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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

A2- Introduction to project selection and methods 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)

A3- Understanding processes for evaluations pilots: co-creating learning with stakeholders
• Co-creation process
• Ex-post in practice: research questions & process
• Preparatory work and steps for pilot ex-posts

PART B – Discussing country-specific outcomes

B1- Defining learning priorities and outcomes
• Data review
• Theory of Sustainability
• Mapping processes

B2- Selecting measurable outcomes
• 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
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
AF-TERG team for ex-post evaluations

Dennis Bours
Caroline Holo
Jindra Cekan, PhD.
Meg Spearman
Please take the following survey and tell us about your expectations for the training:

https://survey.zohopublic.com/zs/6CCNIL
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

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”

OECD/ DAC 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.”

ADB, 2010
JICA conducts ex-post evaluation \textit{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.

\textbf{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 \textit{7 years after each project completion}.

\textbf{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 contributions 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 results—these especially can help inform future project design and funding
Learning from past ex-post project evaluations

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 self-sufficiency in 1 village:
Feeding themselves 30% more 3 years ex-post
Learning from past ex-post project evaluations

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)

Example 2 - Mixed (Typical) outcomes on child health
USAID, 2 years ex-post 2016

- ADRA: 90% (Baseline), 86% (Endline), 92% (Follow-Up)
- CARE: 89% (Baseline), 89% (Endline), 92% (Follow-Up)
- FH: 93% (Baseline), 86% (Endline), 93% (Follow-Up)
- SC: 93% (Baseline), 77% (Endline), 93% (Follow-Up)

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)
Learning from past ex-post project evaluations

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)
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

Ex-post evaluations and sustainability

Ex-post allows to test assumptions and barriers

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

“Hope is not a strategy”

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. **Ownership:** Participants valued health clinic built by the project and sustained it by introducing community tithing to cover costs (CRS/Niger)

2. **Ownership:** Participants valued clinic-based birthing so created locally-created disincentives to compel compliance ("")

3. **Resources & Capacities:** A food security project improved assets and income but better water access led to surprising decreases in gender violence (LWR/ Niger)

4. **Partnerships & Ownership:** Members of Village Banks offered trainings in VB for sale in other, home areas (Pact/Nepal)

Sources: Valuing Voices study for CRS/ Niger, 2016, Cekan for LWR 2008, PACT/ Nepal 2013
Ex-post evaluations and sustainability

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

Relevance and appropriateness

*Does it make sense?*
- Did the project objectives address the needs?
- Did the project intervention address the right issue?
- Is there (still) a need?

Effectiveness

*Did it work?*
- Did the project achieve the desired objectives/outcomes?
- Was the intervention based on knowledge and research to improve the likelihood of success?

Sustainability

*Did it last? ≠ did it work?*
- Are the project’s effects lasting?
- Was the project as worthwhile and meritorious as thought?

Sustainability and unanticipated/emerging effects

Ex-post analysis shows what was sustained (or not), by whom and why. This can illuminate relevance but not efficiency.

Efficiency

*Was it efficient?*
- What was the relationship between the project’s inputs and outputs?
- Could resources have been better used?

Effects/impacts

- Was the project worthwhile?
- Does it have merit?

Some short-term impacts can be traced, longer-term level impacts can be discovered w/ complex data or longer time.

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?

Sources: Adapted from WHO manual 2019 for the Adaptation Fund Phase 1, 2021
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 context-specific.

How is adaptation commonly measured?

- Increased/Improved Assets & Capacities
- Climate information uptake/use
- Reduction of vulnerability of people, places, sector, etc.
Evaluating climate change adaptation ex-post: M&E challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Challenges to Measuring Adaptation</th>
<th>Implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-sector/multisector</td>
<td>Data is required from multiple sector parties, and from sources that may not necessarily coordinate/partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long timeframes to see results (especially with natural systems)</td>
<td>Proxy indicators may be necessary to explore results, and/or choosing sites/interventions where more time has passed if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No single metric for adaptation (or resilience)</td>
<td>Defining success is a deliberative process and evaluation requires concerted stakeholder engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple uncertainties (including future climate risks)</td>
<td>It may be necessary to examine what may be considered “success” under multiple possible scenarios, as well as to focus on the most important local priorities for action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DISTURBANCES:</strong></th>
<th>acute shocks (e.g. a cyclone, flood event) or chronic stresses (e.g. gradual crop loss from temperature rise, sea level rise).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNCTIONS:</strong></td>
<td>ability to serve a particular need or purpose (generate income, attend school, be safe and secure).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **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). |
Ex-post evaluations and climate change adaptation

Introducing: “Resilience Causal Framework” (Constas, 2014)

EX ANTE COMPONENT
Initial Systems: Structures and Functions

DISTURBANCE COMPONENT
Climate Shocks & Stresses

EX POST COMPONENT
Subsequent Systems: Structures and Functions, and Expected Trajectories

LOCAL COMPONENTS
Contextual Factors

Multiple Scales
- System
- Nation
- Region
- Community
- Household

Multiple Methods
- Subjective
- Objective
- Qualitative
- Quantitative

Time & Event Sensitive Measurement

Stretch and drink break
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 phases in the AF-TERG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 0</th>
<th>Ex-post study and evaluability assessment study (foundational work)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Framework developed to conduct ex post evaluations and shortlist of up to five completed projects as pilots for ex post evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Methods tested in at least two pilot projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 adaptation projects
- Implications for the Adaptation Fund on how to develop ex post evaluation guidance

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

- Transformational Change
- Wellness and Livelihoods
- Resilience Building
- Ecosystems-Based Adaptation (EBA)
- Dimensions of Sustainability
AF-TERG process for ex-post evaluations

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lens for Measuring Adaptation:</th>
<th>How does it fit into our proposed methodology?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Change</td>
<td>Not all adaptation can or should be transformational. See resistance – resilience – transformation scale for further details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness and Livelihoods</td>
<td>Wellness and livelihoods can be an indication of successful adaptation if sustained in the context of climate disturbances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience Building</td>
<td>Not all adaptation can or should be resilience-building. See resistance – resilience – transformation scale for further details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystems-Based Adaptation (EBA)</td>
<td>EBA is a strategy at the nexus of human and natural systems that can be supportive of building resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions of Sustainability</td>
<td>Ownership, capacities, resources, and partnerships are often critical factors in determining sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-term evaluability</th>
<th>Project logic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data and methods</td>
<td>Inclusion of interest groups / beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEL plan and resources</td>
<td>Evaluability in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio alignment with Fund strategic results and core indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **dark green criteria** helped us understand which projects would have a sufficient evaluability basis to undertake an ex-post evaluation.
Project selection for ex-post evaluation pilots

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

FILTER 1: CRITERION EVALUATION

MAYBE

NO

GO

A1 Timing
A2 Methodological feasibility evaluating sustainability ex post
A3 Safe evaluation
A4 Financial and technical feasibility and organizational commitment (field consulted)

B1 Diversity of stakeholders and/or implementing entity
B2 Variety of geography
B3 Variety in (cross)sector

FILTER 2: DECISION FUNNEL FOR PROJECT SELECTION

FIVE SHORTLISTED PROJECTS

FINAL SELECTION OF FIRST TWO PILOTS

Ex post inadvisable

Ex post possible, but with issues

Ex post feasible, recommended
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-up
- d) 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 entity
- b) Range of participants

**B2 Variety of geography**

**B3 Variety in (cross)sector**
- >current focus is similar sectors
Criteria ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>MAYBE</th>
<th>GO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2 resources</td>
<td>A2 data quality</td>
<td>A1 timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>A2 project quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A2 ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A2 partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A2 capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A2 exit readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A2 scale-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A2 timing**
- **GO**
  - A1 timing
  - A2 project quality
  - A2 ownership
  - A2 partnerships
  - A2 capacities
  - A2 exit readiness
  - A2 scale-up

**A2 project quality**
- MAYBE
  - A2 data quality

**A2 ownership**
- NO
  - A3 safety

**A2 partnerships**
- NO

**A2 capacities**
- MAYBE

**A2 exit readiness**
- NO

**A2 scale**
- MAYBE

**A2 data quality**
- MAYBE

**A2 resources**
- NO

**A2 exit readiness**
- MAYBE

**A2 scale-up**
- MAYBE

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

- 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

**Criteria ratings**

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

Criteria ratings

| NO | None ('A4 Financial and technical feasibility and organizational commitment' to verify) |
| MAYBE | A2 project quality, A2 data quality, A2 ownership, A2 capacities, A2 resources, A2 exit readiness, A2 post monitoring |
| GO | A1 timing, A2 scale-up, A2 partnerships, A3 safety |

- **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
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 sustainability of outcomes and climate resilience 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?**
What results level ex-post evaluations will focus on?

The Adaptation Fund desired impact to trace is:
“Adaptive capacity enhanced, resilience strengthened and the vulnerability of people, livelihoods and ecosystems to climate change reduced.”

**Emerging outcomes** from local efforts are important to trace ex-post.

**Outputs (what did we deliver)** are normally not evaluated as they are preconditions for results, but outcomes from their presence can be re-created.

Ex-posts ideally track **high-level long-term impacts** (what did we want to change for years), especially for climate-adaptation where effects can be traced 3-5 years +

**Outcomes** (what did we want to achieve) traced on infrastructure, assets and capacities can be evaluated for sustainability.

In Ecuador and Samoa, the final evaluation data is mostly output oriented so outcomes will be re-created ex-post.

---

Ex-post evaluation & M&E pyramid

**Impact (s)**

**Outcomes**

**Outputs**

**Activities**

**Inputs**
Project data needed for comparative evaluation of results durability

Effectiveness
Did it work?
- Did the project achieve the desired objectives/outcomes?
- Was the intervention based on knowledge and research to improve the likelihood of success?

Sustainability
Did it last?
- Were the project’s effects lasting?
- Was the project as worthwhile and meritorious as thought?

Sustainability and unanticipated/emerging effects
- Are the project’s effects lasting?
- Was the project as worthwhile and meritorious as thought?

Activities/outputs
Outcomes
Effects/impact
Post project outcomes/effects

Resources/inputs

Quantitative/qualitative project data
- Quant. outcomes (‘effects’) final data with baseline – final comparison ex-post
- Best if measurable impact(s) data at final for ex-post comparison
- Outputs from which sustained outcomes can be traced qualitatively (weaker case)
- Ideal is control/comparison group from baseline. Can recreate ex-post (rare)

Indirect analysis from qualitative discussions in primary fieldwork:
- Qualitative exploration of why results exceeded or fell short of final outcomes
- Emerging outcomes via discussion – how were outcomes or ideas sustained locally ex-post, how did design and implementation change?
- Can test if assumptions for sustainability documented, qual. discussions if planned for via exit process or if failed to consider
- Can compare outcomes/impacts of concurrent, comparable projects in same place if similar activities and inputs were implemented at the same time.

Some short-term impacts can be traced, longer-term level impacts can be discovered w/ complex data or longer time.

Ex-post analysis shows what was sustained (or not), by whom and why. This can illuminate relevance but not efficiency.

Effectiveness
Was it efficient?
- What was the relationship between the project’s inputs and outputs?
- Could resources have been better used?

Efficiency
Was it worthwhile?
- Was the project worthwhile?
- Does it have merit?

Contextual and external factors outside project boundaries that may have influenced the project trajectory
## Methods in ex-post evaluations

### Do you have outcome / impact data?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have robust outcomes / impacts at endline?</td>
<td>Gather a range of outcomes linked to the Fund project or other donors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YES**
- Use mixed methods that include active participation
- Adapt participatory / Rapid Evaluation Methods
- Contribution Analysis, Most Significant Change
  - Recreate missing endline data via recall with a comparison group
  - With larger samples, use Propensity Score Matching for comparison group

**NO**
- Use Outcome Harvesting
  - With smaller samples; After a few years; For wider context or as control group

### Sustained and Emerging Impacts Evaluation

After data review and co-creation discussions with national partners and evaluators, methods are selected and applied.

### Fieldwork / triangulation

**STEP 1**: Methods decision tree based on data availability and quality

**STEP 2**: Fieldwork / triangulation
Evaluating resilience: framing for resilience analysis

**Methods in ex-post evaluations**

**DISTURBANCES**
Addressed by the sustained outcome

**SYSTEMS**
Coupled Human and Natural Systems

**CHARACTERISTICS**
Outcome Level: Resilience Characteristics

**MEANS AND ACTIONS**
Perpetuating the project outcome

**R-R-T**
Resistance – Resilience – Transformation

**Sustained Outcome**

**NEXUS**

Natural systems
*Structures*
*Functions*

Human systems
*Structures*
*Functions*

**Characteristics**

Feedback loops

At scale

Dynamic

Diverse

Redundant

**Actions**

**Transformation**

Resistance

Resilience

Transformation

**Feedback loops**

**At scale**

**Dynamic**

**Diverse**

**Redundant**

**Actions**

**Actions**

**Actions**

**Actions**

**Partnerships**

**disturbances**
Methods in ex-post evaluations

Evaluating resilience: Disturbances

DISTURBANCES
- Addressed by the sustained outcome

NEXUS
- Natural systems
  - Structures
  - Functions
- Human systems
  - Structures
  - Functions

SYSTEMS
- Coupled Human and Natural Systems

CHARACTERISTICS
- Outcome Level: Resilience Characteristics
- Perpetuating the project outcome

MEANS AND ACTIONS
- Resistance – Resilience – Transformation

Feedback loops
At scale
Diverse
Dynamic
Redundant
Actions
Actions
Actions
Actions

Transformation

Partnerships
Methods in ex-post evaluations

Evaluating resilience: Disturbances

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

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

Clayton, California, 2013

San Juan River portion of Lake Powell (Utah and Arizona)
Methods in ex-post evaluations

Evaluating resilience: Systems

- Natural systems *Structures *Functions
- NEXUS
- Human systems *Structures *Functions

Feedback loops
- Diverse
- Dynamic

Actions
- At scale

- Sustained Outcome
- disturbs

- DISTURBANCES Addressed by the sustained outcome

- SYSTEMS Coupled Human and Natural Systems

- CHARACTERISTICS Outcome Level: Resilience Characteristics

- MEANS AND ACTIONS Perpetuating the project outcome

- R-R-T Resistance – Resilience – Transformation
Methods in ex-post evaluations

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)

**NATURAL Systems**
- **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

Methods in ex-post evaluations

DISTURBANCES
Addressed by the sustained outcome

SYSTEMS
Coupled Human and Natural Systems

CHARACTERISTICS
Outcome Level: Resilience Characteristics

MEANS AND ACTIONS
Perpetuating the project outcome

R-R-T
Resistance – Resilience – Transformation

Partnerships

Transformation
Resilience
Resistance

Human systems
*Structures
*Functions

Natural systems
*Structures
*Functions

NEXUS

Feedback loops

At scale

Diverse

Dynamic

Redundant

Sustained Outcome

disturbances

At scale

Actions

Actions

Actions

Actions

Actions
Feedback Loops: 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**

**Scale**: of sufficient size or timeliness in order to generate desired benefits

“At the required size to solve the problem.”

“**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”
Evaluating resilience: **Characteristics - Dynamism**

**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.”
**Methods in ex-post evaluations**

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

**Redundancy**: 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.”

Minimal Defense

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

Natural

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.

Managed Realignment

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.

Hybrid

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**

**Sustained Outcome**

- **Human systems**
  - Structures
  - Functions

- **Natural systems**
  - Structures
  - Functions

**NEXUS**

- Feedback loops
- At scale
- Diverse
- Dynamic
- Redundant

**DISRUPTIONS**

- Addressed by the sustained outcome

**SYSTEMS**

- Coupled Human and Natural Systems

**CHARACTERISTICS**

- Outcome Level: Resilience Characteristics
- Perpetuating the project outcome

**MEANS AND ACTIONS**

- Resistance – Resilience – Transformation
Ex-post pilots: preparatory work for field work

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
- Etc.

**Actions, e.g.**
- partnerships formed
- new practices
- education
- new skills, knowledge
- new management
- gender inclusion/ consideration
- Etc.
Methods in ex-post evaluations

Evaluating resilience: R-R-T Typology

- Natural systems: Structures, Functions
- Human systems: Structures, Functions
- NEXUS
  - Feedback loops
  - At scale
  - Diverse
  - Dynamic
  - Redundant
  - Actions
  - Actions

Sustained Outcome

DISTURBANCES
Addressed by the sustained outcome

SYSTEMS
Coupled Human and Natural Systems

CHARACTERISTICS
Outcome Level: Resilience Characteristics

MEANS AND ACTIONS
Perpetuating the project outcome

R-R-T
Resistance – Resilience – Transformation

Partnerships

Transformation

Resilience

Resistance
Methods in ex-post evaluations

Evaluating resilience: R-R-T Typology

- **Overhaul of structures and functions (S&F)**
  - Directed transition toward new S&F
  - Improve system capacity to keep current or past S&F
  - Active maintenance of S&F

- **Undirected transition toward new S&F**
  - PASSIVE RESISTANCE
    - Actions designed to passively maintain current/historical structures and functions.
  - AUTONOMOUS TRANSFORMATION
    - Actions designed to facilitate the autonomous transition to new structures and functions.

- **Passive maintenance of S&F**
  - RESILIENCE
    - Actions designed to improve the capacity of a system to return to desired post-disaster structures and functions following a disturbance to the extent possible while recognizing some new elements are inevitable.
  - ACCELERATED TRANSFORMATION
    - Actions designed to more rapidly advance transition towards new structures and functions.
  - DIRECTED TRANSFORMATION
    - Actions designed to drive transition towards new structures and functions.

1-3 Old S&F
4-6 New S&F
Methods in ex-post evaluations

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**

1. **ACTIVE RESISTANCE**
   Actions designed to actively maintain current/historical structures and functions.

2. **PASSIVE RESISTANCE**
   Actions designed to passively maintain current/historical structures and functions.

3. **RESILIENCE**
   Actions designed to improve the capacity of a system to return to desired past or current structures and functions following a disturbance to the extent possible while recognizing some new elements are inevitable.

4. **AUTONOMOUS TRANSFORMATION**
   Actions designed to facilitate the autonomous transition to new structures and functions.

5. **DIRECTED TRANSFORMATION**
   Actions designed to drive transition towards new structures and functions.

6. **ACCELERATED TRANSFORMATION**
   Actions designed to more rapidly advance transition towards new structures and functions.

**RESISTANCE**

- 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

**Example**

- Protected areas expanded for species conservation
- Species translocation out of native range for anticipated future conditions
- Species translocation within and outside current native range
- Some individuals migrate to new ranges and populate
- Some individuals survive current native range with behavioral changes; others die off
- Protected areas established in current native range
Stretch and drink break
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

**STEP 1**
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

**STEP 1**
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?
How does the ex-post evaluation work in practice?

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:

1. **What was the Theory of Sustainability?**
   What assumptions were made in it and who is expected to sustain the results, after reviewing stakeholder and other types of mapping?

2. **What projected ratings of sustainability were made**, if any, and can be validated?
How does the ex-post evaluation work in practice?

Setting up research questions for sustainability

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

1. What is still functioning, how well at 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 socio-ecological 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?
How does the ex-post evaluation work in practice?

Setting up research questions for sustainability

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

1. 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?

What other questions came from the co-creation process?
How does the ex-post evaluation work in practice?

Process for ex-post project evaluation & learning

Is there good quantitative / qualitative sectoral outcomes, impacts data?

- yes → Compare % to which outputs, outcome(s), or impact(s) sustained
- yes → Triangulate with a range of stakeholders & data sources including debriefs locally
- no → Prove for why/why not with all informant groups
- no → Characteristics of Resilience? Threatened by lack of resilience?
- yes → Consider counterfactuals for contribution
- no → What emerged in terms of processes and new outcomes/impacts? Why?
- yes → Disseminate findings back to all stakeholders
- no → May not be evaluable

Source: Valuing Voices Sustained and Emerging Impacts Evaluation
How does the ex-post evaluation work in practice?

### Ex-post evaluation timetable - to confirm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 0</td>
<td>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) &amp; for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>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 1st site or or use CA tools; repeat in 2nd 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2-3</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Consultant submits draft survey instrument to AF for feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Survey put on tablet and consultant trains enumerators and launch survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>Survey results sent to analysis team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>Writing and draft report submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>Debrief with AF and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>Final report submitted to INGO and learning products drafted and shared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ex-post pilots: preparatory work for field work

Conditions needed for fieldwork (1-2)

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

1. **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?

2. **A theory of change or sustainability**, beyond theory of change
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:

4 **Institutional learning, buy-in and cooperation,**
   - logistical feasibility influences site selection, choice of methods and fieldwork support
Ex-post pilots: preparatory work for field work

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?

**mandatory**
# Condition #1— project documentation review

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data access and retention</th>
<th>Sustainability benchmarking and participants</th>
<th>Exit and handover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Data access and retention

- Is endline (and ideally baseline) data disaggregated?
- Are sampling frames, survey and participant lists retained?
Ex-post pilots: preparatory work for field work

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

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-up 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...
Ex-post pilots: preparatory work for field work

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**
- 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?

This should be done first at the national level, reconfirmed at the local level where needed
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)
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:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-sectoral team</th>
<th>Select a multi-sectoral team, women/men, diff. sectoral and language expertise, translator(s) if needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distances to sites</td>
<td>Consider distances to sites given funding and timing, consider vulnerability to climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork logistics</td>
<td>Plan logistics hotels, plan visits with communities, clear funding/ per diem with national partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former project staff</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debrief logistics</td>
<td>Plan debrief logistics in each region including site, invitees, dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning during and from ex-post evaluations

Ex-post evaluation is also about accountability!!

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.
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?

to PART B....
Please take the following quick survey: [here]

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

If you wish, you can also verify your understanding of today’s session by taking this small quiz [Link to quiz A]