Climate Investment Funds

CTF-SCF/TFC.12/4/Rev.1
June 16, 2014

Joint Meeting of the CTF and SCF Trust Fund Committees
Montego Bay
June 25, 2014

Agenda Item 5

APPROACHES TO EVIDENCE-BASED LEARNING IN THE CIF PROJECT CYCLE

PROPOSED DECISION

The joint meeting, having reviewed document CTF-SCF/TFC.12/4/Rev.1, *Approaches to Evidence Based Learning in the CIF Project Cycle*, endorses the proposal to include evidence-based learning tools in a selection of CIF projects as a means to complement the current annual monitoring and reporting on core indicators in the CTF, PPCR and SREP and the monitoring and reporting on common and co-benefit themes in the FIP.

It is understood that CIF funding additional to the allocations proposed in the investment plans will need to be made available to finance the implementation of these tools. The MDBs are requested to work with the government or other client that will be responsible for executing the project to prepare a more elaborated proposal for each proposed tool, describing the activities to be undertaken and the associated costs. Such proposals may be approved as follows:

a) for projects with CIF funding approved prior to the preparation of document CTF-SCF/TFC.12/4, the elaborated proposal for implementing an evidence-based tool may be approved by the MDB Committee drawing on the financing made available through the special initiative proposed in the FY15 CIF Administrative Budget; and

b) for projects submitted for CIF funding approval during or subsequent to the preparation of document CTF-SCF/TFC.12/4, the elaborated proposal for implementing an evidence-based tool should be submitted together with the project proposal to the CIF Committee for review and funding approval.

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In October 2013, the Joint Meeting of the CTF and SCF Trust Fund Committees reviewed document CTF-SCF/TFC.11/5, *Proposal for Modalities and Incentives to Include a Broad Range of Evaluative Approaches in the CIF*, and invited the CIF Administrative Unit, in collaboration with the MDBs:

a) to prepare a more comprehensive overview of approaches that could be put into place with the goal of increasing the number of initiatives that include evaluative approaches as part of their design, including information on how other funds have handled this issue and what are the experiences and emerging best practices;

b) to undertake a stock taking of what MDBs are already doing and plan to do to evaluate CIF-funded projects, and

c) to prepare a portfolio mapping and assessment of which CIF pipeline project/program concepts could be suitable for incorporating real-time evaluative approaches, including impact evaluation, in the further design and development of the projects/programs.

2. The joint meeting requested the CIF Administrative Unit and the MDBs to present to the next joint meeting of the Committees in June 2014 a proposal, based on the above information, as to the project/program concepts suitable for incorporating evaluative approaches. The proposal should include information on: (a) the value added; (b) challenges and how they would be addressed; (c) CIF financing that would be needed to cover the additional costs of the evaluative activities; and (d) CIF pilot countries' interest in incorporating such approaches.

II. OVERVIEW OF WORK UNDERTAKEN SINCE OCTOBER 2013

3. In response to the above decision, the following work has been completed:

a) Development of a high-level menu of approaches to evidence-based learning throughout the project cycle. This menu spanned nine approaches that range in their objectives, methods, and applicability across projects. For each approach a short fact sheet was developed to help provide a common vocabulary and toolset across all CIF programs. The fact sheets are provided in Annex 2, and an overview of these approaches is covered in section III of this report.

b) Identification of the likelihood of generating evidence for each of the CIF programs, based on programs' results frameworks and a review of the challenges associated with collecting evidence for the outcomes and indicators listed in each framework. The summary findings of this analysis are provided in Annex 1.

c) A stock taking of current evidence-based learning approaches that are already built into project budgets and activities (planned or underway). The stock taking

covered both routine activities undertaken by each MDB for all of its projects, and additional approaches, such as independent evaluations, case studies, and real-time learning work. The findings from this stock taking are included in section IV of this report. They are presented on the project level.

d) An assessment conducted by each MDB of its portfolio of approved and pipeline projects to identify candidates for additional evidence-based learning. This assessment resulted in the development of 20 scoping proposals, described in section V of this report and detailed in Annex 3.

III. APPROACHES TO EVIDENCE-BASED LEARNING

A Brief Overview of the Approaches

4. To build capacity and a common vocabulary for undertaking evidence-based learning, the CIF Administrative Unit, in collaboration with the MDBs, prepared a menu of approaches to evidence-based learning. The menu covers nine approaches deemed particularly relevant to the objectives and learning goals of the CIF, and for each approach, a fact sheet was prepared that outlines the role of the approach, relevant projects (e.g., mitigation, resilience, and/or forests), the value-added, the relevant stage(s) of the project cycle, the questions the approach could address, and where to find additional information.

5. The selected approaches are intended to support data-driven learning, adaptation, and improvement. They apply to different project stages, including before projects begin (ex-ante), during implementation (mid-course), and after project completion (ex-post). Generally speaking, these approaches are intended to support both learning and accountability. The objective was to build capacity and increase the number of initiatives that include the evidence-based learning approaches as part of their design and implementation throughout the entire project cycle.

6. Box 1 below shows the list of approaches suggested for each CIF program, and indicates where each approach can apply throughout the project cycle. Most of the approaches apply during project design and/or implementation in order to support real-time learning and improvement, and some are more summative or ex-post in order to understand final project outcomes and identify lessons that can apply to future projects.

7. The approaches offer various tools and techniques for collecting and utilizing evidence of different breadth and depth. Some, like rapid-stakeholder consultation and real-time learning, can be more or less quantitatively rigorous (depending on how they are applied), but are designed to provide useful data at the right time to inform implementation and enhance results. Others, namely impact evaluation, are more rigorous quantitative, but may take months or years to offer useful findings, and sometimes these can only be applied to future projects.

8. Different approaches are suitable for different projects each with their unique context and needs. Some projects that are very context specific, rapidly evolving, and unpredictable are more likely to be suited to real-time input that informs countinous learning, whereas others that are more predictable and stable may be more suited to longer-term approaches that require an

intervention to remain stable for a longer time. There are, therefore, a range of fit-for-purpose options reflected in the approaches.

9. The fact sheets in Annex 2 provide additional information on where these approaches have been used, and the scoping proposals below tie these approaches to 20 specific CIF projects where the MDBs think they could be useful for enhancing evidence-based learning.

Box 1. Selected Evidence-Based Approach Options for CIF Programs

Approach	CTF	PPCR	FIP	SREP		Ex-Ante	Design*	Mid-Course	At End	Ex-post
1. Adaptive Capacity Assessment		✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2. Cost Effectiveness Analysis	✓			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
3. Developmental Evaluation		✓	✓				✓	✓		
4. Formative Evaluation	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓		
5. Impact Evaluation	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
6. Outcome Evaluation	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	✓
7. Real-time Learning	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓		
8. Rapid Stakeholder Consultation	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓
9. Vulnerability Assessments		✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	

*Design refers to the stage after a project has been selected, when details of strategy and implementation plans are being developed.

Summary of Each Evidence-based Learning Approach

10. Each approach is described briefly below. Longer fact sheets covering these approaches are provided in Annex 2.

a) Approach 1: Adaptive Capacity Assessment

Adaptive capacity is the ability of a system to adjust to climate change – to moderate potential damages, take advantage of opportunities, or cope with consequences. Adaptive Capacity Assessment (ACA) helps to identify where the need for building adaptive capacity is the greatest. ACA can be used to assess changes in adaptive capacity where populations are particularly vulnerable (see also, Vulnerability Assessment). ACA can apply to any stage in a project cycle, and can be used to track changes in adaptive capacity over time. The ACA fact sheet describes two practical ACA tools: the National Adaptive Capacity framework developed by the World Resources Institute and the Local Adaptive Capacity framework developed by the African Climate Change Resilience Alliance.

b) Approach 2: Cost Effectiveness Analysis

Cost Effectiveness Analysis (CEA) compares an initiative's costs to its outcomes. It is similar to value-for-money or social return on investment

analyses where the "return" is measured in non-monetary terms, such as greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions avoided or reduced. CEA can be used at any project stage – to inform the project selection, during implementation to understand interim cost effectiveness, or at the end. This approach is most suitable for projects where the full costs can be calculated and where results (effectiveness) can be quantified with some level of confidence. Some CIF programs and projects are not amenable to this approach because it is difficult or impossible to identify all relevant costs or to predict or quantify outcomes.

c) **Approach 3: Developmental Evaluation**

Developmental evaluation is a non-traditional approach to evaluation intended to inform innovative initiatives in complex, dynamic, and/or uncertain environments. It is a useful approach for emergent social-change initiatives, particularly during early stages of an initiative's development or during implementation of initiatives that require ongoing innovation and adaptation to be successful. Developmental evaluation is potentially suitable for climate change interventions that are not formulaically clear, particularly those where the context is rapidly evolving. Findings from developmental evaluations are typically informal and are oriented toward strategy. Developmental evaluation does not involve a formal assessment of results/impact.

d) **Approach 4: Formative Evaluation**

Formative evaluation is used to examine and improve initiatives that are just beginning or underway. It is usually process oriented; focusing on what is and is not working based on early experience, interim results (where available), and changing circumstances. It applies to most types of projects, and is usually less intensive than developmental, outcome, or impact evaluation. For instance, evaluators conducting a formative evaluation often have little interaction with project staff and are clearly independent from the project team; whereas developmental evaluators often have a signficant amount of interaction with project staff and most essentially become part of the project team. Findings from formative evaluation usually include options or recommendations for improving process and implementation. Formative evaluation does not involve a formal assessment of project results/impact.

e) **Approach 5: Impact Evaluation**

Impact evaluation is a traditional evaluation approach that quantitatively analyzes causal links between programs or interventions and a set of outcomes (utlimate goals). An impact evaluation tries to answer questions on whether a project is responsible for changes in the outcomes of interest,

and whether changes in outcomes are directly attributable to the program. The main purpose of impact evaluation is accountability, though at times impact evaluation also can enhance learning during implementation if done in a way to make this possible. To be methodologically rigorous, impact evaluations are implemented at the same time as project implementation. Impact evaluation is considered by many to be the "gold standard" for identifying evidence of results, however, suitable opportunites for impact evaluation in a climate change context are not common given the methodological requirements and complex, dynamic, and long-term nature of both climate change and the interventions trying to address climate change.

f) **Approach 6: Outcome Evaluation**

Outcome evaluation analyzes the realization of an initiative's intended outcomes (ultimate goals) and the role of the project in contributing to or causing those outcomes. Outcome evaluation provides a means to identify mid-course or final project outcomes for internal learning and external accountability purposes. It explores questions about whether a project contributed to intended (or unintended) outcomes, and whether conclusions can be drawn about project effectiveness. Outcome evaluation uses a variety of qualitative and/or quantitative methods. The rigor of the findings depends on the methods used and availability of evidence. For some CIF projects, particularly future-oriented projects, outcomes are impossible to accurately forecast.

g) **Approach 7: Rapid Stakeholder Consultation**

Rapid stakeholder consultation is a general approach to quickly obtaining information from multiple stakeholders using context-suitable approaches, including information technologies such as the internet, cells phones, and SMS (text messaging). Rapid stakeholder consultation usually involves people who have been missed through traditional feedback channels. Use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) offers one way to make interactions between stakeholders faster and easier; however, other tools, such as community meetings, can also enhance rapid stakeholder engagement. This approach can be used at any stage in the project cycle, and it applicable to projects where stakeholders have an important role in project effectiveness.

h) **Approach 8: Real-Time Learning**

Support for real-time learning is the art and science of helping organizations learn, adapt, and improve. "Learning" generally refers to the act, process, or experience of gaining knowledge or skills. Beyond gaining knowledge or skills, this approach involves rapidly *applying learning to*

projects to improve implementation and, ultimately, enhance results. Applied learning in this way requires a combination of data, knowledge, skills, cultural openness to critical reflection and change, and a project amenable to adaptation. Real-time learning can be undertaken at the beginning of a project or during implementation.

i) **Approach 9: Vulnerability Assessment**

Vulnerability assessment is an analysis of a population's or geographic area's exposure and vulnerability to climate change. Vulnerability assessment is suitable when it is unclear how vulnerable a population (human or other) is to climate change, and whether to invest in building adaptation/resilience based on the extent of vulnerability. A "top-down" vulnerability assessment can be used for developing climate change adaptation policies at the international, national, or sub-national / sectoral levels. A "bottom-up" vulnerability assessment can be used to assess the vulnerability of communities and as a basis for building climate adaptive capacity at a smaller scale. Vulnerability assessment is usually undertaken before projects begin to target project investments and inform the design of projects intended to build adaptive capacity.

Examples of Practice from Other Funds

11. The field of evidence-based learning is relatively new, both in the climate change context and more broadly, for a number of reasons. First, evaluation of climate change interventions is a rapidly growing discipline, but it is still nascent when compared to evaluation in other sectors, public health and education in particular. Evaluation of climate change interventions is particularly complicated because it addresses complex interactions between natural and human systems, many of which are neither predictable nor controllable, and most of which will occur most dramatically in the future.

12. Evaluation of climate change is even more complicated when you break it down into climate mitigation, resilience, and forest-related interventions. Although some of these interventions are well understood and more or less formulaic (i.e., if you do X, you can expect Y to happen), most interventions are working in uncharted territory, testing new innovations and generating information about what works in real time for each context while the world around the interventions is itself rapidly changing in both physical (climactic) and human (political, economic, and social) terms. For these reasons, many traditional evaluation approaches, including impact evaluation, are difficult to apply when the interventions and the context they are working in are themselves continuously changing. At the same time, it is precisely because of the high stakes, significant investments being made, and "shifting sands" that identifying evidence and learning as quickly as possible are imperative.

13. Beyond the evaluation field, our understanding of what constitutes "evidence-based learning" is also quickly evolving. There is an increasing recognition across disciplines and sectors that organizations learn by experimenting, testing through trial-and-error what works, and

applying data, feedback, and lessons learned iteratively into implementation to enhance performance and results over time. The expertise around evidence-based learning is coming from multiple fields, including the private sector, organizations such as the Society for Organizational Learning, work on systems thinking, and more nascent sub-fields of evaluation, including developmental evaluation. These perspectives draw similar conclusions about what it takes to intentionally learn based on data and experience and to apply the learning quickly to projects and programs in order to maximize effectiveness.

14. The approaches to evidence-based learning discussed in this report (and drawn upon by the MDBs to develop scoping proposals outlines in Section V of this report) reflect a range of fit-for-purpose options that are representative of the current thinking and advancements in the broader field of evidence-based learning. Each fact sheet (see Annex 3) offer examples of where organizations are trying these approaches, acknowledging that in some cases, these approaches have only recently begun to have applications in the context of climate change.

15. There are also examples of targeted climate change experience and communities of practice geared specifically toward climate change evaluation. The most well-known among these are the Global Environment Facility's (GEF's) Climate-Evaluation Community of Practice (CoP) (see http://www.climate-eval.org) and the SEA[1] Change CoP, an Asia-focused climate change monitoring and evaluation community of practices (see http://www.seachangecop.org). Both of these resources have compiled extensive amounts of information on evaluation of climate change interventions, and both have also sponsored research and development of guidelines to help build capacity among organizations more broadly.

IV. STOCK TAKING OF EVIDENCE-BASED LEARNING ACTIVITIES ALREADY BEING UNDERTAKEN BY THE MDBS

Overview

16. **MDBs already have routine procedures throughout the project cycle that support evidence-based learning**. Each MDB conducts: (a) analyses when preparing for projects; (b) routine monitoring and reporting during project implementation, including mid-term reviews (or equivalent); and (c) project completion reports and, in some cases, additional reflective analyses to identify lessons learned. (See Table 1.) All MDBs have procedures in place to assure project quality and accountability. What is not clear from this stock taking is whether these routine MDB activities are done with a level of rigor and independence (where needed) to consider them *all* within the rubric of "evidence-based learning." Additional analysis would be needed to ascertain the depth, rigor, and consistency of these routinely conducted procedures.

17. **At least 16 ongoing CIF projects have additional evidence-based approaches that are employed during the project cycle.** These additional approaches go beyond the routine (and minimally required) approaches described above. For example, independent evaluations are not typically required by most MDBs – at least for most projects – therefore independent evaluations are considered "beyond routine." The "beyond routine" approaches already planned

[1] Southeast Asia

or underway include rapid stakeholder feedback, vulnerability assessments, real-time learning, and multiple kinds of evaluation (formative, outcome, and impact most often). (See Table 2.)

18. The summary-level findings resulting from the stock taking effort are as follows, and a project-by-project table identifying many of the current approaches is provided in Annex 4.

Summary of Findings from Stock Taking

19. **The Asian Development Bank (ADB)** consults with stakeholders during the project design phase, and also researches what development partners and civil society partners are doing depending on the type of project or the sector of interest. ADB also tries to identify lessons learned from past projects and to build those lessons into the project design. This is also used to narrow down the scope of the outcomes that can be approved. Throughout the project cycle, ADB consults with stakeholders, and at the end of projects, ADB conducts outcome evaluations.

20. **The African Development Bank (AfDB)** projects build stakeholder consultation, economic analysis, and environmental and social impact assessment (and corresponding management plans) into project design. AfDB is planning to launch evaluations of CIF projects with the intention of identifying lessons learned and applying them to projects that are yet to be designed or are still being implemented. After project completion, many projects are evaluated by the Operations Evaluation Department on merit, worth, and pertinence of its development interventions in regional member countries.

21. AfDB is also considering an enhanced multi-faceted approach to enhancing evidence-based learning. This would begin with an impact assessment that would be enabled by identifying clear baselines at the outset of projects. Formative evaluations would inform mid-course adjustments. Cluster evaluations (e.g., on a particular sub-sector or theme), case studies, special topical studies, and higher system-level evaluations are also being considered. As most of AfDB's CIF projects are still in the formative stages, these approaches would be implemented in the next few years.

22. **The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)**, in addition to its routine monitoring and reporting, conducts case studies and independent project assessments, such as the case study on the CTF Turkish Sustainable Energy Financing Facility (TurSEFF) and the Pilot Climate Change Adaptation Market Study, funded by the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) and the International Finance Corporation (IFC). This study focuses on climate change as an increasing concern for businesses worldwide, and especially in Turkey, where water scarcity is a growing challenge. But not knowing what to do about it can be daunting, especially for small and medium-sized firms, according to ground-breaking research. EBRD is planning a gender analysis and detailed case study on the Sustainable Energy Lending Facility outlining the challenges faced when trying to create a renewable energy market in a middle-income economy in transition. For the CTF District Heating Modernization Framework in Kazakhstan, EBRD will also be conducting a case study and gender analysis.

23. **The Inter-American Development Bank (IADB)** selects projects based on evidence that the proposed solutions are viable, that their effectiveness has been documented, and that there is a sound rationale for the intervention. Project proposals are also rated for alignment with strategic priorities, evaluability, and additionality through the Development Effectiveness Matrix. IADB conducts mid-term evaluations for most projects, involving external evaluators who look at the projects from a third-party perspective and provide recommendations for any course correction, in addition to a broader view of the projects.

24. Specific IADB projects with additional (beyond routine) evidence-based approaches include the FIP forest information project in Brazil and the SREP clean cookstoves project in Honduras. The forest information project used a theory of change to strengthen project design, and is closely involving stakeholders throughout implementation to support real-time learning. This project will also have a mid-term formative evaluation and an independent summative evaluation. The cookstoves project in Honduras will use many of these same approaches and is also being designed as an experiment to build evidence of what works in this burgeoning sector. As such IADB is interested in conducting an impact evaluation for this reason. (This proposal for an impact evaluation of this project is included in the list of proposals for evidence-based learning described below.)

25. **The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD**) has multiple evaluations – supplemented by additional approaches – that are either planned or underway. Two examples are the FIP project in Burkina Faso and the CTF renewable energy markets project in Turkey. For the FIP project, IBRD is working closely with stakeholders to support real-time learning and assess changes in income at the local community level and use of participatory M&E tools at the communal and village levels. (Note IBRD has also proposed to do additional evidence-based learning for this project.) For the CTF project in Turkey, IBRD commissioned an independent consultant to conduct an outcome evaluation on behalf of all three MDBs investing in the project (EBRD, IFC, and IBRD).

26. **The International Finance Corporation (IFC)** undertakes a range of activities, including vulnerability assessments (where applicable), stakeholder consultations, cost effectiveness analysis, and environment and social impact assessments. Internally conducted outcome evaluations are conducted for each program/subproject, and external evaluations are conducted by the IFC's Independent Evaluation Group on select projects.

27. Table 1 below summarizes the *routine* evidence-based learning activities undertaken for all projects at each MDB. These activities were reported by the MDBs to the CIF Administrative Unit on request for this stock taking effort. Because each MDB interpreted the request for information on evidence-based approaches slightly differently, the reported information from the MDBs varies from MDB to MDB. For instance, environmental and social assessments are likely routinely conducted by all of the MDBs for each project; however, these particular processes may not have been reported by each MDB as examples of "evidence-based learning" approaches because they are considered routine, if not mundane. As such, the list of "routine approaches" should not be considered comprehensive or consistent across all MDBs.

Table 1: Routine Monitoring, Learning, Reporting, and Evaluation Work Conducted by the MDB for Each Project

MDB	Ex-ante & Design*	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post
ADB	Stakeholder mapping, Cost-benefit analysis; 3rd party inspections; Local consultations; Best practices from partners / stakeholders	Midterm Review; Climate Change Assessment (if needed)	Stakeholder Consultations; Design & Monitoring Framework Assessment; Climate Risk Assessment Review	Evaluation; Project Completion Report
AfDB	Stakeholder Consultation; Environmental and Social Impact Assessment; Environment and Social Management Plan; Economic and financial analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Operations Evaluations Department assessment
EBRD	Feasibility Study; Preparation of Monitoring Plan	Progress monitoring		Operations team completed self-assessment; EvD completed
IADB	Cost-benefit analysis; Development Effectiveness Matrix; Stakeholder consultation	Mid-term formative evaluation	Final supervision report; project close workshop	Project Completion Report
IBRD	Stakeholder consultation; Cost benefit / effectiveness analysis; Monitoring & evaluation framework; Environmental and social assessment	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment
IFC	Vulnerability Assessment; Stakeholder Consultation; Cost effectiveness analysis; Stakeholder consultations; Economic analysis; Environment and social impact assessment; M&E framework; Real-time learning	Annual project supervision, Outcome evaluation; Stakeholder consultations.	Outcome evaluation; Project completion reports; Stakeholder consultations; Impact evaluation	External Evaluation done by IEG (on select projects)

*Design refers to the stage after a project has been selected, when details of strategy and implementation plans are being developed.

28. Table 2 below summarizes the additional, beyond-routine evidence-based learning activities undertaken for select CIF projects at each MDB. According to the MDBs, at least 16 projects have additional evidence-based approaches that are employed during the project cycle. In addition, some of these activities are also routine, but for these projects there is some level of additional beyond-the-minimum level of effort. For example, additional data collection and evaluation is being conducted to enhance generation of evidence and mid-course correction, even if this would be done at some level already.

Table 2: Examples of CIF Projects with Beyond-Routine Evidence-Based Learning

MDB	Fund	Project(s)	Country	Beyond-Routine Activity
ADB	CTF	Vietnam Transport (HCMC)	Vietnam	Extensive stakeholder consultation; Public opinion survey by public transport authority
ADB	PPCR	Mainstreaming Climate Resilience into Development Planning of Key Vulnerable Sectors	Cambodia	Adaptive capacity assessment; real-time learning; outcome evaluation;
ADB	PPCR	Building Climate Resilience of Watersheds in Mountain Eco-Systems	Nepal	Stakeholder consultations in project area with participatory watershed management planning; consultants conducting impact evaluations and case analysis during implementation
EBRD	CTF	Turkish Private Sector Sustainable Energy Financing Facility (TurSEFF)	Turkey	Knowledge from past project informs design; continuous improvement in MRV system; ex-post evaluation; case studies
EBRD	CTF	Ukraine Renewable Energy Direct Lending facility Renewables Direct Lending Facility-Creating Markets for Renewable Power	Ukraine	Ex-post evaluation (likely), case study
EBRD	CTF	Private Sector Bank-Intermediated Project (TurSEFF II, TuREEFF)	Turkey	Knowledge from past project informs design, gender analysis, case study
IADB	CTF	Renewable Energy Program	Mexico	Cost benefit analysis; stakeholder consultation; formative evaluation; summative evaluation
IADB	CTF	Public Sector Renewable Energy	Mexico	Mid-term formative evaluation; Study about Financing Energy Efficiency in Mexico; study about the ESCO market in Mexico; developing financing facility for ESCOs.
IADB	FIP	Forest Information to Support Public and private Sectors in managing Initiatives Focused on Conservation and Valorization of Forest Resources	Brazil	Theory of change - strengthened project approach; Mid-term formative evaluation; Independent summative evaluation

MDB	Fund	Project(s)	Country	Beyond-Routine Activity
IADB/ MIF	FIP	Support for Forest Related Micro, Small, and Medium-sized Enterprises	Mexico	Mid-term formative evaluation; Summative outcome evaluation
IADB/ MIF	SREP	Sustainable Rural Energization (ERUS)-Part I & III: Promoting Sustainable Business Models for Clean Cookstoves Dissemination	Honduras	Mid-term formative evaluation
IBRD	CTF	Morocco Ouarzazate CSP	CSP-MENA	Cost-benefit analysis, additional stakeholder consultation
IBRD	CTF	Clean and Efficient Energy Project	Morocco	Independent review at formative stage provided analysis and recommendations based on best practices; this analysis was then incorporated into project design
IBRD	CTF	Impact Assessment of CTF in Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency market in Turkey	Turkey	Independent outcome evaluation
IFC	PPCR	Investment Project 1: Promoting Climate Resilient Agriculture and Food Security	Bangladesh	Impact evaluation
IFC	PPCR	Building Climate Resilient Communities Through Private Sector Participation	Nepal	Impact evaluation

29. Annex 4 provides a more detailed table that outlines project-by-project information for current evidence-based learning activities that were highlighted in both of the above tables (i.e., routine and beyond routine.)

30. The CIF AU is aware that additional activities may be occurring at a higher level, across multiple projects, portfolios, or programs. For example, ADB has prepared a set of case studies that examine how stakeholder engagement was carried out in the preparation of CIF investment plans across all CIF programs in Cambodia, Indonesia, Nepal, and the Philippines.[2]

[2] See: www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/content/db-stakeholder-engagement-preparing-investments-plans-climate-investment-funds-case-studies-

V. PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEW EVIDENCE-BASED LEARNING SCOPING PROPOSALS

31. The following section provides an overview of the scoping proposals received for each of the programs. Expanded evidence-based learning work should increase the generation of useful evidence of what works and does not work and expand learning both within and across projects. In the future, these activities should yield lessons that can improve delivery and results at the investment plan and program levels as well.

Portfolio Assessment

32. Each MDB undertook a thorough assessment of its CIF project portfolio to identify strong candidates for new, additional evidence-based learning activities that could be implemented at different points in the project cycle.

Evidence-based Learning Scoping Proposals

33. Based on the portfolio assessment and review of the "menu" of evidence-based learning approaches, the MDBs developed scoping proposals, summarized below. Most of these proposals are based on the nine evidence-based learning approaches described above; however, the MDBs also had the opportunity to propose alternative approaches.

34. These proposals cover a rich variety of evidence-based learning approaches. They also span a range of programs, countries, and sectors. The proposals are summarized in the tables below, first across all MDBs/funds and then for each fund, followed by overview information for the proposals. Annex 3 further details each proposal.

35. These proposals reflect work that will be above the already planned activities. In some cases the proposals will involve a similar, but deeper or expanded analysis than is already planned. For example, the proposed rapid stakeholder consultation for the Himachal Pradesh Development Policy Loan in India will supplement the monitoring already planned by gathering rapid feedback from key stakeholder beneficiaries to identify areas where mid-course corrections may be required.

Table 3: High-level Summary of 20 Scoping Proposals by Approach Type*

Type of Approach (See separate descriptions and fact sheets for each approach)	**Number of Proposals**
Impact Evaluation	6
Rapid Stakeholder Consultation	5
Outcome Evaluation	4
Real-time Learning	2
Cost-benefit Analysis	2
Adaptive Capacity Assessment	2
Formative Evaluation	1
Vulnerability Assessment	1

* Three proposals intend to incorporate two approaches (each); therefore the number of total approaches (23) exceeds the number of proposals (20).

36. Each proposal includes a set of questions intended to be answered through research and targeted information collection, and analysis methods are outlined for each proposed approach. Although some of the questions outlined in the scoping proposals may also be posed as part of a standard mid-term review or project completion report, they are intentionally being drawn out in these proposals as separate and/or additional inquiries supported by a method that is above and beyond the routine practices.

37. For example, the six impact evaluations proposed all pose questions about the impact of the project, similar to what many project completion reports often ask; however, these impact evaluations will involve a rigorous quantitative methodology which compares a control group to the "treatment" (program beneficiary) group in order to be able to confidently identify the changes in outcomes that can be directly attributable to the program interventions. Similarly, the rapid stakeholder consultations proposed are designed to integrate timely, relevant-rapid feedback from direct beneficiaries (and other stakeholders) into the project implementation cycle in order to improve implementation in real time.

Clean Technology Fund (CTF) Scoping Proposals

38. As shown in Table 4, five proposals for new evidence-based learning have been submitted for CTF projects.

Table 4: Scoping Proposals - Clean Technology Fund

Proposal number	MDB	Country	Project	Approach	Project approval stage	Additional financing requested (USD)
CTF 1	ADB	Vietnam	Sustainable Urban Transport Hanoi	Outcome Evaluation (mid-course)	Not yet approved	200 000
CTF 2	IADB	Colombia, Mexico	Energy Efficiency Financing Program for the Services Sector (Colombia) FIRA Green Line Project (Mexico)	Formative Evaluation, Rapid Stakeholder Consultation	Approved	400 000
CTF 3	IBRD	India	Himachal Pradesh Development Policy Loan	Rapid Stakeholder Consultation	Approved	250 000
CTF 4	IBRD	Indonesia	Geothermal Development Project	Real-time learning	Approved	200 000
CTF 5	IFC	Thailand	Solar Power Company Investment	Outcome evaluation (2 projects)	Approved	65 000
					Total	**1 115 000**

Highlights of CTF Scoping Proposals

Geographic coverage

39. The projects covered by these five scoping proposals are in middle-income countries in Asia and Latin America.

Approaches chosen

40. There is a good balance between the approaches chosen. Two projects will do an outcome evaluation, one at mid-course and one at end of project. While the other three are more on the formative side, combining formative evaluation with rapid stakeholder consultation or building a real-time learning approach into the project.

Illustrative questions to be addressed (examples: not a comprehensive list of questions)

41. The sustainable urban transport project in Hanoi will focus on the integration of metro line 3 with other public and private transport systems and attempt to answer the following questions:

a) Is there a shift of transport mode – from the use of private cars to public transport? Is there an increase of the volume of passengers using metro line 3? What are the reasons for transport mode shift?

b) Does the project improve the mobility of the passengers and reduce the time burden (time spent from travelling from home to work place, social services or other locations?

42. The Energy Efficiency Financing Program for the Services Sector in Colombia and the FIRA Green Line Project in Mexico will attempt to answer the following questions:

a) How effective and relevant are the risk mitigation instruments developed to manage risks associated to energy efficiency projects?

b) Which risks have been mitigated and which not?

c) What improvements are needed in the proposed model?

d) Which adjustments were undertaken during execution and which were their results?

e) What is the potential of replicating the proposed risk mitigation instruments in other sectors and countries?

43. The Himachal Pradesh Development Policy Loan proposes to incorporate two new evidence-based learning approaches: rapid stakeholder consultation and outcome evaluation (see also Box 2).

Box 2. Himachal Pradesh Development Policy Loan – Proposed Rapid Stakeholder Consultation and Outcome Evaluation

The proposed rapid stakeholder consultation and outcome evaluation will supplement activities already being undertaken, such as the Poverty and Social Impact Analysis. The *rapid stakeholder consultation* will help gather rapid feedback from key stakeholders to identify areas where mid-course corrections may be required. The *outcome evaluation (mid-course)* will add value by analyzing the realization of the intended outcomes and their attribution to the proposed set of activities under the project (i.e., policy reforms and institutional capacity building activities). The added value of this approach will also stem from the fact that Development Policy Loans, as opposed to traditional investment operations, are not subject to comprehensive mid-term reviews during project implementation.

44. The rapid stakeholder consultation will attempt to answer the following questions:

a) How effective is the project in meeting its objectives, including impact on intended beneficiaries from increased hydropower production?

b) What barriers hindering hydropower development are not being addressed by the project?

c) How effective is the (new) institutional structure (to be) for scaling up hydropower in Himachal Pradesh?

45. The outcome evaluation will ask questions such as:

a) What outcomes did the program try to achieve or contribute to and how can these be measured?

b) Were these outcomes achieved? If so, to what extent, how and why?

c) How did the program contribute to the achieve outcomes? How can lessons from this program inform other programs?

46. The Geothermal Development Project in Indonesia, in its real-time learning, will focus on the following questions:

a) What do data tell us about project progress, institutional capacity and experience, and strategies to address possible delays in project implementation?

b) How are hypotheses about the adequacy of the resource (geothermal steam) and institutional capacity changing over time?

c) What specific opportunities do we have to test our assumptions and hypothesis?

47. Two Solar Power Company Investment, Thailand will focus on several questions, including the following:

a) What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

b) To what extent are the objectives of the program still valid?

c) To what extent did the benefits of a programme or project continue after donor funding ceased?

Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) Scoping Proposals

48. As shown in Table 5, six proposals for new evidence-based learning have been submitted for PPCR projects.

Table 5: Scoping Proposals - Pilot Program for Climate Resilience

Proposal number	MDB	Country	Project	Approach	Project approval stage	Additional financing requested (USD)
PPCR 1	AfDB	Mozambique	Baixo Limpopo Irrigation and Climate Resilience Project	Adaptive Capacity Assessment	Approved	350 000
PPCR 2	IADB	Jamaica	Adaptation Program and Financing Mechanism for PPCR Jamaica	Impact Evaluation	Not yet approved	450 000
PPCR 3	IADB	Plurinational State of Bolivia	Climate resilience program for the water and sanitation systems of the metropolitan areas of La Paz and El Alto	Cost-benefit Analysis	Not yet approved	160 000
PPCR 4	IBRD	Haiti	Strengthening Hydromet Services	Cost Benefit Analysis	Not yet approved	40 000
PPCR 5	IBRD	Jamaica	Improving Climate Data and Information Management Project	Rapid Stakeholder Consultation	Not yet approved	350 000
PPCR 6	IFC	Niger	PPCR Niger Irrigation Program	Outcome evaluation (mid-course)	[3] Not yet approved	200 000
					Total	**1 550 000**

Highlights of PPCR Scoping Proposals

Geographic coverage

49. The scoping proposals cover projects in two-low income countries in Africa, one low-income country in the Caribbean, one lower-middle income in Latin America, and one upper-middle income country in the Caribbean.

Approaches chosen

50. The scoping proposals demonstrate a variety of evidence-based learning approaches. The majority engage in baseline analysis through an adaptive capacity assessment, cost-benefit analysis, impact evaluation, or rapid stakeholder consultations. One project will do a mid-course outcome evaluation. Some approaches, like the adaptive capacity assessment and impact evaluations, also have mid-course and/or end-of-project components.

[3] This program is currently under consideration by the PCPR Sub-Committee for approval and will therefore request additional funding (USD 200,000) for its evidence-based activities.

Illustrative questions to be addressed (examples: not a comprehensive list of questions)

51. The Mozambique irrigation and climate resilience project will attempt to answer the following questions with an adaptive capacity assessment:

a) How are different livelihood groups currently affected by climate (hazard/variability) change, in particular flood and in terms of health impacts?

b) How can the negative impacts of climate change be best mitigated by the project?

c) How can the adaptive capacities of the project beneficiaries be best strengthened by the project?

52. The impact evaluation for the Jamaica project on agricultural climate adaptation and financing mechanisms will focus specifically on issues pertaining to the agricultural adaptation component and seek to answer the following question:

a) Will activities such as the construction of check-dams and capacity building efforts – i.e., training farmers to construct and maintain check dams, result in improved water access and an increase in crop yields?

53. The proposed cost-benefit analysis for the water and sanitation project in Bolivia will determine if the methods proposed to expand the availability of water for human and agricultural consumption will contribute to the beneficiaries' wellbeing. The analysis will pose the following questions at the outset and the end of the project:

a) Is the proposed intervention economically feasible while contributing to reduce population vulnerability to the effects of climate change on water availability and quality?
b) Is the proposed intervention economically sound while responding to more extended and severe droughts in the Altiplano due to climate variability and change?

54. The Haiti project strengthening hydromet services will strive to answer the following questions through a cost-benefit analysis:

a) What would be the most appropriate and realistic financing model(s) for efficient and effective hydro-met services in Haiti?

b) Can we estimate potential financial contribution (or percentage) from public and private users?

55. Relying on rapid stakeholder consultations, the Jamaica project on improving climate data and information management will answer the following questions:

a) Can crowdsourcing and other rapid stakeholder consultation methods increase awareness of the impacts of climate change?

b) How can adoption of initiatives to improve climate resilience be enhanced through rapid stakeholder consultations?

56. Under the Niger Irrigation Program, the EBL activities aim to produce lessons learned during program implementation to facilitate course correction as well as lessons learned at and after the end of the closing of the program. (See also, Box 3). The following questions will be answered:

a) What are the actual water savings from improved irrigation techniques?

b) What is the size of credit provided to farmers?

c) What are the farmers' repayment rates?

d) What are the actual IRRs on investment for the farmer?

Box 3. Niger Irrigation Program – Proposed Impact Evaluation

The Niger Irrigation Program is the first IFC climate adaptation program in the Africa region. Lessons learned will be of fundamental importance to future agribusiness and irrigation projects in the same region. The PPCR program is also pivotal to explore how to promote climate change adaptation in the agricultural private sector. In addition, the program allows IFC to pilot new approaches and manage risks that might not have been possible without PPCR support. Hence it is vital that the PPCR programs adopt a rigorous evaluation approach that will measure actual impact on the farmers.

The proposed impact evaluation will be embedded into the project design and implementation to ensure that lessons learned are documented regularly and at an early stage in order to adjust program activities, if necessary.

The results of the impact evaluation will provide needed information on the commercial viability of the program and its replicability potential. This information will be used to determine whether IFC should proceed with a Phase II which comprises of investing IFC's own commercial finance together with (if necessary) PPCR concessional finance to scale up the program scope and impact.

Forest Investment Program (FIP) Scoping Proposals

57. As shown in Table 6, six proposals have been submitted for FIP projects.

Table 6: Scoping Proposals - Forest Investment Program

Proposal number	MDB	Country	Project	Approach	Project approval stage	Additional financing requested (USD)
FIP 1	AfDB	Burkina Faso	Gazetted forests participatory management project for REDD+	Impact Evaluation	Approved	850 000
FIP 2	AfDB	DRC	Integrated REDD+ project in the Mbuji-Mayi/Kananga and Kisangani basing	Rapid Stakeholder Consultation	Approved	171 500 or 257 900 (different options for airtime purchase)
FIP 3	IBRD	Brazil	Sustainable production in areas previously converted to agricultural use project	Cost Benefit Analysis Impact Evaluation Outcome Evaluation (mid-course)	Not approved	200 000
FIP 4	IBRD	Burkina Faso	Decentralized Forest and Woodlands Management Project	Adaptive Capacity Assessment Vulnerability Assessment	Approved	200 000
FIP 5	IBRD	Indonesia	Forest management unit development and community based natural resource management project	Impact Evaluation, Outcome Evaluation (mid-term)	Not approved	400 000
FIP 6	All MDBs	All FIP countries	Dedicated Grant Mechanism	Real-time learning	Not approved	1 600 000
					Total	**3 507 900**

Highlights of FIP Proposals

Geographic coverage

58. The scoping proposals are for projects in two low-income countries in Africa, for one upper-middle income country in Latin America, and for the deployment of a dedicated grant mechanism for all FIP countries to support indigenous and local community engagement in REDD+.

Approaches chosen

59. The project scoping proposals include diverse tools for evidence-based learning. Three proposals employ early-stage interventions, including an assortment of impact evaluations, a cost-benefit analysis, and adaptive capacity assessments and vulnerability assessments, designed to establish baseline conditions. Several assessments will also measure progress during implementation and at the end of the projects. In addition, a couple of projects will complete mid-course outcome evaluations. The remaining project will incorporate rapid stakeholder consultations to gather information in the implementation phase while the dedicated grant mechanism will utilize real-time learning approaches.

Illustrative questions to be addressed (examples: not a comprehensive list of questions)

60. The Burkina Faso project gazetted forests participatory management project for REDD+ has a proposed impact evaluation. It will cover the following topics:

a) Impact of 3 forest management options the project will support: 1. wood and rangeland, 2. wood, 3. Biodiversity (with hunting activities).

b) Socio-economic impacts on (poverty, livelihoods, capacities of the population including for climate change adaptation, forest governance)

c) Environmental (biodiversity, soil and water in particular in the context of climate change adaptation) co-benefits.

61. Through rapid stakeholder consultations, the integrated REDD+ project in the Mbuji-Mayi/Kananga and Kisangani basins of the DRC[4] will answer the following questions:

a) Have the agreed payments been received?

b) What are the stakeholders' experiences with project management?

c) Do the stakeholders have any particular grievances?

62. The Brazil project on Sustainable Production in Areas Previously Converted to Agricultural Use is designed as a pilot intervention. It intends to generate specific lessons for scaling up tools and methodologies that help to increase adoption of low carbon emission technologies in the agricultural sector. The proposed impact evaluation, outcome evaluation, and cost-benefit analysis will support this effort by:

a) Testing the hypothesis whether the project has a positive impact on the rate of adoption of low carbon emission (ABC Plan) technologies.

[4] Notably, for future consideration, the Democratic Republic of the Congo has also expressed interest in working with the World Bank on additional proposal for a separate project that is still under development. A DRC Ministry of Finance representative sent an e-mail on May 26, 2014 expressing interest in developing a future proposal with the World Bank to build evidence-based learning into the Improved Forested Landscape Management Project.

b) Estimating the project's impact on the quality of the technology adoption.

c) Experimenting with different methodologies to measure the project impact on forested areas within the participating production units.

63. The Burkina Faso Decentralized Forest and Woodlands Management Project includes a proposed adaptive capacity assessment that will address the following questions:

a) What is the sensitivity to projected climate related hazards and perturbations?

b) What is missing in current projects that would enhance adaptive capacity?

c) How can planning at local level inform higher-level planning and allocation of resources?

64. The project in Indonesia focusing on the development of forest management units and community-based resource-management demonstrations will answer the following questions through several EBL tools:

a) Are there current socio-economic trends that interact with these sensitivities (and run the risk of amplifying them)? How will society be able to cope with and manage these changes?

b) Which vulnerability-decreasing strategies may be used to reduce risk? What is the priority of strategies?

c) What is missing in the project that would enhance adaptive capacity?

65. The Dedicated Grant Mechanism for indigenous peoples and local communities in all FIP countries will answer the following questions with real-time learning mechanisms (see also, Box 4):

a) Will activities such as capacity development for indigenous peoples and local communities in the eight pilot countries enhance their ability to effectively engage in the national and global REDD dialogue?

b) Will lessons and good practices from the DGM country programs shared through events organized through the global DGM component result in transferring and uptake of local and indigenous knowledge across countries and regions?

Box 4. Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities in all FIP Countries

The FIP Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities has been established to provide the communities in all eight FIP pilot countries: Brazil, Burkina Faso, DRC, Ghana, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Mexico, and Peru.

The Dedicated Grant mechanism is unique in terms of the bottom-up approach to be implemented by and through indigenous peoples and local communities.

A real-time evidence-based learning approach would allow not only the Indigenous Peoples groups, local communities, and other stakeholders to understand whether the supported activities lead to expected outcomes, but would also enable the FIP as a whole to understand whether such mechanism is a useful complement to larger-scale investments in REDD+ across the eight pilot countries.

Another useful aspect would be to explore whether the global component provides opportunities for South-South learning and whether shared experiences and lessons are actually applied in other countries.

The proposed real-time learning will involve collecting information on what is and is not working at the community level within each country, using this information to inform continuous improvement, and sharing of resulting lessons and best practices with all FIP countries at least once a year at global and regional meetings that have already been planned. This cycle would be followed throughout the five years to enable iterative learning and tracking of improvement (and learning dissemination) across the entire project cycle.

The intention is to not only learn what works well, but to determine what lessons and best practices are scalable and transferable across contexts and geographies for this unprecedented effort.

Scaling Up Renewable Energy Program (SREP) Scoping Proposals

66. As shown in Table 7, three proposals are submitted for SREP projects.

Table 7: Scoping Proposals - Scaling Up Renewable Energy Program

Proposal number	MDB	Country	Project	Approach	Project approval stage	Additional financing requested (USD)
SREP 1	ADB	Maldives	Preparing Outer Islands for Sustainable Energy Development Programme	Outcome Evaluation (mid-course)	Not approved	200 000
SREP 2	IADB	Honduras	Sustainable Rural Energization (ERUS): Promoting Sustainable Business Models for Clean Cookstoves Dissemination	Impact Evaluation Outcome evaluation (mid-course)	Approved	510 400
SREP 3	IBRD	Mali	Rural Electrification Hybrid System	Rapid Stakeholder Consultation	Approved	150 000
					Total	**860 400**

Highlights of SREP Proposals

Geographic coverage

67. The projects covered by these three scoping proposals are in SREP countries in Latin America and Asia.

Approaches chosen

68. The projects employ a few different approaches to evidence-based learning. Two incorporate outcome evaluations with one of these also using an impact evaluation, which establishes baseline information and progress during and after the project lifecycle. At least one outcome evaluation will be done at the end of the project. The remaining project utilizes rapid stakeholder consultations throughout project implementation.

Illustrative questions to be addressed (examples: not a comprehensive list of questions)

69. The Maldives project preparing its outer islands for sustainable energy development will rely on a mid-course outcome evaluation to answer the following questions:

a) Does the project have resulted to increase access of clean energy in the small islands? How many households have shifted away from the use of diesel generators as their main source of electricity?

b) Does the project promote economic and livelihood activities, health improvement, and creation of regulatory frameworks on use of clean energy?

c) What are the other benefits that can be derived from the project?

70. The Honduras project promoting the adoption of clean cookstoves will use multiple evaluations to answer the following questions (see also, Box 5):

a) What type of training leads to higher adoption rates?

b) Once adoption rates are high, what is the impact of the program in the short-term on health, social, and economic indicators?

c) What is the impact of the program in the medium- and long-term on health, social, and economic indicators?

Box 5. Honduras Clean Cookstove Project – Proposed Impact Evaluation

The ERUS Cookstoves Program is a pilot project that will scale-up investments in clean cookstoves in Honduras and the LAC region. Despite major advances, the current market penetration of these devices is low in Honduras, with as many as 1.1 million families still cooking with traditional woodstoves or open fires. In the LAC region estimates put the number of people without access to clean fuels at around 50 to 60 million. The program will benefit around 75,000 of these users just in Honduras, however the results and lessons learned from this project will be used for similar programs throughout the region.

Little rigorous research has been undertaken in Latin America to assess the impact of clean cookstoves in a real setting on health, social, economic, and environmental indicators. The proposed impact evaluation (IE) aims to measure the impact of clean cookstoves in Honduras on a sub-set of indicators. The IE will use experimental methods using a phase-in approach, it will test different menus to provide training to users, and it will measure these indicators in three points in time: baseline, first follow-up, and final follow-up. The IE will encompass 5 years, which will facilitate an assessment of the impact of these indicators in the short, medium, and long-term. The approach will provide evidence on the effectiveness of this type of interventions, by using experimental methods—considered the gold standard to more accurately evaluate the impact of a program.

71. The Mali project on a rural electrification hybrid system will use rapid stakeholder consultations to answer the following questions:

a) What is the level of satisfaction of project beneficiaries?

b) What improvements are needed to enhance the effectiveness of the project taking into consideration local particularities and opportunities?

c) How can the design of the project be modified to adapt to local circumstances and further increase the scale-up potential of hybrid mini-grids?

Additional Support from DECIE/DIME i2i

72. In addition, three PPCR projects implemented by AfDB seeking support from the World Bank Development Economics Impact Evaluation unit DECIE/DIME i2i umbrella facility. The projects are: (a) Baixo Limpopo Irrigation and Climate Resilience Project (BLICRP), Mozambique; (b) Sustainable Land & Water Resources Management Project (SLWRMP), Mozambique; and (c) Strengthening Climate Resilience in the Kafue Basin project (SCRIKA), Zambia.[5]

73. The i2i umbrella facility is the result of a partnership between the World Bank Development Economics Impact Evaluation unit (DECIE/DIME) and DFID to expand the use of impact evaluation across the developing world, particularly in areas that have traditionally been under-evaluated. To give all teams the same opportunity to access funds, DIME organizes

[5] The Niger Community Action Project for Climate Resilience (CAPCR) team is also preparing to participate in a DIME workshop in Rwanda.

workshops on a regular basis to match researchers with operations and help teams design high-quality impact evaluations.

74. AfDB project teams applied to join DIME's Agricultural Adaptations program (AADAPT) and to participate in the DIME workshop focusing on Agriculture. It will be held in June 16-20, 2014, in Kigali, Rwanda, in close collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI). This event is co-financed by i2i and the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP), and is a joint research effort between the Center for Effective Global Action at UC Berkeley, the East Africa Social Science Translation, and other academic partners.

75. Projects may include but are not restricted to IDA and non-IDA investments, WB or DFID-financed, and must have particular strategic and policy relevance in agriculture.

76. The objective is to achieve better results by identifying how to make interventions work. During the workshop, each team will be matched with a researcher and develop a preliminary IE design.

77. After the workshop, i2i will open a call for Preparation Grants Proposals. Teams will have 4 weeks to prepare and submit a short concept note outlining the research questions, policy relevance, IE design, timeline, team and budget. Funding will be allocated based on: (a) regional quotas (with 8 impact evaluations planned in Africa); (b) technical merit; and (c) policy relevance of the proposal. The proposals will be assessed through an external, blind peer review process, and final decisions will be made by the i2i technical committee chaired by the Director of Research. Upon satisfactory completion of an Impact Evaluation concept note review per World Bank and i2i guidelines, chaired by the Country Director and peer reviewed by impact evaluation researchers, teams will be considered for continued funding under the Implementation Grants window. Data collection grants will be competitively allocated based on technical merit of the concept note and special justification from the implementing agency.

Value Added

78. The value added of complementary approaches to evidence-based learning built into the CIF project cycle is high.

79. First, based on the research conducted, the proposed approaches will significantly enhance the amount of intentional evidence-based learning that is conducted above and beyond routine practices. Based on the stock taking effort, at least 16 projects conduct efforts that are above-routine, and the new scoping proposals apply to 20 projects. This will be a major scale up.

80. Second, the proposed evidence-based approaches are strategic and transparent.They have been identified by the key parties involved as opportunities to improve the generation of evidence and the application of evidence in order to enhance our knowledge of what does or does not work and to improve results.

81. Third, MDBs and their clients will be requested, whenever possible, to share lessons learned in three ways: (1) A technical paper for an appropriate journal or other publication; (2) A knowledge note to be shared across the CIF and posted on the CIF website; and (3) A blog post which will be publically available. Dissemination of lessons in these ways will help to spread knowledge and learning and to replicate and scale good practices. The CIF Administrative Unit will also build on these knowledge products.

82. Finally, there is no better way to advance work on these complex issues than through intentionally learning from experience, generating new evidence, and continually improving. It is also expected that this initiative will have spillover effects and that there will be cross-fertilization and learning among CIF projects and beyond. It is highly likely that the lessons learned through these CIF efforts will also inform work being done by many other partners who are not formally part of the CIF.

Pilot Country Interest

83. Most MDBs have discussed the proposals with their respective pilot and partner countries' counterparts, as indicated at the bottom of each proposal in Annex 3. Those few that have not yet had these discussions are planning on doing so.

VI. FINANCING REQUIRED

84. Twenty scoping proposals for building evidence-based learning into the CIF portfolio have been developed by the MDBs. These 20 proposals request USD 7 032 400 of additional financing associated with USD 429 599 000 of CIF investments. The total additional financing requested represents 1.64 % of the project investment covered by this work. This is very reasonable given that the cost of evaluation usually lies between 1-5 (plus) % of the total project cost, depending on its type and depth.

85. For the proposals that apply to projects/programs *already approved* by the Trust Fund Committees, it is proposed that a special initiative will be included in the FY15 CIF administrative budget to cover the estimated costs of evidence-based learning components within projects that have already been approved. Such an arrangement is proposed given the expected high transaction costs involved in going back to the CIF and MDB management for approval of supplementary financing.

86. Whenever evidenced-based learning components form part of projects/programs for which CIF funding has *not been approved yet* by the Trust Fund Committees as indicated in tables 4-7, their costs will form part of the project funding. The funding requested will be additional to the indicative funding requested in the investment plan. For those projects/programs that have not been approved by the Trust Fund Committee, the full proposal for the evidence-based learning initiative should be part of the project proposal package that will be submitted for approval by the respective Sub Committee.

VII. PROPOSED WAY FORWARD

87. After approval by the CTF/SCF Trust Fund Committees of the proposals presented in this document, the MDBs will prepare more detailed full proposals for each evidence-based learning intervention. These full proposals will contain:

a) Complete information on the approach to be taken;

b) Description of how this approach will interact with the project implementation;

c) Detailed budget that specifies amounts in different cost categories (e.g., consultancy services, travel, equipment costs, etc.);

d) Schedule of planned activities;

e) Comprehensive terms of reference for all persons to be hired for carrying out the work;

f) Description of the feedback loop, spelling out how the findings and new information produced through evidence-based learning will be used, by whom, and in which intervals, including which processes will be put in place to make sure this happens; and

g) Outline of at least three evidence knowledge products that will, where possible, be produced throughout the course of implementation:

   i. technical paper for an appropriate publication;

   ii. a knowledge note; and

   iii. a blog.

VIII. ANNEX 1. OVERARCHING FEASIBILITY OF GENERATING EVIDENCE ON RESULTS

1. CLEAN TECHNOLOGY FUND (CTF): OVERARCHING FEASIBILITY OF GENERATING EVIDENCE ON RESULTS

Generating evidence of reduced greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions is usually more complicated than it sounds, and the feasibility of doing so ranges significantly from case to case. Similarly, establishing evidence surrounding other CTF expected results, such as increased access to public transportation, can be difficult at best. Below is an overview of the feasibility of generating evidence tying CTF investments to their intended results[6]. Also included are examples of questions that could frame an assessment of CTF's role.

ON FEASIBILITY OF GENERATING EVIDENCE	*EXAMPLE QUESTIONS*
INTENDED RESULT: TRANSFORMED LOW-CARBON ECONOMY[7] *General Feasibility Of Generating Evidence: Low* It is generally difficult to attribute changes in complex economic development pathways to one intervention or influence; making a case for association/contribution is more likely. Identifying evidence of plausible association is generally more realistic, and even then some level of rigorous analysis would be needed to make a case.	1. Are CTF projects influencing low-carbon investments? If so, how?
INTENDED RESULT: AVOIDED GHG EMISSIONS[8] *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Low-High* The feasibility of generating evidence on GHG emissions reduced or avoided varies. Feasibility is higher when it is possible to (a) directly monitor emissions (e.g., end-of-pipe emissions monitoring at power plants) related to a project, although even then variations in production levels and other factors can cause uncertainty, and (b) produce a valid estimate of the emissions that would have occurred in the absence of the project (a counterfactual or business-as-usual baseline scenario). Generating evidence is less feasible when the calculations are based on speculative assumptions, when many external factors could be influencing emissions patterns (e.g., the price of petroleum), and/or the reductions are at a large (sector-wide or nation-wide) and analyses need to be based on models that generate highly uncertain estimates.	2. What GHG emissions were reduced as a result of the intervention, and how certain/uncertain are the reduction estimates?

[6] Based on the December 2012 CTF Results Framework.
[7] Indicator: Country level GHG/unit of GDP.
[8] Indicator: Tons of GHG emissions reduced or avoided.

INTENDED RESULT: INCREASED FINANCE FOR LOW-CARBON DEVELOPMENT MOBILIZED[9] *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Medium (Variable)* The feasibility of generating evidence depends on the availability of information on financing, agreement around indicators of low-carbon development, and ability to make a case that CTF projects have in some way uniquely contributing to increased financing (versus financing that would have materialized in any case). This is generally neither an easy nor an extremely difficult result to analyze; however the ease or difficultly is context and case specific.	3. What are the trends in financing for low-carbon development, and do these trends relate the timing (before, during, after) and content of CTF projects?
INTENDED RESULT: INCREASED SUPPLY OF RENEWABLE ENERGY (RE)[10] *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Medium* Supplies of RE are a function of up-front infrastructure investments; financial incentives for investors, utilities, suppliers, and end-users; grid connectivity and storage; market value of competing sources of energy; etc. CTF interventions are unlikely to be the only influence on the supply of RE. Still, particularly at the project level – and potentially in some cases at the local or national level – it may be feasible to generate evidence of an increased supply (e.g., a new RE supply wouldn't have developed as quickly or at all without CTF assistance).	4. How are the CTF investments influencing the supply of RE?
INTENDED RESULT: INCREASED ACCESS TO PUBLIC TRANSPORT[11] *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Low-Medium* Evidence on increased usage of low-carbon transportation options relies on mode-shift analyses of how many people switch from higher-carbon transportation options to lower-carbon options as a result of lower-carbon transportation alternatives. These estimates typically rely on models that include assumptions and are at least somewhat uncertain. Also, it is difficult to make low-carbon transportation options such as bus rapid transit more attractive than other options; making the case for reductions is difficult for this reason alone.	5. How has the introduction of low-carbon transportation alternatives altered the modes of transportation people are choosing to use?
INTENDED RESULT (CO-BENEFIT): INCREASED ENERGY ACCESS *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Medium (Variable)* It is logical that an increased and improved provision of energy results in a general increase of energy availability. While no one disagrees with increasing access to energy, from the perspective of prevention of climate change, there is a need for low-carbon energy sources to replace older fossil fuel sources or substitute for new fossil-fuel production. Efforts are thus needed to ensure that the increased availability of low-carbon energy results in an increase in access to energy, particularly for poor men and women. This may be more readily measurable in some instances (e.g., distribution of solar panels to villages that are not grid connected) than others (e.g., access to new energy on grids with many unofficial/illegal users and many sources of energy).	6. What are the trends in energy access for poor men and women, and what has contributed to these trends?

[9] Indicator: Volume of direct finance leveraged through CTF funding – disaggregated by public and private finance.
[10] Indicator: Installed capacity (MW) as a result of CTF interventions.
[11] Additional passengers (disaggregated by men and women if feasible) using low carbon public transport as a result of CIF intervention.

2. SCALING UP RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAM (SREP) : OVERARCHING FEASIBILITY OF GENERATING EVIDENCE ON RESULTS

The availability and use of renewable energy (RE) are functions of individual direct investments in RE projects as well as several other factors, including availability of country-level financial incentives and financing mechanisms, grid connectivity, regulatory frameworks, and the international price for both RE/RE materials, such as photovoltaics, and the price of competing fossil fuels, such as coal and natural gas. Beyond RE supply, the use of and benefits from RE are also a function of additional issues, including demand among suppliers and end users. It is easier in some cases than in others to generate evidence of results related to supply, use, and benefits to particular RE projects or broader RE interventions (such as provision of assistance to national energy regulators).

Below is an overview of the feasibility of generating evidence tying SREP investments to their intended results[12]. Also included are examples of questions that could frame an assessment of SREP's role.

ON FEASIBILITY OF GENERATING EVIDENCE	*EXAMPLE QUESTIONS*
INTENDED RESULT: SUPPORT LOW-CARBON DEVELOPMENT PATHWAYS BY REDUCING ENERGY POVERTY AND/OR INCREASING ENERGY SECURITY[13] *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Low-Medium* The concepts of low-carbon development pathways, energy poverty, and energy security are emerging, and they reflect complex relationships between human and natural systems interacting at the macro (national, international, or global) levels. The influence of any one program is typically either very difficult or not possible to tease out, and at most the evidence – if identifiable – would suggest a contribution to larger trends, not direct attribution involving a singular cause-and-effect relationship. Further, indicators of these concepts are still evolving. At best, even rigorous analysis methods are likely to reveal a *plausible* relationship/contribution to overarching trends in these (important) broad areas.	**1.** Are SREP projects contributing to increased energy security[14]? If so, how?

[12] Based on the SREP Results Framework, Revised June 2012.
[13] Indicators: National measure of 'energy poverty' such as the Multi-dimensional Energy Poverty Index, or some equivalent mutually agreed measure; Annual electricity output from RE in GWh; Increased public and private investments in targeted subsector(s) per country per year.
[14] As measured by indicators such as reduction in fuel imports.

INTENDED RESULT: INCREASED SUPPLY OF RENEWABLE ENERGY[15] *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Medium* Supplies of renewable energy are a function of several factors, including up-front infrastructure investments; financial incentives for investors, utilities, suppliers, and end-users; grid connectivity and storage; market value of competing sources of energy; etc. SREP interventions alone are unlikely to be the only influence on the supply of energy. Still, particularly at the project level – and potentially in some cases at the local or national level – it may be feasible to generate evidence of an increased supply (e.g., a new RE supply wouldn't have developed as quickly or at all without SREP assistance).	2. Are the SREP investments influencing the supply of RE? If so, how?
INTENDED RESULT: INCREASED ACCESS TO MODERN ENERGY SERVICES[16] *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Medium* Issues surrounding the feasibility of generating evidence for this expected result are the same as those surrounding the renewable energy supply expected result (above) with the added complication of also analyzing benefits to people resulting from increased supply. In particular, when the introduction of new technologies requires users to change their habits, technology adoption needs to be assessed. Supply issues aside, analyzing energy access and direct measurable benefits to populations requires specialized information collection (e.g., surveys of beneficiary populations and non-beneficiary populations that are otherwise characteristically the same), which may be feasible given enough resources and appropriate methods for the analytical task.	3. What are the trends in access to modern energy services in areas benefiting from SREP interventions compared to the same trends in similar areas that not covered/served by SREP?

[15] Indicator: Annual electricity output from RE as a result of SREP interventions (GWh).
[16] Number of women and men, businesses and community services benefiting from improved access to electricity and fuels as a result of SREP interventions.

3. FOREST INVESTMENT PROGRAM (FIP): OVERARCHING FEASIBILITY OF GENERATING EVIDENCE ON RESULTS

Forest investments intended to both prevent climate change and support co-benefits are some of the more complex climate change interventions for reasons including the constant vulnerability of forests to deforestation and degradation, and challenges of introducing strong (and enforceable) forest protection policies that consider climate change, and the relationship between forests, vulnerable forest communities, and broader economic forces – not to mention other environmental consideration, such as ecosystem health.

Below is an illustrative overview of the feasibility of generating evidence tying FIP investments to examples of FIP expected results[17]. Also included are examples of questions that could frame an assessment of FIP's role.

ON FEASIBILITY OF GENERATING EVIDENCE	*EXAMPLE QUESTIONS*
INTENDED RESULT (CORE OBJECTIVE): REDUCED GHG EMISSIONS FROM DEFORESTATION AND DEGRADATION; ENHANCEMENT OF FOREST CARBON STOCKS[18] *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Low-Medium* The monitoring of GHG emissions / enhancement of forest stocks generally relies on models that use remote sensing and other technologies to estimate forest cover, density, and other forest indicators that can be translated into CO2. Although the techniques and supporting technologies have improved over time, they are still estimates with a range of uncertainty. Further, it is generally difficult to attribute shifts in these outcomes to any particular intervention because many factors (including illegal deforestation and international price of commodities such as soybeans that can be grown in forested areas) influence forests.	1. To what extent have GHG emissions been avoided as a result of improved forest protection policies and practices?
INTENDED RESULT (LIVELIHOOD CO-BENEFIT OBJECTIVE): REDUCED POVERTY THROUGH IMPROVED QUALITY OF LIFE OF FOREST DEPENDENT INDIGENOUS PEOPLE AND FOREST COMMUNITIES[19] *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Low-Medium* Quality of life is a complicated, if not complex, topic, and influencing quality of life is also complex. Changes in poverty levels, lend-tenure rights, levels of education, and other indicators of quality of life typically take years – if not longer – to materialize, and tying changes in these indicators to individual projects or programs, particularly during the first several years of implementation, is generally difficult. Identifying a plausible contribution to change is more feasible, but that also can be difficult.	2. How do changes in forest community income levels and source of incomes relate to changes in forest policies and practices?

[17] Based on the May 2011 FIP Results Framework and October 2013 Results Monitoring and Reporting in the FIP.
[18] Indicators: (a) Tons (millions) of CO2 emissions from reduced deforestation and forest degradation relative to reference emissions level; (b) Tons (millions) of CO_2 sequestered through natural regeneration, re- and afforestation activities, and conservation relative to forest reference level.
[19] Indicators: (a) Percentage of indigenous peoples and local community members/ forest communities (women and men) with legally recognized tenure rights and secure access to economic benefits and/or the means of maintaining traditional livelihoods; (b) Changes in income in forest communities over time; (c) Percentage of enrollment of boys and girls in primary and secondary education in areas with indigenous community members/ forest communities (MDG 2 a); Other quality of life indicators may be identified and validated through a consultative process with indigenous peoples and local communities.

INTENDED RESULT: INCREASED DIRECT MANAGEMENT OF FOREST RESOURCES BY LOCAL COMMUNITIES AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES.[20] *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Low-Medium* Monitoring the management of forest resources by local communities is very difficult in areas where forest communities do not readily communicate with or trust authorities. In addition, not all local management is sustainable and identifying the extent to which traditional forest management system are being deployed relies on deep expertise. A further complication is tying changes in management to the influences behind the changes.	3. Has FIP contributed to the trends in local community/indigenous people forest management?
INTENDED RESULT: NEW AND ADDITIONAL RESOURCES FOR FOREST AND FOREST-RELATED PROJECTS[21] *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Medium-High* Major funding flows and other resources investments from international and domestic funders is more relatively feasible to monitor, and inquiries can be made to understand the reasons why new/ongoing financial commitments are being made. This is not always simple or straight-forward; however, smaller resource investments may be harder to track, commitments do not always materialize into actual funding, and there are often many reasons behind resource commitments.	4. To what extent has FIP been catalytic in attracting resources for forest-related projects?

[20] Indicators: Increase in land and resources under legal control and management of indigenous peoples and local communities including through traditional forest management systems.
[21] Indicators: Leverage factor of FIP funding; $ financing from other sources (contributions broken down by governments, MDBs, other multilateral and bilateral partners, CSOs, private sector).

5. PILOT PROGRAM FOR CLIMATE RESILIENCE (PPCR): : OVERARCHING FEASIBILITY OF GENERATING EVIDENCE ON RESULTS

Climate resilience requires context-specific planning and action that takes into consideration socio-economic factors and natural systems dynamics as well as the uncertainty surrounding when, where, and how climate change will affect populations. Below is an overview of the feasibility of generating evidence tying PPCR projects to their intended results[22]. Also included are examples of questions that could frame an assessment of PPCR's role.

ON FEASIBILITY OF GENERATING EVIDENCE	*EXAMPLE QUESTIONS*
INTENDED RESULT: INCREASED RESILIENCE OF HOUSEHOLDS, COMMUNITIES, BUSINESSES, SECTORS AND SOCIETY TO CLIMATE VARIABILITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE[23] *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Low* The data most readily available pertain to outputs, not outcomes concerning actual increased resilience, which is significantly more difficult to analyze in a manner that will establish clear evidence due lack of available data, level of complexity surrounding "resilience," uncertainty of ties to climate change, and very high costs of conducting rigorous analyses on questions of impact.	1. How have parameters of livelihoods at the household level changed over time? 2. Can a relationship between these changes and the PPCR investment be established?
INTENDED RESULT: STRENGTHENED CLIMATE RESPONSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN[24] *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Medium-High* Tracking changes in climate-related development plans (and budgets) is relatively straight forward, assuming that access to such plans is available and that a case can be made for the relationship between PPCR projects (such as provision of information on best practices and technical assistance) and these plans. In some countries, the responsible authorities, processes for supporting development planning, and status of such plans may be less available or accessible.	3. To what extent is the information supplied by PPCR projects integrated into local and national climate response plans?

[22] Based on the PPCR Results Framework, December 2012.
[23] Indicator (optional): Change in percentage of households (in areas at risk) whose livelihoods have improved; Indicator (optional): Change in damage/losses ($) from extreme climate events in areas at risks that are the geographical focus of PPCR intervention; Indicator (core): Number of people supported by the PPCR to cope with effects of climate change; Indicator (optional): Percentage of people with year round access to reliable and safe water supply (domestic, agricultural, industrial).
[24] Indicator (core): Degree of integration of climate change in national, including sector planning; Indicator (optional): Changes in budget allocations at national and possibly sub- national level of government to take into account effects of CV&CC.

INTENDED RESULT: STRENGTHENED ADAPTIVE CAPACITIES[25] *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Medium* To establish evidence around adaptive capacity requires identification of context-specific climate-vulnerable sectors/populations, a clear definition of adaptive capacity, data on whether countries (or areas within countries) meet this definition or are making progress toward it, and the relationship between changes in adaptive capacity and PPCR projects. Although these requirements are neither simple nor straight forward, existing definitions, scorecards, and other methods provide a starting point for analysis. Still, evidence is likely to be qualitative and based in expert judgment versus on quantitative analysis of impact.	4. How and to what extent have PPCR investments contributed to strengthening adaptive capacities?
INTENDED RESULT: IMPROVED SECTOR PLANNING AND REGULATION FOR CLIMATE RESILIENCE[26] *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Medium-High* The rationale for why the generating evidence is relatively feasible is the same as the rationale above for the expected result "strengthened climate responsive development plan."	5. How have national sector planning efforts and regulations integrated information generated by PPCR?
INTENDED RESULT: USE OF CLIMATE INFORMATION IN DECISION MAKING ROUTINELY APPLIED[27] *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence: Low-Medium* Other than in publically available plans, decision-making and implementation are difficult to track, particularly in countries where such information is not readily collected or available on the Internet. Assessing these factors requires in-depth analysis and innovative metrics. The challenge may be more about obtaining relevant information to base scorecards or other assessments upon.	6. To what extent is climate information being used by decision makers in target venues? What is the response in terms of commitments?
INTENDED RESULT: CLIMATE RESPONSIVE INVESTMENT APPROACHES IDENTIFIED AND IMPLEMENTED *General Feasibility of Generating Evidence on Results: Medium* Evidence surrounding this intended result will involve the extent to which the PPCR is contributing to the development and implementing climate-responsive investment approaches. Generating evidence will generally be feasible if the information on approaches is available; however, the evidence will largely pertain to plans (outputs) rather than ultimate implementation and real-world "testing" as climate change occurs.	7. To what extent have PPCR supported quality climate-responsive investment and approaches which are relevant for climate-vulnerable populations been developed?

[25] Indicator (core): Extent to which vulnerable households, communities businesses and public sector services use improved PPCR supported tools, instruments, strategies, activities to respond to CV&CC.
[26] Indicators: (core) Degree of integration of climate change in national, including sector planning; (optional) Changes in budget allocations at national and possibly sub- national level of government to take into account effects of CV&CC.
[27] Indicator (optional): Evidence showing that climate information products/services are used in decision making in climate sensitive sectors.

IX. ANNEX 2. EVIDENCE-BASED LEARNING – APPROACH FACT SHEETS

FACT SHEET 1: ADAPTIVE CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

Relevance	
Mitigation	
Resilience	✓
Forests	

Applicable Project Phase(s)	
Ex-ante / prospective	✓
Design	✓
Mid-course	✓
At End	✓
Ex-post / retrospective	✓

Other	
Cost	Medium
Level of Effort	Medium - High
Quantitative or Qualitative	Qualitative
Special technology needed?	No

What It Is

Adaptive Capacity Assessments (ACA) identifies links between climate and development and promotes inclusion of climate adaptation activities in development programs. IPCC defines adaptive capacity as the ability of a system to adjust to climate change (including climate variability and extremes) to moderate potential damages, to take advantage of opportunities, or to cope with the consequences. ACA helps determine the capacity of human systems in order to identify and address weaknesses in planning initiatives, examine development initiatives through a climate change lens or as a component of climate vulnerability assessment (described separately as a different but related approach).

This fact sheet describes two practical ACA tools: the National Adaptive Capacity (NAC) framework developed by the World Resources Institute and the Local Adaptive Capacity (LAC) framework developed by the African Climate Change Resilience Alliance (ACCRA). One premise of NAC is that adaptation activities in different countries will be *performed* in different ways, but assumes that core *functions* of adaptation systems are the same in all countries. On a local level, rather than looking at what a community *has*, LAC analyses what the community *does* and *how* it does it.

Value Add for Climate Change Context

- ACA helps to identify where capacity building for climate change adaptation is needed (typically in areas where populations are highly vulnerable to climate change).
- ACA can be used to track whether adaptive capacity changed over time.
- For countries where adaptation activities are just beginning, NAC's assessment of institutional functions can provide an organizing frame for setting priorities and making sense of diverse and scattered information.
- LAC baseline information can support national policy makers in planning, policy/strategy development, and in working with communities to raise awareness and develop context-suitable capacity-building approaches.

Suitable Circumstances

ACA is suitable for initiatives aimed at building capacity for climate resilience at different levels, and for creating mechanisms for monitoring and reporting on changes in adaptive capacity that are tailored to each context.

Relationship to Mitigation, Resilience, and/or Forest Investments

ACA focuses on resilience or adaptation. "Resilience" here is intended to encompass and go beyond adaptation.

Types of Questions this Approach Could Address

Based on the NAC framework:

- Have quality impact and vulnerability assessments been conducted at the national level?

- Have sound national adaptation priorities been set?
- Is appropriate information and analysis reaching key stakeholders?
- To what extent are selected adaptation options implemented on the ground?

Based on the LAC framework:

- How are different livelihood groups currently affected by climate (hazard/variability) change?
- How are development interventions contributing to managing vulnerability to hazards in a changing climate?
- What is missing in current projects that would enhance adaptive capacity?
- How can planning at local level inform higher-level planning and allocation of resources?

When the Approach can be Implemented

ACA can be used prior to project selection (e.g., to help identify where to fund adaptive capacity projects), during the design stage, mid-course (e.g., to reflect on changes in adaptive capacity for monitoring, reporting or evaluation purposes), or at the end of an initiative to identify results and further opportunities for improvement.

Limitations

A national assessment of capacity still needs to be translated to implementation at local and community levels. Likewise, local capacities may or may not be applicable/appropriate for initiative replication or scale up.

Methods

- NAC: Collecting qualitative data using NAC Context Worksheet and NAC Answer Worksheet. The NAC framework is divided into categories (planning, alignment, and risk management), each with several functions.
- LAC: Using qualitative methods (focus groups, semi-structured interviews, written exchanges, and documentary analysis) to answer questions and fill out the LAC Framework tool, which covers asset base, institutions and entitlements, knowledge and information, innovation, and flexible forward-looking decision-making and governance. IFAD has used participatory mapping while conducting LAC assessments.

Challenges that Might Arise in Climate Change

Adaptive capacity is not easy to "test" except in extreme circumstances, such as extreme weather events, and even then it is one of the harder cultural/institutional shifts to identify or measure. The greater benefits of building adaptive capacity will be experienced in the future. Silva Villanueva (2011) concludes that "*expected* outcomes may only be seen in long-term timeframes" because "indicators of adaptive capacity will represent factors that do not determine current vulnerability but that enable a society to pursue adaptive on options in the future."

Where this Approach has been Used

- NAC: Bolivia, Ireland, Nepal, and possibly in African countries
- LAC: Uganda, Mozambique, Ethiopia, Kenya, Ghana, Sierra Leone, Indonesia, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Vietnam by ACCRA and World Vision. LAC and participatory mapping: Mali, Sudan, Swaziland, Rwanda, and India by IFAD

Where to Learn More

General adaptation and adaptive capacity assessment information:

- IPCC (2007) *Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007 (AR_4).* See also AR_5 reports, forthcoming.
- Bours, D., et al. (2014) *Twelve reasons why climate change adaptation M&E is challenging* and

Guidance Note 2: Selecting indicators for climate change adaptation programming, SEAChange. CoP, and UKCIP.

- Silva Villanueva, P. (2011) *Learning to ADAPT: monitoring and evaluation approaches in climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction – challenges, gaps and ways forward*. SCR Discussion Paper 9.

WRI's NAC framework:

- Dixit, A., et al. (2012) *Ready or Not: Assessing Institutional Aspects of National Capacity for Climate Change Adaptation*.

ACCRA's LAC framework:

- ACCRA (2012) *The ACCRA Local Adaptive Capacity framework*; ACCRA (n.d.) *Consultation Document: The ACCRA Local Adaptive Capacity Framework (LAC)*; and Jones, L., et al. (2010) *Towards a characterization of adaptive capacity: a framework for analyzing adaptive capacity at the local level*. ODI.

Mainstreaming adaptation & resilience evaluation into development projects:

- IIED (2013) *A framework for mainstreaming climate resilience into development planning* and Levine, S., et al. (2011) *Rethinking Support for Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change: The Role of Development Interventions*

FACT SHEET 2: COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS

Relevance	
Mitigation	✓
Resilience	✓
Forests	✓

Applicable Project Phase(s)	
Ex-ante / prospective	✓
Design	
Mid-course	✓
At End	✓
Ex-post / retrospective	✓

Other	
Cost	Medium-High
Level of Effort	Medium-High
Quantitative or Qualitative	Both
Special technology needed?	Simulation (optional)

What it is

Cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) compares an initiative's monetary costs to outcomes such as tons of CO_2 emissions avoided or reduced as a result of an intervention project or program. It is similar to, or in some cases the same as, a value-for-money or social return on investment analysis where the return is measured in non-monetary terms. There are several variations of CEA, and multiple analytical components are typically needed for a complete analysis. These include a full analysis of costs; and, where GHG emission reductions are the intended outcomes, analysis of baseline or business as usual scenarios[28]; direct and indirect emission reductions[29], and unintended effects[30]. Outcomes for resilience or other types of climate interventions can be determined on a case-by-case basis; if outcomes are hard to identify or credibly measure, CEA is not recommended.

Value Add for Climate Change Context

- There is clear value add for project selection, monitoring, reporting, and accountability – in those instances where CEA is suitable.
- There is obvious value for mitigation (and related forest) interventions that aim to reduce quantifiable amounts of GHG emissions – and where those reductions can be attributed to the intervention.
- The value add for other climate interventions is variable, depending on whether the full costs and intended outcomes can be quantified.

Suitable Circumstances

- When trying to select investments with quantifiable outcomes – typically aimed at reducing GHG emissions. (Outcomes are at a certain point in time and compared to a business-as-usual (BAU) scenario/counterfactual scenario. GHG emissions are largely cumulative; different outcomes would be expected over time.)
- When reporting interim or final outcomes relative to investment.

Relationship to Mitigation, Resilience, and/or Forest Investments

- CEA will often be related to mitigation and forest investments, where the objective is to reduce GHG

[28] Baseline or business as usual (BAU) scenarios are the likely trajectory of GHG emissions without the intervention. Static or frozen baselines are rare given the dynamic nature of emissions in the real world. Sometimes baselines and BAUs are referred to as "reference" scenarios. The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) defines baseline as a scenario "that reasonably represents the anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHG that would occur in the absence of the proposed CDM project activity."

[29] The Global Environment Facility defines these differences as follows: *Direct* GHG emission reductions are those achieved by project investments such as technology demonstrations and discrete investments financed or leveraged during the project's supervised implementation period (from the project start to the project closure). In contrast, GHG emission reductions achieved, for example, as a result of market facilitation and development through project-supported policy and institutional frameworks, capacity building, information gathering, and replication effects of demonstration activities, are considered *indirect* GHG emission reductions. In addition, a third category, *direct post-project* emission reductions, has been used to quantify the GHG emission reductions of GEF-supported revolving financial mechanisms that are still active after the project's closure (ex post).

[30] Unintended effects are often called leakage when referring to REDD/forest investments. These can be positive or negative.

emissions.
- CEA may also be relevant for resilience efforts, where the unit of "effectiveness" could be measured in terms of the a quantifiable result, such as number of beneficiaries, speed recovering from extreme weather events, and other indicators of improved resilience.

Types of Questions this Approach Could Address

- What are the full costs of a program, including social, economic, and environmental costs?
- What would the costs of not investing in the program be?
- What is the estimated cost effectiveness of alternative programs/projects aiming for the same results?
- What would the status/path of GHG emissions (or other outcome) be without the intervention?
- How much can GHG emissions be avoided/reduced as a result of the intervention?
- To what extent are the anticipated GHG emissions reductions uncertain?
- What is the cost-effectiveness (expected cost per outcome) of the investment?

When the Approach can be Implemented

- CEA can inform investment options ex-ante if there is a basis to estimate future outcomes and weigh alternatives.
- CEA can be conducted at or following project completion, or (less often) mid-course to identify whether interim outcomes are on track relative to costs. At each of these stages, for GHG emissions, "effectiveness" may still be measured as estimated future reductions at a certain point in the future (e.g., a renewable energy source has replaced a fossil fuel source as a result of a project; but the outcomes in terms of GHG reductions will materialize in the future.)

Limitations

- If relevant costs and outcomes cannot be quantified, CEA should be avoided.
- There are many kinds of costs: direct, indirect, opportunity, short-term, long-term, financial, social, environmental, etc. Complete cost estimation is frequently difficult; often simple budget outlays are used for the cost side of the equation, even though these typically do not reflect all relevant costs.
- Incomplete or uncertain measures of effectiveness in terms of outcomes can be a major limitation. GHG emissions, for examples, are often not measured directly, therefore quantification relies upon proxies or indicators, such as models that assume future emission scenarios, fuel purchase records, or land use imagery, each of which has a degree of uncertainty.
- Interventions intended to influence broad behavior change, such as purchasing preferences, are harder to estimate than interventions more narrow in scope or occurring in more of a controlled environment, such as installation of energy efficiency technology at a power plant where emissions can be monitored before and after the installation.
- Indirect effects, such as spillovers effects or emissions leakage, are often significant and particularly difficult to quantify, as they typically occur outside the boundaries of a specific intervention.
- Analyses that are not project based, such as those that are sector or country level, are necessarily based on models that produce estimates which are sensitive to minor adjustments in assumptions. Small changes in assumptions can make large differences in terms of the expected GHG reductions, and there can be a wide range of uncertainty in the resulting estimates.

Methods

Typical steps include:

- Identify all relevant costs (direct, indirect, opportunity, short-term, long-term, etc.).
- Define boundary of analysis, and the types of effects that are considered (social, economic, environmental).
- For interventions aiming to reduce GHG emissions:
    - Identify a business as usual baseline and estimate relative to the baseline the projected GHG reductions that will result from the intervention. There are various guidelines and tools for estimating GHG reductions. Models and other estimation tools are often used for this step,

due to the large number of variables involved. (See links to resources under "Where to Learn More" below.)

- Establish a cost-effectiveness ratio: a) be aware of issues comparing programs with a similar intervention in nature and context, similar in objectives but different in nature, or counterfactual; b) when comparing programs with identical outcomes, use cost comparison criteria; c) when comparing programs with the same objectives and types of costs, but different interventions, use qualitative elements.

Challenges that Might Arise in Climate Change

- Measuring changes in GHG emissions resulting from climate change programs outside of the project boundary is typically difficult. These types of indirect effects are often called "leakage" or spillover.
- Resiliency outcomes are typically harder to quantify; CEA is typically less suitable for these projects unless clear indicators of outcomes can be identified and measured.

Where this Approach has been Used

- Sustainable Energy Initiative (2014) *Case Study on the Turkish Sustainable Energy Financing Facility* (TurSEFF), a CIF project funded by EBRD under the Clean Technology Fund.
- GHG emissions analyses are routinely used in climate change mitigation evaluations as well as related project proposals, project reports. Some organizations, like the Global Environment Facility (GEF), require this for every climate change project at the ex ante stage.

Where to Learn More

These resources relate cost-effectiveness as a general approach:

- WHO (2003) *Making choices in health: WHO guide to cost-effectiveness analysis*.
- Denil, N., et al. (n.d.) *Cost effectiveness analysis*. US DHHS. [Interactive on-line introduction to CEA.]
- Hodges, A., et al. (2011) *Guidance for DFID country offices on measuring and maximising value for money in cash transfer programmes: Toolkit and explanatory text*.
- Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (Japan).

There are many available guidelines, tools, and other resources for estimating GHG emissions that could be used for the "effectiveness" half of the cost-effectiveness analysis.

- *GHG Protocol Mitigation Accounting Standards*.
- The Clean Technology Fund guidelines for reporting GHG reductions, included in the *CTF Monitoring and Reporting Toolkit*.
- The IFC/World Bank has several reported and guidelines on GHG analysis. See (1) World Bank. (2012) *Greenhouse gas analysis at the World Bank*; and (2) IFC's website on greenhouse gas accounting, which contains several sector-specific GHG accounting tools.
- FAO's EX-Ante Carbon-balance Tool (EX-ACT) is an appraisal system developed by FAO providing ex-ante estimates of the impact of agriculture and forestry development projects, programs and policies on the carbon-balance.
- The Global Environment Facility (GEF) CO_2 calculator and separate *Manual for Calculating GHG Benefits of GEF Transportation*.
- UNEP Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, et al. (2013) *Calculating Greenhouse Gas Benefits of the Global Environment Facility Energy Efficiency Projects*. Version 1.0.
- Lawrence Berkley National Laboratories' Bottom-up Energy Analysis System (BUENAS) model used for projecting baseline energy demands and emission savings from buildings and appliances. (BUENAS was being updated in 2013.) See also a version of BUENAS for super-efficient equipment and appliances.
- The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) *Baseline and Monitoring Methodologies*.
- USAID, FCMC (2013) *REDD+ Measurement reporting and verification (MRV) manual*.

FACT SHEET 3: DEVELOPMENTAL EVALUATION

Relevance	
Mitigation	✓
Resilience	✓
Forests	✓

Applicable Project Phase(s)	
Ex-ante / prospective	
Design	✓
Mid-course	✓
At End	
Ex-post / retrospective	

Other	
Cost	Medium-high
Level of Effort	Medium-high
Quantitative or Qualitative	Qualitative
Special technology needed?	No

What it is

Developmental Evaluation (DE) is an approach intended to guide action and adaptation for innovative initiatives in complex, dynamic, and/or uncertain environments. DE supports innovation by bringing data to bear to inform and guide ongoing decision making as part of innovative processes.

Value Add for Climate Change Context

DE is a useful approach for any emergent social-change oriented initiative, particularly during early stages of an initiative's development or for those initiatives that require ongoing innovation and adaptation to be successful because they are operating in complex dynamic environments. Climate change interventions that are not formulaically clear, particularly those where the context is rapidly evolving, are potentially suitable for this approach. DE is not an approach designed to identify program outcomes or impact; it is designed to inform design and ongoing adaptation.

Suitable Circumstances

- When a new, innovative program is in the developmental stage, and early input can help to strengthen program design and implementation approach.
- Evaluation of policy advocacy work where political context is shifting (e.g., promotion of low-carbon development plans at the national level, or scale-up of existing programs).
- Situations with rapidly changing contexts and available information (e.g., after extreme weather event with regard to a rapid-response intervention tailored to unique circumstances).

Relationship to Mitigation, Resilience, and/or Forest Investments

DE is suitable for a broad range of resilience efforts that are tailored to a particular cultural and geographic context, especially those that would be adapted over time with experience and changes in the climate itself. Forest investments operating in complex cultural or political contexts would also often be amenable to this approach, as would be any policy advocacy effort (mitigation, resilience, or forests) that requires routine calibration and adaptation to be relevant with changing circumstances and information. Evaluations of efforts to pass national or global climate policies could, for example, benefit from approach.

Types of Questions this Approach Could Address

- What is developing or emerging as the innovation takes shape?
- What do the initial results reveal about expected progress?
- What seems to be working and not working?
- What elements merit more attention or changes?
- How should the innovation be adapted in response to changing circumstances?
- How can the project adapt to the context in ways that are within the project's control?

When the Approach can be Implemented

DE is often implemented during the initial developmental phases of an initiative, though some are also implemented throughout the formative/mid-course stage of those initiatives that would benefit from

targeted, routine feedback to inform real-time adaptation.

Limitations

- DE evaluators become part of the intervention they are evaluating. This means that the evaluator is not independent or necessarily objective, though some DE evaluators are careful to refrain from sharing their personal opinions and to only serve more as neutral facilitator in an effort to not bias their work.
- DE can require a lot of staff time for engagement with the evaluator. In addition, the evaluator should "have a seat at the table" which can make some people uncomfortable. Also, because of more frequent contact and interaction, DE can cost more money unless scoped to be short term or limited in breadth.

Methods

- Although there are no set methods for DE, generally speaking, DE involves asking evaluative questions, applying evaluation logic, and gathering and reporting evidence (qualitative or quantitative) to support project, program, product, and/or organizational development with timely feedback. Methods used include observation, rapid feedback interviews, utilization of real-time monitoring data, double and triple-loop feedback approaches, systems thinking approaches, social network analysis, adaptive cycle analysis, reflective practice sessions with staff, most significant change analysis, and use of a variety of DE inquiry frameworks. These and other methods are expanded upon in the resources linked to below.
- Developmental evaluators are typically directly engaged with the program, though the extent to which they share opinions and try to directly influence the program depends on the evaluator's style and preferences.

Challenges that Might Arise in Climate Change

- DE may not be considered sufficiently rigorous for those seeking to generate "hard" evidence, and, as mentioned, DE is not intended to identify outcomes, a function many associate with the broader field of evaluation.
- Even though DE is increasingly popular within the international development community, there are few seasoned DE evaluators, and it may be difficult to find someone with the skills and expertise to implement this approach.

Where this Approach has been Used

There are very few examples in the climate change context where DE has been used *by this name.* Some ongoing work in climate change may fit the broad definition of DE even if it is not calling itself DE. There is also an increasing recognition that DE is a suitable approach for climate change interventions, particularly those related to resilience (e.g., see discussion in *Learning to ADAPT*).

Where to Learn More

- Dozois, E., et al. (2010) *A Practitioner's guide to Developmental Evaluation*. Canada: IICRD
- Silva Villanueva, P. (2011) *Learning to ADAPT: monitoring and evaluation approaches in climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction – challenges, gaps and ways forward*. SCR Discussion Paper 9.
- Gamble, J. (2008) *A Developmental Evaluation Primer*. J.W. McConnell Family Foundation.
- Patton, M.Q. (2011) *Developmental evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use*. (Available for purchase)
- Preskill, H., and Beer, T. (2012) *Evaluating Social Innovation*. FSG and Center for Evaluation Innovation.
- OMG Center for Collaborative Learning (2014) *Amplifying learning in systems change investments: An experience in developmental evaluation.*
- Meadows, Donella. (2008) *Thinking in Systems: A Primer* (Available for purchase)

Hargreaves, M. (2010). *Evaluating Systems Change: A Planning Guide*. Mathematica.

FACT SHEET 4: FORMATIVE EVALUATION

Relevance	
Mitigation	✓
Resilience	✓
Forests	✓

Applicable Project Phase(s)	
Ex-ante / prospective	
Design	✓
Mid-course	✓
At End	
Ex-post / retrospective	

Other	
Cost	Low-Medium
Level of Effort	Low-Medium
Quantitative or Qualitative	Both
Special technology needed?	Not usually

What it is

Formative evaluation is used to examine and improve initiatives that are underway, but not complete. Formative evaluations assess what is and is not working based on early experience, interim results (where possible), and changing circumstances. Findings from formative evaluations typically include options/recommendations for improving implementation and enhancing results. Formative evaluations are typically conducted by independent evaluators to minimize subjectivity and conflicts of interest.

Value Add for Climate Change Context

- When outcomes are difficult to quantify, evaluate, and extend over the life of a program, formative evaluation is a suitable model for examining program processes and procedures, and identifying gaps and improvements.
- Formative evaluation is suitable for use when a program's context has changed or new data on interim/early results are available. Examination of these changes is made to improve program performance.
- The typical audience for a formative evaluation is the program team itself, for the purpose of immediately improving program design and implementation, but other audiences, including funders and others working on similar programs, can also be audiences.

Suitable Circumstances

- Any initiative where a mid-course review and assessment could inform further implementation.
- Results of formative evaluation are typically less formal and more process oriented than outcome/summative evaluations or impact evaluations.
- Formative evaluation can be similar to developmental evaluation. M.Q. Patton explains that formative evaluation is typically conducted more at an advanced stage of implementation (less at the initial/developmental phases when compared to developmental evaluation), and is more well suited for initiatives where there is enough of a knowledge base to make program decisions.

Relationship to Mitigation, Resilience, and/or Forest Investments

Given the complex nature of both climate change and the investments designed to prevent and adapt to climate change, formative evaluation is suitable to all types of climate investments with the rare exception of that are very well understood and in essence formulaic (which are typically mitigation projects where results are well known and can be directly measured, such as end-of-pipe emission reductions resulting from use of known technology).

Types of Questions this Approach Could Address

- What is known about interim outcomes? How certain/uncertain are the data on interim outcomes?
- How has the context changed and how does this affect the program?
- Which activities should be changed, deleted, or added in order to improve the program?
- How can evidence and experience in the broader field inform mid-course program adjustments?
- How will these changes be evaluated in the future?

When the Approach can be Implemented

Formative evaluation is conducted mid-course at logical times/phases during implementation where to be useful.

Limitations

Formative evaluation is not designed to generate evidence of final program results/outcomes. Monitoring data and assessment of interim outcomes can be used as input to formative evaluation and/or part of what a formative evaluation includes in its findings. Still formative evaluation typically focuses on strategy and tactics more than on outcomes.

Methods

- There is are no prescribed methods used for formative evaluation; however, methods may include: theory of change development (in the absence of an existing theory of change) or analysis (of an existing theory of change), outcome mapping, analysis of monitoring data (including estimates of what will result at the end of the initiative at the expected rate of implementation/progress), desk reviews or progress reports, review of research and results from related projects, policy analysis, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, pre-post surveys, and others.
- Identify changes in the context since the initiative's inception.
- Triangulate information to identify and corroborate thematic findings.
- Recommend changes to improve the program design and implementation.

Challenges that Might Arise in Climate Change

- There are relatively few challenges that could arise around formative evaluation for climate change given it is a broadly relevant and flexible approach. One that could arise is engaging in a formative evaluation when, realistically, the intervention is not in fact adaptable and suggestions resulting from a formative evaluation would not be acted upon.
- See also the limitation described above.

Where this Approach has been Used

- DFID-funded *Formative Evaluation of World Food Programme's Livelihoods Programme, Karamoja, Uganda*.
- Evaluation of knowledge and use of climate information by graziers in Australia.
- (In process) Evaluation of Solution Exchange (SolEx), a community of practice set up to effectively address development priorities and the MDGs.
- *Formative Evaluation of UNEP's Programme of Work 2010-2011*.
- Evaluation of teaching and learning methods in schools, often called "Formative Assessment."

Where to Learn More

- Dublin, S. (2010) *Formative Assessment Webinar*. Los Angeles: Shared Action. Webinar. Presentation.
- Stetler, C.B., et al. (2006) "The Role of Formative Evaluation in Implementation Research and the QUERI Experience." *Journal of General Internal Medicine.* 2006 February; 21 (Suppl 2): S1-S8.
- Theory of Change Community.
- Outcome Mapping Learning Community.
- For specific examples, see hyperlinks within the text, above.
- See also: OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) *Criteria for Development Evaluation Assistance*, as well as other standards, such as the good practice standards of the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG), and the norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group.

FACT SHEET 5: IMPACT EVALUATION

Relevance	
Mitigation	✓
Resilience	✓
Forests	✓

Applicable Project Phase(s)	
Ex-ante / prospective	✓
Design	✓
Mid-course	✓
At End	✓
Ex-post / retrospective	✓

Other	
Cost	High
Level of Effort	High
Quantitative or Qualitative	Quantitative
Special technology needed?	Statistical software

What it is

Impact Evaluation (IE) as defined here is an evaluation that quantitatively analyzes causal links between programs or interventions and a set of outcomes. An IE tries to answer the following questions: (1) What is the causal impact of the program? and/or (2) What is the most effective method for achieving impact? The focus on causality and attribution is the hallmark of IE and determines the methodologies that can be used.

Sometimes other evaluations of outcomes/results are also called impact evaluations. In this paper, these are referred to separately – see the description of outcome evaluation.

Value Add for Climate Change Context

Where this approach would be suitable there would be a value add for climate interventions trying to rigorously identify impact to test effectiveness and make a case for selecting the best implementation method out of a set of options, or project continuation, adaptation, scaling, or replication.

Suitable Circumstances

- If there is not already evidence of a program's effectiveness.
- Where a "treatment" group (e.g., one receiving program assistance) can be compared to a valid comparison (control) group, usually during the program implementation period.
- Where it is ethical to have a valid control group; i.e., it is not unethical to withhold the program from the certain groups for the purpose of conducting the evaluation, which can be the case, for instance, if life-saving interventions are being withheld from the control group and there are no resource constraints restricting delivery to all eligible beneficiaries.
- Where program outcomes can be accurately identified and measured during the period of the evaluation.
- Where suitable methods (experimental or quasi-experimental designs) can be implemented, and accurate baseline conditions can be identified.
- Where alternative implementation approaches are being debated and there is interest in piloting these approaches to test which is most effective before scaling up.
- To justify a high-quality IE, the program being evaluated should also be innovative (testing a new, promising approach), replicable (can be scaled up or applied in different settings), strategically relevant, untested (little is known about the effectiveness of the program), and influential (results can be used to inform key policy decisions).

Relationship to Mitigation, Resilience, and/or Forest Investments

IEs are suited to interventions that have measurable outcomes (that can be discerned from other influences) during the evaluation time period. In the climate change context, it may, for example, be possible to explore impact for some mitigation interventions that can quantify direct and indirect reductions in GHG emissions that are resulting from the intervention (e.g., by installing energy efficient technologies where emissions reductions can be clearly calculated) compared to a valid control or counterfactual. (The overview of Cost Effectiveness Analysis expands on issues associated on measuring results, including GHG emission reductions.)

Many climate change interventions – whether mitigation, forest, or resilience oriented, - will be challenging matches for IE due to the large number of other variables – many uncontrollable – at play, and therefore the infeasibility of creating true control and treatment groups (see Methods, below). In addition, efforts designed to realize future outcomes, such as many resilience efforts geared toward preparing for future climate change, are harder to evaluate using IE, though IEs can sometimes be used to analyze impact with regard to interim indicators of progress, such as behavior change.

In general, even though conceptually IE could be used for climate mitigation, resilience, or forest investments, real-world examples of this approach being suitable are less common than other approaches. Reasons for this include the relatively narrow set of suitable circumstances and other limitation explained below.

Types of Questions this Approach Could Address

- What is the causal impact of the program?
- What is the most effective method for achieving impact?

When the Approach can be Implemented

Ideally, IEs are developed while the program is being designed and are built into program implementation to allow for parallel treatment and comparison groups. These IEs have the potential to inform program design and implementation mid-course if designed to do so; however, they are often concluded at the end of an initiative (or at the ends of major phases of implementation) to gauge the program's ultimate impact/results.

Outcome evaluations, summative evaluations, and ex-post evaluations that model or otherwise estimate counterfactuals after the fact are not considered impact evaluation here. See discussion of methods for IE, below.

Limitations

There are limited suitable circumstances for IEs in the climate change context (see Suitable Circumstances). IEs are also typically expensive ($500k – many million USD), require specialized expertise, and typically take years to implement. It is good to weigh the scope and stakes of the intervention against the costs of an IE; lower stakes programs – even those with suitable circumstances otherwise - may not warrant an IE, unless there are large potential gains in the knowledge generated that can be applied to future project selection and design or improvements in ongoing implementation.

Methods

IEs are typically conducted by independent evaluators to minimize subjectivity and conflicts of interest. IEs are, however, often conducted in close collaboration with researchers and operations staff. All IEs require a comparison between treatment (those exposed to the program) and control (counterfactual) groups (those not exposed to the program). The impact is the difference in outcome between the control and treatment groups – commonly referred to as counterfactual analysis[31]. IE methods refer to how the control and treatment groups are selected:

[31] A valid counterfactual requires a treatment group that is characteristically the same as a control group in three ways: (1) On average, they must be identical in the absence of the program. (2) They should react to the treatment of the program in the same way; and (3) they cannot be differentially exposed to other interventions during the evaluation period. IEs testing alternative program "treatments" normally include one treatment group for each of the treatment arms, as well as a "pure" no-treatment comparison group that does not receive any intervention.

Experimental design is considered the method that will produce the strongest evidence of impact. It involves randomly allocating eligible participants into treatment or control groups to ensure that the only difference between the two groups is that the measured intervention is provided to the treatment group (not the control group).

Quasi-experimental design methodologies are also commonly used for IEs. These involve constructing a comparison group using matching or reflexive comparisons. Matching involves identifying non–program participants comparable in observable characteristics to participants. The main advantage of evaluations using matching methods is that they do not require as close collaboration between the research design and the operational roll out of the program. The principal disadvantages are that the reliability of the results is often reduced. Two methods used to create quasi-experimental control and treatment groups are propensity score matching and regression discontinuity design.

Challenges that Might Arise in Climate Change

- There are typically several challenges in the way of using IEs for climate change interventions, including lack of baseline/business-as-usual data, a long time lag between intervention and measurable impact, infeasibility of creating a control group, confounding and exogenous variables that influence outcomes, and high cost.
- Validity of experimental and quasi-experimental designs can be marred by issues common to climate change interventions, such as changes in the policies or programs being evaluated, selection bias, substitution bias, and behavioral consequences of the policy experiment either within the treatment group or within the control group.

Where this Approach has been Used

- The IFC PPCR private sector investment in climate resilient agriculture in Nepal includes a quasi-randomized evaluation built into the project design.
- Development Impact Evaluation Initiative (DIME). World Bank.
- Center for Effective Global Action (CEGA), University of California
- Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) program analysis.
- *Hinkel, J. et al. (2013) PROVIA Guidance on Assessing Vulnerability, Impacts and Adaptation to Climate Change. UNEP*

Where to Learn More

- Gertler, P.J., et al. (2011) *Impact Evaluation in Practice*. The World Bank Group.
- Legovini, A. (2010) *Development Impact Evaluation Initiative: A World Bank-Wide Strategic Approach to Enhance Developmental Effectiveness*.
- The World Bank Group (2011) *Impact Evaluations. Methods and Techniques. Evaluation Designs*.
- International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie).
- Africa Impact Evaluation Initiative (AIM).
- Khandker, S.R., et al. (2010) *Handbook on Impact Evaluation: Quantitative Methods and Practices*. The World Bank.
- Bamberger, M. (2005) *Conducting Quality Impact Evaluations Under Budget, Time and Data Constraints*. [Presentation.]
- DIME's impact evaluation series.
- See also: OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) *Criteria for Development Evaluation Assistance*, as well as other standards, such as the good practice standards of the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG), and the norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group.

FACT SHEET 6: OUTCOME EVALUATION

Relevance	
Mitigation	✓
Resilience	✓
Forests	✓

Applicable Project Phase(s)	
Ex-ante / prospective	
Design	
Mid-course	✓
At End	✓
Ex-post / retrospective	✓

Other	
Cost	Medium-High
Level of Effort	Medium-High
Quantitative or Qualitative	Both
Special technology needed?	Depends on methods

What It Is

Outcome evaluations analyze the realization of an initiative's intended outcomes[32] (goals) and the role of the initiative in contributing to or causing those outcomes. The main characteristic of an outcome evaluation is that is an evidence-driven, systematic assessment of progress toward an initiative's intended outcomes.

Outcome evaluation can be part of other evaluation types, including formative evaluation[33] (if designed to identify mid-course outcomes), program evaluation[34] (if designed to identify outcomes), summative evaluation[35] (if conducted at the end of an initiative), or ex-post evaluation[36] (if conducted sometime after the initiatives completion).

(Impact evaluation[37] is considered unique and different, despite also focusing on outcomes, because it uses specific methods that require implementation at the beginning of an initiative or, at the latest, during the implementation phase. Impact evaluation is often considered the "gold standard" for identifying program results; however, it is often infeasible or not suitable to the circumstances of climate change initiatives.)

Value Add for Climate Change Context

- Regardless of when they are conducted, outcome evaluation provides a means to identify results for both internal learning purposes and external accountability purposes.
- Mid-course outcome evaluations can inform improvements to strategy and implementation as well as demonstrate interim results to funders, staff, and other stakeholders.

Suitable Circumstances

Outcome evaluation is broadly applicable to most initiatives when outcomes – or interim outcomes – could be identified and learned from. This applies to most climate change interventions. The relatively few circumstances where outcome evaluation would not be suitable include initiatives with well known (and documented) results that have no particular reason to be evaluated—a situation not generally applicable to climate change interventions— and where conducting an evaluation would have a negative influence on the initiative itself (e.g., if the evaluation would

[32] Outcomes are the state of the target population or condition that an initiative ultimately is designed to influence. Outcomes differ from outputs, which are activities conducted or products.
[33] Formative evaluation is examines initiatives that are underway, but not complete.
[34] Program evaluation, when differentiates from outcome evaluation, is typically focused on the program itself (e.g., covering implementation, program design, governance, etc.) as well as programmatic outputs *and outcomes*. Outcome evaluations often also cover programmatic topics; therefore, these approaches are in practice often the same unless specifically designed to be different.
[35] Typically, the term, "summative" refers to a final or terminal retrospective analysis of program objectives and outcomes. Summative evaluations, unless specifically designed to be different, are functionally the same as outcome evaluations.
[36] "Ex-post evaluation" is generally differentiated from "outcome" or "summative" if it is conducted some time (e.g., two or more years) after program completion. These evaluations can study how well the initiative served its intended purpose, to assess sustainability of outcomes, and to draw inferential conclusions for similar initiatives.
[37] For the purposes of this effort, impact evaluation is defined as an evaluation that quantitatively analyzes causal links between programs or interventions and a set of outcomes.

take staff away from critical implementation work)—a scenario avoided by sound evaluation timing and methods. If outcomes are not clearly defined at an initiative's mid-stage, Formative Evaluation may be more appropriate.

Relationship to Mitigation, Resilience, and/or Forest Investments

Outcome evaluation is relevant for any climate change intervention, be it mitigation, resilience, or forest related. The questions and methods are broad and fit-for-purpose, and they can be adapted to each topic and circumstance.

Types of Questions this Approach Could Address

- What outcomes did the program try to achieve or contribute to, and how can these be measured?
- Where these outcomes achieved? If so, to what extent, how, and why?
- How did the program contribute to the achieved outcomes?
- Was the program more influential in certain areas? What could account for these differences?
- Were there unexpected outcomes? If so, what, and what contributed to them?
- Can conclusions be drawn about the program's overall effectiveness? If so, what are they?
- How can lessons from this program inform other programs?

When the Approach can be Implemented

Outcome evaluation is usually conducted at the end of a program, but it can be used during the course of a program to assess interim (short- and medium-term) outcomes.

Limitations

- Methods used for outcome evaluation (and its close associates) very substantially; it can be difficult for people not familiar with the field to distinguish between a poor and high-quality evaluation design and methods.
- Outcome evaluations are generally less quantitatively rigorous than impact evaluations, even though they are more broadly applicable and feasible. In other words, the quantitative (or qualitative) evidence generated by outcome evaluations is typically not based in rigorous statistical or economic methodologies that can clearly distinguish general outcomes from those outcomes that can be directly attributable to the program.
- If the program has a large scope, outcome evaluation – or any evaluation of results – may be costly to conduct in a credible way. For instance, to understand the outcomes associated with national or multi-country programs, the evaluation has to be sufficiently deep and broad, and this can require a substantial evaluation investment.

Methods

- Outcome evaluations are typically conducted by independent evaluators to minimize subjectivity and conflicts of interest.
- Most methods used to identify results (outcomes versus outputs) are applicable to outcome evaluations, including qualitative and quantitative methods (with the exception of those that are used for impact evaluation).
- Methods should be fit-for-purpose. Examples include desk reviews, theory of change (or theory of no change) analysis, outcome mapping, interviews (of several types), surveys, focus groups, case studies, contribution analysis, most significant change analysis, appreciative inquiry, media analysis, GHG emissions reduction analyses (see methods described in Cost Effectiveness Analysis), simple statistical analyses (e.g., correlation), economic analyses, financial flows analyses, and social network analyses. (Additional methods can also apply.)

Challenges that Might Arise in Climate Change

- Outcome evaluations often reflect on programs' original plans, budgets, and theories of change or logic models (where these exist). However, given that climate change interventions, particularly

those related to resilience and forests, often need to adapt to be effective, these original materials may be moot by the time the evaluation is conducted. Similarly, outcome evaluation findings may not be relevant to future program implementation if they do not reflect changes in context, needs, and evolving evidence of what works in different contexts.

- Given the relatively new sub-field of climate change evaluation, many evaluators do not understand climate change well, necessitating additional time to bring them up to speed. For this same reason, some evaluations are not well designed because they have not benefitted from prior climate-change specific experience.
- There is a common misperception that outcome evaluation can attribute[38] outcomes to initiatives, when, in reality, most programs contribute to outcomes along with other contributing parties/factors. This challenge will subside over time by educating stakeholders and managing expectations not only about evaluation, but also about the role of the initiatives themselves.

Where this Approach has been Used

This approach is widely used. Below are examples:

- The World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group has completed three-phases of climate-change related evaluations. Phase I focused on the World Bank only; Phase II will look at project-level experience in promoting technologies for renewable energy and energy efficiency across the entire World Bank Group; and Phase III focused on climate change adaptation across the entire World Bank Group.
- See Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office (2013) *Climate Change Mitigation Impact Evaluation: GEF Support to Market Change in China, India, Mexico and Russia*. Note: this evaluation fits the definition of an outcome evaluation – not impact evaluation – as defined here.
- In 2012, the Canadian International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and the UK Department for International Development (DFID) completed an evaluation of the Climate Change Adaptation in Africa Programme.
- The Asian Development Bank (ADB) is conducting an evaluation of ADB's Support for Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation.

Where to Learn More

- Bours, B. et al. (2013) *Monitoring & evaluation for climate change adaptation: A synthesis of tools, frameworks and approaches*.
- UNDP (2009) "Types of Evaluation in UNDP", Chapter 5.3 of *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluating for Development Results*. See also the *Addendum June 2011*.
- Mertens, D.M., and Wilson, A.T. (2012) *Program Evaluation Theory and Practice: A Comprehensive Guide*.
- Wörlen, C. (2013). *Guidelines for Climate Mitigation Evaluations*.
- Sanahuja, H. (2011) *Framework for Monitoring and Evaluation of Adaptation to Climate Change*.
- The Global Environment Facility's Climate Evaluation Community of Practice and SEAChange Community of Practice both have several useful climate change evaluation resources.
- Each of the MDBs has an evaluation department which provides information about their approach to outcome (and other types of evaluation): World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group; ADB's Independent Evaluation Office; Inter-American Development Bank's Development Effectiveness Framework; African Development African Bank's Operations Evaluation Department; and EBRD's Evaluation Department. Some, such as the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, also have informative evaluation policies.
- See also: OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Criteria for Development Evaluation Assistance, as well as other standards, such as the good practice standards of the Evaluation Cooperation Group , and the norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group.

[38] Identify a cause-and-effect relationship between a program and its desired outcomes.

FACT SHEET 7: RAPID STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

Relevance	
Mitigation	✓
Resilience	✓
Forests	✓

Applicable Project Phase(s)	
Ex-ante / prospective	
Design	✓
Mid-course	✓
At End	✓
Ex-post / retrospective	✓

Other	
Cost	Varies
Level of Effort	Varies
Quantitative or Qualitative	Qualitative
Special technology needed?	Yes (ICT)

What it is

Rapid stakeholder consultation is a general term describing methods of quickly obtaining information from multiple intervention stakeholders using context-suitable approaches, including information technologies such as the internet, cells phones, and SMS (text messaging) as part of improved feedback loops. Rapid stakeholder consultation usually involves people who have been missed through traditional feedback channels. Use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) offers one way to make interactions between stakeholders faster and easier; however, other tools, such as community meetings can also enhance rapid stakeholder engagement and feedback.

Value Add for Climate Change Context

- Bottom-up/decentralized information gathering allows for more varied and rapid responses as stakeholders interact develop and share solutions, often without the bureaucracy of organizations.
- Rapid and frequent feedback can support monitoring of progress and identify places where mid-course corrections to strategy and tactics are warranted.
- ICTs and other rapid stakeholder consultation approaches can improve responses to extreme whether events in support of climate resilience.

Suitable Circumstances

Fisher (2014) explains that rapid stakeholder consultation is appropriate when initiatives intend to:

- Promote transparency and inclusive participation in (and responsiveness to) meaningful deliberations with a variety of affected communities and persons.
- Create an integrated accountability framework, by strengthening linkages between local, national, regional, and international bodies and actors.
- Build capacity and provide enabling conditions – such as freedom of information and adequate infrastructure – for meaningful inclusion of civil society at all stages of shaping, implementing, and monitoring progress towards the initiative's goals.
- Promote two-way and iterative learning processes – to feed information and insight collected locally into national, regional, and international processes, and to share the lessons learned through collective pooling of information at local, regional, and international levels.

Relationship to Mitigation, Resilience, and/or Forest Investments

Rapid stakeholder consultation may be used for mitigation, resilience, or forest investments. It contributes to the understanding of climate science, assessment of vulnerability to projected impacts, identification of initiative priorities, development of plans and strategies, and implementation of targeted objectives.

Types of Questions this Approach Could Address

- Questions that can be rapidly answered by stakeholders are appropriate for this approach. Questions with short (yes/no or multiple choice) answers may be easiest for rapid information gathering, but more open-ended requests for feedback and deeper consultation may provide more context and depth.

- Usually at least some meta data information about the stakeholder (name, location, gender, other demographic information, and relationship to the intervention) is also asked of the participant.

When the Approach can be Implemented

This approach may be used to get stakeholder feedback while designing projects; during project mid-course for project monitoring, reporting, and improvement; and after project completion for assessing outcomes/impact.

Limitations

- It is difficult to control data quality, unless quality is defines by quantity and diversity of sources.
- It can be difficult to systematically track changes over time, given incomparable data sets over time.
- Not all stakeholders will have access to relevant technologies, creating a bias in the data "sample."
- Implementing participatory methods can be costly and time consuming. Additional staff may be needed to implement these approaches, translate information effectively, etc.
- Fisher (2014) points out that particular attention should be paid to managing the tension between inclusiveness (involving as many stakeholders as possible) and diversity (ensuring that different voices and perspectives are heard and not drowned out by coordination/consolidation requirements).

Methods

Many methods can be used for rapid stakeholder consultation. Unless otherwise noted with external links, the list below is drawn from UNDP's 2013 report *Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results* as summarized on the Better Evaluation website.

- Crowdsourcing: A large number of people actively report on a situation around them, often using mobile phone technology and open source software platforms.
- Real-time, simple reporting: A means to reduce to a minimum the formal reporting requirements for program and project managers and free up their time to provide more frequent, real-time updates, which may include text, pictures, videos that can be made by computer or mobile devices.
- Participatory statistics: An approach in which local people themselves generate statistics; participatory techniques are replicated with a large number of groups to produce robust quantitative data.
- Participatory scenario development (PSD): A process involving the participation of stakeholders to discuss and address future scenarios in a creative and actionable way
- Mobile data collection: The targeted gathering of structured information using mobile phones, tablets or PDAs using a special software application.
- Most significant change technique: A way of collecting and analyzing personal stories and accounts about change related to an intervention. See also the descriptions and tools on Most Significant Change offered on the Better Evaluation and Wikipedia websites.
- The micro-narrative: The collection and aggregation of thousands of short stories from citizens using special algorithms to gain insight into real-time issues and changes in society.

Challenges that Might Arise in Climate Change

- A development or climate change program's stakeholders may not know about climate change or understand its relevance to them. Gathering useful input from stakeholders requires careful planning. Sometimes an investment in building climate literacy among stakeholders is needed before gathering stakeholder feedback; in other cases the feedback does not need to directly call out "climate change"; and in yet other cases, building the climate literacy and capacity to discuss and address climate change may be the actual purpose of the intervention itself.
- Resources are needed for translation purposes and to determine how to gain access to the desired

stakeholders. Some stakeholders may not be connected to technology or may not be literate; creative strategies for reaching these stakeholders and use of incentives can help to boost response rates.
- See also the limitations discussed above.

Where this Approach has been Used

- Volunteer Technology Communities (VTCs) are used in disaster risk management by the World Bank and the Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction..
- ICTs have been used in Senegal, Uganda, and Malawi in relation to climate-change programs and initiatives.
- Interactive participation-enabling and responsiveness-enhancing websites and communication tools such as SeeClickFix (US), Daraja (Tanzania), Infomex (Mexico), Recovery.gov (US), dBrain (Korea), and others created by such organizations as MySociety, Ushahidi, GarageLab, and the Open Development Technology Alliance.
- UNICEF Uganda's Technology for Development unit has developed the following interactive Rapid SMS (text messaging) projects such as uReport, mHealth, and a mobile-phone based birth registration program.
- E-forums and other activities on Community of Practice websites such as http://www.e-agriculture.org/e-agriculture and WHO's independent Expert Review Group (iERG) which focus on the use of ICT for information exchange.

Where to Learn More

- World Bank Group's Information and Communications for Development (IC4D) initiative, IC4D blog, and publications:
  - Akoh, B., et al. (2011) *Africa Transformation-Ready: The Strategic Application of Information and Communication Technologies to Climate Change Adaptation in Africa. Final Report*. World Bank, African Development Bank, African Union.
  - World Bank (2012) *ICT for Greater Development Impact: World Bank Group Strategy for Information and Communication Technology, 2012-2015.*
  - Custer, S. (2012) *How-To-Notes: ICT-Enabled Citizen Feedback Loops (Draft).*
  - Eggli, S. and Park, K.R. (2012) *How-To-Notes: Using ICT to Improve Transparency in Bank-Financed Projects (Draft).* World Bank and Open Development Technology Alliance.
- Tools developed by the Open Development Technology Alliance.
- Conference proceedings: *Data and Accountability for the Post-2015 Development Framework*, New York, January, 2014; see in particular the presentation by Fisher, "Accountability and civic participation in the Post-2015 Development Agenda."
- Nexus for ICTs, Climate Change and Development (NICCD), which has a set of online resources on ICTs, climate change and development associated with the "Climate Change, Innovation and ICTs" research project.
- UNDP Knowledge, Innovation and Capacity Group (2013) *Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results*.
- Jacobs, A. (2010) "Creating the Missing Feedback Loop." *IDS Bulletin*. Volume 41 Number 6 November 2010: 56-64.

FACT SHEET 8: REAL-TIME LEARNING

Relevance	
Mitigation	✓
Resilience	✓
Forests	✓

Applicable Project Phase(s)	
Ex-ante / prospective	
Design	✓
Mid-course	✓
At End	
Ex-post / retrospective	

Other	
Cost	Low-High (variable)
Level of Effort	Low-High (variable)
Quantitative or Qualitative	Usually qualitative
Special technology needed?	Not usually

What It Is

Support for real-time learning is the art and science of helping organizations learn, adapt, and improve. "Learning" generally refers to the act, process, or experience of gaining knowledge or skills. Beyond gaining knowledge or skills, this approach involves rapidly *applying* learning to projects to improve implementation and, ultimately, enhance results. Applied learning in this way requires a combination of data, knowledge, skills, cultural openness to critical reflection and change, and a project amenable to adaptation.

Although there are guiding principles for adult learning[39], individuals tend to learn differently[40]. Definitions of organizational learning vary, but they center around an organization's ability to adapt based on internal and external signals[41]. The concept of "real-time" is interpreted widely; it can be immediate or up to a few years; therefore, it is important to clarify expectations when referring to "real-time."

Other approaches, including developmental evaluation, formative evaluation, and rapid stakeholder consultation typically integrate the fundamental concepts behind real-time learning support into their process; however, learning support does not need to be part of these or other specific approaches to be valid on its own accord. Also, at times any association with the word "evaluation" can be a deterrent to engaging in a learning process – due to the stereotypes associated with this word.

Value Add for Climate Change Context

Real-time learning has clear potential to add value to climate change initiatives, the majority of which need to learn and adapt to be effective. When real-time learning is done well and in the right circumstances, there are very few instances when such support would not be useful. These would be in cases where the intervention is well understood and essentially formulaic; one could take past experiences and simply replicate them. This is not the norm, however, for most climate change initiatives.

Suitable Circumstances

- Suitable circumstances are when a learning opportunity exists (usually a clear reason to learn, adapt, and improve) and there is a learning environment and culture.[42]

- It helps to have realistic expectations around improvement, because learning involves trial and error. Not only does performance often not immediately improve, but also there are no "guarantees" it will improve. However, learning is known to lead to improved performance *over time*.

[39] Six principals of adult learning from Malcolm Knowles: (1) Adults are internally motivated and self-directed; (2) Adults bring life experiences and knowledge to learning experiences; (3) Adults are goal oriented; (4) Adults are relevancy oriented; (5) Adults are practical; (5) Adult learners like to be respected.
[40] The most common high-level typology for adult learning is Visual, Auditory, or Experiential / Kinesthetic.
[41] Peter Senge, founder of the Society for Organizational Learning, describes a learning organization as one that is able to sense changes in signals from its environment (both internal and external) and adapt accordingly.
[42] See also, the discussion of "learning culture" below under "Limitations".

Relationship to Mitigation, Resilience, and/or Forest Investments

Real-time learning support applies cross all types of climate change interventions. It is particularly relevant for adaptation and forest investments (and some mitigation investments) given their complex and rapidly evolving nature.

Types of Questions this Approach Could Address

- What do data tell us about progress, strategies, and barriers? What are our key insights based on experience?
- How are our hypotheses about the role of the program/project changing over time?
- What specific opportunities do we have to test our assumptions and hypotheses?
- What is the relationship between program adaptation and performance over time?

When the Approach can be Implemented

This approach is used during project implementation; however it can also be used as programs are initially designed or launched and as a retrospective ex-post to inform future programs.

Limitations

- Due to the personal and cultural nature of learning and propensity for people to be influenced by perceptions, emotions, and quick reactions to new information (including information not based on solid evidence), real-time learning has the potential to be less evidence-based than other approaches unless clearly designed to be grounded in evidence.
- It is harder than it may seem to find opportunities for real-time learning. Learning cultures[43] are not common and it takes time to develop an environment that is conducive to learning and adaptation at the project or program/organizational levels.
- Providing support for applied learning at the project and organizational levels is just as much an art as it is a science. The skills needed to provide this kind of support are different from those needed for traditional evaluations, for example.
- Expectations around improvement from learning should be moderated, at least at first: When engaging in a new learning challenge, performance often suffers, or appears to suffer, in the short term due to trial-and-error nature of what learning and adaptation necessarily entails.
- It is often difficult to generate "evidence" that real-time learning is leading – or will lead – to improved results. This is only a limitation if there is a need to clearly demonstrate results from the learning process itself.

Methods

There are many approaches to supporting real-time learning at the project and program/organizational levels. Most of them include the following components: (1) Create intentional safe space on routine basis for critical reflection; (2) Gather intelligence – factual data on what has occurred and why; (3) Engage in critical thinking, dialogue, debate, and inquiry; (4) Identify assumptions, insights, and hypotheses (make the tacit explicit); (5) Test, reflect, and iterate–again and again.

Methods for group/organizational learning include coaching, guided learning facilitation[44], adaptive management (from social sciences and natural sciences – particularly relevant for forest investments),

[43] Characteristics of a learning culture include: interest in new information and alternative view points, safety around open communication and difficult feedback, ability to successfully navigate conflict, acceptance of uncertainty, acknowledgement that plans, no matter how well designed, will likely need to change (particularly in complex contexts), tolerance for risk and disappointment, "permission to fail", reward for smart innovation and improvement over time, and accountability to learning and smart adaptation (not just accountability to results or adherence to plans).

plan-do-check-act-(adapt) frameworks, Agile/SCRUM Project Management, Lean, scenario planning, theory of change analysis, outcome mapping, developmental or other forms of real-time evaluation, Appreciative Inquiry, and systems thinking[45]. A fit-for-purpose approach to selecting methods for specific initiatives is recommended.

Oxfam and USAID have developed two resources with specific relevance for climate change and related development initiatives:

- Oxfam's Participatory Capacities and Vulnerabilities Assessment tool (PCVA), designed to help staff and partner organizations engage with communities in contexts where natural disasters are significant drivers of poverty and suffering. PCVA draws from participatory learning and action techniques and tools.

- USAID's Learning Lab has a Collaborative Learning and Adapting (CLA) framework with principles and operational processes intended to enable USAID to become a more effective learning organization and thereby a more effective development organization. CLA also includes an approach to facilitating local participation and capacity and promoting country-led development. It was initially developed by USAID/Uganda.

Challenges that Might Arise in Climate Change

- Learning in the context of climate change may not be predictable or guaranteed because the impacts of climate change are largely going to occur in the future, and both current and future impacts are complex and highly variable. Learning that has occurred this year will not always apply next year, and it may not apply in any other context.
- Several general challenges to realizing the benefits of real-time learning also are common, including lack of time, inadequate support systems, lack of relevant intelligence/data, a culture not conducive or ready to learn (even if changes start small), counterproductive power dynamics, rigid requirements (e.g., always sticking to original plan), and management by dashboard, which can undermine learning if it is not understood in a learning and adaptation context.

Where this Approach has been Used

- This approach has been used by climate change programs on an informal and behind-the-scenes basis. For example, the ClimateWorks Foundation, a philanthropy investing over $1 billion in mitigation projects around the world, is receiving support for real-time learning and adaptation from its third-party evaluation team.

- The UK government, through the International Climate Fund and other funds, has provided "fast-start" funding, technical support, and capacity building support for climate adaptation in Nepal.

Where to Learn More

- Mintzberg, H. (2008) *Tracking Strategies: Towards a General Theory of Strategy Formation.*
- Senge, P. (2006) *The Fifth Discipline: The Art & Practice of The Learning Organization*.
- Society for Organizational Learning.
- Eldis Communities has on-line learning communities for development professionals working in the climate change space. These communities appear to be active, though it is unclear whether any assessment of the benefits to participants has been conducted.
- See also, the links and other references to specific methods, above.

---

[44] Guided learning facilitation can come in many forms. One such form is Emergent Learning – a technique developed by Fourth Quadrant Partners which uses Before Action Reviews, After Action Reviews, and Emergent Learning Tables. Other methods and tools cited in this fact sheet also serve to facilitate learning.

[45] Systems thinking is a broad approach to conceptualizing and analyzing issues. Various methods can be used for systems thinking analysis. See also: Meadows, Donella. (2008) *Thinking in Systems: A Primer* (Available for purchase); and Hargreaves, M. (2010). Evaluating Systems Change: A Planning Guide. Mathematica Policy Research.

FACT SHEET 9: VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT

Relevance	
Mitigation	
Resilience	✓
Forests	

Applicable Project Phase(s)	
Ex-ante / prospective	✓
Design	✓
Mid-course	✓
At End	
Ex-post / retrospective	

Other	
Cost	Low
Level of Effort	Low to Medium
Quantitative or Qualitative	Qualitative or Mixed
Special technology needed?	No

What It Is

Vulnerability to climate change is the degree to which a system is susceptible to, or unable to cope with, adverse effects of climate change, including climate variability and extremes.[46] Vulnerability assessment is conducted to assess trends in a population's or geographic area's exposure and vulnerability to climate change.[47] Some vulnerability assessments cover expected impacts, risks, *and the adaptive capacity* of a region or sector to the effects of climate change. For the purposes of this overview, vulnerability assessment is considered separate from adaptive capacity assessment. A quantitative "top-down" vulnerability assessment may be used in developing climate change adaptation policies at the international, national, sub-national, or sectoral levels. A qualitative or mixed-methods "bottom-up" vulnerability assessment approach can be used to assess the social vulnerability of communities while considering adaptation options at a smaller scale.

Value Add for Climate Change Context

A robust vulnerability assessment will show logical links between development indicators and specific climate risks, so that decision makers and other stakeholders recognize the relationship between climate change, risk, and development indicators.

Suitable Circumstances

Vulnerability assessment is suitable when it is unclear how vulnerable a population (human or other) is to climate change, and whether to invest in building adaptation/resilience based on the extent of vulnerability.[48]

Relationship to Mitigation, Resilience, and/or Forest Investments

Vulnerability assessment is most often used for development programs generally and, in the context of climate change, for adaptation and resilience[49] programming; however, it can also be used for forest investments where consideration is given to vulnerable forest communities and ecosystems. It can inform where and how to invest in these kinds of programs. It is not generally related to mitigation projects other than those in the forest sector that have co-benefits related to vulnerable populations (human or otherwise).

Types of Questions this Approach Could Address

- What are current and future climate change threats?
- What are the stressors and underlying processes related to these threats?

[46] IPCC's Working Group II: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability.
[47] "Vulnerability" may be defined in various ways. UNDP and GIZ describe vulnerability as a function of exposure to climate hazards and perturbations, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity (UNDP 2011).
[48] Bünner (2013) lists the following reasons for conducting VAs: "Internationally, VAs are often used for comparing vulnerabilities of countries, often in form of vulnerability indicators"; "At national level, VAs support the setting of development priorities and … preparing Adaptation Strategies [such as] NAPAs"; "VAs on a sectoral level assist in setting strategic targets in development planning. At local level, VAs are used for developing local adaptation strategies or for mainstreaming adaptation into existing district or community plans. They are often the first step to be realized before designing and implementing an adaptation project."
[49] The term "resilience" here is intended to encompass and go beyond adaptation.

- What is the sensitivity to the projected hazards and perturbations? How will sectors/communities/populations be affected by these hazards and perturbations?
- Are there current socio-economic trends that interact with these sensitivities (and run the risk of amplifying them)? How will society be able to cope with and manage these changes?
- How do stakeholders conceive of systemic effects of climate change?
- Which vulnerability-decreasing strategies may be used to reduce risk? What is the priority of strategies?

When the Approach can be Implemented

Vulnerability assessments are usually conducted at the ex-ante stage; however they could be conducted later to assess changes in vulnerability over time particularly after building adaptation/resilience capacity.

Limitations

There are multiple uncertainties associated with vulnerability assessments; including uncertainties surrounding when and how climate change will occur, and the large number of other variables (socio economic and other) that can affect a population's vulnerability. Advanced modeling can help to reduce uncertainties but still will have a margin of error that is hard to test against real-world data.

Methods

- Using global or national climate change projections and scaling down to the area of study, "top-down" vulnerability assessment uses such quantitative methods as meta-analysis of indicators, data mining, and empirical modeling to analyze expected climate change, the physical science of climate change, and biophysical vulnerability.
- "Bottom-up" vulnerability assessment uses extant quantitative data to predict effects of climate change. The process of gathering information on communities' vulnerability uses such qualitative methods as participatory rural appraisal (PRA), focus groups, oral histories, cognitive mapping, other participant action tools and social-vulnerability modeling tools.
- CIFOR has modeled methods and tools to evaluate deal the vulnerability of "coupled socio-ecological systems." These methods combine quantitative modeling of climate change, scaled down to the appropriate local level, with qualitative evaluation of communities' and sectors' vulnerability. (See references and links below.)

Challenges that Might Arise in Climate Change

Challenges may include high levels of uncertainty, lack of access to key stakeholders, and significant investments needs to build a knowledge base and other types of capacities within vulnerable populations.

Where this Approach has been Used

- CIFOR has conducted mixed-method vulnerability assessments of forest ecosystems and forest-dependent communities and sectors in Cameroon, Ghana, and Burkina Faso. (See links below.)
- GIZ has conducted local-level "bottom-up" vulnerability assessments in at least five countries.
- UK's Climate Change Risk Assessment (CCRA) is conducted every five years to identify the likelihood of 100 major risks from climate change, scale of potential consequences, and urgency to address them. See of website of UK's Adaptation Sub-Committee.
- The Congo Project used a "top-down" VA approach to evaluate the Congo River Basin's vulnerability.

Where to Learn More

- CARE (2009) *Climate Vulnerability and Capacity Analysis (CVCA): Handbook*.
- Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR). See in particular, Locatelli, B., et al. (2008) *Methods and Tools for Assessing the Vulnerability of Forests and People to Climate Change: An*

introduction and Nkem, J., et al. (2007) *Methodological Framework for Vulnerability Assessment of Climate Change Impacts on Forest-Based Development Sectors*.

- Puma M.J. and Gold S. (2011) *Formulating Climate Change Scenarios to Inform Climate-Resilient Development Strategies: A Guidebook for Practitioners*. New York: United Nations Development Program.
- UNDP (2011) *Mapping Climate Change Vulnerability and Impacts: A Guidebook for Sub-National Planners*.
- Climate Adapt: The European Climate Adaptation Platform.
- Action Aid's bottom-up Participatory Vulnerability Analysis tool.

FACT SHEET GLOSSARY

Adaptation	Adjustment in natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climatic stimuli or their effects, which moderates harm or exploits beneficial opportunities.[50]
Adaptive capacity	The ability of a system to adjust to climate change (including climate variability and extremes) to moderate potential damages, to take advantage of opportunities, or to cope with the consequences.[1]
Attribution	The extent to which a result achieved is due solely to a particular intervention.[51]
Capacity building	In the context of climate change, capacity building is developing the technical skills and institutional capabilities in developing countries and economies in transition to enable their participation in all aspects of adaptation to, mitigation of, and research on climate change, and in the implementation of the Kyoto Mechanisms, etc.[1]
Climate change	Climate change refers to any change in climate over time, whether due to natural variability or as a result of human activity. [1]
Climate variability	Climate variability refers to variations in the mean state and other statistics (such as standard deviations, statistics of extremes, etc.) of the climate on all temporal and spatial scales beyond that of individual weather events. Variability may be due to natural internal processes within the climate system (internal variability), or to variations in natural or anthropogenic external forcing (external variability). See also climate change. [1]
Contribution	The *portion* of a result achieved that a particular intervention has caused or contributed to. Contribution assumes that multiple influencing factors have together caused a particular change/result to occur.
Cost-benefit analysis	Cost-benefit analysis compares an initiative's costs to benefits, both expressed in monetary units.
Cost-effectiveness analysis	Cost-effectiveness analysis is comparing an initiative's monetary costs to outcomes that are expressed in a standardized unit, such as tons of CO_2 emissions avoided due to project activities. Results are ratios of monetary cost per standardized unit of an intangible.
Developmental evaluation	Developmental evaluation is an evaluation approach intended to guide action and adaptation for innovative initiatives in complex, dynamic, and/or uncertain environments. It supports innovation by bringing data to bear to

[50] IPCC (2007) "Glossary." *Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007 (AR_4).* Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.
[51] ADB Independent Evaluation Department (2010) *Revised Guidelines for the Preparation of Country Assistance Program Evaluations.*

	inform and guide ongoing decision making as part of innovative processes.
Evaluation	Broadly defined, evaluation is a systematic, evidence-based assessment designed to answer specific fit-for-purpose questions. There are several kinds of evaluation, each with different functions. Many evaluations (including most program, outcome, summative, and impact evaluations) are intended in part of in entirety to identify results through an objective, third-party assessment, but other evaluations (e.g., developmental evaluations and most formative evaluations) are designed to support learning and adaptation. Although many evaluations intend to support both learning and accountability, most are stronger in one of these areas than the other.
Evidence	The available body of facts or information indicating whether a belief or proposition is true or valid.
Ex-post evaluation	An evaluation conducted some time (e.g., two years) after completion of an intervention.
Formative evaluation	Formative evaluation is used to examine and improve initiatives that are underway, but not complete. Formative evaluation involves an assessment of what is and is not working based on early experience, interim results (where possible to identify), and changing circumstances. Findings from formative evaluations typically include options/recommendations for improving implementation and enhancing results.
Human system	The term human system refers to any system in which human organizations play a major role. Often, but not always, the term is synonymous with 'society' or 'social system' e.g., agricultural system, political system, technological system, economic system.[1]
Impact evaluation	Impact evaluation determines the net causal effect of an intervention on an indicator of interest. A key concept in impact evaluation is counterfactual analysis—what would have happened in the absence of the project? The net attributable impact is the difference between the observed value and the counterfactual.[3]
Mitigation	Mitigation (of climate change) is a human intervention to reduce the sources or enhance the sinks of greenhouse gases.[1]
Monitoring	Monitoring is continuous process of data collection and analysis to provide timely feedback on the progress of a project. Monitoring is conducted during project implementation and allows comparison between the actual and the expected performance. Monitoring helps to hold implementing teams accountable for the delivery of outputs and provides a basis for corrective action, where appropriate.[3]
Outcome evaluation	Outcome evaluations analyze the realization of an initiative's intended outcomes (ultimate goals) and the role of the program in contributing to or causing those outcomes. The main characteristic of an outcome evaluation is that is an evidence-driven, systematic assessment of progress toward an

	initiative's intended outcomes.
Real-time	Real-time is a term describing the immediate present or a period of time lasting up to several months. This term is interpreted widely; therefore, it is important to clarify expectations when referring to "real-time."
Resilience	The ability of a system and its component parts to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a hazardous event in a timely and efficient manner, including through ensuring the preservation, restoration, or improvement of its essential basic structures and functions.[1]
Sensitivity	Sensitivity is the degree to which a system is affected, either adversely or beneficially, by climate variability or change. The effect may be direct (e.g., a change in crop yield in response to a change in the mean, range or variability of temperature) or indirect (e.g., damages caused by an increase in the frequency of coastal flooding due to sea-level rise). [1]
Summative evaluation	Summative evaluation is an evaluation conducted at the end of an initiative. Typically, summative evaluations involve a retrospective analysis of an initiative's outcomes. They can also cover other topics within their scope, such as design and process.
Vulnerability	Vulnerability is the degree to which a system is susceptible to, and unable to cope with, adverse effects of climate change, including climate variability and extremes. Vulnerability is a function of the character, magnitude, and rate of climate change and variation to which a system is exposed, its sensitivity, and its adaptive capacity. [1]

X. ANNEX 3. EVIDENCE-BASED LEARNING PROPOSALS

CTF 1: VIETNAM - SUSTAINABLE URBAN TRANSPORT HANOI METRO LINE 3 PROJECT (ADB)

Sustainable Urban Transport Hanoi Metro Line 3 Project	
CIF Project Number	XCTFVN101A
Total CIF Financing for the Project/Program	USD 100 million
Approach to evidence-based learning	Outcome Evaluation (mid–course)
How the approach will be useful	The outcome evaluation will be used to investigate if the project has caused demonstrable effects on improving the transport system in Hanoi. The study will compare the before and after project implementation. Based on expected outcomes, the results of the evaluation will inform changes on: • financing for low carbon development • accessibility of MRT line 3 (footbridge, pedestrian subways, waiting areas, bus stops and feeder links, taxi stands) • volume of passengers using MRT line 3 • shift in transport mode (use of public transport over private cars) • passengers' attitude and experiences • economic/livelihood activities around the MRT stations • women participation and gender sensitive features • policies and regulations (street management system, parking policy, public/private transport pricing framework) • and other co-benefits The results will be useful for the design and implementation of future transport projects.
Key questions to be addressed	The outcome evaluation will primarily look into the integration of MRT line 3 with other public and private transport systems and will attempt to answer the following questions: 1. Is there a shift on transport mode - from the use of private cars to public transport? Is there increase on the volume of passengers using MRT line 3? What are the reasons on transport mode shift? 2. Does the project improve the mobility of the passengers and reduce the time burden (time spent from travelling from home to work place, social services or other locations)?
At what stage(s) will the approach be built into the CIF project cycle?	A baseline study will be conducted prior the implementation of the project and the outcome evaluation will be implemented at the end of the project.
Additional Financing Requested	$ 200 k (tentative)
Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate	[Discussion with government may be pending]

CTF 2: COLUMBIA AND MEXICO - ENERGY EFFICIENCY THROUGH DEDICATED FINANCING LINES FROM SECOND TIER PUBLIC BANKS (IADB)

Energy Efficiency Through Dedicated Financing Lines From Second Tier Public Banks • Energy Efficiency Financing Program for the Services Sector (Colombia) • FIRA Green Line Project (Mexico)	
CIF Project Number	• XCTFCO005A (Colombia) • XCTFMX100A (Mexico)
Total CIF Financing for the Project/Program	• USD 11 million (Colombia) • USD 2.7 million (Mexico)
Approaches to evidence-based learning	Rapid Stakeholder Consultation Formative Evaluation
How the approach will be useful	Both CTF projects aim at supporting the scaling up of private investments in energy efficiency projects through dedicated financing lines from second tier public banks (Bancoldex in Colombia and FIRA in Mexico). These two projects can provide similar lessons learned that could then be applied for the region. A consolidated approach will also reduce costs as one consultant will be hired to study both projects. While under different contexts, market studies during project preparation in both countries identified real and/or perceived risks by both final beneficiaries and local financial institutions (LFIs). Final beneficiaries were unsure that promised savings could materialize and LFIs had lack of knowledge about the risks and returns associated with energy efficiency projects. Such risks, real or perceived, have been identified as key barriers for investing and financing energy efficiency projects. In order to address these barriers and stimulate behavioral changes from key stakeholders (final beneficiaries and LFIs) that could lead to scaled-up private sector investment and finance on energy efficiency projects, the financing lines of the public banks (i.e., FIRA and Bancoldex) were coupled with a number of risk mitigation instruments—both financial (insurance schemes and performance guarantees) and non-financial (promotion of standard contracts for energy service providers, certification of service provider competency, validation of project quality, and monitoring and verification of savings by third parties). These instruments have been developed based on risk assessment studies and stakeholder consultations conducted in both countries. While there is the expectation that these risk mitigation instruments can help strengthening private sector engagement and accelerate the flow of climate change mitigation investment projects, the impact of each instrument and its specific operational designs may have to be evaluated and calibrated during project implementation to ensure agile and successful project execution. It is also expected that the continuous improvements of the risk mitigation instruments to ensure their adaptation to the particular project needs during execution will provide a better understanding of the replication potential of these instruments in other sectors or countries. It is proposed therefore that IADB would apply an approach of Formative Evaluation to the risk mitigation instruments developed in both projects to accumulate and systematize evidence-based learnings from their application in both institutional settings. In short, such an approach will not only help to improve the projects' design during execution, but will also allow to draw lessons on how best to replicate such risk mitigation instruments elsewhere. The following activities would be executed for each of the projects (Colombia and

Mexico):

- Assessment of the use by firms and LFIs of proposed risk mitigation instruments (financial and non- financial) on an ongoing basis (i.e., analysis of the use of instruments by supported projects every 3 months);
- Calibration of instruments according to feedback from users and other relevant stakeholders (LFIs, insurance companies, energy services and technology providers, etc.);
- Feasibility analysis of the different risk mitigation instruments, including their potential to be self-sustained once CTF resources have been depleted, their replication, their capacity to stimulate private sector investment and financing of climate change mitigation projects, etc. (one consultant for both projects) ;
- Identification of the key stakeholders that could provide or facilitate the development of risk mitigation instruments going forward (i.e., crowd in of new insurance and reinsurance providers, new energy services and technology providers, LFIs, etc.).

The evaluation will be complemented with rapid stakeholder consultations (events every 6 months), about the usefulness of the instruments, their operational performance, and areas for further improvements. Such consultations will include LFIs, insurance companies, third party validators, energy services and technology providers, and projects' final beneficiaries.

Key questions to be addressed

The main questions expected to be addressed by these evaluations include:

1. How effective and relevant are the risk mitigation instruments developed to manage risks associated to energy efficiency projects?
2. Which risks have been mitigated and which not?
3. What improvements are needed in the proposed model?
4. Which adjustments were undertaken during execution and which were their results?
5. What is the potential of replicating the proposed risk mitigation instruments in other sectors and countries?

At what stage(s) will the approach be built into the CIF project cycle?

The project in Colombia has already been approved and is expected to start its execution in June/July 2014. The project in Mexico is expected to be approved in the third quarter of 2014 and should be under execution by the end of the year. The formative evaluation and the rapid stakeholder consultations of both projects are expected to be carried out in their first 2 years of execution.

Additional CIF financing requested:

Activity	**Description**	**CIF Funds (both projects)**
Ongoing assessment of the use of the risk mitigation instruments	One individual consultant per project	200,000
Proposals for the calibration of the risk mitigation instruments	Specific consultants as required (legal, financial, technical)	70,000
Feasibility analysis of the risk mitigation instruments in both projects to assess their sustainability and potential for replication	One individual consultant	70,000
Stakeholder consultations	4 consultations through electronic means (web page, e-mail, listing)	60,000
Total		$ 400,000

Pilot country's

Both projects were supported by both beneficiary banks (Bancoldex and FIRA)

interest in and commitment to participate	and their respective national governments. Those institutions and their governments have a strong interest in promoting the risk instruments being developed under the CTF projects, as they consider that they are essential to stimulate private sector investments and financing in energy efficiency and consider that these innovative tools have a high potential for replication in their own countries. A continuous evaluation of the projects in order to assess the functioning of the risk mitigation instruments and calibrate them is considered a key input for the success of both projects.

CTF 3: INDIA - HIMACHAL PRADESH DEVELOPMENT POLICY LOAN (IBRD)

Himachal Pradesh Development Policy Loan	
CIF Project Number	XCTFIN206A
Total CIF Financing for Project	USD 100 million
Approach to evidence-based learning	Outcome Evaluation (mid–course) Rapid Stakeholder Consultation
How the approach will be useful	The approaches will supplement evidence-based learning already undertaken through the project such as the Poverty and Social Impact Analysis (PSIA) aimed at monitoring the social and welfare impacts of benefit-sharing and community-based watershed management at the community level in order to facilitate better targeting, provide feedback for effective implementation, and to promote long-term sustainability of hydropower which is envisaged to be the key driver of economic growth in HP going forward. The *rapid stakeholder consultation* will help gather rapid feedback from key stakeholders to identify areas where mid-course corrections may be required. The *outcome evaluation (mid-course)* approach will add value by analyzing the realization of the intended outcomes and their attribution to the proposed set of activities under the project (i.e., policy reforms and institutional capacity building activities). The added value of this approach will also stem from the fact that DPLs, as opposed to traditional investment operations, are not subject to comprehensive mid-term reviews during project implementation.
Key questions to be addressed	*Rapid stakeholder consultation:* How effective is the project in meeting its objectives, including impact on intended beneficiaries from increased hydropower production? What measures and improvements are needed to enhance the effectiveness of the project? What barriers hindering hydropower development are not being addressed by the project? How effective is the mechanism that allows for compensation to hydropower developers for delays and financial losses in commissioning the projects? How effective is the (new) institutional structure (to be) for scaling-up hydropower in Himachal Pradesh? *Outcome evaluation:* What outcomes did the program try to achieve or contribute to, and how can these be measured? Where these outcomes achieved? If so, to what extent, how, and why? How did the program contribute to the achieved outcomes? How can lessons from this program inform other programs?
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	Real-time learning: during project implementation Rapid stakeholder consultation: during project implementation Outcome evaluation: at end / ex-post
Additional CIF financing requested	$250k (tentative)
Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate.	[Discussions with government may be pending.]

CTF 4: INDONESIA - GEOTHERMAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (IBRD)

Geothermal Development Project	
CIF Project Number	XCTFIDO17A
Total CIF Financing for the Project/Program	USD 125 million
Approach to evidence-based learning	Real-time Learning
How the approach will be useful	Resource development for the project's geothermal fields has suffered substantial delays caused by various factors, including delay in land acquisition and infrastructure preparation. In addition, the implementing agency is itself a newly established entity embarking into an ambitious increase in its operations. The proposed *real-time learning* approach will help gain skills and knowledge to enhance the implementing agency's skills to adapt and improve project implementation. The added value from this approach will result from engaging the large multitude of stakeholders which are related to the implementation of this project, including Government of Indonesia, Pertamina, PGE, PLN, and people living in project areas. The proposed approach will help engage key stakeholders in critical thinking and dialogue, undertaking in-depth testing of assumptions and hypotheses, etc. The outcome of these activities will help identify critical gaps and areas for improvement and associated learning opportunities to avoid further delays in project implementation.
Key questions to be addressed	*Real-time learning:* What do data tell us about project progress, institutional capacity and experience, and strategies to address possible delays in project implementation? What are key insights based on experience? How are hypotheses about the adequacy of the resource (geothermal steam) and institutional capacity change over time? What specific opportunities do we have to test our assumptions and hypotheses?
At what stage(s) will the approach be built into the CIF project cycle?	The approach will be integrated into the project cycle and will be carried out throughout project implementation.
Additional CIF financing requested:	$200k (tentative)
Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate	[Discussion with government may be pending.]

CTF 5: THAILAND - SOLAR POWER COMPANY INVESTMENT (IFC)

Solar Power Company Investment, Thailand	
CIF Project Number	PCTFTH075B
Total CIF Financing for the Project/Program	USD 4.6 million
Approach to evidence-based learning	Outcome Evaluation Study
How the approach will be useful	The outcome evaluation will conduct a systematic assessment of delivered outputs of the two sub-projects under the program, which focused on assisting a Thai company in development of a series of solar PV power plants. This evaluation will address all standard (OECD-DAC) evaluation criteria (strategic relevance, efficiency, impact, and sustainability). The focus will be on learning lessons useful for continuously improving this program, informing strategy, and enhancing future replications of similar operations.
Key questions to be addressed	To what extent did the benefits of a programme or project continue after donor funding ceased? What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project? What has happened as a result of the programme or project? What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries? How many people have been affected? Were activities cost-efficient? Were objectives achieved on time? Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives? To what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives? To what extent are the objectives of the programme still valid? Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives? Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	Mid-course
Additional financing requested	CIF financing requested: $65,000 Additional financing is expected to be provided by IFC, depending on the alignment of the objectives of the exercise with these of similar initiatives conducted by IFC internally. The anticipated ballpark amount provided by IFC: $25,000
Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate	Government recognizes the strategic role of solar PV development for the country and provides strong support through enhancements of the investment climate, stabilization of the regulatory regime, and other measures. However, direct government involvement is not anticipated, as the study will be done on the outputs of the private sector investments.

PPCR 1: MOZAMBIQUE - BAIXO LIMPOPO IRRIGATION AND CLIMATE RESILIENCE PROJECT (AFDB)

Baixo Limpopo Irrigation And Climate Resilience Project	
CIF Project Number	XPCRMZ021A-AFDB-PJ-NA-LO-1-GR-1
Total CIF Financing for the Project	USD 15.75 million
Approach to evidence-based learning	Adaptive Capacity Assessment
How the approach will be useful	The assessment will help to precise how certain project activities should be implemented (for example clinics to be rehabilitated based on the communities' capacities and needs) and to assess the impact of the project in terms of improving adaptive capacities of the beneficiaries. This work would be able to build on the experience in Mozambique of the African Climate Change Resilience Alliance in similar assessments.
Key questions to be addressed	The Local Adaptive Capacity (LAC) framework developed by the African Climate Change Resilience Alliance (ACCRA) will be used. Key questions could include : • How are different livelihood groups currently affected by climate (hazard/variability) change, in particular flood and in terms of health impacts? • How can the negative impacts of climate change be best mitigated by the project? • How can the adaptive capacities of the project beneficiaries be best strengthened by the project? • To what extent has the project strengthened adaptive capacity of the population?
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	Beginning and end of the project
Additional CIF financing requested	$ 350k
Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate	The Executing Agency wrote an email to the Bank requesting to participate in this important approach.

PPCR 2: JAMAICA - ADAPTATION PROGRAM AND FINANCING MECHANISM FOR PPCR JAMAICA (IADB)

Adaptation Program and Financing Mechanism for PPCR Jamaica	
CIF Project Number	XPCRJM049A
Total CIF Financing for the Project	USD 11.3 million
Approach to evidence-based learning	Impact Evaluation
How the approach will be useful	The use of the impact evaluation is intended to demonstrate that the implementation of specific agricultural adaptation activities results in improvements to the livelihoods of communities, reflected in the form of increased crop incomes within a project area. Specifically the theory of change for the PPCR program will focus on evaluating the impact of the construction of check dams (micro structures) within gullies throughout the Rio Minho Watershed (a project area identified in the Jamaica SPCR), which are aimed at reducing vulnerability to climate change through increased water availability to farmers – the primary beneficiaries. The expected impacts will be increased net crop income thereby reducing the vulnerability of farmers to the effects of climate change. It should be noted that the application of an impact evaluation to other elements of the PPCR program for Jamaica e.g. innovative financing, would be extremely difficult to do and the decision was made to apply the Impact evaluation to an intervention that had tangible and easily measureable benefits.
Key questions to be addressed	The key question to be answered will be: 1. Will activities such as the construction of check-dams and capacity building efforts – i.e., training farmers to construct and maintain check dams, result in improved water access and an increase in crop yields? A major assumption related to the activities of the program is that the check-dams will be built in accordance with climate change considerations.
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	At the design stage of the project since baselines will have to be established prior to the intervention (i.e., through the use of initial survey) so as to avoid sampling basis.
Additional CIF financing requested	$450k This is an estimated total cost which would include the cost of two surveys of communities – an initial baseline survey prior to treatment and post treatment (three years after the intervention). The sample size is estimated at 300 – 500 households (primary sampling unit to be used).
Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate	The pilot country has a strong commitment to include this approach in the program as this is becoming a requirement for all programing using multi-lateral financing. As they are pursuing more climate change related programs and are receiving financing for these types of programs, it is a necessity to develop the capacity to design and manage this evidence-based decision making approach in regard to program focusing on climate change adaptation.

PPCR 3. PLURINATIONAL STATE OF BOLIVIA - CLIMATE RESILIENCE PROGRAM FOR THE WATER AND SANITATION SYSTEMS OF THE METROPOLITAN AREAS OF LA PAZ AND EL ALTO (IADB)

Climate Resilience Program for the Water and Sanitation Systems of the Metropolitan Areas of La Paz and El Alto	
CIF Project Number	XPCRBO007A
Total CIF Financing for the Project	USD 44.5 million
Approach to evidence-based learning	Cost Benefit Analysis
How the approach will be useful	The approach will be useful in determining if the methods proposed to expand the availability of water for human and agricultural consumption contribute to the beneficiaries' wellbeing while outweighing costs. This methodology will be implemented in two stages: project preparation and close to the end of the project.
Key questions to be addressed	a) In terms of the component focused on supplying water for human consumption, the cost-benefit analysis is oriented towards addressing the following question: is the proposed intervention economically feasible while contributing to reduce population vulnerability to the effects of climate change on water availability and quality? (i.e., are the benefits of expanding water coverage greater than its associated costs?) b) Regarding the component aimed at increasing availability of water for agricultural consumption, the cost-benefit analysis will address the following question: is the proposed intervention economically sound while responding to more extended and severe droughts in the Altiplano due to climate variability and change? (i.e., are the benefits of the irrigation project in terms of agricultural income greater than its associated costs?)
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	Ex-ante and ex-post. The ex-ante cost-benefit analysis is being developed as part of the final proposal for approval (baseline), whereas the ex-post cost-benefit analysis is planned prior to the end of the project. The purpose of performing the cost-benefit analysis two times during project life cycle is to compare results at the end of the project (observed data) with initial information based on assumptions (baseline). This comparison exercise will facilitate the determination of tangible project's results received by beneficiaries.
Additional CIF financing required	USD160,000 (@ 40,000/year)
Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate	Country interested in knowing that the resources are being utilized in an efficient manner, Bolivia is committed to identifying best approaches for climate resilience that are both technically and economically sound. Being this project an adaptation pilot, it is important that lessons learned for vulnerability reduction are well documented and economic as well as social benefits are analyzed and quantified.

PPCR 4: HAITI - STRENGTHENING HYDRO-MET SERVICES (IBRD)

Strengthening Hydro-Met Services	
CIF Project Number	XPCRHT071A
Total CIF Financing for the Project	USD 5.5 million
Approach to evidence-based learning	Cost Benefit Analysis
How the approach will be useful	The Haiti PPCR Hydro-met project aims to strengthen the Government's institutional capacity to provide hydro-met services in key sectors, such as agriculture and emergency preparedness/civil protection. The proposed approach[52] consists of: - supporting an institutional reform to integrate hydro and meteo services (in principle under the same Ministry but de facto fragmented across several institutions) within the same Unit; and - developing end-user hydromet applications customized to the needs of farmers and emergency planners. To ensure sustainability of the institutional reform and devise a sustainable financing model for hydro-met services in the sector targeted by the project, an economic assessment will: - Determine costs of these services (maintenance of stations, observers, etc.) - identify possible sources of financing (including private funding, cost-recovery mechanisms among public entities, etc.) with a view to improve its long term performance. This assessment should start during project preparation as its findings will inform, among others, the activities of Components 1 and 2. Putting a 'dollar figure' on the modernization of hydro-met services and the institutional development activities (staffing, training, equipment etc.) will be critical to the sustainability the WB/CIF investment. It is indispensable for the Government of Haiti and the Bank to estimate and plan in advance the cost for the country to 'take over' project outputs and ensure continuation of development outcomes once project financing ends. The objective is to help the Client plan for adequate resources within the national budget and donors' support, and put in place cooperation and commercial protocols as appropriate.
Key questions to be addressed	1. Given a certain level of service to be provided, what is the estimated annual operating/investment budget for hydro-met services in Haiti? 2. What would be the most appropriate and realistic financing model(s) for efficient and effective hydro-met services in Haiti? 3. Can we estimate potential financial contribution (or percentage) from public and private users?
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	Ex-ante / design phase.
Additional CIF financing requested	$ 40k [$ 21k consulting fees for economist (30 working days for desk review + field work in HT); $ 5k consulting fees for writer (Blog + Knowledge piece) $ 14k for 2 missions to HT (TTL+Economist)

[52] Project Concept Note review meeting is expected to take place on April 22, 2014.

Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate	The Government of Haiti (CIAT which is the PPCR focal point and Ministry of Agriculture) has requested technical support for preparing some scenarios for the institutional reform of hydromet services. Partner organizations (WMO, EU, IADB) are onboard and we could explore opportunities to carry out this activity in partnership with the WMO.

PPCR 5: JAMAICA: IMPROVING CLIMATE DATA AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT PROJECT (IBRD)

Improving Climate Data and Information Management Project	
CIF Project Number	XPCRJM048A
Total CIF Financing for the Project	USD 7.1 million
Approach to evidence-based learning	Rapid Stakeholder Consultation
How the approach will be useful	• The objective of the *Improving Climate Data and Information Management Project* is to support Jamaica in ensuring improved quality climate information for effective planning and action at local and national levels. • A key aspect of achieving this objective involves identifying innovative information and communication technology (ICT) enabled tools including mobile and geo-referenced applications to engage citizens and stakeholders in the production and consumption of climate data and information. • Because of the high mobile telephony penetration in Jamaica, rapid stakeholder consultation through **crowdsourcing** using mobile phone technology and open source software platforms would be used to generate information regarding climate resilience as relates to the project activities (e.g., enhanced early warning systems as a result of the upgraded hydromet system in Jamaica). Such stakeholder information would be able to generate insights on citizens' participation in the production and consumption of climate data and information in space and time.
Key questions to be addressed	• In a country with high mobile telephone penetration, what is the most effective and efficient way to engage stakeholders in production and consumption of climate data and information? • Can crowdsourcing and other rapid stakeholder consultation methods increase awareness of the impacts of climate change? • How can adoption of initiatives to improve climate resilience be enhanced through rapid stakeholder consultations?
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	Because a knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) survey was undertaken as part of the Jamaica SPCR, this approach would be utilized during project design and implementation. In particular the emphasis would be during project implementation when the project would be generating and disseminating enhancing climate data and information to the various publics in Jamaica. It is anticipated that at various stages during implementation (e.g., at project effectiveness, mid-term review, end of project) and when certain climate events (e.g., hurricanes, floods, storms, droughts, etc.) happen in Jamaica during the course of the project, rapid stakeholder consultations would be undertaken not only to gauge the effectiveness of the supply-side of the project (e.g., early warning systems, climate data and information provision to the publics via various media), but to also understand the demand-side (e.g., what specific climate related information is most useful to the various audiences at what times). This would further help to tailor project products and messages to ensure that they are serving the various audiences in a manner that most effectively enhances their resilience to climate variability and change.
Additional CIF financing requested	$ 350k Rapid stakeholder consultation needs to be done in a rigorous way in order to

	minimize bias and ensure robustness and usefulness of the results. It is anticipated that USD 50,000 would be used at the beginning of the project, USD 50,000 at mid-term review, and USD 50,000 at end of project. In addition, Jamaica usually experiences, almost annually, climate related events such as hurricanes, floods and storms; so it is planned that rapid stakeholder consultations would be undertaken following major climate related events in the first 4 years of project implementation. Each such consultation would cost USD 50,000.
Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate	Jamaica has expressly stated in its SPCR that the various publics are generally not sufficiently aware of the potential impacts of climate change, neither are they aware of the measures that they can take to build resilience, nor are the mechanisms in place to encourage adaptation measures. Consequently, continuing stakeholder consultations that are aimed at increasing awareness of climate change impacts in Jamaica are a key focus of Jamaica's investments in climate resilience. The Government of Jamaica, through the Planning Institute of Jamaica (also the PPCR Focal Point), is in support of this proposal.

PPCR 6: NIGER - IRRIGATION PROGRAM (IFC)

Niger - Irrigation Program	
CIF Project Number	XPCRNE032A
Total CIF Financing for the Project	USD1.5 million for (Phase 1, Advisory Services only)
Country	Niger
Approach to evidence-based learning	Impact Evaluation
How the approach will be useful	PPCR Niger Irrigation Program is the first IFC climate adaptation program in the Africa region and lessons learned will be of fundamental importance to future agribusiness and irrigation projects in the same region. The PPCR program is also pivotal to explore how to promote climate change adaptation in the agricultural private sector. In addition, the program allows IFC to pilot new approaches and manage risks that might not have been possible without PPCR support. Hence it is vital that the PPCR programs adopt a rigorous Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) approach that will measure actual impact on the farmers. An M&E component will consequently be embedded into the IFC-PPCR program to ensure that lessons learned are documented regularly and at an early stage in order to facilitate program activities to be adjusted accordingly, if necessary. The outcomes of each of the program activities will be closely monitored and evaluated by a third party and IFC's M&E team. The results of the M&E exercise will provide much needed information on the commercial viability of the program and its replicability potential. This information will be used to determine whether IFC should proceed with a Phase II which comprises of investing IFC's own commercial finance together with (if necessary) PPCR concessional finance to scale up the program scope and impact.
Key questions to be addressed	The program will closely monitor and evaluate the outcomes and impacts for each program activity. Factors to be assessed will include: i) How will program activities impact crop yields? ii) What are the actual water savings from improved irrigation techniques? iii) What is the size of credit provided to farmers? iv) What are the farmers' repayment rates? v) What are the actual IRRs on investment for the farmer?
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	The M&E plan is being developed in parallel to the roll-out of the program and aims to produce lessons learned during program implementation to facilitate course correction as well as lessons learned at and after the end of the closing of the program. The impact evaluation will include baseline data (before implementation) for beneficiary and control-group households, and an end-line four years after implementation. It will also include a mid-period evaluation follow-up 2 years into the program implementation.
Additional CIF financing requested	$200k. This includes: three rounds of data collection based on household and possibly community surveys, review of purchase and adoption of improved irrigation equipment and techniques, and the evaluation oversight and analyses. No resources have yet been secured or committed for this impact evaluation.
Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate	Niger has expressed interest in seeing rigorous evaluation of IFC program impacts. This evaluation exercise is particularly important for the agri-business sector and local banks in Niger who are interested in developing new credit products and services to farmers, however they currently perceive the risks associated to this new business to be too high. The evaluation of farmer crop

yields, adoption of improved practices, and repayment of credit will help advice and mobilize many actors in the agri-business sector in Niger to adopt climate resilience technologies and practices. In particular, this information will be used to determine whether IFC should proceed with a Phase II involving blending of its own commercial finance with PPCR concessional finance investment in Niger.

FIP 1: BURKINA FASO - GAZETTED FORESTS PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT PROJECT FOR REDD+ (AFDB)

Gazetted Forests Participatory Management Project for REDD+	
CIF Project Number	XFIPBF015A-AFDB-PJ-MA-GR-I
Total CIF Financing for the Project	USD 12.0 million
Approach to evidence-based learning	Impact Evaluation
How the approach will be useful	The FIP in Burkina Faso is testing a model of dry forests sustainable management within the framework of REDD+. It has thus a considerable potential for scaling up not only at the national level but also at the international level. This model is aiming not only at climate mitigation but also at improving local populations' livelihoods and their resilience to a changing climate. Moreover, solid evidence on the impacts of forest conservation activities are still scarce. The impact evaluation will cover areas representing the 3 forest management options the project will support: 1. wood and rangeland, 2. wood, 3. Biodiversity (with hunting activities). It will involve a treatment and control group that will have the same characteristics (using randomization or quasi experimental design approaches) from within and outside the project intervention area. The impact evaluation will focus on socio-economic (poverty, livelihoods, capacities of the population including for climate change adaptation, forest governance) and environmental (biodiversity, soil and water in particular in the context of climate change adaptation) co-benefits. For this, it should draw on the project and FIP results framework, the national frameworks to be designed, as well as existing REDD+ standards for co-benefits such as CCBS (Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards). Two assessments will be conducted, during 2 months each, one at the beginning (or before) of the project in order to determine the baseline, and one at the end. The assessments will rely on a number of instruments including questionnaires (mainly quantitative) and semi-structured interviews (qualitative). It will also include case studies on the impact generated by specific economic activities supported by the project.
Key questions to be addressed	The work will be carried out by an international research center, in collaboration with a national research center. The international research center will be in charge of leading the design of the study (methodology, sampling, questionnaires…) and dissemination activities. It will supervise its implementation and the results analysis. The national research center will be in charge of supporting the design of the study and carrying out its implementation (contracting and managing research officers, field work, data entry and treatment). They will collaborate in writing the final document based on the results obtained.
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	At the beginning and end of project implementation
Additional CIF financing requested	$ 850k (a detailed budget was provided in the context of the FY15 administrative budget submission)
Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate	The government is very interested to have this approach implemented and committed to support it.

FIP 2: DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO - INTEGRATED REDD+ PROJECT IN THE MBUJI-MAYI/KANANGA AND KISANGANI BASINS (AFDB)

Integrated REDD+ Project in the Mbuji-Mayi/Kananga and Kisangani Basins	
CIF Project Number	XFIPZR002A-AFDB-PJ-NA-GR-1
Total CIF Financing for the Project	USD 22.3 million
Approach to evidence-based learning	Rapid Stakeholder Consultation
How the approach will be useful	The Rapid Stakeholder Consultation will set up a permanent system of communication by SMS and mobile phone communication between the project stakeholders themselves, between the project stakeholders and project management teams, and between the project stakeholders and external stakeholders. Pre-established electronic lists of phone numbers of stakeholders by categories[53] will be uploaded in the phones, while phones (300 for the poorest stakeholders) and airtime (unlimited SMS or unlimited phone communication for 600 stakeholders) will be provided so that the stakeholders will be able to send messages easily and at a low cost to the relevant stakeholders. The project and provincial coordination units will manage the system (updating of the contact lists, payment to the mobile companies…) while the mobile company should help to control the use of the stakeholders' phones for the project and condition the airtime buying to it. It will provide an innovative and cost-effective communication mean that will support project implementation, as well as monitoring and evaluation. It will improve stakeholders' consultations, adequately complementing the more traditional consultations under the forms of meetings and workshops by allowing communication with a greater number of stakeholders on a more frequent basis and at a very lower cost, through a communication mean adapted to the large project area and its logistics challenges. It will also allow a more decentralized and democratic communication, cutting-across hierarchy-levels. In the context of this REDD+ project that will be based on performance-based payments (payment for environmental services) schemes, this communication system will allow to share information on : • Activities carried out (performance), in particular to ask for payments; • Whether payments have been received or not; • Potential dangers such as wildfire, forest-depleting activities... ; • Grievances: such as delay in payments, non-compliance on the agreed contracts (on zoning, supports, supervision…), problems with the evaluations of the activities performed; • Consultation or training events; • The availability of inputs, • Technical recommendations; • Etc. This had not been considered in the project appraisal report for different

[53]For example, project and provincial coordination units, local executive agencies, community representatives, Rural Agricultural Management Council representatives, private sector representatives…

	reasons, including : • Mobile phone coverage has recently been extended to more rural areas in DRC • The use of Payment for Environmental Services as part of the project will imply extra communication needs • The application of the new agricultural law vis-à-vis local organizations in rural areas will lead to the emergence of new stakeholders which the project should be in touch with.
Key questions to be addressed	Key questions that will be addressed include : • What are the decisions taken/agreed upon? • Have the activities agreed upon been carried out? • Are the commitments being respected (by both parts)? • Have the agreed payments been received? • What are the stakeholders' experiences with project management? • Do the stakeholders have any particular grievances? • Etc.
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	During the whole cycle of project implementation.
Additional CIF financing requested	$171,500 or $257,900 (depending on the airtime buying option chosen) • 1 month of local consultant for the design of the system and of the training modules : 5 000 USD • Training : 12 000 USD • Acquisition of mobile phones : 10 500 USD (for 300 poor stakeholders) • Airtime buying: 144 000 USD (unlimited SMS among stakeholders) or 230 400 USD (unlimited phone communication among stakeholders) for 600 stakeholders during 48 months, according to preliminary discussions with a mobile phone company.
Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate	The government is fully supportive of having more stakeholders' consultations and rapid bottom up communication. It is especially interested in testing this innovative and low cost approach that will be particularly suited to the wideness of the country.

FIP 3: BRAZIL - SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTION IN AREAS PREVIOUSLY CONVERTED TO AGRICULTURAL USE PROJECT (UNDER THE LOW CARBON EMISSION AGRICULTURE PLAN) (IBRD)

Sustainable Production in Areas Previously Converted to Agricultural Use Project (Under the Low Carbon Emission Agriculture Plan)	
CIF Project Number	XFIPBR011A
Total CIF Financing for the Project	USD 10.72 million
Approach to evidence-based learning	Impact Evaluation
How the approach will be useful	The project is designed as a pilot intervention. It intends to generate specific lessons for scaling up tools and methodologies that help to increase adoption of low carbon emission technologies in the agricultural sector.
Key questions to be addressed	First, an assessment will test the hypothesis whether the project has a positive impact on the rate of adoption of low carbon emission (ABC Plan) technologies. Second, it will estimate the project's impact on the quality of the technology adoption. Third, the Project will monitor a set of sustainability indicators in agroecosystems (SIA) in a limited sample of assisted farms. Fourth, the Project will experiment with different methodologies to measure the project impact on forested areas within the participating production units.
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	*Preparation*: Component structure is related to the project's experimental design, with components 1 and 2 generating two intervention groups (producers with training; and producers with training and technical assistance, a subset of the first group) as well as a control group. *Implementation*: Besides establishing baselines for impact evaluation, each year during implementation the Project will establish lessons learned for discussion and dissemination with actors and agencies involved in Brazil's ABC Plan. *Evaluation*: A mid-term evaluation will be focused on outcomes. A final evaluation will center on measurement of impacts. An economic evaluation will be carried out for the ICR.
Additional CIF financing requested	$200k for supporting evaluative approach and dissemination in and beyond Brazil.
Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate	Brazil, through the agencies involved, is fully committed to the approach. It has been designed jointly; it has informed Project design; and its basic costs have been incorporated into the Project's budget.

FIP 4: BURKINA FASO - DECENTRALIZED FOREST AND WOODLANDS MANAGEMENT PROJECT (AFDB)

Decentralized Forest and Woodlands Management Project	
CIF Project Number	XFIPBF014A
Total CIF Financing for the Project/Program	USD 18 million through World Bank (parallel to a USD 12 million through African Development Bank)
Approach to evidence-based learning	Adaptive Capacity Assessment Vulnerability Assessment
How the approach will be useful	It is broadly understood that changing climate dynamics are having an increasingly negative impacts on livelihoods and security in the Sahelian climates of Burkina Faso, especially in the North or the country. What is less well documented is the level of vulnerability of communities as well the importance of forests and woodlands in increasing adaptive capacity of in the areas of this project (local level), that represent a diverse range of agro-climatic zones. The specific focus of vulnerability and then adaptive capacity assessments in the targeted project areas will provide a deeper understanding of the specific role of forests and woodlands in the targeted communities in the face of increasing climate challenges. This insight will allow for lessons to be more readily scaled up across the country as the circumstances will be understood in greater detail. This approach will complement the evidence-based learning that is integrated into the project as illustrated in the integrated monitoring and evaluation approach already adopted by the project (i.e., cost effectiveness assessment, real-time learning, and stakeholder consultations)
Key questions to be addressed	-What is the sensitivity to projected climate related hazards and perturbations? -How will sectors/communities/populations be affected? -Are there current socio-economic trends that interact with these sensitivities (and run the risk of amplifying them)? How will society be able to cope with and manage these changes? -How do stakeholders conceive of systemic effects of climate change? -Which vulnerability-decreasing strategies may be used to reduce risk? What is the priority of strategies? -How are development interventions contributing to managing vulnerability to hazards in a changing climate? - What is missing in current projects that would enhance adaptive capacity? -How can planning at local level inform higher-level planning and allocation of resources?
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	The approach will be built into the project cycle starting from the preparation of the project and followed as part of the integrated monitoring and evaluation system. The assessments will start at the outset when baseline situations are developed for each community and will be incorporated into the monitoring and evaluation of the program. Learning is present throughout the project lifecycle, as ongoing interventions at project sites will inform monitoring and evaluation systems implemented from the local to the national level.
Additional CIF financing requested	$200k

FIP 5: INDONESIA - FOREST MANAGEMENT UNIT DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY BASED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PROJECT (IBRD)

Forest Management Unit Development and Community Based Natural Resource Management Project	
CIF Project Number	XFIPBF0.A
Total CIF Financing for the Project	USD 17 million through World Bank
Approach to evidence-based learning	Impact Evaluation
How the approach will be useful	1. The Forest Investment Program is supporting the Government's approach on introducing and expanding the so-called KPH system. The Project will support Indonesia's on-going efforts towards the strengthening of decentralized forest management by creating enabling institutional arrangements and operationalizing sub-national Forest Management Units. This would help catalyze further investment in FMUs and contribute to sustainable forest management, reduced deforestation and forest degradation, community livelihood and sustainable landscape management. This approach is seen as a critical step for integrating all economic, biodiversity, and environmental, social and cultural aspect of forest management under one single planning framework. *Proposed Development Objective(s)* The Project aims to help Indonesia reduce institutional barriers to sustainable forest management and REDD+ implementation at the national and sub-national levels. The sub-objectives of the Project are: a. At the national level - to strengthen institutional, financial, and technical capacity and support FMU policy dialogue within the national Government b. At the sub-national level - to generate knowledge by investing in participatory forest land-use planning c. At the site level - to assist a small number of pilot FMUs to become operational and engage with local communities and other stakeholders to improve livelihood and economic activities from sustainable forest management *Expected Key Results* The anticipated key project results at the national and sub-national levels are: At the national level: a. An institutional framework established within the MOFOR to support the development and operationalization of FMUs b. Policy work supported through appropriate multi stakeholder platform c. A centralized FMU Knowledge and Management Information System established within MOFOR to generate and disseminate knowledge

	At the sub-national level: a. Participatory forest land use planning piloted (consultations, appraisals, assessments, mediation and conflict resolution, etc.) within Model FMUs b. Three Pilot FMUs operational and engaged in sustainable forest management and REDD+ activities c. Reduced emissions in the selected Pilot FMUs, based upon a realistic baseline The KPH approach is not seen without skepticism by many forest stakeholders, Civil Society Organizations other advocacy groups given the unprecedented level of deforestation in many parts of Sumatra and Kalimantan, the weak existing governance capacities, conflicting government roles and competences and the wide-spread corruption and mis-management of the unique global forest heritage. However, it might be also a unique opportunity for establishing a more regulated and transparent forest management and monitoring system, based on planning and involvement of key stakeholders. It is therefore of critical importance to closely following the proposed project through its life-cycle as an important learning object and for better understanding critical development pathways.
Key questions to be addressed	- How will sectors/communities/populations be affected? - What are the impacts of this program with regard to sustainability of forest management, biodiversity, benefit sharing of local communities, economic viability of forest management units etc. - Are there current socio-economic trends that interact with these sensitivities (and run the risk of amplifying them)? How will society be able to cope with and manage these changes? - Which vulnerability-decreasing strategies may be used to reduce risk? What is the priority of strategies? - How are development interventions contributing to reduce deforestation and degradation of forests? - What is missing in the project that would enhance adaptive capacity? - -How can planning at local level inform higher-level planning and allocation of resources?
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	The approach will be built into the project cycle starting from the preparation of the project and followed as part of the integrated monitoring and evaluation system. The assessments will start at the outset when baseline situations are developed at national, regional and local level will be incorporated into the monitoring and evaluation of the program through in-depth analytical work and data collection. Learning is present throughout the project lifecycle, as ongoing interventions at project sites will inform monitoring and evaluation systems implemented from the local to the national level.
Additional CIF financing requested	$400k
Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate in this approach.	The transition towards a national KPH system has been embraced at highest government levels. The KPH system is part of the national REDD+ strategy fully supported all major Government agencies and the REDD+ agency.

FIP 6: 8 COUNTRIES (ALL MDBS) – DEDICATED GRANT MECHANISM FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLE AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Indigenous People and Local Communities	
CIF Project Number	Global Component - XFIPDG209A DGM Brazil - XFIPDG201A DGM Burkina Faso - XFIPDG202A DGM DRC - XFIPDG203A DGM Ghana - XFIPDG204A DGM Indonesia - XFIPDG205A DGM Lao PDR - XFIPDG206A DGM Mexico - XFIPDG207A DGM Peru - XFIPDG208A
Total CIF Financing for the Project/Program	USD 50 million in FIP grant resources have been set aside for eight DGM country programs and a global component. The global component exclusively focuses on knowledge sharing, capacity development and learning. Resources for the entire project budgets are allocated as follows: Global Component – USD 5 million DGM Burkina Faso – USD 4.5 million DGM Brazil – USD 6.5 million DGM DRC – USD 6 million DGM Ghana – USD 5.5 million DGM Indonesia – USD 6.5 million DGM Lao PDR – USD 4.5 million DGM Mexico – USD 6 million DGM Peru – USD 5.5 million
CIF Program	Forest Investment Program
Countries	Brazil, Burkina Faso, DRC, Ghana, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Mexico, Peru
Approach to evidence-based learning	Real-time Learning
How the approach will be useful	The FIP Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities has been established to provide the communities in the eight FIP pilot countries with a financing and learning mechanisms to support their participation in and complement the FIP investment programs and projects. The mechanism is unique in terms of the bottom-up approach as it has been developed and will be implemented by and through indigenous peoples and local communities. A real-time evidence-based learning approach would allow not only the Indigenous Peoples groups, local communities and other stakeholders to understand whether the supported activities lead to expected outcomes, but would also enable the FIP as a whole to understand whether such mechanism is a useful complement to larger-scale investments in REDD+ across the eight pilot countries. Another useful aspect would be to explore whether the global component provides opportunities for South-South learning and whether shared experiences and lessons are actually applied in other countries.
Key questions to be addressed	Higher-level key questions to be answered will be: 1. Will activities such capacity development for indigenous peoples and local communities in the eight pilot countries enhance their ability to effectively engage in the national and global REDD- dialogue? 2. Will lessons and good practices from the DGM country programs

	shared through events organized through the global DGM component result in transferring and uptake of local and indigenous knowledge across countries and regions? Additional questions may be developed for each DGM pilot country program once more design details become available.
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	During project implementation. Quarterly or biannual data collection at the country level is proposed. The global component foresees at least one annual and/or regional learning meeting with all eight countries involved – data collection at the DGM global level could be conducted during these events. This cycle would be followed throughout the five years to enable iterative learning and tracking of improvement (and learning dissemination) across the entire project cycle. The first meeting of the DGM Global Steering Committee will take place in August/September 2014. It is suggested to present the evidence-based learning approach during that meeting. First meetings of the National Steering Committees will be held once FIP funding is approved and the MDB has approved the project. It is suggested to present the evidence-based learning approach during the country meetings as well.
Additional CIF financing requested	$ 1.6 million [$30k-$50k per year per country to research and synthesize lessons and to inform in-country and cross-country learning and iterative improvement. This totals USD200,000 each year and total: USD1.6 million over 5 years.]
Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate in this approach.	[To be discussed during the first DGM Global Steering Committee meeting and the first meetings of the National Steering Committees.]

SREP 1: MALDIVES - PREPARING OUTER ISLANDS FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (ADB)

Preparing Outer Islands for Sustainable Energy Development Programme	
CIF Project Number	XSREMV025A
Total CIF Financing for the Project/Program	USD 12.75 million
Approach to evidence-based learning	Outcome Evaluation (mid–course)
How the approach will be useful	The outcome evaluation will be useful to determine the social, economic and environmental viability of the project. The study will look into the expected outcomes and assess if there are any changes on the following: • energy access (number of households using clean energy/diesel generators for electricity) • supply of renewable energy • reliability of energy supply • health impacts (air and noise pollution) • livelihood creation (number of local businesses) • regulatory frameworks/policies • women participation and other co-benefits It will compare the before and after situation in the covered islands. Therefore, baseline data is important to be established to assess the extent of changes or improvement. Sampling frame will be developed to evaluate co-benefits. Survey and/or focus group discussions are proposed to be conducted before and after the project implementation. Key Informant Interviews will also be useful to support the results of the study.
Key questions to be addressed	1. Does the project have resulted to increase access of clean energy in the small islands? How many households have shifted away from the use of diesel generators as their main source of electricity? 2. Does the project promoted economic and livelihood activities, health improvement and creation of regulatory frameworks on use of clean energy? 3. What are the other benefits that can be derived from the project?
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	A baseline study will be conducted prior the implementation of the project and the outcome evaluation will be implemented at the end of the project.
Additional CIF financing requested	$200k (tentative)
Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate	[Discussions with government may be pending.]

SREP 2: HONDURAS - SUSTAINABLE RURAL ENERGIZATION (ERUS): PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE BUSINESS MODELS FOR CLEAN COOKSTOVES DISSEMINATION (IADB)

Sustainable Rural Energization (ERUS): Promoting Sustainable Business Models For Clean Cookstoves Dissemination	
CIF Project Number	PSREHN011A
Total CIF Financing for the Project	USD 2.95 million (5.47 million total project)
Approach to evidence-based learning	Impact Evaluation
How the approach will be useful	The ERUS Cookstoves Program is a pilot project that will scale-up investments in clean cookstoves in Honduras and the LAC region. Despite major advances, the current market penetration of these devices is low in Honduras, with as many as 1.1 million families still cooking with traditional woodstoves or open fires. In the LAC region estimates put the number of people without access to clean fuels at around 50 to 60 million. The program will benefit around 75,000 of these users just in Honduras, however the results and lessons learned from this project will be used for similar programs throughout the region. Other than previous research in Guatemala, under conditions that approximate laboratory settings, little rigorous research has been undertaken in Latin America to assess the impact of clean cookstoves in a real setting on health, social, economic, and environmental indicators. The intended Impact Evaluation aims to measure the impact of clean cookstoves in Honduras on a sub-set of indicators. The IE will use experimental methods using a phase-in approach, it will test different menus to provide training to users, and it will measure these indicators in three points in time: baseline, first follow-up and final follow-up. The IE will encompass 5 years, which will facilitate an assessment of the impact of these indicators in the short, medium, and long-term. The approach will provide evidence on the effectiveness of this type of interventions, by using experimental methods—considered the gold standard to more accurately evaluate the impact of a program.
Key questions to be addressed	1. What type of training leads to higher adoption rates? 2. Once adoption rates are high, what is the impact of the program in the short-term on health, social, and economic indicators? 3. What is the impact of the program in the medium- and long-term on health, social, and economic indicators? Please see Annex 1 for more detail on the indicators to be measured.
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	The IE is being developed in parallel to the roll-out of the project (it is prospective in nature), as it is always recommended in the literature. The IE will include baseline data (before implementation) for beneficiary and control households, and an end-line five years after implementation; but will most likely also include a mid-period follow-up 2.5 years into the project. This approach will facilitate the evaluation of the project in the mid- and long-term periods.
Additional CIF financing requested	$ 510,400. This is an estimated total cost for an impact evaluation, which would include: three rounds of data collection based on household and community surveys, purchase of sensors and other data-gathering hardware, and the evaluation oversight and analyses (See table 1 below for more details). No resources have yet been secured or committed for this impact evaluation.

Table 1. Impact Evaluation Cost Estimates

Surveys	**# units**	**$/unit**	**$/Round**	**#Round**	**Total**
Household Surveys	1,500	80	118,000	3	354,000
Community Surveys	150	40	5,800	3	17,400
Monitoring Instruments					
Ibuttons (measure usage/adoption)	1,500	35	52,500	1	52,500
UCB Particle Monitor (Rental)	1500	50	75,000	1	75,000
Carbon Monoxide Mointor	50	150	7,500	1	7,500
Spirometer (Lung functioning)	50	20	1,000	1	1,000
Disposable Mouthpiece (100 Qty)	40	25	1,000	3	3,000
Total					**$510,400**

Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate	The pilot country has a strong commitment to this approach. These include the executing agency, Fundación Vida, the University of Zamorano, and several government agencies. All actors involved understand the value of the approach for generating evidence that can inform future work and a culture of evidence-based decision making. In addition, the IADB will provide support to build local capacity to participate in this type of approach.

SREP 3: MALI - RURAL ELECTRIFICATION HYBRID SYSTEM (IBRD)

Rural Electrification Hybrid System	
CIF Project Number	XSREM016A
Total CIF Financing for the Project	USD 15.4 million
Approach to evidence-based learning	Rapid Stakeholder Consultation
How the approach will be useful	The proposed *rapid stakeholder consultation* approach will be used to seek feedback from project beneficiaries (e.g., rural households and businesses) and relevant stakeholders (e.g., rural electricity operators) during implementation of the project. The information being collected will be processed and applied toward improving the design and efficiency of the project during implementation. Decentralized information gathering systems (e.g., using innovative ICT applications) will help collect information from multiple and varied stakeholders who may be excluded from typical feedback channels. For instance, the proposed approach can be used to support the implementing agency's efforts to identify potential small towns and villages to be targeted for mini-grids hybridization under the project. This approach can also promote two-way information flows between project beneficiaries and implementing agency, whereby information collected from beneficiaries can be processed and utilized to define adequate sizing and optimal design of the hybrid mini-grids. Such information can also take the form of advice for improving the operational performance of the mini-grids and even determine the opportunity for replacing thermal generation with local biodiesel production based on local potential for biofuel cultivation.
Key questions to be addressed	What is the level of satisfaction of project beneficiaries? How effective is the design of the project in meeting its objectives, including impact on intended beneficiaries? What improvements are needed to enhance the effectiveness of the project taking into consideration local particularities and opportunities? How can the design of the project be modified to adapt to local circumstance and further increase the scale-up potential of hybrid mini-grids? How can the project ensure that information from targeted areas be retrofitted and processed for specific site selection and provide advice on optimal design and operation of mini-grids? A full list of questions will be further refined during project implementation.
Stage(s) the approach will be built into the CIF project cycle	Throughout project implementation.
Additional CIF financing requested	$150k (tentative)
Pilot country's interest in and commitment to participate	[Discussions with government may be pending.]

XI. ANNEX 4. CURRENT EVIDENCE-BASED LEARNING ALREADY BUILD INTO PROJECTS: RESULTS OF STOCK TAKING AT THE PROJECT LEVEL

ADB PROJECT-BY-PROJECT EVIDENCE-BASED LEARNING

Note: ADB projects undertaking evidence-based learning that are beyond routine are shown in *italics*.

Project(s)	Country	Ex-ante	Design	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post	Entire Project Cycle
Clean Technology Fund							
Private Sector Geothermal Energy Program	Indonesia	Stakeholder consultations, Basic research and sector analysis, Country Partnership Strategy review	Stakeholder consultations, Sector analysis, Due diligence, Project Design & Monitoring Framework	Stakeholder consultations Sector analysis Review of borrower's quarterly/annual progress report, and operation's report Development Effectiveness Matrix reports	Stakeholder consultations Sector analysis Project completion review and extended annual review report	Stakeholder consultations Sector analysis Review of borrower's operations report, state of the environment report, national electricity utility development plan Development effectiveness reports	Monitoring tools: Project Performance Report, PPIR, Design & Monitoring Framework
Energy Efficient Electric Vehicles project	Philippines	Stakeholder consultations Basic research and sector analysis. Country Partnership Strategy review	Stakeholder consultations, Sector analysis, Due diligence, Project Design & Monitoring Framework	Stakeholder consultations, Sector analysis, Review of project's progress reports and financial-related information, Semi-annual review/Midterm review, Market survey during mid-term review	Stakeholder consultations Sector analysis Project completion review and completion report	Stakeholder consultations Sector analysis Post-project analysis Review of local government unit data and government reports	Monitoring tools: Project Performance Report, PPIR, Design & Monitoring Framework

Project(s)	Country	Ex-ante	Design	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post	Entire Project Cycle
Private Sector Renewable Energy program	Thailand	Stakeholder consultations, Basic research and sector analysis, Country Partnership Strategy review	Stakeholder consultations Sector analysis Due diligence Project Design & Monitoring Framework	Stakeholder consultations Sector analysis Review of borrower's annual progress report, operation's report, Development Effectiveness Matrix reports	Stakeholder consultations Sector reports review Project completion review and extended annual review report	Stakeholder consultations Sector analysis Review of borrower's technical, operations, and financial model reports Review of financial, operations reports DEM reports	Monitoring tools: Project Performance Report, PPIR, Design & Monitoring Framework
Vietnam Transport (HCMC)	*Vietnam*	*Stakeholder consultations, Basic research and sector analysis, Country Partnership Strategy review*	*Stakeholder consultations Sector analysis Due diligence Project Design & Monitoring Framework*	*Stakeholder consultations, Sector analysis, Quarterly review meetings, Midterm Review, Review of project's progress reports and financial-related information, Establishment of project performance monitoring system and baseline data, Independent monitoring and assessment by external monitoring agency*	*Stakeholder consultations Sector reports review Project completion review and completion report*	*Stakeholder consultations Sector analysis Review of project performance monitoring and evaluation report Public opinion survey by public transport authority Benefit monitoring and post-evaluation report*	*Monitoring tools: Project Performance Report, PPIR, Design & Monitoring Framework*

Project(s)	Country	Ex-ante	Design	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post	Entire Project Cycle
Solar Park: Rajasthan	India	Stakeholder consultations, Basic research and sector analysis, Country Partnership Strategy review	Stakeholder consultations Sector analysis Due diligence Project Design & Monitoring Framework	Stakeholder consultations Sector analysis Review of project's progress reports (quarterly/consolidated annual reports) Review of third party reports	Stakeholder consultations Sector analysis Project completion review and completion report	Stakeholder consultations Sector analysis Review of government agencies' reports	Monitoring tools: Project Performance Report, PPIR, Design & Monitoring Framework
SREP							
Small Hydropower Development	Nepal	Stakeholder consultations, Basic research and sector analysis, Country Partnership Strategy review	Stakeholder consultations, real-time learning, sector analysis, due diligence - Project Inception Missions - Project Administration Manual - Design and Monitoring Framework	Stakeholders and client consultations, sector analysis - Project review missions - Mid-term review missions - Project Performance Reports - Portfolio Performance Indicators and Rating - Review of Borrower's quarterly/Annual progress report - Review of Borrower's operation's report - Development effectiveness monitoring reports	Stakeholder consultations, sector analysis - Project Completion Review Missions - Extended annual review report	Stakeholder consultations, sector analysis, outcome evaluation - Operations Evaluation Missions - Development effectiveness reports - Review of borrower's technical, operations, and financial model reports	Design and monitoring framework Project Performance Reports
PPCR							

Project(s)	Country	Ex-ante	Design	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post	Entire Project Cycle
Investment Project 3 : Coastal Climate Resilient Water Supply, Sanitation, and Infrastructure Improvement-Component 2- Climate Resilient Infrastructure Improvement in Coastal Zone Project	Bangladesh	Stakeholder Consultation, Sector Work, Concept Clearance	Economic and Technical Feasibility Studies, Design & Monitoring Framework, Climate Change Assessment	Technical Feasibilities, Midterm Review, Climate Change Assessment (if needed)	Design and Monitoring Framework Assessment, Climate Risk Assessment Review	Project Completion Report	Project Performance Audit
Technical Assistance 1: Climate Change Capacity Building and Knowledge Management	Bangladesh	Stakeholder Consultation, Concept Clearance	Stock taking exercise, Design & Monitoring Framework	Midterm Review	Completion Review and Completion Report	Completion Review and Completion Report	
Component 1-Project 2- Enhancement of Flood and Drought Management in Pursat	Cambodia	Climate Change Impact and Resilience Assessments	Midterm Review, Design & Monitoring Framework	Completion Review and Completion Report	Completion Review and Completion Report	N/A	
Climate-Resilient Rice Commercialization Sector Development Program	Cambodia	Stakeholder Consultation, Sector Work, Concept Clearance	Economic and Technical Feasibility Studies, Design & Monitoring Framework, Climate Change Assessment	Technical Feasibilities Midterm Review, Climate Change Assessment (if needed)	Design and Monitoring Framework Assessment, Climate Risk Assessment Review	Project Completion Report	Project Performance Audit
Component 3-Project 1- Climate Proofing of Roads in Prey Veng, Svay Rieng, Kampong Chang and Kampong Speu Provinces	Cambodia	It was evident knowing the sector what would be necessary for climate resilience in the project roads.	Evidence of annual floods during rainy season and shortage of water during the droughts in the dry season.				

Project(s)	Country	Ex-ante	Design	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post	Entire Project Cycle
Component 3-Project 2-Climate Proofing Infrastructure in the Southern Economic Corridor Towns	Cambodia						
Component 4-Cluster Technical Assistance: Mainstreaming Climate Resilience into Development Planning of Key Vulnerable Sectors	*Cambodia*	*Rapid Stakeholder Consultation, Vulnerability Assessment /Adaptive Capacity Assessment*	*Rapid Stakeholder Consultation, Vulnerability Assessment /Adaptive Capacity Assessment*	*Stakeholder Consultation, Adaptive Capacity Assessment, Real-time Learning*	*Outcome Evaluation*	*Impact evaluation*	*Real-time Learning*
Building Climate Resilience of Watersheds in Mountain Eco-Systems	*Nepal*	*Problem Tree Analysis, Stakeholder Mapping / Analysis, Stakeholder Consultations/ Strategic Program for Climate Resilience Planning Workshops*	*Design & Monitoring Framework*	*MIS captures baseline beneficiary situation and project staff will update the MIS according to Design & Monitoring Framework indicators, for each subproject. Certain consultants are also tasked to conduct impact evaluations and case analysis during implementation. See NDF TA document for further details.*	*See earlier comment. Both government and ADB will each conduct an evaluation against the Design and Monitoring Framework, and convey this in their project completion reports.*	*ADB project teams do not do ex-post evaluation, but this project may be selected for ex-post evaluation by ADB's independent evaluation department*	*Multi-stakeholder consultations are planned to be conducted throughout project implementation. See the project's consultation, participation and communications plan for details.*
Technical Assistance 1: Mainstreaming Climate Change Risk Management in Development	Nepal	Problem Tree Analysis, Stakeholder Analysis, Stakeholder Consultation	Problem Tree Analysis, Stakeholder Analysis, Stakeholder Consultation	Bi- annual TA review Missions. And since February 2014, with outposting of SAER staff to NRM, regular consultations with relevant government agencies and consultants. Monitoring	Design and Monitoring Framework Review, Completion Review and Completion Report	Impact evaluation	

Project(s)	Country	Ex-ante	Design	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post	Entire Project Cycle
				against Design & Monitoring Framework			
Building Capacity for Climate Resilience	Tajikistan	Inception Mission	Climate Change Impact and Resilience Assessments	Midterm Review Mission, Design & Monitoring Framework	Completion Review and Completion Report	Completion Review and Completion Report	N/A
Building Climate Resilience in the Pyanj River Basin	Tajikistan	Inception Mission	Climate Change Impact and Resilience Assessments	Midterm Review Mission, Design & Monitoring Framework	Completion Review and Completion Report	Completion Review and Completion Report	N/A
Climate Resilience Sector Project	South Pacific-Tonga	Stakeholder Mapping	Stakeholder Consultations and Mapping, Cost-Benefit Analysis, Climate Risk Map				
Pacific Region: Implementation of the Strategic Program for Climate Resilience	South Pacific-Regional Track	Stakeholder Consultation, Annual Pacific CC Roundtable Meeting	PPCR Results Framework, Design & Monitoring Framework, Inception Meeting Indicators				

AFDB PROJECT-BY-PROJECT EVIDENCE-BASED LEARNING

Note: All AfDB projects currently undertake what is considered routine activities.

Fund	Project(s)	Country	Ex-ante	Design	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post	Entire Project Cycle
CTF	Morocco Ouarzazate CSP (MENA)	CSP-MENA	Stakeholder Consultation	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, Environment and Social Management Plan, economic and financial analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Operations Evaluations Department assessment	Project Supervision, Monitoring & Reporting
CTF	One Wind Energy Plan	Morocco	Stakeholder Consultation	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, Environment and Social Management Plan, economic and financial analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Operations Evaluations Department assessment	Project Supervision, Monitoring & Reporting
CTF	EE Program	South Africa	Stakeholder Consultation	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, Environment and Social Management Plan, economic and financial analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Operations Evaluations Department assessment	Project Supervision, Monitoring & Reporting
CTF	Sustainable Energy Acceleration Program	South Africa	Stakeholder Consultation	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, Environment and Social Management Plan, economic and financial analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Operations Evaluations Department assessment	Project Supervision, Monitoring & Reporting
CTF	ESKOM Renewable Support Project-Wind	South Africa	Stakeholder Consultation	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, Environment and Social Management Plan, economic and financial analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Operations Evaluations Department assessment	Project Supervision, Monitoring & Reporting
CTF	ESKOM Renewable Support Project-CSP	South Africa	Stakeholder Consultation	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, Environment and Social Management Plan, economic and financial analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Operations Evaluations Department assessment	Project Supervision, Monitoring & Reporting
PPCR	Sustainable Land and Water Management	Mozambique	Stakeholder Consultation	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment,	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Operations Evaluations Department assessment	Project Supervision, Monitoring & Reporting
PPCR	Baixo Limpopo irrigation and Climate Resilience Project	Mozambique	Stakeholder Consultation	Environment and Social Management Plan, economic and financial analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Operations Evaluations Department assessment	Project Supervision, Monitoring & Reporting

PPCR	Project for the Improvement of Climate Forecasting Systems and Operationalization of Early Warning Systems (PDIPC)	Niger	Stakeholder Consultation	Economic and financial analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Operations Evaluations Department assessment	Project Supervision, Monitoring & Reporting
PPCR	Water Resources Mobilization and Development Project	Niger	Stakeholder Consultation	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, Environment and Social Management Plan, economic and financial analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Operations Evaluations Department assessment	Project Supervision, Monitoring & Reporting
PPCR	Strengthening Climate Resilience in the Kafue Sub-Basin	Zambia	Stakeholder Consultation	Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment, economic and financial analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Operations Evaluations Department assessment	Project Supervision, Monitoring & Reporting
FIP	Integrated REDD+ Project in the Mbuji Mayi/Kananga and Kisangani Basins	DRC	Stakeholder Consultation	Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment, economic and financial analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Operations Evaluations Department assessment	Project Supervision, Monitoring & Reporting
FIP	Gazetted Forests Participatory Management Project for REDD+	Burkina Faso	Stakeholder Consultation	Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment, economic and financial analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Operations Evaluations Department assessment	Project Supervision, Monitoring & Reporting
FIP	Engaging Local Communities in REDD+/Enhancing Carbon Stocks	Ghana	Stakeholder Consultation	Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment, economic and financial analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Operations Evaluations Department assessment	Project Supervision, Monitoring & Reporting
SREP	Menengai Geothermal Project-200 MW Geothermal-Phase A-Resource and Infrastructure Development and Mobilization of Private Sector	Kenya	Stakeholder Consultation	Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment, economic and financial analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Operations Evaluations Department assessment	Project Supervision, Monitoring & Reporting

EBRD PROJECT-BY-PROJECT EVIDENCE-BASED LEARNING

Note: EBRD projects undertaking evidence-based learning that are beyond routine are shown in *italics.*

Project(s)	Country	Ex-ante	Design	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post	Entire Project Cycle
CTF							
Renewable Energy I-Waste Management Framework	Kazakhstan	Feasibility Study	Based on FS prepare Monitoring Plan and implement it	Progress monitoring to commence in 2014	N/A	Aktau Waste Management Project- Will have Operations team self assessment and independent evaluation department review/evaluation	Case study (forthcoming FY15)
Renewable Energy II-Kazakh Railways Sustainable Energy Program	Kazakhstan					Will have Operations team self assessment and independent evaluation department review	Case study (forthcoming FY15)
Renewable Energy III-Kazakhstan Renewable Energy Finance Facility (KAZREFF)	Kazakhstan					Framework - may be selected for full evaluation at some point	Case study (forthcoming at appropriate point)
District Heating Modernization Framework	Kazakhstan	Feasibility Study	Based on Feasibility Study prepare Monitoring Plan and implement it	Progress monitoring to commence in 2014	N/A	Operations team completed self-assessment Evaluation Department completed Validation of self-assessment-distributed to team	Gender analysis (forthcoming), Case study (forthcoming FY15)

Project(s)	Country	Ex-ante	Design	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post	Entire Project Cycle
Turkish Private Sector Sustainable Energy Financing Facility (TurSEFF)	*Turkey*	*Sustainable Energy Market Assessment*	*Based on market assessment and SEFF experience in other countries, sub-sectors were identified and distribution channels (e.g. LEME/LESI, ESCO, PAR) were developed*	*Incentive scheme for loan officers; new distribution channels for supply-side EE (i.e., vendor financing); continuous improvement in the MRV system; independent verification team*	*On-line project tracking; In-depth project impact assessment and evaluation report; Awards ceremony for stakeholders (local banks, clients, government, IFIs); Assessment of remaining market gaps;*	*Independent consultant team verification; Review & publication of in-depth project impact assessment and evaluation report; Review of remaining market gaps; EBRD project evaluation though an Operation Performance Assessment (OPA) by the Evaluation Department*	*Use of List of Eligible Measures and Equipment to facilitate disbursement; Continuous monitoring; Capacity building (workshops, seminars, across geographic regions); Case studies (e.g. ESCO financing)*
Turkish Private Sector Sustainable Energy Financing Facility(TurSEFF)	*Turkey*	*Sustainable Energy Market Assessment*	*Based on market assessment and SEFF experience in other countries, sub-sectors were identified and distribution channels (e.g. LEME/LESI, ESCO, PAR) were developed*	*Incentive scheme for loan officers; new distribution channels for supply-side EE (i.e., vendor financing); continuous improvement in the MRV system; independent verification team*	*On-line project tracking; In-depth project impact assessment and evaluation report; Awards ceremony for stakeholders (local banks, clients, government, IFIs); Assessment of*	*Independent consultant team verification; Review & publication of in-depth project impact assessment and evaluation report; Review of remaining market gaps; EBRD project evaluation though an Operation Performance Assessment (OPA) by the Evaluation*	*Use of List of Eligible Measures and Equipment (LEME) to facilitate disbursement; Continuous monitoring; Capacity building (workshops, seminars, across geographic regions); Case studies (e.g. ESCO financing)*

Project(s)	Country	Ex-ante	Design	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post	Entire Project Cycle
					remaining market gaps;	*Department*	
Ukraine Renewable Energy Direct Lending facility Renewables Direct Lending Facility-Creating Markets for Renewable Power	*Ukraine*					*Framework - may be selected for full evaluation at some point*	*Case study (conducted)*
Renewable Energy II - Novoazovsk Wind Project	Ukraine					Will have Operations team self assessment and independent evaluation department review/evaluation	
Renewable Energy Program-Large Wind Farm	Ukraine					Will have Operations team self assessment and independent evaluation department review/evaluation	
Private Sector Bank-Intermediated Project(TURSEFF II, TuREEFF)	*Turkey*	*Experience from previous TurSEFF*	*Based on TuSEFF experience, residential and SME were separated: Concessionality was eliminated from TurSEFF to take steps towards achieving economic sustainability in EE & RE financing at the SME level; At residential level (TuREEFF), concessionality is*	*Clear quarterly disbursement targets for the banks and the project consultant; Appointing an EBRD relationship manager for each local bank; Appointing an EBRD technical operation leader to manage the project consultant team and do a day-to-day follow up on the project*	*N/A*	*N/A*	*Gender analysis (forthcoming), Case study (forthcoming at appropriate point)*

Project(s)	Country	Ex-ante	Design	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post	Entire Project Cycle
			used to unlock market barriers;				
Private Sector Bank-Intermediated Project(TURSEFF II, TuREEFF)	*Turkey*	*Experience from previous TurSEFF*	*Based on TuSEFF experience, residential and SME were separated: Concessionality was eliminated from TurSEFF to take steps towards achieving economic sustainability in EE & RE financing at the SME level; At residential level (TuREEFF), concessionality is used to unlock market barriers*	*Clear quarterly disbursement targets for the banks and the project consultant; Appointing an EBRD relationship manager for each local bank; Appointing an EBRD technical operation leader to manage the project consultant team and do a day-to-day follow up on the project*	*n/a*	*n/a*	
PPCR							
Enhancing the Climate Resilience of the Energy Sector	Tajikistan						

IBRD PROJECT-BY-PROJECT EVIDENCE-BASED LEARNING

Note: IBRD projects undertaking evidence-based learning that are beyond routine are shown in *italics.*

Project(s)	Country	Ex-ante	Design	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post	Entire Project Cycle
CTF							
Wind Power Development Project (Transmission)	Egypt		Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis/Assessment	Project Supervision; Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG conducts desk-reviews each ICRs and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of ICRs	
Indonesia Geothermal Clean Energy Investment Project	Indonesia		Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis/Assessment	Project Supervision; Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG conducts desk-reviews each ICRs and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of ICRs	
Morocco Ouarzazate CSP	*CSP-MENA*		*Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis/Assessment*	*Project Supervision; Midterm Review*	*Implementation Completion Report*	*IEG conducts desk-reviews each ICRs and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of ICRs*	*In MENA region the Bank is implementing rapid stakeholder (beneficiary) consultations using mobile phones*
Urban Transport Transformation Project	Mexico		Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis/Assessment	Project Supervision; Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG conducts desk-reviews each ICRs and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of ICRs	

Efficient Lighting and Appliance Project	Mexico		Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis/Assessment	Project Supervision; Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG conducts desk-reviews each ICRs and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of ICRs	
Philippines Renewable Energy Development (PHRED)	Philippines		Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis/Assessment	Project Supervision; Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG conducts desk-reviews each ICRs and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of ICRs	
Philippines Cebu Bus Rapid Transit(BRT) Demonstration Project	Philippines		Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis/Assessment	Project Supervision; Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG conducts desk-reviews each ICRs and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of ICRs	
ESKOM Renewable Support Project-Wind	South Africa		Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis/Assessment	Project Supervision; Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG conducts desk-reviews each ICRs and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of ICRs	
ESKOM Renewable Support Project-CSP	South Africa		Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis/Assessment	Project Supervision; Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG conducts desk-reviews each ICRs and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of ICRs	

Private Sector RE and EE Project	Turkey		Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis/Assessment	Project Supervision; Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG conducts desk-reviews each ICRs and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of ICRs	
Impact Assessment of CTF in Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency market in Turkey	*Turkey*		*Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis/Assessment*	*Project Supervision; Midterm Review*	*Implementation Completion Report; Independent outcome evaluation*	*IEG conducts desk-reviews each ICRs and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of ICRs*	
Vietnam Distribution Efficiency Project	Vietnam		Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis/Assessment	Project Supervision; Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG conducts desk-reviews each ICRs and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of ICRs	
Himachal Pradesh Environmentally Sustainable Development Policy Loan	*India*		*Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis/Assessment*	*Project Supervision; Midterm Review*	*Implementation Completion Report*	*IEG conducts desk-reviews each ICRs and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of ICRs*	*Outcome evaluation*
Super Efficient Equipment Program (SEEP)	India		Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis/Assessment	Project Supervision; Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG conducts desk-reviews each ICRs and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of ICRs	
PPCR							

Coastal Embankment Improvement Project	Bangladesh	Stakeholder Consultation	Cost-Benefit analysis; Environmental Impact Assessment	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Implementation Status Report; Routine monitoring and reporting
Climate Resilience-Integrated Basin Management Project	Bolivia	Stakeholder Consultation	Environmental Assessment	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Implementation Status Report; Routine monitoring and reporting
Roads and Bridges Management and Maintenance Program-APL2	Mozambique	Stakeholder Consultation	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Implementation Status Report; Routine monitoring and reporting
Cities and Climate Change	Mozambique	Stakeholder Consultation	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment; Cost-Benefit analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Implementation Status Report; Routine monitoring and reporting
Climate Resilience: Transforming Hydrometeorological Services	Mozambique	Stakeholder Consultation	Benefit-Cost Analysis; Environmental Assessment	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Implementation Status Report; Routine monitoring and reporting
Climate Change and Technical Assistance Project	Mozambique	Stakeholder Consultation	Benefit-Cost Analysis; Environmental Assessment	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Implementation Status Report; Routine monitoring and reporting
Building Resilience to Climate-Related Hazards	Nepal	Stakeholder Consultation	Social Assessment	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Implementation Status Report; Routine monitoring and reporting
Community Action Project for Climate Resilience (CAPCR)	Niger	Stakeholder Consultation	Cost-Benefit Analysis; Environmental and Social Impact Assessment	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Implementation Status Report; Routine monitoring and reporting
Improvement of Weather, Climate and Hydrological Service Delivery	Tajikistan	Stakeholder Consultation	Cost-Benefit Analysis	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Implementation Status Report; Routine monitoring and reporting

Environmental Land Management and Rural Livelihoods	Tajikistan	Stakeholder Consultation	Cost-Benefit Analysis; Rapid ecological baselines; Environmental Assessment	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Implementation Status Report; Routine monitoring and reporting
Strengthening Climate Resilience in Zambia and the Barotse Sub-Basin	Zambia	Stakeholder Consultation	Site-specific Environmental and Social Impact Assessment	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Implementation Status Report; Routine monitoring and reporting
Regional Disaster Vulnerability Reduction Project	Caribbean-Grenada	Stakeholder Consultation	Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Implementation Status Report; Routine monitoring and reporting
Regional Disaster Vulnerability Reduction Project	Caribbean-St. Vincent & The Grenadines	Stakeholder Consultation	Environmental Assessment	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Implementation Status Report; Routine monitoring and reporting
Enhancing the Climate Resilience of the West Coast Road(Apia to Airport)	South Pacific-Samoa	Stakeholder Consultation	Cost-Benefit analysis; Environmental Assessment	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Implementation Status Report; Routine monitoring and reporting
Enhancing the Climate Resilience of Coastal Resources and Communities	South Pacific-Samoa	Stakeholder Consultation	Benefit-Cost Analysis; Environmental Assessment	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Implementation Status Report; Routine monitoring and reporting
Climate Information System and PPCR program Coordination	Yemen	Stakeholder Consultation	Benefit-Cost Analysis; Environmental Assessment	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Implementation Status Report; Routine monitoring and reporting
FIP							
Scaling-Up Participatory Sustainable forest Management (PSFM)	Lao PDR	Stakeholder Consultations	Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment	Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Monitoring and evaluation
Mexico Forests and Climate Change Project	Mexico	Stakeholder Consultations	Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment		Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Monitoring and evaluation

Decentralized Forest and Woodland Management (PGDDF)	Burkina Faso	Stakeholder Consultations	Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment		Implementation Completion Report	IEG assessment	Monitoring and evaluation
SREP							
Rural Electrification Hybrid Systems	Mali		Cost Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment	Project Supervision; Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Independent Evaluation Group conducts desk-reviews of Implementation Completion Reports and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of Implementation Completion Reports	Rapid stakeholder consultations
Extended Biogas Program	Nepal		Cost Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment	Project Supervision; Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Independent Evaluation Group conducts desk-reviews of Implementation Completion Reports and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of Implementation Completion Reports	
ASPIRE Program	Maldives		Cost Effectiveness Analysis (as part of economic analysis); Monitoring & Evaluation framework; Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment	Project Supervision; Midterm Review	Implementation Completion Report	Independent Evaluation Group conducts desk-reviews of Implementation Completion Reports and in-depth reviews (including field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders) of 25% of Implementation Completion Reports	

IADB PROJECT-BY-PROJECT EVIDENCE-BASED LEARNING

Note: IADB projects undertaking evidence-based learning that are beyond routine are shown in *italics.*

Project(s)	Country	Ex-ante	Design	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post	Entire Project Cycle
CTF							
Technological Transformation Program for Bogota's Integrated Public Transport System(BOGOTA SITP)	Colombia	Cost-benefit analysis; Development Effectiveness Matrix	Stakeholder Consultation	Mid-term formative evaluation	Project Completion Report	Ex-post cost/benefit analysis for Project Completion Report	
Strategic Public Transportation Systems Program(SETP)	Colombia	Cost-benefit analysis; Development Effectiveness Matrix	Stakeholder Consultation	Mid-term formative evaluation	Project Completion Report	Ex-post cost/benefit analysis for Project Completion Report	
Sustainable Energy Finance Program	Colombia			Mid-term formative evaluation			
Energy Efficiency Financing Program for the Services Sector	Colombia			Mid-term formative evaluation			
Private Sector Geothermal Energy Program	*Mexico*	*Development Effectiveness Matrix*	*Cost Effectiveness Analysis; Cost Benefit Analysis; Stakeholder Consultation*	*Progress Monitoring Report; Mid-term formative evaluation*	*Project Completion Report*	*Summative Evaluation*	*Results Matrix*
Public Sector Renewable Energy	*Mexico*			*Mid-term formative evaluation; Study about Financing Energy Efficiency in Mexico; study about the Energy Services Company (ESCO) market in Mexico; developing financing facility for ESCOs.*			

Energy Efficiency Program-Part 1	Mexico		Stakeholder Consultation; Study about Financing Energy Efficiency in Mexico; study about the ESCO market in Mexico; developing financing facility for ESCOs. IADB designed a financial structure to provide access to finance to ESCOs energy efficiency projects through Capital Markets	Mid-term formative evaluation; IADB sent a RSP to the group of ESCOs from the ESCO market study, and conducted near 10 interviews. IADB narrow the selection to three ESCOs and conducted due diligence and conducted a portfolio performance review to finalize the selection process.			
ECOCASA Program-Energy Efficiency Program Part II	Mexico	Stakeholder Mapping; Cost Benefit Analysis;	Stakeholder Consultation	Real-time Learning			
Concentrated Solar Power Project (CSPP)	Chile	Stakeholder Mapping; Cost Benefit Analysis;	Stakeholder Consultation	Mid-term formative evaluation			
Large-Scale Photo-Voltaic Program (LSPVP)	Chile			Mid-term formative evaluation			
FIP							
Financing Low Carbon Strategies in Forest Landscapes.	Mexico			Mid-term formative evaluation			
Support for Forest Related Micro, Small, and Medium-sized Enterprises (MSMEs) in Ejido	*Mexico*	*Environmental assessment; stakeholder consultation; market study*	*In consultation with executing agencies: problem tree exercise; objectives tree or theory of change diagraming; logical framework design; ex-ante identification of evaluation questions.*	*Mid-term formative evaluation by external consultant*	*Final supervision report (Final PSR); Project close workshop; sustainability plan*	*Final summative outcome evaluation by external consultant*	*Semester supervision reports (Project Status Reports)*

Forest Information to Support Public and private Sectors in managing Initiatives Focused on Conservation and Valorization of Forest Resources	*Brazil*	*Stakeholder Consultation*	*Theory of change - strengthened project approach*	*Mid-term formative evaluation*	*Independent summative evaluation*		
SREP							
Strengthening the RE Policy and Regulatory Framework(FOMPIER)	Honduras			Mid-term formative evaluation			
Sustainable Rural Energization (ERUS)-Part I & III: Promoting Sustainable Business Models for Clean Cookstoves Dissemination	*Honduras*	*Stakeholder consultation; market study and needs assessment*	*Impact evaluation design; literature review; stakeholder consultations; problem tree exercise; objectives tree or theory of change diagraming; logical framework design; ex-ante identification of evaluation questions.*	*Mid-term formative evaluation by external consultant*	*Final supervision report (Final Project Status Report); project close workshop; sustainability plan*	*Final summative outcome evaluation by external consultant; impact evaluation analyses*	*Validation and verification for carbon financing; semester supervision reports (Project Status Reports)*
ADERC - Grid Connected renewable energy	Honduras	Stakeholder consultation; market study and needs assessment;	Environmental and social impact assessment Stakeholder Consultation	Mid-term formative evaluation	Final report		

IFC PROJECT-BY-PROJECT EVIDENCE-BASED LEARNING

Note: IFC projects undertaking evidence-based learning that are beyond routine are shown in *italics.*

Project(s)	Country	Ex-ante	Design	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post	Entire Project Cycle
CTF							
Sustainable Energy Finance Program	Colombia	Cost-effectiveness analysis	Monitoring & framework, Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment, Formative Evaluation	Project Supervision	Outcome Evaluation		
Geothermal Electricity Finance	Indonesia	Cost-effectiveness analysis	Monitoring & framework, Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment, Formative Evaluation	Project Supervision	Outcome Evaluation		
Private Sector Wind Development(La Ventosa)	Mexico	Cost-effectiveness analysis	Monitoring & framework, Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment, Formative Evaluation	Project Supervision	Outcome Evaluation		
RE Accelerator Program (REAP)	Philippines	Cost-effectiveness analysis	Monitoring & framework, Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment, Formative Evaluation	Project Supervision	Outcome Evaluation		
Sustainable Energy Finance Program	Philippines	Cost-effectiveness analysis	Monitoring & framework, Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment, Formative Evaluation	Project Supervision	Outcome Evaluation		
Sustainable Energy Acceleration Program	South Africa	Cost-effectiveness analysis	Monitoring & framework, Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment, Formative Evaluation	Project Supervision	Outcome Evaluation		
EE Program	South Africa	Cost-effectiveness analysis	Monitoring & framework, Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment, Formative Evaluation	Project Supervision	Outcome Evaluation		

Project(s)	Country	Ex-ante	Design	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post	Entire Project Cycle
Renewable Energy Accelerator Program(TSEFF)	Thailand	Cost-effectiveness analysis	Monitoring & framework, Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment, Formative Evaluation	Project Supervision	Outcome Evaluation		
Sustainable Energy Finance Program(T-SEF)	Thailand	Cost-effectiveness analysis	Monitoring & framework, Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment, Formative Evaluation	Project Supervision	Outcome Evaluation		
Commercializing Sustainable Energy Finance Program (CSEF)	Turkey	Cost-effectiveness analysis	Monitoring & framework, Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment, Formative Evaluation	Project Supervision	Outcome Evaluation		
Renewable Energy Program	Ukraine	Cost-effectiveness analysis	Monitoring & framework, Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment, Formative Evaluation	Project Supervision	Outcome Evaluation		
Sustainable Energy Finance Program	Vietnam	Cost-effectiveness analysis	Monitoring & framework, Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment, Formative Evaluation	Project Supervision	Outcome Evaluation		
Large-Scale Photo-Voltaic Program (LSPVP)	Chile	Cost-effectiveness analysis	Monitoring & framework, Environmental and Social Analysis / Assessment, Formative Evaluation	Project Supervision	Outcome Evaluation		
PPCR							
Investment Project 1: Promoting Climate Resilient Agriculture and Food Security	*Bangladesh*	*Vulnerability Assessment, Stakeholder Consultation*	*Stakeholder Consultations, Cost Effectiveness Analysis*	*formative evaluation*	*Impact Evaluation*		
Technical Assistance 2: Feasibility Study for a Pilot program of Climate Resilient Housing in the Coastal Region	Bangladesh	Vulnerability Assessment	Stakeholder consultation		Outcome Evaluation		

Project(s)	Country	Ex-ante	Design	Mid-course	At-end	Ex-post	Entire Project Cycle
Building Climate Resilient Communities Through Private Sector Participation	*Nepal*	*Vulnerability Assessment, Stakeholder Consultation*	*Stakeholder Consultations, Cost Effectiveness Analysis*	*formative evaluation*	*Outcome Evaluation*	*Impact Evaluation*	*Formative evaluation, impact evaluation*
SREP							
Small Hydropower Development	Nepal	Vulnerability Assessment, Stakeholder Consultation	Stakeholder Consultations, Cost Effectiveness Analysis	Formative evaluation	Outcome Evaluation		`
FIP							
Smallholder Forestry Project (Technical Assistance-MDB Approval Not Required)	Lao PDR	Stakeholder Consultations	Stakeholder Consultations, Cost Effectiveness Analysis	formative evaluation	Outcome Evaluation		Formative evaluation

XII. ANNEX 5. EXPERIENCE FROM OTHER FUNDS: A DESK REVIEW OF SIX FUNDS' APPROACHES TO EVALUATION

As part of a wider effort to increase the emphasis on evaluation and learning across the CIFs, partly in response to a decision by the Trust Fund Committee in November 2013, the purpose of this paper is to explore and identify common characteristics in the approach to evaluation taken by a number of other Funds.

This paper is based on a desk review of six Funds, both within and external to the climate sphere: Global Environment Facility, Green Climate Fund, Global Fund, Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (GAVI), the CIGAR Fund and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). Reviewed Funds were selected either because of their size and prominence or because of their links and potential relevance to Climate Change and the CIFs. It should be noted that the review is not exhaustive nor has it involved discussions for verification, beyond meetings held in March with the GEF Evaluation Office. It should also be noted that the paper does not intend to make judgments either about the approaches taken by each of the Funds or the quality of their evaluative work, but rather to identify shared characteristics across a number of significant and pertinent Funds that might be of relevance to the CIFs moving forward.

Annex 1 summarizes the key characteristics of evaluation identified within each Fund.

1. COMMON CHARACTERISTICS OF EVALUATION WITHIN FUNDS

The important role of evaluation (alongside monitoring) is widely recognized and evaluation can be a significant indicator of the effectiveness of climate (and development) finance. 'Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning' is one of ten measures used by the Overseas Development Initiative in a framework designed to assess the effectiveness of international climate funds[54] and observations around evaluation approach are included within the UK Department for International Development's Multilateral Aid Reviews (MAR).[55] Indeed, in the 2011 MAR assessment of the CIFs, it is observed that "the CIFs' overall performance is good. **Effective independent evaluations and use of the agreed results frameworks should move them into a stronger position[56]**."

How to ensure the **adequate** evaluation of Funds, both climate-related and more widely, remains an area of concern and debate, with an agenda item included in the 16th meeting of the OECD-DAC Network on Development Evaluation in February 2014 on "Evaluation in Global & Regional Multi-Donor Trust Funds and Partnership Programs: How to Proceed?"[57] A number of the Funds included within this paper have, however, received positive comments on their evaluation approach in the MAR and the review has identified a set of shared characteristics across the Funds and outlines them below:

i. Independence

Among the Funds reviewed, the most significant shared characteristic is the provision made for an independent evaluation function, accountable directly to the Board of the respective Funds. In general, this independent evaluation body is expected to identify areas of interest for evaluation, as well oversee and quality assure a range of evaluation studies across the portfolio. The degree of engagement of these bodies with the evaluations themselves varies, with entities such as the GEFEO undertaking studies themselves, and others such as GFATM's TERG commissioning and overseeing external contractors.

While of each of these Funds now has an independent evaluation function, the GCF is unique in making provision for this from the outset: in the case of each of the other Funds, the independent evaluation

[54] http://www.odi.org.uk/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8900.pdf
[55] https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/multilateral-aid-review
[56] https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/67630/cifs.pdf
[57] http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/RD7_Evaluating%20Multidonor%20Partnerships%20-%20note%20for%20EvalNet%20Feb%202014.pdf

function was added at some point subsequent to the establishment of the Fund. The GCF has learnt from the experience of the GEF and the Adaptation Fund (not reviewed here) to ensure that this provision is integral to the Fund and should hopefully build systems around this.

ii. Purpose

According to Fund websites and guiding documents, the purpose of the evaluations carried out or overseen by the independent units is both learning and accountability. In addition, several of the Funds make explicit the aim of evaluations to assist the Board in its decision-making, also making reference to 'improving the quality' of programming within the Fund.

iii. Guiding Documents

The independent evaluation bodies of nearly all of the Funds reviewed have (or, in the case of the GCF, are expected to develop) an Evaluation Policy (usually publicly accessible). Other guiding documents include strategies and workplans, charters and terms of reference for the independent evaluation function. A number also have some sort of standards or guidelines that the organization should adhere to. Links to key guiding documents of the reviewed Funds can be found in Annex 5 – Table 1, below.

iv. Types of Evaluation

There is some variation in the extent to which the independent evaluation functions of the different Funds engage with project-level evaluations, ranging from IFAD's IEO which conducts these directly, to the GEF EO, which over a number of years has worked with programme teams to improve the quality of project-level 'terminal evaluations' and now uses these as the basis for all other GEF evaluations (but no longer directly engages at the project level). A number of evaluation units undertake a quality assurance role of project-level evaluation.

A key role of the independent evaluation functions is to go beyond project-level evaluation to carry out/oversee evaluations that aggregate experiences within the Fund at different levels, usually:

- *Country* – pulling together learning across a country programme;
- *Thematic* – looking at relevant thematic issues across the Fund, in multiple locations;
- *Fund/portfolio* – often assessing performance of the overall Fund.

2. CONCLUSION

At present, the CIF's light-touch governance structure does not include an independent evaluation function, and the governance frameworks of the two Climate Investment Funds provide only that "an independent evaluation of the operations of the CTF [and SCF] will be carried out jointly after three years of operations by the independent evaluation departments of the MDBs." Given the level of investment that the CIFs represent, in addition to the emphasis they place on learning, this limited scope for evaluation seems incongruous in comparison with other Funds.

However, the CIFs are relatively recently established and, as observed above, with the exception of the GCF, other Funds have not tended to make provision for evaluation from the outset. Rather, this has evolved over time as the need for improved learning and accountability has become apparent. There is a precedent, therefore, to put in place a more rigorous approach to evaluation, through codifying the evaluation approach for the fund in a guiding document - such as an evaluation strategy.

The different approaches to independent evaluation taken by each of the other Funds are more or less relevant to the CIFs: while the GEF is comparable with the CIFs in terms of subject area for example, the use of standardized project-level terminal evaluations as the basis of GEFEO evaluations means that the overall approach would not be easily transferable to the CIFs. More directly applicable, however, might be the approach of CGIAR or GAVI. What the different approaches of these Funds do indicate is that evaluations can generate useful lessons by not just focusing at the project level, but at a country, thematic, programme or overall Fund level.

Box 7. The Global Environment Facility's Approach to Evaluation – the GEF Evaluation Office (GEFEO)

Evolution

The GEF's well-developed evaluation system has evolved over a period of more than 20 years. When the GEF was established, it was initially decided that existing systems would be sufficient, with no need for a separate evaluation function. Some 6 years later, the lack of comparability between programmes identified a need for some commonality as well as a strategy from the center. In 2003 the M&E unit became independent and today the GEFEO has around 20 staff and 0.5% of GEF's budget.

Standardization

GEFEO carries out 4 main types of evaluation: performance, country portfolio, thematic and impact, as well as the overall performance studies (OPS) that coincide with GEF replenishments, all of which are based on standardized project-level 'terminal evaluations'. Considerable effort and resource has gone into ensuring the reliability of these terminal evaluations over the years: from 2002, GEFEO reviewed these evaluations and reported back to the Council on both quality and timeliness, while a set of standards and guidelines was published in 2008 (currently being revised). As a result, GEFEO has access to a more or less reliable set of evidence on which it can build.

Mandate

GEFEO is empowered by a strong mandate from the Council, with agencies recognizing the importance of evaluation for continued funding. Multilateral and implementing agencies all have a stake in the GEF, underscoring the need for GEFEO to be independent and explaining the strong accountability focus of evaluation. Recipient countries value the role of evaluation, which has led to systems changes (such as resource allocation) by underscoring portfolio-wide issues.

Investment and Integration

While many organizations have either an internal evaluation system or external evaluations, GEF has both. Investment in and importance of evaluation within GEF is partly linked to the reliance on performance studies for replenishment. By integrating evaluations into regular workplans, GEFEO has reduced costs from $2 million to $1 million.

Continuing Relevance

There is some recognition that to make the most valid contribution, the GEFEO will need to move more towards utility, addressing more comprehensively learning as well as accountability requirements. Achieving this will mean rethinking the current approach and being mindful of potential trade-offs in rigor and independence.

Annex 5 – Table 1.

Fund	Description	Independent Evaluation Provision	Guiding Documents	Purpose of Evaluation	Types of Evaluation	Other Key Characteristics
GEF	**Global Environment Facility.** Established initially in the IBRD in 1991 and as a separate entity in 1994. GEF works in partnership with a number of Implementing Agencies, providing new and additional grants and concessional funding to meet the agreed incremental costs of measures to achieve agreed global environmental benefits. Since its inception, the GEF has provided $12.5 billion in grants	**GEF Evaluation Office (GEFEO)** (since 2003) • Sets minimum requirements for M&E; • Ensures oversight of the quality of M&E systems at program and project levels; • Shares evaluative evidence within the GEF; • Strong mandate from GEF Council, to which GEFEO reports;	GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (2010) Guidelines for Conducting Terminal Evaluations (2008)	• Promoting accountability for the achievement of GEF objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes, and performance of the partners involved in GEF activities. • Promoting learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing on results and lessons learned among the GEF and its partners, as a basis for decision making on policies, strategies, program management, and projects, and improving knowledge and performance.	• Performance evaluations and overall performance studies (OPS), which coincide with GEF replenishment; • Country portfolio evaluations; • Thematic evaluations; • Impact evaluations.	Evaluations are based on standardized 'terminal evaluations' of projects. GEFEO has 20 staff and 0.5% GEF budget. Established two Communities of Practice: Climate-Eval; and Comprehensive Evaluation Platform for Knowledge Exchange ***"GEF publishes all project documentation and evaluations on its website."*** (2011 MAR)

Fund	Description	Independent Evaluation Provision	Guiding Documents	Purpose of Evaluation	Types of Evaluation	Other Key Characteristics
	and leveraged $58 billion in co-financing for over 3,690 projects in over 165 countries.					
GCF	**Green Climate Fund** Still under design, the Fund will contribute to the achievement of the ultimate objective of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).	**Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU)** (from outset) • Built into governance structure of the GCF from the outset; • Independent from other management functions and accountable to the GCF Board.	IEU is expected to develop and update the Fund's evaluation policy Terms of Reference of the Independent Evaluation Unit (2014)	• To inform decision-making by the Board and to identify and disseminate lessons learned; • Accountability to the COP.	• Country portfolio evaluations • Thematic evaluations – of the different types of activities that the Fund will finance, such as those designed to enable and support enhanced actions on climate change adaptation or mitigation. • Project-based and programmatic evaluations - as the Fund will support developing countries in pursuing project-based and programmatic approaches, the IEU may also perform evaluations of these. • Overall assessment of the Fund – this could be carried out using the other types of	The IEU will support the strengthening of evaluation capacities in subnational, national and regional IEs and intermediaries to enable evaluation of their Fund portfolio activities.

Fund	Description	Independent Evaluation Provision	Guiding Documents	Purpose of Evaluation	Types of Evaluation	Other Key Characteristics
					evaluation as building blocks.	
IFAD	**International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)** Specialized agency of the United Nations, established as an international financial institution in 1977. The **Governing Council** is IFAD's highest decision-making authority. The **Executive Board** is responsible for overseeing the general operations of IFAD and for approving its programme of work. Mobilized around US$22.8 billion in	**Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE)** (since 2003) • Reports directly to IFAD's Executive Board • Conducts evaluations of IFAD-financed policies, strategies and operations; • Evaluation Committee – sub-committee of IFAD Executive Board – reviews selected evaluation issues, IOE strategies and methodologies; discusses selected evaluation reports and suggests inclusion of evaluations of particular interest in the IOE annual work programme	Evaluation Policy (2003, revised 2011) Evaluation Manual (2009)	To promote accountability and learning	• Project level – interim (mandatory under the evaluation policy, conducted at the end of project implementation period and before design of subsequent phase); • Project completion evaluations; • Country programme evaluations; • Thematic evaluations; • Corporate-level evaluations.	***"It has a fully independent Office of Evaluation that strives to be at the forefront of good practice in evaluation."*** ***"IFAD learns from evaluation findings, implements recommendations, monitors and reports back to the Board."*** (2011 MAR Assessment) ***"IFAD has reinforced its focus on results and impact."*** ***"The Independent Office of Evaluation shows*** ***continuing improvements in delivery in developing***

Fund	Description	Independent Evaluation Provision	Guiding Documents	Purpose of Evaluation	Types of Evaluation	Other Key Characteristics
	cofinancing and funding from domestic sources for rural development, in addition to IFAD's contribution of about US$15.6 billion in loans and grants					***countries."*** (2013 MAR update)
GAVI	**Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation (GAVI)** Launched in January 2000, GAVI is a Swiss Foundation with international institution status in Switzerland and public charity status in the United States. The GAVI Alliance Board is responsible for strategic direction and policy-making, oversees the operations	**Evaluation Advisory Committee** (since 2008?) • Assists the Board in fulfilling its responsibilities in respect to the oversight of GAVI's organizational and programmatic evaluation activities; • Reviews and approves GAVI's multi-year and annual evaluation work plans; • Reviews the quality and usefulness of evaluation reports from the independent consultant; • For evaluations costing more than $500,000, reviews and approves Terms of Reference and selection	Evaluation Policy (2008, reviewed 2012) GAVI Alliance Evaluation Advisory Committee Charter (2009, revised 2013)	• To generate evidence and promote learning to support improvements in the performance of GAVI's programmes and policies.	• Programme evaluations (or 'thematic evaluations'): to assess a specific program's contribution to GAVI's strategic goals and objectives; • Strategy and policy evaluations; • Partnership evaluations; • Full country evaluations (comprehensive public health effectiveness evaluations); • End of support evaluations; • Meta-review of previous evaluations and reviews in order to	***"Evaluation and lesson learning is a core strength of GAVI with management required to respond and follow up to evaluation recommendations."*** (2011 MAR assessment)

Fund	Description	Independent Evaluation Provision	Guiding Documents	Purpose of Evaluation	Types of Evaluation	Other Key Characteristics
	of the Alliance and monitors programme implementation. 2011-15 donor contributions and pledges to GAVI total US$6.9 bn.	of final contractor.			identify common findings and to learn across programmes, projects and regions.	
GFATM	**The Global Fund** An international financing institution created in 2002. Disbursed $3.9bn of funds in 2013. At the launch of the Fourth Replenishment in December 2013, donors pledged US$12 billion.	**Technical Evaluation Reference Group** (since 2003) • Independent evaluation advisory group accountable to the Board for ensuring independent evaluation of the Global Fund business model, investments and impact; • Reports to Strategy, Investment and Impact Committee (SIIC) annually; • Oversees independent evaluations on behalf of the Board and its Committees into areas where, for reasons of objectivity and credibility, independence in	Global Fund's Evaluation Strategy for 2012-2016 TERG Terms of Reference (2012) TERG workplan 2013-14	To assess impact	• Country evaluations (of high impact countries, building on existing programme reviews); • Thematic reviews; • Data quality assessments; • Independent synthesis report (commissioned independently); • Ten-year evaluation of the Global Fund	

Fund	Description	Independent Evaluation Provision	Guiding Documents	Purpose of Evaluation	Types of Evaluation	Other Key Characteristics
		management and oversight is essential; • Identifies areas which require independent evaluations. • Designs, commissions and oversees these independent evaluations, with administrative support from the Secretariat and within a budget approved by the SIIC; • Independently assesses and reports on the monitoring and evaluation work conducted by the Secretariat and grant recipients.				
CGIAR	**The CGIAR Fund** Established in 2010. Multi-donor trust fund administered by the World Bank, as Trustee, and governed by the Fund Council, a representative body of Fund donors and other	**The Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA)** (2012) • Structurally independent in the CGIAR in that its budget is decided by the Fund Council to which it reports; • The Head of IEA is also an observer to the Fund Council., Manages and supports external evaluations; • IEA both commissions and	CGIAR Policy for Independent External Evaluation (2012) 2014-2017 Rolling Evaluation Workplan CGIAR Standards for Independent Evaluations (2013)	• To provide accountability, support to decision making, and lessons for improving quality and effectiveness of agricultural research for development outcomes.	• A 'system-wide evaluation' is commissioned every ten years; • Independent external evaluations of CGIAR research projects (CRPs); • CRP-commissioned independent external evaluations; • Evaluation of the IEA; • Thematic evaluations.	IEA also provides leadership for an enhanced evaluation culture throughout CGIAR Evaluation Community of Practice (EcoP) established, which serves as a platform for evaluation capacity building, knowledge sharing and joint learning

Fund	Description	Independent Evaluation Provision	Guiding Documents	Purpose of Evaluation	Types of Evaluation	Other Key Characteristics
	stakeholders. The Fund Council is the decision-making body of the CGIAR Fund.	manages evaluations; • Quality Assurance Advisory Panel (QAAP) was established to support IEA management in delivering quality evaluations. The Panel provides strategic advice to IEA on areas such as: evaluation approaches, standards and procedures; Rolling IEA workplan; Development of the CGIAR evaluation network and community of practice; Effective follow-up to evaluation.				

XIII. ANNEX 6. AFDB PPCR PROJECTS SEEKING SUPPORT FROM THE WORLD BANK DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS IMPACT EVALUATION UNIT

Below is a short description of PPCR projects implemented by AfDB seeking support by the World Bank' Development Economics Impact Evaluation unit DECIE/DIME i2i umbrella facility.

1. Baixo Limpopo Irrigation and Climate Resilience Project (BLICRP), Mozambique

Description: The Baixo Limpopo Irrigation and Climate Resilience Project (BLICRP) is currently implemented in a flood prone area: the Xai Xai District of Gaza Province (Southern part of Mozambique). Its objective is to contribute towards poverty reduction and increase communities' climate resilience through increased value addition and agricultural productivity. It will support the provision of climate resilience irrigation and drainage infrastructures, as well as marketing and agro-processing facilities. The project timeframe is five years from 2013 to 2017 and total cost net of taxes and duties, is UA 28.26 million (some 44 million USD). About 8200 farm families comprising of smallholders and emerging farmers in the Baixo Limpopo Irrigation Scheme (BLIS) will directly and indirectly benefit from the project. The project started implementation in October 2013.

Relevance for impact evaluation:

- A climate-resilience project with particular strategic and policy relevance (derived from Mozambique's Strategic Plan for Climate Resilience) as the development of irrigation infrastructure that is resilient against floods and cyclones development is a crucial dimension of climate change adaptation in Mozambique, a country particularly vulnerable to climate change
- Importance of the agricultural and irrigation components of the project in a flood prone area.

2. Sustainable Land & Water Resources Management Project (SLWRMP), Mozambique

*Description***:** The project will increase the capacity of communities to address the inter-linked challenges of adverse impacts of climate change, rural poverty, food insecurity and land degradation. The Project will be implemented in the four drought affected districts of Guija, Mabalane, Chicualacuala and Massengena with estimated total direct beneficiaries of 20,000 and additional 20,000 indirect beneficiaries. The project activities have been packaged into three components namely: Agriculture Water Infrastructure Development; Restoration of Natural Habitats & Landscapes and Project Management. The total cost is estimated at UA13.88 million (some 22 million USD). The project started in October 2013.

Relevance for impact evaluation:

- A climate-resilience project with particular strategic and policy relevance (derived from Mozambique's Strategic Plan for Climate Resilience) as sustainable water and land management is a crucial dimension of climate change adaptation in Mozambique, a country particularly vulnerable to climate change
- Importance of the agricultural and irrigation components of the project (including small community irrigation schemes and water harvesting infrastructures such as earth dams, boreholes and cattle troughs) in a drought prone area.

3. Strengthening Climate Resilience in the Kafue Basin project (SCRIKA), Zambia:

*Description***:** The objective of the project is to foster sustained economic growth, reduce poverty and enhance food security through strengthening the adaptive capacity of 800,000 farmers to better respond to current climate variability and long-term consequences of climate change in the Kafue sub-basin. Project

components focus on irrigation, agriculture and roads rehabilitation activities that will strengthen climate resilience. Community-level infrastructures such as small-scale flood control and diversion structures, irrigation schemes, water reservoirs and small dams will be supported as a pilot mean of community-driven participatory adaptation to climate change. The project will be implemented over a period of five (5) years from 2014 at a total cost, net of taxes and duties, of US$38 million in nine (9) districts of the Kafue basin. The primary beneficiaries include poor rural farmers who often suffer climate-related losses, and other vulnerable groups that depend on natural resources for their livelihoods. The project has started in March 2014.

Relevance for impact evaluation:

- A climate-resilience project with particular strategic and policy relevance (derived from Zambia's Strategic Plan for Climate Resilience) as irrigation, agriculture and roads are crucial dimensions of climate change adaptation in Zambia, a country particularly vulnerable to climate change
- Importance of the agricultural and irrigation components of the project (including small-scale flood control and diversion structures, irrigation schemes, water reservoirs and dams).

4. The Niger Community Action Project for Climate Resilience (CAPCR) team is also preparing to participate in a DIME workshop in Rwanda.