



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/EFC.18/3
2 March 2016

Ethics and Finance Committee
Eighteenth meeting
Bonn, Germany, 15-16 March 2016

Agenda item 4

**OPTIONS FOR THE SECOND PHASE
OF THE EVALUATION OF THE ADAPTATION FUND**

Introduction

1. At its twentieth meeting (April 2013) the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided that an overall evaluation of the Adaptation Fund (the Fund) should be conducted and requested the secretariat to prepare a document to inform the discussion on this overall evaluation, including options for terms of reference (TORs), cost, timing and options for commissioning the evaluation. A decision was taken at the twenty-third meeting (March 2014) to conduct this evaluation as a two-phased evaluation with an oversight conducted by an Independent Review Panel (IRP). Phase 1 evaluation was conducted by an external consortium selected by the IRP, recruited by the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat (the secretariat) following World Bank rules. The process was overseen by an IRP composed of three experts. The Phase 1 Evaluation report was completed in 2015 and the findings and recommendations were presented at the seventeenth meeting of EFC in October 2015.
2. At its seventeenth meeting, the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) recommended that the Board requests the secretariat to prepare options for conducting the second phase (Phase 2) of this overall evaluation.
3. The secretariat has developed the present document which delineates options for conducting the Phase 2 Evaluation of the Fund. After reviewing the document, the EFC may wish to consider the options presented in this document and recommend a way forward to the Board for approval.

Chronology

4. At its thirteenth meeting the Board approved an evaluation framework (AFB/EFC.4/5 – February 2011) for the Fund, discussed whether and when to undertake an overall evaluation for the Fund, and asked the secretariat and the GEF Evaluation Office to explore different options on who would be responsible for implementing the evaluation framework (Decision B.13/20).
5. At its twentieth meeting, the Board decided to request the secretariat to prepare a document for the twelfth meeting of the EFC to inform the discussion of the overall evaluation of the Fund, covering options for the terms of reference, cost, and timing of an overall evaluation, as well as options for commissioning the evaluation.
6. Document AFB/EFC.12/4 was prepared by the Evaluation Office (EO) of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), in its capacity as interim evaluation function for the Fund (Decision B.15/23). This document included a schedule of expected mid-term and final evaluations of the projects/programmes from the portfolio, the implementation status of each project/programme, and the timing of an overall evaluation of the Fund. This document was presented at the EFC twelfth meeting (July 2013).
7. Based on the comments and recommendations of the EFC, the Board – at its twenty-first meeting (July 2013) requested the secretariat to prepare a second document (Decision B.21/17) 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.
8. This second document (AFB/EFC.14/5 – February 2014) reviewed the main aspects of an evaluation, including options for a quality assurance process of the evaluation. It also provided an overview of guiding principles and best practices to implement this type of evaluation including the selection of evaluation teams and two options for selecting an evaluation team (request for proposals and request for tenders). The document identified 4 possible options to conduct an overall evaluation of the Fund, whit strengths, opportunities, weaknesses and threats for each one and an estimated budget:

- a) **Option 1: Process Evaluation.** It would focus on project, programme, and policy implementation and improvements, and evaluate the internal dynamics of the funding institution paying special attention to the Fund's flagship processes – accreditation process, direct access modality, transparency, governance, etc.
- b) **Option 2: Limited Overall Evaluation.** Considering limitations posed by its young portfolio, a limited overall evaluation would include process and performance evaluation of the internal dynamics of the funding institution as well as outcome evaluation of interventions where possible.
- c) **Option 3: Two-phased Evaluation.** Phase 1 would focus on a process/performance evaluation (similar to option 1 above) and Phase 2 would focus on an evaluation of the portfolio including long term outcomes, impacts and sustainability of the Fund's interventions.
- d) **Option 4: Delayed Overall Evaluation.** Delay the overall / comprehensive evaluation until the portfolio reaches maturity. It would then assess progress towards the Fund's objectives, the major achievement and lessons from the Fund's implementation and formulate recommendations for potential improvement.

9. This document was reviewed by the Board at its twenty-third meeting (March 2014). Following discussion on the four options presented in the document, the Board approved option 3 (Two-phased Evaluation) as identified in the document (AFB/EFC.14/5), as well as a request for EFC to propose an Independent Review Panel (IRP) consisting of three members (i) an evaluation specialist (ii) an adaptation specialist and (iii) a representative from civil society (Decision B. 23/18). Responsibilities of the IRP were detailed in TORs; they included the review of the final TOR for the evaluation - which was to include elements of the scope of Decision 2/CMP.9 for the second review of the Fund¹ - select the evaluation team and provide quality assurance during the evaluation process.

10. The Board decided to appoint Ms. Eva Lithman, Mr. Simon Anderson, and Dr. Doreen Stabinsky to an independent review panel (IRP) for the Fund's overall evaluation through an inter-
sessional decision of the Board (Decision B.23-24/4 – May 2014).

11. The TORs for Phase 1 of the Evaluation of the Fund were drafted by the secretariat, reviewed by the IRP, and submitted to the Board for its approval. The TORs were approved through an inter-
sessional decision of the Board (Decision B.23-24/10 – July 2014).

12. A consortium - Tango International and the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) - was recruited to conduct the Phase 1 evaluation of the Fund. An inception report summarized the inception phase of this exercise and was submitted to the secretariat in November 2014. It presented the approach to be used to conduct this phase 1 evaluation, which was aligned with the TORs. It included an evaluation matrix which defined the detailed scope of work for this phase 1 evaluation.

13. Preliminary findings were presented by the Lead Evaluator at the sixteenth EFC meeting on April 8, 2015. The final report of the Phase 1 evaluation was completed in August 2015. This report was reviewed by the EFC at its seventeenth meeting (October 2015) and based on the recommendations from the EFC, the Board – at its twenty-sixth meeting (October 2015) - requested the secretariat to prepare a management response to the Evaluation of the Fund (stage I) and to

¹ The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) decided to undertake a second review of the Fund in accordance with the TOR contained in the annex to Decision 2/CMP.9. The objective of this second review is to ensure the effectiveness, sustainability and adequacy of the operation of the Fund, with a view to the CMP adopting an appropriate decision on this matter at CMP 10. The scope of the second review of the Fund will cover the progress made to date and lessons learned in the operationalization and implementation of the Fund, and will focus on, inter alia:

- a) The provision of sustainable, predictable and adequate financial resources, including the potential diversification of revenue streams, to fund concrete adaptation projects and programmes that are country driven and based on the needs, views and priorities of eligible Parties;
- b) Lessons learned from the application of the access modalities of the Fund;
- c) The institutional linkages and relations, as appropriate, between the Fund and other institutions, in particular institutions under the Convention;
- d) The institutional arrangements for the Fund, in particular the arrangements with the interim secretariat and the interim trustee.

prepare options for conducting phase 2 of the evaluation (Decision B. 26/30). This document presents such options to the EFC as requested by the Board.

Status of the Fund's Portfolio

14. At the time of initiating the phase 1 evaluation, the portfolio of the Fund included 23 projects, which were all still under implementation; 4 of them were approved in 2010, 13 in 2011, 5 in 2012 and 1 in 2013. Few mid-term evaluations (MTE) were available and no final evaluations were conducted. As of September 2015², the portfolio grew to 48 projects representing a total approved grant of US\$318 million, which includes 14 projects implemented by National Implementing Entities (NIEs) and 34 implemented by Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs). In addition, the Fund also approved 14 project formulation grants.

15. A review of the progress reports as well as evaluation reports indicates that 30 projects have produced their first Project Progress Reports (PPRs), 24 their second PPRs, 14 their third PPRs, 4 their fourth PPRs, 1 its fifth, sixth and seventh PPRs. In addition, 10 mid-term reviews are also available and one final evaluation. On the other hand, 18 projects have not produced any progress reports yet (see *Annex 2*).

Review of the Selected Option: Option 3 - Two-phased Evaluation

16. At its twenty-third meeting (March 2014), the Board approved the third option – a two-phased evaluation – for the overall evaluation of the Fund. Phase 1 was to assess whether the operational design and logic corresponds with actual operations, and identifies results of implementation of such operations. Phase 2 was to review the progress toward the Fund's objectives, assess the long term results of the portfolio, including the sustainability of the Fund's interventions, and formulate recommendations for potential improvement. This option assumes a linkage between phase 1 and 2 and phase 2 should be undertaken when the portfolio has matured.

17. An advantage of this approach identified when this option was selected was that more projects and programmes will be completed by the time Phase 2 of this evaluation will be underway, which will provide more information on long-term outcomes and impacts and the possibility to identify lessons learned. On the other hand, it was identified that the risk of a time lag between the 2 phases may render the first phase results inadequate for analysis during the second phase.

Brief Summary of Phase 1 Evaluation

Objectives of Phase 1

18. Phase 1 was a process evaluation intended to inform discussions and decisions on the Fund's operational aspects. It assessed how well the Fund's implicit or assumed logic and the design are working in relation to key processes including:

- Resource mobilization related processes;
- Decision-making processes;
- Resource allocation;
- Access to funding;
- Project/programme cycle;
- Knowledge management processes at the Fund level.

19. This phase 1 evaluation also included the identification of good practices, of processes that require improvement, and to recommend how these improvements can be carried out.

20. The Phase 1 evaluation focused on the Fund's operational performance from its establishment through June 2015. It measured how well the Fund has been operating by assessing its operations and determining whether its target population is served. It identified 5 key questions:

² Ethics and Finance Committee, September 24, 2015, *Annual Performance Report for the Fiscal Year 2015*

- How relevant is the Fund's design to stakeholder policies and priorities?
- How effective are the Fund's main processes?
- How efficient are the Fund's main processes?
- How sustainable is the Fund?
- Is the Fund on-track to achieve intended outcomes at the process level?

Key Findings of Phase 1 Evaluation

21. The evaluation found that the Fund's design was coherent and that it has been contributing directly to various adaptation work streams and complements the role of other climate funds by extending access to all developing countries. The major features of the Fund remain relevant and appropriate with the exception of its resource mobilization strategy. While appropriate at the outset, the main income source (2% share of proceeds from Certified Emission Reduction (CERs)) has been ineffective due to the collapse of carbon market prices.

22. It also found that the Fund is quickly becoming an effective institution capable of achieving its ambitious objective and outlined that the Fund's unique niche is to be at the nexus of innovation and learning about concrete adaptation activities and access modalities. The Fund's main processes are generally effective and demonstrate steady improvement, with the exception of resource mobilization and knowledge management. Inadequate allocation of resources to knowledge management undermines the Fund's short-term effectiveness and long-term significance. Nevertheless, the secretariat has achieved a relatively flat organizational structure and a working environment that encourages the free-flow of ideas, thinking outside the box, and collaborative versus competitive efforts; it is characterized as a learning institution. This has significantly enhanced the secretariat's effectiveness and is, alongside the team's passionate commitment to reducing vulnerability, the reason it has achieved so much despite a small and unpredictable budget. However, the secretariat is overstretched and urgently requires more resources to meet its strategic responsibilities; particularly if responsibilities increase beyond current core functions.

23. The Fund and its institutional arrangements provide good value for money. Most of the Fund's main processes are reasonably efficient, with some room for improvement through streamlined decision-making. The accreditation process will benefit greatly from a recent decision to create a small entity window and upcoming discussions on how to improve efficiency. The World Bank, acting as interim trustee, has performed its core functions in a transparent and efficient manner. Cooperation with stakeholders, including civil society, has contributed to the efficiency of Fund operations; the Fund NGO Network plays a "bridging role" between the Board and civil society. The Fund fosters efficient communication with eligible Party governments and entities through Designated Authorities.

24. Uncertainties surrounding the Kyoto Protocol and carbon markets pose a significant, structural threat to the sustainability, adequacy, and predictability of resources for the Fund. Ambitious post-2020 emissions targets could improve and stabilize CER prices. However, if this does not happen, the Fund's financial and institutional sustainability will be jeopardized. Additional revenue-streams from the first international transfers of Assigned Amount Units and the issuance of Emissions Reduction Units will be helpful but fall short of raising the Fund's resource base to appropriate levels. Based on experience to date, voluntary contributions by Annex 1 Parties are also not expected to provide a reliable solution.

Recommendations Made by the Phase 1 Evaluation

25. On the basis of these findings, the Evaluation Team recommended a series of 13 recommendations:

- Review the experience of other funds to identify good practices to strengthen vulnerability targeting and formulate clear guidance for the Fund's applicants
- Recruit additional senior secretariat staff to address the capacity constraints to undertake effective knowledge management and resource mobilization
- Continue to improve the accreditation process, with specific focus on early identification of

fiduciary risks.

- Strengthen the policy and guidelines for an inclusive and transparent selection of NIEs.
- Develop and implement a comprehensive gender policy based on a review of other funds' gender policies.
- Review the experience of other funds to identify good practices in organizational performance monitoring.
- Delegate approval of project/program proposals to the Fund's dedicated secretariat.
- Delegate more approval and other decision-making responsibilities to committees and panels, especially the EFC and Accreditation Panel
- Undertake a study to assess whether the World Bank will continue to provide the best value added if a fee-based approach is introduced
- Adopt a more consistent and less discretionary approach to closed meetings, and revise the rules regarding active observers
- Organize a joint review with the GCF to explore the best modality for the Fund to access a reliable stream of funding from the GCF
- Designate the current Board member seat on the PPCR governing body for the secretariat.
- Develop and implement a robust, multi-year resource mobilization strategy that specifies regular trust replenishment periods.

Implementation of Phase 2 Evaluation

Objectives of Phase 2

26. The Phase 2 evaluation will be an Outcome Evaluation focusing on the Fund's overall results. It will measure the fund's results and how well its goals have been attained starting at the projects level. The main objective of this phase is to provide the Board with evaluative evidence on the progress towards the Fund's objectives as well as the main achievements and lessons learned from the implementation of the Fund so far through projects, and to provide recommendations on the way forward for the Fund. The phase 2 evaluation therefore focuses on the overarching question:

“What are the achievements of the Fund since it was established and what are the key lessons that can be drawn for the future?”

27. Phase 1 of this overall evaluation of the Fund was a process evaluation of the Fund's operational aspects, including the review of key processes: Resource mobilization related processes; Decision-making processes; Resource allocation; Access to funding; Project/programme cycle; Knowledge management processes at the Fund level. It focused on the governance and management of the Fund including the accreditation process of Implementing Entities and how the Fund has piloted direct access, and the financing of the Fund through proceeds from CERs and other sources. It measured how well the Fund has been operating by assessing its operations and determining whether its target population is served.

28. Phase 2 evaluation will target the project level; that is the projects funded by the Fund. It will assess the performance and achievements of the Fund at the project level, using aggregated data along five standard evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and results (outcomes and impact) and their sustainability. Within each of these criteria, the evaluation will identify and focus on a set of key areas of interest. The key questions of the evaluation are:

- **Relevance:** How relevant is the Fund programming and its portfolio of projects to the guidance of the CMP, and the adaptation to climate change of recipient countries' environmental and sustainable development agendas and programmes?
- **Efficiency:** How efficient are the resources provided by the Fund portfolio converted into expected results? How efficient is the governance and decision making in the Fund portfolio including the implementing entities, and to what extent has the accreditation process of implementing entities met its objectives? How efficient is the Fund's project cycle and management of funds and resources, including the time of different project stages?
- **Effectiveness:** How effective is the Fund portfolio in achieving expected outcomes or

progress towards achieving expected outcomes and impact? Have the concrete adaptation measures supported by the Fund portfolio addressed the adverse impacts of and risks posed by climate change? How effective is the Fund as an international organization including providing direct access to funds by developing countries?

- **Results/Sustainability:** What are the positive and negative, foreseen or unforeseen effects produced by the Fund portfolio to this point, including results already achieved by the fund and its portfolio, and how sustainable are these results?

Audience of the Evaluation

29. As per Phase 1, the main audience of this overall evaluation includes all the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP), Parties to the UNFCCC, development partners, the Board (EFC, Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC), and Accreditation Panel (AP)), the secretariat, the trustee, Implementing Agencies (MIEs, NIEs, RIEs), executing entities, communities implementing and participating in interventions of the Fund, Designated Authorities for project / programme submission, and Fund's observers (UNFCCC Parties, NGOs and other Civil Society Organizations and International Organizations).

30. Evaluation results will be relevant to inform the Fund's second review, processes and future development of the Fund and other climate change financing mechanisms (LDCF, SCCF, CIF), specially the Green Climate Fund. Evaluation results can be useful by Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, the UNFCCC at large, developing countries, donors, and agencies and institutions working on adaptation to climate change and climate finance.

Governance and Organization of Phase 2 Evaluation

Evaluation Framework Principles

31. As per the Evaluation Framework (AFB/EFC.12/4 – June 2013) approved by the Board (Decision B.13/20), roles and responsibilities for evaluation were identified for the Board, the secretariat, the EFC and Implementing Entities. Furthermore, this framework established requirements for how the Fund activities should be evaluated in line with international principles, norms and standards, including a set of principles:

- Independence from policy making process and management;
- Impartiality: giving accounts from all stakeholders;
- Partnerships: between implementing entities, governments, civil society and beneficiaries;
- Credibility based on reliable data, observations, methods and analysis;
- Transparency: clear communication concerning the purpose of the evaluation, its intended use and data and analysis;
- Disclosure: lessons shared with general public;
- Ethics: regard for the welfare, beliefs, and customs of those involved or affected;
- Avoid conflict of interest;
- Competencies and Capacities: selection of the required expertise for evaluations;
- Utility: serve decision-making processes and information needs of the intended users.

Quality Assurance

32. According to the OECD-DAC guidelines, evaluation standards highly recommend the use of a quality assurance process for the evaluation. Quality control and assurance is applied throughout the evaluation, from its design to its implementation and completion. A quality assurance process could include comments and reviews of the specific TORs for the evaluation, develop criteria for selecting the evaluation team, participate in the selection process of the evaluation team as well as reviews and comments on the preliminary, draft and final reports, specifically on conclusions and recommendations.

33. The quality control function could be performed by peer reviewers, a reference group or an

Tasks / Months	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Project Desk Review				■	■	■				
M&E Systems Assessment				■	■	■				
Field Visits					■	■	■			
Analysis										
Data analysis						■	■			
Draft Report							■	■		
Consultation Workshop								■		
Report / presentation to the Board										
Final Document									■	
Presentation to the Board										■
Dissemination										■

Possible Options to Implement Phase 2

39. The intent of this section is to present the main possible options for conducting the Phase 2 evaluation of the Fund. It is based on the analysis conducted by the secretariat, on discussions at the EFC and Board levels on evaluation matters, including the consideration of the Board-approved evaluation framework (AFB/EFC.4/5), the “Options for an Overall Comprehensive Evaluation of the AF” (AFB/EFC.12/4) and the “Options for an Evaluation of the Fund” (AFB/EFC.14/5), and on preliminary discussions with the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (GEF-IEO). It takes also into consideration practices and lessons learned from the phase 1 evaluation.

40. For each option, a description is given followed by an estimated budget, strengths and opportunities, and weaknesses and threats. It is also noted that the cost of any option to conduct Phase 2 Evaluation is entirely contingent upon the scope and nature of evaluation activities, evaluation team member skills, methodology, and constraints of the analysis.

41. In both cases, a firm or consortium would be recruited by the secretariat by request for proposals or by request for tenders, which could follow a request for qualifications or expression of interests following World Bank procurement guidelines and systems. Through a competitive process it is anticipated that the recruited evaluation team would be highly qualified in evaluation and climate change adaptation.

Option 1: Phase 2 implemented by an independent firm and overseen by an IRP

42. An IRP would be selected to oversee the evaluation. Its role would include drafting the TOR for the evaluation, selecting the evaluation team, providing quality assurance during the evaluation process, ensuring the timely delivery of the evaluation by the evaluation firm, coordinating the inputs of the CSO representative (see below), and reporting on progress of the evaluation to the EFC. The IRP would include at least two International Experts (i) an evaluation specialist and (ii) an adaptation specialist, one of them being the IRP Team Leader. Contrary to the first Phase, the IRP Members would be remunerated for their contribution. Indeed, the IRP had stated after the first phase of the evaluation that being “engaged as pro bono is not viable given the responsibilities assigned”. As a result, the comparison below is based on the fact that the IRP members would be remunerated for their work. In addition to those IRP members, a representative from civil society will be invited to participate into the discussions held at the IRP level to ensure that CSO views are taken into account during the evaluation process.

43. The secretariat would provide administrative support to the IRP and to the evaluation firm (e.g. processing the firm and IRP's contracts and payments, arranging their travels, etc.).

Estimated Budget

44. An estimated budget for this option ranges from US\$344,750 to 395,300. See Annex 3 for further details.

Strengths and Opportunities

- a) An independent firm and an IRP will ensure good independence of the evaluation process;
- b) Evaluation process and outputs overseen by a group of international experts (IRP);
- c) In comparison with the first phase of the evaluation or the option 2 described below, this option could be lighter in terms of division of work and evaluation processes;
- d) The role of the Secretariat will be limited to provide administrative support to the IRP and the evaluation firm.

Weaknesses and Threats

- a) Potentially slightly more expensive option, pending on final estimates of option 2

Option 2: Phase 2 implemented by an independent firm overseen by the Secretariat, with quality assurance ensured by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office

45. The GEF-IEO has extensive experience in conducting overall comprehensive evaluations and thus has a toolbox at its facility to address the types of questions for this type of evaluation, plus the experience to use this toolbox. As an independent evaluation function that reports directly to the GEF Council for its GEF-related work, the GEF-IEO has grown from outsourcing the Third Overall Performance Study (OPS3, 2005) to conducting the Fourth and Fifth Overall Performance (OPS4, 2009 and OPS5, 2014). The cost of OPS4 was US\$ 2.2 million and OPS5 was US\$ 1.2 million. In addition to being the independent evaluation function for the GEF Trust Fund, the GEF-IEO is also fulfilling the evaluation function of both the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF). From the inception of the Fund to September 2011, the GEF-IEO provided cross-support to the secretariat in drafting evaluation related documents. At the fifteenth meeting of the Board (September 2011), a decision was taken to entrust the evaluation function of the Fund to the GEF-IEO, for an interim three-year period. In March 2014, the former Director of the GEF-IEO decided to withdraw his office from this function. A new Director of the GEF-IEO has been in place since September 2014. Under his supervision, a senior evaluation officer from the GEF-IEO would provide quality assurance of the evaluation, in coordination with the secretariat.

46. The secretariat will be responsible for drafting the TOR of the evaluation, selecting the evaluation firm, managing the work of the evaluation firm, coordinating the quality assurance inputs of the GEF IEO, ensuring the timely delivery of the evaluation by the firm, and reporting on progress of the evaluation to the EFC.

Estimated Budget

47. An estimated budget for this option ranges from US\$ 316,250 to 355,300, plus any GEF IEO fees if applicable. See Annex 3 for further details

Strengths and Opportunities

- a) Would benefit from the GEF IEO experience in overall comprehensive evaluations, knowledge of the related trust funds such as the GEF Trust Fund, the LDCF and the SCCF for which the GEF-IEO is the evaluation function and experience of the LDCF and the SCCF. As such, the involvement of the GEF IEO would ensure quality assurance to the evaluation process;
- b) Potentially slightly cheaper option, pending on final estimates

Weaknesses and Threats

- a) The secretariat will need to oversee the evaluation process (including, but not limited to: drafting the TOR for the evaluation, selecting the evaluation firm, managing its work and ensuring timely delivery of the evaluation, coordinating the inputs of the GEF IEO, and reporting on progress of the evaluation to the EFC);
- b) Since the evaluation would be overseen by the Secretariat, the independence of the evaluation process is likely to be suboptimal;
- c) Limited technical expertise of the GEF IEO in climate change adaptation;
- d) More complex division of work and evaluation processes than option 1.

Summary of Options

48. The table in annex 1 provides a summary of the two options.

Annex 1: Summary of options

	Description	Est. time frame (months)	Est. Budget (USD)	Summary of Strengths and Opportunities	Summary of Weaknesses and Threats
Option 1: implemented by an independent firm and overseen by an IRP	A firm or Consortium would be recruited to conduct the evaluation. An IRP would be selected to ensure the quality of the Phase 2 Evaluation process.	8-10	344,750 - 395,300	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An independent firm and an IRP will ensure good independence of the evaluation process; • Evaluation process and outputs overseen by a group of international experts (IRP); • In comparison with the first phase of the evaluation or the option 2 described below, this option could be lighter in terms of division of work and evaluation processes; • The role of the Secretariat will be limited to provide administrative support to the IRP and the evaluation firm. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potentially slightly more expensive option, pending on final estimates of option 2
Option 2: implemented by an independent firm overseen by the Secretariat, with quality assurance ensured by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office	A firm or Consortium would be recruited to conduct the evaluation. The secretariat would oversee the evaluation process. The GEF IEO would ensure the quality of the Phase 2 Evaluation.	8-10	316,250 - 355,300 + GEF IEO fees if applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would benefit from the GEF IEO experience in overall comprehensive evaluations, knowledge of the related trust funds such as the GEF Trust Fund, the LDCF and the SCCF for which the GEF-IEO is the evaluation function and experience of the LDCF and the SCCF. As such, the involvement of the GEF IEO would ensure quality assurance to the evaluation process; • Potentially slightly cheaper option, pending on final estimates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The secretariat will need to oversee the evaluation process (including, but not limited to: drafting the TOR for the evaluation, selecting the evaluation firm, managing its work and ensuring timely delivery of the evaluation, coordinating the inputs of the GEF IEO, and reporting on progress of the evaluation to the EFC); • Since the evaluation would be overseen by the Secretariat, the independence of the evaluation process is likely to be suboptimal; • Limited technical expertise of the GEF IEO in climate change adaptation; • More complex division of work and evaluation processes than option 1.

Annex 2: List of projects approved by the Fund through June 30, 2015

	Country	Title	Implementing Entity	Approved Amount (USD)	Approval Date	Project Start	Progress/Evaluation Reports Available
1	Senegal	Adaptation to Coastal Erosion in Vulnerable Areas	CSE	\$8,619,000	17/9/2010	21/1/2011	1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th semiannual PPR, MTR, final evaluation.
2	Honduras	Addressing Climate Change Risks on Water Resources in Honduras: Increased Systemic Resilience and Reduced Vulnerability of the Urban Poor	UNDP	\$5,620,300	17/9/2010	21/6/2011	1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th PPR MTR
3	Nicaragua	Reduction of Risks and Vulnerability Based on Flooding and Droughts in the Estero Real River Watershed	UNDP	\$5,500,950	15/12/2010	23/6/2011	1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th PPR MTR, Final Evaluation (in Spanish only)
4	Pakistan	Reducing Risks and Vulnerabilities from Glacier Lake Outburst Floods in Northern Pakistan -	UNDP	\$3,906,000	15/12/2010	15/11/2011	1st, 2nd, 3 rd PPR MTR
5	Ecuador	Enhancing resilience of communities to the adverse effects of climate change on food security, in Pichincha Province and the Jubones River basin -	WFP	\$7,449,468	18/3/2011	29/11/2011	1st, 2nd, 3rd PPR MTR
6	Eritrea	Climate Change Adaptation Programme In Water and Agriculture In Anseba Region, Eritrea -	UNDP	\$6,520,850	18/3/2011	6/11/2012	1st, 2nd PPR
7	Solomon Islands	Enhancing resilience of communities in Solomon Islands to the adverse effects of climate change in agriculture and food security	UNDP	\$5,533,500	18/3/2011	28/6/2011	1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4 th PPR MTE
8	Mongolia	Ecosystem Based Adaptation Approach to Maintaining Water Security in Critical Water Catchments in Mongolia	UNDP	\$5,500,000	22/6/2011	15/6/2012	1st, 2nd, 3rd PPR MTR
9	Maldives	Increasing climate resilience through an Integrated Water Resource Management Programme in HA. Ihavandhoo, ADh. Mahibadhoo and GDh. Gadhdhoo Island	UNDP	\$8,989,225	22/6/2011	20/6/2012	1st, 2nd PPR (3rd under review)

	Country	Title	Implementing Entity	Approved Amount (USD)	Approval Date	Project Start	Progress/Evaluation Reports Available
10	Turkmenistan	Addressing climate change risks to farming systems in Turkmenistan at national and community level	UNDP	\$2,929,500	22/6/2011	22/5/2012	1st, 2nd, 3rd PPR
11	Mauritius	Climate Change Adaptation Programme in the Coastal Zone of Mauritius	UNDP	\$9,119,240	16/9/2011	30/8/2012	1st, 2nd, 3rd PPR MTR
12	Georgia	Developing Climate Resilient Flood and Flash Flood Management Practices to Protect Vulnerable Communities of Georgia	UNDP	\$5,316,500	14/12/2011	4/7/2012	1st, 2nd, 3rd PPR MTE
13	Tanzania	Implementation Of Concrete Adaptation Measures To Reduce Vulnerability Of Livelihood and Economy Of Coastal Communities In Tanzania	UNEP	\$5,008,564	14/12/2011	29/10/2012	1st, 2nd PPR (3rd under review)
14	Cook Islands	Strengthening the Resilience of our Islands and our Communities to Climate Change	UNDP	\$5,381,600	14/12/2011	4/7/2012	1st, 2nd, 3rd PPR
15	Uruguay	Uruguay: Helping Small Farmers Adapt to Climate Change	ANII	\$9,967,678	14/12/2011	22/10/2012	1st, 2nd PPR
16	Samoa	Enhancing Resilience of Samoa's Coastal Communities to Climate Change	UNDP	\$8,732,351	14/12/2011	28/1/2013	1st, 2nd PPR
17	Madagascar	Madagascar: Promoting Climate Resilience in the Rice Sector	UNEP	\$5,104,925	14/12/2011	24/10/2012	1st, 2nd PPR
18	Papua New Guinea	Enhancing adaptive capacity of communities to climate change-related floods in the North Coast and Islands Region of Papua New Guinea	UNDP	\$6,530,373	16/3/2012	26/7/2012	1st, 2nd PPR (3rd under review)
19	Cambodia	Enhancing Climate Resilience of Rural Communities Living in Protected Areas of Cambodia	UNEP	\$4,954,273	28/6/2012	21/5/2013	1st, 2nd PPR
20	Colombia	Reducing Risk and Vulnerability to Climate Change in the Region of La Depression Momposina in Colombia	UNDP	\$8,518,307	28/6/2012	21/3/2013	1st, 2nd PPR

	Country	Title	Implementing Entity	Approved Amount (USD)	Approval Date	Project Start	Progress/Evaluation Reports Available
21	Djibouti	Developing Agro-Pastoral Shade Gardens as an Adaptation Strategy for Poor Rural Communities in Djibouti	UNDP	\$4,658,556	28/6/2012	13/3/2013	1st, 2nd PPR
22	Egypt	Building Resilient Food Security Systems to Benefit the Southern Egypt Region	WFP	\$6,904,318	28/6/2012	31/3/2013	1st, 2nd PPR MTR
23	Jamaica	Enhancing the Resilience of the Agricultural Sector and Coastal Areas to Protect Livelihoods and Improve Food Security	Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ)	\$9,965,000	28/6/2012	2/11/2012	1st, 2nd PPR (2nd under review)
24	Lebanon	Climate Smart Agriculture: Enhancing Adaptive Capacity of the Rural Communities in Lebanon (AgriCAL)	IFAD	\$7,860,825	28/6/2012	Not Started	None
25	Mauritania	Enhancing Resilience of Communities to the Adverse Effects of Climate Change on Food Security in Mauritania	WFP	\$7,803,605	28/6/2012	14/8/2014	1st PPR (under review)
26	Sri Lanka	Addressing Climate Change Impacts on Marginalized Agricultural Communities Living in the Mahaweli River Basin of Sri Lanka	WFP	\$7,989,727	14/12/2012	4/11/2013	1st PPR
27	Argentina	Increasing Climate Resilience and Enhancing Sustainable Land Management in the Southwest of the Buenos Aires Province	WB	\$4,296,817	14/12/2012	11/06/2015	None
28	Argentina	Enhancing the Adaptive Capacity and Increasing Resilience of Small-size Agriculture Producers of the Northeast of Argentina	UCAR	\$5,640,000	4/4/2013	24/10/2013	1st, 2nd PPR (2nd under review)
29	Guatemala	Climate change resilient production landscapes and socioeconomic networks advanced in Guatemala	UNDP	\$5,425,000	14/09/2013	Not started	None
30	Rwanda	Reducing Vulnerability to Climate Change in North West Rwanda through Community based adaptation.	MINERENA	\$9,969,619	01/11/2013	2/6/2014	1st PPR

	Country	Title	Implementing Entity	Approved Amount (USD)	Approval Date	Project Start	Progress/Evaluation Reports Available
31	Cuba	Reduction of vulnerability to coastal flooding through ecosystem-based adaptation in the south of Artemisa and Mayabeque provinces	UNDP	\$6,067,320	20/02/2014	11/09/2014	1st PPR
32	Seychelles	Ecosystem Based Adaptation to Climate Change in Seychelles	UNDP	\$6,455,750	20/02/2014	30/10/2014	1st PPR (under review)
33	Uzbekistan	Developing Climate Resilience of Farming Communities in the drought prone parts of Uzbekistan	UNDP	\$5,415,103	20/02/2014	26/05/2014	1st PPR
34	Myanmar	Addressing Climate Change Risks on Water Resources and Food Security in the Dry Zone of Myanmar	UNDP	\$7,909,026	27/02/2014	17/02/2015	None
35	Belize	Implement priority ecosystem-based marine conservation and climate adaptation measures to strengthen the climate resilience of the Belize Barrier Reef System	WB	\$6,000,000	18/08/2014	17/03/2015	None
36	India	Conservation and Management of Coastal Resources as a Potential Adaptation Strategy for Sea Level Rise	NABARD	\$689,264	10/10/2014	23/06/2015	None
37	India	Enhancing Adaptive Capacity and Increasing Resilience of Small and Marginal Farmers in Purulia and Bankura Districts of West Bengal	NABARD	\$2,510,854	10/10/2014	28/05/2015	None
38	Costa Rica	Reducing the vulnerability by focusing on critical sectors (agriculture, water resources, and coastlines) in order to reduce the negative impacts of climate change and improve the resilience of these sectors	FUNDECOOPERACION	\$9,970,000	10/10/2014	Not Started	None
39	Kenya	Integrated Programme To Build Resilience To Climate Change & Adaptive Capacity Of Vulnerable Communities In Kenya	NEMA	\$9,998,302	10/10/2014	Not Started	None
40	South Africa	Building Resilience in the Greater uMngeni Catchment	SANBI	\$7,495,055	10/10/2014	Not Started	None

	Country	Title	Implementing Entity	Approved Amount (USD)	Approval Date	Project Start	Progress/Evaluation Reports Available
41	South Africa	Taking Adaptation to the Ground: A Small Grants Facility for Enabling Local Level Responses to Climate Change	SANBI	\$2,442,682	10/10/2014	Not Started	None
42	Ghana	Increased resilience to climate change in Northern Ghana through the management of water resources and diversification of livelihoods	UNDP	\$8,293,972	05/03/2015	Not Started	None
43	Mali	Programme Support for Climate Change Adaptation in the vulnerable regions of Mopti and Timbuktu	UNDP	\$8,533,348	25/03/2015	Not Started	None
44	Nepal	Adapting to climate induced threats to food production and food security in the Karnali Region of Nepal	WFP	\$9,527,160	01/04/2015	Not Started	None
45	Indonesia	Adapting to Climate Change for Improved Food Security in West Nusa Tenggara Province	WFP	\$5,995,666	11/05/2015	Not Started	None
46	Jordan	Increasing the resilience of poor and vulnerable communities to climate change impacts in Jordan through implementing innovative projects in water and agriculture in support of adaptation to climate change	MOPIC	\$9,226,000	10/04/2015	Not Started	None
47	Morocco	Climate changes adaptation project in oasis zones – PACC-ZO	ADA	\$9,970,000	10/04/2015	Not Started	None
48	India	Building adaptive capacities of small inland fishers for climate resilience and livelihood security, Madhya Pradesh	NABARD	\$1,790,500	10/04/2015	Not Started	None
			TOTAL	\$318,006,073			

Source: AF-EFC, September 24, 2015, *Annual Performance Report for the Fiscal Year 2015*

Annex 3: Estimated budget per option

Budget Item	Estimated budget Option 1 (USD)	Estimated budget Option 2 (USD)
Evaluation team fees	160,000 – 190,000 (one senior, one middle level officer and two junior evaluation professionals)	160,000 - 190,000 (one senior, one middle level officer and two junior evaluation professionals)
IRP/GEF-IEO fees	25,000 – 35,000 (1 expert for 15 days each and one Team Leader for 20 days)	To be determined by GEF IEO
Other fees: in country consultants (case studies, in person interviews)	25,000-30,000	25,000-30,000
Travel	40,000	40,000
Communications (telephone calls, etc.) (assumes use of conference services and web base survey platform)	2,500-3,000	2,500-3,000
Workshops	10,000 (One)	10,000 (One)
Translation of document	30,000	30,000
Supplies and equipment	20,000	20,000
Sub total	312,500-358,000	287,500-323,000
Other + Contingency (10%)	32,250 – 37,300	28,750-32,300
Total	344,750 – 395,300	316,250-355,300 + GEF IEO fees if applicable