

# CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

CTF-SCF/TFC.11/4  
September 27, 2013

---

Joint Meeting of the CTF and SCF Trust Fund Committees  
Washington D.C.  
October 29, 2013

Agenda Item 5

**REPORT FROM INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICES OF THE MDBs ON INCLUSION OF  
CIF-FUNDED PROJECTS WITHIN THEIR REGULAR EVALUATION PROGRAMS**

## **PROPOSED DECISION**

The joint meeting expresses its appreciation to the independent evaluation offices of the MDBs for responding to its request for and the information on inclusion of CIF-funded projects within the regular evaluation programs of the MDBs and welcomes the *Report from Independent Evaluation Offices of the MDBs on inclusion of CIF-funded Projects within their Regular Evaluation Programs*.

The joint meeting invites the MDBs to share with the CIF Committees the results of any relevant work that they undertake with respect to CIF-funded projects or other climate change activities of the MDBs. The joint meeting also invites the evaluation programs of the MDBs to share information with the CIF Administrative Unit to enhance lessons learning and knowledge on CIF-financed for use in CIF monitoring reports, learning products and other relevant documents and materials.

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Joint Meeting of the CTF and SCF Trust Fund Committees in April 2013, having reviewed document CTF-SCF/TFC.10/4, *Use of Evaluative Approaches in CIF Activities*, invited the independent evaluation department of each MDB to consider how it can include CIF-funded projects within its regular evaluation program and to report back to the joint meeting of the CTF and SCF Trust Fund Committees in November 2013 to provide an overview on how much of the CIF portfolio could potentially be evaluated, when and with what type of evaluation.

2. All MDBs responded to the invitation from the joint meeting. Several MDBs highlighted how the CIF projects are being evaluated within their regular course of doing business. All MDBs have in place mandatory systems for monitoring and reporting on project implementation as well as systems for independent evaluation. Monitoring and reporting is most often conducted by teams responsible for project implementation, while independent evaluations are commissioned by MDBs independent evaluation offices which report directly to MDB management. Some MDB projects incorporate independent evaluations directly into the project cycle to enhance the learning during project or program implementation. These are commissioned by the respective project or program task team, not the independent evaluation office.

3. The Independent Evaluation Department of the *African Development Bank* has two relevant larger evaluations in their current (2013 – 2015) work program: A sector evaluation of the energy sector is planned for 2014. Synthesis work (meta-evaluation) on the topic of green economy is also planned. These thematic evaluations go beyond CIF, but will e.g. in the case of the energy sector evaluation certainly include the CTF funded concentrated solar power investments. AfDB Evaluation Department offered to work with their CIF MDB focal point on setting evaluation priorities for all four CIF funding streams, but noted that additional funding would be required for this work.

4. In the same way as other MDBs, the Evaluation Department of the *Asian Development Bank* covers CIF interventions within its wider thematic evaluations. For example, currently a thematic evaluation of ADB's climate change portfolio is underway. This thematic evaluation covers projects of the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience. The ADB Evaluation Department also plans to follow up on ADB's CTF interventions within a forthcoming evaluation. Evaluation coverage of CIF interventions is either through country assistance or sector evaluations. So, for example, CTF projects will be evaluated as part of their ongoing energy sector evaluation. Combined, these two thematic evaluations will take into account many of the ongoing CIF supported operations.

5. The Evaluation Department of the Asian Development Bank validates the completion reports of 75% of all investment projects (using internal and external funds), so CIF projects will also begin to be validated post completion. Similar to what the Evaluation Department does for GEF supported projects, the Evaluation Department will also purposefully select CIF projects which have closed and validate the completion reports.

6. The ADB Evaluation Department also conducts project evaluations of a small and purposefully chosen sample (so that findings from such project level evaluations feed into a bigger country-assistance-program or thematic evaluation). Such project evaluations are also post-completion.

7. Over the past few years, the Evaluation Department has also picked up some projects for impact evaluation (no more than 1 or 2 per year). CIFs supported interventions can certainly be included at some future date.

8. The Evaluation Department of the *Inter-American Development Bank* is in the process of revamping its evaluation system. As in other MDBs the Evaluation Department validates project completion reports. It also undertakes thematic evaluations, which would be the ones to cover CIF interventions. Their climate change thematic evaluation, which is currently ongoing, does not cover CIF interventions yet, as limited progress has been made in CIF projects on the ground to date. Another such thematic evaluation, possibly in four years' time, will certainly include CIF projects and programs.

9. The World Bank Group's Independent Evaluation Group covers the World Bank, IFC and MIGA. Under their current procedures, CIF projects would be evaluated in the same manner as other World Bank Group projects. Future CIF-related evaluations would therefore fall under the following categories:

- a) The Independent Evaluation Group currently does a desk validation of all World Bank investment and policy lending projects that file a completion report. (They are, however, reviewing the scope to changing to a targeted sampling procedure.) This would apply to CIF projects. The validation occurs after the completion report is filed, which is six months after the project closes. Typically, then, this would be five to eight years after project initiation.
- b) The Independent Evaluation Group selects a sample of 20% to 25% of completed World Bank projects for a detailed evaluation including a field visit (the Project Performance Assessment Report). These projects are selected purposively, for instance to contribute to forthcoming major thematic evaluations. Some CIF projects would almost certainly be selected. Project Performance Assessment Reports are typically undertaken one to three years after project closure.
- c) 45% of IFC projects are randomly selected for detailed self-evaluations called XPSRs. (PSRs are the product of operational staff, not the Independent Evaluation Group. These are then subject to validation by the Independent Evaluation Group, which may include field visits. XPSRs are undertaken at project maturity, about five years after approval. Unlike World Bank project evaluations, IFC project evaluations are not publicly disclosed.

10. The Independent Evaluation Group conducts larger-scale evaluations on thematic areas. Forestry, climate change, and energy are the subjects of recent or planned thematic evaluations. It would typically be 6 to 10 years before a major theme was revisited.

11. Another product line involves World Bank Group participation in Global Partnerships and Programs. The CIFs fall into this category, and are relatively large, so that it is likely that the Independent Evaluation Group would assess WBG experience with the CIFs at some point in the future.

12. The Independent Evaluation Group undertakes a limited number of ex post impact evaluations, using quasi-experimental methods. The Independent Evaluation Group notes the Trust Fund Committees' interest, expressed at their last meeting, in exploring ways to increase the breadth of evaluative approaches used, including real-time evaluation and ex ante impact evaluation. The ability of the Independent Evaluation Group to conduct such evaluations is constrained by considerations of independence.

13. However, Climate Change Evaluations by the Independent Evaluation Group have strongly recommended that climate mitigation and adaptation projects be designed with learning in mind, including through the use of rapid feedback and through incorporating impact evaluation into project design. This is particularly important for energy efficiency and climate adaptation projects, where there are many open questions about effectiveness and about optimal design and implementation of interventions. The Independent Evaluation Group's evaluations stress that generating and disseminating learning from these efforts represents an important and valuable public good. This approach is also strongly consonant with the World Bank's emerging emphasis on learning and the 'science of delivery.'