



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/EFC.14/10
19 March 2014

ADAPTATION FUND BOARD
Ethics and Finance Committee
Fourteenth meeting
Bonn, 18-19 March 2014

REPORT OF THE FOURTEENTH MEETING OF THE ETHICS AND FINANCE COMMITTEE FOR BOARD REPORT

NOTE: This committee report has been produced during the meeting of the committee, with the purpose of informing and making recommendations to the twenty-third meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board. The Board decisions differ from the recommendations. Because of this preparation process, it has not been edited according to the usual standards of Board documents.

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the meeting

1. The outgoing Chair of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC), Ms. Medea Inashvili (Georgia, Eastern Europe) opened the meeting and greeted the participants at 9.35 a.m. on 18 March 2014.

Agenda Item 2: Transition of the Chair and the Vice-Chair

2. Ms. Su-Lin Garbett-Shiels (United Kingdom, Western European and Others Group) took over the Chairmanship. Ms. Irina Helena Pineda Aguilar (Honduras, Latin America and the Caribbean) took over the Vice-Chairmanship from Ms. Garbett-Shiels.

Agenda Item 3: Organizational matters

(a) *Adoption of the agenda*

3. The agenda below was based on documents AFB/EFC.14/1 (Provisional agenda) and AFB/EFC.14/2 (Annotated provisional agenda). The Chair informed the Committee that, following a request by the incoming Board Chair, EFC agenda item 5, Portfolio monitoring: report of the missions to Honduras and Nicaragua, would be presented and discussed under the Board agenda in order to allow for an open and transparent discussion on the missions' findings.

4. At the invitation of the Chair, the Manager of the secretariat proposed three topics to be added to item 11, Other Matters: one on Information from the World Food Programme (WFP) on implementation of the project in Mauritania; one on the renewal of the agreement with the United Nations Foundation on the collection of on-line donations, which was due to expire and a presentation by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) on its review of the Fund's direct access modality. Thus amended, the agenda was adopted.

1. Opening of the meeting
2. Transition of the Chair and the Vice-Chair
3. Organizational matters
 - (a) Adoption of the agenda
 - (b) Organization of work
4. Modified accreditation process for small entities
5. Portfolio monitoring: report of the missions to Honduras and Nicaragua
6. Options for an evaluation of the Fund
7. Core indicator methodologies
8. Complaint handling mechanism
9. Implementation of the code of conduct
10. Financial issues
 - (a) Financial status of the Trust Fund and CER monetization
 - (b) Work plan for the fiscal year 2015
 - (c) Board and secretariat, and trustee budgets for the fiscal year 2015
11. Other matters
12. Adoption of the recommendations and report
13. Closure of the meeting

(b) *Organization of work*

5. The Committee adopted the organization of work proposed by the Chair.

6. In accordance with paragraph 29 of the rules of procedure, the Chair then called upon all EFC members to orally declare any conflict of interest that they might have with any item on the current meeting agenda. No conflicts of interest were declared.

7. The Chair welcomed four new members to the EFC: Ms. Angela Churie-Kallhaug (Sweden, Annex I Parties), Mr. Hans Olav Ibrenk (Norway, Annex I Parties), both of whom had transferred from the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC), Ms. Wenhong Huang (China, Non-Annex I Parties), who unfortunately was unable to attend the meeting, and Mr. Nauman Bashir Bhatti (Pakistan, Asia), who would arrive later.

Agenda Item 4: Modified accreditation process for small entities

8. The representative of the secretariat gave a presentation on this topic. Based on the Panel's experience with an applicant national entity under review, along with other entities, the Panel had requested to be allowed to further review this entity through a field visit to develop a case example. The Board decided to: (a) Allow for further review of the entity through a field visit to develop a case example for the need of a "small grants window" or similar mechanism; and (b) Request the Accreditation Panel to work in conjunction with the secretariat to provide options for operationalizing such a mechanism to the twenty-third Board meeting (Decision B.22/2).

9. The representative of the secretariat explained that one Panel expert and a member of the secretariat visited the NIE039, the applicant national entity in question, and gave some details of the difficulties faced by the country, in terms in particular of small population and extremely long distances. The NIE, too, had problems of limited staff and modest budget, meaning that any relatively large-scale project would need access to external or international expertise.

10. She drew attention to Document AFB/EFC.14/3 which presented three potential options for a process to accredit smaller entities: Option 1 would maintain the status quo and would entail no modifications to the fiduciary standards to accommodate the systems of smaller entities. Option 2 would be a streamlined approach, again with no changes to the fiduciary standards, but making small entities aware of what they needed to have in place to meet those standards, which might not be the same as that demanded of a large multilateral organization. This would also involve systematizing compensatory measures for current fiduciary standards based on smaller entities' institutional risk profile. Option 3 would be a new process just for small entities, in which, based on the Fund's experience to date, a new set of fiduciary standards would be developed, and the direct access modality would be evolved to reflect the risks associated with smaller entities.

11. She explained that all three options had benefits and drawbacks. For example, if Option 1, the status quo, were retained, it would reinforce the perception that the Fund's stringent standards could not be diluted, and the time and monetary costs to the Fund of this option were zero. On the other hand, if an entity such as NIE039 were to seek accreditation under this option, its costs in terms of additional staff and outside expertise could be estimated at about 40% of its operating budget, and it had to be asked whether such an expenditure would be sustainable.

12. The positives of Option 2 were that it built on existing requirements while understanding the resource limitations of small entities, and that it provided an opportunity for access by a larger number of countries and wider range of organization types. On the other hand there might

be a perception that the Fund was diluting its fiduciary standards, and that accreditation decisions were being made subjectively. Some time would be required for the development of mitigating measures by the Accreditation Panel, and the costs would be of the order of US\$ 30,000 - 35,000.

13. Option 3 would allow building standards based on risk profile rather than simply following the standards built for larger multilateral institutions, and would take into consideration the resource limitations of small entities. On the other hand, this option might create a perception that small entities could not meet rigorous standards and it would entail the complication of two separate application processes. The total cost of this option was likely to be in the region of US\$ 60,000 - 70,000.

14. The Committee stressed that it was important to determine how fiduciary standards could be adjusted without being undermined. What was essential was that an entity, whether large or small, be able to demonstrate that it could comply with those standards. Also, as the Fund was constantly under scrutiny, it was important to maintain the integrity of its accreditation process. It was suggested that it would be beneficial for small entities to be accredited only up to a certain cap on project costs, reducing financial risk to the Fund. Indeed, some small countries would prefer to receive smaller grants, that they were confident of handling, than large ones that might overwhelm them.

15. It was suggested that there were two separate issues: how to deal with small entities in general, and specifically what to do about NIE039. However, the representative of the secretariat explained that NIE039 was simply being used as a case study, and that there were already at least three applications from entities in similar situations. Option 1 would almost certainly exclude such bodies from achieving accreditation.

16. In response to questions, she explained that one example of "compensatory factors" might be that a small entity that typically would not have an internal audit department, could instead outsource the task to an external auditor.

17. A consensus emerged that the way forward was Option 2, with the addition of certain features such as timelines and realistic example figures.

18. After reviewing document AFB/EFC.14/3 and the ensuing discussion, the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board request the Accreditation Panel:

- a) To continue its consideration of approval for accreditation of small entities on the basis of Option 2 (Streamlined Process) as outlined in the document;
- b) With assistance from the secretariat, to further elaborate steps that might be undertaken by small entities (as defined in paragraph 10 of document AFB/EFC.14/3) to demonstrate compliance with the Fund's fiduciary standards, that would be commensurate with the type, risk profile and size of the institutions;
- c) To report back in the next Panel report, for consideration at the 15th meeting of the EFC.

(Recommendation EFC.14/1)

Agenda Item 5: Portfolio monitoring: report of the missions to Honduras and Nicaragua

19. This item was deferred for discussion by the Board.

Agenda Item 6: Options for an evaluation of the Fund

20. The Chair of the EFC opened the discussion referencing an email from the Director of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Independent Evaluation Office, indicating that the Office had withdrawn as the evaluation function of the Fund. The committee members noted the withdrawal and determined that other than acknowledging the Office's wish to withdraw, no further action was required from the Board. The Chair then requested the representative of the secretariat to present the paper on evaluation options.

21. The representative of the secretariat recalled that the Board at its thirteenth meeting had approved an evaluation framework for the Fund and discussed whether to undertake an overall evaluation for the Fund (Decision B.13/20). At the time there had been questions about the best time to launch such an evaluation given the portfolio's lack of maturity. The Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF, in its capacity as interim evaluation function for the Fund, had submitted a document at the request of the Board, which was presented at the twelfth meeting of the EFC and proposed that the interim evaluation function either implement a comprehensive evaluation of the Fund or oversee the evaluation conducted by another entity. The Board had subsequently decided to request the secretariat to prepare a document containing: a) options for terms of reference for possible evaluations of the Fund covering different scopes; b) a proposal regarding the timing of each option taking into account the status of the Fund's active portfolio; c) costs associated with each option; and d) options for commissioning the evaluation (Decision B.21/17). She drew attention to Document AFB/EFC.14/5, delineating options for a possible evaluation of the Fund.

22. She explained that while there was sufficient data available on the Fund's processes and policies, there was little in terms of project outcomes, since so few had been completed or even reached mid-term evaluation. That would influence the type of evaluation that could be undertaken in the near future. She also mentioned that the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) decided that the interim institutional arrangements for the secretariat and the trustee shall be reviewed after three years (decision 1/CMP.3, paragraph 32). The next such review was scheduled to be undertaken by CMP10 (December 2014) and the timing of the evaluation may take this review into consideration.

23. A first option would be to carry out a process evaluation, which would inform other reviews and decision-making processes. The cost of that option would be in the region of US\$ 190,000 to 200,000 and it would take about five or six months to complete. The drawbacks of that option would be that it would provide limited information, covering processes only. In addition, limited time would be available to design and implement it, it would involve a need to access funds immediately, and it might be a repetition of certain aspects to be evaluated by other studies.

24. A second option would be to carry out a limited overall evaluation, covering the Fund's processes and a modicum of project information. The cost of that option would be in the region of US\$ 245,000 to 260,000 and it would take seven or eight months to complete. Its advantages would be that it would be informed by previous Fund reviews, and that it would provide information on short-term outcomes. On the other hand its weaknesses would be that only

limited information at the project level would be available and findings would not be available until the first quarter of 2015.

25. A third option would be to undertake the evaluation in two phases, the first to be completed by the time of CMP10. The first phase would take five to six months and the second one a further seven or eight months to complete. Total costs would be US\$ 300,000 to 335,000. It would combine the advantages of options 2 and 3, but its disadvantages would be the time lag of results from one phase to other, which might render phase I inadequate for analysis during phase II.

26. A fourth option would be to do a comprehensive evaluation, but to delay its start. Doing it later would enable it to be more comprehensive, but the disadvantages of option 4 would be that its results would not be available till 2016, and it would be the most costly and time-consuming option to complete.

27. Two other issues for discussion were the need to establish a Quality Assurance Panel to work on terms of reference for the evaluation process itself, and the question of whether the third member of the Panel should be a representative of civil society or a member of the Board, and whether the process for selecting the body to carry out the evaluation should be a Request for Tender or a Request for Proposals.

28. With regard to the timing of the various evaluation options, some members took the view that it would be important to have initial findings of an evaluation by CMP10. Others considered that the relevant CMP decision required a second review to examine issues such as financial sustainability, the direct access modality, and institutional linkages. That would mean that option 3 would be feasible, since the review was not intended to look at the impact of projects, only processes.

29. The Committee expressed a preference that the third member of the Quality Assurance Panel should be from civil society, rather than from the Board, in the interest of transparency. The Committee also agreed to call it an Independent Review Panel instead.

30. After reviewing document AFB/EFC.14/5, and the subsequent discussion, the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board:

- a) Approve Option 3 (Two-phased evaluation) as outlined in the document, with the aim of completing Phase I in time for discussion at the twenty-fourth Board meeting (October 2014),
- b) Request the Chairs and Vice-chairs of the Board and EFC to propose for consideration by the Board during the intersessional period an independent review panel consisting of three members (i) an evaluation specialist (ii) an adaptation specialist, and (iii) a representative from civil society for a decision by the end of April 2014. The selection will be based on criteria contained in Annex II to this report. The independent review panel will undertake the responsibilities outlined in the terms of reference contained in Annex III including the review of the final TOR for the evaluation, which should include elements of the scope of Decision 2/CMP.9 for the second review of the Adaptation Fund (in Phase I), select the evaluation team, provide quality assurance during the evaluation process, and report on progress of the evaluation to the Ethics and Finance Committee at its fifteenth meeting.

- c) Request the secretariat to issue a request for proposals following the World Bank procurement rules and procedures; and

(Recommendation EFC.14/2)

Agenda Item 7: Core indicator methodologies

31. The representative of the secretariat recalled that the Board, at its twenty-first meeting, had approved a proposal for steps to take to improve the Fund's results tracking system. As part of that work, the secretariat identified a preliminary set of six indicators to track at the Fund level. She drew attention to Document AFB/EFC.14/6 which presented the methodology for measuring each of those indicators.

32. After reviewing document AFB/EFC.14/6, the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board approve the use of the proposed core indicators and request the secretariat to:

- a) Make the necessary changes to incorporate the core indicators and revised results tracker into the Fund's results management system;
- b) Inform implementing entities of the changes to the results tracking system including the requirements to provide indicative core indicator targets for fully developed project proposals and their inclusion in project performance reports (PPRs);
- c) Request implementing entities already implementing projects and programmes to provide project-level information as it relates to the core indicators; and
- d) Complete the development of guidance for the modified results tracker and an exit survey for the accreditation process.

(Recommendation EFC.14/3)

Agenda Item 8: Complaint handling mechanism

33. The Manager of the secretariat briefed the EFC on the implementation of decision B.22/21. She reported that the Accreditation Panel had started the review of the fiduciary standard on transparency, self-investigative powers and anti-corruption measures of an implementing entity about which a complaint had been raised. She would inform the Committee of the review outcome at a subsequent meeting.

34. Separate from the above, she reported that a Board member had provided information to the secretariat for attention, and that the secretariat was following up on the information.

Agenda Item 9: Implementation of the code of conduct

35. The Chair drew the attention of the Committee to the code of conduct posted on the Fund website. No matters were raised under this item

Agenda Item 10: Financial issues

(a) Financial status of the Trust Fund and CER monetization

36. The trustee reported on the financial status of the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund and CER monetization (AFB/EFC.14/7), showing US\$ 170.9 million available to support new Board funding decisions. He informed the Committee that the Executive Directors of the World Bank had responded to the CMP decision to extend the World Bank's mandate as interim trustee for an additional year, to end-May 2015, by approving the amendment to the Terms and Conditions of Service between the Bank and the CMP. Finally, the Committee noted the World Bank's interest in a timely and effective process for the Second Review of the Fund arrangements.

37. The trustee reported on donations processed and CER monetization, and noted that under current market conditions the estimate of potential resources for the Fund up to 2020 remained at approximately US\$ 200 million. The trustee reported on outstanding pledges to the Adaptation Fund from France, Finland, and two Belgian regional governments. He also reported that, during the last quarter, the Trustee had sold 1.8 million CERs and generated US\$ 1.2 million in proceeds.

38. He drew attention to the very weak state of carbon markets, and limited demand for CERs, as well as the weak demand for ERUs and AAUs. He added that additional costs associated with adding monetization of ERUs and AAUs to the trustee's mandate had been included in the FY15 administrative budget proposal.

39. The Committee took note of the trustee's report.

(b) Work plan for the fiscal year 2015

40. The Manager of the secretariat presented the work plan contained in document AFB/EFC.14/7.

41. The Committee discussed whether to establish a new funding target, given the success in exceeding the target of US\$ 100 million by the time of the last COP of the UNFCCC. There was general agreement that having a new target would maintain momentum, and that making it an annual one, rather than for a longer period, would keep donors' focus on the Fund's needs.

42. It was agreed that a fundraising target should be established, its level to be set by the Fundraising Task Force.

43. The Ethics and Finance Committee recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board approve the work programme and the tentative work schedule contained in document AFB/EFC.14/7.

(Recommendation EFC.14/4)

(c) Board and secretariat, and trustee budgets for the fiscal year 2015

44. A representative of the secretariat presented document AFB/EFC.14/6, showing the Board and secretariat budgets for FY 2015.

45. The Manager of the secretariat added that the personnel costs in the document included costs of promoting two Fund staff, which would place them on the same level as the corresponding personnel in the GEF secretariat.

46. A representative of the secretariat also explained that the amounts for communications and publications had been increased, as many additional such items were currently planned. It was also planned in the near future to produce additional Adaptation Stories.

47. The representative of the trustee drew attention to Table 6 in the same document, showing the estimated trustee budget for 2015, and explained the increases and decreases over the figures for 2014.

48. The Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) agreed to amend the budget to include US\$ 335,000 for an overall evaluation of the Fund as recommended in agenda item 6 and to remove the US\$ 17,000 for the Evaluation Function, as the GEF Independent Evaluation Office's withdrew as evaluation function of the Fund. The budget table as amended is included in Annex IV of the EFC report.

49. Having considered the budget proposal by the secretariat and trustee, the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board approve, from the resources available in the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund:

- a) The proposed budget of US\$ 3,294,808 to cover the costs of the Fund operations over the period 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015, comprising US\$ 2,499,808 for Board and secretariat services, US\$ 335,000 for the independent evaluation and US\$ 460,000 for accreditation services.
- b) An additional allocation of US\$ 203,000 to the secretariat for the readiness programme over the period 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015, for activities to be carried out by the secretariat. Amounts already approved by the Board but not disbursed in FY14 would be disbursed in FY15; and
- c) The proposed budget of US\$ 863,000 for trustee services to be provided to the Adaptation Fund over the period 1 July, 2014 to 30 June, 2015, comprising US\$ 246,000 for CER Monetization services, US\$ 150,000 for external legal counsel related to AAUs and ERUs, and US\$ 467,000 for all other trustee services.

(Recommendation EFC.14/5)

Agenda Item 11: Other matters

Project in Mauritania (WFP)

50. The representative of the secretariat presented information provided by the World Food Programme (WFP) on the preparations for a project in Mauritania.

51. The Committee observed that this project was already behind schedule.

52. The Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board request the secretariat to write a letter to the World Food Programme (WFP) indicating

they report back to the EFC about the Mauritania project's inception workshop and submit a revised implementation schedule of the project by June 2014.

(Recommendation EFC.14/6)

Agreement with United Nations Foundation (UNF)

53. A representative of the secretariat explained that the agreement with the United Nations Foundation (UNF), for the collection of online donations was due to expire, and asked for the Committee's views on whether it should be renewed.

54. One member said that as the arrangement brought in only about US\$ 1,000 in a year, it hardly seemed worth continuing.

55. Another representative of the secretariat replied that as it was the only mechanism for accepting private donations, and as it had no financial cost to the Fund itself, there would be no disadvantage in retaining it.

56. The Ethics and Finance Committee recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board instruct the secretariat and the trustee to initiate negotiations with the United Nations Foundation (UNF) in order to extend the agreements with UNF for the collection of online donations.

(Recommendation EFC.14/7)

Presentation by International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)

57. A representative of IIED gave a presentation on its review of how the Adaptation Fund's direct access modality contributed to institutional development. He explained that the review aimed to provide an appreciative evaluation of institutional development aspects.

58. The Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) took note of the information provided by the representative of IIED.

Contract of the Manager of the secretariat

59. The Manager of the secretariat left the room in order for the EFC Chair to open a discussion on this issue. The committee members were in general agreement that her contract should be extended and that a two year extension was insufficient for continuity of the operations of the Adaptation Fund.

60. The Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board request its Chair to communicate the following to the Head of the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat:

- a) The Head of the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat had sought the guidance of the Board on the issue of extending the contract of the Manager of the secretariat.
- b) The Board is satisfied with the performance of the current Manager of the secretariat and

- c) Recommends the extension of her contract in accordance with the procedures of the World Bank.

(Recommendation EFC.14/8)

Agenda Item 12: Adoption of the recommendations and the report

61. The present report was adopted based on the draft report of the Committee contained in document AFB/EFC.14/L.1, as orally amended.

Agenda Item 13: Closure of the meeting

62. The meeting closed at 6:25 p.m. on 19 March 2014.

ANNEX I

**Ethics and Finance Committee
Fourteenth meeting
Bonn, Germany, 18-19 March 2014**

EFC members present in the meeting

Ms. Su-Lin GARBETT-SHIELS (Chair) (United Kingdom, Western Europe and Others Group)

Ms. Irina Helena Pineda AGUILAR (Vice-Chair) (Honduras, Latin America and the Caribbean)

Mr. Zaheer FAKIR (South Africa, Africa)

Mr. Petrus MUTEYAULI (Namibia, Africa)

Mr. Nauman Bashir BHATTI (Pakistan, Asia)

Mr. Alamgir Mohammed Monsurul ALAM (Bangladesh, Asia)

Ms. Medea INASHVILI (Georgia, Eastern Europe)

Mr. Aram TER-ZAKARYAN (Armenia, Eastern Europe)

Mr. Philip WEECH (Bahamas, Latin America and the Caribbean)

Mr. Peceli VOCEA (Fiji, Small Island Developing States)

Mr. Adao Soares BARBOSA (Timor Leste, Least Developed Countries)

Ms. Ana FORNELLS DE FRUTOS (Spain, Annex I Parties)

Ms. Angela CHURIE-KALLHAUGE (Sweden, Western Europe and Others Group)

Ms. Patience DAMPTEY (Ghana, Non-Annex I Parties)

ANNEX II

Terms of reference for independent review panel

The independent review panel will be requested to:

Preparation Phase:

- Finalize TORs for the AF overall evaluation and disseminate for comments
- Identify the mix of skills and experiences required to conduct this evaluation
- Oversee the development and pretesting of data collection instruments and ensure reliability of sources of information developed and utilized by the evaluation implementing team
- Select evaluators to undertake evaluation

Implementation phase:

- Follow progress of the implementation
- Provide feedback to evaluation implementing team periodically
- Assess quality of reports entered by evaluators
- Arrange for meeting with AF stakeholders to discuss draft report (during the AFB meeting)
- Ensure presentation of AF final evaluation results

Final stage:

- Evaluate performance of evaluators

The minimum criteria included to implement quality assurance reviews by the independent review panel:

- The evaluation report presented an assessment of all possible and relevant outcomes and achievement of the AF objectives in the context of AF strategic priorities, and guidance
- The evaluation report was consistent, the evidence presented was complete and convincing and sustained in data collected
- The evaluation report presented a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes as possible. The lessons and recommendations listed in the final evaluation report are supported by the evidence presented and are relevant to the AF operations.
- Do the recommendations directly follow from the evaluation's findings and the conclusions? Are they supported by sound analysis and reasoning? Are they "actionable," in the sense that they can be implemented in existing circumstances? And lessons: does the report mention lessons that may be used in refining process and strategies or designing new policies? Are they adequately explained?
- The final evaluation report included the actual AF cost (totals, per activity, and per source).

- The final evaluation report included an assessment of the quality of the M&E plan at entry, the operation of the M&E system used during implementation, and the extent M&E was sufficiently budgeted for during preparation and properly funded during implementation.
- The final evaluation report clearly stated the quality of data used in the design and implementation of the evaluation: What is the quality of data and information gathered by the team? Are there serious questions about their reliability and validity? Does the report mention, in a transparent manner, the relative strengths and weaknesses of the data obtained?
- The final evaluation report covers defined evaluation questions: Are all evaluation questions answered in the report? Are the data and evidence presented clearly? Are alternative explanations of findings explicitly considered and explored

ANNEX III

Criteria for selection of independent review panel:

Key profile components of the independent review panel include:

- A combination of evaluative skills and thematic knowledge.
 - Evaluation experience: extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods; a strong record in designing and leading overall evaluations; technical competence in the area of evaluation (theory and practice), and a strong methodological background.
 - Strong knowledge in project management with strong emphasis monitoring and evaluation
 - Previous extended experience in designing, implementing and evaluating adaptation projects and programs in developing countries
 - Experience in least developed countries or those most vulnerable to climate change impacts.
 - Extended knowledge of the Adaptation Fund and of UNFCCC, Kyoto protocol and climate change and other environmental international regimes and policies
 - Extended knowledge on operational aspects of institutions (policies, governance, and accounting).
- Language capacity in English and at least one of the other six official languages of the UN (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish) and extent of international work (all AF regions)
- Independent evaluation capacity,
 - Application of ethical guidance.
 - Absence of conflict of interest: the team/evaluator must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and /or have benefited from the fund/programme/project under evaluation. Evaluators are independent from the development intervention, including its policy, operations and management functions, as well as intended beneficiaries.
- Strong communication and outreach skills.

ANNEX IV

Approved FY14 budget, FY14 estimate and proposed FY15 budget of the Board and secretariat

All amounts in US\$		Approved FY14	Estimate FY14	Proposed FY15
PERSONNEL COMPONENT				
Full-time staff (including benefits):				
01	Senior Program Manager (GH)	243,185	243,185	251,057
02	Program Manager (GG)	169,441	169,441	180,186
03	Program Manager (GF)	156,569	156,569	169,441
04	Operations Officer (Accreditation) (GF)	153,696	153,696	156,569
05	Program Assistant (GC)	85,680	85,680	85,680
06	Junior Professional Associate (JPA)	77,807	77,807	77,807
	sub-total AFB staff	886,378	886,378	920,740
GEF staff cross-support (including benefits):				
01	Head of the AFB Secretariat (GJ) - 10%			
02	Accounting support (GF) - 14%			
03	AF database, KM strategy (GF) - 2%			
04	AF database (GF) - 3%			
05	Communications and outreach (GG) - 2%			
06	HR support (GD) - 5%			
07	IT support (GF) - 5%			
08	Review of projects (1@GF) - 6%			
10	Review of projects (5@GG) - 6%			
11	Head of Operations and Business Strategy (GH) - 2%			
	sub-total GEF staff	176,413	223,023	179,198
GEF Evaluation Office cross-support:				
01	Evaluation report	3,000	-	-
02	EO staff cost	8,000	-	-
03	Travel to AFB meetings	6,000	-	-
	sub-total GEF EO cross-support	17,000	0	0
Consultants & others				
01	AFB Secretariat Support (Legal support etc.)	25,000	33,000	35,000
02	Design and Operation of dedicated Web sites	35,000	20,000	85,000
03	Communications Strategy & KM	89,700	89,700	127,000
04	Result Based Management (RBM)	10,000	11,000	85,000
05	Environment and social safeguards		7,000	20,000
	sub-total Consultants	159,700	160,700	352,000
	SUB-TOTAL PERSONNEL COMPONENT	1,239,491	1,270,101	1,451,938
TRAVEL COMPONENT				
01	AF Secretariat staff	330,000	200,000	174,000
02	Awareness Raising	43,400	43,400	40,000
03	Board - 24 eligible members	400,000	300,000	200,000
	SUB-TOTAL TRAVEL COMPONENT	773,400	543,400	414,000
GENERAL OPERATIONS COMPONENT				
01	Office Space, Equipment and Supplies	200,000	200,000	200,000
02	Support to Chair (communications)	23,870	23,870	23,870
03	Publications and Outreach	40,000	40,000	70,000
	SUB-TOTAL GENERAL OPERATIONS COMPONENT	263,870	263,870	293,870
MEETINGS COMPONENT				
01	Logistics, interpretation, report writing etc.	480,000	300,000	240,000
02	Translation	150,000	100,000	100,000
	SUB-TOTAL MEETINGS COMPONENT	630,000	400,000	340,000
	TOTAL ALL COMPONENTS	2,906,761	2,477,371	2,499,808
Overall Evaluation				
All amounts in US\$		Approved FY14	Estimate FY14	Proposed FY15
01	Overall evaluation	-	-	335,000
	TOTAL OVERALL EVALUATION	0	0	335,000
Accreditation				
All amounts in US\$		Approved FY14	Estimate FY14	Proposed FY15
01	Accreditation Panel (fees & conting.)	272,000	278,975	300,000
02	Accreditation Panel/Staff (travel)	160,000	160,000	160,000
	TOTAL ACCREDITATION	432,000	438,975	460,000
	GRAND TOTAL ALL COMPONENTS & ACCREDITATION	3,338,761	2,916,346	3,294,808