



**ADAPTATION FUND**  
Readiness Programme  
for Climate Finance

## **Webinar 17: Evaluation framework and integrating evaluation throughout the project life cycle**

**14 March 2024**

**Report**



## **Introduction:**

The Adaptation Fund (the Fund or alternatively, the AF) held its seventeenth webinar on Evaluation framework and integrating evaluation throughout the project life cycle on 14 March 2024. The focus of this webinar is to understand the steps taken at the proposal development and midterm stage, how to prepare for and conduct a final evaluation, and the importance of monitoring and reporting for supporting the evaluation activities.

The new Evaluation Policy of the Adaptation Fund is a Fund-wide policy that came into effect in October 2023 and replaced the Evaluation Framework. The purpose of the Evaluation Policy is to identify the fundamental expectations, processes, and protocols to support a reliable, useful, and ethical evaluation function that contributes to learning, decision-making, and accountability for the Adaptation Fund.

All presentations made by the speakers are available on the AF website: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/readiness/news-seminars/>.

## **Welcome Remarks**

The webinar began with welcome remarks and an introduction from Farayi Madziwa, Team Lead of the Climate Finance Readiness Programme of the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat (the secretariat). Farayi highlighted that the webinar will discuss two critical aspects for ensuring successful adaptation. First one being adaptation fund evaluation which allows us to access effectiveness and efficiency, and second one is integrating evaluation into the project life cycle. He also highlighted that the webinar would discuss the evaluation policy relevance for all implementing entities during project monitoring and reporting, and the policy relevance during midterm evaluation.

## **Session 1: Adaptation reasoning criteria in AF Projects**

Ms. Susan Legro, AF-TERG member, gave an overview to the introduction to the Evaluation Policy (EP) and EP guidance, and building in good M&E at the design stage. Some key highlights from her presentation include:

- Entry points for evaluation include 1. Logical Framework 2. Theory of Change 3. Use of indicators 4. Cross-cutting issues 5. M&E Plan and Budgeting. A new guidance note is coming out this year on evaluation and project design
- Essentially you have the logical framework or the results framework, you have a theory of change as to how your project is going to work, use of indicators, there are some cross cutting in issues like gender, and then you have your monitoring and evaluation plan and budgeting. So those are all areas of the funding proposal where entities should think about good evaluation.

Questions	Answers
What does an extra A in SMA(A)RT indicators mean?	Achievable and attributable. Smart - Specific, measurable, Achievable, realistic and timebound
Could you clarify the difference between the logical framework and the theory of change, and whether all of them are required in a project proposal.	For the AF the Log frame is really the results framework. The theory of change is the more summarized narrative encapsulating the proposal, it must be articulated in such a way as to demonstrate the how the various parts of the proposal are expected to achieve the overall outcome of the project. There will be a need for breakdown indicating cost categories for the evaluation budget (IE fee)
How does AF M&E take care of long-term impacts and how does evaluation result affect future projects?	<p>In terms of impacts, the theory of change should certainly be thinking about impacts and should have in mind the impact that you want to achieve. The project impacts is not always seen until after project completion. You should have done thinking in the theory of change and your project logic structure about the kinds of outputs and then outcomes you would like to see, the best that I think a final evaluator can usually do in an adaptation project is to give some indication.</p> <p>The more data that you have, the more useful the evaluation can be for developing future projects because you can point to what worked.</p>

## Session 2: Policy relevance for IE project performance reporting during mid-term evaluations

Mr. Justice Mussah, Climate Change Specialist of the secretariat continued to give an overview on Policy relevance for IE project performance reporting during mid-term evaluations. He highlighted the issues to be considered during monitoring and reporting, and the proposed new structure for project evaluation cost.

Some key highlights from his presentation include:

- The policy does not cover the monitoring functions that are covered under AF results-based management (RBM) system and Strategic Results Framework (SRF).
- However, the EP contribute more broadly to streamlined approaches to monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) across the Fund. New

- evaluation requirement such as Baseline report or improved quality of MTE and FE contributes to MEL functions.
- EP aligns with and reinforces the objectives of the Fund's Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) and Gender Policy (GP).

Questions	Answers
<p>Could you please further explain about the new decision on the budget allocation for the evaluation activities (IE vs EE)?</p>	<p>The Secretariat will send a newsletter to all entities regarding the new cost structure for evaluation</p>
<p>Could you please elaborate more on the management response to the MTR and Final Evaluation. Is there a form/template/ or elements on which the management response should address itself to. 2) Is there provision for a response also from AF on the MTR and final Evaluation</p>	<p>There is not template for the management response of the MTR. However standard elements include: (i) position and justification of IE against a specific recommendation included in the MTR report (i.e. agreed/not agreed/partially agreed); (ii) proposed actions to be taken; (iii) responsible party; (iv) timeline.</p> <p>IEs are to submit to the secretariat and the DA or DAs a management response to the final evaluation report within six months of receiving the evaluation report. This should describe what, why, and how final evaluation learning will be incorporated into current or future AF Fund work.</p> <p>Here is the evaluation policy which provides further guidance on MTR and FE:  <a href="https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/New-Design-Evaluation-Policy.pdf">https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/New-Design-Evaluation-Policy.pdf</a></p> <p>The secretariat shares summary review of the MTR/TE with the IE, if there any comments. We make sure evaluations cover main elements in compliance with the Fund's Evaluation Policy, and if the MTR, recommends any project change, we provide specific guidance to IE, in compliance with OPG Annex 7, available here:  <a href="https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/OPG-ANNEX-7-Project-Programme-Implementation-Approved-Oct-2017.pdf">https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/OPG-ANNEX-7-Project-Programme-Implementation-Approved-Oct-2017.pdf</a></p>
<p>Could you clarify how the line item for the evaluation costs is expected to appear? Do you require the breakdown on the Evaluation cost under both IE and EE?</p>	<p>Prior to the new decision, evaluation cost was split between implementing entity and execution entity. MTR were done by the implementing entity, then executing entity</p>

	was responsible for conducting the evaluation, the final evaluation. But with the new regime or with the new decision, both the MTR and the final evaluation is supposed to be born out of the implementing entity fees. You can have a line item budgets that should be part of the 8.5% of the implementing entity fees.
--	--

**Session 3: Guidance on Final Evaluation under the Evaluation Policy Closing Remarks**

Ms. Susan Legro, AF-TERG member, gave an overview of Final Evaluation under the Evaluation Policy and how to communicate the results to project participants and how to share data and information both during the project process and afterwards about what has been learned.

Some key highlights from her presentation include:

- The guidance is mandatory for projects that were approved at or moving forward from the October 2023 board meeting. So, if you have a brand new project that was approved in October 2023, that project will follow the evaluation policy guidance all the way through.
- The evaluation policy and the guidance was designed to be as minimal as possible, so the TERG did not introduce lots of new tasks or requirements, and the only thing that has changed regarding the midterm review is that the midterm review or evaluation should be conducted for all projects with the duration of four or more years. Under the previous evaluation framework, if you had a four year project, you did not have to do a midterm review. Now, if a project is four year or longer, the evaluation should be done.
- The TERG has a guidance note on reporting and how to use the results of the evaluation, along with a guidance note on budgeting.

**Session 4: Closing Remarks**

The webinar closed with concluding remarks from Farayi Madziwa, who thanked everyone for their participation and their engagement in the webinar, despite joining from different time zones.