



Annex I

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

Terms of Reference

for the Mid-term Review of the Adaptation Fund's

Second Medium-term Strategy 2023-2027 (MTR of MTS2)

9 September 2024

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Background	4
2.1. The Adaptation Fund	4
2.2. The Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund	5
2.3. The Fund's Medium-term Strategy 2018-2022	6
2.4. The MTR of the MTS1	7
2.5. The Fund's Medium-term Strategy 2023-2027	8
2.6. The Second Comprehensive Evaluation of the Fund	10
3. Objectives of the MTR of MTS2	11
4. MTR Questions	12
5. Scope of the MTR of MTS2	15
6. MTR Approach and Methods	15
7. Limitations and challenges	18
8. Quality assurance	18
9. MTR phases and deliverables	18
10. Qualifications and experience	21
11. Arrangements	22



Acronyms

AF	Adaptation Fund
AF-TERG	Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund
AFCIA	Adaptation Fund Climate Innovation Accelerator
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
LLA	Locally led adaptation
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.40/72 (March 2023), the Board requested the Adaptation Fund (AF or the Fund) Technical Evaluation Reference Group (AF-TERG) to prepare a mid-term review (MTR) of the Fund's Medium-term Strategy 2023-2027 (MTS2) and its Implementation Plan.¹ The MTR is to be conducted and completed by February 2026 so that it can be presented at the forty-sixth meeting of the Board (planned for March 2026). In preparation for the execution of the second phase of the Comprehensive Evaluation of the Adaptation Fund, the AF-TERG included this MTR in 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) as one of the main building blocks of the Comprehensive Evaluation.
2. This terms of reference (ToR) sets out the background, scope of work, and requirements of the MTR of MTS2 to guide prospective bidders for this review.

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

¹ This is the second strategy for which the Fund conducted a mid-term review. The first MTR concluded in October 2021.

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>



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 (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 April 2024, it has 32 National Implementing Entities (NIE), 9 Regional Implementing Entities (RIE), and 15 Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIE).

2.2. The Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund

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-

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>

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-](https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/AFB.B.33.b.Inf_.2._Amended_and_Restated_Terms_and_Conditions.pdf)

[content/uploads/2019/06/AFB.B.33.b.Inf_.2._Amended_and_Restated_Terms_and_Conditions.pdf](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/>

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 second phase of the second Comprehensive Evaluation of the Adaptation Fund.¹² A number of completed evaluations of the AF-TERG from its previous work programme as well as other planned evaluations under the second work programme are intended to inform the Comprehensive Evaluation. The latter includes the mid-term review of the Second Medium-Term Strategy of the Fund (MTR of MTS2), the readiness evaluation, and an evaluation of the processes, governance, and systems of the Adaptation Fund¹³.

2.3. The Fund's Medium-term Strategy 2018-2022

14. The AF Board launched the development of the Fund's first medium-term strategy (MTS1) 2018-2022¹⁴ in March 2016 to respond to the adoption of the Paris Agreement in December 2015. The Implementation Plan for the MTS1 was approved in March 2018.¹⁵
15. The MTS1 was envisaged to provide the Fund with strategic directions by identifying concrete actions to scale up its work into new areas of innovation and knowledge generation. The MTS1 had three strategic pillars (action, innovation, and learning and sharing) and four cross-cutting themes (engaging and empowering the most vulnerable communities and social groups; advancing gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls; strengthening long-term institutional and technical capacity for effective adaptation; and building complementarity and coherence with other climate finance delivery channels).
16. It also articulated the Fund's unique approach, which among others included maintaining its niche within the evolving architecture of international climate finance, characterized by its focus on:

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 \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#).

¹³ This evaluation is the Option 2 in the Options Paper presented to the Board in its thirtieth meeting (October 2022) and which the Board also decided will be implemented as part of Option 3. For more information, see Options Paper accessed from: [AFB.EFC .30.11 Options-for-the-Overall-Evaluation-of-the-Fund-final.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#).

¹⁴ Adaptation Fund Medium Term Strategy 2018 – 2022. Accessed from: [Medium-Term Strategy 2018-2022 - Adaptation Fund \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#)

¹⁵ [AFB.B.31.5.Rev .1 Implementation plan for medium-term strategy.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#)



- Concrete action in developing country Parties
- Small-scale (“starter”) projects/programmes, typically under US\$10 million for a single-country project or US\$15 million for a regional programme
- Direct and Enhanced Direct Access modalities
- Building the capacities and track records that NIEs require to access significantly higher levels of adaptation finance
- Testing new practices, tools, and technologies for effective adaptation
- Pragmatic learning and sharing, especially through south-south collaboration

17. Under MTS1, the Fund launched seven new funding windows and further defined the Fund’s niche, role and positioning within the wider climate funds’ landscape. For example, the Fund launched the Innovation Facility that provides small and large grants and with the objective to (i) roll out successful innovations; (ii) scale up viable innovations; (iii) encourage and accelerate innovations; and (iv) generate evidence of effective and efficient innovation in adaptation. Related funding opportunities included the Small Grants for Innovation (Direct Access), Small Grants AFCIA¹⁶, and Large Grants for Innovation. The Fund also opened Learning Grants under MTS1’s third pillar, providing NIEs with project under implementation that has reached mid-point up to US\$150,000 for knowledge generation, transfer, and sharing.

2.4. The MTR of the MTS1

18. In its thirty-first meeting (March 2018) through Decision B.31/32,¹⁷ the Board requested the AF-TERG to undertake the MTR of MTS1 and its Implementation Plan and report the findings to the Board at its thirty-sixth meeting (October 2021). The Implementation Plan of MTS1 (Section 6) also stated that “the implementation of the MTS would be evaluated after the mid-term in 2020-2021 and after its end in 2023. The mid-term review was planned to be useful in informing the possible subsequent second Medium-term Strategy (which could span years 2023-2027), and that such evaluations would be carried out by the Evaluation Function of the Fund.”¹⁸ . In response to this Board decision and following the first half of MTS implementation, the AF-TERG conducted the MTR of MTS1 with the aim of assessing progress and informing the development of the next strategy for 2023-2027. The MTR concluded in October 2021, when the Board took note of the findings and recommendations of the review from the AF-TERG Chair’s presentation in the twenty-eight meeting of the EFC.¹⁹

19. Some of the key findings of the MTR include the following:²⁰

- The MTS1 was a good, fit-for-purpose strategy that was ambitious, forward-looking, and responsive to global processes and imperatives for climate change adaptation.
- The MTS1 achieved significant strides and the progress during the first half of the MTS has been significant. It launched seven new funding windows, meeting targets for its funding windows and seeing Board approval to double the country cap and expanding accreditation of NIE from one to

¹⁶ www.adaptation-undp.org/smallgrantaggregator and www.ctc-n.org/afcia

¹⁷ [AFB.B.31.7 circulated to the Board v2.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#)

¹⁸ P. 31, Implementation Plan of the Adaptation Fund’s Medium-Term Strategy 2018 – 2022. See footnote 15.

¹⁹ [AFB.EFC .28.9 Report-of-the-28th-meeting-of-EFC-1.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#).

²⁰ Mid-term Review of the Adaptation Fund’s Medium-Term Strategy 2018-2022. Accessed from: [Mid-term Review of the Medium-term Strategy of the Adaptation Fund - AF-TERG \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#)

two entities. It has introduced innovation and learning and sharing through established pillars and backed by new funding windows.

- Implementation is not fast enough to achieve some of the ambitious projected targets envisioned in the Implementation Plan and the new windows by the end of the strategic period.
- Innovation has been a new area for the Fund and has taken time to launch. While the need for innovation was clear, it was clearly challenging for the Fund (and the climate change adaptation community generally) to define “innovative.” Responding to this challenge, the Board set up an innovation task force in 2019 and established the definition and working vision of innovation in the context of adaptation.
- While the strategy has been used effectively to guide governance, management, and other funding decisions that lever impact for the Fund, it could be used more effectively to optimize the Fund’s impact. The output-oriented Implementation Plan did not fully harness the ambition and potential envisaged by the MTS.
- While the strategy has set the Fund on the right track, there is opportunity to take it further. There are opportunities to use the strategy better to move closer to the ambitions of the MTS and take bolder, more decisive action for the next one, and beyond.

20. With these findings, the MTR put forward recommendations for the current strategic period (i.e., 2018-2022) and for the next MTS. These recommendations were intended to accelerate and enhance the quality of adaptation action, and to optimize the design of the MTS1 and its Implementation Plan.

21. The AFB Secretariat presented at the thirty-seventh meeting of the Board (October 2021) an initial management response to the MTR of the MTS1 of the Fund as contained in document AFB/EFC.28/6.²¹ The initial response considered by the Board outlined the extent to which the AFB Secretariat agrees or disagrees with the report, provided an update on actions already being undertaken to address some of the recommendations, and included an annex with specific responses to the findings.

22. The AFB Secretariat submitted an update to the initial management response,²² reflecting the views expressed by the EFC at its twenty-eighth meeting (October 2021) on the findings and recommendations set out in the MTR report.²³ In addition, the updated management response included an action plan for the implementation of proposed recommendations of the MTR as approved by the Board.

2.5. The Fund’s Medium-term Strategy 2023-2027

23. Through Decision B.37/38 (March 2022), the Board requested the AFB Secretariat to develop a second medium term strategy for the period 2023 to 2027 (MTS2). To this end, the AF Board established a task force to guide the work of the AFB Secretariat, composed of three members from Annex 1 countries and three members non-Annex I countries elected intersessionally. The AF Board considered the final draft strategy at its thirty-ninth meeting (October 2022). Consistent with the

²¹ [AFB.EFC_28.6_Mgt_response_MTR_MTS_final_9302021.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#).

²² [MTR_MTS_Updated_management_response_action-plan.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#).

²³ See para. 45 under Agenda 6 in [AFB.EFC_28.9_Report-of-the-28th-meeting-of-EFC-1.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#)/



recommendations of the MTR of the MTS1 (see also discussion under Section 2.4), the AF Board decided that the development of the MTS2 would include open and inclusive consultations of the Fund's stakeholders such as the Board, contributor and recipient governments, accredited entities, civil society organization network and other civil society representatives, as well as other stakeholders.²⁴

24. Through Decision B.39/61 (October 2022), the AF Board decided to adopt the MTS2.²⁵ In the same decision, the AF Board also requested the AFB Secretariat to prepare, under the guidance of the MTS 2023-2027 task force, a draft Implementation Plan²⁶ for the MTS2.
25. The MTS2 and its Implementation Plan build on the Fund's experience implementing the MTS1. The MTS2 aims to further consolidate the Fund's comparative advantage and optimize its impact through the three strategic pillars of financing adaptation action, innovation, and learning and sharing.
26. Under the MTS2, a cross-cutting strategic emphasis on promoting locally based and locally led adaptation were introduced while increasing the Fund's ambition under the strategic pillars and strengthening the linkage and synergies between them and scaling up funded activities and results.²⁷
27. The MTS2 continues its focus from the MTS1 on the three strategic pillars: action, innovation, and learning and sharing.
 - **Action** - Developing countries are supported in undertaking and accelerating high quality, local level and scalable adaptation projects and programmes that are aligned with their national adaptation strategies and processes. The Action Pillar builds on the Fund's well-recognized niche of supporting smaller-size (typically up to US\$10 million), country-driven adaptation projects/programmes consistent with national adaptation planning processes and producing concrete and tangible results for the most vulnerable communities.
 - **Innovation** - Modalities for funding the development and diffusion of innovative adaptation practices, tools and technologies expanded, risk-taking encouraged, and linkages to learning strengthened.
 - **Learning and sharing:** Knowledge and evidence, including local and indigenous knowledge, on effective and innovative adaptation action and finance is generated and disseminated with various stakeholders for application.
28. Six cross-cutting themes underlie all Fund activities and processes:
 - Promote locally based or locally led adaptation;
 - Enhance access to climate finance and long-term institutional capacity;
 - Empower and benefit the most vulnerable people and communities as agents of change;
 - Advance gender equality;
 - Enable the scaling and replication of results; and

²⁴ [AFB Decision-B.37-38.1-Addendum to the report of- the Board to CMP 16 CMA 3.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#)

²⁵ [Medium-Term-Strategy-2023-2027.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#)

²⁶ [AFB.B.40.5.Rev .1 Draft MTS Implementation -Plan.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#)

²⁷ p.5, [Medium-Term Strategy 2023–2027 - Adaptation Fund \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#)

- Strengthen complementarity, coherence, and synergies with other adaptation funders and actors.
29. The Implementation Plan for the MTS2 outlines proposed activities over the five-year period for the Fund to achieve outcomes, outputs, and expected results. It organizes activities primarily along the three strategic pillars of the MTS2, including activities to enhance the linkages and synergies between them, and includes narratives for the six cross-cutting areas.²⁸
30. The Implementation Plan further states that the Fund’s unique role within the global response to climate change is informed by guidance from Parties and feedback from the Fund’s various stakeholders during the consultation process. This role is reflected in the Fund’s mission to serve the Paris Agreement by accelerating effective adaptation action and efficient access to finance, including through direct access, to respond to the urgent needs and priorities of developing countries. The three pillars and six cross-cutting themes of the MTS2 breaks down how the Fund will serve and strengthen this role. Hence, the pillars and cross-cutting areas are expected to facilitate the Fund’s fulfilment of its mission, vision, and goal as set out in the MTS2’s theory of change.

2.6. The Second Comprehensive Evaluation of the Fund

31. Through decision B.39/57 (October 2022), 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’)²⁹ based on which the Board decided to take a phased approach.
32. 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-FY23³⁰ and FY25-FY27³¹, respectively) and the AFB Secretariat knowledge products.³² This MTR of MTS2 will provide critical inputs to the Comprehensive Evaluation.
33. The Comprehensive Evaluation will focus on the overall achievements of the Fund since the completion of the last 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.
34. The Comprehensive Evaluation should ultimately inform the Fund’s future directions, operations, and decision-making in the coming years. In particular, it will inform the preparation of the MTS3 (2028-2032) and will also be used to inform reporting within the Fund and to the UNFCCC. It should offer

²⁸ [AFB.B.40.5.Rev .1 Draft MTS Implementation -Plan.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#)

²⁹ 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

³⁰ [AF-TERG-Strategy-and-Work-Programme-final.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#).

³¹ [AFB-EFC.33-6-AF-TERG-Second-multiyear-work-programme.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#).

³² [Knowledge & Learning - Adaptation Fund \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#).

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 an adaptive management and learning across all Fund stakeholders. The objective of the Comprehensive Evaluation is to 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.

3. Objectives of the MTR of MTS2

35. The main objective of this MTR is to assess progress of the Adaptation Fund towards the MTS2 and its Implementation Plan in a dynamic climate change context. The MTR also has a secondary objective of identifying lessons from the implementation of the MTS2 that can inform the remainder of its implementation.
36. The MTR of MTS2 is time critical and will be used for the following purposes:
- (a) To provide critical inputs to the independent Comprehensive Evaluation of the Fund, as commissioned by the AF-TERG, which is expected to be completed by October 2026.³³
 - (b) To provide strategic learnings and recommendations that can inform adaptive management by the Fund, and its stakeholders during the implementation of the MTS2.
37. The Evaluation Policy³⁴ should be applied to all evaluations conducted by the Fund and should inform amongst others, the evaluation design, evaluation processes, and communication and utilization of evaluative products. Therefore, the MTR of MTS2 will be consistent with the Fund's Evaluation Policy,³⁵ including the application of its seven evaluation principles (i.e., relevance and utility, credibility and robustness, transparency, impartiality and objectivity, equitable and gender-sensitive inclusivity, complementarity, and complexity-sensitive and adaptive), evaluation criteria (i.e., relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, equity, adaptive management, scalability, and human and ecological sustainability and security), and 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 MTR.
38. The vendor is expected to provide impartial, rigorous and independent advice to the AF-TERG in developing the MTR. 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 draft 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.

³³ While the MTR of MTS2 is a critical input to the Comprehensive Evaluation, it is worth noting that other studies and knowledge products commissioned by the AF-TERG and the AFB Secretariat will also inform the Comprehensive Evaluation.

³⁴ [New-Design-Evaluation-Policy.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#)

³⁵ [New-Design-Evaluation-Policy.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](#)

39. The primary audience of the MTR includes the Board, the AFB Secretariat, and the Accreditation Panel. Other users may include the Fund's contributors, its implementing and executing entities, civil society groups, donors, and other multilateral climate funds as well as the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement in its regular review process of the AF.
40. The Fund has many stakeholders, and they should be consulted on the work of the Fund and their experience with it. The stakeholders include: 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.

4. MTR Questions

41. The MTR of MTS2 will focus on assessing the Fund's strategy – the pillars and cross-cutting areas as strategic directions to the Fund, the funding windows, accreditation, scaling, and innovation as well as how the MTS2 supports the Fund's niche and strengths. It will focus on the processes and results related to the development and implementation of the MTS2 and its Implementation Plan.
42. The **MTR of MTS2 has four overarching review questions**, which will be discussed and finalized during the inception phase including any supporting sub-questions as necessary:
 - i. What additional lessons can be learned from the Fund's implementation of the management response to the MTR of MTS1?
 - 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 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?

Assessment levels

43. The four review questions will likely require an assessment at three levels, macro, meso, and micro. The review team should refer to the Rapid Evaluation³⁶ to see the relevance of this framing to the MTR and coordinate with the Comprehensive Evaluation team for alignment.
 - Macro level relates to the Fund's goals and performance (e.g., Q3)
 - Meso level focuses on the implementation of the Fund's strategies, policies, and implementation at the country and implementing entities levels (e.g., Q1, Q2)
 - Micro level considers results of projects/programmes (e.g., Q4)

Additional information on the MTR questions

³⁶ Rapid Evaluation of the Adaptation Fund. Accessed from: [AFB.EFC_.32.6.Rev_.1 Rapid-evaluation.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](https://www.adaptation-fund.org/AFB.EFC_.32.6.Rev_.1_Rapid-evaluation.pdf).



MTR Question 1: What additional lessons can be learned from the Fund's implementation of the management response to the MTR of MTS1?

44. The MTR of MTS1 yielded lessons for the strategic period that the MTS1 covered and the succeeding MTS (i.e., MTS2). This MTR will seek to generate additional lessons from the implementation of the management response to the MTR of MTS1. Relevant sub-questions may include (but not limited to) the following:

- i. Are there any additional lessons from good practice in the field of organizational strategy that can be generated from the implementation of MTS1 in the entire strategic period that it covered?

MTR Question 2: To what extent is the MTS2 and its Implementation Plan supportive of the goal of the Adaptation Fund? How useful and effective is the MTS2 and its Implementation Plan as a strategic management tool?

45. The MTR will examine the extent to which the MTS2 supports the Fund in fulfilling its goal, which is informed by the Paris Agreement and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The Fund's goal is specifically "People, livelihoods and ecosystems are adequately protected from the adverse impacts of climate change with their adaptive capacity enhanced, resilience strengthened and the vulnerability of people, livelihoods and ecosystems to climate change reduced in the context of climate-resilient and sustainable development".³⁷ Relevant sub-questions may include (but not limited to) the following:

- i. Does the MTS2 contain the elements of what a good organizational strategy should have – for example, clarity of priorities, flexibility, enabling choices, consideration of context, etc.- so that it can support the Fund's overall goal?
- ii. How aligned is the MTS2 with the Fund's mandate, Board decisions, other relevant international agreements and supporting countries in achieving their SDGs?
- iii. How does the Adaptation Fund define and measure 'adequate protection' of people, livelihoods, and ecosystems from adverse impacts of climate change? How is this definition embodied in the strategy and how is it used in practice to decide funding approvals?
- iv. How does the strategy and its Implementation Plan influence the AF actions, portfolio, and results? How and to what extent does the AF Board and AFB Secretariat use the MTS2 for decision-making?
- v. Has the MTS2 had any impact on the quality and quantity of the concrete adaptation projects the Fund has so far supported? Is there a difference between the portfolio of projects approved under MTS1 and MTS2 in terms of quality and quantity? If there is, what are the strategy-specific drivers that led to these differences?

MTR Question 3: To what extent and how did the MTS2 and 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 replication and scaling up of adaptation activities?

46. The review will assess the extent to which the Fund's niche and external and internal contextual and organizational factors are driving the strategy and its Implementation Plan, and in essence are

³⁷ p.22, Medium-term Strategy 2023 – 2027. [Medium-Term-Strategy-2023-2027.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](https://www.adaptation-fund.org/medium-term-strategy-2023-2027.pdf)

affecting the Fund's effectiveness. Some specific sub-questions to address the review question include but are not limited to:

- i. How has the adaptation finance landscape evolved through time? How does the Adaptation Fund fit within this landscape and compared with the other climate funds?
- ii. Does the MTS2 help position the Fund within the evolving climate finance environment by helping it to play to its comparative advantages and niche? Does the Implementation Plan support the Fund to undertake concrete actions that reinforce its position within this evolving environment?
- iii. How does the MTS2 and its Implementation Plan inform the Fund's decision on the balance between scaling and piloting?
- iv. To what extent has the Fund considered the consolidation and optimization of the aspects of the Fund's niche notwithstanding resource uncertainty (i.e., as a Fund that provides quick and direct financing; creates new solutions built on what works; supports innovative solutions with higher risk; complements others through catalytic financing; and brings needed new players into the climate change adaptation space)?
- v. How does the strategy and its Implementation Plan enable the Fund to maximize its impact? Has it influenced the Fund in focusing its support to conditions that are key to accelerate effective adaptation action and align with the Fund's mandate advantage compared to other climate finance delivery channels?

MTR Question 4: 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?

47. The MTR will assess the activities, outputs, and where possible, outcomes set out in the Implementation Plan per pillar, across pillars (i.e., linkages and synergies), and cross-cutting themes.

48. The Implementation Plan is organized according to the pillars and cross-cutting themes and therefore presents a framework for assessing the progress in implementing MTS2. Some specific sub-questions to address the review question include but are not limited to:

- i. Does the Implementation Plan allow for the tracking and measurement of the Fund's achievements under MTS through specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound indicators and realistic targets?
- ii. What has been the progress and challenges in achieving the key indicators and targets set out in the Implementation Plan?
- iii. What has been the progress under the pillars and cross cutting priorities during the strategic period?
 - a. Were the rate and volume of approvals under the single-country and regional concrete adaptation project/programme windows complemented with efforts under the EDA window? How did the approvals and window activities catch up given the delays in previous strategic period? Note that the EDA window only opened in 2020, two years late compared to the indicative general timeline of the Implementation Plan.
 - b. How and to what extent has the EDA modality helped strengthen the capacity and meet the needs of the most vulnerable?
 - c. Have the AFB Secretariat's knowledge products helped translate stakeholder interest to actual grant applications and Board approvals?



- d. Has there been sufficient clarity on the innovation element of the applications under the three innovation funding windows?
- e. Does the Fund have appropriate and adequate capacity and tools to advance the cross-cutting priorities?
- iv. How have the Fund's funding windows, and other support options been adjusted to respond to local needs? To what extent have these adjustments contributed to adaptation effectiveness?
- v. What are the LLA-specific considerations in the Fund's project approval processes beyond the ESP/safeguards?
- vi. What have been the bottlenecks and lessons from the funding windows?
- vii. To what extent has the enabling organizational systems³⁸ as set out in the Implementation Plan enable the MTS2 implementation and achievement of results?

5. Scope of the MTR of MTS2

49. The MTR of MTS2 will cover the MTS2 strategic period starting from 2023 and up to a pre-defined cut-off date. (The cut-off will be defined during the review inception). The MTS1 strategic period (2018-2022) will be considered only for questions related to the identification of lessons from its implementation.

6. MTR Approach and Methods

50. The MTR of MTS2 is a strategic-level evaluation with a formative approach, meaning that the results achieved from its implementation are likely to be emergent and the processes are ongoing. Nevertheless, the focus of the MTR2 is on examining whether the MTS2 is supporting the niche and mandate of the Fund, as a strategic and management tool and on the progress so far in its Implementation Plan including in the likelihood of achieving the targets.

6.1. MTR Approach

51. Bidders are encouraged to propose efficient, effective, and where possible, innovative approaches. The MTR 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 MTR approach should be consultative. Two types of consultations are required from the MTR team: (1) consultations with key stakeholders to collect data; and (2) consultations for validation and feedback on findings, lessons and recommendations with the AF-TERG and AFB Secretariat. 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 proposal should identify the key stakeholders and then detail how, when, and with whom

³⁸ These systems include (i) finance, (ii) internal processes and systems, (iii) external partnerships and relationships, and (iv) keeping the MTS2 and Implementation Plan up to date.

consultations will be undertaken throughout the evaluation process. The details will be firmed up during inception stage.

6.2. MTR Methods

53. To be robust and consistent with the requirements of the Fund's Evaluation Policy, the review questions will require a mixed methods approach. It will include a combination of data collection and analytical methods of quantitative and qualitative nature. To ensure the credibility and robustness of the MTR, both primary and secondary data will be collected and used and should be complemented with other suitable forms of strengthening the evidence base. It is anticipated that the MTR will at a minimum undertake:

(i) **Semi-structured interviews**

54. The MTR will undertake semi-structured interviews with individuals or groups considered as key stakeholders to the Fund such as the AFB Secretariat, AF Board, IEs, and country representatives.

(ii) **Group discussions**

55. The MTR may organize group discussions if bringing together different types of stakeholders (e.g., to test if there is consensus on the Fund's comparative advantages and niche) is desirable.

(iii) **Desk-based review**

56. Desk-based review will enable the MTR team to familiarize themselves with the documents and data available (or not) for the review. Some examples of desk-based exercises include the timelines for the evolution of the climate finance architecture, mapping the development process and progress in implementing MTS2, the changes/course corrections since MTS1, and identifying lessons from the implementation of MTS1; and

(iv) **Where relevant, the MTR may include selective case studies**

57. Case studies may be used for instance, to highlight key findings on notable lessons from MTS1 and achievements and lessons related to MTS2. The MTR team should explore how the cross-cutting themes or funding windows³⁹ could serve as a starting point or an organizing framework for the case studies. For example, the MTR can test the efficiency and effectiveness of establishing new funding windows; how the funding windows led or are leading the Fund to test, replicate, and learn across the portfolio; and generate relevant lessons from this. The MTR team shall explore such possibilities during the review inception considering data availability.

58. If proposing a methodology that includes field visits, bidders should justify what value they will add in answering the review questions and how - the MTR team will agree with AF-TERG the selection process to identify the countries to be visited during inception. If so agreed with AF-TERG, a clear selection methodology including the set of criteria for selection and the types of stakeholders to be consulted in country will be prepared as part of the inception report.

6.3. Data collection

59. The data collection activities for the MTR will include the extensive use of secondary information from completed and ongoing AF-TERG evaluations, AFB Secretariat data, documents and knowledge

³⁹ See for instance [All-AF-Funding-Windows-Graphic.pdf \(adaptation-fund.org\)](https://www.adaptation-fund.org/all-af-funding-windows-graphic.pdf).

products, and other external sources; and primary data/information such as those from interviews. 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.

(i) Secondary data sources

60. The MTR team shall continuously work with the AF-TERG Secretariat in identifying and collecting various data sources from the inception phase and throughout the implementation phase. Internal AF data sources include but are not limited to the MTS1 and its Implementation Plan, the MTR of MTS1, the MTS2 and its Implementation Plan, various AF-TERG evaluation products such as the Rapid Evaluation and Thematic Evaluations (innovation, scaling, readiness), AF knowledge products, Board minutes and video recordings, internal monitoring data for MTS1 and MTS2 Implementation Plans, project portfolio information, and other information on the application and use of funding windows. Note that the AF-TERG's thematic evaluations will be particularly relevant as they have also addressed some of the questions of interest under this MTR of MTS2.
61. External sources such as the Adaptation Gap Report, grey and published literature, and other climate funds' evaluations should also be considered if relevant.

(ii) Primary data sources

62. Primary data and information will be generated through interviews and multi-stakeholder group discussions either remotely or during the field verifications. The review 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 team should swiftly speak to the AF-TERG focal point and AF-TERG Secretariat to schedule these further consultations.

6.4. Data analysis

63. The MTR team will analyse the data and information collected and triangulate findings using various data sources. Analytical techniques could include desk-based content and thematic analyses, descriptive statistics including trend analysis, comparative analysis, process analysis, and others as may be applicable to respond to the review questions.
64. It is recommended that the MTR 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 MTR team should explore how such analysis would be undertaken and presented.
65. For quantitative data, it may be sufficient to use Excel for disaggregation and analysis and to generate tables and graphs. The MTR team will need to ascertain during inception the extent to which actual reported results can be used as opposed to expected results/targets.

6.5. Data management.

66. 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.

6.6. Evaluation Matrix

67. The MTR team should produce a draft evaluation matrix as part of the proposal, and which will be finalized in the inception phase. The evaluation matrix will contain the final set of review questions and sub-questions, judgement indicators for each question, data sources, data collection methods, and analytical techniques. The matrix will highlight the questions and sub-questions where evidence has been assessed (ex-ante) to be weak, adequate, or strong. It should also demonstrate how the review will triangulate evidence.

7. Limitations and challenges

68. The complexity of stakeholders and stakeholder engagement will present a challenge to the MTR. The large number of stakeholders to be consulted to ensure that the MTR 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 MTR.
69. In addition, the MTR will involve coordination work with the AF-TERG and AFB Secretariat to understand their work and collect evidence and information.
70. Where new and unforeseen challenges are encountered in accessing the required data and information or if there are any risks of slippage, the MTR team should promptly communicate and discuss potential solutions and/or impact to AF-TERG. However, it is expected that the MTR team have properly understood the data limitations during the inception phase and that the review approach and methods have been designed in a way that also provides a solution to these constraints. The AF-TERG Secretariat and 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.
71. Bidders should present in the proposal a risk and mitigation table that would indicate how these and other limitations and challenges will be addressed. Limitations and challenges will also be included in the inception report and the final report.

8. Quality assurance

72. Proposals should set out a robust quality assurance system for the entirety of the MTR, 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, MTR 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 MTR questions. For this, training for both central and local teams (if any) on the use of the data collection protocols should be considered.

9. MTR phases and deliverables

73. The MTR will be organized in three phases:

- Phase 1: Review inception
- Phase 2: Review implementation
- Phase 3: Drafting the MTR Report, and Validation
- Phase 4: Final communication and dissemination

9.1. Phase 1: Review Inception (November 2024 –January 2025)

Deliverable	Key dates
• Draft Inception Report	December 2024
• Final Inception Report	January 2025

74. The phase will commence with a virtual kick-off meeting between the MTR team and the AF-TERG. 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 will be scheduled to cover in more detail the emergent and the final MTR design, evaluation matrix, and MTR data collection plan. These meetings will ensure a shared vision and understanding between the MTR team and the AF-TERG as the approach and MTR plan are being designed and finalized. Additionally, the evaluation team will have an initial engagement with the AFB Secretariat during this phase to consult on the evaluation questions and the timelines.

75. Amongst the activities to be undertaken under this phase include the following: (i) review of available internal and external documents and sources of information; (ii) identification of information and data gaps; (iii) gaining a comprehensive understanding of the relevant contextual factors and Fund processes and activities that the MTR will cover, (iv) undertaking relevant stakeholder consultations, as agreed in advance with the AF-TERG focal point and AF-TERG Secretariat Coordinator; (v) producing the inception report (details of the content below); and (vi) preparing to launch the next phases of the review immediately after the conclusion of the inception phase.

76. The inception phase will ultimately produce the detailed approach for the MTR. Specifically, the inception report shall at a minimum include the following:

- background and context to the MTR,
- preliminary findings from contextual review surrounding climate change adaptation and finance,
- preliminary assessment of the MTS2 theory of change as a tool for assessing the quality of the strategy and Implementation Plan,
- preliminary portfolio mapping and analysis to gauge the extent to which this data source is sufficient in addressing the MTR questions,
- overall MTR design (approach and methods) and associated opportunities and constraints,
- communication, consultations at two levels including the AF-TERG and the AF Board throughout the review period and other stakeholders as part of data collection, and linkages with the CE and other AF-TERG work programme,
- ethical considerations,
- an evaluation matrix (with the review questions sub-questions as may be relevant and agreed during the inception, judgement indicators, data sources, data collection methods, and analytical techniques),



- quality assurance system for data collection, data analysis, and reports,
- consultation touchpoints with the AF-TERG, AF Board, the AFB Secretariat, and with the Comprehensive Evaluation team and relevant AF-TERG focal person throughout the MTR,
- communication and dissemination plan,
- a detailed work plan,
- a clear division of labour amongst the MTR team, and
- draft data collection protocols.

9.2. Phase 2: Review Implementation (February 2025 – May 2025)

Deliverables	Key dates
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1 EFC brief• Preliminary findings for discussion first with AF-TERG and then with AFB Secretariat representatives	<p>March 2025</p> <p>March 2025 and May 2025 respectively</p>

77. The implementation phase of the MTR is comprised of two main activities- data collection and data analysis. The data collection and analytical activities will be undertaken between February 2025 and May 2025. The MTR team should design the implementation phase in a way that allows for additional, follow-up data collection and validation to address the gaps identified during the analytical process.
78. The MTR team is expected to launch and mobilise for both remote and field data collection (if any) straight after the conclusion of the inception phase. The data collection will be guided by the approved evaluation matrix in the Inception Report. The implementation phase will also include generation of preliminary findings as they become available so the AF-TERG, 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 March 2025 and May 2025. Note again that any report and its content will be agreed with the AF-TERG, since the final product is an AF-TERG report.
79. During the entire implementation phase, the MTR team shall keep the AF-TERG abreast of how the MTR is progressing by having regular consultations with the AF-TERG focal point and Chair, for instance, to discuss ongoing analysis, emerging issues or challenges, before a deliverable is finalized. In addition, the MTR 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.
80. The team will communicate regularly with the Comprehensive Evaluation consulting team and the AF-TERG Comprehensive Evaluation focal point for alignment purposes.

9.3. Phase 3: MTR Report drafting (July 2025 – November 2025)

Deliverables	Key dates
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1 EFC Brief• Draft MTR Report	<p>September 2025</p> <p>September 2025</p>

• Final MTR Report	November 2025
--------------------	---------------

81. A draft report will be prepared for discussion and agreement with the AF-TERG in September 2025 and then shared for feedback and validation to the AFB Secretariat in early October 2025. The final report will incorporate comments from the AF-TERG and AFB Secretariat and be ready by end November 2025. The AFB Secretariat will prepare at this point a management response that will accompany the final report to the EFC by end of December 2025/early January 2026.

9.4. Phase 4: Final communication and dissemination

Deliverables	Key dates
Draft PowerPoint presentation for the EFC	Early March 2026 (TBC)
Dissemination and communication products	End of March 2026 (TBC)

82. Once the MTR report has been finalized, the MTR 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).

10. Qualifications and experience

83. The MTR requires a multidisciplinary team of experts. It is essential that the team has strong experience in assessing organizational strategies and conducting corporate evaluations for multilateral institutions and/or multilateral climate funds. The team should already have a good baseline knowledge of climate finance architecture in general and adaptation finance specifically.

84. The MTR 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 MTR team should be well resourced to ensure that the concurrent implementation activities can be completed on time and at the required standard. Field visits, if any, are expected to be undertaken by locally based consultants.

Qualifications of the firm

- 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.
- The firm should also have an extensive network of qualified consultants to be able to tap into when necessary on specific topics.

Essential qualifications of the team

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) Strong and proven experience developing (or assisting) corporate/organizational strategies. Experience working with climate funds is an advantage.
- (c) Minimum of 15 years of experience in leading and implementing mixed method evaluations or external reviews at the corporate level.
- (d) Proven capacity to dynamically lead a team of multidisciplinary, multicultural evaluation team that are based in different geographic locations and to effectively engage diverse stakeholders.
- (e) Ability to communicate complex technical detail with clarity, and ability to identify and focus on the key messages among competing detail.

Team members

- (a) Strong expertise and demonstrable experience in organisational and strategy assessments especially of multilateral institutions and/or multilateral climate funds.
- (b) Strong knowledge of multilateral climate funds and the broader climate funds architecture.
- (c) Strong expertise and demonstrable experience in climate change adaptation evaluations, with a wide geographic and contextual coverage with a focus in developing countries.
- (d) 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.
- (e) Demonstrable experience delivering successful utilisation-focussed and participatory evaluations.
- (f) Experience working and/or located in non-Annex 1 countries, recipients of AF projects.
- (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 funding mobilisation and 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.

11. Arrangements

Roles and responsibilities

85. The AF-TERG is the commissioner, on behalf of the Board, and the owner of the MTR process and its final report. An 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 be provide feedback, comments and final clearance for all deliverables, following consultations with the AF-TERG Chair and members, and with the AFB Secretariat, as necessary.
86. Support in organizing the meetings and contacting the relevant stakeholders will be provided during the duration of the assignment.
87. 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.
88. 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.

Location

89. The MTR will be largely home-based and could potentially include field-based work. The evaluation team is expected to work during EST time zone office hours as needed.

Travel

90. 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

91. All contracts with the Adaptation Fund are World Bank contracts and follow the relevant rules and regulations of the Bank.
92. 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 and other rules.