



**ADAPTATION FUND**  
Readiness Programme  
for Climate Finance

# **Webinar: Introduction to AF Evaluation Policy**

**22 November 2023**

**Report**



## **Introduction**

The Adaptation Fund (the Fund or alternatively, the AF) held a webinar on Introduction to AF Evaluation Policy on 22 November 2023.

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. The policy is supplemented with a detailed set of guidance notes to support its implementation. The Evaluation Policy outlines the evaluation function for the Fund and its entities, and lays out the evaluation function's goals, criteria, and principles. It also brings a more consolidated approach to stakeholder roles and responsibilities in relation to evaluation.

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 Vladislav Arnaoudov, AF-TERG Secretariat Coordinator & Senior Evaluation Officer. Vlad highlighted that the evaluation policy is extremely important and one of the core policies of the fund. It's a policy that applies to the of the secretariat, and the implementing entities. This was followed by remarks from Mr. Mahamat Abakar Assouyouli, Senior Climate Change Specialist at the secretariat, who continued to highlight that the short fall in adaptation actions is also illustrated in terms of finance in the adaptation gap report delivered a weeks ago by UNEP. The need of repetition finance are 10 to 18 times greater than what is available in terms of finance and why the adaptation fund is striving to mobilize more funding from its contributors. We also need to ensure that our together, we, we pave the way to invest our resources in an efficient manner, and that's where evolution plays a crucial role. This new policy was developed in an inclusive manner and brings many benefits to the fund. The development process was guided by an evolution policy advisory group. This policy seeks to enable evaluation to contribute effectively towards the achievement of the fund, a vision and mission as is currently implemented to the 7 Million premise strategy of the fund. This policy also contributes more broadly to streamline the approach to monitoring evaluation, learning across the fund, and elevates the quality of a evaluation reporting documents as part of the fund reporting.

## **Session 1: Understanding the role of the Evaluation Policy (EP)**

Ms. Debbie Menzes, AF-TERG chair, gave an overview on Understanding the role of the Evaluation Policy (EP). The purpose of this Evaluation Policy is to identify the fundamental expectations, processes, and protocol to support a reliable, useful, and ethical evaluation function that contributes to learning, decision-making, and

accountability for the Adaptation Fund to pursue its mission, goal, and vision effectively:

Some key highlights from her presentation include:

- Three core functions include: 1. Generation of Evaluation 2. Utilization of Evaluation 3. Evaluation Capacity Development
- Baseline data: Purpose includes Design, Targets, Monitoring and is required for all projects
- Mid-Term Review: Purpose includes Adaptive management, learning, decision-making and required for Projects that are over 4 years
- Final Evaluation: Purpose includes assess impact, learning and accountability and is required for all completed projects and programmes.

## **Session 2: Relevance of the policy to IE project/programme proposal submission**

Ms. Saliha Dobardzic, Senior Climate Change Specialist at the secretariat gave an overview on relevance of the policy to IE project/programme proposal submission.

Some key highlights from her presentation include:

- The harmonization of EE costs and IE fees across the various windows aims to reduce confusion for IEs and simplify calculations by IE as well as reduce risk of errors in the review and oversight process by Secretariat.
- Regarding IE fees, the limit is to be i. For single country projects and programmes, 8.5% of total project/programme cost for all funding windows; ii. For regional projects and programmes, 10% of total project/programme cost for all funding windows.
- Where the EE is different from the IE, for single country projects and programmes, the limit is to be 9.5% of total project/programme and, for regional projects and programmes, 10% of total project/programme cost for all windows.
- For EDA and innovation projects, reflecting the need for added flexibility, to require the IE to provide justification as part of its proposal submission if requesting costs beyond the cap on a case-by-case basis.
- For EDA and innovation projects which may require additional investments to support execution, certain activities may be eligible to be charged under a project component when the EE or EEs in those cases is/are not yet identified. The IE would be required to provide justification as part of its proposal submission if requesting costs beyond the cap on a case by case basis.

### **Session 3: Policy relevance for IE project performance reporting including mid-term and terminal evaluations**

Mr. Vladislav Arnaoudov, AF-TERG Secretariat Coordinator & Senior Evaluation Officer, gave an overview of policy relevance for IE project performance reporting including mid-term and terminal evaluations.

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 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).
- IEs to prepare and submit a project baseline report based on primary data collection and/or relevant and reliable secondary data, per the Fund's "Results Framework and baseline guidance." Baseline data shall be submitted to the secretariat by no later than the submission of the first PPR.
- IE is to submit a management response to the MTR report to the secretariat within six months of receiving the MTR report, describing what, why, and how MTR learning will be utilized.
- For projects, an independent final evaluation to be submitted to the secretariat and the DA within nine months of project completion For programmes approved and implemented under a single IE, a final evaluation to be planned and budgeted as final project evaluation For Programme with projects involving multiple IEs, final evaluations to be planned, budgeted, and managed as thematic evaluations. For the programme evaluations, IEs will be notified within three months of approval of the Fund's evaluation budget whether their project has been selected for the programme evaluation.

### **Session 4: Preparing and managing an evaluation and available guidance and Role of ex-post evaluations**

Ms. Susan Legro, AF-TERG Member, gave an overview on Preparing and managing an evaluation and available guidance and Role of ex-post evaluations.

Some key highlights from her presentation include:

- Ex post evaluations may generate a variety of benefits for different stakeholders, such as to Increase upwards accountability to donors and decision makers and downwards to project participants; Determine how much projects contribute to AF intended impacts and document unintended, maladaptive and emerging results; Verify lessons to improve the design of adaptation projects, strategy, M&E, and management for decision-makers at the Fund and for its partners; Cross-check sustainability ratings at closure and inform similar estimates moving forward
- Consider available resources when establishing the scope of the evaluation in the Terms of Reference
- Consider available resources when planning reporting activities and evaluation products

### **Session 5: 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.