

Terms of Reference

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



Technical Evaluation
Reference Group
ADAPTATION FUND



ADAPTATION FUND

Ex post evaluations in Argentina

Contents

1.1. Background.....	1
1.1.1. Adaptation Fund governance	2
1.1.2. Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaption Fund (AF-TERG).....	2
1.1.3. Ex post evaluation background.....	3
1.1.4. The next two ex post evaluations	6
1.2. Scope of Work	8
1.2.1. Tasks.....	8
1.2.2. Additional information	9
1.3. Deliverables	10
1.4. Schedule	11
Annex A: Specific requirements for the consultant(s).....	13
Annex B: Detailed Scope of Work.....	14
Evaluation Objectives	14
Evaluation Questions	14
Methods options for ex post evaluations.....	19
Annex C: Work Principles.....	20
Annex D: Final evaluation summary report outline	21

1. Project Objectives

1.1. Background

The Adaptation Fund 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 Katowice Climate Conference in December 2018, the Parties to the Paris Agreement decided that the Adaptation Fund shall also serve the Paris Agreement.

The Fund supports country-driven projects and programmes, innovation and global learning for effective adaptation. 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. www.adaptation-fund.org

1.1.1. Adaptation Fund governance

The Fund provides climate finance to developing countries who are Parties to the Kyoto Protocol.

The Fund is supervised and managed by the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board), which is accountable to CMP [and CMA]. 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. The PPRC is responsible for assisting the Board with assessing project and programme proposals submitted to the Board and review project and programme performance reports. An Accreditation Panel (AP) has been established to ensure that organizations receiving Fund money meet the fiduciary standards. The AP provides recommendations to the Board regarding the accreditation of new IEs and the suspension, cancellation or re-accreditation of entities already accredited.

The World Bank serves as an interim trustee of the Fund. The Global Environment Facility (GEF), through a team of dedicated officials, provides secretariat services to the Board. The Board Secretariat manages the day-to-day operations of the Adaptation Fund such as research, advisory and administrative services.

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

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. From October 2023 onwards, the AF-TERG will be responsible for the implementation of the new Evaluation Policy (EP) of the Adaptation Fund.

The AF-TERG, which is headed by a chair, provides an evaluative advisory role through performing evaluative, advisory and oversight functions. The group is comprised of independent experts in evaluation, called the AF-TERG members. A small secretariat provides support for the implementation of evaluative and advisory activities as part of the work programme.

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. www.adaptation-fund.org/about/evaluation/

1.1.3. Ex post evaluation background

At the nineteenth meeting (October 2016), the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) of the Board discussed the importance of the follow-up of projects and programmes once they have been completed, including their post-implementation evaluation. Based on the above discussion, The Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) decided to:

[...]

Recommend that the Adaptation Fund Board request the secretariat to propose, at the 20th meeting of the PPRC options for how post-implementation learning and impact evaluation could be arranged for Adaptation Fund projects and programmes, taking into account on-going discussions on the evaluation function of the Fund.

(Recommendation PPRC.19/32, October 2016)

Having considered the comments, recommendation and discussions of the PPRC during the meeting, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to request the secretariat to:

[....]

Propose, at the twentieth meeting of the PPRC, options for how post-implementation learning and impact evaluation could be arranged for Adaptation Fund projects and programmes, taking into account ongoing discussions on the evaluation function of the Adaptation Fund, as well as Phase II of the evaluation.

(Decision B.28/32, October 2016)

Pursuant to the PPRC discussion and Board Decision B.28/32, the Secretariat developed a document, which presented three options for how ex post evaluations of Adaptation Fund projects and programmes could be arranged. The three options presented in document were as follows:

- I. The Evaluation Function of the Adaptation Fund would conduct the ex-post assessments.*
- II. The ex-post evaluation would be conducted by independent evaluators but selected by the Implementing Entity (IE).*
- III. An external third party selected by the Adaptation Fund could perform the ex-post evaluation.*

At the twentieth meeting, the PPRC reviewed the options prepared by the secretariat presented in the document AFB/PPRC.20/30, to arrange post-implementation learning and impact evaluations of Adaptation Fund projects and programmes. Based on the recommendation of the PPRC, the Board – at its twenty-ninth meeting (March 2017) – decided to request the secretariat:

(i) To undertake a revised analysis of the implications of options one and three for the ex-post assessment or evaluations of completed projects/programmes, as contained in document AFB/PPRC.20/30, taking into account:

- a) The cost-effectiveness of the two options; and*
- b) The discussions during the twentieth and twenty-first meetings of the Ethics and Finance Committee on the evaluation function of the Adaptation Fund; and*

(ii) To present the revised analysis to the Project and Programme Review Committee for its consideration at its twenty-second meeting.

(Decision B.29/29, March 2017)

At the twenty second meeting of the PPRC (March 2018), the secretariat presented a document showing the cost-effectiveness of the above two options and, budget implications for ex post evaluations included in the indicative three-year evaluation work programme of the Evaluation Framework of the Adaptation Fund (the Fund). Furthermore, the document also presented the revised analysis of the two options, with consideration to the Adaptation Fund Board decision to:

[...]

Approve the option of re-establishing a long-term evaluation function for the Adaptation Fund through a Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG), as described in documents AFB/EFC.20/3 and AFB/EFC.21/4

(Decision B.30/38, March 2018)

Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) regarding the two options described in document AFB/PPRC.22/26 for conducting ex post evaluations of completed Adaptation Fund projects and programmes, the Board decided:

- a) To convey the assessment of the two options to the Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund (AF-TERG), once it is operational, which will subsequently report to the Board on its preferred option; and*
- b) To request the AF-TERG to take into account the above discussion in the PPRC.*

(Decision B.31/24, March 2018)

The discussion is recapped in document AFB/PPRC.22/27, the Report of the twenty second meeting of the PPRC. One of the elements being that as the AF-TERG would be evaluating projects and programmes (at portfolio level) it should report to the PPRC in addition to the EFC. That part of the recommendation was not taken over by the Board in its decision, but is noteworthy.

At its thirtieth meeting the Board decided:

- a) To approve the option of re-establishing a long-term evaluation function for the Adaptation Fund through a Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG), as described in documents AFB/EFC.20/3 and AFB/EFC.21/4;*

[...]

(Decision B.30/38, October 2017)

To implement the decision above, the secretariat drafted the Terms of Reference of the TERG and shared them with the GEF-IEO and the secretariat of the Global Fund's Technical Evaluation Reference Group, for their inputs and advice.

Having considered the comments and recommendation of the EFC, the Board decided at its thirty-first meeting in March 2018:

a) To approve the terms of reference of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund (AF-TERG) as contained in Annex III to the report of the Board (AFB/B.31/8);

b) To approve the amendment to the terms of reference of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) as contained in Annex IV to the report of the Board (AFB/B.31/8);

c) To establish the AF-TERG Recruitment Working Group composed of the following Board members and alternates: Mr. Ibila Djibril (Benin, Africa), Mr. Marc-Antoine Martin (France, Annex I Parties), Ms. Barbara Schäfer (Germany, Annex I Parties) and Ms. Margarita Caso (Mexico, Non-Annex I Parties); and

d) To request the AF-TERG Recruitment Working Group, with the support of the secretariat, to undertake the necessary arrangements for the recruitment of the AF-TERG chair and four members intersessionally between the thirty-first and thirty-second meetings of the Board and to report back to the EFC at its twenty-third meeting.

(Decision B.31/25, March 2018)

On February 24, 2019, inter-sessional decision B.32-33/15 resulted in the appointment of the first Chair of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund (AF-TERG).

(Decision B.32-33/15)

At the thirty-fourth Board meeting (October 2019) the manager reported - as noted in meeting report AFB/B.34/20 - that the AF-TERG had completed the selection process for four members and had held their first in-person meeting with the members to discuss the set-up, mandate, communication channels and expectations. Preliminary work had taken place on the AF-TERG work programme, with a focus on evaluative components and products.

A study on approaches to ex post performance evaluations has been carried out during fiscal year 2020 (FY20), to inform the development of the AF-TERG strategy and work programme, and to be foundational to future AF-TERG work on ex post evaluations.

The first AF-TERG strategy and work programme was presented to the Board intersessionally between the first and second parts of its 35th meeting. Having considered the document AFB/EFC.26.a-26.b/3 and the recommendation by the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Board decided to approve the draft strategy and work programme of the AF-TERG contained in Annex 1 of the document AFB/EFC.26.a-26.b/3.

(Decision B.35.a-35.b/29, April 2020)

The AF-TERG work programme^{1 2} states that a draft ex post guide will be elaborated for field testing during fiscal year 2021 (FY21). An AF-TERG information update to the 28th EFC meeting (September 2021) provided an overview of the phased approach and the two projects selected for piloting ex post methods, being:³

- Enhancing Resilience of Samoa's Coastal Communities to Climate Change (Samoa, UNDP)

¹ AF-TERG, 2020. [Strategy and Work Programme of the AF-TERG](#).

² AF-TERG, 2022. [Fiscal Years 2023 – 2024 Update to the Work Programme of the AF-TERG](#).

³ AF-TERG, 2021. [Progress Update on Ex Post Evaluations \(AF-TERG\)](#).

- Enhancing resilience of communities to the adverse effects of climate change on food security, in Pichincha Province and the Jubones River basin (Ecuador, WFP).

The AF-TERG work on ex post follows a multiphase process, including:

- Phase 1 – Methodology (completed): to develop a framework for ex post evaluations and a shortlist of up to five completed projects as pilots for ex post evaluation.
- Phase 2 – Piloting (ongoing): to train evaluators and main project stakeholders on methods, and test guidance and methods from Phase 1 in at least two pilots.
- Phase 3 – Implementation and Learning (planned): to continue ex post evaluations over time, informing approaches, methods, and systems within the Fund.

The three phases built on AF-TERG foundational work (Phase 0) implemented in FY20: an ex post evaluation study and an evaluability assessment of the Fund's portfolio, whose findings were summarized in document AFB/EFC.26.b/Inf.2.⁴

An information update to the 29th EFC meeting (March 2022) provided an update on phase 2 processes and emerging lessons from testing the methodology in Samoa.⁵ An information update to the 30th EFC meeting (October 2022) provided key findings for the Adaptation Fund and implementers of phase 2, including evaluation summaries of the ex post pilots that took place in Samoa and Ecuador.⁶

Each year, the AF-TERG will commission two ex post evaluations of strategically selected projects that have closed 3-5 years before, that would provide learning on climate change actions and accountability of results financed by the Fund.

1.1.4. The next two ex post evaluations

The rationale for ex post evaluations is that the Fund wants to know whether its desired impact is (expected to be) achieved, being aware that adaptation takes time to become evident and often will only be visible years after projects have closed. In terms of addressing the Adaptation Fund's ultimate goal, how are the sustained outcomes enhancing adaptive capacity, strengthening resilience, and reducing the vulnerability of people, livelihoods and ecosystems to climate change? Can the sustained outcomes withstand short and longer-term shocks and stresses, climate and otherwise?

Based on the work conducted by the AF-TERG regarding the review of ex post evaluations methods, the evaluability of Fund supported projects conducted in FY20, the piloting of methods in FY22, the AF-TERG is continuing the work in phase 3, conducting ex post evaluations over time, and related capacity building of evaluators.

These terms of reference relate to this third phase in FY23, for which the tasks are detailed further below.

The ex post framework developed and tested as part of the ex post pilots in Samoa and Ecuador was adjusted after the pilots.⁷ Adjustments to the approach were designed to meet the evaluator where they

⁴ AF-TERG, 2020. [Evaluating Adaptation: Common Challenges Identified Across Three Studies \[AF-TERG\]](#).

⁵ AF-TERG, 2022. [Progress Update on Ex Post Evaluations and Emerging Lessons from Phase 2 \(On-Going\) \[AF-TERG\]](#).

⁶ AF-TERG, 2022. [Information update on phase 2 of the ex post project sustainability evaluations \[AF-TERG\]](#).

⁷ AF-TERG, 2022. [Training material for ex post evaluations \[AF-TERG\]](#).

are in terms of experiences and skillsets. This is done via inception reports informed by training and finalized by discussions of the most fitting and relevant methods. The consultant(s) will apply the methods laid out in the training guide in order to evaluate aspects of sustainability and resilience in **two selected projects in Argentina**, being:

- [Enhancing the Adaptive Capacity and Increasing Resilience of Small-size Agriculture Producers of the Northeast of Argentina](#)
- [Increasing Climate Resilience and Enhancing Sustainable Land Management in the Southwest of the Buenos Aires Province](#)

The specific requirements and desired qualifications for the consultant(s) can be found in Annex A.

With the aim of arriving at a Fund-specific framework for conducting ex post evaluations, the first phase developed innovative methods focusing on aspects of both sustainability of outcomes and climate resilience. The framework developed and ex post evaluations aim to answer the following questions:

- How sustainable have the selected project outcome or outcomes been over time since project completion?
- How and in what ways is/are the sustained project outcome(s) climate-resilient since project completion (and beyond)?

The framework has a project vetting process followed by training. Concepts are transferred to evaluators and IEs via a pre-evaluation process that teaches what sustainability and resilience are, how they can be evaluated and what methods can be used based on the data quality, co-creation priorities, costs, and timelines of the national evaluators and IEs. Given the relative newness of the Adaptation Fund's climate change portfolio and the limited body of work on the ex-post evaluation for adaptation, lessons from these pilots are fed into intermediate learning products plus a toolkit to be shared. The framework strives to consider the characteristics, strengths and weaknesses of the Fund portfolio in order to determine which method for evaluation is more relevant / suitable to evaluate the sustainability and resilience of project outcomes.

The framework also intends to assess climate resilience, bearing in mind that this area is pivotal to climate change adaptation yet has rarely been measured, and much like adaptation, is a subjective and context-specific concept. A resilience analysis tool was developed and covers four resilience analysis components:

- (i) Climate disturbances: The climate shocks and stresses addressed by the sustained outcome(s).
- (ii) Systems and RRT: A typology of resistance-resilience-transformation (RRT) into which the overall project can be mapped based on how the adaptive strategy actions either maintain or change existing systems (their structures and functions).
- (iii) Adaptation: The climate information use and climate vulnerability reduction brought about by the sustained outcome(s)

- (iv) **Resilience Characteristics:** A set of possible characteristics to describe the attributes of the sustained outcome in the context of the larger systems (e.g. diversity, continuity/feedback loops, scale, redundancy, and flexibility).

During the Phase I, a guidance report was developed, which was piloted in Phase 2. Based on the framework for ex post evaluation, this report suggests a subset of evaluation methods depending on the availability and quality of outcome and impact data. The menu of methods has also been expanded and further customized based on the evaluator's understanding and preferences, as well as the particular evaluation priorities. These methods have been expanded, but will be customized based on what the evaluator(s) suggest and the evaluative priorities allow. It also provides a step-by-step approach to identifying elements of climate resilience in sustained project outcomes by applying the resilience analysis tool.

The key stakeholders of the ex post evaluations are on one hand the requestor, being the Board, and on the other hand [the Implementing Entity](#) guiding the implementation of the project as well as the in-country [Designated Authority](#) and AF-TERG peers.

1.2. Scope of Work

1.2.1. Tasks

Following the ex post framework developed and adjusted after the pilots, the consultant(s) will apply the methods laid out in the guide in order to evaluate aspects of sustainability and resilience in **two selected projects**, being:

- [Enhancing the Adaptive Capacity and Increasing Resilience of Small-size Agriculture Producers of the Northeast of Argentina](#)
- [Increasing Climate Resilience and Enhancing Sustainable Land Management in the Southwest of the Buenos Aires Province](#)

When doing so, the consultant will keep a focus on food and nutrition security and gender:

- **Sustainability:** based on provisional research undertaken during phase 1, several methods will be suggested to the consultant in order to assess sustainability of project outcomes. Preliminary analysis of available final evaluation data will shape methods recommendations, and discussions with the evaluator(s) and implementing partner could depart from the methodological approach available in the training and guidance report. First we will examine data available and its robustness; if it's robust enough then mixed methods may be applied, and if not, an array of qualitative options will be considered. Examples of potential methods could be:
 - Where there is robust outcomes data, to use mixed-method Sustained and Emerging Impacts Evaluation methods
 - Where there is an unclear Theory of Change and weak outcomes or only outputs, to use Contribution Analysis or Most Significant Change or Qualitative Comparative Analysis

- Where there is no outcome data, to recreate it through re-call qualitative methods that could include StorySurvey. If there is enough data, randomize with Propensity Score Matching
 - Where contribution could not be traced to the Fund or after the first year(s) of ex post sustainability evaluation, to use Outcome Harvesting
 - Where safety is an issue for data collection, to maybe opt for shortened versions of the above via Rapid Evaluation adaptations.
- **Resilience:** the consultant will apply the resilience analysis tool developed during phase 1 and revised based on piloting experience in phase 2. They will familiarize themselves with the frameworks used for resilience analysis (namely the ‘characteristics of resilience’ and ‘resistance-resilience-transformation’ or R-R-T typology). With the remote guidance of the AF-TERG ex post consultants, the evaluator will apply the framework and assess each of the four resilience analysis components by making use of both resilience analysis tables and evaluation questions available in these TORs and the ex post evaluation guidance report. The resilience work will be based on completion of both initial desk review and additional fieldwork (observation, interviews, focus groups, surveys etc.) and documentation review provided by country counterparts to verify, correct, and update initial analysis.

The detailed scope of work is available in Annex B.

1.2.2. Additional information

Confidentiality and access to information: Data collected under this Statement of Work, including interview data, pictures and data on the ex post methodology are property of the AF-TERG and therefore subject to the World Bank’s [“Access to Information Policy”](#) and [“Data Privacy Policy”](#).

The consultant(s) will protect the confidentiality of any participants, including individuals engaging in the evaluation at all stages. No personally identifiable information will be collected. The consultant will ensure that no data or related documentation collected or compiled under this SoW are distributed for commercial or non-commercial purposes to third parties, nor will they be used by the consultant(s), firm, its staff, or sub-contractors for purposes other than those expressly stated in this SoW, without the prior written approval of the AF-TERG.

All information owned or held by the AF-TERG, including data and other deliverables produced under this SoW is subject to the World Bank Access to Information Policy. The end product produced under this SoW will be made publicly available.

Data formats: The reports should be delivered both in Word and PDF format. Pictures should be delivered in JPEG format. Vector graphics should be delivered both in EPS and SVG format.

Before undertaking the evaluation, the consultant will conduct an initial desk review of project completion report (when available), final evaluation, MTR (mid-term review) and any other progress reports in order to familiarize themselves with the project, its objectives, and accomplishments at completion. The evaluator(s) will draft an inception report based on the first part of the training. The AF

TERG ex post team will review the draft inception report and provide customized methods training and undergo in-depth discussions to help the national evaluator and (N)IE create a final inception report on which basis the pretest and evaluation will be completed. This process will involve a co-creation engagement between the evaluator, the AF TERG ex post team, and key (N)IE stakeholders and partners.

During the evaluation, the consultant will be supported by the AF-TERG ex post consultants and Secretariat. The consultant will also be trained pre-fieldwork and will have regular check-ins with the team leads and consultants. Discussions about the co-creation process and early learning can shape the next steps of the evaluation. Therefore, data need to be shared regularly, along with photographic evidence from the field. Data will be sent in at least weekly to check on quality, and the consultant will receive feedback and/or direction as appropriate.

Given that this ex post framework is still being tested, evaluation methods are likely be revised as needed, as they evolve during and as a result of fieldwork. Feedback provided by the consultant on piloting methods is essential. This assignment draws on both a “mentoring” and collaborative process, from which lessons will be used to improve methods and the ex post framework in the future. The consultant should thus carefully collect and highlight any potential lessons and difficulties encountered while undertaking the evaluation. These lessons could be reported during the regular check-ins with the team or could be the subject of an additional deliverable. The lessons on methods could be as diverse as:

Ex post design:

- Elements that need to be considered as part of future ex post evaluations, and that should be tested or revised
- Lessons about the evaluative process and tools including what needs adapting for further piloting in other sectors or geographies or with more complex projects
- Lessons about evaluating adaptation and resilience of natural systems, including tools to evaluate ex post based on adaptive strategies in the context of specific ecosystems

Dissemination/ MEL Learning:

- Learning from the pilot ex posts including stakeholders about the funding and the project cycle preparedness for sustainability
- Feedback on actual sustainability vis-à-vis projected sustainability ratings
- Feedback on the guidance received for the evaluation, and fitness of process with the AF-TERG principles

Note that the AF-TERG has developed a set of ten work principles to guide the work of the AF-TERG, including the work that it commissions, presented in Annex C. The consultant will ensure that these principles are followed in the processes and products, especially those principles that focus on co-learning and cogeneration of knowledge.

1.3. Deliverables

The consultant will provide final summary reports for the two projects highlighting early signs of resilience and longer-term sustainability in the project post-completion.

Annex D provides the details of the minimum evidence to be featured in the final evaluation summary reports.

Deliverables: There will be eight (8) deliverables for this assignment:

- a) Two draft inception reports (1/2) and two finalized inception reports (3/4) outlining the approaches for the evaluations (one draft and final report per project);
- b) Two draft findings reports (one per project) (5/6) to be issued at the end of fieldwork; and
- c) Two final ex post evaluation summary reports (one per project) (7/8), including;
 - An accompanying brief (1-2 pages) for disseminating key findings among participants / local counterparts, translated to local language(s)
 - A brief presentation summarizing the evaluation summary report for both the (N)IE, Adaptation Fund and wider / external audiences.

Any other material generated or produced (field notes, site photos, etc.) during this consultancy will be delivered to the AF-TERG.

1.4. Schedule

The deliverables are expected to be developed within 3 months as shown in the table below. Payments will be made according to the delivery of the expected products, which will be considered accepted as soon as the AF-TERG's comments are effectively incorporated and approved by the AF-TERG Chair. The reports will be delivered in English.

The order of deliveries may be discussed and eventually amended according to necessary adaptations and in agreement with the contractor(s) and involved.

Description of Deliverables	Quantity	Planned Delivery Date
[Note that the timeframe of deliverables once corporate procurement has indicated the timeframe for the procurement process]	1	
[The fieldwork should take place in May and June, to align with the seasonality of project activities]	1	
[The two final ex post evaluation summary reports should be finished half August 2023, to be in time for delivery to the Board in October 2023]	1	
	1	

	1	
	1	

The following is the suggested payment schedule:

- 20 percent after getting the inception reports approved (10 percent for the two draft inception reports and 10 percent for the two final inception reports);
- 30 percent for delivery of the draft findings reports at the end of the fieldwork (15 percent for each draft findings report);
- 50 percent for delivery of the final ex post evaluation summary reports (25 percent for each ex post evaluation summary report, each including a 1-2 page brief and a presentation).

Annex A: Specific requirements for the consultant(s)

The requirements that should be documented for at least one team member as proposed are as follows:

- Master level degree in evaluation, international development, economics, environmental sciences or other field of applied social sciences with a strong research component – or Bachelor level degree in these fields with an equivalent combination of education and experience
- At least six years of relevant experience in evaluation and evaluation related research, with a focus on final completion evaluations, ex-post evaluations, longer term impact, sustainability and learning. Preferably with experience in ex-post evaluations taking place three to five years after project completion and focusing both on the human and natural systems.
- Experience of working in the project host country (e.g. Argentina)
- Experience of evaluating food, nutrition security, and gender in multiple geographic locations.
- Experience flexibly piloting new methods, adapting to opportunities and barriers during fieldwork, and consulting with clients during the evaluation
- Deep knowledge of theory of change, evaluation design and evaluation methodologies, including the measurement of causal change in the different sectors relevant to the Fund
- Proven analytical and problem-solving skills, and proven ability to apply these skills in a practical setting, including the ability to identify issues, present findings / recommendations and contribute to resolution of evaluative challenges
- Experience with data collection, the development of data collection protocols, data entry, and data analysis, with experience in applying mixed statistical, data analysis and triangulation methods
- Ability to lead smaller teams such as quantitative enumerators or review their work
- Experience with reporting on the results of data analysis and triangulation, with demonstrated analytical and organizational skills, and capable to work under strict timelines
- Strong interpersonal skills and ability to work effectively with partners and promote collaboration in a multi-cultural environment
- Excellent command of English and Spanish written as well as spoken fluency, and literacy in the predominant local language of the project site(s) or ability to work well with local language interpreters

Desirable qualifications are:

- Experience of or exposure to climate change adaptation and climate resilience related projects, portfolios / work streams, especially in multiple Latin American countries
- Knowledge of and/or experience with projects funded by the Adaptation Fund or other environmental / climate change funds
- Knowledge of and/or experience with the use of online meeting tools (like Webex) and survey tools (like SurveyMonkey)

Annex B: Detailed Scope of Work

Evaluation Objectives

The framework developed in phase 1 for ex post evaluation - and adjusted as part of the pilots in phase 2 - focuses on aspects of both **sustainability of outcomes** and **climate resilience**. It will also include a focus on food and nutrition security and gender. The ex post evaluation's objective is to detect early signs of resilience and longer-term sustainability by:

- Recreating the Theory of Change, update it to a Theory of Sustainability/ Resilience with stakeholders
- Evaluating the project results sustainability since the end of the project and if anything emerged to sustain results, or why were some results not sustained?
- Evaluating the resilience of the project to climate change and other shocks since the end of the project or if not, what were the constraints to resilience?
- What can such results show about the resistance-resilience-transformation typology

It aims to answer the following overarching questions:

1. How sustainable are the project outcomes over time since project completion?
2. Are the sustained outcomes also climate-resilient?
3. What can we learn about the process of evaluating these two aspects?

Evaluation Questions

This section describes the evaluation questions associated with each of the above overarching questions:

a. Sustainability of outcomes

a1. Explain the **context** of the intervention as a backdrop to its strategy and results.

Evaluation questions:

- What are the Sustainability Assumptions, for instance what trajectories in the operating system of the project are assumed to hold long after closeout and are they all positive? Why? Have they held up?
- What are the Economic, Political, Human/Social, and Natural Capitals that are relevant to the evaluation, for instance, how does economic or political stability affect the likelihood of sustaining outcomes and impact(s) since closure?

a2: Learn about the **strategy** supporting the project's sustainability throughout implementation.

Evaluation questions:

- Was there any Adaptive Management done during implementation, pre-exit, to foster sustainability, e.g. delay departure to develop partner capacities or resources to take over?

- Was there a tangible Sustainability plan and Exit Strategy and how well was it implemented before closure? Also were there Sustainability Ratings (what were they) and what assumptions were they based on that the ex-post can test?
- Was there during implementation, or latest before exit, a Risk Management Strategy to forestall sustainability being diminished by foreseeable risks to it? For instance, were contingencies planned for drought or flood in agricultural projects? What? How?
- The Programming Relevance is discerned from fieldwork, particularly how many activities have been sustained (through what capacities, partnerships, resources, below), asking which had value relevant to needs, given local capabilities to sustain the resources, partnerships, etc. So, how relevant do the activities appear from the Theory of Change to generating the results that the evaluation can return to test? Were there unexpected outcomes that threatened the relevance, e.g. an outcome that harmed a group of participants that led it to abandon that activity?

a3: Explore the **conditions** necessary to support sustainability – ownership, resources, partnerships, capacities - and whether they are present (or lacking) to enable continuation of the results. This step also examines whether are are emerging outcomes.

Evaluation questions:

- What capacities exist that are still being passed on to those who were not primary 'beneficiaries' of the project? By whom? How? Was this due to the project's implementation and planning? What are the drivers and barriers discernible from documentation that could be tested, regarding capacities built, e.g. skill levels attained? Are there new capacities built that were unforeseen by the project, yet achieving similar results in different ways? Which?
- What partnerships exist to keep implementing the activities generated by the project? Were these the same ones the project ended with? If not, how have they changed and why and how can documentation on partners at closure be documented, revisited during the Theory of Sustainability mapping discussions, be ground-truthed in the field? What are the perspectives by national partners on the drivers or barriers to sustaining results? Are there new, emerging outcomes due to different partnerships achieving similar results?
- What resources fuel the sustainability of the activities of the project? Where do they come from? Were these the same one the project ended with or did the project have a role in garnering new ones? If not, how have they changed and why? Are there new, emerging outcomes due to different resources achieving similar results?
- How locally owned is the project results – via expected activities or new ones? How have local communities – and regional and national stakeholders- ensured the continuation of the results in ways possibly different from those designed by the project, yet still meeting needs?

a4: Outline the **disturbances** endured by the outcome, including human, social and economic shocks and stresses, as well as climate disturbances.

Evaluation questions:

- Based on the analysis of the capitals in the Context, above (Economic, Political, Human/Social, and Natural Capitals), what disturbances were most likely to affect them by the end of the project? Have these (re) occurred? How have outcomes been sustained in spite of these shocks?

a5: Explain the **sustained and emerging outcomes...**

Evaluation questions:

- What emerged from local efforts to sustain results differently from the planned Theory of Change, and what if any unexpected/ maladaptive outcomes arose?
- What outcomes appear to be the most evaluable given the analysis above? Review data availability and quality; Organizational considerations in terms of greatest interest to learn about these outcomes by the IE and AF, methodological considerations for what is traceable in a reasonable timeframe, particularly affecting the choice of sites, timing, reporting, etc.

FINAL OVERVIEW/ RATING OF SUSTAINABILITY: Low, Medium, High?

- o In discussion with the AF team, explain at the inception and again at the final evaluation, what weighting of the conditions especially, followed by the strategies and disturbances, justifies a low – medium – or high rating of sustainability.

b. Resilience of outcomes

b1. Name **climate disturbances (stresses and shocks), and their impacts, that the sustained outcomes address.**

Evaluation questions:

- What climate disturbances or other shocks and related impacts did the project seek to build resilience against with the outcome(s) sustained since completion?
- Are there any disturbances that affected outcomes after project completion but were not accounted for by the project team (via risk management strategy, other) during implementation? Did these disturbances undermine project results or inadvertently bolstered them?

b3. Use the **R-R-T typology (resistance-resilience-transformation) to examine how the adaptation strategy and actions actively or passively changed or maintained human and natural **systems** and their respective structures and functions.**

Evaluation questions:

- What are the natural systems that the sustained project outcome(s) influenced, and/or were influenced by? What are the natural systems structures and functions the project influenced?

- What are the human systems (assets, community, skills) that the sustained project outcome(s) influenced, and/or were influenced by? What are the human systems structures and functions the project influenced?
- What is the nexus - between human and natural systems - in which the project generated outcomes? (e.g. What did relevant human-natural interface look like; policies, practices, skills, culture? How did the project affect it and how did it change since project completion?)
- How has the climate risk baseline shifted (or climate disturbance trends changed) since project completion? What structures and functions targeted by sustained outcomes address it? Are there any natural or human thresholds beyond which the project outcomes and impacts will no longer support climate resilience on the basis of evidence since project completion?
- Where does the sum total of the projects sustained outcomes and effects since project completion sit on the typology of R-R-T (from 1 Active Resistance to 6 Accelerated Transformation)? In other words, are current actions designed to actively or passively change or maintain structures and functions in light of climate disturbances?

b2. Identify the **adaptation measures in terms of how assets and capacities were used to reduce climate vulnerability.**

Evaluation questions:

- What are the ways in which climate information use has changed as a result of the sustained outcome? Is there new climate information available? Are there new adaptive options that were not possible prior to the intervention? Are resources and/or relevant information more readily accessible as a result of this new information use?
- Who is using this climate information to reduce their exposure or sensitivity, or enhance their adaptive capacity, to face climate disturbances? Has it influenced individuals or communities or policies/plans/practices in response to climate risks?
- To what extent does the new climate information use reduce vulnerabilities to climate change at the site/intervention areas? How does it affect uncertainty and decision-making under climate uncertainties? How does this new information use (not) reduce maladaptation or the possibility of maladaptation?

b4. Determine which **characteristics of resilience are exhibited by sustained outcomes and in what systems and their respective structures and functions.**

Evaluation questions (optional/answer those that apply):

- *Redundancy:*
 - Did the project support natural systems to enable or enhance duplicate or back-up solutions to managing or responding to particular climate risks?

- Did the project outcome support, build or otherwise generate a back-up options, systems, or additional pathway or means to address a specific vulnerability or climate disturbance for people, sectors?
- *Diversity:*
 - In what ways did the project outcome(s) support, generate, or foster biological diversity or diversity in natural systems?
 - In what ways did the project outcome(s) support, encourage, or foster a diversity of inputs and interests from multiple stakeholders (a variety of persons, groups, authorities) and/or relevant information sources?
- *Temporal and Spatial Scale:*
 - Did the project contribute to assets, capacities, and/or other resources over the temporal scale (time needed) needed to achieve resilience outcome(s)? Consider both human and natural systems.
 - Did the project contribute to assets, capacities, and/or other resources at the spatial scale (geographic boundary and/or natural boundary) necessary to achieve resilience outcome(s)? Consider both human and natural systems.
- *Continuity/Feedback Loops:*
 - In what ways did the project support or develop partnerships, communication channels, information access, or other regular feedback loops that helped sustain desirable project outcomes after the project completed?
 - Are there examples of how the project improved the ability of biota (living things other than humans) and abiota (land, water, etc.) to communicate among or between each other in order to bolster their resilience to climate impacts?
- *Flexibility:*
 - Were there project components (or the activity areas under those components) added, amended, or deleted after project completion in order to achieve resilience outcomes? How did the project influence risk identification and risk tolerance? How is this reflected in the outcome(s)?
 - Did the project enhance the capacity of or better enable natural systems to adjust or adapt in the face of climate risks by supporting local ecosystems?
- *Other:*
 - Are there other types of resilience or characteristics of resilient outcomes that are valued by relevant and/or targeted actors (local beneficiaries, government staff, community leaders, women, indigenous peoples, youth, others) that were a part of the project boundaries (and/or were not reflected in project outcomes, activities and/or outputs prior)?
 - Are there other types of resilience or characteristics of resilient outcomes that there is evidence of their valuable to natural systems in dealing with climate disturbances within the

project boundaries (and/or were not reflected in project outcomes or activities, outputs prior)?

FINAL OVERVIEW OF ADAPTATION AND RESILIENCE: Low, Medium, High?

- *Relative to the specific climate disturbances* (stresses, shocks) targeted by the outcomes, explain at the final evaluation and since the final evaluation, how and to what extent the results (outputs, outcomes, impacts) are addressing adaptation needs and improving climate resilience. In discussion with the AF team, and by weighting the outcome against the adaptation and resilience goals, especially, determine whether the sustained outcome justifies a low – medium – or high rating of climate adaptive resilience.

Ex Post Evaluation Process and Methods (options)

The methods presented below in the visual for the ex post evaluation process are illustrative and should not be considered as final. They will be revised based on data quality and availability and the aims of national stakeholders. Methods could also be influenced by the skillsets of the (national) evaluators, timeline, and availability of project respondents and funding.

Annex C: Work Principles

Based on the AF-TERG's mandate and its two overarching objectives, and in the spirit of guiding its work for the benefit of the Fund, the AF-TERG has developed a set of ten work principles to guide the work of the AF-TERG, including the work that it commissions. The consultant will ensure that these principles are followed in the processes and products.

1. **Be relevant and responsive to the Fund priorities and operating contexts:** Stay tuned and responsive to the Fund's operational strategic and governance priorities; Fund partners' priorities; and relevant developments in the broader field of CCA and operating contexts.
2. **Make contributions that benefit Fund's stakeholders - people, livelihoods and ecosystems:** Observe equity, transparency and impartiality in our work designs, processes and products to serve the interests of Fund stakeholders.
3. **Produce MEL products that add value to the Fund:** Ensure the production of useful, credible, actionable, innovative, independent and timely monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) products that contribute to the performance and impact of the Fund at all levels.
4. **Support the development of MEL capacity of the Fund's key stakeholders:** develop the MEL capacity of the Fund's key stakeholders through engaging them in all our work, nurturing relationships of trust, co-learning and co-creation, and cultivating a sense of collective ownership of the MEL tools.
5. **Contribute to the development of the CCA monitoring, learning and evaluation (MEL) field:** Seek opportunities for sharing the Fund's MEL experience with the CCA and evaluation communities and to contribute to the discussion and development of the MEL in CCA and related fields.
6. **Draw on good and innovative MEL practice:** Identify, utilize and build on good, new, ethical MEL approaches and practice in the CCA and related fields.
7. **Respect and utilise different knowledges:** Seek, respect, value and work with traditional and local knowledge alongside other forms of knowledge and apply appropriate standards of quality to all types of knowledge.
8. **Work synergistically to produce optimal results:** Work collaboratively together, equitably share responsibilities, give our best, engage in constructive dialogue, exercise mutual respect, assume good intent and be open to surprise towards getting the most from the Fund's investment in MEL.
9. **Conduct collective, reflexive learning that improves practice:** Undertake purposive, collective, continuous and critical learning to improve our evaluative, oversight and advisory practice and the value it creates for the Fund over time.
10. **Ensure cost-effective utilization of the Fund's resources:** Utilize our time and budget in the most cost-effective ways while ensuring the production of fit-for-purpose MEL products.

Annex D: Final evaluation summary report outline

The outline for the final evaluation summary report can be found below. Two summary report examples can be found in document “[Information update on phase 2 of the ex post project sustainability evaluations \(AF-TERG\)](#)”, delivered to the 30th meeting of the EFC (October 2022).

Table of Contents

List of Tables and Figures

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Project General Information

Evaluation Background

 Evaluation Process

 Evaluation Scope

 [relevant technical field(s)]

 Evaluation Methods and Limitations

Findings: Sustainability, Resilience, and Impact

 Sustainability

 Site 1: ...

 Site 2: ...

 Site X: ...

 Resilience

 Impact

 Emerging Project impact

 Adaptation Fund impact

Conclusions

Lessons Learned and Corresponding Recommendations

 For Implementing Entities

 For the Adaptation Fund and funders

 For projects designed with [relevant technical field(s)] components

 For improvements in M&E to capture data on sustained results after project completion

 For the AF-TERG on methods

Annex 1 Resilience Analysis Framework