AFB/PPRC.20/30
3 March 2017

Project and Programme Review Committee
Twentieth meeting
Bonn, Germany, 14-15 March 2017

Agenda item 11

OPTIONS FOR POST-IMPLEMENTATION LEARNING AND IMPACT EVALUATION OF ADAPTATION FUND PROJECTS AND PROGRAMMES

Background

1. At its nineteenth meeting (October 2016), the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) of the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) discussed the importance of the follow-up of projects and programmes once they have been completed, including their post-implementation evaluation. Various solutions and timeframes for conducting post-completion assessments were discussed. One solution discussed was to encourage Implementing Entities (IEs) to conduct a medium term post-completion assessment with a small grant. Another option would be to award grants for such evaluations to civil society organizations.

2. Based on the above discussion, and a subsequent PPRC recommendation, the Board decided to request the secretariat to propose, at the twentieth meeting of the PPRC*, options for how post-implementation learning and impact evaluation could be arranged for Adaptation Fund projects and programmes, taking into account on-going discussions on the evaluation function of the Adaptation Fund, as well as Phase II of the evaluation.*

(Decision B.28/32)

3. Pursuant to the Board Decision B.28/32, the secretariat has developed this document, which presents options for how ex-post evaluations of Adaptation Fund projects and programmes could be arranged. The document begins with an introduction of overarching points for consideration followed by a summary of challenges for conducting longer-term assessments of climate adaptation projects, and key elements for framing guidance on conducting longer-term assessments. It then presents options for potential timeframes of the assessment based on Development Finance Institution (DFI) practice in this area and an overview of the landscape of ex-post evaluation by Multilateral Development Banks(MDB) / Development Finance Institutions is presented in Annex 2. Finally, it presents options for the way the Adaptation Fund could arrange longer-term assessments of completed projects and options for funding arrangements. A summary of the options discussed is presented in Annex 1.

Introduction

4. As the impacts of climate change materialize increasingly over the coming decades, results of the assessments of long-term achievements would require evaluations to extend over periods much longer than those associated with the project and programme lifetimes. Development evaluation is an existing overarching approach to address complex evaluation problems and contexts which can be suitable for climate change adaptation. Given the paucity of examples for long-term evaluations of completed projects in climate change adaptation, adaptation evaluation can learn from the experiences in other fields. In surveying options for longer-term evaluations for the Adaptation Fund, there are several key points for consideration:

- A good evaluation can be costly and the financial implications of hiring external evaluators need to be considered.
- The interest, financial resources and capacity of implementing entities to hire external evaluators in cases where they do not already have an independent evaluation unit.
- Within the context of adaptation, the two aspects of contending with long term horizons are (i) Complex adaptation interventions take a long time to be effective (e.g. Ecosystem Based Adaptation (EBA) where it takes time for trees to grow and perform their ecosystem function) and their impacts can arise years after the intervention takes place and (ii) Adaptation results can only be judged as the impact of climate change on weather-related events in a specific setting

becomes clearer over time (e.g. farmers with access to drought resilient crops managing to sustain yields despite increasing incidents of droughts).

- Given that long-term outcomes and impacts will rarely materialize within the relatively short timeframe of an intervention, the longer term evaluation will necessitate an additional workload for performing interim process assessments and ex-post evaluations than in conventional (i.e. short-term timeframes) Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E).

- Countries are increasingly focusing their adaptation efforts on multi-scale, cross-sectoral and integrated strategies, moving away from an isolated project focus thus making attribution challenging.

Purpose

5. Assessments of longer-term outcomes of completed adaptation projects are way to assess whether positive outcomes are sustained beyond the project timelines. Sustainability and impact are the main criteria for this evaluation. Assessing long-term outcomes of adaptation may address the question of sustainability in terms of the wider implications of adaptation. The main evaluation questions common to ex-post evaluations that maybe answered in the post completion evaluation of adaptation projects are “is the effect continuing without external support after the end of cooperation?” and “was long-term impact produced?”.

Challenges

6. The current section explores the challenges to assessing Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) in the long term and highlights steps taken to the Adaptation Fund to innovate in this relatively new field. Majority of the challenges for evaluating longer-term outcomes of climate change adaptation stem from inherent challenges in evaluating adaptation interventions.[1] Based on a review of the existing literature on the topic and international agencies’ experience in implementing adaptation projects, the following challenges stand out.[2]

(a) Lack of a standard ‘off the shelf’ methodology

7. There is a lack of a well-established standard ‘best practice’ M&E methodology and indicators for adaptation interventions, as is generally available for many regular (i.e. non-climate change focused) development interventions. Unlike development interventions where there is a significant pool of well-established methodologies and ‘best practices’ to draw on, M&E for adaptation interventions often requires the adjustment of standard development indicators (or even the definition of new ones) and/or combinations of indicators to obtain a reasonable assessment of the impacts of the individual project or programme.

(b) Lack of a standard adaptation metric: indicators as proxies

8. There is no standard metric for adaptation, which makes tracking and aggregating results across different sectors and localities very challenging. Identifying the best possible proxy outcome indicator is therefore a key challenge in designing M&E frameworks.

[1] Bours, D., McGinn, C. and Pringle, P. (2014), *Guidance note 1: twelve reasons why climate change adaptation M&E is challenging,* SEA Change CoP and UKCIP, available at: http://www.ukcip.org.uk/wp-content/PDFs/MandE-Guidance-Note1.pdf
[2] Bours, Dennis, Colleen McGinn, and Patrick Pringle. "Monitoring & evaluation for climate change adaptation: A synthesis of tools, frameworks and approaches." *SEA Change Community of Practice and UKCIP, Phnom Penh, Cambodia, and Oxford, UK.* (2013) Page 3. Available at: http://www.ukcip.org.uk/wp-content/PDFs/SEA-change-UKCIP-MandE-review.pdf

9. The Adaptation Fund has made some strides to innovate this field by the adoption of its Results Based Management (RBM) Framework that was approved by the Board in June 2010 (Decision B.10/12).

10. The 'results chain' which is the center of RBM, provides a structured logical model that lays out the sequence and steps necessary to achieve stated objectives - beginning with inputs, which support activities to generate outputs, outcomes and impacts. The second element of the RBM provides a way to present progress towards the achievement of expected results and targets, integrating lessons learned into management decisions and reporting on performance.[3] The Fund's Results Tracker [4] includes long-term goal, outcome, outputs, and a small set of indicators for the Fund as a whole working toward the achievement of the overall goal and outcomes. The Fund's five core indicators allow the Fund to aggregate quantitative indicators for a diverse portfolio (including agriculture, water management, coastal management, rural development, food security, and disaster risk reduction, among others).

(c) Timing

11. Adaptation impacts do not unfold within the range of the project cycle and there is no guarantee that outcomes will turn out as expected. Timeframes for the expected benefits of adaptation interventions are usually much longer than the normal lifetime of standard projects and programmes. This means that paradoxically, impacts will often need to be documented (i.e. early trends observed) before they have full materialized.

(d) Uncertainty and shifting baseline

12. Due to the nature of adaptation as an additional but not easily distinguishable factor in an already dynamic development process, the definition of specific baselines for an isolated adaptation intervention is difficult. Uncertainties affecting the process of climate change adaptation, which are equally unpredictable but not solely dependent on direct physical climate change impacts include population growth, the effect of an increased frequency and intensity of droughts on migration trends, and changes in socio-economic trends and political priorities. Since development investments can have relatively predictable and sustainable outcomes in the absence of climate change impacts, a successful baseline scenario needs to predict accurately not only the physical climate impacts but also the development outcomes under such physical effects. Moreover, specific data needed to construct the baselines can be scattered across many different ministries, departments, sectors and projects.

13. The Adaptation Fund Board, through its guidance for terminal evaluations (Document AFB/EFC.5/5) approved at its fourteenth meeting (Decision B.14/24),[5] has provided guidance on assessing the sustainability/ impacts of its projects. According to the AF guidance document for Project/Programme Terminal Evaluations, the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes and progress towards impact at project/programme completion can be assessed by evaluating risks to sustainability and how risks comprise linkages from outcomes to impacts. The dimensions of risks identified by the guidance document include (i) Financial and economic risks (ii) Socio-political risks (iii) Institutional framework and governance risks and, (iv) Environmental risks.

14. The Adaptation Fund guidance document for Terminal Evaluation (TE) addresses uncertainties on climate change impacts - baselines by recommending evaluations to ask

[3] Results Based Management Framework, available at: https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/AFB.B.8.8_RBM.pdf Pg. 3.
[4] Adaptation Fund Results Tracker Guidance Document, available at: https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AF-ResultstrackerGuidance-final.pdf Pg. 1.
[5] Guidelines for Project/Programme Final Evaluations, available at: https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Guidelines%20for%20Proj_Prog%20Final%20Evaluations%20final%20compressed.pdf

pertinent questions such as – “What is the risk that assessments (vulnerability assessments, existing adaptive capacity assessments, reference and scenario development etc.) would be insufficient to allow interventions to be sustained and linkages to impacts analyzed?” “Was the vulnerability assessment conducted at the beginning of the project appropriate and scientifically based?”.

(e) Attribution

15. Adaptation has a set of very localized conditions that makes it hard to attribute to a single pot of money. The problem of attributing outcomes in the form of increased resilience directly to specific adaptation investments is challenging, as adaptation is inherently a complex process cutting across sectors and levels of interventions. Understanding which adaptation intervention is working and which is not is challenging due to the complex and over-lapping donor-reporting mechanisms. There are many factors that influence the long-term outcome of the project.

Key elements for framing guidance on conducting longer-term assessments

16. The elements mentioned below could be useful if/when the Board decides to produce a guidance document on longer-term assessments of Adaptation Fund projects and programs. It might also be a useful tool to build National Implementing Entity (NIE) capacity and present an opportunity for the Fund to contribute/ further innovate in the field of post-implementation learning of climate adaptation projects.

(a) Participatory monitoring and evaluation

17. There is an increasing focus on involving Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in M&E through participatory M&E although there is little evidence of formal structures being in place to promote CSO involvement in this sphere. A number of organizations (e.g. International Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Bank, the Global Fund) are trying to increase the extent to which CSOs are involved in M&E[6]. *Participatory monitoring and evaluation* is valuable in complex adaptation contexts and especially in longer-term evaluations to assess changes in attitudes and decision-making. It helps examine the impact and effectiveness of interventions, to create baselines and comparison groups; and to build ownership or recommendations. Data gathered in a participatory manner offer a methodologically simple way of understanding impacts on livelihoods and household experiences that may be difficult to capture via a set of indicators. It is also helpful in ensuring that contributions of various elements to success of the intervention are understood. There are challenges however in sustaining participation for the purpose of monitoring over long time frames as it places demands and potential opportunity costs on participants who may not directly experience the benefits of activities.

(b) Intermediate Outcomes (IO) that lead to longer term sustainability

18. Juha I. Uitto, Jyotsna Puri and Rob D. van den Berg in *Evaluating Climate Change Action for Sustainable Development (2017)*, identify four IOs based on a meta-analysis of nine completed projects that lead to longer-term sustainability. They are: (i) Sustained built adaptive capacity, and a high utilization level of introduced adaptive measures; (ii) Sustained and high

[6] The World Bank, IFAD and Global Fund all have documentation stressing the importance of involving CSOs in M&E processes. Available at: https://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Generic-Documents/Monitoring%20and%20evaluation%20frameworks%20and%20the%20performance%20and%20governance%20of%20international%20funds.pdf

level of stakeholder engagement (iii) Mainstreaming at central policy and planning level is successful and sustained; (iv) High likelihood of generating broader adoption and replication.[7]

(c) Process indicators

19. *'Process indicators',* measure progression towards the achievement of an outcome, but do not guarantee or measure the final outcome itself. For example, process indicators, such as training quality as perceived by participants, or 'percentage increase in the cultivation of drought-resistant crops, can be applied to help indicate progress towards the intended long-term outcomes that would otherwise not be measurable within the timeframe of the project.

20. To measure the full measure of outcomes (For example: desalinized agricultural lands and changing agricultural practices) and the final impact that these outcomes (For example: increased resilience in farmers' livelihoods), L. Christiansen, C. Schaer et al, recommend planning and budgeting for two ex-post evaluations in the M&E design phase. One planned to be performed two years after the activities end in order to assess whether the resilient agricultural practices are being sustained and that progress with desalination is as expected. The other evaluation would be planned to take place ten years afterwards, where the long-term outcomes and impacts are expected to be rooted in the behavior of the farmers (i.e. adopted in the new agricultural practices) and to have increased the resilience of their livelihoods.[8]

21. The *importance of the institutional context* is increasingly being acknowledged in academic literature as a useful process indicator of adaptation impacts. The resilience of formal institutions, including local authorities, governance and legislative systems, and their capacity to accommodate climate change adaptation in planning, legislation and practice, has been shown to give a good indication of the sustainability of the impacts of an adaptation intervention.

(d) Catalytic effects

22. The Fund may devise a methodology to measure *to what extent AF support had a catalytic effect*. In the case of the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), programmes opened up within Least Developed Country (LDC) governments thinking about climate change and its impacts. The GEF IEO's analysis of catalytic effects carried out on 13 completed projects looked at seven indicators of momentum and synergy[9] generated by LDCF programs and institutions, as identified by project stakeholders.[10] One of the findings of the analysis was that LDCF support to National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPA) implementation projects through both near- and long-term adaptation measures resulted in

---

[7] Miyaguchi, Takaaki, and Juha I. Uitto. "What Do Evaluations Tell Us About Climate Change Adaptation? Meta-analysis with a Realist Approach." In *Evaluating Climate Change Action for Sustainable Development*, pp. 235-254. Springer International Publishing, 2017. http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-43702-6_1 Part III - Page 244-253

[8] Lars Christiansen, Caroline Schaer, Cecilie Larsen and, Prakriti Naswa, "Monitoring and Evaluating Climate Change Adaptation: a summary of key challenges and emerging practice" UNEP DTU Partnership Working Papers series; Climate Resilient Development Programme, Working Paper 1: 2016. Accessed at file:///C:/Users/WB508019/Downloads/MandE-challenge-guidance-note_01-07-16%20(2).pdf

[9] Indicators of momentum and synergy- Projects generated significant social, economic, cultural, and human well-being co-benefits ; Projects built on the traditional knowledge and practices of local communities; Projects had impacts on multiple sectors and at different levels of society; Projects built foundations for larger-scale project(s) through analytic work, assessments, and capacity building; Projects were instrumental in developing longer-term partnerships; Projects were successful in developing new cost-sharing approaches/leveraging new resources and; Projects improved management effectiveness of adaptation-relevant sub national systems.

[10] Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office (GEF IEO), Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund, Evaluation Report No. 106, Washington, DC: GEF IEO, 2016.http://www.gefieo.org/evaluations/least-developed-countries-fund-ldcf-2016

catalytic effects leading to a reduction of expected socioeconomic losses associated with climate change and variability. However, extensive replication and upscaling demands further financing beyond the projects' time frame.

(e) Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development (TAMD)[11]

23. Tools such as TAMD, developed by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and its partners, is designed as an evaluative framework to be implemented ex post. TAMD offers a framework for use in many contexts and at many scales, to assess and compare the effectiveness of interventions that directly or indirectly assist populations in adapting to climate change. TAMD testing was conducted simultaneously in six countries – Nepal, Ethiopia, Pakistan used the framework in an ex post approach, evaluating completed projects that were deemed enhancing the resilience.[12] Data demands for ex-post evaluations are high. Through the use of an ex-ante approach, information on the benefits of adaptation can be used in an ex post evaluation with climate trends to address the challenge of long time scales and contribution/attribution.[13]

Scope of the evaluation

24. "Ex-post evaluation" is generally conducted some time (e.g., two or more years) after program completion. These evaluations can study how well the initiative served its intended purpose, to assess sustainability of outcomes, and to draw inferential conclusions for similar initiatives. Considerations for the scope of the evaluation.

(a) *Temporal Scope* – A review of timeframes for ex-post evaluations employed by various MDBs/ DFIs presents the following options

- Amazon Fund/ Brazilian National Development Bank (BNDES) - 1.5 to 2 years after project completion[14].
- Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) – 4 years after completion.
- Asian Development Bank (ADB) – Project Completion Report (1-2 years after completion) and Project Performance Evaluation Report (3 years after completion).
- United States Agency for International Development (USAID) – 3 years after completion.
- Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) – 2 years after completion.

(b) Spatial Scope

- Narrowed down to where measures are more restricted.
- Extend to take account of synergy between several measures covering a different geographical area.[15]

Overview of Ex-post Evaluation arrangement by DFIs

25. The MDBs and DFIs (e.g. JICA, IDB and the ADB) stand out for conducting ex-post assessments. More recently the USAID and the Amazon Fund have conducted longer-term

[11] Brooks, N., Anderson, S., Ayers, J., Burton, I., and Tellam, I. (2011) Working paper 1: Tracking adaptation and measuring development (TAMD). International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). Available from: www.seachangecop.org/node/118 .
[12] Bours, Dennis, Colleen McGinn, and Patrick Pringle. *Monitoring and Evaluation of Climate Change Adaptation: A Review of the Landscape: New Directions for Evaluation, Number 147*. No. 147. John Wiley & Sons, 2015.
[13] Bours, Dennis, Colleen McGinn, and Patrick Pringle. *Monitoring and Evaluation of Climate Change Adaptation: A Review of the Landscape: New Directions for Evaluation, Number 147*. No. 147. John Wiley & Sons, 2015.
[14] Project completion implies the end of financial cooperation including reporting obligations.
[15] Guidelines for the ex-post evaluation of programmes (1994-1999 programming period). Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/eval/ben.pdf

post-completion assessments of projects. This section briefly introduces the arrangement for ex-post evaluations of the Amazon Fund and the GEF-IEO LDCF approach due to their relevance to the climate change adaptation context. Details of the arrangements for ex-post evaluations by the multilateral institutions and bi-lateral institutions are presented in Annex 2.

26. *The Amazon Fund/BNDES* [16] - The Amazon Fund's first projects were completed in 2013 and 2014. The most relevant evaluations take place in two stages under the Amazon Fund: i) *At the end of a project*: aiming to evaluate the immediate results (outputs) and direct effects (outcomes) and ii) *Ex-post*, in a period of between 1 and up to 2 years after the end of a project: aiming to evaluate the direct effects (outcomes), as well as the achieved indirect effects (impacts), focusing primarily on sustainability and the lessons learned that may be useful for other projects. A reference group and an array of actors is part of each project evaluation team:

- Representatives from the Division of Impact Evaluation and Employment from the BNDES Planning Department;
- Representatives from the Department for Management of the Amazon Fund BNDES;
- Representatives from Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) within the specific Technical Cooperation Project;
- Representatives from the organization responsible for the execution of the project to be evaluated; and;
- Evaluation team members The impact evaluation teams are composed of experts from GIZ and external consultants selected from applicants from the Brazilian Monitoring and Evaluation Network.

27. *Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office (GEF IEO)*[17] – The programme evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund (2016) measured results and sustainability of projects by asking questions such as:

- What are the emerging results and factors that affect the sustainability and resilience of these results?
- To what extent LDCF support has a catalytic effect?
- How does LDCF support relate to other GEF focal areas beyond climate change adaptation?
- What are the gender equality and the empowerment of women objectives achieved (or likely to be achieved) and gender mainstreaming principles adhered to by the LDCF?
- To what extent are the emerging results of LDCF support sustainable?

28. The evaluation was led by:

- A Senior Evaluation Officer as task manager, with oversight from the Chief Evaluation Officer, and the Director of the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO).
- The evaluation team consisted of an Evaluation Officer, a Senior Consultant; and three Junior Consultants. The consultants were hired to undertake specific tasks such as conducting a country field visit, reviewing all project documentation, and a portfolio and quality at entry analysis for all projects that make up the LDCF portfolio.

[16] Technical Cooperation GIZ and Amazon Fund (January 2016) http://www.amazonfund.gov.br/FundoAmazonia/export/sites/default/site_en/Galerias/Arquivos/Impact_Evaluations_Projects_Supported_Amazon_Fund_2016_ENGLISH.pdf

[17] Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office (GEF IEO), Program Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund, Evaluation Report No. 106, Washington, DC: GEF IEO, 2016. https://www.gefieo.org/evaluations/least-developed-countries-fund-ldcf-2016

29. The methodology incorporated a portfolio analysis, meta-evaluation review, interviews and field visits.[18]

Options

30. The following section presents three options for how the Adaptation Fund could arrange longer-term evaluation of completed projects and programmes. This is not an exhaustive list but a recommendation of options that would be most suitable for the Fund, given the diversity in the capacities of its implementing entities. Each option also includes potential options for how funding might be arranged.

31. It should be noted that funding arrangements would vary depending on the options presented and notably if ex-post evaluations of completed projects would be conducted on a systematic or sample basis. For example, the IDB conducts ex-post performance and sustainability assessments (EPAs) on a sample basis (20% of completed projects) 2 years after completion and Ex-post impact evaluation Reports (IERs) on at least two projects completed in the previous 4 or more years. Similarly, ADB's Independent Evaluation Department (IED) significantly reduced the number of Project Performance Evaluation Reports (PPERs) to a purposive sample of around 10 operations per year since 2007. On the other hand, JICA conducts ex-post studies on all completed projects.

32. The portfolio of Adaptation Fund projects and programmes is young and there are at present only a handful of completed projects. In this respect, an option could be that the Adaptation Fund, as decided by the Board, may in the short term conduct ex-post assessments on all completed project but may shift to conducting ex-post assessment on a sample basis as its portfolio of completed projects matures. This section does not give any budgetary estimates but suggests options for how funding could be arranged for conducting ex-post evaluations of completed projects and programmes.

Option 1: *The Evaluation Function of the Adaptation Fund would conduct the ex-post assessments*

33. Following the discussions on providing the Fund with an evaluation function, including the latest decision (B.28.36) requesting the secretariat to present further information on Option 1 (Technical Evaluation Reference Group, TERG such as the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria) and Option 2 (GEF IEO), the designated institution acting as the Evaluation Function of the Adaptation Fund may include as part of its responsibilities, managing and carrying out ex-post evaluations of completed projects and programmes on a systematic or sample basis.

34. The evaluation function, performed by an independent entity would be directly accountable to the Board. It would include as part of its mandate, the responsibility to carry out and oversee longer-term assessments of completed projects under the oversight of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) and approved by the Adaptation Fund Board. The Adaptation Fund Board secretariat would provide administrative and technical support to the evaluation function. It would also provide such other support as needed to enable the team/unit performing this function to carry out its responsibilities effectively and efficiently.

[18] A meta-evaluation is defined as an evaluation "designed to aggregate findings from a series of evaluations" by OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms and Results Based Management, p.27, Paris: OECD, 2002. A meta-evaluation can also refer to an evaluation of evaluations, which is the meaning that is used here.

Potential Funding Arrangements

35. **Based on budget arrangements, approved by the Adaptation Fund Board for the evaluation function**
Funding arrangements for this option may follow, upon Adaptation Fund Board approval, budget arrangements for the options currently being discussed (i.e. TERG and GEF IEO which may perform the Evaluation Function of the Adaptation Fund).

36. The budget may have to be revised to take into consideration the costs of hiring additional experts who may be needed to perform longer-term assessments of completed projects and programs. The budget may include an additional line item to include the cost considerations for an ex-post evaluation work program.

Pros and Cons

37. *Pros* – Delegating longer-term assessments of Adaptation Fund projects and programmes to the Evaluation Function of the Fund would solve IE constraints with respect to interest, resources and capacity to hire independent experts to conduct longer-term assessments.

38. *Cons* –Challenges may relate to identifying a diverse team of experts with knowledge and experience in both ex-post evaluations and evaluating longer-term outcomes of climate change adaptation projects. If the organization performing this function is a resident group, there would be general operating costs and benefits that would need to be paid. The budget for the options for evaluation function may need to be revised for taking into account the staffing requirements for including longer-term assessments of completed projects and programmes under the responsibilities of the institution performing the evaluation function. Additional costs emerge since the secretariat would have to provide administrative support.

Option 2: *The ex-post evaluation would be conducted by independent evaluators, but selected by the Implementing Entity*

39. Under this option, Implementing Entities may select an independent evaluator to conduct the ex-post assessment of a completed project. Under this option the IE may hire an independent team of consultants as is done for the preparation of terminal evaluation reports; or as it sees fit, delegate this responsibility to its independent evaluation unit (if it already such a unit in place). For example, the West African Development Bank (BOAD) has followed the lead of multilateral development finance institutions and set up an ex-post evaluation unit. BOAD has conducted ex-post evaluations of four of its projects. As part of the promotion of the evaluation culture of the African sub regional development banks, BOAD in collaboration with African Development Bank (AfDB), the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) of the World Bank Group (WBG) and Islamic Development Bank, organized a symposium on "The challenges of project/program evaluation and solutions for sub-regional development banks and their partners".[19]

40. All ex-post evaluations of completed projects will follow minimum requirements set by the Adaptation Fund. Guidance for conducting ex-post assessments of completed projects would be presented in a Guidance document prepared by the Adaptation Fund secretariat with the possible help of a consultant. In addition to the Implementing Entity, the Adaptation Fund

[19] West African Development Bank (BOAD) Ex-post Evaluation of Projects: http://www.boad.org/en/ex-post-project-evaluation

Board secretariat may support the independent evaluator selected by the entity with any information/ documents needed to fulfil its evaluation needs effectively and efficiently.

Potential Funding Arrangements

41. **Systematic Funding**
This option may apply if ex-post assessments of completed projects are to be performed for all completed projects and programmes. The ex-post assessment in this case would be an additional reporting requirement along with the enumerated reporting requirements in the Agreement, which would then need to be amended. This option may require an additional provision for ex-post evaluations in the breakdown of implementing entity fees. Implementing Entities may include a section for ex-post evaluations in the budget, which may be used to contract the ex-post assessment of completed projects to independent group of consultants or its own independent evaluation unit.

42. **Ad-hoc funding**
If the Board decides to conduct ex-post evaluations of completed projects and programs on a representative basis, then funding can be arranged in the form of small grants (such as readiness grants) for ex-post evaluations of completed projects and programs to Implementing Entities. The ad-hoc funding option may be used to assess interventions that are relatively new and pilot in nature and where evaluation has a strong learning and participatory aspects. These grants may be awarded to the implementing entity, which will then contract an independent team of consultants to conduct longer-term evaluations of completed projects.

Pros and Cons

43. *Pros* – A locally sourced independent evaluation team or an independent evaluation unit would have sound idea about the country context and have language competencies that an external evaluation unit might not have. Data collection and management might also be more timely and effective. It would also be cost effective as it minimizes expenses that could be incurred by travel to field locations. This option may also build capacity of institutions that currently do not handle this type of assessments. Lastly, having ex-post evaluations done in a systematic way, as embedded in the project reporting requirements and implementing entity budget structure, would provide a good opportunity for strengthening the AF Results Framework with post-implementation "impact" elements.

44. *Cons*- Country capacities vary across the Adaptation Fund portfolio and to this effect, the capabilities of NIEs to identify a robust team of independent evaluation experts might be challenging. Using different independent evaluators to perform such evaluations may not be ideal for consistency across the various ex-post assessments.

Option 3: *An external third party selected by the Adaptation Fund could perform the ex-post evaluation*

45. The Board could call for an expression of interest to select an external third party to perform longer-term evaluations of completed projects/programmes. It may alternatively approach a handful of potential external evaluators and assess their competence and suitability to undertake the longer-term assessment of the Adaptation Fund portfolio of completed projects and programmes.

46. The external evaluator could be a university, think tank or CSO that has the necessary tools in place, experience in conducting ex-post evaluations and/or interest in the field of evaluating the impacts and sustainability of climate change adaptation projects and programmes. The external evaluator selected by the Board would be required to comply with

guidance on ex-post evaluations set by the Board. The secretariat would provide administrative support and prepare the Terms of Reference (TOR) for such external evaluation team or external consultants that the Ethics and Finance Committee sees fit and as approved by the Board.

47. For example, under USAID's FANTA III project, the Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy at Tufts University carried out the Food for Peace (FFP)-funded multiyear ex-post studies in four countries (Bolivia, India, Kenya and Honduras). Additionally, the Abdul Lateef Jamal Poverty Lab (J-PAL) funded by the Department of Economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) also does rigorous impact evaluations. JICA also entrusts a certain portion of its ex-post evaluation studies to external third parties that were not involved in the planning and implementation of the projects to be evaluated such as universities, research institutions, academics, consultants etc. Additionally, the World Bank, AfDB and ADB work with the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie) for research, training and learning purposes.

Potential Funding arrangements

48. **MoU between the Adaptation Fund and the external institution (university, think tank, civil society organizations, academics)**
Such an option may be arranged based on a work program and in line with a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Adaptation Fund Board and the respective institution. The arrangement for selecting an external evaluator could be the same as for the Phase 2 evaluation, which would include a call for expression of interests and subsequent contracting by the secretariat following World Bank procedures. The TOR may be prepared by the AF Secretariat and approved by the board. The AF Secretariat would provide support to the external institution in particular with regards to the implementation of its work program. Evaluations can be conducted on either a systematic or sample basis as decided by the Board.

49. **Ad-hoc funding**
If the Board decides to conduct ex-post evaluations of completed projects and programs on a representative basis, then funding can be arranged in the form of grants to an external evaluator which could be a think tank, university or CSO screened by Adaptation Fund. The Adaptation Fund may finance ex-post studies to assess interventions that are relatively new and pilot in nature and/or projects and programmes where evaluation has a strong learning and participatory aspect.

Pros and Cons

50. *Pros* – In the case of think tanks or universities, this approach might present an opportunity to form a partnership and lower costs as the think tank/university might have a stake in the information that the study would generate and perhaps advance their own cause/program by the questions the evaluation is asking and the data generated.

51. *Cons* –This approach might impose constraints on the Fund in terms of an additional work load that would be needed to coordinate and monitor outputs of the external third party. Where emphasis is placed on the role of CSOs in the M&E process, there is little evidence on how this is achieved in practice, whether there are, and if so what sort, of institutional arrangements give effect to these goals. Since the secretariat will be in charge of coordinating the work of the external third party, the independence of the assessments might be sub-optimal.

Recommendations

52. After reviewing the document, the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) may wish to consider the options presented in this document and recommend a way forward to the Board for approval such as:

(a) Including options for ex-post evaluations of Adaptation Fund projects and programmes as part of the responsibilities of the Evaluation Function of the Fund;

(b) Requesting Implementing Entities to select independent evaluators to conduct ex-post evaluations; or

(c) Selecting an external third party to perform the ex-post evaluation.

53. The PPRC may also wish to consider, and make recommendations to the Board on the options for funding arrangements under each of the options above and whether ex-post evaluations of completed projects and programmes should be done on a systematic or ad-hoc /sample basis.

54. The PPRC may also wish to recommend to the Board to request the secretariat to prepare a practical proposal for the way forward based on the options selected above.

Annex 1: Summary of Options

	Description	Funding arrangement options	Pros	Cons
<u>Options 1:</u> The Evaluation Function of the Adaptation Fund would conduct the ex-post assessments	The designated institution acting as the Evaluation Function of the Adaptation Fund, as decided by the Board, may include as part of its mandate, the responsibility to carry out and oversee longer-term assessments of completed projects.	**Budget arrangements (as approved by the Board) for the evaluation function of the Adaptation Fund -** • Funding arrangements for this option may follow, upon Adaptation Fund Board approval, budget arrangements for the two options currently being discussed - the TERG and GEF IEO	• Would solve implementing entity constraints with respect to interest, resources, capabilities and their capacity to hire independent experts to conduct longer-term assessments.	• The pool of experts with experience in conducting expost evaluation of climate change adaptation projects may be small. • If the organization performing this function is a resident group, there would be general operating costs and benefits that would need to be paid. • Additional costs emerge since the secretariat would have to provide administrative support.
<u>Option 2:</u> The ex-post evaluation would be conducted by independent evaluators, but selected by the Implementing Entity	The Implementing Entity may hire an independent team of consultants as is done for the preparation of terminal evaluation reports; or as it sees fit, delegate this responsibility to its independent evaluation	**Systematic funding** – • May apply if ex-post assessments would be conducted for all completed projects/programmes. • May require an additional provision for ex-post evaluations in the	• A locally sourced independent evaluation team/ independent evaluation unit would have sound idea about the country context and have	• Country capacities and the capabilities of NIEs vary across the Adaptation Fund portfolio. To this effect it maybe be challenging for NIEs to identify a robust

	unit (if it already such a unit in place).	breakdown of implementing entity fees. • Implementing Entities may contract the ex-post assessment of completed projects to independent group of consultants or its own independent evaluation unit **Ad-hoc funding** – • Funding can be arranged in the form of small grants for ex-post evaluations of completed projects and programs to Implementing Entities. • Grants may be awarded to the implementing entity, which will then contract an independent team of consultants to conduct longer-term evaluations of completed projects.	language competencies. • Data collection and management might also be more timely and effective. • Would be cost effective as it minimizes expenses incurred by travel to field locations. • May also build capacity of institutions that currently do not handle such assessments. • Could provide a good opportunity for strengthening the AF Results Framework with post-implementation "impact" elements.	team of independent evaluation experts. • Utilizing different independent evaluators to perform such evaluations might not be ideal for consistency across the various ex-post assessments.
<u>Option 3:</u> An external third party (university/ think tank/ CSO) selected by the Adaptation Fund could perform the ex-post evaluation	The Adaptation Fund could select an external third party to perform longer-term evaluations of completed projects/programmes. It may alternatively approach a handful of potential external	**MoU between the Adaptation Fund and the external institution-** • Would be arranged based on a work program and in line with an MoU between the Adaptation Fund Board and the respective institution.	• This approach might present an opportunity to form a partnership and lower costs as the think tank/university might have a stake in the information that the study would	• Might impose constraints on the Fund in terms of an additional work load that would be needed to coordinate and monitor outputs of the external third party.

	evaluators and select an evaluator based on an assessment their competence to conduct longer-term evaluations of completed Adaptation Fund projects/ programmes.	• The arrangement for selecting an external evaluator could be the same as for the Phase 2 evaluation, involving a call for expression of interests and subsequent contracting by the secretariat following World Bank procedures. • The TOR maybe prepared by the AF Secretariat and approved by the board. • The AF Secretariat would provide support to the external institution in particular with regards to the implementation of its work program. **Ad-hoc funding –** • Funding can be arranged in the form of grants to an external evaluator screened by the Adaptation Fund. The Adaptation Fund may finance ex-post studies to assess interventions that are relatively new and pilot in nature where evaluation has a strong learning and participatory aspect.	generate and perhaps advance their own cause/program by the questions the evaluation is asking and the data generated.	• Where emphasis is placed on the role of CSOs in the M&E process, there is little evidence on how this is achieved in practice and what sort of institutional arrangements give effect to these goals. • As the secretariat will be in charge of coordinating the work of the external third party, the independence of the assessments might be sub-optimal.

Annex 2: Overview of the landscape of Multilateral and Bi-lateral institutions' arrangements for conducting ex-post evaluations

Institution	Timeframe	Unit	Description
Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)[20]	4 years after completion	Office of Evaluation and Oversight (OVE)	• Ex-Post Impact Evaluation Reports (IER) are prepared selectively by OVE preferably four years or more after project completion, aimed at evaluating the longer term results and sustainability of a program or project, including its impact and/or outcomes, and the effectiveness and efficiency in achieving the development objectives, drawing lessons for future operations • The purpose is to evaluate the results of an operation, particularly in terms of its outcomes and/or impact. • M&E activities at the IDB are a shared responsibility between the Bank and the Borrowing Country. • Under the principle of shared responsibility, Borrowers have the main responsibility of collecting the basic information required for the preparation of the Project Completion Report (PCR) and ex-post evaluations. • The Bank establishes whether the Borrower has the capacity to perform the evaluation, and if it does not, it defines the assistance that the Borrower will require with this activity. Several instruments are available at the Bank to support Borrowing Countries to develop institutional capacity in ex-post evaluation as well as technical assistance for ex-post evaluations of operations. • Ex-post evaluations are performed by: a) Management, which is responsible for real-time evaluations of all loan operations, up to the moment of

[20]Evaluation of IDB operational objectives: General Operational Policies. Accessed at: http://www.iadb.org/en/about-us/evaluation-of-idb-operational-objectives,6242.html

			project completion. To this end, Management creates a PCR. b) The OVE carries out independent reviews of the PCRs produced by Management and produces independent evaluations of completed projects. c) Any Borrower, who elects to do so, may undertake ex-post evaluation of operations, taking into account the institutional capacity to carry them out.
Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)[21]	2 years after completion	Office of Evaluation, Planning and Coordination Department; Post Project Monitoring and the project implementation departments (i.e. Departments and overseas offices)	• Project evaluation at JICA has four types of project cycles: ex-ante evaluation, mid-term evaluation, terminal evaluation and ex-post evaluation. • They are carried out for all projects 2 years after completion in principle so as to ensure full accountability and to enhance effectiveness and efficiency of Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) operations. • The main targets of the feedback of ex-post evaluations are organizations that are implementing the project (the project continuing after the cooperation), the respective implementing division at JICA, and the JICA overseas offices. • Roles for Ex-post Evaluations[22]: (a) The Office of Evaluation, Planning and Coordination Department which is responsible for planning and coordinating the overall evaluation activities within JICA carries out ex-post evaluations such as country program evaluation and thematic evaluation. The Office supports and supervises evaluation activities by departments and overseas offices.

[21] Office of Evaluation, Planning and Coordination Department Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), "JICA Guidelines for Project Evaluation" (September 2004) Accessed at: https://www.jica.go.jp/english/our_work/evaluation/tech_and_grant/guides/pdf/guideline01-01.pdf Page 9-10.
[22] Office of Evaluation, Planning and Coordination Department Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), "JICA Guidelines for Project Evaluation" (September 2004) Accessed at: https://www.jica.go.jp/english/our_work/evaluation/tech_and_grant/guides/pdf/guideline01-01.pdf

			(b) Post Project Monitoring and the project implementation departments (Departments and overseas offices) involved in project implementation conduct ex-ante, mid-term, terminal, and ex-post evaluations of individual projects under their responsibility.
United States Agency for International Development (USAID)[23]	3 years after completion	Tufts University through the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance (FANTA III) Project	• The USAID Office of Food for Peace has completed and published the results of 12 ex-post program evaluations across four countries. • This multi-year, multi-country, ex-post study was undertaken by Tufts University through the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance (FANTA) III Project.[24] The FANTA III project is a cooperative agreement funded by USAID and provides comprehensive technical support to USAID and its partners (including host country governments, international organizations, and nongovernmental organizations). • It used quantitative and qualitative methods over the course of 3 years to explore the effectiveness of FFP development food assistance projects' sustainability plans and exit strategies in Bolivia, Honduras, India, and Kenya. The ex-post study investigated effectiveness of programmatic approaches that ensure sustainability of FFP project activities and benefits of assistance once it is withdrawn and the project ends. The assessment conducted by Tufts University concluded that, "evidence of project success at the time of exit …did not necessarily

[23] Plan International Blog – "USAID's ex-post evaluations identified projects that really work" https://www.planusa.org/ex-post-evaluations; Sustaining Development: Results from an Ex-Post Evaluation Among Food for Peace Development Food Assistance Projects: http://dev.usaidlearninglab.org.623elmp01.blackmesh.com/lab-notes/sustaining-development-results-ex-post-evaluation-among-food-peace-development-food

[24] FANTA III partners include - Centre for Counselling, Nutrition and Health Care (COUNSENUTH), Development Alternatives Inc. (DAI), Helen Keller International (HKI), Instituto de Nutrición de Centro América y Panamá (INCAP), International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Media for Development International (MFDI), Michigan State University (MSU), Micronutrient Initiative (MI), Tanzania Food and Nutrition Centre (TFNC), Tufts University, University of California, Davis (UC–Davis), University of Tampere (UTA), Washington University in St. Louis (WUSTL).

			imply sustained benefit over time." The team further highlighted three elements of program design and implementation that are critical to achieving sustainability – resources, capacity and motivation.[25]
Asian Development Bank (ADB)[26]	3 years after completion	Independent Evaluation Department (IED)	• At project completion, the borrower and ADB prepare PCRs to assess the implementation process and achievement of objectives, and to make a preliminary assessment of sustainability. PCRs provide a preliminary assessment of sustainability 1−2 years after project completion. • Project Performance Evaluation Reports (PPER) provide an assessment of sustainability some years later, and at least 3 years after completion. • From 2007, IED significantly reduced the number of PPERs, moving to a purposive sample of around 10 operations per year.

[25] FANTA III, "Effective Sustainability and Exit Strategies for USAID FFP Development Food Assistance Projects" http://www.fantaproject.org/research/exit-strategies-ffp
[26]Asian Development Bank, Independent Evaluation Department – *Special Evaluation Study* on "Post-completion sustainability of Asian Development Bank-Assisted Projects" https://www.oecd.org/derec/adb/47186868.pdf
The African Development Bank (AfDB) and the *World Bank* are the closest in comparison ADB though there are differences in the timing of completion and project performance evaluation reporting. ADB undertakes PCRs and PPERs at a later date after completion to enable it to directly observe the status of sustainability for outcomes and other project effects.