Adaptation Fund Evaluation policy

Policy relevance for IE project performance reporting during mid-term evaluations
Structure of presentation

Key post-approval timelines with implications for monitoring and reporting

Issues to be considered in monitoring and reporting

Proposed new structure of project evaluation cost
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Timelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Inception Phase</td>
<td>After execution of the legal agreement (Legal agreement should be executed within 4 months after approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Project/Programme Implementation</td>
<td>Within 6 months after the first cash transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term Review</td>
<td>Depending on the length of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Programme Closing</td>
<td>The start date is the inception day ~ ~ ~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Evaluation</td>
<td>Submitted within nine (9) months after completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What and why monitor project implementation

Compliance with institutional policies
- Project-level results, as reported in the approved proposal
- AF’s Environmental and social policy

Compliance with national policies/best practices
- Procurement
- Financial management integrity

Compliance with global development paradigms
- SDGs
- Paris alignment
- Gender, indigenous people, local communities, youth, etc.
New Evaluation POLICY and Fund’s monitoring function

The policy does not cover the monitoring functions that are covered under AF results-based management (RBM) system and Strategic Results Framework (SRF).

However, the EP contribute more broadly to streamlined approaches to monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) across the Fund. **New evaluation requirement such Baseline report or improved quality of MTE and FE contributes to MEL functions.**

EP aligns with and reinforces the objectives of **the Fund’s Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) and Gender Policy (GP).**
AF project’s reporting requirements - Project Evaluations

- **Mandatory evaluations**
  - Baseline data report
  - Mid-Term Review
  - Final Evaluation

- **Non-Mandatory evaluations**
  - Real-time evaluation
  - Ex-post evaluations
Mandatory project evaluation – baseline report

01
IEs to prepare and submit a project baseline report based on primary data collection and/or relevant and reliable secondary data, per the Fund’s “Results

02
Baseline data shall be submitted to the secretariat by no later than the submission of the first PPR

03
The baseline data report may be conducted independently or semi-independently, or self-conducted
Mandatory project evaluation – mid-term review

- **Revised reporting requirement under new EP**
- **IEs are required to conduct MTRs of any project with four or more years of implementation**
- **MTR report submitted to the secretariat no later than six months after the project midpoint**

IE is to submit a management response to the MTR report to the secretariat within six months of receiving the MTR report, describing what, why, and how MTR learning will be utilized.

MTRs are optional for projects less than three years in duration; these may be self-conducted.
Mandatory project evaluation – final evaluation

• Compulsory independent final evaluation
  
  All Fund-supported projects and programmes that complete implementation

• Within nine months of project completion
  
  Final Projects evaluation timeline

• Within six months of receiving the evaluation report
  
  Management responses to final evaluation timeline
Budget implication for project evaluations

30. Having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided to:

(a) Take note of the report on the review of budget implications and options for evaluation policy implementation as contained in document AFB/EFC.32/10;

(b) Request the implementing entities to set the overall evaluation budget for proposed projects and programmes at 1 to 5 per cent of the project or programme budget, to be counted towards the implementing entity fee, starting from the forty-second meeting of the Board;

(c) Invite the implementing entities to consider “Proposed new structure of project evaluation cost” referred to in paragraph 30 of document AFB/EFC.32/10 as a guidance for allocating funding for evaluation activities;

Evaluation budget range of 1 to 5 % to be implemented with suggested indicative cost structure – see next slide
## Proposed new structure of project evaluation cost – GUIDANCE NOTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project size</th>
<th>Evaluation cost %</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to US$ 1 million</td>
<td>Min 5%</td>
<td>Evaluation cost as % of total project cost and deducted from IE fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US$1 – US$5 million</td>
<td>Between 2-5%</td>
<td>Evaluation cost as % of total project cost and deducted from IE fees&lt;br&gt;IE has the ability to assess adequate budget for evaluation based on project size and proposed range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US$5 – US$10 million</td>
<td>Between 1-2%</td>
<td>Evaluation cost as % of total project cost and deducted from IE fees&lt;br&gt;Max 2% of total project cost applied regardless of project size.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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