termed the presumed environmental impact) of the different projects was added. The source was the evaluations and no other documents were consulted. Again using the same scoring system, the average value in the 1996 Study was 2.6 and in this Study 2.5. This result has also remained practically unchanged.

Taken together, these figures suggest that the same pattern has held good between 1996 and 2002. We find the environmental impact of the projects to be greater than indicated by the evaluators' assessment. Their assessment in turn exceeds the importance of the environment as stated in the ToR for the evaluation. This difference between the desk officer's, the evaluators' and the consultant's assessment of the importance of the environment is summarised in Table 5, below.

**Table 5 Number of environmentally important projects, i.e. scoring 3 or 4**

According to Desk Officer (in ToR)	4
According to the Evaluators	10
According to the Consultant	18

In the 1996 Study, 37 out of 66 projects, 56 per cent, scored 3 or 4, i.e. were perceived as having either a slight or a major direct effect on the environment. In this study the consultant's assessment is that a slightly smaller proportion of the projects had a direct environmental effect, *viz.* 45 per cent of the total number of evaluations.

These figures suggest that the conclusion from 1996 still holds good, namely that Sida has not paid sufficient attention to relevant environmental issues in formulating the Terms of Reference, nor in the evaluations themselves.

In the 1996 Study it was assessed whether the evaluators had competence with regard to environmental issues, but it was not assessed whether the ToR required this competence. The argument goes that competence of this kind must be included in the evaluation team if the projects have an environmental impact. The following table shows the results.

**Table 6 Environmental competence required in ToR**

Yes	9	11.4%
No	66	83.5%
n.a.	4	5.1%
Total	79	100.0%

<sup>10</sup> See also Table 2 for more details of the scoring procedure.

A minor fraction of the ToRs stipulated environmental competence for carrying out the evaluation. While there were 18 environmentally relevant projects (the consultant's assessment) in the sample, only in four cases did the ToR require environmental competence. The ToR for the evaluations were generally quite specific on the different areas of competence needed for the evaluations, and it was therefore surprising that environmental competence was not included for the environmentally relevant projects. Depending on the character of the project, environmental or special competence is very often a prerequisite of proper assessment of environmental impacts.

This concludes the review of Table 1, **Summary assessment of the evaluation**. Next follows a review of the results of Table 2, **Questions posed regarding Sida's evaluations**. An important part of these refers to **Sida's Evaluation Policy**, while others are directly related to **Sida's Policy on Environmental Impact Assessment in International Development Cooperation**.

### Question 1a: was an EIA carried out before project start?

It is mandatory that an environmental impact assessment (EIA) be made prior to project start.<sup>11</sup> In the 1996 Study only 5 per cent of the evaluations reported that an EIA had been carried out before implementing the projects. Based on the 2000 and 2001 evaluations, 2.5 per cent had carried out an EIA and another 2.5 per cent had partly done so. Consequently there has not been any improvement between 1996 and 2002.

It is important to understand the implications of the methodology used for this study. Whether an EIA had been carried or not was based on reading the evaluations. In other words, if the evaluations or the ToR made reference to an EIA it was assumed that an EIA had been made. But it could also be that an EIA had been carried out but was mentioned neither in the ToR nor in the evaluations as such.

In order to probe deeper into the issue it was decided to review the original project documents at Sida, including what is called the *Bedömningspromemoria*, BPM (Assessment made for a Sida decision). This time the result was that only 18 per cent had carried out an EIA.

It is still possible that an EIA had been carried out before project start, but was simply not mentioned in the project document or in the BPM. This should still give cause for concern, since it indicates that information that is supposed to be used in the evaluations is not readily available, and indeed may not be available at all.

### Question 1b: is an EIA carried out in the evaluation (ex post EIA)?

A review of Sida's 1998 **Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessments in International Development Cooperation** suggests that *ex ante* EIAs are the most important while *ex post* EIAs are important but not essential<sup>12</sup>. This impression is confirmed when examining the new **Sidas Regelverk** (Sida's Rules and Regulations), where major emphasis is laid on *ex ante* EIAs.

Given the fact that a large number of projects/programmes did not carry out *ex ante* EIAs, the number of *ex post* EIAs can be expected to be still smaller. The table below confirms this hypothesis.

<sup>11</sup> See Sida *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in International Development Cooperation* from July 1998. (Decision made on 24 June 1998 by the Director General of Sida.) These replaced the guidelines from 1991, which also required an EIA. In order to reduce the volume of guidelines and rules Sida has condensed them into what is called *Sidas Regelverk*. The decision to replace the 1998 *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment* was taken on 19 June 2001.

<sup>12</sup> This hypothesis was confirmed by the comments on the Draft Report. Many seemed to believe that if a desk officer considered a project to have no impact on the environment, no *ex post* EIA was required.

**Table 7 Ex post EIAs 1996 and 2002**

	1996 Study	2002 Study
Yes	17%	10%
Partly	5%	8%
Total	22%	18%

There has been no improvement since 1996 and there might even have been a deterioration.

### **Question 1c: does the evaluation point out that an EIA is missing?**

Similar results were found when comparing the results from the 1996 Study with the results from the current study. In 1996, 13 per cent of the evaluations pointed out that an *ex ante* EIA was missing; in this study the figure was 8 per cent. The fact of so few evaluators mentioning that an *ex ante* EIA was missing suggests that the evaluators have either not been informed about, or else have ignored, their obligation to follow up on *ex ante* EIAs<sup>13</sup>. The evaluators commonly mentioned that information and data as such were missing, but the specific fact that an *ex ante* EIA was missing was not pointed out to the same extent.

### **Management response to the evaluations**

It is mandatory to prepare a management response within six weeks after an evaluation has been carried out. This mandatory rule can be found in **Sida's Evaluation Policy** from 1999.<sup>14</sup> The consultant intended to investigate to what extent the results of the evaluations of projects assessed as environmentally important were reflected in the management responses. Out of 39 evaluations only 10 management responses could be identified (26 per cent). The small number of responses made it impossible to pursue the matter further.

### **Question 2a: are any environmental aspects mentioned in the project objectives?**

**Table 8 Environmental objectives in project objectives 1996 and 2002**

Partly	5.0%	6.1%
Sub-total	37.5%	34.8%
No	57.5%	60.6%
n.a.	5.0%	4.5%

The results are much the same for both periods covered.

### **Question 2b: are environmental objectives assessed in the evaluation?**

**Table 9 Environmental objectives assessed**

	1996	2002
Yes	28.8%	20.0%
Partly	6.1%	12.5%
Total	34.8%	32.5%

<sup>13</sup> This obligation can be found in both *Sida's Evaluation Policy* and in *Sida's Environmental Impact Assessment in Development Cooperation*. See *Sidas Regelverk* chapters C8 and C4.

<sup>14</sup> This policy is also included in *Sidas Regelverk*.

The results are similar. Taking the set of projects with an explicit environmental objective (Table 8), it was found that in two evaluations the environmental objectives were not evaluated (both the 1996 and 2002 studies).

### Question 3: are environmental side-effects considered in the evaluation?

**Table 10 Environmental side-effects 1996 and 2002**

	1996	2002
Yes	24.2%	22.5%
Partly	7.6%	17.5%
No	68.2%	60.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Again the results are similar.

### Question 4a: are long-term impacts of the project/programme assessed in the evaluation?

There was no clear Sida Evaluation Policy when the 1996 Study was made, based on evaluations published in 1994 and 1995. (Sida's first evaluation policy was adopted in December 1995 and could not have influenced the evaluations.) A number of questions were then identified as relevant in the context of an evaluation in general and particularly with respect to the environment. The long-term impact was one such area which was considered important. Sida's new evaluation policy (1999) has made the requirements much clearer. Regarding impact, the evaluators have to answer two questions:

*What are the intended and unintended effects of the activities, including effects on the intended beneficiaries and on others?*

*What are their positive and negative effects in the short and the long term? (p. 3)*

**Table 11 Long-term impact assessments 1996 and 2002**

	1996	2002
Yes	57.6%	47.5%
Partly	21.2%	25.0%
No	21.2%	27.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Sida's template for ToR also includes long-term impact. Whereas in the 1996 report 21 per cent did not include an assessment of the long-term impacts of the project, in this study 28 per cent had not done so.

### Question 4b: is the long-term environmental impact included in the assessment?

**Table 12 Long-term environmental impact assessment**

	1996	2002
Yes	13.6%	12.5%
Partly	12.1%	10.0%
No	74.2%	75.0%
n.a.	0.0%	2.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

The 1996 and 2002 results are similar. About 75 per cent of the evaluations did not contain a long-term environmental impact assessment.

### Question 5a: is sustainability discussed in the evaluation?

It is mandatory to discuss the sustainability of a project in the evaluations. This is also captured in the Sida's template for ToR.

**Table 13 Discussion of sustainability in the evaluation, 1996 and 2002**

	1996	2002
Yes	53.0%	57.5%
Partly	9.1%	17.5%
No	37.9%	25.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

An improvement occurred between 1996 and 2002. Whereas sustainability was not discussed in 38 per cent of the evaluations in 1996, in the 2002 Study this figure had fallen to 25 per cent. But, given that Sida's Evaluation Policy explicitly states (p. 3) that sustainability shall be discussed, the result must be considered unsatisfactory.

### Question 5b: is environmental sustainability included in this discussion?

**Table 14 Environmental sustainability 1996 and 2002**

	1996	2002
Yes	4.5%	7.5%
Partly	0.0%	15.0%
No	95.5%	77.5%
n.a.	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

If little attention is paid to sustainability in general, environmental sustainability is unlikely to receive adequate treatment. The table above confirms this hypothesis. Nevertheless, there has been an improvement between 1996 and 2002. Also, there are fewer environmentally important projects in this study (45 per cent as against 56 per cent in the 1996 Study).

### Question 6a: is a financial analysis included in the evaluation?

A financial analysis is needed to discuss efficiency, as indeed Sida's Evaluation Policy stipulates. With respect to efficiency it is stated (p. 3):

***Efficiency** – Are there more cost-effective methods of achieving the same results? Could the same outputs have been produced with a smaller amount of inputs/resources or could the same inputs/resources have produced a larger output?*

Sida's ToR template also states the need to cover cost-effectiveness.

Unless basic financial information is available, hardly any assessment can be made with respect to efficiency. For example, a project might have as an objective to provide clean water to peasants. There are usually various technical solutions. To answer the question of efficiency there must be financial data available and also some information on the costs of alternatives. But financial data, although necessary,



are not sufficient. The evaluator will often have to devote a considerable amount of time to adapting the financial data to the needs of the evaluation. Using the example above, how much of wages and salaries should be allocated to the actual provision of clean water and how much should be allocated to other activities such as administrative overheads?

Efficiency belongs to the domain of economic analysis, where costs and benefits to society at large have to be analysed. An economic analysis, discussing benefits and cost, requires good financial data.

**Table 15 Financial analysis in the evaluation 1996 and 2002**

	1996	2002
Yes	39.4%	37.5%
Partly	18.2%	22.5%
No	39.4%	40.0%
N.a.	3.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

The results from 2002 are similar. “Partly” in this context means that some financial data were provided. 40 per cent of the studies not having a financial analysis must be considered a poor result.

### **Question 6b: is an economic analysis included in the evaluation?**

When the 1996 Study was made there was no clear policy on how to deal with benefits and costs as compared to a more limited financial analysis, but it seemed logical to include a question as to whether the evaluators had attempted to estimate, or at least discuss, the costs and benefits of the project being evaluated. In the new policy, an in-depth economic analysis is not required and this decision might be justified on the grounds that it would be very expensive and that the benefits obtained would not justify the cost. For this reason the focus is on cost-effectiveness.

**Table 16 Economic analysis in the evaluation 1996 and 2002**

	1996	2002
Yes	4.5%	2.5%
Partly	4.5%	10.0%

The results from 2002 are similar to those from 1996. In the 2002 Study only one study attempted a cost-benefit analysis. Four studies contained some economic reasoning. The data suggest that a discussion of alternative uses of scarce resources is lacking and an analysis of benefits and costs to society is practically lacking.

The criteria used by the consultant were not very strict. If the evaluation included a discussion of the project’s efficiency, this was sufficient to meet the requirement of evaluating the project’s cost-effectiveness. However, since basic financial data were often unavailable to the evaluators, the results are not surprising.

### Question 6c: are environmental costs and/or benefits considered in the economic analysis?

**Table 17 Environmental costs and/or benefits considered in the economic analysis 1996 and 2002**

	1996	2002
Yes	6.1%	2.5%
Partly	0.0%	2.5%
Sub-total	6.1%	5.0%

To an economist addressing benefits and costs, it is natural to include environmental costs and benefits as well. One problem is that a major part of the projects lack clear objectives and outputs and financial data are difficult to obtain. In this context a meaningful economic analysis is next to impossible to carry out, which explains the almost complete absence of a discussion of environmental costs and benefits.

### Question 7a: was a monitoring system set up for the project?

Related to the availability of financial data and efficiency is the issues of *effectiveness*. Sida's Evaluation Policy states the following questions:

*Have outputs been produced as planned?<sup>2</sup>*  
*Have project and programme objectives been fulfilled? (p. 2)*

In order to answer these questions there has to be a monitoring system. This should among other things provide information on inputs delivered, activities carried out and outputs produced. The existence of an effective monitoring system is a pre-requisite for a future evaluation.

**Table 18 Was a monitoring system set up 1996 and 2002?**

	1996	2002
Yes	16.7%	15.0%
Partly	13.6%	15.0%
No	56.1%	35.0%
N.a.	13.6%	35.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

In many of cases it was not possible to know whether an effective monitoring system was established. The bulk of the evaluations analysed suggest that the consistent use of a logical framework approach is lacking. Hardly ever does an evaluation suggest that a good monitoring system was established to secure that planned activities and outputs are reached.<sup>15</sup>

### Question 7b: if no monitoring system was set up for the project, does the evaluation recommend it?

**Table 19 Was a monitoring system recommended?**

	1996	2002
Yes	45.5%	50.0%
Partly	3.0%	7.5%

<sup>15</sup> The Director General's memorandum for the planning for the period 2003–2005 notes that there is a lack of verifiable indicators (p. 3), and that overall objectives are vague (p. 4).

The results from 2002 are similar to those in 1996, though lack of monitoring systems seems to be a growing problem. More than half the evaluations recommend that a monitoring system be established. This is a serious problem, because the lack of a monitoring system implies that at least half the projects could not be evaluated adequately because essential data were lacking.

### Question 7c: are environmental indicators discussed in the evaluation?

**Table 20 Environmental indicators discussed 1996 and 2002**

	1996	2002
Yes	7.6%	5.0%
Partly	3.0%	2.5%
Sub-total	10.6%	7.5%

As was noted earlier, 45 per cent of the projects were identified as environmentally important in 2002. One would therefore have expected a larger frequency for environmental indicators than 7.5 per cent. However, the problem is not only that of the environment in Sida's evaluations. It is also related to the basic principles of project identification, planning, programming, implementation, monitoring and reporting. Because there are deficiencies in this chain, environmental concerns are hard to address operationally.

### Question 8a: does/do the evaluator(s) have competence in assessing environmental impact?

The Sida Evaluation Policy states that:

*The **credibility** of evaluations depends on the competence and integrity of the evaluators as well as on the degree of transparency of the evaluation process. (p. 4)*

The Sida ToR template indicates that information shall be provided on the *Composition and competence of evaluation team*. In general the evaluations provide little information on the evaluation team's competence.

**Table 21 Environmental competence 1996 and 2002**

	1996	2002
Yes	33.3%	2.5%
Partly	0.0%	0.0%
Sub-total	33.3%	2.5%

36 evaluations provide no information on the team's environmental competence. Since there is very little information on the composition and the competence of the evaluation team in general, no definite conclusions can be drawn.

### Question 9a: are any references made to material concerning evaluation methodology?

This seemed a logical question to ask in the 1996 Study. The new **Sida Evaluation Policy** does not formally require the evaluators to discuss evaluation methodology or refer to related material, but it does explicitly state that approaches and methods used in the evaluation should be clearly presented in the evaluation reports (p. 4).

**Table 22 Evaluation methodology 1996 and 2002**

	1996	2002
Yes	9.1%	10.0%
Partly	6.1%	5.0%
Sub-total	15.2%	15.0%

The results from both the 1996 and the 2002 studies show that the evaluators hardly ever made any reference to studies on evaluation methodology (roughly 10 per cent). The result “partly” indicates that while there are no specific references to written evaluation material, the authors had at least discussed evaluation methodology.

### **Question 9b: is there a methodological discussion of evaluating environmental issues?**

**Table 23 Methodological discussion of environmental issues 1996 and 2002**

	1996	2002
Yes	1.5%	2.5%
Partly	6.1%	0.0%
Sub-total	7.6%	2.5%

If methodological issues are not addressed generally, then an environment-related methodological discussion will not be undertaken. The poor results in Table 23 are a consequence of the previous section.

## 4 Some conclusions and further reflections

The results of this analysis of the data from a random sample of 40 Sida evaluations from 2000 and 2001 do not differ significantly from those of the 1996 Study. Comparing the results, the most noteworthy positive change was that almost all evaluations in 2000 and 2001 included the ToR in the report, as against 79 per cent in the 1996 Study.

The various questions posed in the 1996 and the present Study deal with different evaluation aspects in general and then specifically with the environment. The project cycle consists of various steps, including project identification, planning, programming, implementation, monitoring, reporting and evaluation. Important deficiencies were noted, such as the lack of effective monitoring systems and lack of financial data. In general, few improvements can be made to the quality of evaluations unless basic requirements in the project chain have been secured.

The main conclusion from 1996 still stands: *'The sustainable use of natural resources and the protection of the environment' is a stated objective of Swedish development cooperation. ... it can be stated that this development objective has not been translated into policy with regard to Sida's evaluations.*<sup>16</sup>

A word of warning is called for regarding the interpretation of the results. This is not a study of the impact of Sida's activities on the environment. It is a study of how the environment has been dealt with in Sida's evaluations. The fact that the environment has not been adequately dealt with in the evaluations, and particularly the lack of EIAs, should not be interpreted as Sida projects always having ignored the environment or having had a detrimental impact on the environment. On the contrary, from the study of the evaluations it can be seen that in several cases there has been a positive impact on the environment even though an *ex post* EIA was not carried out.

For example, one evaluation of a research project on small-scale gold mining in Tanzania dealt largely with environmental issues, particularly the negative environmental effects of using mercury. Mercury is mixed with the gold dust, manually and without any protection. The mixture is then heated and the mercury released into the surrounding environment. Reading between the lines, it is probably true to say that, partly as a result of this project, successful mitigation measures have been taken, involving the use of other techniques to extract the gold. But there is no EIA in the evaluation. This particular case might suggest that as long as the evaluation deals with the environmental issues, no formal EIA is needed. But the following example will show that an *ex post* EIA is needed.

In other cases the lack of an EIA made it impossible to know if there has been a positive and/or a negative impact. For example, land reform activities will impact on the use of land and consequently on the environment. The impact can be both positive and negative or a combination of both. Several evaluation studies did not carry out an *ex post* EIA and the environmental impact is therefore not known. This example illustrates the need to implement Sida's policy on EIAs.

The next section attempts to shed light on why there has been no improvement with respect to EIAs and Sida and its evaluations.

---

<sup>16</sup> p. 31.

## 5 Why no EIAs and what to do?

### Introduction

The results from the comparative review, comparing the results in the 1996 Study with the main findings in 2002, revealed a sombre picture. Treatment of the environment has remained inadequate in Sida's evaluations. In particular, EIAs are not carried out on a regular basis. The ToR for this Study state that:

*The study has a strong learning purpose and is to be used not only for environmental assessments in evaluations, as indicated in the above objective, but also for discussions and decisions in Sida (environment policy unit, the subject networks, programme officers, Sida management, etc) on how to further enhance environmental awareness and performance in Sida funded projects/programmes and evaluations. The study should therefore be structured to comply with this purpose and intended use.*

According to the ToR the study should also attempt to probe deeper into the reasons for failing environmental considerations in evaluations and, if possible, provide recommendations for improving the present state of affairs. The study was also to focus specifically on Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

In discussions and e-mail correspondence with Sida staff<sup>17</sup> a number of possible explanations emerged as to why EIAs are not being carried out. Among these the following seemed worth exploring further:

- Sida's policy is not sufficiently clear with respect to EIAs;
- There is a lack of knowledge within Sida regarding the environment;
- Sida staff are overburdened with work and cannot digest all the information; and
- There is a lack of incentives to ensure that policies are implemented.

These issues are further discussed below.

### Is Sida's policy on Environmental Impact Assessments sufficiently clear?

#### Environmental Policy

The fifth Swedish development co-operation objective, regarding the environment, was passed by the Swedish Parliament in 1988. In 1991 **Riktlinjer för miljökonskvensbedömningar i biståndet** (Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessments in International Cooperation) were approved by the Director General of Sida.<sup>18</sup> On page 5 it is stated that:

*Consequently Sida shall assess the environmental consequences of all project and programme proposals.*<sup>19</sup>

This wording made an EIA mandatory. However, on the following page there is a guideline on process that could be interpreted as an EIA not being mandatory but only strongly recommended.<sup>20</sup> *The Evalua-*

<sup>17</sup> A large number of desk officers were approached in the process of obtaining information on the different projects being studied. The Head of NATUR, desk officers of Sida's Environmental Policy Unit, Sida's Senior Environment Adviser and a couple of controllers including Sida's Chief Controller were also contacted.

<sup>18</sup> In 1995 the various public Swedish aid organisations were amalgamated as Sida. The old Sida ceased to exist.

<sup>19</sup> In the original text: Sida skall således bedöma miljökonskvenserna av samtliga projekt eller programförslag i sin beredning.

<sup>20</sup> För att rent praktiskt kunna beakta miljömålet i biståndsinnsatsen bör därför... (Our underlining) The Swedish word **bör** is a strong recommendation.

tion Manual for Sida<sup>21</sup> stated that all evaluations must include an *ex post* EIA. However, this manual did not have any official status.

The amalgamation of the various Swedish public aid organisations into Sida in 1995 made it easier to ensure that EIAs were actually implemented.

In June 1998 the Director General of Sida approved a revised and more detailed version of the **Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessments in International Cooperation**, a fairly long document (51 pages). Whereas in the past *ex ante* EIAs had been strongly recommended, the policy had now become crystal clear:

*Environmental impact assessments (EIA) shall be included in project proposals which are submitted to Sida for assessment. (p. 1)*

While the major focus in the Guidelines is on *ex ante* EIAs, the policy is also clear with respect to *ex post* EIAs:

*Sida's various evaluation activities shall include the evaluation of environmental impacts. (p. 9)*

This document provided the mandatory policy framework regarding EIAs for this present study.

Between 1995 and 2000, Sida's rules, regulations and policies ran to almost 2,000 pages. It was becoming increasingly clear that there was a need to revise the different policies, not least to consolidate them into one document and to assign responsibilities for their implementation. This work started in the year 2000 and the new regulations and rules were successively introduced. Together they comprise what is named as **Sidas Regelverk** (Sida's Rules and Regulations).

The EIA rules are now (in Sidas Regelverk) only 3 1/2 pages long, as compared to 51 previously. (Reprinted in Appendix 4) They stipulate *ex ante* EIAs.

In the former Guidelines (1991 and 1998) as well as in the new slimmed-down rules, the main focus is on *ex ante* EIA. However, Sidas Regelverk does not contain a Sida policy regarding the environment and the sustainable use of natural resources.

Regarding *ex post* EIAs, the policy is perhaps open to various interpretations. *The follow-up of EIA shall be included in the agreements signed by Sida.*<sup>22</sup> This part is mandatory (the Swedish word "skall").

---

<sup>21</sup> The first version was published in Swedish in 1992. A revised Swedish version was published in 1993 and was subsequently published in English in 1994.

<sup>22</sup> In the Swedish text: *Uppföljning av MKBn skall regleras i avtal*. In agreements with Swedish development co-operation partners a standard clause is inserted regarding the environment. For example, in the agreement on a programme between the Government of Sweden and the Government of Mozambique it is stated that:

**ARTICLE XII ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

*UEM are responsible for the implementation of the agreed recommendations from the environmental impact assessment of the programme. The implementation of agreed recommendations and the environmental impact of the programme will be followed up in the agreed monitoring and evaluation activities of and within the programme.*

This agreement, signed by the Swedish Ambassador and the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, was subsequently translated into an agreement between Sida and the University which includes exactly the same clause on the environment. No specific references are made to implementation procedures. The *Promemoria – Continued Institutional and Research Support for Mozambique* does not include or make reference to an *ex ante* EIA. In fact the word "environment" is not even mentioned in the *Promemoria*.

As far as can be ascertained no *ex ante* EIA was made. In this context the inclusion of a standard phrase on the environment is of doubtful value. And even if an *ex ante* EIA had been made, several accompanying measures would probably have had to be taken to secure the implementation of the agreement.

This example, as well as the empirical results in the previous section, illustrates the fact that a Sida policy may be clear but, failing concerted efforts to implement it, may well become a form of words.

However, the mandatory status of the above can, at first sight, be variously interpreted in the text which comes later in the policy:

*The follow-up and evaluation of the project's real impact on the environment ought to be done jointly with other follow-up activities and evaluation of the project during and after its implementation. (Our translation)*<sup>23</sup>

The Swedish word "bör", translated "ought to", is a strong recommendation, but it is not mandatory. One interpretation could be that *ex post* EIAs are not mandatory. This could perhaps explain the absence of *ex post* EIAs. The other interpretation is that *ex post* EIAs are mandatory and that they should not be done separately from other Sida activities. This is the interpretation favoured by the Miljöpolicyenheten, Environment Policy Unit, at Sida.

The new rules also assign responsibilities. The "owner" of this rule is Miljöpolicyenheten within Avdelningen för naturresurser och miljö (NATUR), Department for Natural Resources and the Environment.

According to **Sidas Regelverk** the owner of a rule has the responsibility to:

*Continuously monitor the implementation of the rule and its relevance for Sida, among other things to secure that the objective of the rule is attained. (Our translation)*<sup>24</sup>

Sidas Regelverk is continuously being revised and is available on Sida's Intranet. Each rule/regulation can be electronically accessed directly from a list constituting Sidas Regelverk. No hardcopies are circulated on a regular basis in Sida. It is the responsibility of Sida employees to access, interpret and apply these regulations. As far as is known there are no courses given on Sidas Regelverk as a whole, though courses are given on some of the different parts such as courses on the environment, gender, HIV/AIDS and poverty alleviation.

In some cases desk officers expressed the view that EIAs are inapplicable to certain activities. This is for example the case with Sida/SAREC's **Svensk Ansökan** (Swedish Application), for funding of Swedish development research. In the documentation to the applicants it is mentioned that an *ex ante* EIA shall be made. However, in the specific instructions on what shall accompany the application no reference is made to any *ex ante* EIA.

Prior to submitting research applications to the different reference groups a screening is made within SAREC, mainly on formal aspects. At this stage no checking is done as to whether an EIA is included in the application. On the one hand, Sida/SAREC might have good reasons for not implementing the EIA policy, which might be considered as too rigid. On the other hand, if such behaviour is generalised throughout Sida, the implemented policy will then ultimately depend on the views of the different desk officers and their superiors. In such a scenario what the actual Sida policy will be remains an open question.

## Evaluation Policy

The Director General of Sida approved the current version of Sida's Evaluation Policy, a short (six-page) document, in October 1999. It was subsequently incorporated into Sidas Regelverk. Ownership rests with the Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit (UTV).

UTV is also responsible for an existing standard outline format for Terms of Reference for Sida's Evaluations (to be revised in connection with the launching of a new evaluation manual for Sida; see next page). There is also a template entitled **Sida Evaluation – A Standardized Format**.

<sup>23</sup> In the Swedish text it is stated that: *Uppföljning och utvärdering av insatsens verkliga miljökonsekvenser bör göras tillsammans med övrig uppföljning och utvärdering av projektet under och efter genomförandet.*

<sup>24</sup> *Löpande följa regelns tillämpning och relevans inom Sida, bl.a. att målet med regeln uppfylls...* Sidas Regelverk, Inledning, punkt 8.



The word environment is only mentioned once in the Evaluation Policy. Under section 5 on **Development Goals and Cross-Cutting Issues** it is stated that:

*Sida's departments are required to regularly review development activities in relation to the action programmes in the following areas:*

- poverty reduction;
- peace, democracy and human rights;
- **environmentally sustainable development** (our bold);
- gender equality.

Further down it is clearly spelt out that:

*If a particular goal is not regarded as relevant to an intervention under review, this should be explicitly stated in the evaluation report.*

In the template ToR, however, this strong wording gets lost among many other issues to be covered in an evaluation and no specific reference is made to the environment.

The **Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessments in International Cooperation** (1998) contain a lot of practical information. **Sida's Evaluation Manual** from 1992/93 fulfilled, for many years, a similarly important role in Sida's evaluations and it was also widely used (and still is). With the creation of the new Sida, UTV decided to prepare a new manual and a study was launched to pave the ground, namely **Managing and Conducting Evaluations. Design study for a Sida evaluation manual** (Sida Studies in Evaluation 99/2). The manual has not yet been finalised. Meanwhile the Evaluation Policy fills an important gap; in its advisory role UTV also refers to evaluation guidance in other published work (including the 1992/93 Sida manual).

The lack of an updated evaluation manual may be one of the factors explaining why the evaluations scrutinised for this study hardly ever included a discussion on evaluation methodology, as required in the **Standardized Format**.

### **Management Response**

The 1996 Study resulted in an internal UTV seminar in May 1997, and subsequently a document was prepared giving the recommendations in one column and the follow-up activities in another, and also stating the unit responsible for initiating the activity, along with a time frame for the follow-up.<sup>25</sup> A follow-up was carried out in December 1998. In the covering letter it was mentioned that this was Sida's first attempt to implement a systematic management response.

In the past the procedures for dealing with the results of evaluations were not clear. In November 1998 the Director General of Sida resolved on procedures (**Handläggningsordning**) for Sida's evaluations. The basic principle was that:

*All evaluations and audits shall result in documented decisions and follow-up that actions have been taken.*<sup>26</sup>

A major role in ensuring the implementation of this decision lies with the Chief Controller. The heads of departments and the controllers within the departments were also assigned key roles.

---

<sup>25</sup> Ref No: UTV-1996-0029 dated 11 September 1997.

<sup>26</sup> Alla utvärderingar och revisioner skal leda till dokumenterat ställningstagande, åtgärder och uppföljning av att åtgärder vidtagits. GD decision 158/98.

For this Study some additional information was also collected on the elaboration of Management Responses. For the 39 evaluations analysed, it was only possible to identify 10 Management Responses. In fact, several desk officers were unaware of the fact that a Management Response had to be made and/or they considered it inapplicable to their type of work. This fact suggests that, in spite of all efforts to secure the implementation of Sida's policy, in many instances, it is simply not adhered to.

This review of Sida's policy with respect to Environmental Impact Assessments clearly shows that **the policy is clear**. The reason for the lack of EIAs must be sought elsewhere.

### **There is a lack of knowledge regarding the environment within Sida**

One hypothesis mentioned as an explanation why EIAs are not carried out is the lack of knowledge.

This was also suggested in a study carried out by Mr. Tomas Bergenholtz at Sida in 2001. He concluded that out of 1,035 Sida-supported activities, only in 45 cases could it be assumed that the co-operating partners had carried out or would carry out an *ex ante* EIA. In 360 cases the Sida desk officer had made an assessment and in 630 cases EIA was not even referred to. It should be noted that many of the 360 cases merely stated that: *It is not expected that the project will have any negative effects on the environment*. As the author points out, why are positive effects not included? To state that there will be no negative environmental effects suggests that environmental issues are mainly perceived by many Sida desk officers as a problem and not as an opportunity to ensure sustainable development and the eradication of poverty.

One of his main recommendations was that there should be short training courses for Sida employees. With respect to environmental issues a large number of courses have been carried out, as can be seen From Table 24, below:

**Table 24 Sida courses on environment**

<b>Sida Stockholm</b>	Number of courses. 1995–2001 (Spring)	Number of participants
The environment and EIA, 2.5 days	13	176
Tailor-made courses, 5 hours (1999)	14	169
Basic training environment	1	8
<b>Swedish Embassies</b>	Number of Embassies	Number of participants
EIA courses, 2 days	10	120
Pilot courses, 2 days	3	37

In addition there have been many contacts between Miljöpolicyenheten and Sida employees. To provide further support, Sida employees have various ways and means of accessing competence. The Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, the National Chemical Inspectorate and Sida have agreements whereby Sida employees can draw on their expertise. In addition, Sida has agreements both with the Environmental Impact Assessment helpdesk at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences in Uppsala and with the Environmental Economics Unit at Gothenburg University on providing support to Sida employees.

The training courses offered by Sida involve not only the environment but also important areas such as gender, human rights, HIV/AIDS and, not least, sustainable livelihoods. To what extent the volume of courses on the environment is higher as compared to other subject matters and policy issues was not investigated.

It may be that several employees within Sida do not have adequate knowledge of environmental issues. However, a clear majority (perhaps 75 per cent) of Sida's staff have undergone some form of environmental training, and the combined resource base made available (as explained above) is impressive, not forgetting the mass of documented information. Lack of knowledge as a major problem seems a difficult hypothesis to sustain.

One area which might warrant more attention is training. While the different courses on the environment apparently have been much appreciated by the participants, they may not be sufficiently relevant to the needs of Sida employees. And even more important, what courses are needed for Sida senior staff, for example heads of departments and divisions, in order to ensure that they have the knowledge to adequately implement Sida's policy, not least with respect to the environment?

Are the courses relevant in an overall Sida policy context? For example, an expert on environmental issues must also be sensitive to other policy issues, such as eradication of poverty and gender equality. Do the trainers/teachers have the necessary pedagogic skills?

These questions might warrant further reflections by Sida.

### **Sida staff are overworked and cannot digest all the information**

Practically all Sida employees contacted (primarily programme staff) expressed concern over the very large amount of information that has to be filtered and digested, and the pressure this exerts on the work situation. The problem of workload<sup>27</sup> (whether real or merely perceived) is of course an important one and should be dealt with in different ways.

In the case of the environment Sida has published a series of documents. More than thirty Sida publications have been produced in recent years dealing with the environment, topics covering a large spectrum of development issues. In addition, most of the publications also include references to other studies. Sida also regularly publishes (or supports uploading of) various materials such as updates and newsletters, including **Environment, Development and Conflict (EDC) News**, **Sustainable Development Update (SDU)** and more recently **Nytt om befolkning och miljö** (News on Population and Environment).

As was noted in the previous section, knowledge and information seem to be more than adequate. In addition, a large amount of information is directly available to Sida employees. The problem does not seem to be lack of information or expertise.

The environment is but one important area of work for Sida. Sida employees are continuously receiving copious information on gender, human rights, HIV/AIDS, sustainable livelihoods and other important issues. One of the most difficult tasks of a Sida employee is to filter and digest the information circulated and at the same time be operationally productive (get things done). Sida shares this type of problem with most organisations.

Some items of information are more important than others. Their importance can be viewed from the perspective of the individual employee. People interested in, say, primary education will most likely not be very much concerned with environmental impact assessments. At the same time, Sida has an EIA policy (plus many other policies) and has to make sure that it is implemented. Consequently, Sida also has an interest in influencing the employee's filtering process, i.e. the individual's capacity for and means of filtering rules and regulations. How this can be accomplished might warrant another study.

---

<sup>27</sup> A survey within Sida showed that the employees consider that they have a heavy workload. See PM from the Director General's Office dated 3 June 2002, Planering 2003–2005.

Another important aspect is the packaging of information. At present many Sida employees feel inundated by the volume of incoming information. The work done to streamline Sida's different policies by developing Sidas Regelverk is one important step in the right direction.

When interviewing or dealing with Sida employees, the overall impression of a staff faced with an enormous workload is unmistakable. The different channels for dealing with this issue, some indicated above, all belong to the realm of management consultants. Nevertheless, a few comments will be made here so as to highlight some key issues involved.

People and organisations often get trapped into focusing too much time on non-priority activities. The following figure demonstrates a useful approach:

**Figure 1 Urgency and importance**<sup>28</sup>

		Importance	
		Low	High
Urgent	Low	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>
	High	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>

Urgent and important matters are usually attended to, box **D** (Crises, pressing problems, deadline-driven projects, meetings and preparations). However, the problem often lies in the fact that people get trapped into urgent and non-important activities represented by box **C** (Interruptions, some phone calls, some mail, some reports, some meetings, many proximate and pressing matters and many popular activities). Everybody would agree that indulging in activities of low importance and low urgency is mostly a waste of time, box **A**.

In the course of time non-urgent and highly important activities fail to get carried out, box **B**. This leads to a highly sub-optimal use of human resources. –*This is the Quadrant of Quality. Here's where we do our long range planning, anticipate and prevent problems, empower others, broaden our minds and increase our skills through reading and continuous professional development ...* (Covey, 1994, p. 37)

According to Covey, investing time in quadrant **B** increases our abilities and also reduces quadrant **C**, since planning, preparation and prevention keep many things from becoming urgent.

Research suggests that when senior management committed itself and its organisation to improve corporate work methods, dramatic increases in productivity were obtained. Moreover, work satisfaction also increased significantly.

For many people the sustainable use of natural resources often comes in category **B**. It is important but not very urgent. But it will be a pity if environmental issues have to move into category **D** before effective action is taken.

Human capital has become much more important in development than it used to be. This process continues. Sida has paid a lot of attention to advancing the knowledge frontier of its employees. It also provides incentives for physical fitness training. Perhaps the time has come to provide its employees, not

<sup>28</sup> This model has been taken from Steven Covey's book *First Things First*, Simon & Schuster, 1994, p. 37. See also his *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*, 1989. Creative people will enjoy reading *Organizing for the Creative Person* by Lehmkuhl, Dorothy and Lamping, Dolores Cotter, Three Rivers Press, New York, 1993.

least at management level, with better tools for better realising their potential. This of course would also increase their productivity.

### **Lack of incentives to ensure that Sida policies are implemented**

Sweden has seen a rapid expansion of resources allocated to international development co-operation. The different departments of Sida receive more funding every year. As one Sida employee stated: *The increase in appropriations is perhaps not so much based on results, i.e. successful implementation of policies and attainment of the overall development objectives, as on assessments of needs and political commitment of the Swedish government.*

Along with the successive increase in allocations (to countries and programmes) there has been a constraint in expanding the staffing and other administration costs of Sida. This makes it difficult to manage an ever-increasing budget and also demands new management methods and tools.

The six Swedish development co-operation objectives cover a wide spectrum of human activities, which means that practically any activity can be justified in relation to one or other Swedish development objective. One project may focus on the environment and another on gender balance, but both objectives may be relevant for both projects. Consequently, it can be argued that there is no incentive scheme, which ensures that Sida policies are implemented in an integrated and coherent way.

What specific rewards would a Head of Department, a Head of Division or a Desk Officer receive if s/he were to ensure actual implementation of the set of complex Sida policies, as compared to generating new projects on which to spend allocated funds?

The funding for international development co-operation is voted by the Swedish Parliament. The history of Swedish development co-operation suggests that failure to spend allocated aid money is seen as a problem and will incur severe criticism, from the government funding bodies as well as from within Sida. Pressures are high on Sida programme staff to see to it that allocated funds are made use of and disbursed within the budget period.

## 6 Conclusions and Recommendations

### Introduction

In this study, which is a follow-up and a continuation of the 1996 Study, an assessment has been made of how and to what extent the environment has been considered in recent Sida evaluations. Many of the results and conclusions suggest that the shortcomings and problems are not only relevant for the environment in Sida's evaluations. The Sida study from 1998, **Evaluating Gender Equality – Policy and Practice**, points in the same direction.

It is recommended that:

- The major conclusions and recommendations of this Study be made available to Sida senior management, to the Controllers and to the Internal Auditors.

The following section, accordingly, is not limited to environmental issues. It also attempts to put the environmental issues in a broader Sida context.

### Implementation of Sida's policy in general

#### Conclusions

The point of departure of this study was to revisit our Study from 1996 (covering all 66 evaluations published in 1994 and 1995). The result of the current analysis, of 40 randomly selected evaluations (half the number of evaluations published in 2000 and 2001), shows that there has not been any improvement since 1996. Ex ante and ex post EIAs were hardly done at all in 1994 and 1995 and the result is similar for the evaluations in 2000 and 2001.

The lack of EIAs is contrary to Sida's policy. From this Study, mainly based on Sida's evaluations in 2000 and 2001, the following conclusions emerge regarding Sida's mandatory policies:

- Management responses are often not being carried out;
- The evaluations rarely include a discussion as to why a development goal is not included/addressed in the evaluation;
- Monitoring systems are often lacking, making it difficult, if not impossible, to evaluate the effectiveness of a project;
- Financial data are often lacking, making the efficiency of the project impossible to evaluate; and
- *An important part of the evaluations do not discuss sustainability as required in Sida's Evaluation Policy.*

Taken together, these deficiencies largely explain why the environment is not adequately dealt with in Sida's evaluations. The general issue of Sida's evaluation policy and its implementation comes outside the scope of the Terms of Reference for this assignment. Having said this, it should be clear that unless steps are taken to address the above deficiencies or shortcomings, little can be accomplished with regard to environment considerations in Sida's evaluations.

In this vein, Sida's Controllers and the Internal Auditors might consider reviewing the question of the apparent inadequate implementation of Sida's evaluation policy in general. In order to do so, actions need to be taken which lie outside the responsibility of UTV.

## Sida's EIA policy

### Conclusions

From the evaluations carried out in 1994 and 1995 it could only be ascertained that *ex ante* EIAs had been undertaken in 5 per cent of the projects. The results of the analysis of Sida's evaluations in 2000 and 2001 are practically identical.

From the original project documents it could be established that 18 per cent of the projects had carried out an *ex ante* EIA. The findings by Mr. Bergenholtz from 2001 yield a higher figure, 40 per cent, but he accepted that an EIA had been made merely on the basis of a simple statement that the project would not have any negative environmental consequences. In our case we required additionally, in line with the EIA requirements, at least a line of explanation as to **why** the project was considered not to have any environmental impacts.

For the years 1994 and 1995 about 22 per cent of the evaluations carried out an *ex post* EIA, and for the years 2000 and 2001 this figure had dropped to 18 per cent, but considering the random sampling technique the difference might not be significant.

In the 1996 report it was recommended that something along the following lines should be included in the ToR for evaluations:

*The evaluator(s) shall make an analysis/assessment of the project's (programme's) effects with regard to the Swedish development co-operation objective 'the sustainable use of natural resources and the protection of the environment'. (p.31)*

In September 1997 UTV agreed that such a standard phrase should be included. However, in the **Status Follow-Up Activities** dated December 1998 UTV declares that:

*UTV has changed opinion. Other UTV studies have shown that standard phrases may lead to a 'ritualistic treatment' in the ToR of the issues in question. This does not improve the quality of the analysis in the evaluation report. UTV will revise the evaluation policy in 1999 and in the new policy be more explicit on cross-cutting issues in evaluations.*

The 1999 **Evaluation Policy** is explicit in this respect, but the ToR template still only makes reference to *cross-cutting issues* among many other issues to be covered in the evaluation.

As a result, the environment and other cross-cutting issues are not systematically dealt with in the evaluations. The fact that only 8 per cent of the evaluations point out that an *ex ante* EIA is missing indicates that the evaluators are unaware that they are supposed to follow up on the *ex ante* EIA. The fact that Sida does not know to what extent *ex ante* EIAs have been made should give cause for concern.

Another problem may be that Sida (as yet) does not have an updated evaluation manual.

During the course of work the consultant attempted to identify who is ultimately responsible for the inclusion of EIAs. Many people had different answers and opinions that in the end were not consistent. This is probably not unique to cross-cutting issues such as the environment.

### Recommendations

On the basis of the major conclusions it is recommended that:

- UTV make specific reference to the various cross-cutting issues, and that it be mandatory to carry out an *ex post* EIA. The mandatory nature should be reflected in wording contained both in the Evaluation Policy and in the templates available to Sida employees;

- UTV prioritise early preparation of an updated Evaluation Manual including instructions on how to deal adequately with cross-cutting issues;
- UTV consider preparing a checklist for evaluators. This should include checking whether an *ex ante* EIA was actually made and that an *ex post* EIA – at least a few lines – has to be made;
- NATUR revise the regulation in **Sidas Regelverk** on EIA so that an *ex post* EIA is made clearly *mandatory during evaluations*; and
- NATUR commission a study to review to what extent *ex ante* EIAs have been carried out.

There is a need to clearly define responsibilities for implementing Sida's policy. How this should be done lies outside the scope of the ToR.

## Workload of Sida employees

### Conclusions

Sida employees feel, as already mentioned above, that they have an excessively heavy workload. To what extent this holds true has not been explored in this Study. It was even mentioned that they are “bombarded” with policy-related information, not least regarding the environment and related topics.

Considering the low performance in the implementation of EIAs, as shown both in this Study and in the 1996 Study, it might be worthwhile reconsidering the design of the courses dealing with the environment.

The way in which the important information is packaged is also important. Although **Sidas Regelverk** is an important step forward, much remains to be done to make it more accessible and better known to Sida employees.

Because of their strategic role, much would be gained if Sida managers were assisted in implementing Sida's policies. How this should be done lies outside the ToR of this Study.

Sida has successfully striven to advance the knowledge frontier and the physical well-being of its employees. In any organisation, the employees' time is scarce. It does not appear as if Sida has cultivated a culture where Sida employees have learnt how to optimise their scarce time (apart from offering a course in Personal Planning). There are plenty of management courses available in this field. Moreover, the psychological well-being of an employee and his/her skills in relating to colleagues will have repercussions in the way s/he handles the tasks at hand. Providing simple psychological techniques can significantly improve the employees' productivity.

### Recommendations

On the basis of the conclusions above it is recommended that:

- Sida consider revising its courses with a view to including new courses and training to enhance the productivity of its staff;
- With respect to **Sidas Regelverk** and EIAs, professional editing be done with a view to further clarifying what is mandatory;
- Sida commission a study to assess the impact of its courses on environmental issues;
- Sida commission a study to investigate to what extent **Sidas Regelverk** is known to and applied by Sida staff; and
- Sida consider providing regular mandatory training courses on its **Regelverk** as a whole, and not only on various aspects of it.



The discussion on improving the use of the human potential within Sida and the need for training Sida management have been presented to stimulate further discussion and analysis within Sida. No specific recommendations are provided since they would be beyond the scope of this study.

### **Lack of incentives to ensure that Sida policies are implemented**

#### **Conclusions**

There is no effective incentive system for implementing Sida's development co-operation objectives in an integrated (holistic) way. The lack of EIAs is but one manifestation of this.

How to address this issue is beyond the ToR for this Study.

# Appendix 1

## Terms of Reference

### Background

In 1996 Sida-UTV commissioned a study on to what extent and how Sida addressed environmental concerns and impact in its evaluations (*The Environment and Sida's Evaluations*, Sida Studies in Evaluation 96/4). This study covered all evaluations carried out during the two years 1994 and 1995 (66 reports). The study, the first part of which consisted of developing an appropriate methodology for the whole analysis, showed dismal results with regard to assessments of environmental performance.

Using a scoring system, the analysis indicated that the environment was given limited attention both in the evaluations' Terms of Reference (ToR) and in the evaluations themselves. By contrast, the evaluated projects' presumed impact on the environment, as judged by the evaluators, was significantly higher. Only three of the 66 evaluated projects had carried out an EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment) prior to project implementation, mandatory in Sida since 1991. Nearly 60 per cent of the evaluations assessed or discussed long-term project impact, but only 13 per cent included the environment in the discussion. Hardly any indicators measuring environmental impact were found, and the lack of monitoring systems were striking according to the evaluators. Half of the evaluations discussed sustainability but only 3 of them included environmental sustainability in this discussion.

It could be argued, the evaluators concluded, that evaluations of Swedish development cooperation generally ignored environmental effects. The report provided a series of recommendations with a view to improve evaluations of projects that are deemed to have environmental effects. Recommendations included measures to improve on formulating ToR, on the EIA system, on environmental monitoring and on seeing to the need and quality of baseline studies.

The results of the 1996 study were disappointing considering the initiatives taken since 1988. The long-term sustainable use of natural resources and the protection of the environment was adopted, in 1988, as the then fifth objective (now six) for Swedish development cooperation. In pursuance of this objective, a number of activities were initiated in the group of Swedish development cooperation agencies at the time. In 1991, Sida introduced "Guidelines for environmental impact assessments in aid" (EIA) and a rule was adopted that an EIA must be conducted for all projects prior to implementation. Information and training related to environmental aspects was initiated at this time. Sida's evaluation manual (publ. 1993) stated that all evaluations must include an ex-post EIA, i.e. an investigation of any environmental impact that the project might have caused or is likely to cause.

Since the agency merger into 'new Sida' in 1995, a growing number of activities have taken place aimed at improving environmental awareness and consideration in Sida funded activities. Revised EIA guidelines were introduced in 1998. In preparing for these guidelines consultations were held during the second half of 1997 with most of Sida's operative departments and units. In 1999, training courses were held with most of these units in order to introduce the new guidelines. Similar courses were held at 13 embassies during 1999 and 2000. Parallel to this, 14 general environmental training courses (2.5 days) for Sida staff have been run since 1995 and up to now. Finally, at the beginning of 2000, guidelines were introduced for Strategic Environmental Analysis, as an instrument for environmental considerations at macro economic level.

Sida-UTV has decided to renew the above 1996 study – using the same methodology, questionnaires and type of assessments – to find out to what extent and how environmental considerations and assessments in Sida evaluations have improved over the years since 1996, and the factors affecting any identified changes; and, in case of limited improvement, the reasons for this.

### **Purpose and use of study**

The objectives of the study are

- to review and assess the extent and manner in which Sida evaluations in recent years have treated environmental issues and assessed the environmental impact of development cooperation projects and programmes (same objective as with the 1996 study), and
- to make a comparative, systematic and problem-oriented analysis of the differences in the findings and results of the 1996 study and now; and
- to provide a basis for further discussion and analysis of how to improve the use of environmental assessments in evaluations of different types of development assistance.

The study has a strong learning purpose and is to be used not only for environmental assessments in evaluations, as indicated in the above objective, but also for discussions and decisions in Sida (environment policy unit, the subject networks, programme officers, Sida management, etc) on how to further enhance environmental awareness and performance in Sida funded projects/programmes and evaluations. The study should therefore be structured to comply with this purpose and intended use.

### **Coverage and scope**

The study shall cover evaluations carried out by Sida during the two years 2000 and 2001, i.e. evaluations included and registered in the series *Sida Evaluations*. In all, 81 evaluation reports were registered, 42 in 2000 and 39 in 2001. The study shall be based on a sample of approximately fifty per cent (50%) of all reports. The method used by the Consultant for selecting the approximately forty reports (40) must be approved, for significance, by UTV prior to the actual implementation of the study.

The report shall include the following seven elements:

- (i) An extensive and lucid summary of the results of the 1996 study, in addition to a note on its scope, methodology and recommendations.
- (ii) An identification and analysis of Sida activities, guidelines and other factors (external as well as internal) that have, or should have, affected environmental considerations in Sida funded projects and programmes as well as evaluations.
- (iii) A review and assessment of the extent and manner in which Sida evaluations in the last two years have addressed environmental issues (see objective above).
- (iv) A comparative analysis of the differences in findings between the 1996 study and those found under (iii), including a discussion on factors most likely to have influenced these differences or changes.
- (v) An analytical discussion on problems, constraints or shortcomings in Sida – whether in policies/guidance, commitment, techniques or organization – in promoting adequate environmental considerations in its work.

The less improvement in such considerations that are found to have taken place, the more effort should be given to the analysis under this item.

(vi) A brief discussion on lessons learned, e.g in terms of Sida's inherent ability (capacity) and incentives to live up to policies and rules.

(vii) Conclusions and recommendations; where relevant, recommendations should be targeted to various levels in Sida's organization.

### **Methodology**

As stated above, the sampling method used for selecting the reports to be scrutinized should be approved by UTV.

In all other respects, the Consultant should apply the same methodology as used in the 1996 study (i.e. variables and scoring system used in assessing the evaluation population; method of analysis incl questionnaire; etc). Reference is made to the 1996 study, specifically to its section on Methodology (Section 3, pages 5–7, as attached to these ToR).

In the event the Consultant finds reason to divert from this methodology, or make any additions (such as to the questionnaire), UTV should be consulted prior to the actual implementation of the study (see under Reporting below).

### **Reporting and Timing**

Within approximately a week from initiating the study (signing the contract), the consultant should very briefly present UTV with the methodology to be used (sampling and any adaption or updating he may suggest; as indicated under Methodology above). This brief presentation should be done in writing (e-mail). Following UTV's (written) approval, the study should be effected immediately.

The consultant should present his main findings, in writing, as early as possible but no later than *24 May 2002*. Written comments from concerned parties in Sida (UTV; Environmental Policy Unit; others) will be delivered to the Consultant in good time before a subsequent, half-day joint discussion seminar takes place (for Consultant and concerned/interested parties). The seminar, which will discuss the main findings, submitted comments etc, will be organized by UTV and is planned to take place no later than *12 June*.

A full Draft Report (incl an Executive Summary), incorporating the comments made by Sida in June, is to be submitted by the Consultant to Sida-UTV by latest *10 September 2002*.

To facilitate comparison, the report should as closely as possible follow the format used in the 1996 report.

With comments to this Draft Report delivered by Sida to the Consultant within a couple of weeks from receiving it, the Consultant is expected to deliver a Final Report by latest *10 October 2002*.

### **Evaluation team and qualifications**

The team should consist of at least two persons. The team leader should have evaluation experience in team leading positions, as well as experience from environmental impact assessments. Both should be familiar with formal evaluation techniques. Professional training in environmental economics should be represented on the team.

## Appendix 2

### Summary assessment of the evaluation

No.	ToR in report	Importance of Env in ToR	Importance of gender in ToR	Presumed env. impact	Importance of env in Evaluation	Importance of gender in Evaluation	Environmental Competence required in ToR	Gender Competence required in ToR	Year of Evaluation	Department	Region	Imp. ToR/ Presumed impact	Imp. eval/ Presumed impact
	Y=1, N=0	ToR 1-4	1-4	1-4	1-4	1-4	Y=1, N=0	Y=1, N=0					
1	1	2	2	3	2	2	0	0	2001	SIDA- ST	EE	0.67	
2	1	1	2	2	2	3	0	0	2001	SIDA- ST	EE	0.50	1.0
3	1	1	1	2	2	3	0	1	2001	DESO	AS	0.50	1.0
4	1	2	1	4	2	4	1	0	2001	NATUR	AF	0.50	0.5
5	1	1	4	1	1	4	0	0	2001	DESO	LA	1.00	1.0
7	1	1	1	2	2	3	0	0	2001	SIDA- ST	EE	0.50	1.0
6	1	1	1	3	4	4	0	0	2001	UTV	O	0.33	1.3
8	1	1	1	2	2	3	0	0	2001	SAREC	AF	0.50	1.0
9	1	1	3	1	1	3	0	0	2001	DESO	AS	1.00	1.0
10	1	2	1	4	4	1	0	0	2000	SEKA	LA	0.50	1.0
11	0	n.a.	n.a.	4	1	1	n.a.	n.a.	2000	NATUR	LA		0.3
12	1	4	2	4	4	4	1	1	2001	NATUR	AS	1.00	1.0
13	1	1	1	1	1	3	0	0	2000	RELA	LA	1.00	1.0
14	1	1	4	1	1	4	0	1	2000	RELA	LA	1.00	1.0
15	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	2000	DESO	O	1.00	1.0
16	1	1	2	1	1	3	0	0	2000	DESO	AF	1.00	1.0
17	1	1	1	4	4	4	0	0	2000	UTV-AFRA	AF	0.25	1.0
18	1	1	3	3	2	2	0	1	2000	DESO	AS	0.33	0.7
19	1	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	2000	DESO	AF	1.00	1.0
21	1	2	2	2	2	3	0	0	2000	SEKA	AS	1.00	1.0
20	0	3	4	4	4	4	0	1	2000	NATUR-INEC	AS	0.75	1.0
22	1	1	1	4	3	3	0	0	2000	NATUR	AF	0.25	0.8
23	1	1	1	2	1	4	0	0	2000	NATUR	AS	0.50	0.5
24	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	2000	SIDA- ST	EE	1.00	1.0
25	1	1	4	1	1	4	0	1	2000	AS/EN	AS	1.00	1.0
26	1	4	4	4	2	4	0	1	2000	NATUR	AF	1.00	0.5
27	1	3	2	2	2	3	0	0	2000	SAREC	AF	1.50	1.0
28	1	1	1	1	1	3	0	1	2000	AS/EN	AS	1.00	1.0
29	1	2	2	4	4	3	1	0	2000	NATUR	AF	0.50	1.0
30	1	1	2	2	1	3	0	0	2000	AFRA	AF	0.50	0.5
31	1	1	2	3	2	3	1	1	2000	NATUR	AF	0.33	0.7
32	1	1	2	1	1	3	0	0	2001	SIDA- ST	EE	1.00	1.0
33	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	2001	DESO	O	0.50	0.5
34	1	1	1	3	2	1	0	0	2001	DESO	EE	0.33	0.7
35	1	2	1	3	2	1	0	0	2001	SIDA- ST	EE	0.67	0.7
36	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	2001	SAREC	O	0.50	0.5
37	1	2	3	4	4	4	0	1	2001	NATUR	AF	0.50	1.0
38	1	1	2	2	2	2	0	0	2001	SIDA- ST	EE	0.50	1.0
39	1	1	1	4	3	2	0	0	2001	NATUR	AS	0.25	0.8
40	1	2	1	3	3	1	0	0	2001	NATUR	LA	0.67	1.0
Average												0.69	0.87

Questions Posed Regarding Sida's Evaluation

No.	1a	1b	1c	2a	2b	3	4a	4b	5a	5b	6a	6b	6c	7a	7b	7c	8a		8b	9a	9b
	EIA made before project start	EIA made during evaluation	EIA missing pointed out	Environment in project objectives	Environment assessed in evaluation	Env. side-effects considered	Long term impacts assessed	Long term environmental impacts assessed	Sustainability discussed	Environmental sustainability discussed	Financial analysis included	Economic analysis included	Environmental costs and benefits included	Monitoring system set up	If not, recommended	Environmental indicators discussed	Environment	Gender	Evaluators competence in	References made to evaluation methods	Methodology discussion on environment
1	n.a.	no	n.a.	yes	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	no	no	n.a.	no	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
2	n.a.	partly	n.a.	no	n.a.	partly	no	no	no	no	no	no	n.a.	no	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
3	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	no	no	n.a.	no	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
4	n.a.	no	n.a.	yes	partly	partly	no	no	no	no	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
5	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	no	no	no	no	yes	no	no	no	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
6	n.a.	yes	n.a.	no	n.a.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
7	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	n.a.	yes	n.a.	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
8	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	partly	partly	no	yes	no	no	no	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
9	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	partly	no	no	no	no	no	n.a.	no	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
10	n.a.	partly	n.a.	yes	yes	yes	partly	partly	partly	partly	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	n.a.	no	no	
11	n.a.	no	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	no	yes	no	yes	no	partly	no	n.a.	yes	n.a.	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
12	n.a.	yes	n.a.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	partly	partly	partly	no	n.a.	partly	n.a.	yes	yes	yes	no	no	
13	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
14	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	no	n.a.	yes	no	no	
15	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	partly	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	partly	no	
16	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	no	n.a.	yes	no	no	no	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
17	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	yes	no	partly	partly	no	partly	no	no	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
18	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	yes	no	no	partly	no	yes	no	n.a.	yes	n.a.	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
19	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	partly	no	yes	no	yes	partly	no	yes	n.a.	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
20	n.a.	no	n.a.	partly	partly	no	partly	no	yes	no	yes	no	n.a.	partly	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
21	n.a.	no	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	no	yes	no	partly	no	n.a.	partly	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	yes	no	
22	yes	no	n.a.	yes	partly	partly	yes	partly	partly	partly	no	no	n.a.	partly	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
23	n.a.	no	n.a.	partly	no	no	partly	no	partly	no	no	no	n.a.	no	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
24	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	partly	no	no	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
25	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	yes	no	yes	no	partly	no	no	n.a.	yes	no	n.a.	yes	no	no	
26	n.a.	no	n.a.	yes	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	
27	partly	no	yes	yes	partly	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	yes	no	
28	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
29	n.a.	yes	n.a.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	partly	partly	yes	yes	n.a.	partly	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
30	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	no	no	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
31	no	no	yes	yes	partly	yes	yes	no	yes	no	partly	no	no	n.a.	partly	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
32	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	yes	no	partly	no	yes	no	no	yes	n.a.	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
33	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	partly	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	no	partly	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	yes	no	
34	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	yes	yes	no	no	no	yes	no	no	n.a.	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
35	no	no	n.a.	yes	yes	partly	partly	partly	partly	partly	yes	no	no	no	partly	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
36	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	partly	no	yes	no	yes	no	no	n.a.	partly	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
37	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	partly	partly	partly	partly	yes	yes	n.a.	n.a.	yes	yes	
38	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	n.a.	no	partly	no	yes	no	no	no	n.a.	no	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
39	n.a.	no	n.a.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	partly	partly	no	no	no	yes	no	n.a.	n.a.	partly	no	
40	n.a.	partly	n.a.	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	no	partly	no	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	n.a.	n.a.	no	no	
yes	1	4	3	13	8	9	19	5	23	3	15	1	1	6	20	2	1	4	4	1	
partly	1	3	0	2	5	7	10	4	7	6	9	4	1	6	3	1	0	0	2	0	
no	3	33	0	23	5	24	11	30	10	31	16	35	16	14	0	37	3	0	34	39	
n.a.	35	0	37	2	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	22	14	17	0	36	36	0	0	
Total	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	
yes	2,5%	10,0%	7,5%	32,5%	20,0%	22,5%	47,5%	12,5%	57,5%	7,5%	37,5%	2,5%	2,5%	15,0%	50,0%	5,0%	2,5%	10,0%	10,0%	2,5%	
partly	2,5%	7,5%	0,0%	5,0%	12,5%	17,5%	25,0%	10,0%	17,5%	15,0%	22,5%	10,0%	2,5%	15,0%	7,5%	2,5%	0,0%	0,0%	5,0%	0,0%	
no	7,5%	82,5%	0,0%	57,5%	12,5%	60,0%	27,5%	75,0%	25,0%	77,5%	40,0%	87,5%	40,0%	35,0%	0,0%	92,5%	7,5%	0,0%	85,0%	97,5%	
n.a.	87,5%	0,0%	92,5%	5,0%	55,0%	0,0%	0,0%	2,5%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	55,0%	35,0%	42,5%	0,0%	90,0%	90,0%	0,0%	0,0%	

## Appendix 4

### Sida's regulations

#### Environmental impact assessment in development co-operation

##### Purpose

- to improve the conditions for Swedish international development co-operation to contribute to sustainable development.
- to point out, in a systematic manner, the positive and negative environmental impacts of a proposed contribution.

##### Motive

The fifth objective of Swedish international development co-operation stipulates that Swedish development co-operation shall contribute to the sustainable use of natural resources and the protection of the environment. Under Sida's policy in its action programme for sustainable development, environmental considerations must be an integral part of all development co-operation. Some reasons for this are that:

- Environmental issues are decisive for sustainable production, food safety and economic development.
- Combating poverty is impossible in the long-term if no account is taken of the natural resources and environment on which people depend for their livelihood.
- Peoples' health depends on the state of the environment and the existence of natural resources.
- Democratic systems are threatened when destruction of the environment and lack of resources encroach upon the possibilities of people to make a livelihood.

##### Scope of the rule

Sida's programme officers must ensure that an EIA is carried out on all contributions in Sida's development co-operation. It is the responsibility of the partner in co-operation to carry out the EIA. Sida's role is that of inspection and support. In exceptional cases of contributions that are considered to have very little environmental impact, Sida's programme officers may be responsible for an EIA in the form of a brief appraisal in the assessment memoranda or other documents used in the decision-making process.

##### Measures

###### *The EIA process at Sida*

1. Whenever Sida is approached to provide information on conditions for Swedish development co-operation, the programme officer responsible for the assessment of contributions shall inform them that an EIA must be carried out for all contributions that are part of Sida's development co-operation. The programme officer must clearly inform the partner in co-operation of the requirements for the performance and content of the Environmental Impact Assessment as shown below.

## Sida's requirements for performance and content of an EIA

An EIA shall be carried out during the planning stage of a contribution and constitute one of the bases of Sida's decision on support. An EIA shall be made sufficiently early for its conclusions to influence both the design of contributions and Sida's decision on support.

The EIA must contain a systematic survey and assessment of the probable favourable and unfavourable environmental consequences and must give a clear picture of their magnitude, scope and significance.

The appearance, content and scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment must be adapted to the needs of the contribution in question. For contributions that are expected to have little environmental impact, the EIA can be very brief (just a few lines), while contributions that may have a significant environmental impact require a more comprehensive and detailed EIA.

The partner country's environmental legislation, EIA rules and environmental standards form a starting point for the EIA. Sida may, however, set environmental standards that are stricter than those of the partner country if this is considered necessary for sustainable development and hence for Sida's decision on support. An EIA must also be made for projects that do not require one under the legislation of the partner country.

An EIA shall pay regard<sup>1</sup> to direct or indirect influences on:

- humans, flora and fauna;
- land, water, air, climate and landscape;
- material assets and cultural heritage;
- the interaction between the above factors.

The EIA report shall include the manner in which men and women, different age groups and social and ethnic groups are affected by the environmental impact.

The EIA shall contain proposals for measures to prevent or minimise damage and proposals for optimising the contribution's impact on sustainable development within the context of the project's objectives. Where appropriate, alternatives to the contribution should be proposed in the EIA, e.g. alternative solutions to the problem, alternative project designs or alternative locations.

The EIA should contain a description of the current state (baseline) and should provide indicators that make it possible to monitor the impact of the project on environmentally sustainable development.

The EIA report shall include details of whether affected interest groups have received sufficient information and had the opportunity to take part in and influence the process, and whether separate views have been presented, documented and taken into account.

The conclusions of the EIA shall be included in relevant parts of the project proposal's LFA Analysis or other planning documents of the project proposal in so far as these exist.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sida's views in this respect are tied to the EU directive on EIA (Council directive on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment 85/337/EEG of 1987 with amendments and additions 11/97/EG of 1998).



2. In the *initial assessment* of an application, the Sida programme officer shall establish whether an EIA has been carried out and reported in the programme/project specification.
3. If a programme/project specification does not contain an EIA, the Sida programme officer shall call attention to this and state briefly the necessary scope and direction of the EIA for Sida to consider support.
4. The EIA shall be checked by Sida. If further details are required, Sida's programme officer shall state this.
5. If, as early as in the initial assessment, it appears that the proposal has an unacceptable environmental impact, the application for support shall be turned down. Here the precautionary principle should apply i.e. Sida should not support activities that might cause serious damage to the environment even if there is no scientific proof.
6. In the in-depth assessment, Sida shall review the EIA in detail. If it requires additions, Sida shall state so. Sida may decide to have an external review made of an EIA if this is considered to be necessary in its assessment of the project.
7. In those cases where Sida, after review, observes that an EIA requires additions, it shall not make a decision on its contribution until the additional work has been carried out.
8. The conclusions of Sida's review and the standpoint adopted by Sida on an EIA shall always be summarised in the assessment memoranda or other documents on which Sida's decision on support is based.
9. Follow-up of the EIA shall be regulated in agreements. Monitoring and evaluation of the actual environmental impact of the contribution and of planned measures actually being undertaken in accordance with the EIA should be done together with other monitoring and evaluation of the project during and after its implementation.
10. Ongoing contributions that have not previously undergone an EIA shall undergo one at the first suitable opportunity, e.g. at the beginning of an assessment of possible extension of Sida's support.

#### *Special forms of aid*

When development co-operation is financed jointly with other donors, the EIA guidelines of the lead agency should be followed. One Sida requirement is, however, that the lead agency approves an EIA of the contribution and reports the results of its investigation before Sida decides on financing. The follow-up of the EIA shall be regulated in the agreement. Sida reserves the right to assess the EIA if this appears justified. The results of such review shall then constitute part of the basis of Sida's decision on joint financing.

The requirement for an EIA also applies to contributions via multilateral institutions and via independent Swedish, foreign and international non-governmental organisations and shall be regulated in agreements with these partners in co-operation. Where necessary Sida shall carry on a dialogue on which EIA requirements should be applied.

#### *Other environmental analyses*

Before sector programme support is implemented, a strategic environmental assessment should be carried out by the partner in co-operation. This environmental assessment shall contain a description and analysis of environmental impacts, environmental work and sustainable solutions in the sector, including legislation and other environmental regulations. Sida should similarly take into account

strategic environmental assessments that the country is carrying out in relation to contributions in different sectors and in regions.

When country strategies are being prepared, Sida shall make an environmental analysis. But this should, as far as possible, be carried out on the basis of the country's own documents and other available material. An environmental analysis at this level must take in those environmentally related issues that are central to the country's development from the sustainability point of view. The environmental analysis aims to enhance the economic and social analyses, including that of poverty, and should be clearly tied to Swedish co-operation with the country in question.

### **Adjoining Areas**

Sida's views on and treatment of issues involving EIA are also taken up in the following documents:

- Sida at Work
- Environmental Care – Sida's programme for sustainable development
- Sida's Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) in International Development Cooperation
- Guidelines for the Application of LFA in Project Cycle Management
- The Country Strategies – Guidelines for Strategic Environmental Analysis

Regulation owner: Environment Policy Division (Department for Natural Resources and the Environment)

GD-decision: GD 54/01

## Appendix 5

### Documents consulted

- Alberts, Tom and Andersson, Jessica. **The Environment in Sida's Evaluations.** Sida Studies in Evaluation 96/4.
- Bergenholtz, Tomas. **Uppföljning av användandet av Miljökonsekvensbedömning (MKB) i Sidas insatser och av dess samarbetspartner. Promemoria.** Sida, Stockholm, 19 February 2001.
- Covey, Stephen R. **The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People. Restoring the Character Ethic.** Simon & Schuster, 1989.
- Covey, Stephen R., Merrill Roger A. and Merrill, Rebecca R. **First Things First. To Live, to Love, to Leave a Legacy.** Simon & Schuster, 1994.
- Ekman, Bengt. **Sidas ställningstagande och åtgärder avseende utvärderingar och revisionsrapporter – Förslag till ordning. Promemoria.** Sida, Stockholm, 11 November 1998. The decision made by the Director General of Sida has the same date.
- Gerremo, Inge. **För dig som behöver råd och dessutom gärna vill ha dem "kostnadsfritt". Promemoria.** Sida, Stockholm, 5 March 2002.
- Lehmkuhl, Dorothy and Lamping, Dolores Cotter. **Organizing for the Creative Person.** Three Rivers Press, New York, 1993.
- Lewin, Elisabeth.
- **Evaluation Manual for Sida. 2nd Edition.** Evaluation Unit, Planning Secretariat, SIDA, 1994.
  - **Utvärderingshandbok för Sida. 2nd edition.** Utvärderingsgruppen, Planeringssekretariatet, SIDA, 1993.
- Lövgren, Eva. **'Management response': The Environment and Sida's Evaluations.** Sida, Stockholm, 7 December 1998.
- Palmgren, Johanna. **Rapport från Miljöpolicyenheten angående uppföljning av rekommendationer i "The Environment and Sida's Evaluations" av Tom Alberts and Jessica Andersson, ref No: UTV-1996-0029. Promemoria.** Sida, Stockholm, 22 September 1998.
- Peck, Lennart and Engström, Stefan. **Managing and Conducting Evaluations. Design study for a Sida evaluation manual.** Sida Studies in Evaluation 99/2.
- Peck, Lennart. **Evaluating Gender Equality – Policy and Practice.** Sida Studies in Evaluation 98/3.
- Schultz, Maria. **Samarbetsavtal mellan Sida och Institutionen för Landskapsplanering Ultuna, Sveriges Lantbruksuniversitet. Promemoria.** Sida, Stockholm, 8 December 2000.
- Segnestam, Mats. **Poverty and the Environment.** Working Paper 10. Task Force on Poverty Reduction. Sida, Stockholm, 1996.

Sida, Director General's decisions:

- **Sida regulations – Environmental Impact Assessment in International Development Cooperation.** Decision made on 16 June 2001. Gd 54/1.
- **Införande av systematiska ställningstagande och åtgärder avseende utvärderingar och revisioner i Sidas verksamhet.** Decision made on 11 November 1998. Gd 158/98.

Sida, Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit.

- **Sida's Evaluation Policy,** Stockholm, 1999. Swedish version below.
- **Policy för Sidas utvärderingsverksamhet.** Stockholm, 1999.
- **Planering 2003–2005.** Decision made on 3 June 2002.

Sida, Avdelningen för naturresurser och miljö.

- **Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessments in International Development Cooperation.** Sida, Stockholm, July 1998.
- **Riktlinjer för miljökon sekvenser i utvecklingssamarbetet.** Stockholm, 1991.
- **Miljöanalys – några synpunkter till hjälp i bl.a. landstrategiarbetet.** Stockholm, June 1997.
- **The Country Strategies – Guidelines for the Strategic Environmental Analysis.** Sida, Stockholm, March 2000. The Swedish title below.
- **Landstrategierna – handledning för strategisk miljöanalys.** Sida, Stockholm, March 2000.
- **Landstrategierna och miljön.** Stockholm, May 1999.

Sida.

- **Annual Report 2001.**
- **Sammanfattning av LFA metoden. The Logical Framework Approach (LFA).** Metod-enheten/Enheten för resursbasutveckling för internationellt utvecklingssamarbete. Stockholm, January, 2002.
- **Riktlinjer för miljökonsekvensbedömningar i biståndet.** Stockholm, 1991.

Sida – Regeringskansliet, Utrikesdepartementet. **Riktlinjer för landstrategier i svenskt utvecklings-samarbete.** Stockholm, 1999 (?).

Ärnfast, Inger and Dougnac, Susana. **Skrivbordsstudie avseende miljökonsekvensbedömningar i Sidas utvärderingar.** Stockholm, 28 May 2002.

Note: **Sidas Regelverk (Sida's Rules and Regulations)** does not exist as a printed official document. It is available on Sida's Intranet and is being continuously updated.

## Appendix 6

### Sida Evaluations 2000

- 00/1 **Swedish Support to Local Self Governance in Mongolia**  
Nils Öström, Lennart Lundquist  
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation
- 00/2 **Reaching out to Children in Poverty. The integrated child development services in Tamil Nadu, India**  
Ted Greiner, Lillemor Andersson-Brolin, Madhavi Mittal, Amrita Puri  
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 00/3 **Apoyo al PROMESHA. Evaluación del Programa de Capacitación para el Mejoramiento Socio Habitacional**  
Ronaldo Ramírez, Patrick Wakely  
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation
- 00/4 **Land Management Programme in Tanzania**  
Kjell J Havnevik, Magdalena Rwegangira, Anders Tivell  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 00/5 **Swedish Support to the National Environment Management Council in Tanzania, 1986–1999**  
Grant Milne  
Department for Africa
- 00/6 **Evaluation of the African Books Collective**  
Cecilia Magnusson Ljungman, Tejeshwar Singh  
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 00/7 **Twinning Cooperation between Riga Water Company and Stockholm Water Company**  
Martti Lariola, Sven Öhlund, Bengt Håkansson, Indulis Emsis  
Department for Eastern and Central Europe
- 00/8 **Cambodia Area Rehabilitation and Regeneration Project**  
Hugh Evans, Lars Birgegaard, Peter Cox, Lim Siv Hong  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 00/9 **Lao National Drug Policy Programme**  
Margaretha Helling-Both, Göran Andersson  
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 00/10 **Sida Support to the Asian Institute of Technology. Summary report**  
Jan Rudengren, Inga-Lill Andréhn, Guy Bradley, Richard Friend, Dan Vadjal  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment. Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation
- 00/10:1 **Sida Support to the Asian Institute of Technology. Annex 1: the Aqua Outreach Programme**  
Guy Bradley, Richard Friend  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 00/10:2 **Sida Support to the Asian Institute of Technology. Annex 2: Electric power system management programme**  
Björn Kjellström  
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation
- 00/10:3 **Sida Support to the Asian Institute of Technology. Annex 3: Scholarships.**  
Dan Vadjal  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment

- 00/10:4 **Sida Support to the Asian Institute of Technology. Annex 4: Overall programme and crosscutting issues.**  
Jan Rudengren, Inga Lill Andrehn  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 00/11 **Butajira Rural Health Project. An evaluation of a demographic surveillance site**  
Stephen Tollman  
Department for Research Cooperation, SAREC
- 00/12 **Nordpraktik – New Managers for Russia**  
Lennart Peck, Björn Ternström  
Department for Eastern and Central Europe
- 00/13 **Environmental Projects in Morocco**  
Jean Pierre Bramslev, Gunilla Göransson, Bo Andréansson  
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation
- 00/14 **Government Accounting and Interim Budget Development Projects in Tanzania**  
Guy Andersson, Suzanne Flynn, Philip Harding, Stewart Maugham  
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 00/15 **A Twinning Cooperation between Swedish and Bosnian Municipalities**  
Börje Wallberg  
Department for Eastern and Central Europe
- 00/16 **Vietnam Women's Union: Promoting Gender Equality**  
Wanjiku Kaime-Atterhög, Tra Thi Van Anh  
Asia Department
- 00/17 **Swedish Support to the Development of Policy Research in Cambodia, the Cambodia Development Resource Institute (CDRI)**  
Jan Eklöf, Mona Lilja, Charles Myer.  
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 00/18 **Study of the Swedish Philippine NGO Program: Final report**  
Roger Dimmell, Pamela Grafilo.  
Department for Cooperation with Non-Governmental Organisations and Humanitarian Assistance
- 00/19 **Strengthening of Democracy on the Atlantic Coast in Nicaragua. Programa RAAN-Asdi-RAAS 1994–2000**  
Hans Peter Buvollen, Mario Rosales Ortega, Leticia Velásquez Zapeta.  
Department for Latin America
- 00/20 **Regional Programmes FARMESA, Farm-level Applied Research Methods in Eastern and Southern Africa and RELMA, Regional Land Management Unit**  
Jan Eriksson, Eva Tobisson, Ian Walton.  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 00/21 **The Protection, Promotion and Support of Breastfeeding. An evaluation of Dutch and Swedish support to organisations working in the field of breastfeeding**  
Jerker Carlsson, Ria Brouwers, Vivienne Forsythe, Sissel Hodne Steen.  
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 00/22 **Fighting Poverty Strategically? Lesson from Swedish Tanzanian development cooperation, 1997–2000**  
Overseas Development Institute  
Department for Africa, Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 00/23 **Export Promotion of Organic Products from Africa. An evaluation of EPOPA**  
Kim Forss, Emma Sterky.  
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation

- 00/24     **Sida Supported Environmental Research Projects in Tanzania**  
Tom Alberts, Marcelo Dougnac.  
Department for Research Cooperation, SAREC
- 00/25     **Feeder Roads Programme, Mozambique**  
Nils Bruzelius, Peter Bentall, José Luis Rocha Lobo  
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation
- 00/26     **Sida Supported Master of Science Program by Distance Education in Mozambique, Vietnam, Cambodia and Namibia**  
Karlis Goppers, Björn Baaberg, Alicia Borges-Månsson, Richard Noonan  
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 00/27     **MacroFinancial Support to Mozambique**  
Nordic Consulting Group.  
Department for Africa
- 00/28     **AIDS, STD Health Action Project in Indica, Mumbai. An evaluation of ASHA**  
Anjali Gopalan, S Sundararaman  
Asia Department
- 00/29     **Sustainable use of Groundwater Resources. An evaluation of SUWaR, Nicaragua**  
Ingvar Åhman  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 00/30     **Cooperación para la Democracia y Derechos Humanos en Nicaragua, 1997–2000**  
Almachiara D'Angelo, Fredrik Uggla, Juan Faroppa  
Department for Latin America
- 00/31     **Empowerment of Women through Panchayati Raj in Rajasthan and Orissa, India**  
D.K. Manavalan  
Asia Department
- 00/32     **Support to the Vi Agroforestry Program**  
Göran Haldin, Bert Koppers, Rosina Auren  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 00/33     **The Swedish Energy Support to Nicaragua, 1981–1999**  
ORGUT Consulting AB  
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation
- 00/34     **When Development Projects go Orphan. Lessons from 20 years of Swedish forestry support to Nicaragua**  
Pierre Frühling  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 00/35     **Rapport från utvärderingen av stödet till de partiknutna organisationerna**  
Fredrik Uggla, Li Bennich-Björkman, Axel Hadenius, Fredrik Nornvall, Annika Tamra, Magnus Öhman  
Department for Cooperation with Non-Governmental Organisations and Humanitarian Assistance
- 00/36     **The Swedish Consultancy Fund in Mozambique**  
Karlis Goppers.  
Department for Africa
- 00/37     **Assessment of Lessons learned from Sida Support to Conflict Management and Peace Building: Final Report**  
SIPU International AB, Stockholm, Centre for Development Research, Copenhagen, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo  
Department for Cooperation with Non-Governmental Organisations and Humanitarian Assistance

- 00/37:1 **Assessment of Lessons learned from Sida Support to Conflict Management and Peace Building: State of the Art/Annotated Bibliography**  
Ninna Nyberg Sørensen, Finn Stepputat, Nicholas Van Hear  
Department for Cooperation with Non-Governmental Organisations and Humanitarian Assistance
- 00/37:2 **Assessment of Lessons learned from Sida Support to Conflict Management and Peace Building: Annex 1–5, Case Studies**  
Ivar Evensmo, Hilde Henriksen Waage, Joakim Gundel, Jennifer Schirmer, Björn Bengtson, Barbro Ronnmö, Dan Smith  
Department for Cooperation with Non-Governmental Organisations and Humanitarian Assistance
- 00/38 **Fortalecimiento Institucional al Comisionado Nacional de los Derechos Humanos en Honduras: Defensa y protección de los Derechos de la Mujer**  
Sonia Marlina Dubón  
Department for Latin America
- 00/39 **Programa de Capacitación en Economía para Funcionarios de la República de Cuba**  
José Antonio Alonso  
Department for Latin America
- 00/40 **Swedish Initiative for Support of Sustainable Management of Water Resources in Southern Africa**  
Len Abrams, Lennart Peck, Klas Sandström  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 00/41 **Water and Environment Project in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania**  
Bastiaan de Laat, Erik Arnold, Philip Sowden  
Department for Eastern and Central Europe
- 00/42 **Sidas stöd till Utan Gränser/SCCs insatser i Honduras efter orkanen Mitch: återuppbyggnad av ekonomi och produktion för familjer och ekonomiska föreningar inom den sociala sektorn i Honduras**  
Ingmar Armyr, Mats Bartling  
Avdelningen för Samverkan med Enskilda Organisationerna och Humanitärt Bistånd



## Appendix 7

### Sida Evaluations 2001

- 01/01 **Rural Development and Democratisation in Russia and Estonia. An evaluation of Sida's Support to the Three Projects in Russia and Estonia.**  
Paul Dixelius, Camilla Gramner, Dan Hjalmarsson.  
Department for Eastern and Central Europe
- 01/02 **Project for Development of Social Work in St Petersburg 1998–2000.**  
Nils Öström, Dmitri Gavra.  
Department for Eastern and Central Europe
- 01/03 **Tackling Turmoil of Transition. An evaluation of lessons from Vietnam-Sweden health cooperation 1994 to 2000.**  
Alf Morten Jerve, Gunilla Krantz, Pham Bich San, Paul Spivey, Tran Tuan, Claes Örtendahl.  
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 01/04 **Learning from Experience. Evaluation of UNICEF's Water and Environmental Sanitation Programme in India, 1966–1998.**  
Pete Kolsky, Erich Bauman, Ramesh Bhatia, John Chilton, Christine van Wijk.  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 01/04:1 **Learning from Experience. Evaluation of UNICEF's Water and Environmental Sanitation Programme in India, 1966–1998. Annexes.**  
Pete Kolsky, Erich Bauman, Ramesh Bhatia, John Chilton, Christine van Wijk.  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 01/05 **Resource Centre for Panchayat Training and Democratic Processes.**  
Nirmala Buch, Rukmini Rao.  
Asia Department
- 01/06 **Sida's Contributions to Humanitarian Mine Action.**  
Kristian Berg Harpviken, Ananda S. Millard, Kjell Erling Kjellman, Arne Strand.  
Department for Cooperation with Non-Governmental Organisations and Humanitarian Assistance
- 01/07 **Assumptions and Partnerships in the Making of a Country Strategy. An evaluation of the Swedish-Mozambican Experience.**  
Marc Wuyts (team leader), Helena Dolny, och Bridget O'Laughlin.  
Department for Africa, Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 01/08 **Swedish NGO Cooperation with Belarus. Evaluation of a programme implemented by Forum Syd.**  
Peter Winai.  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/09 **Active Labour Market Policy in Russia? An evaluation of Swedish technical assistance to the Russian Employment Services 1997–2000.**  
Henrik Huitfeldt.  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/10 **Svenska bataljonens humanitära insatser i Kosovo.**  
Maria Broberg Wulff, Karin Ströberg.  
Enheten för humanitärt bistånd
- 01/11 **Democracy and Human Rights. An evaluation of Sida's support to five projects in Georgia.**  
Birgitta Berggren, Patrik Jotun.  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe

- 01/12 **Sida's Support to the University of Asmara, Eritrea; College of Science and Faculty of Engineering.**  
Eva Selin Lindgren  
Department for Research Cooperation
- 01/13 **Strengthening Local Democracy in North West Russia 1995–2000.**  
Ilari Karppi, Kaisa Lähteenmäki-Smith.  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/14 **Approach and Organisation of Sida Support to Private Sector Development.**  
Sunil Sinha, Julia Hawkins, Anja Beijer och Åsa Teglund  
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 01/15 **Follow-up of Social Sector Support to Moldova.**  
Nils Öström  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/16 **Human Rights Training in Vietnam.**  
Carl-Johan Groth, Simia Ahmadi-Thosten, Clifford Wang, Tran van Nam  
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 01/17 **Swedish-Danish Fund for the Promotion of Gender Equality in Vietnam.**  
Shashi R. Pandey, Darunee Tantiwiranmanond, Ngo Thi Tuan Dung  
Asia Department
- 01/18 **Flood Relief Assistance to the Wastewater Services in Raciborz, Nysa and Klodzko, Southern Poland.**  
Olle Colling  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/19 **Sewer Pipe Network Renovation Project in Sopot, Poland.**  
Olle Colling  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/20 **Sida Supported Municipal Twinning Cooperation with Central and Eastern Europe, 1996–2001.**  
Gunnar Olesen, Peter Rekve, Henrik Permin  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/21 **Swedish Support to the Power Sector in Mozambique.**  
Arne Disch, Trond Westeren, Anders Ellegård, Alexandra Silfverstolpe  
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation
- 01/22 **Expanded Support to the International Sciences Programme (ISP) in Uppsala University.**  
David Wield  
Department for Research Cooperation
- 01/23 **Sida Supported County Twinning Programme in the Baltic Countries 1996–2001.**  
Gunnar Olesen, Peter Rekve, Henrik Permin  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/24 **Formative Evaluation of Uganda Land Management Project.**  
Jan Erikson, James Reinier Scheele, Sebina Nalwanda  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 01/25 **Sida Support to the Psycho Social Rehabilitation Project in Bosnia and Herzegovina (SweBiH).**  
Nils Öström  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/26 **Swedish Support to the Agriculture Sector in Zambia.**  
A.R. James, M. Davelid, T. Breinholt, D. Chitundu, T. Lundström  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment

- 01/27 **Sida's Support to NUSESA – Network of Users of Scientific Equipment in Eastern and Southern Africa.**  
Eva Selin Lindgren  
Department for Research Cooperation
- 01/28 **Cambodian Human Rights and Democracy Organisations: Towards the Future.**  
John L. Vijghen  
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 01/29 **Sida's Support to the Land Reform Related Activities in Poland.**  
Mark Doucette, Sue Nichols, Peter Bloch  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/30 **Sida's Support to the Land Reform Related Activities in Lithuania.**  
Mark Doucette, Sue Nichols, Peter Bloch  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/31 **Sida's Support to the Land Reform Related Activities in Latvia.**  
Mark Doucette, Sue Nichols, Peter Bloch  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/32 **Review of PAHO's project. Towards an Integrated Model of Care for Family Violence in Central America. Final Report.**  
Mary Ellsberg, Carme Clavel Arcas.  
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 01/33 **Sistematización del Proyecto de OPS. Hacia un modelo integral de atención para la violencia intrafamiliar en Centroamérica.**  
Mary Ellsberg, Carme Clavel Arcas.  
Departamento de Democracia y Condiciones Sociales.
- 01/34 **Of Trees and People ...: An Evaluation of the Vietnam-Sweden Forestry Cooperation Programme and the Mountain Rural Development Programme in the Northern Uplands 1991–2000.**  
Claes Lindahl, Kirsten Andersen, Kjell Öström, Adam Forde, Eivind Kofod, Steffen Johnsen.  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 01/35 **Acting in Partnership. Evaluation of FRAMA (Fund for Agricultural Rehabilitation after Mitch) Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAGFOR) – Sida project Nicaragua.**  
Bengt Kjeller, Raquel López  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 01/36 **Sociedad de Cooperación. Evaluación de FRAMA (Fondo de Rehabilitación para la Agricultura despues del huracán MITCH) Ministerio de Agricultura y Forestal (MAGFOR) – Asdi en Nicaragua.**  
Bengt Kjeller, Raquel López  
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 01/37 **Report on the Hoanib River Catchment Study Project Evaluation. Final Report.**  
Harmut Krugman  
Department for Africa
- 01/38 **Sida's Support to the Land Reform Related Activities in Estonia.**  
Mark Doucette, Sue Nichols, Peter Bloch  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/39 **Legal Services to the Poor People in Zimbabwe.**  
Haroub Othman, Dorille von Riesen  
Department for Africa

## Appendix 8

### Another cross-cutting issue – Gender

In relation to the study from 1996, when commencing this study, gender issues seemed at first to be receiving more attention than environmental issues. If this were true, why had a cross-cutting issue such as gender succeeded better than the environment? Gender issues were dealt with in a Sida study:

**Evaluating Gender Equality – Policy and Practice** from 1998.

*In order to shed light on this, it was decided to add a few questions. However, after having concluded the reading of the evaluations and tabulated the results, a more complicated picture emerged. The findings are summarised in the following tables.*

### The importance of gender in the ToR

**Table 1 Importance of gender in the ToR**

Score

1	2	3	4	n.a.	Total
19	12	3	5	1	40
47.5%	30.0%	7.5%	12.5%	2.5%	100.0%

**Average:** 1.8

In the case of the environment the average score was 1.5.

### The importance of gender in the evaluation

**Table 2 The importance of gender in the evaluation**

Score

1	2	3	4	n.a.	Total
8	6	15	11	0	40
20.0%	15.0%	37.5%	27.5%	0.0%	100.0%

**Average:** 2.7

Table 2 is our assessment of the importance of the gender issue in the evaluation. The average score for the environment was 2.5. We did not attempt to assess the importance of gender issues in the project/programme, as this would have required significantly more work and exceeded our ToR.

Comparing this table with the previous one, it will be seen that the evaluators assigned more importance to gender than the Sida desk officers, on average 2.7 as against 1.8.

Gender issues were treated in 80 per cent of the evaluations (32 evaluations scoring 2–4) while the environment was treated in 60 per cent (24). Gender issues seem to have been mainstreamed rather more successfully than environmental ones.

## Gender competence required in the ToR

**Table 3 Gender competence required in the ToR**

Yes	13	16.5%
No	62	78.5%
n.a.	4	5.1%
Total	79	100.0%

In the case of the environment, environmental competence was required in eight ToR.

### **Question 8b: does/do the evaluator(s) have competence in assessing gender issues?**

As with the environment, very little information is provided on the competence of the evaluation team, as can be seen from the table below.

**Table 4 Evaluators' competence in assessing gender issues**

2002

yes	10.0%
partly	0.0%
no	0.0%
n.a.	90.0%
Total	100.0%

In the case of the environment, only 2.5 per cent had documented environmental competence, and in the majority of cases the evaluators' competence could not be stated.

Environmental, gender-related, and probably other cross-cutting issues seem to involve similar problems. In some evaluations the issues are dealt with professionally. Generally speaking, Sida's policies have not been mainstreamed into the organisation.



## Sida Studies in Evaluation

- 99/4**      **Managing the NGO Partnership. An assessment of stakeholder responses to an evaluation of development assistance through Swedish NGOs.**  
Claes Lindahl, Elin Björkman, Petra Stark, Sundeep Waslekar, Kjell Öström  
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 00/1**      **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. A DAC review of agency experiences 1993–1998.**  
Prudence Woodford-Berger  
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 00/2**      **Sida Documents in a Poverty Perspective. A review of how poverty is addressed in Sida's country strategy papers, assessment memoranda and evaluations**  
Lennart Peck, Charlotta Widmark  
Department for Policy and Socio-Economic Analysis
- 00/3**      **Evaluability of Democracy and Human Rights Projects. A logframe-related assessment. Vol 1: Annex 1-6. Vol. 2: Annex 7**  
Derek Poate, Roager Riddell, Nick Chapman, Tony Curran et al  
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 00/4**      **Poverty reduction, sustainability and learning. An evaluability assessment of seven area development projects**  
Anders Rudqvist, Ian Christoplos, Anna Liljelund  
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 00/5**      **Ownership in Focus? Discussion paper for a Planned Evaluation**  
Stefan Molund  
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 01/01**      **The Management of Results Information at Sida. Proposals for agency routines and priorities in the information age.**  
Göran Schill  
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 01/02**      **HIV/AIDS- Related Support through Sida – A baseline study. Preparation for an evaluation of the implementation of the strategy "Investing for Future Generations – Sweden's response to HIV/AIDS"**  
Lennart Peck, Karin Dahlström, Mikael Hammarskjöld, Lise Munck  
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 02/01**      **Aid, Incentives and Sustainability. An Institutional Analysis of Development Cooperation. Main Report**  
Ellinor Östrom, Krister Andersson, Clark Gibson, Sujai Shivakumar  
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 02/01:1**      **Aid, Incentives and Sustainability. An Institutional Analysis of Development Cooperation. Summary Report**  
Ellinor Östrom, Krister Andersson, Clark Gibson, Sujai Shivakumar  
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 03/01**      **Reflection on Experiences of Evaluating Gender Equality**  
Ted Freeman, Briitha Mikkelsen  
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 03/02**      **Environmental Considerations in Sida's Evaluations Revisited – A follow-up and analysis six years**  
Tom Alberts, Jessica Andersson, with assistance from: Inger Årnfäst, Susana Dougnac  
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit

### Sida Studies in Evaluation may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida  
105 25 Stockholm  
Phone: +46 (0)8 690 93 80  
Fax: +46 (0)8 690 92 66  
info@sida.se

### A complete backlist of earlier reports may be ordered from:

Sida, UTV, S-105 25 Stockholm  
Phone: +46 (0)8 698 51 63  
Fax: +46 (0)8 698 56 10  
Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>









SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY  
S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden  
Tel: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64  
Telegram: sida stockholm. Postgiro: 1 56 34-9  
E-mail: [info@sida.se](mailto:info@sida.se). Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>