

Request for Expression of Interest
Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund
Short-term consultancy (STC) position

- July 2, 2020 -



Reviewing and Revising the Adaptation Fund Evaluation Framework

The purpose of this request for expressions of interest is to provide the background, qualifications as well as key deliverables and processes to select and contract a consultant to support the development of the new Adaptation Fund Evaluation Framework.

Scope of Work

The Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund (AF-TERG) is an independent evaluation advisory group, accountable to the Board, established to ensure the independent implementation of the Fund's evaluation framework. Specifically, the TERG will provide a) evaluation function, b) advisory function, and c) oversight function. One of the AF-TERG's responsibilities is to review and revise the evaluation framework: "Activities within the work programme are diverse and include the following: a) Review of AF Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) related Frameworks, Policies and Guidelines."

The objectives of the assignment as are to: (1) identify and propose necessary revisions to the Fund's evaluation framework; and (2) produce a draft Evaluation Framework for the Adaptation Fund to be presented to and discussed with the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) of the Board for its consideration with a view to its subsequent approval by the Board. The Terms of Reference for this short-term consultancy position are attached.

Duration

The successful candidate will be offered a short-term consultancy position covering multiple fiscal years, following the World Bank rules, for up to 70 working days in fiscal year 2021 (FY21) and up to 30 days in fiscal year 2022 (FY22). Start of the position is envisaged for September 1 2020.

Qualifications

The specific qualifications and experience required are:

- Evaluation experience: (1) A strong record of at least 10 years' experience in designing and leading overall evaluations at progressively increasing levels; (2) Technical competence in the area of monitoring, learning and evaluation (theory and practice), and a strong methodological background; and (3) recent experience in MEL policy review and development.
- Policy knowledge and development experience: (1) Has a good understanding of international environmental and climate-related agreements and international institutional operations; and (2) environment, gender and equity policies.
- Development experience: (1) At least 8 years of professional experience in development at field level and international level; (2) Experience in least developed countries, working with those most vulnerable to climate change impacts; (3) Strong record in facilitation and managing interactive and participatory multi-stakeholder processes.
- Climate change / climate finance experience: Sound knowledge of the Adaptation Fund and of UNFCCC, Paris Agreement, Kyoto protocol, climate change and other environmental international regimes and policies;
- Institutional experience: Extensive knowledge on operational aspects of multilateral climate fund institutions (policies, governance, and accounting); and
- Social skills: strong record in managing participatory work processes in different cultural contexts.

Desirable qualifications are:

- Strong information and communications technology (ICT) and outreach skills and experience. Being able to collect data from different types of Adaptation Fund stakeholders such as senior level government officials, experts on adaptation and evaluation and representatives of civil society organizations (CSOs) and private sector organizations (PSOs);
- Strong social and environmental safeguards skills and experience;
- Climate change / climate finance experience: (1) knowledge of, and experience in applying climate change adaptation (CCA) concepts; (2) social ecological systems (SES); and (3) Knowledge of and/or experience with projects funded by the Adaptation Fund or other environmental / climate change funds;

- Strong knowledge in project management;
- Knowledge of and/or experience with the use of online meeting tools (like Webex) and survey tools (like Zoho Survey / SurveyMonkey); and
- Additional language skills next to English – such as in any of the other five official languages of the United Nations (Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian and Spanish).

Submission requirements

Interested consultants are hereby invited to send their expression of interest – expressing how their background fits the required qualifications – together with an up-to-date curriculum vitae to af-terg-sec@adaptation-fund.org with “**AF-TERG Secretariat evaluation framework STC**” in the subject line.

The application deadline is close of business on July 24, 2020 (Washington DC time). Only shortlisted candidates will be contacted for a follow-up online or telephone interview.

For any clarification concerning this communication, please contact the above email address. We are happy to provide clarification on the terms of reference if needed.

Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund

Terms of Reference for short-term consultancy (STC) position



Reviewing and Revising the Adaptation Fund Evaluation Framework

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

The Adaptation Fund (hereafter referred to as the Fund) was established by the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol of the United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change (CMP) to finance concrete adaptation projects and programs in developing countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change. At the Katowice Climate Conference in December 2018, the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA) decided that the Adaptation Fund shall also serve the Paris Agreement. The Fund's goal is "People, livelihoods and ecosystems are adequately protected from the adverse impacts of climate change."¹ The intended impact is "Adaptive capacity enhanced, resilience strengthened and vulnerability of people, livelihoods and ecosystems to climate change reduced."²

Mission statement: *The Adaptation Fund serves the Paris Agreement by accelerating and enhancing the quality of adaptation action in developing countries. The Fund does so by supporting country-driven projects and programmes, innovation, & global learning for effective adaptation. All of the Fund's activities are designed to help build gender responsive capacity to reach and benefit the most vulnerable.*

Since 2010, the Adaptation Fund has committed about US\$ 720 million for climate change adaptation (CCA) and resilience projects and programs, including 100 concrete localized adaptation projects in the most

¹ AF. 2018. Medium-Term Strategy 2018-2022. March 2018. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/medium-term-strategy-2018-2022/>

² Ibid.

vulnerable communities of developing countries around the world with more than 6 million direct beneficiaries.³

1.2 Adaptation Fund governance

The Fund provides climate finance to developing countries who are members of CMP [and CMA]^{4 5} through accredited Implementing Entities (IEs). The three types of IEs are: (i) National Implementing Entities (NIEs) such as national government agencies and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), (ii) Regional Implementing Entities (RIEs) such as regional consortia and banks, and (iii) Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs) such as United Nations agencies and development banks. By September 2019, 31 NIEs, 6 RIEs and 12 MIEs had been accredited.⁶

The Fund is supervised and managed by the Board, which is accountable to CMP [and CMA]. The majority of Board members are from developing countries. The Board has two committees, namely, the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC), and the Project/Programme Review Committee (PPRC). The EFC is responsible for advising the Board on issues of conflict of interest, ethics, finance, fund and portfolio monitoring, evaluation and audit.⁷ The PPRC is responsible for assisting the Board with assessing project and program proposals submitted to the Board and review project and program performance reports.⁸ An Accreditation Panel (AP) has been established to ensure that organizations receiving Fund money meet the fiduciary standards. The AP provides recommendations to the Board regarding the accreditation of new IEs and the suspension, cancellation or re-accreditation of entities already accredited.⁹

³ AF. 2019. Press Release "Adaptation Fund Board Approves US\$ 63 Million in New Projects". October 17, 2019. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/adaptation-fund-board-approves-us-63-million-in-new-projects-including-first-innovation-and-scale-up-grants/>

⁴ CMP; Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol. See: <https://unfccc.int/process/bodies/supreme-bodies/conference-of-the-parties-serving-as-the-meeting-of-the-parties-to-the-kyoto-protocol-cmp>

CMA; Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement. See: <https://unfccc.int/process/bodies/supreme-bodies/conference-of-the-parties-serving-as-the-meeting-of-the-parties-to-the-paris-agreement-cma>

⁵ The CMA and CMP also decided to ensure that developing and developed country Parties to the Paris Agreement are eligible for membership on the Adaptation Fund Board. CMP further requested that the Subsidiary Body on Implementation considers the matter and provides a recommendation in November 2019 during COP 25.

⁶ AF. 2019. Annual performance report for the fiscal year 2019. AFB/EFC.25/3. October 2019. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/annual-performance-report-for-fy19/>

⁷ AF. 2015. Ethics and Finance Committee Terms of Reference. Amended March 2018. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/TOR-of-EFC-amended-in-Mar2018.pdf>

⁸ AF. 2015. Project and Programme Review Committee Terms of Reference. Amended October 2015. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/TOR-of-PPRC-amended-in-Oct2015.pdf>

⁹ AF. 2012. Terms of Reference for the Establishment of the Adaptation Fund Board Accreditation Panel. Available at: https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Accreditation-Panel-TORs_0.pdf

The World Bank serves as an interim trustee of the Fund.¹⁰ The Global Environment Facility (GEF), through a team of dedicated officials, provides secretariat services to the Board. The Board Secretariat manages the day-to-day operations of the Adaptation Fund such as research, advisory and administrative services.

The Fund pioneered a direct access modality to climate financing through which NIEs are able to directly access financing and manage all aspects of climate adaptation and resilience projects, from design through implementation to monitoring and evaluation.

1.3 Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaption Fund (AF-TERG)

The Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) endorsed at its thirteenth meeting (March 2011 - Decision B.13/20.a) an evaluation framework for the Fund, which was developed in accordance with international standards in evaluation; it includes evaluation principles and criteria and two overarching objectives, discussed later. A revised version of the framework, contained in document AFB/EFC.6/4, was approved at the Board's fifteenth meeting.¹¹ The framework establishes requirements for how Fund activities should be evaluated in line with international principles, norms, and standards. The evaluation framework is intended to add value and contribute towards the achievement of the Fund's goal, and to the realization of the planned social and environmental impact.

The AF-TERG is an independent evaluation advisory group accountable to the Board, established in 2018 to ensure the independent implementation of the Fund's evaluation framework. The AF-TERG reports to the Board through the EFC and provides an evaluative advisory role through performing evaluative, advisory and oversight functions. The Board decided to establish AF-TERG as a long-term evaluation function during its thirtieth meeting held in October 2017 and approved AF-TERG's Terms of Reference in March 2018 during its thirty-first meeting.¹²

The AF-TERG, which is headed by a chair, is comprised of an independent group of experts in evaluation, called the AF-TERG members. A small AF-TERG secretariat, which is led by a coordinator, provides support for the implementation of evaluations and studies as part of the evaluative work program. While being independent of the operations of the Fund, the aim of the AF-TERG is to add value to the Fund's work through conducting independent evaluation and evaluation related work.

¹⁰ AF. 2019. Amended and restated terms and conditions of services to be provided by the international bank for reconstruction and development as trustee for the Adaptation Fund (2017-2020). Available at: https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/AFB.B.33.b.Inf._2._Amended_and_Restated_Terms_and_Conditions.pdf

¹¹ AF. 2012. Evaluation Framework. June 2012. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/evaluation-framework-4/>

¹² AF. 2018. Report of the thirty-first meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board. March 2018. AFB/B.31/8, Annex III, Terms of Reference of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG). Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/report-thirty-first-meeting-afb-20-23-march-2018/>

One of the AF-TERG's responsibilities is to review and revise the evaluation framework: *"Activities within the work programme are diverse and include the following: a) Review of AF Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) related Frameworks, Policies and Guidelines."*¹³ In addition, the indicative evaluation function work programme (2018-2020) prepared by the EFC specifically tasks AF-TERG to review and revise the Adaptation Fund evaluation framework and related guidelines.¹⁴ So does the AF-TERG workplan for July 2020 to June 2022. In short, the reviewing and revision of the evaluation framework is done through tracking Board decisions related to evaluation recommendations and providing advice on keeping it updated to conform to the highest international principles, norms, and standards.

1.4 Context for reviewing and revising the evaluation framework

The evaluation framework, of which the latest version was approved by the Board in 2012,¹⁵ states the objectives of the framework as:

- *Accountability for the achievement of the Fund objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes, and performance of Fund-financed activities and their contribution to those objectives; and*
- *Learning, feedback, and knowledge-sharing on results and lessons learned among different groups participating in the Fund to improve ongoing and future activities and to support decision-making on policies, strategies, programme management, projects, and programmes.*

The evaluation framework provides a clause for its own reviewing and revision as follows: *"The evaluation framework should remain in effect until and unless the Board decides otherwise. It should also be kept under review and updated to conform to the highest international principles, norms and standards. Potentially, if the Fund Board decides, the evaluation framework and its implementation should be evaluated in three or four years."*¹⁶ (p. 5).

Several multilateral organizations, such as the GEF,¹⁷ the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB),¹⁸ the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP),¹⁹ the United Nations

¹³ Ibid. p. 15.

¹⁴ AF. 2017. Updated options for an evaluation function and cost implications: Indicative three-year evaluation work programme of the Fund with costs. AFB/EFC.21.4. September 2017. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/updated-options-evaluation-function-cost-implications-2/>

¹⁵ AF. 2012. Evaluation Framework. June 2012. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/evaluation-framework-4/>

¹⁶ Ibid. p. 5.

¹⁷ Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office (GEF IEO). 2019. GEF Evaluation Policy (unedited). June 2019. Available at: <https://www.gefio.org/evaluations/gef-evaluation-policy-2019>

¹⁸ IDB. 2019. [Evaluation Policy Framework](http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getdocument.aspx?docnum=EZSHARE-872199154-11142). Available at: <http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getdocument.aspx?docnum=EZSHARE-872199154-11142>

¹⁹ UNDP. 2019. The revised UNDP evaluation policy. Available at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.shtml>

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC),²⁰ the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP),²¹ the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA),²² and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA),²³ among others, recently reviewed *their* M&E policies, frameworks and/or guidelines to conform to the highest international principles, norms and standards.

Over the past years, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) also revisited the definitions and use of the OECD DAC evaluation criteria and recently adopted revised definitions and principles for use.²⁴

Against this background, AF-TERG initiated conversations on reviewing and revising the evaluation framework with the Board Secretariat through its Manager and the EFC during the thirty-second Board meeting in 2019.

AF-TERG subsequently conducted a survey of Board members and observers to identify the Board's evaluation needs, priorities and expectations (November 2019 to January 2020). The TERG is now consulting with other AF entities (e.g. NIEs) about their evaluation needs, priorities and expectations. The responses to the survey indicated the need for a review of the evaluation framework. AF-TERG has also conducted a preliminary review of the evaluation framework, identifying subsequent post-2012 developments that justify a comprehensive review and revision:

- **Serving the CMA:** In accordance with Decision 1/CMP.14²⁵ and Decision 1/CMA.1,²⁶ the Fund has started serving the Paris Agreement from 1 January 2019.²⁷ The Fund is currently in a 'transitional period where the Fund serves both the Kyoto Protocol and Paris Agreement. Once the share of proceeds under Article 6, paragraph 4 of

²⁰ ECLAC. 2017. Evaluation Policy and Strategy. Available at: <https://repositorio.cepal.org/handle/11362/35507>

²¹ ESCAP. 2017. ESCAP Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Guidelines. Available at: <https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/ESCAP-Monitoring-and-Evaluation--Policy-and-Guidelines-2017-rev-20180507.pdf>

²² ESCWA. 2017. Evaluation Policy. Available at: https://www.unescwa.org/sites/www.unescwa.org/files/page_attachments/escwa-evaluation_policy_online.pdf

²³ UNFPA. 2019. Evaluation Policy 2019. Available at: <https://www.unfpa.org/admin-resource/unfpa-evaluation-policy-2019>

²⁴ OECD DAC. 2019. Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dacriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

²⁵ UNFCCC. 2019. Report of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol on its fourteenth session, held in Katowice from 2 to 15 December 2018. Available at: <https://unfccc.int/documents/193364>

²⁶ UNFCCC. 2017. Report of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement on the first part of its first session, held in Marrakech from 15 to 18 November 2016. Available at: <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/conferences/past-conferences/marrakech-climate-change-conference-november-2016/cma-1/cma-1-decisions>

²⁷ AF. 2019. Report of the Adaptation Fund Board, Note by the Chair of the Adaptation Fund Board – Addendum. AFB/B.34-35/3. November 2019. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/report-of-the-adaptation-fund-board-note-by-the-chair-of-the-adaptation-fund-board-addendum/>

the Paris Agreement²⁸ becomes available, the Fund will start serving the Paris Agreement exclusively.

- **New or updated Adaptation Fund policies, strategies and guidelines:** Open Information Policy (July 2013),²⁹ Environment and Social Policy (ESP – amended March 2016),³⁰ IE guidance document on compliance with the ESP,³¹ Risk Management Framework (amended October 2014),³² Gender Policy and Action Plan (approved March 2016),³³ ³⁴ and the Guidance Document for Implementing Entities on Compliance with the Adaptation Fund Gender Policy (March 2017),³⁵ Knowledge Management Strategy and Action Plan (October 2016),³⁶ the Ad Hoc Complaint Handling Mechanism (ACHM – October 2016),³⁷ the Operating Policies and Guidelines for Parties to Access Resources (OPG amended October 2017),³⁸ the Resource Mobilization Strategy 2017-2020 (October 2016),³⁹ the Medium-Term Strategy 2018-2022,⁴⁰ and Revised Strategic results framework (amended March 2019).⁴¹
- **New funding windows:** As part of the implementation of its Medium-Term Strategy 2018-2022, the Fund launched three funding windows to scale up effective projects, share knowledge of effective actions, and accelerate innovation in

²⁸ UN. 2015. Paris Agreement. Available at: <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement>

²⁹ AF. 2013. Open Information Policy. July 2013. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/open-information-policy-adopted-in-july-2013/>

³⁰ AF. 2016. Environmental and Social Policy. March 2016. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Amended-March-2016-OPG-ANNEX-3-Environmental-social-policy-March-2016.pdf>

³¹ AF. Guidance document for Implementing Entities on compliance with the Adaptation Fund Environmental and Social Policy. June 2016. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/guidance-document-implementing-entities-compliance-adaptation-fund-environmental-social-policy/>

³² AF. 2014. Risk Management Framework. October 2014. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/risk-management-framework/>

³³ AF. 2016. Gender Policy and Action Plan. March 2016. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/opg-annex4-gender-policy/>

³⁴ Currently under update.

³⁵ AF. 2017. Guidance document for Implementing Entities on compliance with the Adaptation Fund Gender Policy. March 2017. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/guidance-document-implementing-entities-compliance-adaptation-fund-gender-policy-2/>

³⁶ AF. 2016. Knowledge Management Strategy and Action Plan. October 2016. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/knowledge-management-strategy-action-plan/>

³⁷ AF. 2016. Ad Hoc Complaint Handling Mechanism (ACHM). October 2016. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/ad-hoc-complaint-handling-mechanism-approved-october-2016/>

³⁸ AF. 2017. Operational Policies and Guidelines for Parties to Access Resources from the Adaptation Fund. October 2017. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/operational-policies-guidelines-parties-access-resources-adaptation-fund/>

³⁹ AF. 2016. Resource Mobilization Strategy 2017-2020. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/resource-mobilization-strategy-2/>

⁴⁰ AF. 2018. Medium-Term Strategy 2018-2022. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/medium-term-strategy-2018-2022/>

⁴¹ AF. 2019. Strategic Results Framework of the Adaptation Fund. March 2019. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/strategic-results-framework-of-the-adaptation-fund-amended-in-march-2019/>

adaptation.⁴² Project Scale-Up Grants under the Fund's Readiness Programme for Climate are aimed at activities to expand or replicate projects/programs approved by the Board for implementation by accredited NIEs.⁴³ Learning grants focus on assisting NIEs in enhancing their systems to capture and disseminate adaptation experiences and knowledge.⁴⁴ Innovation grants will be offered to NIEs and are aimed at enhancing and speeding development of innovative adaptation practices on the ground.⁴⁵

- **Building on previous reviews of the evaluation framework:** The evaluation framework has been reviewed before,⁴⁶ and this review and revision should build on these efforts.
- **Terms of Reference:** Terms of Reference of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group (March 2018),⁴⁷ and amended Terms of Reference of the Ethics and Finance Committee (March 2018).⁴⁸
- **Evaluation and assessment recommendations:** Lessons and recommendations from the first phase evaluation of the Fund (2015);⁴⁹ second phase evaluation of the Fund (2018);⁵⁰ and assessment on the progress in the implementation of the Adaptation Fund's Gender Policy and Action Plan (2019).⁵¹ The assessment, for example, noted that mid-term and final evaluations are not yet mandated to include gender outcomes, demanding an update and development of the guidelines for final evaluations and mid-term evaluations respectively.⁵²

⁴² AF. 2018. Decisions of the Thirty-second Meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board. October 2018. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/decisions-thirty-second-meeting-adaptation-fund-board/>

⁴³ See: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/project-scale-up-grants/>

⁴⁴ See: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/knowledge-learning/learning-grants/>

⁴⁵ See: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/apply-funding/innovation-grants/>

⁴⁶ AF. 2012. Proposed amendments to the Evaluation Framework. AFB/EFC.8/12. February 2012. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/proposed-amendments-to-the-evaluation-framework/>

⁴⁷ AF. 2018. Report of the thirty-first meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board. March 2018. AFB/B.31/8, Annex III, Terms of Reference of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG). Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/report-thirty-first-meeting-afb-20-23-march-2018/>

⁴⁸ AF. 2015. Ethics and Finance Committee Terms of Reference. Amended March 2018. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/TOR-of-EFC-amended-in-Mar2018.pdf>

⁴⁹ AF. 2015. Evaluation of the Fund (Stage 1). September 2015. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/evaluation-of-the-fund-stage-1/>

⁵⁰ AF. 2018. Second Phase of the Overall Evaluation of the Fund. March 2018. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/second-phase-overall-evaluation-fund/>

⁵¹ AF. 2019. Assessment Report on Progress in the Implementation of the Adaptation Fund's Gender Policy and Gender Action Plan. AFB/B.34/Inf.9. October 2019. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/assessment-report-on-progress-in-the-implementation-of-the-adaptation-funds-gender-policy-and-gender-action-plan/>

⁵² Ibid. p. 22.

As part of tracking and utilizing the highest international evaluation principles, norms and standards, AF-TERG is identifying proven and promising evaluation practices to consider in reviewing and revising the framework. These include and are not limited to the following:

- **Evaluating at the nexus of ‘environment, climate and development’:** Evaluating at the nexus of environment, climate and development is increasingly becoming important for the Fund. Some of the new developments from which the evaluation framework review will benefit includes: (i) the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework that provides for joint monitoring, review, reporting and evaluation of initiatives towards achieving Agenda 2030;⁵³ (ii) the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), which includes the following norms and standards: internationally agreed principles, goals and targets, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism, with emphasis on the utility and use of evaluations; and (iii) social-ecological systems (SESs) or coupled human and natural systems (CHANS) thinking based evaluations.^{54 55}
- **Evaluating transformational change:** Climate change is impacting negatively on both human and natural systems and worsening inequalities between the rich and the poor in a way that demands transformational change. The impacts require new funding, programming and evaluation modalities, some of which demand more rapid, nimble, inclusive evidence and collective learning and adaptive management. Such change is needed at systemic level and needs to be sustained over time.^{56 57} Understanding how to evaluate transformational change is important to the Fund as it entails collaborative evidence generation and co-learning to understanding how, why and to what extent an AF-funded initiative has contributed to change.
- **Evolving evaluation approaches:** Evaluation approaches have been evolving since the approval of the evaluation framework. The Fund has noted some of these changes and applied them in its evaluation practice. For example, even though the

⁵³ United Nations Sustainable Development Group. (2019). United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework: Internal guidance. June 2019. Available at: <https://unsdg.un.org/resources/united-nations-sustainable-development-cooperation-framework-guidance>

⁵⁴ Tyson, W. 2017. Using social-ecological systems theory to evaluate large-scale co-management efforts: a case study of the Inuvialuit Settlement Region. *Ecology and Society* 22(1). Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312398077_Using_social-ecological_systems_theory_to_evaluate_large-scale_comanagement_efforts_A_case_study_of_the_Inuvialuit_Settlement_Region

⁵⁵ Rowe, A. 2019. Ecological thinking as a route to sustainability-ready evaluation. In *Evaluation in complex settings* (pp. 25-44). Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320517752_Ecological_Thinking_as_a_Route_to_Sustainability_in_Evaluation

⁵⁶ Climate Investment Funds (CIF) Transformational Change Learning Partnership. See: <https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/knowledge-documents/cif-transformational-change-learning-partnership-pioneering-joint-learning>

⁵⁷ Itad. 2019. Final evaluation report: Evaluating transformational change in the Climate Investment Funds. Available at: https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/sites/cif_enc/files/knowledge-documents/evaluation_of_transformational_change_in_the_cif_final_w_mresp_jan_2019.pdf and https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif_enc/sites/cif_enc/files/knowledge-documents/evaluation_of_transformational_change_in_the_cif_annexes_final2.pdf

evaluation framework does not cover a theory of change (ToC) approach to evaluations, the Fund required its use in the first and second phase evaluations of the Adaptation Fund evaluation. A theory of change approach will also be required in the review of the Fund’s Medium-Term Strategy (MTS, 2018-2022), whose design is ToC-informed. AF-TERG has developed an MTS ToC from its own perspective. Other evaluation approaches that have potential value for the Fund include and are not limited to ripple effect mapping (REM),⁵⁸ ⁵⁹ Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA),⁶⁰ rapid impact evaluation (RIE),⁶¹ principles-focused evaluation,⁶² outcome evaluation,⁶³ contribution analysis,⁶⁴ developmental evaluation⁶⁵ and Blue Marble evaluation.⁶⁶

- **Evaluation practices:** Consider good and next practice and culture changes in the evaluation profession that emphasize co-generation of knowledge, evidence and recommendations.⁶⁷ ⁶⁸
- **Evaluation criteria:** While the evaluation framework covers the five OECD DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact, a sixth criterion of coherence has been recently added to the OECD DAC criteria.⁶⁹ AF-TERG is open to additional and/or other criteria as needed.
- **Studies conducted by AF-TERG:** AF-TERG conducted three studies covering: (i) an evaluability assessment of proposals approved by the Fund, (ii) innovative MEL practices in the adaptation and environment field, and (iii) a study on ex-post

⁵⁸ Kollock, D. R. 2011. Ripple effects mapping for evaluation. Washington State University Extension. Available at: <https://naaee.org/sites/default/files/rem.complete.pdf>

⁵⁹ Chazdon, S., et al. (Eds.) 2017. A Field Guide to Ripple Effects Mapping. Available at: https://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/handle/11299/190639/REM_monograph_withcover.pdf

⁶⁰ Baptist, C., and Befani, B. 2015. Qualitative Comparative Analysis – A Rigorous Qualitative Method for Assessing Impact. Coffey. Available at: https://www.adcoesao.pt/sites/default/files/avaliacao/4_2_qualitative_comparative_analysis_-_a_rigorous_qualitative_method_for_assessing_impact_junho_2015.pdf

⁶¹ Rowe, A. 2019. Rapid impact evaluation. *Evaluation* 25(4), pp. 496–513. Available at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1356389019870213>

⁶² Patton, M. Q. 2018. *Principles-focused Evaluation – The guide*. Guilford Press, New York.

⁶³ Wilson-Grau, R. and Britt, H. 2013. *Outcome Harvesting*. Ford Foundation. Available at: <https://www.outcomemapping.ca/resource/outcome-harvesting>

⁶⁴ Mayne, J. 2008. Contribution Analysis: An approach to exploring cause and effect. *Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Brief 16*. Available at: <https://cgspace.cgjar.org/handle/10568/70124>

⁶⁵ Patton, M. Q. 2010. *Developmental Evaluation – Applying Complexity Concepts to Enhance Innovation and Use*. Guilford Publications, New York.

⁶⁶ Patton, M. Q. 2019. *Blue Marble Evaluation*. Guilford Press, New York.

⁶⁷ Talking about best practice inhibits change and innovation, and focuses on a process that is comfortable, given what would there be to improve if it is 'best practice'? There also isn't one single best way of doing things, given it would mean that context doesn't matter. Terms like good, effective, or better practice show more humility and less overgeneralization.

⁶⁸ Next practice points towards the good (or better) practice of what is to come, given the past is a poor playbook for the future. Next practice focuses on adopting good practice from unrelated sectors or industries, from unusual suspects who bring fresh and different perspectives. Next practice is to be found in the gray areas between the silos we inhabit.

⁶⁹ OECD. 2019. Global consultations on adapting the evaluation criteria. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/eval-criteria-global-consultation.htm>

evaluations. The findings and recommendations will have a bearing on the review of the evaluation framework.

- **Evaluation frameworks and policies of comparable funds and organizations:** AF-TERG is also aware that comparable funds and organizations serving the United National Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) or other multilateral environmental agreements, and/or operating in the climate change field are developing evaluation frameworks and policies that are worth reviewing for learning lessons. These include and are not limited to the Green Climate Fund (GCF), in draft,⁷⁰ and the GEF.⁷¹

2. Purpose, objective and process

2.1 Goal and purpose

The goal of the assignment is to prepare a draft Evaluation Framework for the Fund for discussion and subsequent approval by the Board that is fit for purpose for the Adaptation Fund in light of Fund developments, current climate change knowledge, evidence and learning needs, challenges and opportunities as well as, international evaluation principles, norms and standards, and proven and emerging evaluation practices.

2.2 Objectives

The objectives of the assignment as defined in these Terms of Reference are to: (1) identify and propose necessary revisions to the Fund's evaluation framework; and (2) produce a draft Evaluation Framework for the Adaptation Fund to be presented to and discussed with the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) of the Board for its consideration with a view to its subsequent approval by the Board.

2.3 Process

The review and subsequent revision of the Evaluation Framework of the Fund will be conducted in a consultative and participatory manner with the support of a consultant commissioned by the AF-TERG (to be selected and contracted through this REoI). The AF-TERG is the owner of the project and will monitor its implementation, provide guidance, comment on and sign off on key deliverables at determined points of the process. One member of the AF-TERG will be the technical focal point (TFP). The TFP will be the TERG lead person for monitoring and guiding the project during its execution in collaboration with the AF-TERG Secretariat Coordinator.

⁷⁰ GCF. 2019. The GCF Evaluation Policy - Draft. Available at: <https://ieu.greenclimate.fund/evaluation-policy-of-the-gcf>

⁷¹ GEF IEO (n 17)

Consistent with its guiding principles, which include co-creation and co-learning with Fund stakeholders the AF-TERG will establish a Project Working Group (PWG) with 5-6 members from key stakeholder groups: (i) the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) of the Adaptation Fund Board, (ii) the AFB Secretariat, and (iii) the AF-TERG, and will involve (iv) external experts as needed. The Chair of the AF-TERG or the TERG member designated as technical focal point will Chair the PWG meetings and ensure that necessary meetings are convened on a regular basis. The AF-TERG Secretariat Coordinator will coordinate the process and participate in meetings. The PWG is expected to hold at least three meetings, the precise number and timing to be defined during the inception phase.

The PWG shall support and guide the work of the consultant and make sure that the revised evaluation framework will be in line with expectations and correspond to the needs of the Fund and its internal partners for evaluation guidance. In addition, consultations will take place with other key stakeholders, such as the IEs and the NGO Network to ensure that their interests and needs are taken into account. It will also involve peer organisations, and MEL experts to capture current developments in the MEL field particularly related to adaptation to the effects of climate change.

The selected consultant will take the advice of the PWG into account in the pursuit of the assignment while at the same time retaining his/her independence of judgement. As needed, he/she may ask AF-TERG to provide junior consultants to support him/her to carry out the assignment. AF-TERG members who are not part of the PWG will provide their contributions through periodic reviews of the process and key deliverables. AF-TERG as a whole retains the responsibility to sign off key deliverables.

The consultant will report to the Coordinator of the AF-TERG Secretariat. The AF-TERG Secretariat Coordinator shall manage the contracting process and the contract, will coordinate the project and ensure adequate support for the process through the AF-TERG Secretariat. The AF-TERG Secretariat Coordinator shall also ensure that necessary meetings with the Project Working Group are convened and participate in the Project Working Group described above. The AF-TERG Secretariat Coordinator will be responsible for making sure that the project is moving forward and for providing institutional guidance as needed.

2.4 Tasks and expected results

The review and revision will involve:

- a. A critical assessment of the current Evaluation Framework;
- b. Guide the PWG and the AF-TERG on what the final product should be: a framework, strategy, policy, guidelines, identifying key pros and cons for each of these options and/or combinations.

- c. Identifying, collating and making use of evaluation framework reviews, evaluation recommendations with a bearing on the evaluation framework, and relevant Board decisions made since 2012;
- d. Identifying and analyzing the Fund’s relevant decisions, policies, strategies and programs made after the approval of the latest evaluation framework;
- e. Identifying and making use of insights from studies and evaluations commissioned and conducted by AF-TERG during fiscal years 2019 and 2020;
- f. Surfacing good and next evaluation and evaluation-related practice, and useful evaluation approaches, especially in the environment and CCA fields;
- g. Studying and drawing insights from the current practice in the development of M&E, evaluation, and MEL frameworks from relevant institutions also in relation to ownership of such frameworks and integrated approaches to MEL;
- h. Establishing current and emerging needs of the Fund internal community with regards to MEL and MEL guidance;⁷²
- i. Suggest a revised structure and content of the evaluation framework based on the review findings;
- j. Seek, obtain and incorporate Fund stakeholder feedback on a draft new evaluation framework for the Fund; and
- k. Progressively enrich and refine the evaluation framework based on: (i) interactive stakeholder feedback, and (ii) field-testing until it is ready for presentation to the Board.

Table 1 below outlines the planned activities, associated key deliverables and timelines for the review. The three main deliverables are: (1) an Inception Report and Evaluation Plan (D1); (2) an evaluation framework review report (D2); and (3) a revised evaluation framework (D3). The process of developing these deliverables will be as important as the products.

⁷² Fund internal refers to those part of the Fund’s governance structure as well as other key stakeholders, like – but not limited to – the UNFCCC/COP, Board, Board Secretariat, Designated Authorities (DAs), IEs, the Adaptation Fund NGO Network, and other country-level stakeholders.

Table 1: Project activity and associated deliverables and tentative deadlines

Activity	Deliverable (D)/ Tentative deadlines
Inception phase	
1. Conduct: (i) a desk review and analysis of the evaluation framework, other evaluation frameworks and key documents related to it, (ii) identify relevant Fund and Board decisions, internal and external evaluation insights, Fund policies and strategies, and (iii) hold some key interviews	D1: Evaluation framework review inception report, evaluation plan, and PowerPoint presentation to support discussion and co-generation with the Project Working Group.
2. Hold an inception meeting with the Evaluation Framework Reference Group	Draft Inception Report 15 November 2020
3. Revise the draft inception report, evaluation framework review plan, and PPT presentation based on interactions with the Reference Group	Final Inception Report 15 December 2020
4. Revise and finalize the draft inception report, evaluation framework review plan, and PPT presentation	
Review phase	
5. Engage in a collaborative, inclusive and iterative process of reviewing the evaluation framework through: (i) further desk review work, (ii) interactions with Fund internal and external stakeholders, and (iii) ongoing support, feedback and advice from the PWG.	D2: Evaluation Framework Review report and PowerPoint Presentation
6. Draft an evaluation review report and produce a PPT presentation.	Review Report and Powerpoint 15 February 2020
7. Share the report and present the PPT presentation to identified stakeholder groups, obtain and address feedback	
8. Provide the TERG with an assessment of the type of document it should develop: policy, framework, strategy, guidelines with pros and cons of each.	

Revision phase

8. Engage in a collaborative, inclusive and iterative process of revising and reformulating the evaluation framework by (i) drawing on the evaluation framework review findings and recommendations, (ii) interactions with Fund internal and external stakeholders, and (iii) ongoing support, feedback and advice from the Reference Group.

9. Produce a PowerPoint presentation on a new draft evaluation framework.

10. Share the draft revised evaluation framework and present the PowerPoint presentation to identified stakeholder groups, obtain and address feedback.

11. Field-test and finalize the revision of the evaluation framework in consultation with the Reference Group

D3: Draft Revised Adaptation Fund Evaluation Framework

First Draft Revised Evaluation Framework and Presentation

15 June 2021

Final Evaluation Framework

15 December 2021

3. Work principles

Based on the AF-TERG's mandate and its two overarching objectives, and in the spirit of guiding its work for the benefit of the Fund, the AF-TERG has developed a set of ten work principles to guide the work of the AF-TERG, including the work that it commissions.

1. **Be relevant and responsive to the Fund priorities and operating contexts:** Stay tuned and responsive to the Fund's operational, strategic and governance priorities; Fund partners' priorities; and relevant developments in the broader field of climate change adaptation (CCA) and operating contexts.
2. **Make contributions that benefit Fund's stakeholders – people, livelihoods and ecosystems:** Observe equity, transparency and impartiality in our work designs, processes and products to serve the interests of Fund stakeholders.
3. **Produce MEL products that add value to the Fund:** Ensure the production of useful, credible, actionable, innovative, independent and timely monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) products that contribute to the performance and impact of the Fund at all levels.
4. **Support the development of MEL capacity of the Fund's key stakeholders:** Develop the MEL capacity of the Fund's key stakeholders through engaging them in all our work, nurturing relationships of trust, co-learning and co-creation, and cultivating a sense of collective ownership of the MEL tools.
5. **Contribute to the development of the CCA monitoring, learning and evaluation (MEL) field:** Seek opportunities for sharing the Fund's MEL experiences with the

CCA and evaluation communities and to contribute to the discussion and development of the MEL in CCA and related fields.

6. **Draw on good and innovative MEL practice:** Identify, utilise and build on good, new, ethical MEL approaches and practice in the CCA and related fields.
7. **Respect and utilise different knowledges:** Seek, respect, value and work with traditional and local knowledge alongside other forms of knowledge, and apply appropriate standards of quality to all types of knowledge.
8. **Work synergistically to produce optimal results:** Work collaboratively together, equitably share responsibilities, give our best, engage in constructive dialogue, exercise mutual respect, assume good intent and be open to surprise towards getting the most from the Fund's investment in MEL.
9. **Conduct collective, reflexive learning that improves practice:** Undertake purposive, collective, continuous and critical learning to improve our evaluative, oversight and advisory practice and the value it creates for the Fund over time.
10. **Ensure cost-effective utilisation of the Fund's resources:** Utilize our time and budget in the most cost-effective ways while ensuring the production of fit-for-purpose MEL products.

Abbreviations

AF	Adaptation Fund (Also, 'the Fund')
AFB	Adaptation Fund Board (Also, 'the Board')
AF-TERG	Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund
AP	Accreditation Panel
CCA	Climate change adaptation
CHANs	Coupled Human and Natural Systems
CIF	Climate Investment Funds
CMA	Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
COP	Conference of the Parties
CSO	Civil society organisation
ECLAC	United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
EFC	Ethics and Finance Committee
ESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
ESCWA	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia
ESP	Environment and Social Policy
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEF IEO	Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office
ICT	Information and communications technology
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IE	Implementing Entity
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MEL	Monitoring evaluation and learning
MIE	Multilateral Implementing Entity
MTS	Medium-Term Strategy (of the Adaptation Fund)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NIE	National Implementing Entity
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

OECD DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee
OPG	Operating Policies and Guidelines for Parties to Access Resources (of the Adaptation Fund)
PPRC	Project/Programme Review Committee
PSO	Private Sector Organization
PWG	Project Working Group
REM	Ripple Effect Mapping
REoI	Request for Expressions of Interest
RIE	Regional Implementing Entity/Rapid Impact Evaluation
SES	Social-Ecological Systems
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNFCCC	United National Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund