

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

- August 17, 2020 -



Mid-Term Review of the Adaptation Fund
Medium-Term Strategy 2018-2022

The purpose of this request for expressions of interest (RoEI) is to provide the background, qualifications as well as key deliverables and processes to select and contract a senior consultant to support the mid-term review (MTR) of the AF Medium-Term Strategy (MTS) 2018-2022.

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 AF-TERG will provide a) evaluation function, b) advisory function, and c) oversight functions. One of the AF-TERG's responsibilities is to conduct a mid-term review (MTR) of the Adaptation Fund Medium-Term Strategy (MTS).

The purpose of the assignment is to provide feedback to the Fund on how well the MTS is guiding and enabling the Fund overall. In particular, the MTR will review the MTS' responsiveness to the UNFCCC CMP/CMA¹, countries and CCA needs, and how it guides the Fund's governance, management, operations, fund raising, partnerships, etc.

¹ CMP: Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol; CMA: Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement.

The senior consultant will have two key tasks:

1. Conduct research on the contemporary knowledge, experiences and lessons on how strategies are effectively used as guiding tools for management, governance and financing of organizations and good existing and emerging practices² on how key concepts in the Fund and elements of the MTS (eg, innovation, learning, and adaptation measures) are evaluated. This information will be used in the development of the framework that will guide the implementation of the MTR;
2. Conduct the MTR and provide recommendations for the Board to consider in relation to the continued implementation of the MTS for the remainder of the time it covers, and recommendations to feed into the development of the next MTS.

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for this short-term consultant position are attached. Following the AF-TERG principles of work (last page of the ToR), the MTR will be conducted to gain **broad participation** across all Fund stakeholders in the design and execution of the MTR including recommendations and next steps. This participatory approach will promote co-generation of knowledge, while maintaining the independence of the exercise. In this way, the MTR should provide opportunities for the stakeholders and the AF-TERG to learn from good existing and emerging practices in the strategy field, relevant to the Fund as well as lessons from ~~how~~ implementation and successes of the MTS so far.

Duration

The successful candidate will be offered a short-term consultant position for up to 65 days, following World Bank rules. Start of the position is envisaged for late September / early October 2020 with the deliverable of the MTR by February 2021.

Qualifications

The consultant will have a strong experience in the fields of strategy and evaluation.

In particular, the consultant will have 12 or more years of experience on the following areas (*required qualifications*):

- Strategy: (1) developing, implementing, managing, and reviewing strategies that have been proved useful to guide strategic decisions at governance, management

² 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.

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

and operations levels (including AF grantees); and (2) technical competence in conducting positioning analysis (eg, scanning, landscape analysis);

- Strong and proven skills and track record in facilitating and managing participatory and multi-stakeholder consultations and practices in different cultural contexts;
- Evaluation: (1) conducting strategic evaluations for purposes of management and governance decision making; (2) technical competence in the area of monitoring, evaluation and learning (theory and practice), including knowledge in a diversity of methodological approaches; and (3) recent experience in MEL reviews of strategies, policies or institutions;
- International environmental and climate-related agreements and international institutional operations and their financial institutions. In particular, the consultant should have **sound knowledge of the Adaptation Fund and will have knowledge and experience on climate change adaptation.**

In addition, and specifically, the consultant will have knowledge, experience and good understanding of the following areas (specific desired qualifications):

- Development experience at field level and international level, preferably in least developed countries and working with those most vulnerable to climate change impacts and with topics of environment, gender and equity policies;
- Creatively and successfully adapting evaluative inquiry under highly constrained circumstances, such as the challenges presented by COVID-19;
- Being able to bring together data and information from different types of Adaptation Fund stakeholders such as Board members, senior level government officials and representatives of civil society organizations (CSOs) and private sector organizations (PSOs) and experts from different fields such as strategy, adaptation and evaluation;
- Information and communications technology (ICT) for outreach and consultation;
- Project management experience and capacity;
- Knowledge of and/or experience with the use of online meeting tools (like Webex) and survey tools (like Zoho Survey);
- 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 MTR of the MTS STC” in the subject line.

The application deadline is close of business on September 8, 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 consultant (STC) position



Mid-Term Review of the Adaptation Fund

Medium-Term Strategy 2018-2022

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."*³

The intended impact is *"Adaptive capacity enhanced, resilience*

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.*

³ AF. 2018. Medium-Term Strategy 2018-2022. March 2018. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/medium-term-strategy-2018-2022/>

strengthened and vulnerability of people, livelihoods and ecosystems to climate change reduced.”⁴

Since 2010, the Adaptation Fund has committed about US\$ 745 million for climate change adaptation (CCA) and resilience projects and programs, including 102 concrete localized adaptation projects in the most vulnerable communities of developing countries around the world with more than 6 million direct beneficiaries.⁵

1.2. Adaptation Fund governance

The Fund provides climate finance to developing countries who are members of CMP (and CMA)^{6 7} 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 July 2020, 32 NIEs, 6 RIEs and 13 MIEs had been accredited.⁸

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. 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. 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.

The World Bank serves as an interim trustee of the Fund. The Global Environment Facility (GEF), through a team of dedicated officials, provides secretariat services to the Board.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ AF. 2020. Press Release “Adaptation Fund Board Greenlights Six New Concrete Adaptation Projects on the Ground, Totalling US\$ 31 Million”. June 2, 2020. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/adaptation-fund-board-greenlights-six-new-concrete-adaptation-projects-on-the-ground-totaling-us-31-million/>

⁶ 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>

⁷ 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.

⁸ AF. 2020. Press Release “Adaptation Fund Board Accredits United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization as Fund’s 51st Implementing Entity”. July 1, 2020. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/adaptation-fund-board-accredits-united-nations-food-and-agriculture-organization-as-funds-51st-implementing-entity/>

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 Adaptation 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.⁹ 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.¹⁰

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.

1.4. Context of the Mid-Term Review of the Adaptation Fund Medium Term Strategy

According to the MTS¹¹ and in relationship to its monitoring, evaluation and reporting system, "the MTS constitutes the Fund's highest-level Results Framework for the 2018-

⁹ AF. 2012. Evaluation Framework. June 2012. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/evaluation-framework-4/>

¹⁰ 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/>

¹¹ AF. 2018. Medium-Term Strategy 2018-2022. March 2018. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/medium-term-strategy-2018-2022/> Section 7.1.1. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting system (page 29).

2022 period and, as such, is the basis against which the Fund will be evaluated for both learning and accountability purposes.” Towards this end:

- Implementing Entities will monitor, evaluate and report on projects/programmes funded under Strategic Framework 1 (SF1) and SF2 in order to assess performance and distil valuable lessons that can improve the outcomes and impact of future projects.
- The Secretariat will monitor whether activities under SF1, SF2 and SF3 are being implemented and crosscutting themes advanced in line with the Fund’s 2018-2022 Strategy, standards are being met, risks are being managed, targets are being reached, and resources are being used efficiently. Findings and recommendations will be submitted to the Board in an Annual Performance Report.
- The Board will commission an independent performance evaluation of SF1, SF2 and SF3 activity portfolios, focusing on progress towards Expected Results, lessons to be learnt from failures as well as success and implications for Fund-level outputs and objectives. This evaluation will specifically assess the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and potential long-term impact of activities under SF1, SF2 and SF3, as well as the Fund’s MTS as a whole.
- The Board will also commission an independent process evaluation, examining the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the Fund’s institutional arrangements, strategic priorities, policies and processes.
- The two evaluations will be finalized in time to inform the Fund’s MTS for the 2023-2027 period.

When the Board approved the implementation plan for the MTS in March 2018,¹² it decided to request the evaluation function *“to undertake a MTR of the MTS and its implementation plan and present its report to the Board at its thirty-sixth meeting”* (decision B.31/32). The Implementation Plan itself (Section 6) says that *“the MTS has been composed with its lifetime of five years in mind, so that revising it during that time will not be necessary, unless external circumstances in which the Fund operate, change radically. The implementation of the MTS would be evaluated after the mid-term in 2020-2021, and after it ends in 2023. The mid-term evaluation is planned to be useful in informing the possible subsequent MTS (which could span years 2023-2027). Such evaluations would be carried out by the Evaluation Function of the Fund.”*

The AF-TERG Strategy and Work programme, approved in June 2020 by the Board, indicates that the MTR will be prepared in FY21.¹³ The review will be presented at the

¹² AFB/B.31/5/Rev.1 (March 2018)

¹³ AFB/EFC.26.a-26.b/3 (May 2020).

28th meeting of the EFC (March 2021). As it will explained with more detailed below, the MTR is the first step in the process to conduct the evaluation of the MTS, to be carried out in FY23 after completion of the five-year strategy period and an Overall Evaluation of the Fund planned for FY23. During FY22 preparatory work will be commissioned to conduct these two evaluations. Studies and evaluations on issues and themes identified during the AF-TERG consultations will be conducted that will complement the MTR as well the final evaluation of the MTS and the Overall Evaluation of the Fund.

The MTR is conducted, and its recommendations will be developed under the premise that the Fund is an institution that considers and promotes **adaptive management** as a good practice. Therefore, the MTR's findings and recommendations will be seriously considered and followed up by the relevant parts of the Fund. MTRs are important tools for the Board, management, country, regional and multilateral entities partnering with the Fund to reflect and oversight the implementation of the strategy and discuss potential mid-course correction to respond more closely to the new realities and capacities of organizations that may have changed since the initial preparation and approval of the strategy. MTRs can provide improvement-focused external advice and comments.

Following the AF-TERG principles of work (see below), the MTR will be conducted ensuring that there is broad participation from across all the Fund stakeholders in the design of the MTR and in the development of recommendations and next steps. This **participatory approach** will promote co-generation of knowledge and co-management of the process, maintaining the independence of the exercise. In this way, the MTR should provide opportunities for the stakeholders and the AF-TERG to learn from how the MTS has been implemented so far.

2. Goal, purpose and process of the MTR

2.1. Goal

The goal of the assignment is twofold.

First, the consultant will conduct research on contemporary and relevant thinking, and good and emerging practices¹⁴ and experiences on the following three topics:

- **Use and evaluation of strategies** to guide and enable decision making at governance, management and operations levels (and recipients) from relevant

¹⁴ 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.

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 grey areas between the silos we inhabit.

development-oriented organizations, and in particular, those providing climate financing.

- Given the current COVID-19 situation, the consultant will also explore how other similar shocks and stresses, such as Ebola or HIV, have impacted the preparation and implementation of organizational strategies.
- **Evaluation of key aspects and concepts of the Fund** such as innovation, learning, adaptation measures with impact on the ground and simplified access processes.

The experience and lessons on these three topics will be used to develop the framework that will guide the MTR.

The second element of this assignment is to actually conduct the review of the MTS with support from AF TERG members and Secretariat.

2.2. Purpose

The purpose of the review is to assess how well the MTS is guiding the Fund overall. In particular, the Fund's responsiveness to the UNFCCC CMP/CMA¹⁵ guidance and country and climate adaptation needs and guiding the Fund's governance, management, and operations. The MTR will question if the MTS is the strategy is fit-for-purpose in the context of the AF's mandate and for the era the world and climate financing are in today and for the future. The MTR will also track the implementation of the MTS, so far, identifying progress and recommend to the Board, possible course correction and suggestions to be incorporated into the development of the next MTS.

The MTR responds to both the learning and accountability functions of the Fund's evaluation. Given the early state of the MTS implementation, the MTR will emphasize **learning** from its implementation so far and will bring learning from outside the Fund, particularly with regards to good (and successful) / next practices on strategies relevant to the Fund. The MTR will promote, emphasize and prioritize its use by different stakeholders, both to support the second half of the MTS implementation and for preparation of future strategies.

2.3. Process: Two phases

The MTR will be conducted in two phases. The first phase will bring to the Fund good / next practices, lessons and experiences on use and evaluation of strategies, and based on these, as well as extensive consultations, conduct the MTR on a second phase.

The MTR will be conducted considering the following elements:

¹⁵ CMP: Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol; CMA: Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement.

- The MTR will be a first step and key input to the evaluation of the MTS (to be conducted at the end of its term, 2022) and the Overall Evaluation of the Fund, also to be conducted in 2023 focusing on examining the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the Fund's institutional arrangements, strategic priorities, policies and processes. These two evaluations will be finalized in time to inform the Fund's MTS for the 2023-2027 period;
- Alignment and coordination with the rest of the AF-TERG work programme. The work programme includes, during FY21, the commissioning of studies and thematic evaluations that should inform all evaluations.
- Takes into account the monitoring and evaluation activities and knowledge, performance and learning products generated by the AFB Secretariat, the IEs and the UNFCCC COP/CMP/CMA processes, at different levels (eg, PPRs, Fund Annual Performance Report, etc.) and including key AF-TERG documents such as guiding principles (see below).

The AF-TERG is the commissioner and final producer of the review. The TERG will monitor its implementation, provide guidance, comment on and sign off on key deliverables at determined points of the process. The consultant will work as part of a team comprised by TERG members and Secretariat. One member of the AF-TERG will be technical focal point. This person will be the AF-TERG lead person for monitoring and guiding the project during its execution in collaboration with the AF-TERG Secretariat Coordinator.

The MTR will be conducted following consultative and participatory approaches, according to the AF-TERG principles of co-learning and co-creation of evaluations. All key stakeholders will be requested to participate and provide feedback and views throughout the MTR. One particularly way that the AF-TERG proposes to ensure direct participation, consultation and feedback into the MTR is to establish a MTR Working Group (WG) with 5-6 members from key stakeholder groups: (i) the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) of the Adaptation Fund Board, (ii) Project and Planning Review Committee (PPRC) (iii) the AFB Secretariat, (iv) the AF-TERG, (v) a representative of the NIEs group and will involve (vi) external experts on the development and practices of strategies. These members will bring to the process not only their personal/institutional views and experiences but also are expected to consult with other members of their constituencies (eg, other Board members, other NIEs, etc.). The WG will provide a space where different opinions, experiences and lessons are discussed and feed into the review. The Chair of the AF-TERG or the AF-TERG member designated as technical focal point will chair the WG 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 precise number and timing of the meetings will be defined during the inception phase, however, at a minimum, the WG is expected to hold three meetings, the precise number and timing to be defined during the inception phase. The

senior consultant will be a resource person and support the AF-TERG member and AF-TERG Secretariat Coordinator in the implementation of these meetings.

The WG shall support and guide the work of the consultant and make sure that the framework to conduct the MTR and the actual MTR are in line with expectations and correspond to the needs of the Fund and its key stakeholders. The selected consultant will take the advice of the WG into account in the pursuit of the assignment while at the same time retaining his/her independence of judgement.

The WG is just one way of conducting proactive consultations. In fact, the MTR process will promote extensive consultations with Fund stakeholders on their interest and needs regarding the AF and the MTS, and their experiences with the development, implementation and future of the MTS.

As needed, he/she may request support from the AF-TERG Secretariat data analyst for support in carrying out the assignment. AF-TERG members who are not part of the WG 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 AF-TERG Secretariat Coordinator. 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.

The AFB Secretariat will prepare a management response to the MTR that takes into account, as necessary, views expressed by stakeholders and that will be shared with the Board together with the MTR.

3. Audience and disclosure

There are three crucial and linked cascading audiences for the MTR.

- The Board: given the Board's mandate in setting the strategic direction for the Fund by approving and monitoring the MTS and using it to oversee the performance of the Fund, it is the key audience of the review. The Board will consider the MTR's findings and recommendations to decide on changes (if any) for the second half of the MTS implementation as well as for the preparation of the new MTS;
- The AFB Secretariat is also a critical and essential audience as the key implementers of the MTS to guide management choices of the work of the Fund and since they will implement the Board decisions emanating from the MTR;

- The IEs as well as representatives from governments and CSOs/PSOs will be affected by the decisions the Board may take with regards to the MTS so they should also be considered as part of the crucial audience.

The MTR will specify who is the key target groups responsible for each recommendation. The Board, AFB Secretariat, IEs, representatives from government and CSOs/PSOs will be asked to actively participate (see below) in the implementation of the MTR.

The draft MTR and the draft management response will be distributed as an EFC document by the AF-TERG and AFB secretariat, respectively. The Board decision and the final versions of MTR and management response will be made public as per the standard practice for AF Board documents.

4. Task, expected deliverables, and methodology

Phase 1. MTR readiness / inception work

This phase will be short (4-5 weeks). The key output will a synthesis of key issues, experiences and lessons relevant to reviewing the MTS (see below). This information will be used to develop the framework, in the second phase, that will guide the MTR. In addition, this first phase will also include an initial consultative process with key stakeholders to gather initial thoughts and expectations on what should be included in the MTR, particularly from the Board, AFB Secretariat and IEs.

The key areas and questions that the consultant will research and explore include:

- 1) **Strategies as guiding tools for management and governance of organizations (experiences from outside the Fund).** What are the relevant leading experiences and current thinking on: (1) the framing and effective use of strategy to guide management, governance and funding of relevant development-oriented organizations and (2) the evaluation of strategies to effectively guide management, governance and financing? What does real use of strategy look like in dynamically managing and governing an organization? How strategies are used effectively in governance and management-planning, monitoring, learning, reporting, allocating funds, engaging and empowering stakeholders? What incentives drive the use of strategy? How COVID-19 is affecting the implementation of strategies (real time) as well as lessons from how Ebola and HIV affected the implementation of strategies in the past? The research responding to these questions will provide a frame on how to review the MTS, its “fit for purpose” (eg, relevance for the time, background context of what strategy should or could do for the AF) and how strategy thinking is changing in different sectors and industries. [7 days]
- 2) **Evaluating key Fund concepts that are elements of the MTS.** What are the current practices on evaluating key concepts of the Fund, such as innovation, adaptation,

adaptive management, sustainability, human and natural systems nexus to CCA, etc? what are relevant evaluations that have been completed recently or under way? [3 days]

- 3) **Conducting MTRs.** Any experiences and good / next practices on conducting midterm evaluations and midterm reviews of strategies? How should the MTR be forward looking and promote the use of participatory evaluation approaches? Any experiences on conducting MTRs under crisis situations (eg, pandemic such as COVID-19, Ebola, HIV, etc) [2 days]
- 4) **Evaluative Evidence on the Fund and its operations.** what is the current evaluative evidence about the Fund and its operations, from within and outside the Fund? [3 days]

The consultant will conduct semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, such as Board members, AFB Secretariat staff, other AF-TERG Members and representatives of the IEs and CSOs/PSOs network and possibly use social media for gathering inputs. For this first phase, the consultant will document the key needs and expectations from these groups regarding the MTR.

The consultant will facilitate two meetings of successful practitioners on relevant subjects to brainstorm and discuss the recent relevant experiences and thinking on (i) the evolution of the field of strategy and the use of strategy to guide management and governance and (ii) evaluating key Fund concepts that are part of the MTS (see above). The participants should represent both the human and natural systems context of the Fund. The AF-TERG Secretariat will coordinate and the AF-TERG member focal point will support these meetings. The consultant and the AF-TERG may decide to convene other groups on other subjects if necessary.

The consultant is encouraged to use techniques, such as rapid evidence assessment (REA),¹⁶ to conduct the research on the key areas highlighted above.

The key tasks to be conducted in this first phase include:

- Light REA on four key areas described above;
- Convene two expert groups (2 hour each, 5-7 people), one on strategy practices and another on evaluation practices of the technical elements of the MTS, following the key questions presented in items (1) and (2) above;

¹⁶ The rapid evidence assessment can be completed usually in less than one week. Please see the following references: <https://cebma.org/faq/what-is-an-rea/> and <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/rapid-evidence-assessments>; <https://guides.temple.edu/c.php?g=78618&p=4156608>

- Conduct interviews with up to 10 people (Board, AFB Secretariat staff and IEs);
- Prepare a synthesis(es) of the findings to support the development of the MTR framework;
- Actively interact and receive feedback and support from the AF-TERG.

Phase 2. The MTR

The MTR will be conducted in about four months, with the MTR presented at the March 2021 Board meeting. The review will:

- Assess the extent to which the MTS is fit for purpose for the AF mandate, context and era of the world, the urgency of the climate crisis and the evolving climate finance landscape;
- Assess the extent to which the Board and the Secretariat use the MTS to guide decisions and choices about the work and resource allocation of the Fund, in particular, responsiveness to the UNFCCC COP guidance, Board decision, and country and climate adaptation needs and the Fund's governance, management, and operations;
- Assess the extent to which the MTS is the right strategy;
- Track the implementation of the MTS, so far, identifying progress and recommend to the Board, possible course correction and suggestions to be incorporated into the development of the next MTS.

The key areas to be explored (more could be identified in the process of the first phase) will include:

- **Results and use of the MTS so far.** What has been the role of the MTS in shaping and filtering the AF actions, portfolio, and results? How is the strategy used for decision making, shaping portfolio choices, and investments? How has the MTS been operationalized so far? What has been the progress in achieving the MTS? (a review of the key indicators and their targets) [12 days]
- **Positioning of the Fund** in the world and within the CCA financing landscaping. Does the MTS help position the Fund, by helping it to play to its comparative advantages and niche? [2 days]
- **Responsiveness to stakeholders.** How was the MTS developed? What are the needs of stakeholders that the MTS should account for in its structure, focus and implementation? Are they present? How is the current situation of COVID-19 and discussions/negotiations on CCA affecting the current MTS, missions, funding, structures or organizations (especially those focused on reaching the most vulnerable)? How responsive is the MTS to the guidelines provided by the CMP /

CMA? What are the external drivers that have shaped (and will shape) the choices the Fund has made? [12 days]

- **Alignment with the Fund's mandate.** What is the alignment of the MTS with the Fund's mandate, UNFCCC COP guidance, Board decisions, other relevant international agreements and supporting countries achieving their SDGs? [7 days]
- **Quality of the MTS.** what is the quality of the MTS (eg, does it have the key elements required in a strategy, such as: positioning of the Fund, setting priorities, making choices, managing risk, perspective, internal coherence, linkages and support to learning and adaptive management, execution, efficiency, etc.)? One particular aspect to be assessed is the quality from the point of evaluability: does the MTS have the elements necessary to be evaluated and credibly report and assess its achievements and shortcomings? [5 days]
- Follow up to the Overall Evaluation of the AF. [2 days]
- MTS going forward. [10 days]
 - o **Impacts of current context.** Is the MTS prepared for the new "normal" (eg, COVID-19 pandemic and post recovery) and current discussions and negotiations on CCA financing? What are the implications of COVID-19 for the future MTS;
 - o **Preparing the new MTS.** What lessons should be incorporated in future processes for developing the new MTS? What issues should be considered in the development of the new MTS?

The key tasks to be conducted in the second phase will be:

- Prepare framework and inception report/evaluation matrix and methodologies according to the key areas and questions presented above;
- Actively participate, as resource person, and support the WG implementation;
- Conduct interviews with up to 20 people (AFB Secretariat, Board, IEs, CSOs, funding partners, etc.);
- Survey of IEs: feedback on MTS (eg, lessons, achievements, shortcomings, etc), and expectations for completing it and for new MTS);
- Document review/desk review (eg, UNFCCC COP/CMP/CMA guidance and Board decisions, Sec documents to monitor, report and implement the MTS, KM, etc.);
- Fund portfolio: relevance to the MTS and to CCA, portfolio of AF, lessons from AF completed projects relevant to the MTS (innovation, scale up, concrete actions), actual and expected results);
- Deep dives: select 3 countries, 3 NIEs, 1 MIE and 1 RIE;
- Reporting, consultation, synthesis and actively interacting with the AF-TERG;
- Two versions of the MTR: draft and final MTR.

5. Timetable and deliverables

Task	Deliverable	Timeframe
REoI advertised	RoEI	August 18, 2020
Selection of consultant	Consultant is selected	Sept. 20, 2020
Phase 1	Research and consultation Framework for MTR and short synthesis reports	Sept – October Oct 30, 2020
Phase 2	Data collection Socialization of Draft MTR with AF stakeholders Draft MTR Factual review by AFB Sec MTR	October – December Early January, 2021 Mid January, 2021 Late January, 2021 February 2021
MTR presentation to Board	MTR to Board	March 2021

6. 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. The MTR and the consultant will ensure that these principles are followed in the processes and products.

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 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 experience 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, utilize 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 utilization 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.