



Annex II

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

Terms of Reference

for the Comprehensive Evaluation of the Adaptation Fund

9 September 2024

Table of Content

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction | 4 |
| 2. Background | 4 |
| 2.1. The Adaptation Fund | 4 |
| 2.2. The Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaption Fund (AF-TERG) | 5 |
| 2.3. The First Overall Evaluation of the Adaptation Fund | 5 |
| 3. The Comprehensive Evaluation of the Adaptation Fund: a “phased approach” | 6 |
| 3.1. Rapid Evaluation: identification of existing evidence, gap assessment, and lessons for the Comprehensive Evaluation | 7 |
| 3.2. The Mid-term review of the second medium term strategy of the Adaptation Fund (MTR of the MTS2) | 7 |
| 4. Objective of the Comprehensive Evaluation | 8 |
| 4.1. What the Comprehensive Evaluation will answer | 9 |
| 4.2. Scope of the Evaluation | 12 |
| 4.3. Evaluation Approach and Methods | 12 |
| 4.4. Limitations and challenges to the Comprehensive Evaluation | 14 |
| 5. Quality assurance | 15 |
| 6. Evaluation phases and deliverables | 15 |
| 6.1. Phase 1: Evaluation Inception (January 2025 to June 2025) | 15 |
| 6.2. Phase 2: Evaluation Implementation (July 2025 to March 2026) | 16 |
| 6.3. Phase 3: Evaluation Reporting and Further Triangulation (March 2026 to June 2026) | 17 |
| 6.4. Phase 4: Final communication and dissemination (July to December 2026) | 17 |
| 7. Qualifications and experience | 17 |
| 8. Arrangements | 19 |



Acronyms

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| AF | Adaptation Fund |
| AF-TERG | Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund |
| AP | Accreditation Panel |
| CER | Certified Emission Reduction |
| CMA | Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement |
| CMP | Conference of the Parties Serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol |
| EFC | Ethics and Finance Committee |
| ESP | Adaptation Fund Environment and Social Policy |
| FY | Financial Year |
| GEF VPU | Global Environment Facility Vice President Unit |
| GP | Adaptation Fund Gender Policy |
| IE | Implementing Entity |
| MIE | Multilateral implementing entity |
| MTR | Mid-term review |
| MTS1 | Adaptation Fund Medium-term Strategy 2018-2022 |
| MTS2 | Adaptation Fund Medium-term Strategy 2023-2027 |
| NIE | National implementing entity |
| OECD-DAC | Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development- Development Assistance Committee |
| PPRC | Project and Programme Review Committee |
| RIE | Regional implementing entity |
| ToR | Terms of reference |
| UNFCCC | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change |

1. Introduction

1. Through decision B.39/57 (October 2022), the Adaptation Fund Board (hereafter, the ‘Board’) requested the AF-TERG to prepare a Comprehensive Evaluation of the Fund to be delivered by August 2026 (60 days prior to the forty-seventh meeting of the Board). The decision followed the paper on the options related to conducting the evaluation (‘Options paper’)¹ based on which the Board decided to take a phased approach. In preparation for the execution of the Comprehensive Evaluation, the AF-TERG included this evaluation as part of its second multi-year work programme (FY25- FY27)² (as approved through Decision B.42/46 at the forty-second meeting of the Board in April 2024).
2. This term of reference (ToR) sets out the background, scope of work, and requirements of the Comprehensive Evaluation to guide prospective bidders for this evaluation.

2. Background

2.1. The Adaptation Fund

3. The Adaptation Fund (AF) was established through decisions by the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol to finance concrete adaptation projects and programmes in developing countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change. At the COP24 in 2018, the Parties to the Paris Agreement decided that the Adaptation Fund shall also serve the Paris Agreement.
4. The Fund supports country-driven projects and programmes, innovation and global learning for effective adaptation.³ All of the Fund’s activities are designed to build national and local adaptive capacities while reaching and engaging the most vulnerable groups, and to integrate gender consideration to provide equal opportunity to access and benefit from the Fund’s resources. They are also aimed at enhancing synergies with other sources of climate finance, while creating models that can be replicated or scaled up.
5. The Fund provides climate finance to developing countries who are Parties to the Kyoto Protocol and now to the Paris Agreement.
6. The Fund is supervised and managed by the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board), which is accountable to CMP and CMA.⁴ The majority of Board members are from developing countries. The Board has two committees, namely, the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC), and the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC). The EFC is responsible for advising the Board on issues of conflict of interest, ethics, finance, fund and portfolio monitoring, evaluation and audit.⁵ The PPRC is responsible for assisting the Board in assessing project and programme proposals submitted to the Board and in reviewing project and programme performance reports.⁶ An Accreditation Panel (AP) has been established to ensure that organizations receiving Fund money meet fiduciary standards. The AP provides recommendations to the Board regarding the accreditation of new implementation entities

¹ AF. 2022. Options for the overall evaluation of the Fund (AFB/EFC.30/11). October 2022. Available at: https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/AFB.EFC_30.11_Options-for-the-Overall-Evaluation-of-the-Fund-final.pdf

² AF. 2024. Multiyear work programme and budgets of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund for the period 2025 – 2027 (AFB/EFC.33/6/Rev. 1). April 2024. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/AFB-EFC.33-6-Rev-1-AF-TERG-Second-multiyear-work-programme-2.pdf>

³ AF. 2022. Medium-Term Strategy 2023-2027. Available at <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Medium-Term-Strategy-2023-2027.pdf>

⁴ CMP; Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol. See: <https://unfccc.int/process/bodies/supreme-bodies/conference-of-the-parties-serving-as-the-meeting-of-the-parties-to-the-kyoto-protocol-cmp>

CMA; Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement. See: <https://unfccc.int/process/bodies/supreme-bodies/conference-of-the-parties-serving-as-the-meeting-of-the-parties-to-the-paris-agreement-cma>

⁵ AF. 2015. [Ethics and Finance Committee Terms of Reference](https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/TOR-of-EFC-amended-in-Mar2018.pdf). Amended March 2018. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/TOR-of-EFC-amended-in-Mar2018.pdf>

⁶ AF. 2015. [Project and Programme Review Committee Terms of Reference](https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/TOR-of-PPRC-amended-in-Oct2015.pdf). Amended October 2015. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/TOR-of-PPRC-amended-in-Oct2015.pdf>

(IEs) and the suspension, cancellation or re-accreditation of implementing entities already accredited.⁷

7. The World Bank serves as an interim trustee of the Fund.⁸ An Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat ('the AFB Secretariat') provides support to the Board through a team of dedicated officials, who are part of, but remain operationally independent from the Global Environmental Facility Vice Presidency Unit (GEF VPU) of the World Bank. The AFB Secretariat manages the day-to-day operations of the Adaptation Fund such as research, advisory and administrative services.
8. As of April 2024, the Fund has approved a total of 176 projects with a total approved amount of US\$ 1,216,537,589. As of the same time, it has 32 National Implementing Entities (NIE), nine Regional Implementing Entities (RIE), and 15 Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIE).

2.2. The Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaption Fund (AF-TERG)

9. The AF-TERG is an independent evaluation advisory group accountable to the Board, established in 2018 to ensure the independent implementation of the Fund's Evaluation Framework. Since October 2023 onwards, the AF-TERG ensures the independent implementation of the new Evaluation Policy of the Adaptation Fund.⁹ The AF-TERG, which is headed by a Chair, provides an evaluative advisory role through performing evaluation generation, evaluation utilization and evaluation capacity building functions. The AF-TERG designs, commissions and oversees independent evaluations and relevant tasks on behalf of the Board and its Committees according to the Evaluation Policy. In relation to the evaluation utilization (knowledge management) and evaluation capacity building, the AF-TERG works closely with the AFB Secretariat with a view to ensure synergies and synchronize outreach to Fund's stakeholders.
10. The group is comprised of five part-time independent experts in evaluation, called the AF-TERG members, and the Manager of the AFB Secretariat (the 'Manager') as an *ex officio* member. The AF-TERG members serve in their personal capacities only and may not represent their employers, governments or Fund's entities.
11. A small AF-TERG Secretariat led by a Coordinator/Senior Evaluation Officer provides support to the AF-TERG, in particular with regards to the implementation of the evaluation work programme. The AF-TERG Secretariat consists of two staff members and is supported by consultants as approved in the AF-TERG annual workplan and budget.
12. While independent of the operations of the Adaptation Fund, the aim of the AF-TERG is to add value to the Fund's work through independent monitoring, evaluation, and learning.¹⁰
13. The AF-TERG's second multi-year work programme (FY25 - FY27)¹¹ was approved at the forty-second meeting of the Board (April 2024). The work programme includes several Board-mandated products that are expected to further shape the future of the Adaptation Fund, including the Comprehensive Evaluation of the Adaptation Fund.¹²

2.3. The First Overall Evaluation of the Adaptation Fund

14. The first overall evaluation for the Fund was discussed by the Board in as early as the Board's thirteenth meeting (March 2011) as part of the decision to approve the Fund's Evaluation Framework (Decision B.13/20). At that time, there were questions about the best time to launch the evaluation given the lack of maturity of the Fund's portfolio. The Board discussed the overall evaluation again at its twenty-first meeting (July 2013) and requested the AFB Secretariat, through Decision B.21/17, to

⁷ AF. 2012. [Terms of Reference for the Establishment of the Adaptation Fund Board Accreditation Panel](https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Accreditation-Panel-TORs_0.pdf). Available at: https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Accreditation-Panel-TORs_0.pdf

⁸ AF. 2019. Amended and restated terms and conditions of services to be provided by the International bank for reconstruction and development as trustee for the Adaptation Fund (2017-2020). Available at: https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/AFB.B.33.b.Inf_2._Amended_and_Restated_Terms_and_Conditions.pdf

⁹ AF-TERG.2022. Evaluation Policy of the Adaptation Fund. Available at: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/evaluation-policy-of-the-adaptation-fund-graphically-edited/>

¹⁰ See: <http://www.adaptation-fund.org/about/evaluation/>

¹¹ See Board document AFB/EFC.33/6: [AFB-EFC.33-6-AF-TERG-Second-multiyear-work-programme.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#)

¹² Further information is available here: [Approach to the Design of the Terms of Reference for the Comprehensive Evaluation of the Adaptation Fund and the Mid Term Review of the Second Medium Term Strategy of the Adaptation Fund - Adaptation Fund \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#).

prepare: a) options for terms of reference for possible evaluations of the Fund covering different scopes; b) a proposal regarding the timing of each option taking into account the status of the Fund's active portfolio; c) costs associated with each option; and d) options for commissioning the evaluation.

15. Then through Decision B.23/18, in the twenty-third Board meeting (March 2014), the Board decided to approve a two-phased overall evaluation as outlined in document AFB/EFC.14/5 and requested for the constitution of a three-member independent review panel. The panel was tasked among other things to select the evaluation team, provide quality assurance during the evaluation process and report on progress of the evaluation to the EFC. The ToR for Phase 1 of the evaluation was approved through Decision B.23-24/10.
16. The **first phase of the first overall evaluation** was a process evaluation of the Fund's operational aspects, and a review of key processes including (i) resource mobilization; (ii) decision-making; (iii) resource allocation; (iv) access to funding; (v) project/programme cycle; and (vi) knowledge management processes at the Fund level.¹³ It focused on the governance and management of the Fund such as the accreditation process of IEs and how the Fund has piloted direct access, and the financing of the Fund through proceeds from CERs and other sources. It assessed the Fund's operations and determined whether its target population is served. The first phase of the evaluation was completed in 2015 and the findings and recommendations were presented at the seventeenth meeting of the Board's EFC in October 2015.
17. At its twenty-sixth meeting (October 2015), the Board decided to request the AFB Secretariat to prepare options for conducting the second phase (Phase 2) of the first overall evaluation. These options were presented at the eighteenth meeting (March 2016) of the EFC.
18. The purpose of the **Phase 2 of the overall evaluation**¹⁴ was to evaluate the long-term outcomes, impacts and sustainability of Adaptation Fund interventions, focusing on its portfolio of funded projects. Its objective was to examine and assess the progress of the Fund's portfolio toward financing concrete adaptation projects and programmes in developing countries Parties to the Kyoto Protocol. It assessed the portfolio's relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and potential impacts and the sustainability of technical, institutional, and financial results. This phase provided the Board with evaluative evidence on the progress towards the Fund's objectives as well as the main achievements and lessons learned from the implementation of the Fund through projects. It also provided recommendations on the way forward for the Fund.

3. **The Comprehensive Evaluation of the Adaptation Fund: a "phased approach"**

19. The Board, at its thirty-ninth meeting (October 2022),¹⁵ decided (Decision B.39/57)¹⁶ "to adopt a phased approach to the second overall evaluation of the Fund, while proceeding urgently with a Rapid Evaluation as a first phase and undertaking a Comprehensive Evaluation at a later stage, with a view to contributing to the development of the Adaptation Fund's third medium-term strategy (MTS) for 2028-2032. The Board requested the AF-TERG to prepare the ToRs for the Comprehensive Evaluation in line with option 3 of the EFC document AFB/EFC.30/11 and present the evaluation, for Board consideration, no later than 60 days before the forty-seventh meeting of the Board (planned for October 2026). The AFB Secretariat is requested to prepare a draft management response to the evaluation for consideration at the same meeting.
20. The phased approach of the second Comprehensive Evaluation also implies a "building block" approach where many pieces of evaluative evidence and knowledge are brought into the Comprehensive Evaluation such as those covered in the first and second AF-TERG work programmes (FY21-FY23¹⁷ and FY25-FY27¹⁸, respectively) and the AFB Secretariat knowledge products.¹⁹ For example, the 'building blocks' of the Comprehensive Evaluation include evaluations that relate to readiness; accreditation; scalability; innovation; and process, systems, and governance. The following sections describe two major inputs to the second Comprehensive Evaluation, namely the completed Rapid Evaluation and the upcoming MTR of the MTS2. Other potential sources of evidence are

¹³ [Evaluation of the Fund \(Stage 1\) - Adaptation Fund \(adaptation-fund.org\)](https://adaptation-fund.org/evaluation-of-the-fund-stage-1-adaptation-fund).

¹⁴ [Second Phase of the Overall Evaluation of the Fund - Adaptation Fund \(adaptation-fund.org\)](https://adaptation-fund.org/second-phase-of-the-overall-evaluation-of-the-fund).

¹⁵ [AFB.EFC.30.11 Options-for-the-Overall-Evaluation-of-the-Fund-final.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](https://adaptation-fund.org/afb-efc-30-11-options-for-the-overall-evaluation-of-the-fund-final.pdf).

¹⁶ [AFB.B.39.13-decisions-document_clean2.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](https://adaptation-fund.org/afb-b-39-13-decisions-document-clean2.pdf).

¹⁷ [AF-TERG-Strategy-and-Work-Programme-final.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](https://adaptation-fund.org/af-terg-strategy-and-work-programme-final.pdf).

¹⁸ [AFB-EFC.33-6-AF-TERG-Second-multiyear-work-programme.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](https://adaptation-fund.org/afb-efc-33-6-af-terg-second-multiyear-work-programme.pdf).

¹⁹ [Knowledge & Learning - Adaptation Fund \(adaptation-fund.org\)](https://adaptation-fund.org/knowledge-learning).

available in the AF website under AF-TERG and the AFB Secretariat knowledge management web pages.

3.1. Rapid Evaluation: identification of existing evidence, gap assessment, and lessons for the Comprehensive Evaluation

21. Following Decision B.39/57 and as part of the phased approach to the Comprehensive Evaluation, the AF-TERG prepared ToRs (see Annex 2) for existing evidence and knowledge about the Fund in line with option 1 contained in EFC document AFB/EFC.30/11. The ToR was reviewed by the EFC in November 2021 through an intersessional decision. The Rapid Evaluation had three objectives:
 - i. Develop a framework to organize existing evidence around the Fund's mandate, priorities, core indicators and the Fund's Evaluation Policy.
 - ii. Synthesize evidence, lessons, and experiences to identify trends and identify potential knowledge gaps, in relation to the results (including impact), operations and comparative advantage of the Fund.
 - iii. Provide inputs to the overall evaluation of the Fund which, per Decision B.29/7, will conclude in 2026.
22. The Rapid Evaluation²⁰ synthesized existing evidence and knowledge from AF-TERG generated evaluations, knowledge products developed by the AFB Secretariat, and final evaluations prepared by implementing entities. No new primary data was collected and analyzed (e.g., no interviews, or review of external evidence). The value of the Rapid Evaluation is that it identified the adequacy of evidence for various areas of interest to the Comprehensive Evaluation.
23. The Rapid Evaluation used a three-level framework to organize the evidence and conduct analysis. It also used the evaluation criteria of the Adaptation Fund's Evaluation Policy. The existing evidence and gaps should be considered when defining and finalizing the evaluation questions of the Comprehensive Evaluation. However, even at the bidding stage, proposals should demonstrate understanding of the existing and most pertinent gaps that the Comprehensive Evaluation will tackle. Some of the gaps will be addressed by other programmed AF-TERG evaluations and the design of the Comprehensive Evaluation should also be cognizant of that.
24. In addition, the Rapid Evaluation identified several lessons/inputs that should be considered in the Comprehensive Evaluation. The Rapid Evaluation also specified some methodological limitations that the exercise encountered. Bidders should bear these limitations in mind when proposing an approach.
25. The Rapid Evaluation was completed in 2023 and presented to the Board at its forty-first meeting (October 2023).²¹ Through decision B.41/3, the Board took note of management response²² and in paragraph (b) of the same decision, requested the AFB Secretariat to prepare, in consultation with the AF-TERG, an action plan to respond to the findings arising from the Rapid Evaluation, and provide updates intersessionally, as further contained in present document AFB/B.41-42/12 (March 2024).²³

3.2. The Mid-term review of the second medium term strategy of the Adaptation Fund (MTR of the MTS2)

26. Another key input to the Comprehensive Evaluation will be the MTR of the MTS2. The MTR of the MTS2 is expected to be undertaken from the last quarter of 2024 (e.g., October 2024) to March 2026. It will focus on assessing the Fund's MTR2; the funding windows, accreditation, scaling, and innovation as well as how the MTS2 supports the Fund's niche and strengths in the evolving climate finance landscape. It will focus on the elements of processes and results related to the development and implementation of the MTS2 and its Implementation Plan. The MTR includes four key evaluation questions:
 - i. What additional lessons can be learned from the Fund's implementation of the management response to the MTR of MTS1?

²⁰ Rapid Evaluation of the Adaptation Fund. Accessed from: [AFB.EFC_32.6.Rev_1_Rapid-evaluation.pdf](https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/AFB.EFC_32.6.Rev_1_Rapid-evaluation.pdf) ([adaptation-fund.org](https://www.adaptation-fund.org)).

²¹ AFB. 2023. AFB/EFC.32/6/Rev.2 Rapid evaluation of the Adaptation Fund. Available at: https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/AFB.EFC_32.6.Rev_2_Rapid-evaluation-Rev.2.pdf

²² [AFB.EFC_32.8 Mgt response Rapid evaluation final-1.pdf](https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/AFB.EFC_32.8_Mgt_response_Rapid_evaluation_final-1.pdf) ([adaptation-fund.org](https://www.adaptation-fund.org))

²³ [AFB.B.41-42.12 Updated-Mgmt-Response and-Action-Plan Rapid-evaluation.pdf](https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/AFB.B.41-42.12_Updated-Mgmt-Response_and-Action-Plan_Rapid-evaluation.pdf) ([adaptation-fund.org](https://www.adaptation-fund.org))



- ii. To what extent is the MTS2 and its Implementation Plan supportive of the goals of the Adaptation Fund? How useful and effective is the MTS2 and its Implementation Plan as a management tool?
 - iii. To what extent and how did the MTS2 and its Implementation Plan reflect and leverage the Fund's niche, strengths, and weaknesses? How and to what extent does the MTS2 influence how the Fund is enabling scaling up concrete adaptation activities?
 - iv. To what extent is the Fund on track (or not) in the implementation of the MTS2 and achieving the targets set out in its Implementation Plan?
27. The MTR will use a combination of methods in a mixed methods approach and will triangulate findings using various methods and data sources of qualitative and quantitative nature. It is anticipated that the MTR will at a minimum undertake:
- i. key informant interviews with the AFB Secretariat, AF Board, IEs, and country representatives, and conduct group discussions with a mix of stakeholders;
 - ii. desk-based review of documents and data, to map the development process and achievements of MTS2, the changes/course corrections since MTS1, and to validate results of/under MTS1; and
 - iii. where relevant, selective case studies may (but not necessarily will) include field visits supported by local consultants.
28. The MTR will be conducted in parallel with the Comprehensive Evaluation for most of its implementation period. The AF-TERG Secretariat will ensure that there is sufficient communication, coordination and exchange of information between the Comprehensive Evaluation and the MTR of MTS2.

4. Objective of the Comprehensive Evaluation

29. The Comprehensive Evaluation will focus on the overall achievements of the Fund since the completion of the first Comprehensive Evaluation in 2017 to date, focusing on what has worked and what has not, and how these achievements and lessons support the Fund in fulfilling its mandate. Such achievements and lessons will be contextualized in various operating contexts in which Fund-supported projects and programmes are implemented. Hence, the Comprehensive Evaluation will provide not only an in-depth examination of how the Fund works and whether it is doing the right things, but also quite importantly, whether it is doing things right to achieve its mandate.
30. The Comprehensive Evaluation should ultimately inform the Fund's future directions, operations, and decision-making in the coming years. It should offer insights into how the Fund could be more impactful, supportive of, and responsive to country needs, and how it can reach the most vulnerable faster and more impactfully through adaptive management and learning across all Fund stakeholders. The objective of the Comprehensive Evaluation is threefold and will assess:
- i. what is working well and what is not,
 - ii. the effectiveness and efficiency of how countries access the Fund's financial resources; and
 - iii. the relevance and added value of the Fund to current and future needs and demands in the context of the climate change crisis and priorities for adapting to it.
31. The evaluation team is responsible for preparing the Comprehensive Evaluation report that synthesizes, triangulates, and validates existing and new evaluation evidence. Existing evidence comes from evaluations and knowledge products prepared by the AF-TERG and the AFB Secretariat. The AF-TERG and the evaluation team will identify areas and topics for which evaluative evidence is limited and data will have to be collected and analyzed using methods such as case studies, interviews, literature review and portfolio analysis. The Rapid Evaluation²⁴ conducted in 2023 (section 3.1) has identified existing evidence and gaps. Additional evidence will be available to the evaluation team as part of the evaluations planned to be conducted under the second multi-year work programme of AF-TERG, such as the evaluation on systems, processes and governance of the Fund and the evaluation

²⁴ <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/rapid-evaluation-of-the-adaptation-fund/>

of the readiness programme. The Comprehensive Evaluation team is not expected to conduct stand-alone evaluations.

32. The Comprehensive Evaluation takes into consideration and responds to the following:

- The climate crisis and the urgency of countries to access financing to deal with adaptation priorities.
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change discussions on climate change adaptation, particularly the Global Goal on Adaptation processes and reporting and the transition of the Fund from serving the Kyoto protocol to the Paris Agreement.
- All Board decisions, including those related to the implementation of the evaluation.
- How the Fund makes decisions and how these decisions could be improved with additional evidence to contributing to the improvement of its operations, mission, and niche.
- Priorities and gaps for additional knowledge and evaluative evidence identified through a survey of AF stakeholders conducted by the AF-TERG in June 2023 and existing evidence and gaps in knowledge identified in the Rapid Evaluation (completed in October 2023).
- The findings and lessons coming from evaluations prepared by the AF-TERG second multiyear work programme, particularly the MTR of the MTS2 and knowledge products from the AFB Secretariat.

33. The Evaluation Policy should be applied as part of the Comprehensive Evaluation design and implementation,²⁵ including the application of the Policy's seven evaluation principles, evaluation criteria and the other aspects related to roles and responsibilities and processes. As part of its responsibilities established in the Evaluation Policy, the AF-TERG will commission, manage, advise, and oversee the design and implementation of the evaluation.

34. The vendor is expected to provide impartial, rigorous and independent advice to the AF-TERG in developing the Comprehensive Evaluation. As the commissioner of the report on behalf of the Board, and as part of the delivery of the Fund's independent evaluation function, the AF-TERG will oversee and be an active participant in the design and finalization of the Comprehensive Evaluation report. The data collection, analysis, drafting and other associated activities will be largely undertaken by the vendor, but the AF-TERG reserves the right to participate in these processes, as required.

35. The primary audience of the Comprehensive Evaluation is the Board. In addition, the evaluation report will also be an important document for the AFB Secretariat and Accreditation Panel. The results of the Comprehensive Evaluation will further inform the future work of AF-TERG and its next multi-year work programme covering the period after July 2027. Other audiences include the Fund's contributors, its implementing and executing entities, civil society groups, the UNFCCC thematic bodies, the broader adaptation finance community including other multilateral climate funds, and the broader adaptation finance community.

36. The Fund has a multitude of stakeholders, and they should be consulted throughout the design, implementation and preparation of the Comprehensive Evaluation on areas such as the work of the Fund and their experience with it as well as informed of the results of the Comprehensive Evaluation. The stakeholders include, among others: AF Board (and its committees), the AFB Secretariat, AF Accreditation Panel, national, regional and multinational implementing entities, national governments, beneficiaries of the Fund projects and those affected/impacted by them, particularly those most vulnerable, civil society, other funders of climate adaptation and the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement and secretariat.

4.1. What the Comprehensive Evaluation will answer

Overarching question

37. The Fund aims to contribute to enhanced adaptive capacity, strengthened resilience, and reduced vulnerability of people, livelihoods, and ecosystems in the face of climate change. Therefore, **the overarching question of the Comprehensive Evaluation relate to the extent to which the Fund is progressing to fulfil its niche and to achieve its mandate.** This question will be addressed in a context-specific manner, and thus the secondary key question is **if this mandate is still relevant in the current**

²⁵ [New-Design-Evaluation-Policy.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#)

context and as it relates to recipient countries, the AF Board and UNFCCC needs, decisions, and priorities on climate change adaptation.

Assessment at three levels

38. The evaluation will assess the Fund's achievements and extract lessons at three levels - macro, meso, and micro. The following sections provide information on each of the proposed levels as well as some suggested questions. The questions will be finalized during the inception phase of the evaluation and agreed with the AF-TERG. In the proposal, the consulting team should prioritize these questions and may suggest others given their experience with other comprehensive evaluations of similar organizations.

(1) Macro level relates to the Fund's goals and performance.

39. The evaluation will assess the Fund's niche and comparative advantages as they relate to the current climate financing architecture, COP guidance on the financial instruments, and country needs and how this niche has been incorporated in the Fund's mandate and strategy.

40. Examples of questions under this level could include:

- What are the current niche and comparative advantages of the Fund?
 -
 - How are they represented in the MTS2?
 - What are the complementarities with other climate funds' work and donors?
- To what extent has the Fund been impactful, supportive, and responsive to country needs?
- Have the Fund resources reached the needs of the most vulnerable in an impactful way?
- How have the Fund governance, policies, strategies, and processes contributed to this?
- How efficient is the Fund's utilization of scarce financial resources and expertise? What has been the experience of the Fund with financial resource mobilization?
- To what extent has the Fund's approach to and definition of vulnerability improved the relevance and effectiveness of the Fund? Did it facilitate a more targeted response to specific vulnerable groups?
- How and to what extent has the Fund coordinated and maximized the opportunities for synergies with other climate funds at the global, regional, and country levels?

(2) Meso level focuses on the implementation of the Fund's strategies, policies, and processes at the country and implementing entities levels.

41. The meso level assesses the achievements and lessons from the implementation of the MTS2²⁶, the different Fund policies, such as the ESP, GP and EP, processes (e.g., accreditation, project cycle, and others) and funding modalities. This should be assessed with a lens of the countries and implementing entities. Furthermore, the Comprehensive Evaluation should consider the synergies between the Fund activities and operations. It will also consider whether the Fund has achieved its mandate in a timely, adaptive, cost-effective, country-driven, and sustainable manner; and how the governance, policies, strategies, and processes contributed to this.

42. Examples of questions under this level could include:

- What are the key outcomes in terms of the three strategic pillars of the Fund's second Medium-Term Strategy?
- To what extent have the ESP and GP been implemented, and what lessons have been learned, particularly related to countries and implementing entities?
- To what extent has the Fund's Evaluation Policy been implemented and how is it enabling the Fund to learn and be more accountable? How has the independent evaluation function been implemented and what have been the results to date?
- How is the knowledge generated by the Fund contribute to the Fund's mandate and the global discussion on climate change adaptation?
- How are Fund operations aligned (or not) with national adaptation strategies and processes?

²⁶ The assessment of the MTS2 will be conducted through the mid-term review which should be completed by March 2026. Therefore, the Comprehensive Evaluation should not repeat the work of MTS2 but provide a synthesis of the findings and recommendations from that evaluation.



- How have the different processes (accreditation, scaling, etc.) or funding modalities (such as readiness, scaling and innovation facilities, funding windows) contributed to the priorities of the Fund, countries and implementing entities?
- What, if any, are the differences in the levels of country ownership between projects/programmes implemented by NIEs, MIEs, and RIEs and different types of entities such as subnational, associations, civil society organizations, etc.? How does the Fund ensure country ownership where a country is not using direct access?
- How does the Adaptation Fund align and support national and implementing entities priorities for adaptation and broader sustainable development?
- How and to what extent has the Fund engaged with different stakeholders to promote innovation, scale-up and sustainability?
- How long does it take for Fund's financial support to reach the most vulnerable? How timely is the support?
- How cost effective is the Fund's operations?

43. At this level, the Comprehensive Evaluation will also draw on the findings from the review questions that the MTR of MTS2 covered and listed in Section 3.2.

(3) Micro: results at the projects/programmes level.

44. The Comprehensive Evaluation will assess the results of concrete adaptation actions at the project level and as an aggregate at the Fund portfolio level. The Comprehensive Evaluation should test how 'adaptive capacity', 'strengthened resilience', and 'reduced vulnerability' have been achieved or in the process to be achieved. Results and lessons will be reported according to the MTS2 cross-cutting issues and different contexts (see below).

45. Examples of questions under this level could include:

- What are the emerging key messages from projects and activities in terms of the nine evaluation criteria outlined in the Fund's Evaluation Policy?
- What are the achievements of the intended outcomes of the projects/programmes?
- What are the recurring and systemic project-level gaps and weaknesses?
- What are the common barriers to efficiency and effectiveness at the project level?
- What are the existing limitations to impact measurement at the project/programme-level and on the aggregate at the portfolio level?
- How is the Fund learning from its projects/programmes and local players?
- How cost-efficient are the Fund's projects?

The assessment should consider different contexts, critical issues for adaptation, and the Fund's Evaluation Criteria

46. Complementing the three levels, the Comprehensive Evaluation will consider different contexts given adaptation is generally context specific. Some examples of context include the different geographic regions that the Fund works in, different types of countries, such as Small Island Developing States (SIDS), Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Fragile and Conflict States (FCS), different ecosystems, vulnerability types and groups, and others. Documenting these approaches and generating lessons learned from the viewpoint of adaptation effectiveness and impact in a more context-specific way is critical in shaping prospective approaches and therefore impacts of the Fund.

47. Another set of contexts that the Comprehensive Evaluation should consider is the six cross-cutting issues identified in the MTS2 as critical issues for adaptation: locally led or based adaptation; enhance access to finance and local capacity; empower and benefit the most vulnerable; advance gender equality; scaling up and replication; complementarity and coherence with others working in the climate adaptation space.

48. Finally, the assessment should consider and discuss the evaluation criteria established in the Fund's Evaluation Policy: (i) relevance; (ii) coherence; (iii) effectiveness; (iv) efficiency; (v) impact; (vi) equity; (vii) adaptive management; (viii) scalability; (ix) human and ecological sustainability and security.²⁷

²⁷ See footnote 23.

4.2. Scope of the Evaluation

49. The Comprehensive Evaluation will look across the full spectrum of Fund activities (i.e., policies, strategies, governance, decisions, and processes) and operations globally. It will cover the period commencing April 2017 (i.e., the first overall evaluation covered the period from Fund inception to March 2017) to June 2026. The final scope and cut-off dates for data will be discussed and agreed during evaluation inception phase.

4.3. Evaluation Approach and Methods

50. The approach and methods for the Comprehensive Evaluation should demonstrate a clear understanding and a good grasp of previous and ongoing AF-TERG work as contained in its first and second work programmes, as well as in internal (i.e., from the AFB Secretariat) and external (e.g., from other climate funds) sources.

4.3.1. Evaluation Approach

51. The Comprehensive Evaluation approach should be consistent with the principles outlined in the Adaptation Fund's Evaluation Policy: (i) relevance and utility; (ii) credibility and robustness; (iii) transparency; (iv) impartiality and objectivity; (v) equitable and gender-sensitive inclusivity; (vi) complementarity; and (vii) complexity-sensitive and adaptive.²⁸ Bidders are encouraged to propose efficient, effective, and where possible, innovative approaches. As highlighted in Section 2.4 and in Section 7, the Comprehensive Evaluation will be undertaken in an environment where there are significant limitations and challenges to data and information sources. Thus, in addition to pushing the methodological frontiers of strategic evaluations, innovation should quite importantly address these data constraints. Proponents should think out of the box and come up with approaches that could incorporate methods that will be cost-effective and timely, for example, SMS-based data collection, the use of artificial intelligence, geographic information system to validate vulnerabilities, and others.
52. The evaluation approach should be consultative. Two types of consultations with key stakeholders are required from the evaluation team: (1) to collect data; and (2) to validate and provide feedback on findings, lessons and recommendations with the AF-TERG and the AFB Secretariat (see also Section 3.8 Evaluation Phases). The second type of consultations will increase the ownership of findings, conclusions, and recommendations for key stakeholders such as the Board, AFB Secretariat, AF-TERG, IEs, and others. The evaluation proposal should identify the key stakeholders and then detail how, when, and with whom consultations will be undertaken throughout the evaluation process. The details will be firmed up during the evaluation inception stage.

4.3.2. Evaluation Methods

53. Consistent with the methodological discussion specified in the options paper²⁹ and the guidance by the Board in decision B.39/57, the Comprehensive Evaluation, when collecting new data, synthesizing, conducting new analysis and triangulating evidence will include methods that are quantitative and qualitative in nature. To ensure the credibility and robustness of the Comprehensive Evaluation, both primary and secondary data will be collected and used. It is anticipated that the Comprehensive Evaluation will at a minimum undertake the following:

(i) Semi structured interviews

54. The Comprehensive Evaluation will conduct semi-structured interviews with individuals or groups of key stakeholders, such as from the AFB Secretariat, AF Board, IEs, and country representatives.

(ii) Portfolio analysis

55. A desk-based quantitative analysis of Fund portfolio should be conducted. Some potential headlines for analysis include the size of grants; project cycle; completed and ongoing projects; sector, themes, funding windows, geographic scope, IEs; co-financing; partnerships; results dashboard including project ratings over time by relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and M&E. The portfolio review will cover the Fund's portfolio of projects/programmes approved, under implementation, and completed between April 2017 and June 2026.

²⁸ See footnote 23.

²⁹ Ibid.

(iii) Desk reviews of documents

56. The desk-based review of documents will enable the evaluation team to familiarize themselves with the breadth and depth (and consequently limitations) of materials available for the evaluation. It will help the evaluation team in making informed decisions as to the finalization of the evaluation questions and the precise scope, boundaries, and design of the evaluation. The synthesis of evidence as of June 2023 has already been compiled in the Rapid Evaluation and therefore the evaluation team should use it as a critical starting point and input throughout the evaluation.

- **Landscape analysis.** To establish a broad view of the climate adaptation financing context to ascertain the Fund's strategic positioning within it, the evaluation will review climate adaptation financing and the place of the Fund within this context.
- **Existing evaluative evidence.** Identify existing evidence within the Fund using and updating the synthesis conducted for the Rapid Evaluation and from outside the Fund, particularly from other relevant climate funds.

(iv) Evaluability of the Fund's Theory of Change

57. The team will work with the AF-TERG and the AFB Secretariat to revisit and further clarify the Fund's theory of change so it can be used in the evaluation. The MTS2 presents a theory of change that will support the discussion on how the theory of change of the Fund may be for the evaluation (this should be completed in consultation with the MTR of the MTS2 work on the MTS2's theory of change). The theory of change will be used to test the performance of the Fund and the change mechanisms that facilitate or hinder it.

(v) Data collection

58. The data collection activities for the Comprehensive Evaluation will be comprised of extensive use of secondary information from existing and ongoing AF-TERG evaluations, AFB Secretariat documents, and other external sources, and of collecting additional, new evidence to supplement and fill the evidence gaps from the secondary sources. Hence, any new data collection activities are expected to be focused and targeted to avoid any duplication of work and to add real value by responding to the additional data needs of the evaluation.

59. Under this activity, and as agreed during the inception phase, the evaluation team will collect data on areas which were identified as areas where evidence gaps exist.

60. **Secondary data sources.** The evaluation team shall continuously work with the AF-TERG in identifying and collecting various data sources from the inception phase and through to the implementation phase of the evaluation. Internal sources will include but not limited to (i) AF-TERG completed evaluations, the Fund's Evaluation Policy and Guidance Notes, and the first Comprehensive Evaluation of the Fund (Phase 1 and 2); (ii) AF-TERG planned and ongoing evaluations (e.g., MTR of MTS2, evaluation of processes, systems, and governance); and (iii) AFB Secretariat knowledge products and data (e.g., project/programme evaluations, approved funding proposals, annual performance reports, mission reports, knowledge products; monitoring data).

61. External sources such as grey and published literature on climate finance architecture, and other climate funds' evaluations and evidence sources should also be considered (as above).

62. **Primary data sources.** Interviews and multi-stakeholder group discussions may also have to be undertaken to fill evidence gaps or for triangulation purposes. The evaluation team will work closely with the AF-TERG focal point and AF-TERG Secretariat in finalizing the list of stakeholders and scheduling the interview/discussion with them. In some cases, specific stakeholders may only be identified through other stakeholders already reached (i.e., in a snowball sampling) and in this case, the evaluation team should swiftly speak to the AF-TERG focal point and AF-TERG Secretariat to agree and schedule these further consultations. Key stakeholders will include the AFB Secretariat, AF Board members, implementing entities, designated authorities and other country representatives, AF CSO network, other climate funds, adaptation experts from the UNFCCC, and potentially the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)'s Working Group II on Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability.

63. **Data management.** A clear record (i.e., interview and discussion notes, spreadsheet for quantitative data, etc.) from the data collection activities must be stored, and where requested, anonymized summaries shall be furnished to the AF-TERG. All data collected through this assignment will be the property of the World Bank and by extension, the Adaptation Fund.

(vi) Filling evaluative evidence gaps

64. The team will identify and agree with the AF-TERG on areas that will need further assessment. This should be identified during the inception phase and spelled out in the inception Report. Secondary and primary data will be used for assessing these areas with limited existing evidence.

(vii) Case studies

65. The case studies will enable the Comprehensive Evaluation to look at the implementation of the Fund and associated challenges and lessons at two levels: countries and implementing entities. It is also an opportunity to incorporate country and implementing entity perspectives to inform Fund-level analyses and consequently future approaches - this is a direct response to one of the inputs/challenges that the Rapid Evaluation noted in the report.
66. The country case studies aim to compare the differences in the Fund's approach (i.e., how the Fund works within a country to complement the country National Adaptation Plans or adaptation strategy of the IEs), level of achievements, and lessons across contexts. They will serve as a deep dive to gain a more granular understanding of the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of the Fund in various contexts. Countries will be selected in a purposive sampling that will try to represent different geographies and to complement data that the Fund already has. The evaluation team can also explore the possibility of including countries that do not have a national implementing entity or AF-funded projects to understand the constraints to accessing finance from the Fund. The country-level case studies could be either in-person or remote, or a combination of the two. The selection of countries will have to take into account other evaluations undertaken by the AF-TERG so there is no duplication nor confusion in the field.
67. The implementing entities case studies aim to investigate the drivers behind accessing adaptation finance from the Fund (or not) and these drivers should be categorized during analysis. Similar to the country case studies, the selection will be through purposive sampling. Implementing entities case studies could be a purely remote exercise. However, the evaluation team should investigate the possibility of reaching entities during country visits where it is technically sensible.
68. The evaluation team will agree with AF-TERG the selection process to identify the case studies during the inception phase.

4.3.3. Evaluation Matrix

69. The proposal should include a draft evaluation matrix that will organize the evaluation approach. It will be agreed during the inception phase. The evaluation matrix will contain the evaluation questions and sub-questions that already have extensive evidence and those that will need more evidence. It should be very clear on which of these questions and sub-questions will require additional data collection and analysis and what exactly its purpose would be (e.g., to fill gaps, to supplement poor quality information, etc.); it will be guiding the data collection activities and analytical processes. It should also demonstrate how the review will triangulate evidence. The evaluation matrix will specify the judgement indicators for each question, the data sources, data collection methods, and analytical techniques.

4.4. Limitations and challenges to the Comprehensive Evaluation

70. Like the Rapid Evaluation, the Comprehensive Evaluation will involve broad and complex topics, context, and processes. It will also address multiple facets and dimensions of a highly dynamic and ambitious Fund which will entail a high density and complex content. The Rapid Evaluation identified some key limitations and challenges that should be considered by the Comprehensive Evaluation team. Some examples include:
- Deep gaps in available evidence and data both in quantity and quality at all levels, particularly at the level of the evaluation criteria in the Evaluation Policy and cross-cutting themes of the MTS2.
 - Evidence from country and implementing entity perspectives is limited.
 - Evidence and analysis of the interlinkages between criteria (for instance between impact, equity, and sustainability) remain an exception, with relatively limited insights into synergies and trade-offs.
71. The complexity of stakeholders and stakeholder engagement will also present a challenge to the evaluation. The large number of stakeholders to be consulted to ensure that the evaluation draws on views from across a balanced representation of stakeholders, and from diverse views, and the oft-

prolonged process of consultation (i.e., from requesting for a meeting to the actual interviews/discussions) should be considered when planning the evaluation.

72. In addition, the evaluation will also involve coordination work with the AF-TERG and AFB Secretariat to understand their work and collect evidence and information.
73. It is expected that the evaluation team have properly understood the data limitations during the inception phase and that the evaluation approach and methods have been designed in a way that also provides a solution to these constraints. The AFB Secretariat will act as the main source of data and the availability and quality of data will be discussed during the inception phase and solutions will be provided in the inception report.
74. Bidders should present in the proposal a risk and mitigation table that would indicate how these (and others identified during the inception phase) limitations and challenges will be addressed. Limitations and challenges will also be included in the inception report as well as in the final report.

5. Quality assurance

75. The technical proposal should set out a robust quality assurance system for the entirety of the evaluation, which will ensure delivery of high-quality evaluative processes and outputs. The quality assurance system should have appropriate staffing that have experience undertaking quality checks of all the drafts and final reports (e.g., inception report, evaluation report, and others). In addition, bidders are expected to have the capacity to quality assure and supervise concurrent data collection activities and the data being collected to ensure that the application of the approved data collection methods is appropriate and the data and information coming through are of high quality and can contribute to addressing the key evaluation questions. For this, training for both central and local teams (if any) on the use of the data collection protocols should be considered.

6. Evaluation phases and deliverables

76. The evaluation will be organized in four phases:

- Phase 1: Evaluation inception
- Phase 2: Evaluation implementation
- Phase 3: Drafting Comprehensive Evaluation Report, and validation
- Phase 4: Communication and dissemination

6.1. Phase 1: Evaluation Inception (January 2025 to June 2025)

| Deliverable | Key dates |
|---------------------------------|--------------|
| • Contract start up (signature) | January 2025 |
| • 1 EFC brief | March 2025 |
| • Draft Inception Report | May 2025 |
| • Final Inception Report | June 2025 |

77. The phase will commence with a virtual kick-off meeting between the evaluation team, the AF-TERG members and the AF-TERG Secretariat Coordinator once the contract is signed. During this meeting, any further comments, and pending questions to the ToR, along with the ways of working moving forward, will be discussed. Key dates for delivering outputs will also be confirmed. Subsequent meetings, including an in-person meeting in the Fund headquarters, will be scheduled to cover in more detail the emergent evaluation design, evaluation matrix, and data collection plan and particularly the case studies; and to agree on the final inception report. These meetings will ensure a shared vision and understanding between the evaluation team and the AF-TERG as the approach and evaluation plan are being designed and finalized. Additionally, the evaluation team will have an initial engagement with the AFB Secretariat during this phase to learn about the Fund, and to consult on the evaluation questions and the timelines.
78. Among the activities to be undertaken under this phase include the following: (i) review of available documents and sources of information, particularly the Rapid Evaluation, to familiarize with existing evidence and subject of the evaluation; (ii) identification of existing evidence and remaining or emergent evidence gaps; (iii) gaining a comprehensive understanding of the full spectrum of Fund operations and performance that is within the scope of the evaluation and identifying how/which to prioritise and focus on also as informed by (ii); (iv) undertaking preliminary stakeholder consultations

to inform the final design; (v) producing the inception report (details of the content below) and a brief to be presented by the AF-TERG to the EFC (March 2025); and (vi) preparing to launch the next phases of the evaluation immediately after the conclusion of the inception phase.

79. The inception phase will ultimately produce the detailed approach for the Comprehensive Evaluation. Specifically, the inception report shall, at a minimum, include the following:
- Background and context to the Comprehensive Evaluation,
 - An update to the Rapid Evaluation with new evaluative evidence,
 - The Fund’s theory of change adopted from the MTS2 that can be used for the evaluation,
 - The overall evaluation design (approach and methods) and associated risks, opportunities, and constraints,
 - Ethical considerations in the Comprehensive Evaluation,
 - The evaluation matrix,
 - Additional areas or topics that have limited evaluative evidence and for which additional data may need to be collected and analyzed during the implementation phase. These areas and topics will be agreed with the AFTERG,
 - Quality assurance system for data collection, data analysis, and reports,
 - Consultation plan to gather primary data and validate findings from AF stakeholders,
 - Proposed communication and dissemination plan, and
 - A detailed work plan with roles and responsibilities and a clear division of labor amongst the evaluation team, and

6.2. Phase 2: Evaluation Implementation (July 2025 to March 2026)

| Deliverables | Key dates |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Preliminary findings for discussion first with AF-TERG and then with AFB Secretariat representatives before the EFC meetings | September 2025 and February 2026 |
| 2 EFC briefs | October 2025 and March 2026 |

80. The implementation phase of the Comprehensive Evaluation is comprised of data collection and analysis, (including triangulation) although some data collection and analysis should have taken place during the inception phase. The evaluation team should design the implementation phase in a way that allows for additional, follow-up data collection and validation to address any gaps identified during the analytical process (and even during the drafting phase). The implementation phase will also include generation of preliminary findings as they become available so the AF-TERG, the AFB Secretariat and EFC are informed. Any preliminary findings will be first discussed and agreed with AF-TERG, then shared for validation and feedback from the AFB Secretariat and finally presented to the EFC. This process should take place at least twice in September 2025 and February 2026 in preparation for the presentation to the EFC. Note again that any report and its content will be agreed with the AF-TERG, since the final product is an AF-TERG report.
81. During the entire implementation phase, the evaluation team shall keep the AF-TERG abreast of how the evaluation is progressing by having regular consultations with the AF-TERG focal point and Chair, for instance, to discuss ongoing analysis, and emerging issues or challenges, before a deliverable is finalized. In addition, the evaluation team will have a regular catch-up (i.e., every two weeks) with the AF-TERG focal point. Ad hoc meetings may be scheduled as needed.
82. The team will also communicate regularly with the MTR consulting team and the AF-TERG MTR of MTS2 focal point for alignment purposes.
83. A major step during the implementation phase is bringing together the secondary and primary evidence collected for analysis and cross-validation. The synthesis aims to highlight issues identified across different evaluations and learning products to feed into or address evaluation questions using an existing database/secondary source. Examples of questions/sub-questions that the synthesis could directly inform include the achievement of Fund-supported activities and the systemic issues related to project implementation and performance including factors that have supported and constrained performance.

84. The synthesis will have to be systematic but also pragmatic. The steps taken to synthesize evidence should be clearly described and sources should all be traceable. This synthesis is more about the consolidation of evidence in a manner that can address the evaluation questions. The evaluation team should explore the use of established approaches such as systematic review of qualitative evidence and apply them flexibly in the context of this Comprehensive Evaluation. The result should be the generation of overarching findings and thematic narratives from the various qualitative sources.
85. For qualitative information, it is recommended that the evaluation team apply a coding system and/or the use of analytical software such as Nvivo, MAXQDA, and other AI-powered tools to be transparent and systematic. Note that some qualitative information could also be summarized and analyzed quantitatively so the evaluation team should explore how such analysis would be undertaken and presented. For quantitative data, it may be sufficient to use Excel for disaggregation and analysis and to generate tables and graphs. The precise process through which qualitative and quantitative analyses have been undertaken are to be described in detail in the evaluation report.
86. As previously noted, it is possible that information gaps are identified during the analytical process and therefore the evaluation team should be prepared to engage in an iterative process between data collection and data analysis and must ensure that the work plan and resourcing will allow for this.

6.3. Phase 3: Evaluation Reporting and Further Triangulation (March 2026 to June 2026)

| Deliverables | Key dates |
|---------------------------------------|------------|
| Draft Comprehensive Evaluation Report | March 2026 |
| Final Comprehensive Evaluation Report | June 2026 |

87. The evaluation team will write the report using the findings and conclusions from its analytical and synthesis activities following an outline that has been discussed and pre-agreed with the AF-TERG. During the report drafting, further triangulation may be required either to incorporate new evidence coming from concurrent evaluations or if inconsistencies were identified whilst writing. Proper citations will be followed throughout the report.
88. The Comprehensive Evaluation report preparation will follow the same process as described by the preliminary findings. A draft report will be prepared for discussion and agreement with the AF-TERG in March 2026. The final report will incorporate comments from the AF-TERG and AFB Secretariat and be ready by June 2026. The AFB Secretariat will prepare at this point a management response that will accompany the final report to the EFC by mid-August.

6.4. Phase 4: Final communication and dissemination (July to December 2026)

| Deliverables | Key dates |
|---|----------------------|
| Draft PowerPoint presentation for the EFC | July – December 2026 |
| Dissemination and communication products | |

89. Once the Comprehensive Evaluation report has been finalized, the evaluation team will prepare a draft PowerPoint presentation that the AF-TERG will use as the basis for a presentation to the EFC. The consultants will also prepare products for dissemination and communication that the AF-TERG will use. One of these products will be an evaluation brief of no more than three pages to capture the main findings, lessons, and recommendations. The brief is a communication product, expected to be written in an accessible manner and professionally designed with visual materials (as opposed to pure text only). The completion of dissemination and communication products should consider the decision that the Board will take in October 2026 and may include additional changes to the report and request for additional products and activities.

7. Qualifications and experience

90. The Comprehensive Evaluation is a complex and multifaceted undertaking that requires diverse expertise and interdisciplinarity. It is essential that the team has strong experience in conducting organizational or corporate level evaluations. Experience with multilateral institutions and/or

multilateral climate funds is a plus. It is also important that there is sufficient expertise in the team in evaluating adaptation outcomes (i.e., increased adaptive capacity and resilience) and institutional achievements that will be generated through an inductive process from a portfolio of projects/programmes. The team should already have a good baseline knowledge of climate finance architecture and adaptation finance specifically.

91. The evaluation team, to be led by an experienced team leader, will be composed of evaluators and analysts with various levels of expertise. Whilst there is no minimum number of recommended team members, the evaluation team should be well resourced to ensure that the concurrent implementation activities -most especially iterative data collection, synthesis, and analytical activities- can be completed on time and at the required standard.

Qualifications of the firm

- (a) The successful consulting firm (or a consortium of firms) shall have at least 10 years of combined experience in corporate evaluations particularly of multilateral organisations and climate funds AND project/programme level outcome evaluations particularly of climate change adaptation projects/programmes.
- (b) The firm should also have an extensive network of qualified consultants to be able to tap into when necessary both on specific topics or for the on-the-ground country case studies.

Essential qualifications of the team

- (a) Local knowledge, gender diversity, ability to work in multiple languages, and ability to travel.
- (b) Experience working in the field.
- (c) Team members that are based in the AF recipient countries who could quickly participate and be deployed to conduct the country and implementing entity case studies.

Team Leader

- (a) Strong and proven academic background in applied research, climate change, or environmental sciences, with a PhD /Masters level degree or equivalent in a relevant field (climate change adaptation; international development; social sciences or related area).
- (b) Minimum of 15 years of experience in leading and implementing mixed method evaluations or external reviews at the corporate level. Experience with climate change evaluations is a huge advantage.
- (c) Proven capacity to dynamically lead a multidisciplinary, multicultural evaluation team that are based in different geographic locations and to effectively engage diverse stakeholders.
- (d) Ability to communicate complex technical detail with clarity, and ability to identify and focus on the key messages among competing detail.
- (e) Ability to communicate sensitively with diverse AF stakeholders across geographies, including on issues that might be perceived as locally sensitive.

Team members

- (a) Strong expertise and demonstrable experience with organizational evaluations and corporate evaluations for multilateral institutions and/or multilateral climate funds.
- (b) Strong expertise and demonstrable experience in climate change evaluations, and in particular evaluating climate change adaptation outcomes with a wide geographic and contextual coverage.
- (c) Practical experience and in-depth expertise in mixed methods, in addition to pure qualitative (i.e., key informant interviews, focus group discussions, etc.) and quantitative methods (i.e., descriptive statistics, etc.), and in managing both qualitative and quantitative data.
- (d) Excellent facilitation skills and proven ability to undertake multi-stakeholder group discussions in an effective and ethical manner.
- (e) Demonstrable experience delivering successful utilization-focussed and participatory evaluations.
- (f) Strong knowledge of multilateral climate funds and the broader climate funds architecture.

- (g) Proficiency in Spanish, French, and Arabic.

Desirable qualifications across the team

- (a) Experience working with other climate funds.
- (b) Experience in areas including but not limited to locally based and locally led adaptation, knowledge generation, scaling and innovation in climate change adaptation, gender and inclusion, institutional resourcing including budgeting/finance, and origination and management of climate change adaptation projects.
- (c) Team composition exhibits local knowledge, gender diversity, ability to work in multiple languages, and ability to travel.

8. Arrangements

Roles and responsibilities

- 92. The AF-TERG is the commissioner and owner of the Comprehensive Evaluation process and its final report. One AF-TERG member will be the focal point and will provide strategic guidance and technical steer and monitor the Comprehensive Evaluation during its design and execution. The focal point shall also ensure that the required methodology is applied. The AF-TERG focal point and AF-TERG Secretariat Coordinator will provide feedback, comments and final clearance for all deliverables, following consultations with the AF-TERG Chair and members.
- 93. Support in organizing the meetings and contacting the relevance stakeholders will be provided during the duration of the assignment.
- 94. The evaluation team will be provided with all necessary documentation and databases needed in support of the above scope of work via access to a cloud-based background documentation repository or will provide access in another way to any documentation.
- 95. The implementing entities are expected to provide access to project-specific information, data, stakeholders, and other resources as may be relevant to the evaluation. Any request will have to be coordinated with and made through the AF-TERG Secretariat. Request for interviews/discussions will have to be allocated sufficient time and advance notice.
- 96. A steering committee or advisory group may be established following the inception report, if deemed necessary.

Location

- 97. The Comprehensive Evaluation will be a combination of remote work to be delivered by the evaluation team at each member's respective home base, and field-based work for the case studies. The evaluation team is expected to work during EST time zone office hours as needed.

Travel

- 98. Any travel undertaken during this consultancy will be arranged by the consulting firm and costs should be included in the overall costs of the evaluation.

Arrangements

- 99. All contracts with the Adaptation Fund are World Bank contracts and follow the relevant rules and regulations of the Bank.
- 100. The contracting will be conducted in a phased approach, with each contract covering a period not longer than one fiscal year, or from July to June the following year. The issuance of new contracts will be done in line with the World Bank procurement rules.