

# **Evaluating projects ex-post** & emerging sustainability and resilience

Presented by: Jindra Cekan, PhD. (Valuing Voices), Meg Spearman and Caroline Holo Date: October 2021



Training material Part A

## Aim of the ex-post training

◆ Introduce stakeholders to sustainability definitions, ex-post impact(s) evaluations, assumptions, principles, and examples from ex-post evaluations as well as resilience

♦ Introduce stakeholders to the AF-TERG ex-post evaluation process and share Phase 1 selection of ex-post pilot projects –Ecuador & Samoa

♦ Share aims of ex-post evaluations and main research questions, including theories of sustainability, resilience and preconditions for collaborative learning

◆ Introduce stakeholders to the co-creation process and focus on learning priorities in the pilot countries as well as select priority outputs/outcomes/ impacts to be evaluated

Discuss with the evaluator(s) preparation for fieldwork, including outline the array of methods to evaluate sustainability of outputs/ outcomes and climate resilience (inc. aspects such as infrastructure, livelihoods, knowledge) based on secondary documentation and data

Once outcomes/ impacts set, discuss best methods to use in evaluation



## Aim of the ex-post training

## **Training contents and structure**

# PART A – Introduction to ex-post evaluations, resilience and the piloting processes

A1- Understanding ex-post & resilience evaluations

- Sustainability and ex-post sustainability
- Ex-post evaluation, CCA and resilience

#### <u>A2- Introduction to project selection and methods</u> for the ex-post & resilience evaluations pilots

- AF-TERG process for ex-post evaluations
- Project selection and methods for ex-post (inc. methods for resilience analysis)

#### <u>A3- Understanding processes for evaluations pilots:</u> <u>co-creating learning with stakeholders</u>

- Co-creation process
- Ex-post in practice: research questions & process
- Preparatory work and steps for pilot ex-posts



#### Ference Group APTATION FUND

#### **PART B – Discussing country-specific outcomes**

#### B1- Defining learning priorities and outcomes

- Data review
- Theory of Sustainability
- Mapping processes

#### <u>B2- Selecting measurable outcomes</u>

- Outcome/output review for outcome selection
- Tracing outcomes to sustainability and resilience

# PART C – Developing country-specific methods and approaches

- Choice and discussion of field methods
- Application of resilience framework
- Methodological considerations during fieldwork

# Introduction



## Introduction

#### The AF-TERG and the evaluation team



#### The Adaptation Fund (AF)

The Adaptation Fund was established to finance concrete adaptation projects and programmes in developing countries that are parties to the Kyoto Protocol and are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change.

The Fund is supervised and managed by the Adaptation Fund Board (AFB). It now **serves the Paris Agreement**.



#### The Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the AF

The AF-TERG is an **independent evaluation advisory group**, accountable to the Board, established to ensure the independent implementation of the Fund's evaluation framework.

Specifically, the TERG provides an:

- a) evaluation function,
- **b)** advisory function, and
- c) oversight function



## Introduction

#### **AF-TERG team for ex-post evaluations**



Dennis Bours



Caroline Holo



Jindra Cekan, PhD.



Meg Spearman



## PART A

# Introduction to :

- ex-post evaluations,
- resilience,
- methods and processes for the piloting

# A1 – Understanding ex-post & resilience evaluations

#### **Contents**

- Definitions and implications of ex-post evaluations
- Learning from past ex-post evaluations (examples)
- Ex-post evaluations and sustainability
- Ex-post evaluations and climate change adaptation
- Introducing resilience



## **Understanding ex-post evaluations**

**A**1

Sustainability and ex-post sustainability definitions

#### Sustainability (projected ex-post project evaluation):

"The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed....The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time" <u>OECD/ DAC</u> Aid Criteria, 2019

#### **Ex-post Sustainability (actual ex-post):**

"Ex-post evaluation is generally conducted... three years after the project['s] completion with the emphasis on the effectiveness (relevance) and sustainability of the project...." Japanese International Cooperation Agency/ JICA

"The basic idea of sustainability is that a project should be designed to produce a continuous flow of outputs, services, and outcomes over its useful or economic lifetime. Project results should be sustainable even where there are several risks to outputs and outcomes."



<u>ADB</u>, 2010

seedlings

JICA conducts ex-post <u>evaluation</u> 2-3 years after each project completion They are the only donor to have done over 2000 ex-post evaluations; most donors have done very few.

#### Why evaluate ex-post?

- To make ODA projects more efficient and effective, and to ensure the accountability
- To understand whether effects are (still) being realized as planned (effectiveness and impact)
- To understand whether effects are likely to continue in the further-ex-post future (sustainability)

#### JICA's also conducts ex-post monitoring 7 years after each project completion

#### Why monitor long-term ex-post sustained impact?

- To see whether the project continues to be effective
- To see whether there are issues with operation and maintenance
- To see whether efforts were made to promote tangible sustainable development under developing countries' ownership





## **Understanding ex-post evaluations**

## Understanding contribution and emerging impacts through ex-post



At exit it is impossible to verify how much the project will contribute to sustainability... but many assume full success and full attribution to the project (unproven).

#### John Mayne: Contribution vs. attribution?

- Ex-post-project evaluations could isolate & verify the attributional claims made at the time of the terminal evaluation, but more likely trace <u>contributions</u> the project made.
- Sustained and Emerging Impacts Evaluations (SEIE) also look at how the sustainability between final and ex-post was shaped by local efforts to maintain priority results that are locally/nationally 'owned', often using emerging efforts to harness resources, capacities, partnerships, foster resilience...
- Analyzing climate resilience means looking for ways in which the sustained outcomes have affected and been affected by underlying socio-ecological systems.

Main lessons from ex-post project evaluations

#### Main lessons:

- There are always positive and negative lessons from all project evaluated; not all activities are typically sustained, but all results can be learned from;
- Questions of why some results lasted in some places over others can illuminate differences in context, design, implementation, M&E or exit
- Some outputs/outcomes could be sustained differently than originally conceived, given differed resources/ capacities etc.; this has important future design implications, especially for scaling up 'success' that can be differently defined
- There can be **emerging outcomes** that came from local efforts to sustain resultsthese especially can help inform future project design and funding



The Power Of Learning



What ex-post evaluations can tell: example of a positive impact

#### **Example 1 - Positive Ex-post Food Security Impacts**

Catholic Relief Services Niger, Agriculture component, 3 years ex-post 2015

Months of food selfsufficiency in 1 village:

Feeding themselves 30% more 3 years ex-post





**13** USAID/ CRS Niger, Nutritional and Food Security Program (PROSAN Rayuma)

What ex-post evaluations can tell: example of mixed outcomes

Percentage of households with children 3-35 months of age participating in growth monitoring:

**Decreased child health** via growth monitoring from end line by only 4-16% (ADRA, FH, SC)

Improved child health via growth monitoring by 3% (CARE)





14

ADRA, CARE, FH, Save the Children Bolivia USAID Exit Strategies, 4-country study, Tufts Friedman School of Nutrition and FHI/360'16

What ex-post evaluations can teach: negative impact

#### **Example 3 - Worst Case: Negative Water/ Sanitation Outcomes** USAID, 3 years ex-post 2016

# **3-year sustainability of key RANO-HP sanitation and hygiene outcomes :**

**Unsustained behavior change** results at endline:

- Dismal rates of Feces disposal (below baseline),
- Handwashing (below midterm).
- **Discouraging rates of Latrine use** (decreases by 60-75%) with Nearly doubled open defecation (since midterm)



USAID/ CRS/ CARE/ CARITAS, and local NGOs Madagascar, RANO-HP project. Note: Baseline unavailable, only re-created **15** 

Midterm

Evaluation 2000

What ex-post evaluations can teach: unanticipated outcomes

#### **Example 4** - Mixed Results with Unexpected Positive Results in Village Savings and Empowerment... but Could have Good News Unevaluated PACT WORTH Nepal, 2008

Only 2/3 banks were sustained...

Yet 10% were new village banks formed post-closure in communities by word of mouth or self-help training

(Note: No baseline or final, only since midterm, project was replicated in 12 countries)

**Technical Evaluation** Reference Group ADAPTATION FUND





## **Ex-post evaluation and sustainability**

**Ex-post illuminates the theory of sustainability of Tufts/ FHI 360 (2016)** 

#### Figure 1. Sustainability and Exit Strategies Conceptual Framework



Adapted from Coates and Kegode. 2012. "Kenya Exit Strategies Study Round 2 Report." Unpublished, submitted to FANTA April 8.

17

## **Ex-post evaluations and sustainability**

## **Ex-post allows to test assumptions and barriers**



"Hope is not a strategy"



Designed "sustainability plans cannot be based on the hope that activities and benefits will continue in the absence of the key factors..."

(Rogers, Tufts for USAID)

Testing assumptions that projects make about sustainability. Tufts found 'hopes' were unsustained':

- Local **ownership/ motivation of activities didn't continue** without further resources (inputs or remuneration)
- (Un)continued resources and commitment for outputs/ outcomes delivery
- Ongoing institutional capacities of participants and partners not sustained via training
- Exit not justified via hoped readiness... w/o **benchmark for handover pre-exit**
- Q: What ex-post learning is a priority for the project and its stakeholders? Q: What are the Project's assumptions/ barriers to achieving sustained impact(s) to test in Phase 2?

## **Ex-post evaluations and sustainability**

## Example of illustrative emerging outcomes to explore in a ToS



- **1.** <u>**Ownership:**</u> Participants valued health clinic built by the project and sustained it by **introducing community tithing to cover costs** (CRS/Niger)
- 2. <u>Ownership</u>: Participants valued clinic-based birthing so created locally-created disincentives to compel compliance (")
- **3.** <u>Resources & Capacities</u>: A food security project improved assets and income but better water access led to surprising decreases in gender violence (LWR/ Niger)
- 4. <u>Partnerships & Ownership</u>: Members of Village Banks offered trainings in VB for sale in other, home areas (Pact/Nepal)



## **Ex-post evaluations and sustainability**

## What ex-post can teach us about sustainability: project logic and OECD criteria



#### **Process surrounding the interventions**

Was it well managed?

- Did planning and decision-making processes ensure the project's success? •
- Did management processes ensure success?
- Did processes for developing activities ensure their success?

impacts can be discovered w/ complex data or longer time

 $\leftarrow$  Contextual and external factors outside project boundaries that may have influenced the project trajectory  $\rightarrow$   $\rightarrow$ 

## **Ex-post evaluations and climate change adaptation**

## **Evaluating climate change adaptation ex-post: context**

- Mis-match of tools and incentives: Evaluation tools often focus on people and not natural systems/environment; climate change 'M&E' tools (would) have to be adapted for use in ex post.
- Newness of adaptation portfolios: Projects with high level objectives of adaptation are relatively new compared to projects that have been climate-screened or climate-proofed (e.g. those without adaptation objectives, but rather as a 'co-benefit' to a project with other objectives), so learning has been inconsistent and largely sector-based.
- Common pitfalls to 'measuring' adaptation: Adaptation is multi/cross-sector, with long timeframes, no single metric/indicator, and is highly contextspecific.





## **Ex-post evaluations and climate change adaptation**

## **Defining resilience in the context of CCA**

"Resilience" to the effects of climate change and related extreme weather events can be described as a high-level goal of climate change adaptation.

Through adaptation, the structures and functions critical to life would be less affected by climate-related disturbances and/or these disturbances would be less impactful.

**DISTURBANCES:** acute shocks (e.g. a cyclone, flood event) or chronic stresses (e.g. gradual crop loss from temperature rise, sea level rise).

Affect

#### Is affected by

#### **STRUCTURES:**

\*a literal, physical asset (forest, storm wall, evacuation shelter, etc.), \*a figurative asset like an institution or set of practices (local government, economy, early warning system).

#### FUNCTIONS:

ability to serve a particular need or purpose (generate income, attend school, be safe and secure).

## **Ex-post evaluations and climate change adaptation**

**A**1

DAPTATION FUND





## **Stretch and drink break**



**Questions? Comments?** 

# A2- Introduction to project selection and methods to ex-post pilots

#### **Contents**

- AF-TERG process for ex-post evaluations
- **Project selection for ex-post evaluation pilots**
- Methods in ex-post evaluations
- **Methods for resilience** (differentiate changes in human and natural systems, and the nexus between them, and explore ways to characterize the resilience of sustained outcomes)

## **AF-TERG process for ex-post evaluations**

	Ex-post study and evaluability assessment study (foundational work)		
Phase 1	Framework developed to conduct ex post evaluations and shortlist of up to five completed projects as pilots for ex post evaluation		
Phase 2	Methods tested in at least two pilot projects.		
	Current phase		
Phase 3	Ex post evaluations and capacity building continue over time feeding into adjustments within the Fund's MEL processes		



## **AF-TERG process for ex-post evaluations**

#### Foundation work for ex-post: ex-post evaluation study (phase 0)

The ex post evaluation study (2019) presented the following:

- > An overview of ex post evaluation approaches and learning practices in development cooperation
- > A brief discussion on the state of ex post as applied to environment and adaption projects
- Implications for the Adaptation Fund on how to develop ex post evaluation guidance

The study observes there are **five lenses** through which adaption interventions are often evaluated:

Transformational Change	Wellness and Liv	velihoods	Resilience Building
	ation (EBA)	Dimensio	ons of Sustainability



## **AF-TERG process for ex-post evaluations**

#### Foundation work for ex-post: evaluability assessment (phase 0)

The evaluability assessment (2019) explored the extent to which the Fund's projects have structures, processes, and resources that can support credible and useful monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL).



Assessment of the Fund's portfolio: 100 projects (from 2010 to 2019)

Based on the assessment's findings, it provides conclusions and next steps on how to improve the evaluability of the Fund's projects and portfolio.

#### Evaluability of project against seven categories of criteria :

Project	logic	MEL plan and resources	Lo	ng-term evaluability
Data and methods		Inclusion of interest groups / beneficiaries		Evaluability in practice
Technical Evaluation Reference Group	Portfo	lio alignment with Fund strategic	results and co	ore indicators

Selection framework for ex-post evaluation pilots (phase 1)

#### **FILTER 1: CRITERION EVALUATION** NO MAYBE GO A1 Timing A2 Methodological feasibility mandatory evaluating sustainability ex post A3 Safe evaluation A4 Financial and technical feasibility and organizational commitment (field consulted) Diversity of stakeholders optional and/or implementing entity B2 Variety of geography Variety in (cross)sector

#### FILTER 2: DECISION FUNNEL FOR PROJECT SELECTION



**A**2

## Detailed criteria for project selection for ex-post pilots (phase 1)

#### Mandatory criteria: project evaluability

#### A1 Timing

a) Years ex post project completion (min of three years, max of five)

- b) Duration of project (four-plus years)
- c) Completion more recent than five years
- d) Seasonality of final evaluation matches ex post (summer 2021)

#### A2 Methodological feasibility evaluating sustainability ex post

a) Overall project quality at completion and ratings of quality and likely sustainability

b) Measurable outcome & impact data at completion

c) Sustainability planning, including ownership, resources, partnerships, capacities, exit readiness and any post-monitoring, replication or scale-upd) Institutional memory accessible of prior project (field consulted)

#### A3 Safe evaluation

a) Personal safety (unrest) and b) COVID-19 (health) – in 2021

## A4 Financial and technical feasibility and organizational commitment (field consulted)

- a) Stakeholder engagement and ex post learning commitment
- b) Quality of evaluators
- c) Time needed for quality ex post evaluation versus funding available

#### **Optional criteria: Fund considerations\***

\*not evaluated for cohort #1 / pilots

#### **B1 Diversity of stakeholders and/or implementing entity**

a) Multilateral implementing entity vs. National implementing entityb) Range of participants

**B2 Variety of geography** 

#### **B3 Variety in (cross)sector** >current focus is similar sectors

**Project selection for ex-post evaluation pilots (Ecuador)** 

#### **Criteria ratings**



## MAYBE A2 data quality NO A2 resources A3 safety

a) project closure: June 2018 (3 years ago)
b) duration: 5 years (11/29/2011 to 6/15/2018)
c) final evaluation: publication in September 2018 (3 years)
d) seasonality: field work between July and August

- Some tangible outputs and outcomes, but there are risks to sustainability brought by the economic situation
- "Grassroots design", strong participation, interinstitutional coordination, project awareness in the community, institutional ownership for the project
- Sustainability and closing plans at Parish level, which gives a base for future monitoring
- Replication of activities by neighboring communities
- Outcome indicators are often output-focused in the results framework

Project selection for ex-post evaluation pilots (Samoa)

#### **Criteria ratings** GO A1 timing A2 scale-up A2 partnerships A3 safety MAYBE A2 project quality A2 data quality A2 ownership A2 capacities A2 resources A2 exit readiness A2 post monitoring

#### NO

None ('A4 Financial and technical feasibility and organizational commitment' to verify)

a) project closure: June 2018 (3 years ago)
b) duration: 5 years (1/28/2013 to 06/30/2018)
c) final evaluation: publication in September 2018 (3 years)
d) seasonality: field work in July 2018

- CIM plan model to be replicated by other Funds and countries
- Project rests on many stakeholders and partnership principle of community plans
- At the time of final evaluations, outcomes are only partially achieved and impact still provisional
- Sustainability of outcomes is linked to issues of ownership or budget, and uncertainty around this
- Outcome indicators are often output-focused in the results framework
- A sustainability plan is developed but it is unclear how MEL will be sustained
   32

#### **AF-TERG ex-post evaluation framework**

#### Phase 1 developed an ex-post evaluation framework with methods to be revised in Phase 2.

The ex-post framework focuses on aspects of both <u>sustainability of outcomes</u> and <u>climate resilience</u> to answer the following **overarching** questions:

How sustainable are the project outcomes/ impact(s) over time since project completion?

How are the sustained project outcomes climate-resilient?





## **Methods in ex-post evaluations**

DAPTATION FUND

## What results level ex-post evaluations will focus on?



#### Ex-post evaluation & M&E pyramide

## **Methods in ex-post evaluations**

### Project data needed for comparative evaluation of results durability



 $\leftarrow$  Contextual and external factors outside project boundaries that may have influenced the project trajectory  $\rightarrow$   $\rightarrow$ 

## **Methods in ex-post evaluations**


**Evaluating resilience: framing for resilience analysis** 



**Evaluating resilience: Disturbances** 



#### **Evaluating resilience : Disturbances**

<u>Shocks</u>: sudden expected or unexpected climatic events – or disasters - such as drought, flood, hurricanes, wildfire, etc.





Clayton, California, 2013

**<u>Stresses</u>**: slower onset climatic changes such as sea-level rise, change in habitable area, loss of soil or plant matter, etc.



San Juan River portion of Lake Powell (Utah and Arizona)

**Evaluating resilience : Systems** 



**A**2

#### **Evaluating resilience : Systems (1)**



#### Adaptability vs adaptation

Adaptability: the extent to which something/someone can/could adapt (resilience is not always the goal - i.e. adaptability means different things in different contexts/ for different entities).

#### Adaptation:

if and when something/ someone has adapted/ adapts.

#### **Evaluating resilience : Systems (2)**



#### **Structures**

- Forests
- Reefs
- Mountains
- Barrier islands
- Rivers
- Etc.

#### **Functions**

- Hydrological Cycle
- Shelter & Habitat
- Nutrient Cycle
- Carbon Cycle
- Photosynthesis
- Etc.

#### **HUMAN Systems**

#### Structures

- Institutions
- Policies
- Environmental agreements
- Physical infrastructure
- Etc.

#### Functions

- Safety
- Health
- Food security
- Education
- Economic growth
- Etc.





**Evaluating resilience : Characteristics** 



AZ

#### **Evaluating resilience : Characteristics - Feedback Loops**

<u>Feedback Loops</u>: having ways to generate and communicate information that can be used to take or adjust actions / decisions

"The transmission of evaluative or corrective information about an action, event, or process to the original or controlling source."



"Feedback occurs when outputs of a system are routed back as inputs as part of a chain of cause-and-effect that forms a circuit or loop."





#### **Evaluating resilience : Characteristics - Scale**

# **<u>Scale</u>**: of sufficient size or timeliness in order to generate desired benefits

"At the required size to solve the problem."

**Technical Evaluation** 

Reference Group ADAPTATION FUND

eedback loops At scale Diverse Dynamic Redundant "Scalability is the capability of a system, network, or process to handle a growing amount of work, or its potential to be enlarged to accommodate that growth."



#### **Evaluating resilience : Characteristics - Diversity**



**Diversity: different things/entities** serving different functions but part of a larger common system or set of purposes

"The state or fact of being diverse; difference, unlikeness... multiformity"

"The condition of having or being composed of differing elements "

At scale

Diverse

Dynamic

At scale

Diverse

Dynamic

Redundant

#### **Evaluating resilience : Characteristics - Dynamism**

Shoreline

Channe

Shoreline

Channel



**Riparian** zone Pioneer vegetation Exposed gravel bar/Dry riverbed

#### **Dynamic:** flexibility and changes that are centered around a common set of purposes (or equilibrium)

"Pertaining to or characterized by energy or effective action; vigorously active or forceful; energetic"

"Marked by usually continuous and productive activity or change"

"Dynamic equilibrium (biology): A system in a steady state since forward reaction and backward reaction occur at the same rate."

47

#### **Evaluating resilience : Characteristics - Redundancy**

#### <u>Redundancy</u>: having back-up; two or more things serving the same/similar function or role

"The provision of additional or duplicate systems, equipment, etc., that function in case an operating part or system fails, as in a spacecraft."



"Serving as a duplicate for preventing failure of an entire system (such as a spacecraft) upon failure of a single component."





Many communities have developed right along the ocean with minimal natural defenses from a small strip of beach between them and the ocean

Natural habitats that can provide storm protection include salt marsh, oyster and coral reefs, mangroves, seagrasses, dunes and barrier islands. A combination of natural habitats can be used to provide more protection, as seen in this figure. Communities could restore or create a barrier island, followed by oyster reefs and salt marsh. Temporary infrastructure (such as removable sea wall) can protect natural infrastructure as it gets established.

Natural infrastructure can be used to protect built infrastructure in order to help the built infrastructure have a longer lifetime and to provide more storm protection benefits. In managed realignment, communities are moving sea walls farther away from the ocean edge, closer to the community and allowing natural infrastructure to recruit between the ocean edge and the sea wall.

In the hybrid approach, specific built infrastructure, such as removable sea walls or openable flood gates (as shown here) are installed simultaneously with restored or created natural infrastructure, such as salt marsh and oyster reefs. Other options include moving houses away from the water and raising them on stilts. The natural infrastructure provides key storm protection benefits from small to medium storms and then when a large storm is expected, the built infrastructure is used for additional protection.

**Evaluating resilience : Means and Actions** 



#### **Evaluating resilience : Means and Actions**

- Means, e.g.
  - follow on financing
  - income/revenue generation
  - ➤ access to resources
  - > shift in power, politics
  - ➤ new institutions
  - new policies, plans

#### <u>Actions, e.g.</u>

- partnerships formed
  - ➤ new practices
  - ➤ education
- new skills, knowledge
- > new management
- gender inclusion/ consideration



**Evaluating resilience : R-R-T Typology** 



**A**2

#### **Evaluating resilience : R-R-T Typology**



**A2** 

#### Evaluating resilience : R-R-T Typology - example

• Species translocation out of native range for anticipated future conditions

Some individuals migrate to new ranges and populate

 Protected areas established in current native range



#### TRANSFORMATION



## e.g. Species Conservation Intervention

 Species translocation within and outside current native range

 Some individuals survive current native range with behavioral changes; others die off

 Protected areas expanded for species conservation

## **Stretch and drink break**



**Questions? Comments?** 

# A3- Understanding processes for evaluations pilots: co-creating learning for ex-post pilots

#### **Contents**

Overview of co-creation process for ex-post evaluations

co-creation process for ex-post evaluations including setting learning purpose, organizational and national priorities to complement AF ex-post aims

- How does ex-post work in practice?
  - setting research questions
  - process for ex-post evaluation and learning
  - timeline of ex-post evaluations
  - preparatory work for field work
  - after ex-post: debriefing and sharing organizational learning

## **Co-creation process for ex-post evaluations (purpose/ process)**



The ex-post evaluation follows a

**Co-creation process** 



Define the purpose, scope and initial design of the post-project evaluation, and understanding conditions for the field work

#### **STEP 2**

Determine learning priorities and outcomes to evaluate for specific country pilots via collaboration

## **STEP 3**

Given the outcomes chosen, what methods to evaluate outcome sustainability and resilience?

## **Co-creation process for ex-post evaluations (purpose/ process)**



#### The ex-post evaluation follows a

**Co-creation process** 



Define the purpose, scope and initial design of the post-project evaluation, and understanding conditions for the field work

#### **STEP 2**

Determine learning priorities and outcomes to evaluate for specific country pilots via collaboration

#### STEP 3

Given the outcomes chosen, what methods to evaluate outcome sustainability and resilience?

Defining purpose, usability and design of evaluation with stakeholders

#### **STEP 1** Define the purpose, scope and initial design of the post-project evaluation

Purpose and usability to set evaluation questions with key stakeholders

- Reminder of ex-post evaluation questions: sustainability & relevance... and resilience
- Stakeholders' expectations and discussion questions pre-evaluation:
  - What other things should be learned from the evaluation and why?
  - How will the evaluation process & findings be used?
  - Who will use the eval. data in the future and how will that influence retention & dissemination, from local levels to international?
  - What array of stakeholders involved in ex-post learning, stakeholder mapping, regional/ national debriefs (w/representatives from wider groups)?
  - Sufficient capacities of (internal and external) evaluators re: methods?
  - Timing, OK? Staff seconded? Sufficient budget? Detailed project data shared with evaluator?
  - Preconditions to successful fieldwork
  - What else?



Setting up research questions for sustainability

Questions we ask in evaluating the ex-post sustainability of outputs/ outcomes and impacts after agreements on scope of the evaluation and review of sufficient data quality:



#### **Pre-field work: verify sustainability**

- What was the Theory of Sustainability/ resilience? What assumptions were made in it and who is to sustain results, after reviewing Stakeholder and other Mapping ?
- 2. What projected ratings of sustainability were made, if any, and can be validated?



#### Setting up research questions for sustainability



#### Field work (1) : possible questions to explore for the evaluation

- What is still functioning how well ex-post and regarding resilience categories & RRT? Why or why not?
- 2. What conditions/inputs during project implementation were assumed at exit changed since closure?
- 3. What unexpected outcomes arose?
- 4. Why would results last (or not)/ for how long)?
- 5. How do implementing partners on the project see the long-term effects? Emerging ones?
- 6. How have sustained outcomes affected and been affected by underlying socioecological systems (climate resilience)?
- 7. What external shocks affected the participants, partners, natural system, wider country?

Stakeholder to decide: Are all these ex-post questions a priority for the project and its stakeholders?

#### Setting up research questions for sustainability



#### Field work (2) : questions to understand relevance (why? = barriers and drivers)

- How widely 'owned' were the activities/ outputs-outcomes to be sustained? By whom?
- 2. How did resources, capacities and partnerships get sustained?
- 3. How did the output/ outcome change as a result?
- 4. How well was the project handed over to local actors or other implementers/ donors/ partners?
- 5. What shifts in power relationships happened? How did the intervention change the power relations more widely e.g. gender, generational, systemic/organizational?
- 6. Did men, women, boys, and girls experience the results differently?
- 7. What recommendations from the project's final evaluation and subsequent studies were implemented and did they affect sustainability?
- 8. Are there lessons for other projects' design, implementation, timeframe, handover & exit?
- 9. How to plan for resilience better?

#### **Process for ex-post project evaluation & learning**



Source: Valuing Voices Sustained and Emerging Impacts Evaluation

#### **Ex-post evaluation timetable - to confirm**

Date	Task
Week 0	Co-creation process where stakeholders agree on what will be evaluated, what benefits will come from the ex-post evaluation, what is needed logistically (data, fieldwork) & for learning
Week 1	Virtual briefing with AF team with consultant on approach on Eval Qs to be answered, confirm expectations of final process and product, and training on ex-post and resilience
Week 2	Field team out to the local area(s): Fieldwork 8 days (day 1 and 8 travel days) 2 Qualitative SEIE tools, e.g. Community RRA tools/ transect walk, FGD, analysis on 1 <sup>st</sup> site or or use CA tools ; repeat in 2 <sup>nd</sup> site, in addition of counterfactual village(s) using Outcome Harvesting, then analysis and triangulation by partner interviews in each area at district level including draft writeup
Week 2-3	District debriefs and partner input with consolidation of qual data to shape quantitative survey. Debrief on qual findings to stakeholders, with input on outstanding questions to be answered
Week 3	Consultant submits draft survey instrument to AF for feedback
Week 3	Survey put on tablet and consultant trains enumerators and launch survey
Week 4	Survey results sent to analysis team
Week 4	Writing and draft report submission
Week 5	Debrief with AF and
Week 5	Final report submitted to INGO and learning products drafted and shared

#### **Conditions needed for fieldwork (1-2)**

Before going to the field, the evaluator will have to prepare the following :



**Project Documentation review**, including design & final (mandatory) and baseline evaluation documents with

- Qualitative and quantitative data of outputs & outcomes
- Measured targets & indicators in (min) final evaluation
- An endline survey or review, endline sampling frames, methodology and survey design for statistical comparison
- What benchmarking, exit, handover for readiness for exit, access to data & reidentification of participants?

A theory of change or sustainability, beyond theory of change



#### **Conditions needed for fieldwork (3-4)**

#### Before going to the field, the evaluator will have to prepare the following :

- 3 Four types of mapping:
- a) Stakeholder mapping of types of engaged stakeholders
  - including implementing institutions/ partners, local government and other organizations
  - include names/ contacts of final evaluation respondents, former implementation staff at final and now ex-post, project participant (+gender) lists by site(s)
- b) Project sites mapping by concentration of activities, geographical and other differences for site selection
- c) Mapping of other development interventions at sites to isolate & not influence sustainability outcomes
- d) Mapping of shocks, climate disturbances and ecosystems

Before going to the field, the evaluator should ensure that there is:



Institutional learning, buy-in and cooperation,

• logistical feasibility influences site selection, choice of methods and fieldwork support

#### **Condition #1– project documentation review**

#### Before going to the field, the IE and evaluator should gather and review the project's secondary data documentation (mandatory)

**DATA GATHERING**. The following documents will be consulted to provide background on the project :

- **Project Proposal**,
- **Final Evaluation, Baseline and Midterm Reports,**
- Sustainability ratings (if exists),
- List of Assets/ Infrastructure created,
- **Capacities Gained (documented knowledge change used)**,
- Monitoring and Results Reports (where relevant, Vulnerability Assessment Mapping),
- If quantitative mixed methods, M&E including sampling and disaggregated data from the final evaluation by project site in disaggregated form
- Exit strategies guidelines used,
- Other documents as per co-creation process?





#### **Condition #1– project documentation review**

# **DATA REVIEW**. After gathering secondary data from the project, the evaluator and IE should review the following information:

**Data access and retention** Sustainability benchmarking and participants Exit and handover

#### **Data access and retention**

- Is endline (and ideally baseline) data disaggregated?
- Are sampling frames, survey and participant lists retained?



#### **Condition #1– project documentation review**

Leview

**DATA REVIEW**. After gathering secondary data from the project, the evaluator and IE should review the following information:

Data access and retentionSustainability benchmarking and participantsExit and handover

#### Benchmarking to sustainability and tracing participants and partners

- Were there any planned project efforts to close out or transfer implementation support to another entity during implementation?
- Were there benchmarks or indicators signaling the end of, phasing out of, or reduction of project support?
- Was there follow-on funding already secured or was the same project implemented elsewhere?
- Reports since the project closed about ongoing activities (operations & maintenance of infrastructure),
- Budgets for operations and maintenance, etc...

#### **Condition #1– project documentation review**

# **DATA REVIEW**. After gathering secondary data from the project, the evaluator and IE should review the following information:

Data access and retention Sustainability benchmarking and participants Exit and handover

#### **Exit and Handover**

Leview

- Were there lists of project participants and key stakeholders and can they be found ex-post?
- Were new staff put in key positions and would those there now know of the project then as well as intervening changes?
- Who was involved at what level in exit and handing over for continuation?
- Can you find them?

## **Ex-post pilots: preparatory work for field work with major IE/EE**

#### **Condition #2 – Theory of sustainability**

#### Before going to the field, the IE and evaluator should develop a Theory of Sustainability

The **anticipated theory of change/ sustainability** post project for specific outcomes and outputs (consider financial, systems, organizational, infrastructure, behavior change etc..) should answer...

- What is expected to still be functioning based on findings from terminal evaluation and initial discussions with IE/EE?
- How well were ex-post plans developed and/or executed? What were plans for continuation of activities and/or follow-on support, replication, scale-up, other?

#### • Regarding resilience

- What characteristics of resilience are possible based on targeted outcomes (Did the project aim for redundancy, diversity, feedback loops, scale, dynamism/dynamic solutions?)
- What is the overall strategy of the project on the RRT scale? Did the sum total of the sustained outcomes aim for resistance, resilience and/or transformation?

## **Ex-post pilots: preparatory work for field work with major IE/EE**

**Condition #3 – Mapping** 

#### Before going to the field, the IE and evaluator should map all stakeholders, activities, and shocks



Draw a stakeholder map of organizations to sustain the results including partnerships & resources, capacities to be sustained, how design & exit enabled this (e.g. grassroots orgs).

- Complement the stakeholder map with a stakeholder analysis to examine interests and power dynamics.
- Capacity and commitment and structure of institutions assuming responsibility post project and relationships of those locally implementing.
- What conditions/inputs internal to the project implementation that were assumed at exit changed since closure? (locally reconfirmed)

## **Ex-post pilots: preparatory work for field work with major IE/EE**

**Condition #3 – Mapping** 

#### Before going to the field, the IE and evaluator should map all stakeholders, activities, and shocks



**Site selection by mapping concentration**, **isolation** of project activities from other organizations'

Mapping of local, regional, national and international shocks that would affect sustainability (e.g. policy, economy, security) pre and post closure.

- What climate disturbances (stresses, shocks) affected the vulnerability and resilience affected the participants, partners, natural system, wider country?
- Describe the viability of **the local ecosystem** and describe how it has changed since the project's end.
- Why? (locally reconfirmed)
# **Ex-post pilots: preparatory work for field work with major IE/EE**

## **Condition #4 – Institutional buy-in & learning**

### Before going to the field, the IE and evaluator should make sure there is institutional buy-in

- What three things should be learned from the project *other than sustainability and resilience* and why?
- What would be necessary for results to be sustained/ still functioning well?
  - ✓ Quality (maintenance/ operations/ training) for resilience of infrastructure assets?
  - ✓ Quality of materials used .... So more sustainable
  - ✓ Actual use of the infrastructure (traffic, time to hospital etc.)
  - ✓ Resources and partnerships for assets or capacities?
  - ✓ Individual and organizational capacities to sustain outputs/ outcomes for assets or capacities
- How will the evaluation process & findings be used? (e.g. M&E capacity building? Fundraising based on most sustained results to be replicated/ scaled-up? Regional knowledge sharing? Something else?)
- Who will use the eval. data in the future and how will that influence retention & dissemination, from local levels to international? (e.g. who retains the data for future ex-post monitoring like JICA, who accesses the debriefs, report?)
- What array of stakeholders involved in ex-post learning, stakeholder mapping, regional/ national debriefs (w/representatives from wider groups)? (e.g. who are major stakeholders to involve in mapping, and in evaluation based on outcome selected?)



# **Ex-post pilots: preparatory work for field work**

## **Condition #4 – Institutional buy-in & learning**

### Before going to the field, the IE and evaluator should make sure there is preparation on logistics

### Additional considerations of logistics and staffing:

Multi-sectoral team	Select a multi-sectoral team, women/men, diff. sectoral and language expertise, translator(s) if needed
Distances to sites	Consider distances to sites given funding and timing, consider vulnerability to climate change
Fieldwork logistics	Plan logistics hotels, plan visits with communities, clear funding/ perdiem with national partners
Former project staff	We suggest at least one former staff member from the project accompany us to the field for introductions and context both qualitative and quantitative phases.
Debrief logistics	Plan debrief logistics in each region including site, invitees, dates

# **Ex-post pilots: after the fieldwork**

## Learning during and from ex-post evaluations

### Ex-post evaluation is also about accountability !!



Sustainable development starts with local voices, strengthens listening and accountability mechanisms between government and citizens, and holds donors and implementers accountable to them.

#### REMINDER

- An ex-post explores what activities and outcomes were sustained years later (e.g. participants still practicing behaviors) and to enduring impacts (e.g. reductions in vulnerability to climate change) by asking local participants and partners about what happened since project exit.
- An ex-post that uses Sustained and Emerging Impacts Evaluation (SEIE) documents **emerging** results such as completely new ways locals implemented, funded, partnered, having taken ownership of the project. This learning is vital to future **accountability.**

# **Ex-post pilots: after the fieldwork**

## **Debrief and sharing of organizational learning**

### Organizational learning need to be debriefed and shared locally & nationally for re-design of new projects



**Community level**: share draft findings with each community to confirm findings during a plenary called on the last day

**District/ region level**: debrief with key stakeholders of each district/ region, including those from other projects in the area to ground-truth and spread learning

**Donor level**: share final report with other major in-country donors for learning

**Community level**: share infographics translated back to the original communities

**Donor level**: share findings of SEIE with donors to shape next funding, implementation, M&E cycles

# What's next?

- Part B learning priorities and country-specific outcomes
- More detailed discussions with the selected national evaluator(s) about selection of outcomes/ outputs to evaluate.
  - That would be a second training and discussion



# See you tomorrow!



**Questions? Comments?** 



### **Survey**

Before you go....

What was most surprising? What was unclear? What else do we need to know?

You can also verify your understanding of today's session by filling out this quick survey Link to survey

