



April 2021

Review and Revision of the Adaptation Fund Evaluation Framework

Inception Report



**Technical Evaluation
Reference Group**
ADAPTATION FUND



April 2021

Review and Revision of the Adaptation Fund Evaluation Framework

Inception Report



**Technical Evaluation
Reference Group**
ADAPTATION FUND

AF-TERG Chair: Debbie Menezes

Focal point: Mutizwa Mukute

Team members: Peter Weston, Luís Garcia Espinal, Claudio Volonte, Anh Bui

AF-TERG Secretariat Coordinator: Dennis Bours

The Adaptation Fund was established through decisions by the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol 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 decided that the Adaptation Fund shall also serve the Paris Agreement. The Fund supports country-driven projects and programmes, innovation and global learning for effective adaptation. All of the Fund's activities are designed to build national and local adaptive capacities while reaching and engaging the most vulnerable groups, and to integrate gender consideration to provide equal opportunity to access and benefit from the Fund's resources. They are also aimed at enhancing synergies with other sources of climate finance, while creating models that can be replicated or scaled up. www.adaptation-fund.org

The Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund (AF-TERG) is an independent evaluation advisory group accountable to the Adaptation Fund Board, established in 2018 to ensure the independent implementation of the Fund's evaluation framework. The AF-TERG, which is headed by a chair, provides an evaluative advisory role through performing evaluative, advisory and oversight functions. The group is comprised of independent experts in evaluation, called the AF-TERG members. A small secretariat provides support for the implementation of evaluative and advisory activities as part of the work programme.

While independent of the operations of the Adaptation Fund, the aim of the AF-TERG is to add value to the Fund's work through independent monitoring, evaluation and learning. www.adaptation-fund.org/about/evaluation/

© Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund (AF-TERG)

Reproduction permitted provided source is acknowledged. Please reference the work as follows:

AF-TERG, 2021. Review and Revision of the Adaptation Fund Evaluation Framework — Inception Report. Adaptation Fund Technical Evaluation Reference Group (AF-TERG), Washington, DC.

The unedited inception report was finished January 2021.





Table of Contents

List of acronyms and abbreviations	iii
I. Introduction and context	1
II. Goal and objectives of the assignment	3
III. Approach and methodology	4
IV. Inception phase findings	6
A. The niche of the Adaptation Fund	6
B. Changes in the Adaptation Fund since the current evaluation framework was approved	6
C. Maturing understanding of the climate change adaptation context regarding need and urgency for better and faster evidence	8
D. Developments in the evaluation profession and operating context since the current evaluation framework was approved	10
E. Options for a revised evaluation instrument	12
V. Conclusion and next steps	14
Annexes	16
Annex A - References and documents reviewed	16
a) References	16
b) Documents reviewed	20
Annex B. Research and stakeholder matrices	27
a) The review research tool	27
b) The assignment process and target informants	31
Annex C. Data collection protocol	34
a) Qualitative sampling frame	34
b) Review phase: Interview guidelines	36
c) Draft key informant interview question guides	37
d) List of persons interviewed	40
Annex D. Comparison of the guidance characteristics of the current evaluation framework against those of an evaluation policy or evaluation strategy	41
Annex E: Research and evaluation principles and ethics applied to this assignment	47
a) The Fund's evaluation principles	47
b) The AF-TERG work principles	47
c) The consultant team's ethics declaration:	48



Acronyms and abbreviations

AF-TERG	Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund
AP	Accreditation Panel
Board	Adaptation Fund Board
CCA	Climate change adaptation
CIF	Climate Investment Funds
CMA	Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
COP	Conference of the Parties
CSO	Civil society organization
EFC	Ethics and Finance Committee
ESP	Environment and Social Policy
Fund	Adaptation Fund
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEF IEO	Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IE	Implementing Entity
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MEL	Monitoring, evaluation, and learning
MIE	Multilateral Implementing Entity
MTR	Mid-term review
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	OECD's Development Assistance Committee
OPG	Operating Policies and Guidelines for Parties to Access Resources (of the Adaptation Fund)
PPR	Project performance report
PPRC	Project/Programme Review Committee
secretariat	Secretariat of the Adaptation Fund Board
SES	Social-Ecological Systems
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund



I. Introduction and context

The Adaptation Fund (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 programmes 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 the Fund shall also serve the Paris Agreement. The Fund's goal is that "(p)eople, livelihoods and ecosystems are adequately protected from the adverse impacts of climate change" (Adaptation Fund, 2018a). The intended impact is "(a)daptive capacity enhanced, resilience strengthened, and vulnerability of people, livelihoods, and ecosystems to climate change reduced" (Adaptation Fund, 2018a).

The Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) endorsed at its 13th meeting (March 2011 – Decision B.13/20.a) an **evaluation framework** for the Fund, which was developed in accordance with international standards in evaluation at the time of approval. A revised version of the framework, contained in document AFB/EFC.6/4, was approved at the Board's 15th meeting in 2012 (Adaptation Fund, 2012a). The Fund's evaluation framework explains concepts, roles, and use of evaluation within the Fund and the responsibilities of different participating entities. Specifically, the framework establishes requirements for how Fund activities should be evaluated at three levels: project, Implementing Entity (IE), and Fund. It includes evaluation principles and criteria, and two overarching objectives, which are (i) **accountability** for the achievement of the Fund objectives; and (ii) **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.

The Board has authorized the Fund's Technical Evaluation Reference Group (AF-TERG) to conduct the review and revision of the Fund's evaluation framework with the support of consultants. This inception report outlines how the review and revision will be carried out.

The assignment has been divided into three phases:

- 1) Inception phase to present how the assignment will be completed and conduct an initial review of key documents from the Fund and from the evaluation and climate change adaptation (CCA) communities to support the inception phase and implementation of the next phases.
- 2) The review phase to focus on the reviewing of the Adaptation Framework in relation to new and relevant policies/strategies and procedures approved by the Board and/or by the Board secretariat, current discussions, and evolution of the profession and the climate change community.
- 3) Revision phase to focus on revising the current evaluation framework into a new instrument to fit the purpose of the current and near future evaluation and learning functions of the Fund.

The inception phase research has concluded that the current evaluation framework is becoming outdated due to three high-level shifts (with more detailed discussion provided in Section IV below):

- changes within the Fund itself since the framework was approved
- advancements in the wider evaluation discipline
- the urgency of climate impacts and a maturing understanding about its complexities, requiring faster CCA knowledge and action.

In addition, the research has concluded that the current evaluation framework contains elements of an evaluation policy, strategy, and framework/guidelines without fulfilling any of them. Consequently, a mere revision of the current evaluation framework is likely to be insufficient to position the Fund's evaluation function for the challenges and demands of the coming five to 10 years. Therefore, this inception report proposes the development of an Adaptation Fund evaluation policy that is fit-for-purpose.

This inception report has been guided by the study's terms of reference (ToR) prepared by the AF-TERG. It is informed by conversations of the consultancy team with: (i) AF-TERG members as a whole; (ii) the AF-TERG Chair, members, and coordinator as individuals; (iii) the secretariat; and (vi) evaluation experts in peer agencies who have conducted similar reviews and revisions. It is also informed by an initial review of the Fund's current evaluation guidance, strategies, and policies; evaluations and studies of the Fund itself; peer organizations' evaluation instruments; and review of academic and grey literature on this subject.

This inception report summarizes the key work by the team during the inception phase. Details of work is available in annexes and internal working documents.



II. Goal and objectives of the assignment

The **goal** of this assignment is to produce, a fit-for-purpose evaluation instrument for the Fund for discussion and subsequent approval by the Board.

The **objectives** of the assignment as defined in the ToR for the assignment are to:

- 1) Identify contemporary relevance and gaps of, and propose necessary revisions to, the Fund's evaluation framework and propose a more appropriate evaluation instrument for the Fund.
- 2) Produce a draft instrument for the 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 review will be guided by research questions that fit into five overriding themes:

- A. the niche of the Fund
- B. integration of Board decisions, Fund policies, and other relevant development in the Fund since 2012
- C. maturing understanding of the climate change adaptation context regarding need and urgency for better and faster evidence
- D. new and evolving thinking and practice in the evaluation field
- E. the type of evaluation instrument(s) that would serve the needs of the Fund's evaluation function and its partners.



III. Approach and methodology

The inception phase, which took place from September 2020 to mid-January 2021, will be followed by an evaluation framework review phase, and a revision phase. The review phase will take place between January and March 2021. Processes will be highly consultative with internal and external stakeholder participation, as well as an exhaustive review of relevant internal and external documentation that began during this inception phase. The resultant **evaluation framework review briefing** will be submitted to the EFC in **March 2021** with findings and recommendations for developing a new instrument that will govern the evaluation function of the Fund.

As part of the inception phase, the team undertook preliminary interviews and review of key relevant documents from the Fund, and the CCA and evaluation communities. These inception phase reviews will contribute to the detailed review phase. Highlights of the findings of this initial review are presented below in Section IV.

The revision phase will inform the drafting of the **new evaluation instrument** for the EFC to assess and submit to the Board for approval. A draft evaluation instrument will be due in **June** and a final version for EFC and Board consideration will be due in **October 2021**.

The review and subsequent revision of the current Fund's evaluation framework will employ a qualitative approach to primary data collection, as well as analysis of documents of the Fund and external peer organizations, academia, and evaluation associations.

Research and consultation methods will conform to the Fund's principles for evaluations and the AF-TERG's work principles. The following methods will be employed in the review phase:

- a) *Document review* of all Fund documents and Board decisions since 2012; widely recognized international evaluation standards and evaluation guidance; and literature from the most relevant and progressive peer organizations and institutions.
- b) *Key informant interviews* with Board members, IEs, the Fund's NGO Network, AF-TERG members, secretariat, Fund consultants, partner organizations, and external authorities in evaluation theory and practice.
- c) *Participatory consultation and data-gathering workshops*. Online participatory workshops will engage Fund internal stakeholders to review and provide feedback on the findings, lessons, and actions emanating from each phase of this assignment. During the review and revision phases, some "mini-workshop" webinars may also be developed to help interpret data, generate collective ideas and directions, and seek consensus on ways forward.

After the review phase, the **phase to develop an updated draft evaluation instrument** will leverage the findings and recommendations of the current evaluation framework review. It will also draw upon the literature and practices from the evaluation and CCA communities. In addition, the consultants will conduct follow-up informant consultations to collaboratively refine the instrument's form and contents.

Responsibilities

The research team is composed of three experienced consultants who are also the authors of this inception report. Supervision and quality assurance will be conducted by the following:

AF-TERG has the final responsibility for the review and revision of the Evaluation Framework, with support from a research team.

A Focal Point will supervise the research team on behalf of the AF-TERG.

An Evaluation Technical Advisor will support the focal point and the research team on behalf of the AF-TERG.

The EFC will supervise the AF-TERG and consider its Evaluation Framework review and revision recommendations before presenting them to the Board.

The Board will consider the EFC advice resulting from the assignment and make the final decision on the resultant draft evaluation instrument.



IV. Inception phase findings

During the inception phase, the team reviewed Board decisions and policies, strategies, and processes approved since the current evaluation framework was put in place. It also reviewed the evaluation profession landscape within and outside the CCA sector. The team will conduct further research during the next few months to further understand and bring to the Fund the current and latest discussions from the evaluation profession. Initial research found the following issues to be of importance to the direction of the review and development of the Fund's instrument. These issues should inform the evaluation function and provide clarity in the relationship between the monitoring and learning functions.

A. The niche of the Adaptation Fund

The Fund's strategic niche is an important consideration in shaping the review and revision of the evaluation framework. Fund documentation outlines that the Fund aspires to play a more effective and agile role in the climate finance landscape among other actors contributing to similar goals. This aspiration is described by its Mid-term Strategy (MTS). The Board, supported by the secretariat, developed the MTS for the Fund following a stepwise process that spanned from the 28th to the 30th meeting, approved through decision B.30/42. It recognizes the Fund has a *"well-recognised niche supporting smaller (typically less than US\$ 10 million), country-driven adaptation projects/programmes"* (Adaptation Fund, 2018a).

The MTS further outlines the following as part of the Fund's niche: (i) an exclusive focus on CCA; (ii) direct and enhanced access modalities that are intended to reduce costs and complexities of accessing funds, while strengthening developing countries' ownership of supported programmes; and (iii) commitment to pragmatic learning and sharing, mostly involving South-South collaboration. An implementation plan for the MTS¹ sets out to create additional funding windows that include innovation and learning among other programming opportunities.

B. Changes in the Adaptation Fund since the current evaluation framework was approved

Informants from the AF-TERG and secretariat pointed out that while the current evaluation framework is helpful, the Fund has evolved since the approval of the Framework almost 10 years ago. The Fund has approved several policies, the MTS (2018-2022), and procedures that affect the monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) functions of the Fund in general and the current evaluation framework in particular. In addition, the Board established the AF-TERG, which is one of the key implementors of the Fund's evaluation function.

Therefore, the current evaluation framework needs to redefine and integrate these new developments and roles.

The team identified **30 Board decisions made since 2012** that affect the evaluation function but that are not recognized in the evaluation framework. The most relevant relate to the following:

- authorizing the conduct of two overall evaluations of the Fund itself and other studies into the Fund’s evaluation and learning approaches
- approval of core indicators, the MTS, its implementation plan, and the Fund-Level Effectiveness and Efficiency Results Framework
- approval of ToR for the EFC and AF-TERG
- establishment of the AF-TERG, appointment of the Chair and members and approval of its Strategy and Work Programme
- commissioning and approving the MTS (especially its M&E section).

Similarly, the team identified 42 Fund policies, processes, guidelines, and strategies approved by the Board or introduced by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) since 2012 that need to be referenced or that may influence the evaluation function. The most pre-eminent is the Fund’s **MTS 2018 – 2022** with its three strategic pillars of (i) Action, (ii) Innovation, and (iii) Learning and Sharing and its implementation plan. The list also includes, among others, the Fund’s Ad-hoc Complaint Handling Mechanism, Results-Based Management Framework, Strategic Results Framework, Knowledge Management Strategy, and Readiness Programme.

Over the last six years, several **internal studies and evaluations of the Adaptation Fund** have had implications for rethinking the evaluation function. These include two independent evaluations of the Fund (2015 and 2018); *A Review of the Strategic Results Framework and the Adaptation Fund-Level Effectiveness and Efficiency Results Framework* (2018); the *Evaluability Assessment Report* (2020); the *Study on Approaches to Ex Post Evaluation of Climate Change Adaptation* (2020); and the preliminary findings on an internal gap analysis of the valuation framework and its current structure and content (2019). A synthesis of final evaluations and a mid-term review of the MTS were underway within the AF-TERG at the time of writing this inception report.

Review of the first and second independent evaluations of the Adaptation Fund highlighted several issues pertinent to **improving evaluation practice for the Fund**. These especially related to how monitoring and **evaluation and subsequent learning needs to be better coordinated with partners**, coherent, systematically inclusive, and communicated, and how **cumulative knowledge needs to be better managed and exploited** for sharing and continuous improvement.

Other recent studies managed by the AF-TERG supported these findings. They also highlighted the need for the Fund’s evaluation function to deliberately **align to the Paris Agreement**; encourage tracking and **adoption of new and emerging evaluation approaches**, including “adaptive management,” “close-to-real-time” and “coupled human and natural systems,” lesson learning, and application; and position the Fund’s learning capabilities to incorporate long-term learning.

The evaluability assessment (July 2020) of proposals approved by the Fund emphasized that future MEL systems require improving the “evaluability” of Fund projects at **design stage**. They should also pursue improvements in **inclusion, adaptive management** tailoring MEL systems, particularly monitoring systems, to generate robust **evidence on programme management and delivery**; a focus on “**close-to real-time**” **lesson learning**; and explicit focus on **learning from unintended consequences** and failures as well as successes.

One informant highlighted that the Fund does not yet have a track record regarding two of its three evaluation levels: evaluation of the Fund itself (self-evaluation) and evaluating its IEs. Therefore, at this point of the Fund’s life, it needs to develop a strong evaluation instrument that can better mandate and enable such evaluations to emerge, with least resistance. This suggests that a fit-for-purpose evaluation instrument should cover the following levels of the Fund: projects, programme portfolios, strategic level (e.g. strategy, policies, practices, mindsets, relationships, and power), and Fund level (e.g. governance, mission, position/niche, and scale).

C. Maturing understanding of the climate change adaptation context regarding need and urgency for better and faster evidence

Based on best practices identified in literature and insights from peer organization and Fund stakeholders, the team found some evaluation challenges **specific to CCA** that affect not only the purposes but also methods that must be incorporated into evaluation.

Perhaps the most important challenge for CCA evaluation is for its intended learnings and uses to respond to the **urgency of climate action**. The Global Risks Report 2020 (WEF, 2020) spells out that “*Climate change is striking harder and more rapidly than many expected. ... Alarming, global temperatures are on track to increase by at least 3°C towards the end of the century—twice what climate experts have warned is the limit to avoid the most severe economic, social, and environmental consequences. The near-term impacts of climate change add up to a planetary emergency...*”. The inevitable response is that CCA thought-leaders like the Fund must reorganize to produce faster evaluative lessons commensurate to the urgency of the crisis (Patton, 2019).

One informant suggested that “*the shelf life of learning is approximately two years*” before it is outdated. Yet conventional approaches to evaluation can take almost as long to generate learnings. **This calls into play a fusing of monitoring and evaluation and design functions** away from siloed disciplines to something more integrated and inter-dependent (Picciotto, 2015; Ophir, 2018).

As one informant summed up, “*separating monitoring from evaluation is dysfunctional!*” Monitoring is where timely learning can be generated to inform timely project adjustment and new design insights, which the long gaps between evaluations cannot provide. “*You really need to have your antennae out for what we don’t know, what is promising, what are the problems.*” These insights suggest that the Fund evaluation instrument should show how monitoring is linked to both evaluation and learning.

The Fund must reorganize to ensure evaluative learning not only informs better programme design but also leverages its evaluation lessons for greater “political” influence towards social betterment (Henry and Mark, 2003; Kirkhart, 2004; Schwandt, 2019). This is part of its organizational *“whole-of-process’ approach to optimizing evaluation use pointing to the importance of broader organizational, cultural, behavioural, and process-related aspects,”* as one informant wrote.

Baseline and comparative longitudinal data are not sufficient for determining **contribution vs. attribution** in CCA programming, in the face of **contextual complexity**: evaluation in CCA needs to cope with *“assumptions of unpredictability as well as incompleteness, instability, and a plurality of perspectives”* (Schwandt, 2019) and the nature-confounding effects or factors that are often unobservable and uncontrollable.

To these main challenges, other elements have been identified, such as the following:

- uncertainty about actual climate change patterns to come
- divergent adaptation values, perceptions, and goals of different stakeholders
- measurement of complex, multi-objective, and interdisciplinary strategies.

CCA interventions almost inevitably seek and/or result in impacts on human systems, as well as natural/environmental systems. Yet evaluations tend to focus on human systems results alone. Thus, evaluations of Fund interventions need to accommodate not one but two evaluands: the human and the natural, or **“coupled human and natural systems”** (Rowe, 2012). Human and natural systems present evaluation challenges of different time horizons and spatial implications. To address these issues in evaluation, the measuring and valuing of change in nature and environmental services can be borrowed from established economic techniques (Rowe, 2012), as well as natural and physical sciences (Rowe, 2019).

Concerning how the Fund works with IEs, secretariat informants highlighted that **the Fund relies on the capacity of these partners to commission their own evaluations at the project level**. Consequently, the variety of evaluation reports from these organizations (national and regional) is diverse and often sub-standard (Adaptation Fund, 2018b), impairing a comprehensive and efficient evaluation/reporting/learning function. This may illustrate the need to (i) standardize evaluation processes, capacities, and roles; (ii) increase partner evaluation capacity; and (iii) work directly with implementing partners.

Internal and external informants advocated for a more proactive evaluation function that would, for example, provide **more active support for IEs at national and subnational levels**. This is also supported by the AF-TERG principles. The Fund’s evaluation function needs to change to **directly engage with implementers when designing, measuring, and reporting for evaluations. It was also suggested the Fund should directly support** learning for programme improvement among IEs and up to portfolio-level. This was predicted to generate efficiency, dynamism, and evaluative agility for the Fund and partners. This would, in turn, enable the Fund to share adaptation lessons with the wider global community more effectively and authoritatively. Going *“beyond the language or incorporating local voices”* to actually doing so would also be aligned Fund principles of

working synergistically and co-generation. It would also give legitimacy to the Fund's current evaluation objective to evaluate IEs.

In addition, in recent years, most partnered countries have developed their own policies for climate action. The Fund's evaluation function and approaches must align to these policies. Of particular relevance are those spelled out in Nationally Determined Contributions to climate action and national climate action plans.

D. Developments in the evaluation profession and operating context since the current evaluation framework was approved

The first step in reviewing how the current Fund's evaluation framework sits within the evaluation profession was to consider evaluation instruments used by other climate finance organizations. A scan of peer organizations in climate finance and other multilateral agencies has provided a first context with the Fund's current evaluation framework. This included reviewing the evaluation instruments of 15 peer organizations; an in-depth comparison of six of those (see Annex C), selected for diversity; and interviews with evaluation experts in the Green Climate Fund (GCF), Global Environment Facility (GEF), and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The latter organizations were selected because they have similar objectives to the Fund and the Board usually considers them as peers to learn with and from.

We established that the peers have reviewed and changed their own evaluation instruments in the last four years to evaluation policies – decisions the team was keen to understand. This includes, among others, the GCF (policy approval still pending), GEF, UNEP, UNDP, World Food Programme, United Nations Population Fund, World Health Organization, UN Women, and the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF).

In relation to UNFCCC-affiliated agencies, external peer informants stated their organizations opted for a policy because it carries the "legal" authority to shift the whole organization and external partners. They also pointed out a policy is less subject to regular updating than, say, a strategy or technical guidance; it is more readily replicated by implementers who do not have their own evaluation policy already; and a simple policy still enables more flexible strategies and agreements to determine how it will be actioned instead of trying to be all things in one document.

The research team also assessed the international evaluation standards that contribute **evaluation criteria, principles, norms, and ethical guidance** that undergird most UN and multilateral organizations' evaluation guidance. Expert informants perceived evaluation standards such as those of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) to **be insufficiently adapted to climate adaptation demands and on countries and communities and to massive shifts taking place across the globe.**

Literature describes how the geopolitical context into which the “DAC criteria” was introduced has passed. In this earlier context, government and multilateral agencies, and experts in the Global North, dominated development programmes and evaluation; governments were assumed to be stable within a global order (Picciotto, 2015); evaluation could focus on social research to the exclusion of “external” factors like supporting ecosystems (Rowe, 2019) and evaluation was undergirded by notions of scientific rationality and modernization (Schwandt, 2019).

Conceptual shifts that the Fund’s evaluation function and the wider discipline must grapple with include the following:

- Legitimacy, sustainability, and usefulness of evaluations require that **local, indigenous and most impacted peoples** become co-creators (Schwandt, 2019) in the evaluation design and interpretation of meaning, and even the evaluation’s ontology (nature of reality), epistemology (ways of knowing), and axiology (ethical principles) (Gaotlhobogwe, and others, 2018).
- Democracy is globally in retreat and many governments and global institutions have a “crisis of legitimacy” (Schwandt, 2019).
- The **economic and geopolitical power** of Global North and South countries is converging as OECD countries stagnate and previously low-income countries are growing rapidly (Picciotto, 2015).
- The planet is on the verge of **exceeding its capacity to provide enough natural resources** and food and absorb human waste and pollution (Picciotto, 2015).
- Development is no longer dominated by a few public actors. Over 100,000 private **multinational enterprises** inject USD 1.3 trillion dollars into national economies around the world. New and pervasive development models are emanating from a market systems perspective (blended finance, social impact investing, enterprise finance) (Evaluating Impact Investing, n.d.). **Consumer and social activists** are networking and influencing on a global scale, and large **philanthropic foundations and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs)** are outgrowing some multilateral agencies and taking a lead in much international evaluation thinking (Evaluating Impact Investing, n.d.).

Critics note that DAC criteria and the evaluation focus of related institutions like UNEG do not address this growing complexity and interconnections of the world in which development projects take place (Patton, 2019; Picciotto, 2015 and Ophir, 2018). The critics argue these entities assume linear cause-effect logic, compliance, and isolated project/programme evaluation. Instead, they need to focus on evaluation guidance suited to where change is the only constant. These include complex adaptive systems, ethical values, values clarification, methodological flexibility such as developmental evaluation (Patton, 2010), and non-negotiable philosophical principles.²

In addition, informants described these conventional standards as **being focused on accountability of implementers to donors in a time when accountability to intended beneficiaries and an emphasis on learning, especially co-learning, and adapting is of**

highest priority for an effective CCA effort. Future evaluation capacities must ensure that capacities serve the needs and interests of the implementing organizations and people of concern (especially Indigenous people and marginalized people) as well, not just donor interests.

However, some informants acknowledged the conventional evaluation standards as important foundations for credibility. Therefore, the review and instrument development will regard these standards as credible foundations upon which to build and improve.

To respond to the above challenges, additional insights provided through the literature review and consultations emphasized the need for the **Fund to become more innovative in developing evaluation capacities beyond current conventional practices within CCA and multilateral agencies**. Consistent with the literature, informants stated that the Fund needs to learn from **promising evaluation practices from inside and outside CCA to become adaptive to rapidly changing and increasingly complex contexts, and knowledge demands** cited above. The Fund and other climate finance agencies must take a position to be self-critical about why local, indigenous, and vulnerable voices are marginalized or invisible to their organizational processes and how to remedy that.

The rise of Internet-connected technology contributes to the shift in tools of evaluation. Mobile digital data collection and remote data collection, for example, have become standard practice. In addition, two-thirds of the global population have a mobile phone and half have Internet access (WEF, 2020). Moreover, this connectivity revolution presents opportunities for innovations for greater co-creation and timely learning. One informant described a global organization that has innovated its MEL approaches to engage intended beneficiaries directly into ongoing, community-based, real-time evaluative learning.³

E. Options for a revised evaluation instrument

A central question confronting the Fund and this assignment is what type of evaluation instrument will best serve the Fund and its evaluation function. The inception phase identified three appropriate forms of instrument: framework, strategy, or policy. As part of the inception phase research, the team conducted a direct comparison of the characteristics of the different options it uncovered, drawing on academic and grey literature, and empirical observation of actual instruments. In terms of these three options, the following understandings have been established:

An evaluation framework – Conventionally, an evaluation framework is a lower-order pragmatic “how-to” document that may cover “... *guidance on data sources and [evaluation] management processes [and] sometimes ... an overall program theory/logic model...*” (BetterEvaluation, 2018). Another definition highlights the role of the evaluation framework “*to lay out the components of the [evaluation] initiative... [to increase] understanding of the [evaluated] programmes goals and objectives,*” and “*help to develop sound monitoring and evaluation plans and implementation of monitoring and evaluation activities*” (UN Women, 2010).

An evaluation strategy – Observation of other organizations’ evaluation strategies³ revealed that a strategy tends to include a **detailed plan of activities** towards achieving desired objectives. Alongside this, a **risk and mitigation plan** is commonly included to pre-empt potential challenges during the strategy implementation against each of the actions considered. The underlying rationale of an evaluation strategy is to pursue specific and **timebound objectives for attaining improved evaluation quality and delivery**, to better serve the goals of the organization. Strategies should also frame the financial resources needed to achieve these objectives.

While recognition of structure must be considered when developing an evaluation strategy, it does not resemble the regulatory or formal structure of an evaluation policy. As such, the evaluation strategy provides some degree of flexibility to be adjusted to new internal or external dynamics, while its goal remains unchanged.

An evaluation policy – Trochim (2009) and Feldman (2019) describe an evaluation policy as the rules and principles of an agency to guide its decisions and actions when doing an evaluation. It is useful to *“affirm the agency’s commitment to conducting rigorous, relevant evaluations and to using evidence from evaluations to inform policy and practice”* (Feldman, 2019).

The evaluation policy should **clarify hierarchy, delegation, and authority** of detailed processes, roles, resources, and methods; and ensure the policy’s hierarchical positioning relative to other policies and processes is unambiguous. These characteristics regulate a cascaded structure of authority that is applicable across the whole organization (Trochim, 2009) (which is less evident in the evaluation framework).

The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (n.d) summarizes the purpose of its evaluation policy as a document that *“[helps] staff and ... partners align their expectations in determining why, when, and how to use evaluation... [and] to be more transparent, strategic, and systematic in deciding what and how to evaluate.”*

In relation to its level of detail, BetterEvaluation (2020) explains that *“(t)he policy document is often a **fairly brief document, which is supported by more detailed guidance, guidelines, or a procedures manual.**”*



V. Conclusion and next steps

To be prepared for the challenges outlined above and others, cutting-edge evaluation insights from the wider evaluation community will be considered and proposed in the review phase, as well as next generation paradigms and practices, consistent with AF-TERG principles. The Fund, in its process of developing a new instrument to govern the evaluation function and the links to the monitoring and learning functions, should consider new ways of thinking and forms of evaluation practice (particularly in the context of climate change). These should be linked to planning and decision-making conducted under **unpredictability, incompleteness, instability, and a plurality of perspectives.**

Informants stressed that the Fund's evaluation function and conventional evaluation standards are not sufficient to deal with the above challenges. Instead, the Fund needs to evolve **to the forefront of evaluation practice and nimbleness to generate and share timely new knowledge to support CCA.** According to AF-TERG informants, such an innovative and responsive evaluation profile would enable the Fund **to become a sector-leading, influential, and relevant contributor to the global CCA effort.** However, these capacities would expand the Fund's evaluation function relative to its current arms-length grants model and siloed approach to MEL.

A revision of the current evaluation framework – The Fund's 2012 framework is essentially an internally focused set of guidelines and directives that illustrate the Fund's understanding of good evaluation practice at the time of its approval. The current Fund evaluation framework states its purpose as:

*"... to explain concepts, roles, and use of evaluation within the Adaptation Fund and to define the **institutional framework and the responsibilities** of different entities participating in the Fund. Specifically, it establishes **requirements** for how Fund activities should be evaluated in line with international principles, norms, and standards... Furthermore, the framework does not deal with the capacity of Implementing Entities to do monitoring and evaluation, since this is covered within the accreditation process."*

The Fund's evaluation framework has an ambiguous scope of authority and straddles elements of a policy, a framework, and a strategy. It also acknowledges the absence of various elements it flags for later development and incorporation. Thus, review and further research and development of a revised evaluation instrument is timely. Next steps will be as follows:

Step 1: Prepare recommendations for the formulation of a Fund evaluation policy for the EFC/Board.

Step 2: Review the evaluation framework by:

- a) identifying areas of the evaluation framework that are outdated
- b) articulating the evaluation-related Board decisions and policies, strategies, and processes approved since 2012, with priority on the MTS and the advent of the AF TERG

- c) obtaining internal Fund stakeholders' comments on what needs to be added, removed and/or modified in the evaluation framework
- d) obtaining external stakeholders and evaluation experts' comments on what need to be added, removed and/or modified in the evaluation framework
- e) identifying what is missing or should be added to the evaluation framework based on international good and next practice concerned with where evaluation thinking and practice are heading.

Step 3: Formulate an Adaptation Fund evaluation policy by:

- a) drafting and circulating for comment a structure for a revised instrument, drawing on recommendations of the evaluation framework review
- b) drafting and circulating for comment detailed contents of each section of the new instrument's structure
- c) conducting follow-up individual and group consultations to refine section contents
- d) completing and submitting a complete draft evaluation policy that considers the Fund's niche, assets, and relevant internal developments within the Fund since 2012, as well as new and emerging evaluation thinking and practice
- e) conducting a workshop to present findings to key stakeholders and facilitate critiques and proposed revisions
- f) incorporating revisions to the draft over as many feedback loops as necessary to submit a final draft policy for submission to the EFC/AFB for consideration and approval.

Looking ahead: Once a policy is established, the Fund will need to develop more adaptive/ agile and time-limited evaluation guidance for executing the expectations of the policy. Such evaluation guidance documents are proposed to be an organizational evaluation *strategy*, pragmatic evaluation *guidelines* (or frameworks in the conventional sense) and multi-year evaluation *action plans*.



Annex A

References and documents reviewed

NB: This section is divided into two types of reference. Part a) covers journal and grey literature. Part b) covers all organizational documents reviewed from the Fund and relevant peer organizations.

a) References

Adaptation Fund (2012). Evaluation Framework. June 2012. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/evaluation-framework-4/>

_____ (2018a). Medium-Term Strategy 2018-2022. March 2018. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/medium-term-strategy-2018-2022/>

_____ (2018b). Independent Evaluation of the Adaptation Fund, Part 2. Adaptation Fund, Washington, D.C. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/second-phase-overall-evaluation-fund/>

Adaptation Fund Technical Evaluation Reference Group (2020) AF-TERG Work Principles. November 2020. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/work-principles-of-the-af-terg/>

Baptist, Carrie, and Barbara Befani (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.

BetterEvaluation (2018) *Evaluation Framework*. Available at: https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/evaluation-options/evaluation_framework_templates

BetterEvaluation (2020) *Evaluation Policy*. Available at: https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/evaluation-options/evaluation_policy

Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (n.d.). How we work – evaluation policy, Available at: <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/How-We-Work/General-Information/Evaluation-Policy>

Bours, Dennis, Colleen McGinn, and Patrick Pringle (2014). *Monitoring and Evaluation for Climate Change Adaptation: A Synthesis of Tools, Frameworks, and Approaches* (2nd ed.) Phnom Penh, Cambodia: Sea Change Community of Practice, and Oxford, United Kingdom: UK Climate Impacts Programme (UKCIP). Available at: <https://www.ukcip.org.uk/wp-content/PDFs/SEA-Change-UKCIP-MandE-review-2nd-edition.pdf>

Buffardi, Anne L., and others (2019). Monitoring and learning from country-level portfolio decision-making and adaptation. Briefing Note. London, United Kingdom: Overseas Development Institute.

Chazdon, Scott, and others (eds.) (2017). *A Field Guide to Ripple Effects Mapping*. Available at: https://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/handle/11299/190639/REM_monograph_withcover.pdf.

Christie, Christina A., and Sebastien T. Lemire (2019). Why evaluation theory should be used to inform evaluation policy. *American Journal of Evaluation*, April. Available at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1098214018824045>

Clark, William C., Ronald B. Mitchell, and David W. Cash (2006). Evaluating the influence of global environmental assessments. In Ronald B. Mitchell, and others, eds. *Global Environmental Assessments. Information and Influence*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cooksy, Lesley J., Melvin M. Mark, and William M.K. Trochim (2009). Evaluation policy and evaluation practice: Where do we go from here? In Trochim, William. K., Melvin M. Mark, and Leslie J. Cooksy, eds., *Evaluation Policy and Evaluation Practice: New Directions for Evaluation*, 123, 103–109. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/ev.308>

Dinshaw, Ayesha, and others (2014). Monitoring and evaluation of climate change adaptation: methodological approaches, OECD Environment Working Paper, No. 74, Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1787/5jxrclrOntjd-en>.

Dozois, Elizabeth, Marc Langlois, and Natasha Blanchet-Cohen (2010). *DE 201: A Practitioner's Guide to Developmental Evaluation*. Montreal, Canada: The J.W. McConnell Family Foundation and Victoria, Canada: International Institute for Child Rights and Development.

Evaluating Impact Investing (n.d.). Module 9 – Standards. Available at: www.evaluatingimpactinvesting.org/syllabus/standards.

Feldman, Andrew (2019). Why your agency should have an evaluation policy. *Government Executive*, 23 September. Available at: <https://www.govexec.com/management/2019/09/why-your-agency-should-have-evaluation-policy-now/160068/>.

Fisher, Susannah, and others (2015). Evaluating climate change adaptation: learning from methods in international development. In Bours, Dennis, Colleen McGinn, and Patrick Pringle, eds., *Monitoring and Evaluation of Climate Change Adaptation: A Review of the Landscape. New Directions for Evaluation*, 147, 13–35. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/ev.20128>

Gaotlhobogwe, Motlaleng, and others (2018). Conceptualizing evaluation in African contexts. In Fiona Cram, K. A. Tibbetts, & J. LaFrance, eds., *Indigenous Evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation*, 159, 47–62. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/ev.20332>

Guest, Greg, Arwen Bunce, and Laura Johnson (2006); and Coenen, Michaela, Tanja A. Stamm, and Gerold Stucki (2012), cited in Namey, Emily (2017). Riddle me this: How many interviews (or focus groups) are enough? *R&E Search for Evidence*, FHI 360. 25 April. Available at: <https://researchforevidence.fhi360.org/riddle-me-this-how-many-interviews-or-focus-groups-are-enough>.

Henry, Gary T. and Melvin M. Mark (2003). Beyond use: understanding evaluation's influence on attitudes and actions, *American Journal of Evaluation*, vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 293–314. Available at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/109821400302400302>

Hernandez, Kevin, Ben Ramalingam, and Leni Wild (2019). Towards evidence-informed adaptive management. Working Paper, No. 565. London, United Kingdom: Overseas Development Institute. Available at: <https://www.odi.org/publications/11475-towards-evidence-informed-adaptive-management-roadmap-development-and-humanitarian-organisations>

Kirkhart, Karen E. (2004). Reconceptualizing evaluation use: an integrated theory of influence. *New Directions for Evaluation, 2000*: pp. 5–23. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.1188>.

Kollock, Debra Hansen (2011). *Ripple Effects Mapping for Evaluation*. Washington State University Extension. Available at: <https://naaee.org/sites/default/files/rem.complete.pdf>

Leiter, Timo (2017). The adaptation M&E navigator: a decision support tool for the selection of suitable approaches to monitor and evaluate adaptation to climate change. In Uitto, Juha Ilari, Jyotsna Puri, and Rob D. van den Berg, eds. *Evaluating Climate Change Action for Sustainable Development*. Springer. Available at: https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-43702-6_18

Liu, Jianguo, and others (2007). Complexity of coupled human and natural systems. *Science*, vol. 317, No. 5844, pp. 1513-1516. Available at: <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/317/5844/1513>

Mark, Melvin M., Leslie J. Cooksy, and William K. Trochim, W.M.K. (2009). Evaluation policy: an introduction and overview. In Trochim, William K., Melvin M. Mark, and Leslie J. Cooksy, eds., *Evaluation Policy and Evaluation Practice: New Directions for Evaluation*, 123, 3–11. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/ev.302>

Mayne, John. 2008. Contribution analysis: an approach to exploring cause and effect. ILAC Brief, No. 16. Utrecht, The Netherlands: Institutional Learning and Change. Available at: <https://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/70124>.

OECD (2011). *Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation*. Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/development/effectiveness/busanpartnership.htm>.

OECD (2019). Global consultations on adapting the evaluation criteria. Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/eval-criteria-global-consultation.htm>.

Ophir, Zenda (2018). Updating the DAC criteria blog series. In *Evaluation for Development: a focus on transformation and the Global South*. Available at URL: <https://zendaofir.com/tag/dac-criteria/>

Pasanen, Tiina, and Inka Barnett Pasanen (2019). Supporting adaptive management. Working Paper, No. 569. London, United Kingdom: Overseas Development Institute. Available at: <https://www.odi.org/publications/16511-supporting-adaptive-management-monitoring-and-evaluation-tools-and-approaches>

Pasanen, Tiina and Louise Shaxson (2016). How to design a monitoring and evaluation framework for a policy research project: a Methods Lab publication. London, United Kingdom: Overseas Development Institute. Available at: <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/10259.pdf>.

Patton, Michael Quinn (2010). *Developmental Evaluation – Applying Complexity Concepts to Enhance Innovation and Use*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

_____ (2018). *Principles-focused Evaluation – The Guide*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

_____ (2019). *Blue Marble Evaluation*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Picciotto, Robert (2015). *The 5th Wave: Social Impact Evaluation*. New York, NY: Rockefeller Foundation. Available at: <https://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/report/5th-wave-social-impact-evaluation/>

Rowe, Andy (2012). Evaluation of natural resource interventions. *American Journal of Evaluation*, vol. 33, No. 3, 384–394. Available at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1098214012440026>

_____ (2017). Ecological thinking as a route to sustainability in evaluation. Project: Sustainability – Ready evaluation. Available at: <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9781503605565-003/html>

_____ (2019). Ecological thinking as a route to sustainability-ready evaluation. In Hopson, Rodney, and Fiona Cramm, eds. *Evaluation in Complex Settings*. Stanford University Press. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320517752_Ecological_Thinking_as_a_Route_to_Sustainability_in_Evaluation

Rowe, Andy, and Kai N. Lee (2012). Linking knowledge with action: an approach to philanthropic funding of science for conservation. A report to the Conservation & Science Program, David & Lucile Packard Foundation, https://www.packard.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Linking-Knowledge-with-Action_DEC-2012.pdf.

SDI, n.d. Know Your City - online searchable database. Available at: <https://sdinet.org/explore-our-data/>. Slum Dwellers International (SDI), Cape Town, South Africa.

Sharp, S., Craig Valters, and Brendan Whitty (2019). How DFID can better manage complexity in development programming. Briefing Note, April. London, United Kingdom: Overseas Development Institute. Available at: <https://www.odi.org/publications/11315-how-dfid-can-better-manage-complexity-development-programming>

Schwandt, Thomas A. (2019). Post-normal evaluation? *Evaluation*, vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 317–329. Available at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1356389019855501>

Trochim, William M.K. (2009). Evaluation policy and evaluation practice. In William M.K. Trochim, Marvin. M Mark, and Leslie J. Cooksy, eds. *Evaluation Policy and Evaluation Practice: New Directions for Evaluation*, 123, 13–32. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/ev.303>

Tyson, William (2017). Using social-ecological systems theory to evaluate large-scale co-management efforts: a case study of the Inuvialuit Settlement Region. *Ecology and Society*, vol. 22, No. 1. Available at: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol22/iss1/art5/>



United Nations (2015). *Addis Ababa Action Agenda from the Third International Conference on Financing for Development. The final text of the outcome document adopted at the Third International Conference on Financing for Development* (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 13–16 July 2015) and endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 69/313 of 27 July 2015. Available at: https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/ares69d313_en.pdf

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2016). *Evaluation Strategy 2016-2018*, Paris IOS/EVS/PI/147. Available at: http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/IOS/images/UNESCO_Evaluation_Strategy.pdf

United Nations Evaluation Group (2016). *Norms and Standards for Evaluation*. Paris. <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>.

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

United Nations High Commission for Refugees (n.d.), *Evaluation Strategy 2018-2020*. Geneva. Available at: <https://www.unhcr.org/5a93c8637.pdf>

UN Women (2010) *Programming Essentials, Monitoring and Evaluation*. New York. Available at: <https://www.endvawnow.org/en/articles/335-monitoring-and-evaluation-frameworks-3-parts.html>

Wilson-Grau, Ricardo, and Heather Britt (2013). *Outcome Harvesting*. Washington, D.C.: Ford Foundation. Available at: <https://www.outcomemapping.ca/resource/outcome-harvesting>

World Economic Forum (2020). *The Global Risks Report 2020*. Insight Report. 15th ed. Geneva. Available at: http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Global_Risk_Report_2020.pdf.

b) Documents reviewed

The following section lists all documents reviewed for this inception report. The sub-section lists are:

1. Fund documents describing the decisions, guidance, and procedures that affect the status quo of its evaluation function.
2. Fund and UNFCCC documentation relating to influences on the evaluation function (primarily since 2012).
3. Evaluation instruments of comparable climate funds and multilateral organizations.

1. Adaptation Fund documents describing the decisions, guidance, and procedures that affect the status quo of its evaluation function

Table 1. List and sources of evaluation-related Adaptation Fund evaluation documents reviewed

Organization	Document name	Year	Available at
Adaptation Fund	Evaluation framework	2012	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/evaluation-framework-4/
Adaptation Fund	Guidelines for project/programme final evaluations	2011	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/guidelines-for-projectprogramme-final-evaluations/
Adaptation Fund	Proposed amendments to the evaluation framework	2012	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/proposed-amendments-to-the-evaluation-framework/
Adaptation Fund	Results-based management and evaluation framework	2011	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/generic/results-based-management-and-evaluation-framework/
Adaptation Fund	Project-level results framework and baseline guidance document	2011	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/AF-FinalDraftGuidance-wimpactproposal-10March11.pdf
Adaptation Fund	An approach to implement results-based management	2010	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/an-approach-to-implementing-results-based-management-rbm/
Adaptation Fund	Project performance report process, structure, and content	2010	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/project-performance-report-process-structure-and-content/
Adaptation Fund	Project performance report guidance document to project performance report template	2011	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/project-performance-report-guidance-document-to-project-performance-report-template/

2. Adaptation Fund and multilateral agency evaluation instruments (primarily since 2012)

Table 2. List and sources of Fund-related documents reviewed that indirectly influence its evaluation function

Organization	Output	Year	Available at
UNFCCC	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	2016	https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/conferences/past-conferences/marrakech-climate-change-conference-november-2016/cma-1/cma-1-decisions
Adaptation Fund	Methodologies for reporting Adaptation Fund Core Impact Indicators	2014	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/methodologies-for-reportingadaptation-fund-core-impact-indicators-march-2014/
UNFCCC	Report of the Conference of the Parties on its sixteenth session, held in Cancun from 29 November to 10 December 2010	2010	
UN	Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development	2015	https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld
UN	Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030	2014	http://www.preventionweb.net/files/43291_sendaiframeworkfordrren.pdf

(continued)

Table 2. List and sources of Fund-related documents reviewed that indirectly influence its evaluation function (continued)

Organization	Output	Year	Available at
UNFCCC	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	2018	https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/08a1e.pdf
UNFCCC	Paris Agreement	2015	https://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/convention/application/pdf/english_paris_agreement.pdf
Adaptation Fund	Report of the Fund Board, note by the Chair – addendum	2019	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/report-of-the-adaptation-fund-board-note-by-the-chair-of-the-adaptation-fund-board-addendum/
Adaptation Fund	Evaluability Assessment Final Report, July	2020	
Adaptation Fund	Open information policy	2013	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/open-information-policy-adopted-in-july-2013/
Adaptation Fund	Environmental and social policy	2016	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Amended-March-2016_-_OPG-ANNEX-3-Environmental-social-policy-March-2016.pdf
Adaptation Fund	Guidance document for Implementing Entities on compliance with the Adaptation Fund environmental and social policy	2016	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/guidance-document-implementing-entities-compliance-adaptation-fund-environmental-social-policy/
Adaptation Fund	Risk management framework	2015	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/risk-management-framework/
Adaptation Fund	Gender policy	2016	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/opg-annex4-gender-policy/
Adaptation Fund	Gender guidance document	2017	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/guidance-document-implementing-entities-compliance-adaptation-fund-gender-policy-2/
Adaptation Fund	Knowledge management strategy & action plan	2017	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/knowledge-management-strategy-action-plan/
Adaptation Fund	Ad-hoc complaint handling mechanism	2016	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/ad-hoc-complaint-handling-mechanism-approved-october-2016/
Adaptation Fund	Operational policies and guidelines for parties to access resources from the Adaptation Fund	2017	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/operational-policies-guidelines-parties-access-resources-adaptation-fund/
Adaptation Fund	Operational Policies and Guidelines Annexes	2017	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/apply-funding/policies-guidelines/
Adaptation Fund	Resource mobilization strategy 2017-2020	2016	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/resource-mobilization-strategy-2/
Adaptation Fund	Medium-term Strategy 2018-2022	2018	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/medium-term-strategy-2018-2022/
Adaptation Fund	Review of the Strategic Results Framework and the Adaptation Fund-Level Effectiveness and Efficiency Results Framework	2018	

(continued)

Table 2. List and sources of Fund-related documents reviewed that indirectly influence its evaluation function (continued)

Organization	Output	Year	Available at
Adaptation Fund	(Amended) Strategic results framework of the Fund	2019	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/strategic-results-framework-of-the-adaptation-fund-amended-in-march-2019/
Adaptation Fund	Decisions of the thirty-second meeting of the Fund Board	2018	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/decisions-thirty-second-meeting-adaptation-fund-board/
Adaptation Fund	Project scale-up grants guidelines	2018	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/project-scale-up-grants/
Adaptation Fund	Learning grants guidelines	2018	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/knowledge-learning/learning-grants/
Adaptation Fund	Innovation grants guidelines	2018	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/apply-funding/innovation-grants/
Adaptation Fund	Report of the thirty-first meeting of Board	2018	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/report-thirty-first-meeting-afb-20-23-march-2018/
Adaptation Fund	Ethics and Finance Committee ToR	2018	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/TOR-of-EFC-amended-in-Mar2018.pdf
Adaptation Fund	Assessment report on progress in the implementation of the Fund's gender policy and gender action plan	2019	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/assessment-report-on-progress-in-the-implementation-of-the-adaptation-funds-gender-policy-and-gender-action-plan/
TANGO International/ODI	Independent Evaluation of the Adaptation Fund (stage 1)	2015	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/evaluation-of-the-fund-stage-1/
TANGO International	Independent evaluation of the Adaptation Fund (stage 2)	2018	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/second-phase-overall-evaluation-fund/
Adaptation Fund	Project-level results framework and baseline guidance document	2015	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Results%20Framework%20and%20Baseline%20Guidance%20final%20compressed.pdf
External consultant	Tracking results for adaptation: the experience of the Fund	2016	https://www.4c.ma/medias/daouda_ndiaye_-_tracking_results_for_adaptation-the_experience_of_the_adaptation_fund.pdf
Adaptation Fund	Implications of the establishment of the Fund's evaluation function	2018	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/implications-establishment-funds-evaluation-function/
Adaptation Fund	Study in approaches to ex post evaluation of climate change adaptation	2020	
Adaptation Fund	Options for post-implementation learning and impact evaluation of Fund projects and programmes	2017	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/AFB.PPRC_20.30-Options-for-post-implementation-learning-and-impact-evaluation.docx_clean.pdf
Adaptation Fund	Evaluation assessment final report	2020	
Adaptation Fund	Fund innovative CCA MEL. Final report	2020	
Adaptation Fund	Methodologies for reporting Fund core impact indicators	2014	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/AF-Core-Indicator-Methodologies.pdf
Adaptation Fund	Guidance on accreditation standards	2016	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Guidance-on-Accreditation-Standards.pdf

(continued)

Table 2. List and sources of Fund-related documents reviewed that indirectly influence its evaluation function (continued)

Organization	Output	Year	Available at
Adaptation Fund	Compliance with the strategic results framework: update of the project/programme performance report and results tracker guidance	2019	https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/AFB.EFC_.25.4_Update-of-PPR_and_Guidance-for-Results-Tracker.pdf
Adaptation Fund	Ethics and Finance Committee ToR. Amended March 2018.		https://www.adaptationfund.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/TOR-of-EFC-amended-in-Mar2018.pdf

3. Evaluation guidance of comparable climate funds and multilateral organizations

Table 3. List and sources of comparable organizations' evaluation instruments reviewed

Organization	Output	Year	Available at
GEF	Evaluation policy	2019	https://www.gefio.org/evaluations/gef-evaluation-policy-2019
GCF	Evaluation policy	(pending Board approval)	Not yet available
UNEP	Evaluation policy	2016	https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment-programme/evaluation-office/policies-and-strategies
IDB	Evaluation policy framework	2019	http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getdocument.aspx?docnum=EZSHARE-872199154-11142
UNDP	Revised evaluation policy	2019	http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.shtml
UNECLAC [United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean]	Evaluation policy and strategy	2017	https://repositorio.cepal.org/handle/11362/35507
UNESCAP [United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific]	Monitoring and evaluation: policy and guidelines	2017	https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/ESCAP-Monitoring-and-Evaluation--Policy-and-Guidelines-2017-rev-20180507.pdf
UNESCWA [United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia]	Evaluation policy	2017	https://www.unescwa.org/sites/www.unescwa.org/files/page_attachments/escwa-evaluation_policy_online.pdf
UNFPA	Evaluation policy	2019	https://www.unfpa.org/admin-resource/unfpa-evaluation-policy-2019
UNIDO [United Nations Industrial Development Organization] Independent Evaluation Division	Evaluation manual	2018	

(continued)

Table 3. List and sources of comparable organizations' evaluation instruments reviewed (continued)

Organization	Output	Year	Available at
OECD	Better Criteria for Better Evaluation Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use	2019	http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm
UNSDG [United Nations Sustainable Development Group]	Framework guidance	2019	https://unsdg.un.org/resources/united-nations-sustainable-development-cooperation-framework-guidance
CIF	Transformational Change Learning Partnership: Pioneering Joint Learning to Catalyze Low-Carbon, Climate-Resilient Development	2019	https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/knowledge-documents/cif-transformational-change-learning-partnership-pioneering-joint-learning
CIF	Evaluation of Transformational Change in the Climate Investment Funds: Final Evaluation Report	2019	https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/sites/cif_enc/files/knowledge-documents/evaluation_of_transformational_change_in_the_cif_final_w_mresp_jan_2019.pdf
GCF	Evaluation policy development	2018	https://ieu.greenclimate.fund/evaluation-policy-of-the-gcf
GCF	The IEU's 2020 work plan	2020	https://ieu.greenclimate.fund/about-the-ieu/work-plan-and-tor
GCF	Independent evaluation of the GCF's results management framework (RMF2018)	2018	https://ieu.greenclimate.fund/evaluations/rmf
GCF	IEU's learning oriented real-time impact assessment programme	2018	https://ieu.greenclimate.fund/evaluations/lorta
GAVI	Evaluation policy. Version 4.0	2019	https://www.gavi.org/sites/default/files/document/corporate-policies/Gavi%20Evaluation%20policy.pdf
IFAD	Evaluation policy	2015	https://webapps.ifad.org/members/eb/102/docs/EB-2011-102-R-7-Rev-3.pdf
WFP [World Food Programme]	Evaluation policy (2016-2021)	2015	https://www.wfp.org/publications/wfp-evaluation-policy-2016-2021
World Bank	Evaluation principles	2019	https://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/sites/default/files/Data/reports/WorldBankEvaluationPrinciples.pdf
UNEG	Ethical guidelines for evaluation	2019	http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866
UNEG	Norms and standards for evaluations in the un system	2016	http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914
WHO [World Health Organization]	Evaluation policy	2018	https://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/EB143/B143(9)-en.pdf
ECG [Evaluation Cooperation Group]	Big book on evaluation good practice standards	2012	https://www.ecgnet.org/document/ecg-big-book-good-practice-standards
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	Evaluation policy		https://www.gatesfoundation.org/How-We-Work/General-Information/Evaluation-Policy#:~:text=Our%20evaluation%20policy%20is%20intended,what%20and%20how%20to%20evaluate.

(continued)

Table 3. List and sources of comparable organizations' evaluation instruments reviewed (continued)

Organization	Output	Year	Available at
UNICEF	Revised evaluation policy	2018	https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/files/Revised_Evaluation_Policy_Interactive.pdf
EBRD [European Bank for Reconstruction and Development] Evaluation Division	Evaluation work programme 2020	2019	



Annex B Research and stakeholder matrices

a) The review research tool

The following table lays out the review tool framework. Each of the sources of information (horizontal axis) will be analysed according to its relevance and contribution to resolving each of the key review questions (vertical axis).

Table 4. Review phase research tool

Research question	Sources of information							
	Fund stakeholders (via advisory group and legal advisors)	Implementing partners (IEs, DAs, NGOs)	External informants peer orgs, donors and eval experts	Literature and international standards	Peer orgs' evaluation instruments	Board decisions	Approved Fund policies, strategies, and processes	Reviews, evaluations, and studies of the Fund
Context and positioning of the Adaptation Fund in the wider evaluation discipline								
Q1. What are the external imperatives to which the Evaluation Function and its framework/ policy/strategy must respond (including, inter alia, conventions, the urgency of climate change, the evolution of the MEL field, stakeholders, and beneficiary needs)?								
Q2. What are the new and emerging evaluation and learning practices (broadly and in the climate change field) that are showing promise to respond to the evolution of thinking in the evaluation field and the urgency of climate change adaptation?								

(continued)

Table 4. Review phase research tool (continued)

Research question	Sources of information							
	Fund stakeholders (via advisory group and legal advisors)	Implementing partners (IEs, DAs, NGOs)	External informants peer orgs, donors and eval experts	Literature and international standards	Peer orgs' evaluation instruments	Board decisions	Approved Fund policies, strategies, and processes	Reviews, evaluations, and studies of the Fund
Context and positioning of the Adaptation Fund in the wider evaluation discipline								
Q3. To what extent is the Adaptation Fund's current evaluation function positioned to cope with emerging demands on evidence-based decision-making and perform at the vanguard of evaluation practice (especially, but not exclusively, in relation to climate change adaptation)?								
Q4. To what extent does the content of the Fund's current evaluation framework provide the AF-TERG, Board secretariat, EFC and PPRC with clarity and lines of authority to efficiently facilitate timely evaluation, learning, and application of lessons?								
Q5. 1) To what extent does the current evaluation framework support or limit Fund and project managers' ability to make timely and informed decisions (considering, for example, adaptive management, adjusting implementation, making decisions about adding and leveraging value)?								

(continued)

Table 4. Review phase research tool (continued)

Research question	Sources of information							
	Fund stakeholders (via advisory group and legal advisors)	Implementing partners (IEs, DAs, NGOs)	External informants peer orgs, donors and eval experts	Literature and international standards	Peer orgs' evaluation instruments	Board decisions	Approved Fund policies, strategies, and processes	Reviews, evaluations, and studies of the Fund
Integration with the Fund's evolution since 2012								
<p>Q6. 1) What Board decisions and Fund policies, strategies, and procedures, since 2012, need to be incorporated into the Fund's current evaluation function for interpretation and application by Board committees and secretariat?</p> <p>Themes will consider:</p> <p>(i) relevant related decisions made by the Board and guidance from the CMP</p> <p>(ii) Fund's policies such as the Environmental and Social and the Gender policies</p> <p>(iii) subsequent strategic choices made by the Fund, which include the Fund's Medium-Term Strategy (2018-2022) and Knowledge Management Strategy, the establishment and functioning of the AF-TERG</p>								
Type of evaluation instrument and contents that would serve the needs of the Fund and its partners								
<p>Q7. What type of instrument(s) would optimize the Fund's ability to govern, implement, and evaluate its evaluation function?</p>								

(continued)

Table 4. Review phase research tool (continued)

Research question	Sources of information							
	Fund stakeholders (via advisory group and legal advisors)	Implementing partners (IEs, DAs, NGOs)	External informants peer orgs, donors and eval experts	Literature and international standards	Peer orgs' evaluation instruments	Board decisions	Approved Fund policies, strategies, and processes	Reviews, evaluations, and studies of the Fund
Type of evaluation instrument and contents that would serve the needs of the Fund and its partners								
Q8. What options are available to the Fund to optimize the benefits of adopting a new evaluation instrument and to mitigate potential risks associated with a change?								
Q9. What options are available for potential content and structure for an evaluation instrument, and what does the review team recommend to the Fund?								
Q10. What are the implications of a new evaluation instrument on existing Fund policies, strategies, guidelines, and organizational structure? i.e. which existing Fund documentation will become redundant, and which would need to be altered to align with a new evaluation policy?								
Q11. What are the budgetary implications and recommendations of the Fund adopting a new evaluation instrument?								

b) The assignment process and target informants

The following table outlines the broad steps of each phase of this project, the data collection methods applied to each step, and which key informants will be participating in each step.

Table 5. Research process matrix

Research plan steps	Specific methods	Target participants								
		AF-TERG	Secretariat	EFC / Board	AG	IEs & EEs	DAs	NGOs	Peer Orgs	Eval Experts / Academics
Objective 1: Deliver evaluation framework review inception report, evaluation plan, and PowerPoint presentation [under completion]										
Objective 2: Identify and propose necessary revisions to the Fund's evaluation framework										
1. Compare Fund's evaluation framework with peer organizations' evaluation policies to identify potentially superior practices at levels of strategy/governance, portfolio & Programme/ Project.	<p>Draw from inception phase document collection.</p> <p>Seek additional sources from AF-TERG informants, peer organizations' websites (especially their evaluation units) and from organization contacts.</p> <p>Conduct content analysis against the normative framework.</p> <p>(The normative framework would be used to iteratively create table of ideal evaluation framework & policy contents; document promising examples from peer organizations and literature; identify the Fund's current status and gaps relative to the criteria; and highlight required modifications [improve or remove] and new content requirements).</p>									
1b. Continue to collect and analyse academic literature related to emerging practices in evaluation and learning.	<p>Keyword journal searches on Research Gate.</p> <p>Seek suggestions from evaluation experts.</p> <p>Draw from AF-TERG informants.</p> <p>Explore evaluation associations' websites (and journals where accessible).</p>									
2. Interviews to conduct SWOC [Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges] analysis with Fund stakeholders, IEs & EEs, and peer organizations.	Key informant interviews (online).	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
3. Continue to refine the normative framework and deepen research into promising and emerging practices.										
4a. Assemble & test emerging Evaluation Policy themes.	<p>Review of results of Step 3.</p> <p>Mini-workshops (online).</p>	x	x	?	x	?	?			
4b. Draft a review report to identify and propose necessary revisions to the Fund's evaluation framework.	<p>Written report of findings, lessons, and recommendations.</p> <p>Online PowerPoint presentation.</p>									

(continued)

Table 5. Research process matrix (continued)

Research plan steps	Specific methods	Target participants								
		AF-TERG	Secretariat	EFC / Board	AG	IEs & EEs	DAs	NGOs	Peer Orgs	Eval Experts / Academics
Objective 2: Identify and propose necessary revisions to the Fund's evaluation framework										
5. Conduct workshop to present the report and invite feedback from key stakeholders.		x	x	?	x	?	?			
6. Collaboratively finalize report that identifies and proposes necessary revisions to the Fund's evaluation framework (Deliverable D2).	Participatory workshop to reflect on, affirm or refine lessons and recommendations. Develop a next phase action plan.	x	x	?	x		?			
Objective 3a: Produce a draft evaluation policy for the 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										
1. Draft a broad new structure (skeleton) for the Fund's Evaluation policy: Fund-level; Programme/ Project-level.										
2. Seek and incorporate findings of the Review of the evaluation framework report, and response comments from the EFC and/or Board.	Feedback meetings. Document review.	x		x						
3. Gain AF-TERG and AG feedback and input into draft structure.	Review cycles. Mini-workshops.	x	x		x					
4. Draft each section.	Re-analysis and actioning of review phase findings and recommendations. Re-draw on review source documents and interview transcripts as needed.									
5. Circulate each draft section for first review from AF-TERG, AG and secretariat; update in light of feedback.	Review cycles.	x	x		x					
6. Submit complete draft evaluation policy.	Draw together and synthesize all sections into one complete set of evaluation guidance documents.	x			x					
7. Conduct a workshop to present the draft evaluation policy and invite feedback from Fund stakeholders.	Written guidelines with justifications. Online PowerPoint presentation.	x	x	?	x	?	?			

(continued)

Table 5. Research process matrix (continued)

Research plan steps	Specific methods	Target participants								
		AF-TERG	Secretariat	EFC / Board	AG	IEs & EEs	DAs	NGOs	Peer Orgs	Eval Experts / Academics
Objective 3b): Produce a final evaluation framework for the Fund – Ethics and Finance Committee										
1. Gather detailed responses from Fund EFC, PPRC and secretariat.	Documents. Informal interviews. Review meetings.	x	x	x	x					
2. Analyse and incorporate detailed feedback and new 2021 reference documents.										
3. Share revisions, gain feedback, and incorporate over as many feedback loops as necessary.	Email circulation. Informal interviews. Review meetings.	x	x	x	x					
4. Produce a final draft evaluation policy for the Fund Ethics and Finance Committee (Deliverable D3)										



Annex C Data collection protocol

a) Qualitative sampling frame

The **review phase** will seek to incorporate at least one or preferably two or more key decision-makers from each of the **Board secretariat, EFC, PPRC, AF-TERG and possibly, the Board itself**, who have some engagement with organizational learning. This is a deliberately broad criterion implicating not just the evaluation function, but monitoring, results tracking, knowledge management, and evidence-based decision-making at all levels. Specific informants will be identified via the AF-TERG and/or by contacting each office's head to request nominations of the most appropriate members of their teams.

Among **all external informant categories** (key participant categories 5 to 9 in Annex B), the research team will complete the following steps:

1. Assemble a complete list of potential informants (e.g. all IEs, all Delegated Authorities, all Fund-partnered NGOs, and peer organizations, etc.).
2. Finalize a list of characteristics of each informant category and assign ranks or labels to each potential informant (e.g. number of Fund projects; levels of internal capacity; specific types of evaluative expertise; global region).

The following table is an example of our categorization for Implementing Entities:

Table 6. Example of categorization for Implementing Entities

Characteristics:	Type	# of AF projects	Region	Country	Specialization
Example	NIE MIE		Americas Africa Asia SIDS Europe Global		Marine Ecological conservation Agriculture Community dev. etc
<i>e.g. Fundación Natura</i>	<i>NIE</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Americas</i>	<i>Panama</i>	<i>Ecol. conservation</i>
Organization 1					
Organization 2					
Organization 3					
etc					

3. In collaboration with the AF-TERG, purposively select a shortlist of two to three informants per category that are representative of a diversity of identified characteristics. We will also select a couple of “reserve” informants in each category, in case any first preferences are unavailable.

The distribution of interviews per informant categories will be assembled in the table below:

Table 7. Sampling frame format

Characteristics:	Type of entity:	Implementing Entities	Delegated Authorities	NGO Network	Comparable climate fund	Academic experts
	Identified:	51	74	12	e.g. GCF, LDCF, CIF, GEF, ICF	TBC
Sample	Region					
	North America					
	South America					
	Africa					
	Asia					
	Oceania					
	Europe					
	Global					
	Total sample size				1 per organization	

Thus, we expect these sampling approaches to yield interviews with **around 12 Fund informants and around 20 external informants**. Research has found that, among relatively homogenous groups, for individual interviews, 70 per cent of concepts are found in the first six interviews (and up to 97 per cent by the 12th interview) (Guest, and others, 2017). Given that we will be engaging several heterogenous, but interrelated groups, we are confident that covering more than five times more interviewees than this figure of six will provide us with saturation of informant insights.

If interviews with selected informants result in irreconcilable divergences in responses or any are not available for interview, additional informants on the reserve list will be contacted, invited, and scheduled for interview to expand our sample.

b) Review phase: Interview guidelines

Draft interview questions are presented in sub-section c) below. The overarching steps for each interview will be:

1. Contact, invite, and schedule meetings with each key informant.

The research team will send an interview request, and state the purpose, length, and usage of information. Each meeting will commence with additional time to test and secure technical and logistical aspects of the online interview. A short test contact may be arranged in advance of the full interview to confirm the functionality of the interview platform and Internet bandwidth.

2. A copy of the interview questions will be shared with participants, including a brief explanation of the purpose and ethical parameters of the interview with the interviewee.
3. At the commencement of each interview, the purpose and ethical parameters will be re-shared verbally. The key informants will be asked to give informed consent in relation to voluntarism, level of confidentiality/data privacy, and usage of the information they share.
4. Interviews will be semi-structured. A set of probes will be designed for some questions/ topics within the interview guide.

The interview will follow this structure:

- i. Introduction – purpose, duration, and ethical parameters.
- ii. Open ended questions.
- iii. Core in-depth questions (and potentially Likert-scales type of questions).
- iv. Concluding section for interviewer's observations and opinions.

Question guides will be drafted in English but may be translated into French or Spanish where necessary. Accordingly, interviews may be conducted in Spanish or French if required.

Timing of interviews will consider time zone, schedule, and obligations of informants to minimize inconvenience and optimize attendance.

The research team has not yet developed a sampling frame or draft question guides for the **policy formulation phase** of this project (March to October 2021). Identifying the mix of key informants and stakeholders and learning requirements for this phase will be a product of the review phase.

c) Draft key informant interview question guides

The following sub-section spells out the questions used for the **inception phase interviews**, plus the approach that will be taken for developing question guides for the **review phase**.

The policy formulation phase is not likely to employ semi-structured question guides so much as collaborative discussions and mini-workshops based around content determined by the review report.

Interview guide for inception phase consultations

The following introduction guided the discussions for all inception phase informants. Following this is a list of questions used for interviewing Fund stakeholders in the secretariat, and a separate set of questions used for interviewing external peer informants.

Introduction to each discussion:

“To start, let me tell you a little about the purpose of this discussion.

The Adaptation Fund’s evaluation framework has been in place since 2012. An AF-TERG analysis of the Framework concluded that it needed to be reviewed and updated to take into account decisions, strategies, and policies approved by the Board and CMP since 2012, and ongoing developments in the evaluation discipline generally.

Subsequently, the Board tasked the AF-TERG to do exactly that. Therefore, the AF-TERG has assembled a team of evaluation consultants to undertake an external review and revision of the Fund’s evaluation guidance to submit to the Board and EFC for consideration.

Early work by the AF-TERG is pointing towards the need to use the review to develop a Fund-wide Evaluation Policy or Policy Framework. A policy would, for example,

- define the Fund’s evaluation function at a high, whole-of-Fund level, in an aspirational way, such as high-level linkages to monitoring and learning*
- establish more permanent features of the evaluation function, which do not change frequently.*

More utilitarian evaluation guides and standards would be developed subsequently, cascading out of the policy.

Based on the scope of the assignment, the external team of consultants, composed of Peter, Luis, and Anh, is working on an inception report to guide the review and revision work.

So far, the team has been reviewing background documents such as Board decisions concerning evaluation, Fund policies, strategies, and guidelines; evaluation studies of the Fund; external literature; and promising practices from peer organizations.

What is still missing in working out how to go about the review are insights from stakeholders like you and those in other teams in the Adaptation Fund. So, against this background, we are interested in seeking your guidance on how we should go about the review of the evaluation framework and policy development. So, we have some questions we’d like your thoughts on.

For the purpose of this discussion, is that clear?

[yes, no, explain bit more please?]

Before we start, I want to assure you that any comments you make will be held confidentially by the review team, and nothing you say will be attributed to you in the review report. We will just include a list in the inception report of all the people we spoke to.

And, of course, if any of you need to leave the interview early, or don't want to respond to any questions, you may.

So, before we start, let me just confirm that each of you is happy with those conditions?

Transcribe responses here [yes, no, etc]:

Great. Then, let's start with our first question:"

Inception phase question guide for Adaptation Fund internal stakeholders

1. What has been your experience with the Adaptation Fund evaluation framework?
2. What key questions or issues you do would want resolved regarding the Fund's current and potential evaluation function at Fund, AF-TERG, and Implementing Entity levels?
3. How can we make the Evaluation Function more relevant to the Fund (Board, secretariat, AF-TERG and IEs)?
4. As we go about reviewing the current evaluation framework and exploring policy content:

How can we best include Fund stakeholders in the review process? i.e. How might we optimize meaningful participation without overburdening stakeholders?

Who do you think we should be consulting with to gain critical insights? They may be people internal or external to the Fund.

5. Once we have completed the review process and start formulating a draft evaluation policy (or whatever the final guidance), who should be involved in inputting that document?
6. In reviewing the Fund's evaluation function, what do you think are some of the most important Board-approved documents or policies or strategies, etc. that we need to study and align with? (In what ways might a new evaluation policy link with those other policies, etc.?)
7. Who would benefit from an Adaptation Fund Evaluation Policy:
 - among internal stakeholders?
 - among external stakeholders?
8. That completes the questions we had planned. Before we finish, do you have any other insights about evaluation in the Adaptation Fund, or embarking on a process of reviewing or formulating policy for the Adaptation Fund?

[Before we close, let me ask: later, when we start the actual review phase, we would like to follow up again with each of you to gain more specific insights. Would that be okay?]

Inception phase question guide for external peer informants

Level of engagement

0-What opportunity have you had to ever engage with the Adaptation Fund from an evaluation perspective?

Evaluation Policy: Development

1. Could you elaborate on the main drivers that compelled your organization to create an updated evaluation policy? Which areas did the organization feel would benefit from having an evaluation policy?
2. Could you please describe the development process, and what we could learn from it? e.g. Who inputted into the formulation of the policy? What approaches were taken when developing it? Was it a collaborative process with other teams/departments beyond the evaluation office?

M&E framework vs. Evaluation policy

3. Why, specifically pursue a policy, instead of other options like an evaluation strategy or framework? What are the distinctions you sought to capitalize on or avoid?
4. What are the risks or weaknesses you perceive in institutionalizing an evaluation policy? Has anything been put in place to mitigate those risks?
5. Has the institutionalizing of the policy had any influence on the functioning of your organization – positive or negative?
6. Within the organization, where does responsibility sit for:
 - operationalizing the policy
 - monitoring its relevance?

Evaluation policy: Content

7. What are the elements included in the policy evaluation that you would identify as the “cornerstone” from your perspective?
8. How does the evaluation policy relate to other areas (departments or teams) beyond the evaluation office?
9. How does the evaluation policy engage external stakeholders in evaluation – such as local-level beneficiaries to implementation partners and national stakeholders?
10. That completes the questions we had planned. Before we finish, do you have any other insights about evaluation in the Climate Adaptation space, or embarking on a process of reviewing or formulating policy for the Adaptation Fund?

[Before we close, let me ask: later, when we start the actual review phase, we would like to follow up again with each of you to gain more specific insights. Would that be okay?]

Interview guides for the review phase consultations (to be further refined)

At the beginning of the review phase, several question guides will be developed. Each will be customized to the type of informant/participant – as per Annex B. The introductory information and ethical considerations will be similar to that of the inception phase guides. The questions will target the key review questions listed in Section VI (methodology), relative to the type of informant. Question guides will exclude review of Question 1, regarding Board decisions and documents missing from the current framework, because it has been sufficiently covered already by the AF-TERG and this inception phase.

d) List of persons interviewed

The following list presents all stakeholders interviewed during the inception phase.

Table 8. Inception phase interviews completed

	Informant Type	Organization	Informant Name	Position/Title	Interview Date
1	Board secretariat	Adaptation Fund	Mikko Ollikainen	AFB Sec Manager	November 17, 2020
2	Board secretariat	Adaptation Fund	Mahamat Abakar Assouyouiti	Senior Climate Change Specialist	November 17, 2020
3	Board secretariat	Adaptation Fund	Bianka Kretschmer	Climate Change Analyst	November 17, 2020
4	Board secretariat	Adaptation Fund	Martina Dorigo	Program Analyst	November 17, 2020
5	AF-TERG	Adaptation Fund	Nancy MacPherson	AF-TERG Member	November 26, 2020
6	AF-TERG	Adaptation Fund	Andy Rowe	AF-TERG Member	December 7, 2020
7	AF-TERG	Adaptation Fund	Debbie Menezes	AF-TERG Chair	December 11, 2020
8	AF-TERG	Adaptation Fund	Dennis Bours	AF-TERG Secretariat Coordinator	December 10, 2020
9	AF-TERG	Adaptation Fund	Claudio Volonte	AF-TERG Member, technical advisor	Multiple
10	AF-TERG	Adaptation Fund	Mutizwa Mukute	AF-TERG Member and focal point	Multiple
11	External UN Agency	UNDP	Alan Fox	Deputy Director, IEO	December 8, 2020
12	External Climate Finance	GCF	Andreas Reumann	Senior Evaluation Officer	December 8, 2020
13	External Climate Finance	GCF	Asha Warsame	IEU administration officer	December 8, 2020
14	External Climate Finance	GEF	Carlo Carugi	Senior Evaluation Officer	December 10, 2020
15	AF-TERG members and staff, including the Board secretariat manager, to co-develop an initial description of the kind, scope, and content of Final evaluation framework/policy				September 22, 2020



Annex D

Comparison of the guidance characteristics of the current evaluation framework against those of an evaluation policy or evaluation strategy

Policies reviewed – UNDP (2019), GEF (2019), UNFPA (2019), UNICEF (2018), UNEP (2016), IFAD (2015). While many more have been reviewed for the inception report (see Annex A.b), these six were shortlisted to provide a representative cross-section of peer organizations in the UN system or CCA and resilience sectors. The review of policies found the UNFPA to be the gold standard. Policies prior to 2017 were less consistent in their structures.

Descriptions of the characteristics of an evaluation strategy have been derived from studying the evaluation strategies of UNHCR and UNICEF, augmented by explanations from expert informants from other multilateral climate action organizations and literature cited in Section V.

Table 9. Comparative characteristics of evaluation frameworks, policies, and strategies

Characteristic	Current Evaluation Framework <small>(NB – some responses are split into what is in the current evaluation framework vs. what is a conventional evaluation framework’s content)</small>	Policy	Strategy
Timeframe	Adaptation Fund framework: Permanent – no end point “until and unless the Board decides otherwise” (p. 5).	From four years to permanent. GEF & UNEP - Permanent – no end point. Subject to advice from IEO. UNDP & UNICEF - Review and update every four years (by Audit and Evaluation Committee) IFAD – No clause for updating.	Fixed, short- to medium-term as needed (e.g. between one to three years)
Defines the whole organization’s principles, criteria, and minimum standards for planning and conducting evaluations	Yes. Principles (now outdated in relation to the AF-TERG principles) and criteria (drawn from outdated OECD DAC criteria). Also raises and provides some advice for climate-relevant evaluation issues.	Yes Some include “ethical considerations” as well.	No. A strategy is too short term to be the source reference for such items.
Defines why evaluation is important to the functioning of the organization	Adaptation Fund framework: Yes. The EFC provides a simple description of accountability and learning objectives.	Yes. Most focus around accountability and learning. UNFPA includes “evidenced decision-making” as well.	No.

(continued)

Table 9. Comparative characteristics of evaluation frameworks, policies, and strategies (continued)

Characteristic	Current Evaluation Framework (NB – some responses are split into what is in the current evaluation framework vs. what is a conventional evaluation framework's content)	Policy	Strategy
Institutionalizes independence & impartiality of the evaluation function	<p>No.</p> <p>Only to the extent that each evaluator should be independent (p.18).</p> <p>All responsibility delegated to the GEF evaluation office.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>GEF, UNDP, IFAD: Yes – reports direct to Board/ Council.</p> <p>UNFPA: Partial. Reports to the Board but administratively to the Exec Director.</p> <p>UNEP & UNICEF – Weak. Independent but reports to the Executive Director, not Board.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The actions of a strategy are determined by its higher authority.</p>
Institutionalizes organization's financial commitment to independent evaluation function	<p>No.</p> <p>Only stated that evaluations requested by the Board will be paid for by the Fund (p.10) and that project evaluations should be budgeted by the project (p.17).</p> <p>No funding for the evaluation function is described.</p>	<p>Yes. (with a spectrum of certainty)</p> <p>UNFPA – Strong commitment. Provides a funding formula (min. 1.4 per cent, max. 3 per cent of total programme expenditure).</p> <p>UNICEF has strong commitment. Provides “at least 1 per cent of its overall programme expenditure...”</p> <p>GEF – Weak commitment via four year rolling work plan & budget.</p> <p>IFAD – Weak commitment via three year rolling plan and budget.</p> <p>UNDP – Weak commitment. No formula.</p> <p>UNEP – No. Subject to will of Board/Assembly.</p>	<p>Contributes detail.</p> <p>Whereas a policy might outline the Board's or other authority's obligations to provide adequate financial resources, a strategy may contain a detailed budget for pursuing evaluative/ learning initiatives under the strategy.</p>
Institutionalizes how the evaluation office director and staff will be recruited, dismissed and performance-managed	<p>Adaptation Fund framework: No.</p> <p>No evaluation office – delegated to the GEF evaluation office.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>All have appointment clauses.</p> <p>IFAD has more detail than others.</p>	<p>No.</p>
Describes structure and all organizational responsibilities for diverse evaluation types (e.g. Fund-level, thematic, country, project, etc.)	<p>Adaptation Fund framework: Yes.</p> <p>Relative to the structure in 2012, including secretariat and evaluation services delegated to the GEF.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>UNICEF is highly structured in table form.</p> <p>IFAD is weak, focusing mainly on the IOE.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
Level of authority over evaluation office	<p>Adaptation Fund framework: None.</p> <p>The framework can only be advisory to the then GEF evaluation office.</p> <p>The framework compels the GEF to prepare an annual workplan and budget.</p>	<p>Director and team bound by the policy.</p> <p>GEF, UNEP, UNFPA, UNICEF & IFAD – Responsible for all evaluations.</p> <p>UNDP – Responsible for all evaluations above project/programme</p> <p>UNDP, GEF, UNICEF – responsible for “normative function”: to development of all evaluation standards, procedures, criteria, etc “to ensure consistent measurement”.</p> <p>UNDP, GEF & IFAD – responsible to disseminate lessons,</p> <p>UNDP – quality check decentralized evaluations; promote country ownership of evaluation</p>	<p>Likely to be developed by the evaluation office.</p> <p>Evaluation office likely to be accountable to its higher authority (in AF-TERG's case, the EFC)</p>

(continued)

Table 9. Comparative characteristics of evaluation frameworks, policies, and strategies (continued)

Characteristic	Current Evaluation Framework (NB – some responses are split into what is in the current evaluation framework vs. what is a conventional evaluation framework's content)	Policy	Strategy
Level of authority over other internal offices	<p>Adaptation Fund framework: Advisory.</p> <p>Secretariat services are delegated to GEF. Primary roles described relate to providing advisory services to the EFC and implementing Board decisions resulting from evaluation recommendations, and the monitoring function.</p> <p>The EFC is responsible for both evaluation and monitoring, and in relation to evaluation, must provide recommendations to the Board.</p> <p>The PPRC is encouraged to consider lessons from evaluations.</p> <p>The Accreditation Panel is encouraged to ensure IEs have M&E capabilities (no criteria provided) and to consider lessons from evaluations (again, not interpretation of what or how to consider).</p>	<p>In most organizations, all divisions are bound by the policy (though for a minority, the policy only directly implicates the evaluation office).</p> <p>GEF, UNFPA, UNICEF – Secretariat responsible for ensuring programmes and projects are aligned with evaluation requirements; and recommendations actioned.</p> <p>UNDP – Operations division or country offices commission programme/project evaluations. Head of operations is key liaison point with evaluation office.</p> <p>UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF – Chief officer ensures the independence and resourcing of the evaluation function, and appoints the evaluation director... BUT Senior Management decides on IEO budget.</p> <p>UNEP – the Executive Director is custodian.</p> <p>IFAD – Other divisions' role is limited to cooperating with the IOE.</p>	Entirely dependent on which offices are signatories to the strategy
Level of authority over external partners (e.g. IEs)	<p>Adaptation Fund framework: Advisory.</p> <p>The framework lists roles and responsibilities to have M&E plans and to conduct mid-term, final evaluations and incorporate lessons.</p> <p>Responsibilities are loosely defined and have neither definition of responsibilities nor clarity of obligation and consequence for non-alignment.</p>	<p>IEs can be bound via reference to the policy in overarching agreements (e.g. GEF). Though most UN samples do not state explicit expectations on external partners.</p> <p>GEF – GEF Agencies (=IEs) responsible for terminal evaluations. May have an evaluation unit.</p> <p>Country Focal Points – must be consulted & informed by implementers.</p> <p>UNDP, UNICEF & UNEP – none</p> <p>IFAD – Refers to review feedback loops.</p>	None
Level of authority of Board/Council	<p>Adaptation Fund framework: The Board is assigned the responsibilities of an evaluation office.</p> <p>It "authorizes independent evaluations and approves standards, guidance on procedures, and quality assurance for project and programme evaluations. In addition, the Board reserves the right to carry out independent reviews or evaluations of projects and programmes" (p.10)</p>	<p>Always the Custodian (UNDP, UNFPA, GEF, IFAD, UNICEF) UNEP is the exception.</p>	None, other than verification that the strategy is consistent with the policy or other Board decision.
Provides technical detail for how evaluations should be conducted	<p>Adaptation Fund Framework: Partial.</p> <p>Describes when in project cycle evaluations should take place and report content and scope.</p> <p>No content provided regarding Fund-level or thematic.</p> <p>Conventionally – yes. This would be the key function of an evaluation framework.</p>	<p>Generally, high-level guidance without detail</p> <p>GEF – No</p> <p>UNDP – No</p> <p>UNEP, UNFPA, UNICEF & IFAD – Partial level of detail.</p>	Optional. Or supplemented with guidelines.

(continued)

Table 9. Comparative characteristics of evaluation frameworks, policies, and strategies (continued)

Characteristic	Current Evaluation Framework <small>(NB – some responses are split into what is in the current evaluation framework vs. what is a conventional evaluation framework's content)</small>	Policy	Strategy
Institutionalizes how the evaluation function is to interlink with other policies and learning functions (e.g. monitoring, knowledge management, results management, performance monitoring and project/programme design)	<p>No.</p> <p>Only to the extent that the framework restates many roles of stakeholders as described in the Fund's "Operational Policies and Guidelines".</p> <p>Onus is placed on the EFC to ensure monitoring and evaluation are mutually beneficial.</p> <p>The annex lists Board documents (pre-2012) that have implications for the evaluation function.</p>	<p>Half explicitly spell out interlinkages at high-level (without the "how to" detail).</p> <p>UNEP, UNDP, GEF & IFAD – No.</p> <p>UNFPA – Yes. Interlinkages noted, but not detailed.</p> <p>UNEP – Yes – in relation to monitoring and audit functions only.</p> <p>UNICEF – Vague references to the IOE coordinating with audit, monitoring and data management functions. No details.</p>	Entirely dependent on which offices are signatories to the strategy
Determines learning and capacity-building objectives of the organization	<p>No.</p> <p>Learning is listed as an objective (p. 5). Evaluation is listed as distinct from, but complementary to, the results-based management framework. (pp. 3-4).</p>	<p>Generally, organizational learning has been limited to disseminating evaluation findings and some wider organizational evaluation capacity-building. The better examples consider public accessibility and system-wide integration of learning (e.g. UNFPA).</p> <p>UNFPA – Yes, including IEO providing training in evaluation for whole of organization; plus, dissemination of learning; plus public accessibility; plus organization-wide commitment to enhancing learning from evaluations and "system-wide evaluation and partnerships."</p> <p>IFAD – Yes. IOE is to facilitate post-evaluation learning within the organization and the partnered country; plus a dedicated learning theme per year; plus syntheses to inform the functioning of the organization; plus IOE participation in a wider IFAD COP on knowledge management; plus org. obligation to adopt and track recommendations.</p> <p>GEF, UNDP & UNEP – Partial: IEO disseminates lessons and seeks management responses to evaluations.</p> <p>Missing a higher vision for organizational learning.</p> <p>UNICEF – Affirmed. IOE director is responsible for internal evaluation capacity development and knowledge dissemination, without specific direction.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>– in relation to short to medium-term learning objectives.</p> <p>Limited to the offices/ division implicated in the strategy.</p>
Authority to revise the document sits with the Board	<p>Adaptation Fund framework: Yes.</p> <p>(See p.5 and p.10)</p>	<p>Yes. Generally, the IEO is to provide advice to the Board.</p> <p>Board may review via independent review.</p> <p>Supported by the Audit and Evaluation Committee.</p> <p>UNEP – No – Sits with Executive Director.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>A strategy should be developed by the offices/ divisions implementing it.</p>
Authority to revise the document sits with the evaluation office	<p>Adaptation Fund framework: No</p> <p>Conventionally – yes (if authorized by its ToR and the evaluation policy)</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>Responsible for identifying processes and/or policy revisions and making recommendations.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

(continued)

Table 9. Comparative characteristics of evaluation frameworks, policies, and strategies (continued)

Characteristic	Current Evaluation Framework <small>(NB – some responses are split into what is in the current evaluation framework vs. what is a conventional evaluation framework's content)</small>	Policy	Strategy
Can mandate organizational commitment to coherence and collaboration with peer organizations	Adaptation Fund framework: No No partnerships are envisaged by the document. Conventionally – No. A framework would not issue organizational mandates, but may support such a mandate with technical guidance to execute the mandate.	Yes. Generally stated through high-level statements with insufficient comments on scope that limits accountability. UNFPA best example. GEF – Yes but weak. To “the global evaluation community.” UNDP – Partial and weak – only within UN system. UNEP – Yes but weak. To other UN, multilaterals and bilateral organizations. UNICEF – Yes but weak. General affirmation of “global partnerships and networks” and aligning to UNEG. UNFPA – Yes. Strong and detailed explanations of evaluative collaborations with diverse peers and partners.	No. The strategy does not set an organizational mandate.
Can mandate organizational commitment to capacity-building implementing/ country partners	Adaptation Fund framework: No. Conventionally – No. A framework would not issue organizational mandates but may support such a mandate with technical guidance to execute the mandate.	Partner countries and implementers ignored by half the sample policies. UNFPA and UNICEF best examples. UNDP, UNEDP, GEF – No. Limited to joint evaluations. UNFPA – Yes. Strong articulation of commitment to national evaluation capacities. UNICEF – commitment to “promoting the national ownership and leadership of evaluation activities.”	No. The strategy does not set an organizational mandate.
Provides detailed plan for how collaboration and capacity support will be done	Adaptation Fund framework: No. Conventionally – Yes – if these objectives are part of the organization’s policy or strategy.	Partial. Most samples refer to mutual commitments between organizational divisions. But no detailed plans.	Yes. The strategy may define how collaboration and partner capacity-building will be pursued and with which other organizations.
Directs the importance of meaningful inclusion of “grassroots” voices and diversity in shaping learning	Adaptation Fund framework: Limited. The framework aspires to CSOs being consulted by evaluations (p.13). No reference to intended beneficiaries, gender considerations, or marginalized groups such as Indigenous people or people with disabilities. The “ethics” principle notes that evaluations should respect beliefs and customs and the “effectiveness” criterion encourages considering benefit to involved and vulnerable communities (without articulating a role for them).	Samples are generally weak. Passing references to inclusion or feedback to country or community stakeholders. GEF – Encourages involvement of “other stakeholders,” including community members and civil society in general terms. UNDP – No. Covered in a separate policy on stakeholder engagement. UNEP – No. Ambiguous reference to “participation of stakeholders” without defining stakeholders, and being “sensitive to ... human rights, discrimination and gender inequality... beliefs, manner and customs...”	Optional. A strategy can define how Fund offices will engage grassroots voices and diversity in practice.

(continued)

Table 9. Comparative characteristics of evaluation frameworks, policies, and strategies (continued)

<p>Nimble and flexible to adapt</p>	<p>Adaptation Fund framework: No. Requires an ad-hoc decision by the Board.</p> <p>Conventionally – yes. An evaluation framework may be adjusted in line with strategy or funding cycles.</p>	<p>No. Generally, not structured for routine revision. Every four to five years.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Consistent with peer organizations as peak evaluation guidance document</p>	<p>No Conventionally, an evaluation framework would provide the technical detail to support higher evaluation directives.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No Positioning a strategy under the peak guidance is standard practice.</p>
<p>Support documents referenced to operationalize the main document</p>	<p>To support its function, the framework envisages the creation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • guidelines for final evaluations • guidelines for mid-term evaluations. <p>Conventionally, the evaluation framework is a document that supports the execution of the policy or strategy.</p>	<p>GEF – Conflict of Interest agreements UNDP – Multi-year evaluation plan Decentralized evaluation plans (regions and countries) EIO/Operations charter IFAD – an Evaluation Manual.</p>	



Annex E

Research and evaluation principles and ethics applied to this assignment

This research will adhere to the following evaluation principles and ethical standards:

a) The Fund's evaluation principles:

1. **Independence:** from policy-making process and management
2. **Credibility:** based on reliable data, observations, methods, and analysis
3. **Transparency:** clear communication concerning the purpose of the evaluation, its intended use, data, and analysis
4. **Ethics:** regard for the welfare, beliefs, and customs of those involved or affected
5. **Impartiality:** giving accounts from all stakeholders
6. **Partnerships:** between Implementing Entities, governments, civil society, and beneficiaries
7. **Competencies and capacities:** selection of the required expertise for evaluations
8. Avoidance of **conflict of interest**
9. **Disclosure:** lessons shared with general public
10. **Utility:** serve decision-making processes and information needs of the intended users.
(Adaptation Fund, 2012b, p. 14)

b) The AF-TERG 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 principles (AF-TERG, 2020) to guide its work, including what 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 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 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 (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, utilize, and build on good, new, ethical MEL approaches and practice in the CCA and related fields.
7. **Respect and utilize 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 use 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.

c) The consultant team's ethics declaration:

The senior consultant will be responsible for ensuring that data collection and analysis approaches are designed to protect and respect informants' privacy and professional protection by establishing and following credible ethical research principles. The senior consultant will ensure all members of the review team who collect or handle primary data have been oriented in the ethical considerations employed in the review. Ethical principles will include the following:

Voluntarism and confidentiality of participants: All participation in interviews must be voluntary, and not create harm to informants during or after the data gathering. Their confidentiality will be protected according to their permissions. Voluntary involvement will be assured by a written and verbal explanation of the study being conducted. The script will inform respondents that they may choose to not respond to certain questions and may end the interview at any time.

Do no harm: Project and research themes will be screened for topics and questions that may cause embarrassment or loss of reputation. Mitigating approaches and referral options must be developed accordingly.

Integrity: Data from informants will be presented honestly and proportionately, such as the authoritativeness, extent-shared, and intensity of opinions across the target participant cohort and aligning quotes with the review themes intended by the informant. Unexpected or contentious findings will be triangulated with other forms of data and opinions to gauge significance.

Stakeholder perspective: To the extent possible, preliminary findings will be shared with assignment stakeholders to invite their reactions and interpretations. This includes periodic, informal meetings, and formal workshops.

Professional objectivity: The Team Leader has completed and been cleared by a police check within the last two years, is registered under the Australian Securities and Investments Corporation; and is a member of the Australian Evaluation Society and complies with its *Guidelines of Ethical Principals*.

Furthermore, the senior consultant declares that he has no business, familial, or financial relationship with any staff or directors of the Fund, World Bank, or any agencies affiliated with this assignment. **No conflict of interest exists.**

1. Approved by AFB decision B.31/32.

2. For examples of proposed key principles, see references by Patton (Blue Marble), Picciotto and Ofir in Annex A.

3. Especially UNHCR Evaluation Strategy 2018-2020; and UNESCO *Evaluation Strategy 2016-2018*, Internal Oversight Service, Evaluation Office, IOS/EVS/PI/147.