

CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

Joint CTF-SCF/16/5
May 24, 2016

Joint Meeting of the CTF and SCF Trust Fund Committees
Oaxaca, Mexico
June 15, 2016

Agenda Item 5

EVALUATION AND LEARNING SPECIAL INITIATIVE:
BUSINESS PLAN

PROPOSED DECISION

The joint meeting of the CTF and SCF Trust Fund Committees reviewed the document JOINT CTF-SCF/TFC.16/5, "*Evaluation and Learning Special Initiative: Business Plan*", and appreciates the work undertaken by the CIF-wide Advisory Group on Evaluation and Learning and the CIF Administrative Unit in preparing the business plan.

The joint meeting approves the business plan with its four priority learning themes:

- 1) Transformational change;
- 2) Private sector investment;
- 3) Local stakeholder engagement and benefit; and
- 4) CIF design and approach.

The joint meeting invites the CIF Administrative Unit, under the guidance of the Advisory Group, to implement the activities identified in the business plan. The joint Committee also requests the CIF Administrative Unit to incorporate the feedback and address the comments received from the Trust Fund Committee members at the joint meeting during the implementation of the business plan.

Introductory Memo from the CIF Evaluation and Learning Advisory Group

Dear Joint Meeting of the CTF-SCF Trust Fund Committees,

On behalf of the CIF Evaluation and Learning Advisory Group, we are delighted to share with you the business plan for the CIF Evaluation and Learning Special Initiative.

In May 2015 the Joint CTF-SCF Trust Fund Committee (TFC) endorsed a proposal to enhance the generation of knowledge from evaluation for learning in the CIFs to complement the current annual monitoring and reporting across CIF programs and the evaluation work undertaken independently by each of the multilateral development banks.

An Advisory Group was established at the end of last year to support the Admin Unit and the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist at the Admin Unit. The Advisory Group includes representatives from MDBs, donors, recipients, observers, CIF AU and external experts.

The Advisory Group has worked incredibly hard over the past six months to shape and refine ideas for this initiative, and develop a plan for their implementation. Since last November the Group has met three times to develop the business plan and guidance on governance as well as on operational priorities, and also conducted multiple reviews over email, in order to refine ideas and develop a plan for their implementation. The group also conducted 43 stakeholder consultations which have fed into the business plan, including from MDB representatives, public and private sector representatives, CSOs and TFC members, who provided valuable technical expertise as well as input on governance and learning priorities.

The result of these efforts is this high-level business plan for the CIF Evaluation and Learning Special Initiative. The plan includes sections on guiding principles and concepts, on priority learning themes, on implementation approaches and on the governance for the Advisory Group. Specific evaluation and learning activities will be outlined in a work plan which will be developed and submitted after the approval of this business plan at the TFC meetings in June.

The consultative and participatory nature of the work will be carried on as the Advisory Group guides the development and implementation of specific evaluation and learning activities, with the MDBs, recipient countries and others, based on what they would find most useful for informing investment and strategy decisions.

The Advisory Group looks forward to ample opportunity for further input and collaboration on this initiative in the coming months, including on prioritizing, planning and implementing specific evaluation and learning activities that align with the criteria and priority learning themes identified. Joe Dickman, the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist, will lead these efforts together with colleagues on the Advisory Group and CIF AU.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this business plan. We look forward to your feedback and to the implementation of this important initiative.

With best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Marta Simonetti', with a horizontal line underneath the name.

Marta Simonetti
Chair, CIF Evaluation and Learning Advisory Group
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development

CIF Evaluation and Learning Advisory Group:

Marta Simonetti, Chair, MDB Representative (EBRD)
Gustavo Luedemann, Recipient Country Representative (Brazil)
Ibrahim Lankoande, Recipient Country Representative (Burkina Faso)
Alison Pollard, Donor Country Representative (UK/DfID)
Janet Olatundan Adelegan, Observer Representative (Global Network for Environment and Economic Development Research)
Rob Van den Berg, External Expert (IDS Sussex and Centre for Development Impact)
Ulf Moslener, External Expert (Frankfurt School UNEP Collaboration Centre)
Monika Weber-Fahr, External Expert (Sustainable Energy for All)
Joe Dickman, CIF Administrative Unit

1	Introduction.....	4
1.1	Background.....	4
1.2	Purpose.....	4
1.3	Current Process	5
1.4	Document Orientation	5
2	Guiding Concepts and Principles.....	6
2.1	Evaluation and Learning in Context	6
2.2	Context for Organizational Learning	7
2.3	User Orientation to Inform Actions and Decisions	8
2.4	Guiding Principles.....	8
3	Priority Learning Themes	10
3.1	Context for Priority Learning Themes	10
3.2	Priority Theme 1: Transformational Change	11
3.3	Priority Theme 2: Private Sector Investment	12
3.4	Priority Theme 3: Local Stakeholder Engagement and Benefit	14
3.5	Priority Theme 4: CIF Design and Approach.....	15
3.6	Additional Thematic Priorities.....	16
4	Implementation Approaches.....	16
4.1	Criteria for Assessing Opportunities	16
4.2	Implementation of Activities Within the First Six Months.....	17
4.3	Implementation of Activities Within 6-12 months	18
4.4	Implementation of Activities in Years Two and Three	19
4.5	Approaches to Evaluation and Learning	19
4.6	Process for Developing Ideas and Funding Activities.....	20
4.7	Managing and Reporting on Implementation.....	21
5	Role of Advisory Group.....	21
5.1	Context for Advisory Group.....	21
5.2	Roles and Responsibilities	22
5.3	Relationship to the Joint CTF-SCF TFC, Core MDB Committee, and Other Existing Groups	22
5.4	Principles for Working Together	23
5.5	Expectations for Participation.....	24
5.6	Process for Proposing Activities and Commissioning Proposals, Contracts, and Reference Groups.....	25
5.7	Periodic Reviews.....	26
6	Annex 1: Evaluation and Learning Advisory Group Terms of Reference	27
7	Annex 2: Summary of Stakeholder Consultations.....	29
7.1	Context	29
7.2	Findings from Consultations.....	30

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

1. The Climate Investment Funds (CIF) were set up in 2008 as an unprecedented investment to quickly scale up finance for climate change mitigation and adaptation activities and to learn lessons that would inform both the CIF and the broader international climate finance architecture.
2. The importance of the learning objectives of the CIF has been widely acknowledged. A number of activities aimed at generating and applying learning have been undertaken, and all MDBs have in place mandatory systems for monitoring and reporting on project implementation, including project completion reports, end-of-project evaluations, and systems for independent evaluation. However, as identified by the 2014 Independent Evaluation of the CIF and by others since then, there is an opportunity to conduct more thorough, rigorous, and strategic evaluation and to ensure that evaluations contribute to learning at different levels to support the broader objectives of the CIF, including improved portfolio design and strengthened program management.
3. Today, given the unprecedented scale of CIF interventions, as well as the rapid scale up of climate finance more broadly, there is an urgent need to increase the evaluative work within the CIF, capture real-time learning, and facilitate sharing of lessons learned and good practice to improve effective delivery and achievement of results. Key CIF stakeholders consider this evaluative work to be important for both accountability and learning to support continuous improvement.
4. In May 2015, the Joint CTF-SCF Trust Fund Committee (TFC) endorsed a proposal to enhance the generation of knowledge from evaluation for learning (hereafter referred to as “the initiative”) in the CIF to complement the current annual monitoring and reporting across CIF programs and the evaluation work undertaken independently by each of the multilateral development banks (MDBs).

1.2 Purpose

5. The TFC created a “special initiatives budget” (funded through the SCF Administrative Budget) to support this work, with initial resources of approximately \$9 million USD to support learning based on evaluative and evidence-based activities within the CIF at different levels, including the project, program, thematic, and portfolio/fund levels. The purpose of this work is:
 - To capture evidence and lessons on an ongoing basis so that they can inform ongoing CIF activities within an actionable time horizon, where adjustments are still possible; and,

- To identify valuable evidence and lessons learned to inform current and future climate finance investments.
6. This overall purpose informs the direction of this Business Plan, including a preference towards learning and action-oriented evaluative approaches that enable the use of evidence in real time. Leveraging the extensive experience of the CIF, the initiative seeks to build on this mandate and undertake catalytic, evidence-based learning that makes important contributions to the effectiveness and impact of the CIF and other climate institutions.

1.3 Current Process

7. The TFC requested that a CIF-wide Advisory Group on Evaluation and Learning, hereafter referred to as the Advisory Group, be formed to advise on the strategic direction of this work. The Advisory Group is to provide strategic advice on the priorities and use of resources dedicated to this initiative to support evaluation and learning across the CIF in a manner that complements rather than duplicates ongoing monitoring, evaluation, and learning activities. The TFC’s decision also resulted in the creation of a new position, Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist, to help lead and support this work from within the CIF Administrative Unit.
8. A first order of business for the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist and the Advisory Group was to create an Evaluation and Learning Business Plan, which covers the Advisory Group’s roles and responsibilities, strategic priorities for evaluation and learning, and high-level guidance on implementation.¹ This Business Plan is the manifestation of this work.

1.4 Document Orientation

9. This Business Plan includes four main sections that describe, at a high level, *what* the initiative will initially prioritize for evaluation and learning, *why* it has identified these priorities, and *how* it will conduct this work. These sections cover:
- Guiding Concepts and Principles;
 - Priority Learning Themes;
 - Implementation Approaches; and
 - Role of the Advisory Group.
10. Annex 1 contains the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Advisory Group. Annex 2 provides a summary of findings from stakeholder consultations which informed the content of this Business Plan.

¹ A more detailed initiative work plan and budget will be developed following Business Plan approval and in accordance with the priorities and principles outlined in this Business Plan.

2 Guiding Concepts and Principles

2.1 Evaluation and Learning in Context

11. Evaluation and learning can mean different things to different people, and in different contexts. The purpose here is not to rigidly define these terms, but rather to offer a description of how they are interpreted and used in the context of this initiative. It is important to provide this clarity to foster a common understanding for the types of activities that will be targeted.
12. The overall aim of this initiative is to create evidence-based learning drawing on the experience of the CIF, using evaluation and other systematic approaches. Ultimately, this learning should inform and improve strategies, decision-making, and other significant ‘pivot points’ around investments and implementation. A user-focused and demand-led orientation to learning will lead to choices of evaluation topics and approaches that are practical and applied, with the explicit goal of creating value for priority audiences or users.
13. The initiative will utilize international best practices in both evaluation and learning, drawing on the Advisory Group and other technical and thematic experts. Given the innovation and real-time orientation, and the intent to complement the existing evaluation and learning work within the CIF and MDBs, the initiative will seek to go beyond business as usual by exploring new frontiers in this space, particularly the nexus between evaluation and learning.
14. **Evaluation** is defined here as the systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, program, or policy, including its design, implementation, and results². Evaluation can support dynamic learning processes particularly well when a range of approaches are used, including both formative and summative perspectives. This means evaluating both processes and results, as well as why or how they have occurred and particularly what this means for stakeholders going forward.
15. This forward-looking orientation to evaluation increases the potential for applied learning by focusing the gathering and interpretation of evidence on specific current and future strategy and decision-making processes of priority evaluation users. High levels of user engagement in the evaluation process itself also increases relevance and use, if conducted well.
16. **Learning** within this context is considered to have occurred *when new knowledge is being used to shape behaviors, as manifested in decisions or actions*³. This user-centric and applied interpretation similarly drives the choice of topics and program or project contexts

² Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee. 2003. *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*

³ O’Dell, Carla. 2011. *The New Edge in Knowledge*. Wiley.

for evaluation and learning, prioritizing those for which evidence and learning can enable improved decisions and actions of key users.

17. Research indicates that learning is retained more effectively when it actively involves the learner^{4,5} otherwise knowledge acquired is often easily forgotten⁶. The initiative therefore prioritizes modalities for knowledge generation and sharing that are conducive to knowledge retention and use, such as socially interactive processes enabling learning with peers and small groups. Consequently, the initiative will invest in evaluation and learning *processes* that effectively engage priority users, beyond the generation of *products* such as reports.

2.2 Context for Organizational Learning

18. These concepts are supported by evidence of how learning does or does not occur within teams and institutions, including those in the CIF community.
19. Important organizational barriers can limit the uptake and application of learning. These may include disincentives for risk-taking or a culture of risk avoidance, a lack of clear leadership direction and rewards systems for learning, entrenched cognitive biases amongst staff and teams, and procedural factors that can limit learning and adaptation in investment design and implementation cycles.^{7,8} Cognizant of these constraints, the initiative will target opportunities and contexts conducive for learning and with the potential to influence strategies and decisions.
20. Interactive and collective learning approaches, drawing upon informal learning and tacit knowledge, are particularly effective at the individual, team and institutional levels. A recent study on learning in the World Bank, for example, finds that that research and evaluation products are not generally associated with high levels of use in operational decision-making. However, interpersonal exchanges and learning-by-doing approaches, including through networks and peer learning, are among the most influential.⁹
21. The World Bank study notes that despite the importance of informal learning and tacit knowledge in managing projects and forming team or group behaviors, activities that enable more productive use of tacit knowledge are often not prioritized. It recommends increased attention to informal networks and learning-oriented evaluations. Related

⁴ Carey, Benedict. 2015. *How We Learn*. Random House Trade Paperbacks.

⁵ Brown, Peter C., Henry L. Roediger III, and Mark A. McDaniel. 2014. *Make Knowledge Stick* Belknap Press

⁶ A phenomenon documented by research on Ebbinghaus' Forgetting Curve. See for example: Loftus, Geoffrey R. 1985. "Evaluating forgetting curves". *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*.

⁷ IEG (Independent Evaluation Group). 2014. "Learning and Results in World Bank Operations: How the Bank Learns." The World Bank Group.

⁸ Milway, Katie and Saxton, Amy. *The Challenge of Organizational Learning*. The Stanford Social Innovation Review, 2011

⁹ IEG 2014.

lessons have been documented in bilateral donor institutions¹⁰ and likely apply similarly across CIF institutions¹¹ and stakeholder organizations.

22. Collaborative evaluation and learning approaches can help transfer individual learning and tacit knowledge to team and institutional learning and knowledge. They can also foster collective learning at the wider systems level amongst multiple institutions and stakeholder groups. This kind of joint learning can result in changes in policies and practices, and in the case of the CIF, improved strategies and investments.¹²
23. The CIF model entails a strong potential for cross-institutional collaboration and knowledge sharing, both at the MDB and the country levels as well as amongst the wider CIF community and wider climate finance sector. The initiative is thus uniquely placed and explicitly designed to take a systems-level view, facilitating collective learning both within and across institutions and contexts.

2.3 User Orientation to Inform Actions and Decisions

24. The initiative aims to be user- and use-oriented, focusing on opportunities where there is a demand to use evaluation and learning to explicitly inform and improve decisions and strategies. This includes, for example:
 - CIF investment decisions (e.g., at portfolio, program, country, or project levels);
 - Program and project design and implementation (e.g., whether to replicate or scale up particular types of interventions or implementation strategies);
 - Real-time strategic discussions about the direction of the CIF;
 - Funding decisions by donor countries; and
 - Application of lessons to broader climate change finance institutions and initiatives.
25. A variety of users are involved in these and other types of decisions that the evaluation and learning activities will seek to inform. These include, for example, MDB focal points, recipient country focal points, CIF AU staff, donors, local stakeholders, and other climate finance institutions. As it is not possible to meet all of the needs of all stakeholders through this initiative, priority users will be identified for each specific activity and sub-topic within the priority learning areas described in Section III.

2.4 Guiding Principles

26. The initiative will use the following guiding principles to help operationalize the above concepts. All potential evaluation and learning activities will be assessed against these principles. Only activities meeting the majority of these principles to a satisfactory extent

¹⁰ See for example: Independent Commission for Aid Impact. 2014. "How DFID Learns."

¹¹ See for example: Independent Development Evaluation, African Development Bank. 2015. "Making Evaluation Influential at the African Development Bank". *Evaluation Matters*. Q1, 2015

¹² Seel, Norman M. 2012. *Encyclopedia of the Sciences of Learning*. Springer.

will move to the funding and implementation stage. While it will often not be feasible or necessary for any one evaluation and learning activity to meet all of these principles, the principles serve as a useful guidepost for strategic alignment and screening for quality assurance.

Guiding Principles for Evaluation and Learning

- 1) **Strategic:** Responds to priority learning areas and knowledge gaps as articulated by users, addressing areas with strong potential for evidence-based learning and catalytic influence.
- 2) **Fit-for-purpose:** Approaches and methods are driven by users and intended uses, respond to learning questions and needs, and are tailored to unique evaluation and learning contexts.
- 3) **Learning-oriented:** Learning activities build on established research and best practices for effective individual and organizational learning; evaluation approaches emphasize learning.
- 4) **Applied:** Practical orientation and applied focus to inform actions and decisions; learning is shared widely in targeted and dynamic ways to stimulate dialogue and inform action.
- 5) **Collaborative and participatory:** Participatory approaches and collaborative partnerships are pursued to facilitate relevance and adoption of lessons among priority users;
- 6) **Inclusive and gender-responsive:** Evaluation and learning activities include analysis of gender dimensions and issues affecting vulnerable or marginalized populations.¹³
- 7) **Innovative:** Utilizes and explores both established and innovative approaches and methods; quality and rigor are pursued in both quantitative and qualitative approaches.
- 8) **Timely and cost-effective:** Produces early results and learning within a reasonable timeframe (e.g., 6-18 months); demonstrates cost-effectiveness and resource efficiency.
- 9) **Ethical:** High ethical standards and practices are planned and carried out, including cultural sensitivity and respect for the dignity, privacy, and agency of individuals and groups.
- 10) **Supports local knowledge and capacity:** Local stakeholders, knowledge, and expertise are engaged, supported, and leveraged.

¹³ This includes “human rights, the right to health, the rights of indigenous peoples, local communities, migrants, children, persons with disabilities and people in vulnerable situations and the right to development, as well as gender equality, empowerment of women and intergenerational equity.” UNFCC/CP/2015/L.9. December 2015.

3 Priority Learning Themes

3.1 Context for Priority Learning Themes

27. This section of the Business Plan identifies a set of four initial priority learning themes to be pursued starting in 2016, once the Business Plan is approved. These themes, elaborated upon below, are:
- Transformational change;
 - Private sector investment;
 - Local stakeholder engagement and benefit; and
 - CIF design and approach.
28. Consistent with the user-centric orientation of the initiative and the goal to inform and improve key decisions and strategies, the four priority themes reflect aggregated input from 43 CIF stakeholders gathered during consultations conducted between January and April 2016¹⁴ and extensive discussion among Advisory Group members. Each theme was clearly identified as a priority interest to multiple sets of CIF stakeholders, and each also is relevant to the wider climate finance sector.
29. Critically important cross-cutting themes – including gender and inclusivity dimensions – will be mainstreamed in all evaluation and learning activities to the extent relevant and feasible, and as such are highlighted in the overall guiding principles in Section II. Specific evaluation and learning activities may choose to highlight these or other thematic, programmatic, or topical dimensions as part of the overall program of work addressing the priority learning themes.
30. The priority themes are intended to be high level and directional, to serve as guidance for a more specific annual work plan and budget that will follow approval of this Business Plan. The annual work plan and budget will include evaluation and learning activities that align broadly with one or more of these priority themes and address more specific sub-topics relating to particular programs, sectors, or issues, based on user needs and decision-making processes. The process for identifying and implementing specific evaluation and learning activities related to the themes is described in Section IV.
31. A variety of both evaluation and learning activities can be used to address the learning themes and the multiple sub-topics and programmatic or sector applications within them. Additional priority themes may also be identified as the initiative progresses. Priorities themes will be revisited as needed to ensure continued relevance. For each of the four priority themes, the rationale, key users, and initial sub-topics or potential areas of inquiry are identified below.

¹⁴ A summary of the stakeholder consultations can be found in Annex 2

3.2 Priority Theme 1: Transformational Change

32. **Rationale:** Supporting the achievement of transformational change is an overarching goal of the CIF as well as other climate funds. Each CIF program aims to support transformation at scale, as identified in the respective results frameworks. Recent work by the CIF¹⁵ and CIF institutions¹⁶ has explored this topic to some extent. However, questions remain regarding how the term “transformation” is interpreted (and to whom) and operationalized within the CIF context, and the extent to which CIF activities and investments are designed and implemented to support transformational change. These questions are widely seen by stakeholders as warranting deeper analysis to better understand CIF’s role and inform expectations, decisions, and implementation going forward. This theme is also of strong importance and interest to the wider climate finance community.
33. Transformational change is inherently multi-faceted and complex. Change at a systems level is often slow to emerge, but can sometimes be rapid. These inflection points can be difficult to predict in both the natural and social sciences, and their emergence are sometimes best understood with hindsight. Given the urgency of the climate crisis, however, a key challenge is to better understand transformational change at the nexus of social, economic and environmental domains, to increase the ability of these systems to mitigate and adapt to climate change as it unfolds.
34. The transformation theme can be approached in several different ways, for instance, according to a set of specific dimensions (e.g., institutions, policies, markets, technologies, behaviors¹⁷); at different scales (e.g., individual, organization, sector, economy, country, region, program, global); and in the context of various definitions (e.g., relevance, depth, scale, and sustainability¹⁸).
35. Transformation as a systems-level theme transects all of the CIF’s work, and for this reason is worthy of stand-alone attention. However, it also relates strongly to each of the other priority themes as well as others not covered here. As such, other priority themes will also integrate analyses of transformational change in relation to their specific sub-topics and issues, as relevant.
36. **Key users and uses:** Transformational change is widely applicable to the full CIF and climate finance community, presenting a compelling opportunity for collective learning within and between different stakeholder groups. For example, recipient countries can learn with donors, MDBs, and the CIF AU about the extent to which financing can be used to support transformational change in different contexts in order to better design and implement

¹⁵ See for example: Climate Investment Funds (CIF). 2015. “Climate Investment Funds: Accomplishments, Transformational Impact, and Additionality in the Climate Finance Architecture.” Joint CTF-SCF/TFC.15/3. November 2015

¹⁶ See for example: IEG (Independent Evaluation Group). 2016. “Supporting Transformational Change for Poverty Reduction and Shared Prosperity.” World Bank Group.

¹⁷ CIF 2015

¹⁸ IEG 2016

funds, programs, and project investments. Donors, MDBs, the CIF AU and other climate institutions can learn from and with recipient countries and local stakeholders about how transformational change happens within specific institutions, groups, and sectors, in order to better identify and advocate for specific levers of change.

37. At the same time, different priority users will have specific and differentiated needs related to this theme. For instance, donors are also interested from an accountability perspective, given that transformation is an explicit goal of the CIF. MDBs and the CIF AU may wish to better understand how to support transformation as part of their value proposition. Some recipient country institutions and industry actors may be especially interested from a trade and economic competitiveness perspective, while other institutions and local stakeholders from the perspective of sustained and shared prosperity, resilience to shocks, and protection of natural resources. Specific priority users and uses for distinct evaluation and learning activities and sub-topics will be further developed as part of the approach papers discussed below in Section IV.

38. Illustrative areas of inquiry:

- What does transformation mean within the CIF, as applied to different programs contexts, and objectives? How is it applied in strategic and operational decision-making? How is CIF's transformative influence analyzed and reported on?
- What are the drivers and barriers to transformational change?
- How and to what extent is CIF supporting transformational change? In what areas, for whom, and under what conditions? Where has transformation not occurred, despite intentions, and what can be learned from this?
- What are the early indications of transformational change and how will it manifest itself, either gradually or through systems changes?
- How can CIF investments and activities be optimized to better support transformation? What kind of institutional management processes are needed inside of CIF institutions to properly support transformation?

3.3 Priority Theme 2: Private Sector Investment

39. **Rationale:** Ambitious global mitigation and adaptation targets will not be met without a dramatic upsurge of private sector investment in clean technologies and climate adaptation. Economies need to be transformed or developed into low-carbon, climate-resilient economic systems. This transformation requires a fundamental shift towards widespread deployment and implementation of low-carbon technologies and services, much of which must be led by the private sector.

40. CIF programs and partners explicitly aim to crowd-in or enable private sector investment, and have modified or adopted new approaches at times to improve their reach with commercial actors. Currently, private sector funds account for 28% of total CIF funds (approximately \$USD 2.3 billion), and are expected to achieve a leverage ratio of

approximately 1 to 9.6.¹⁹ Still, there is recognition that approaches could be enhanced to more fully leverage CIF activities to engage with and stimulate private sector investment at the scale that is needed for lasting, transformational change. How to best use concessional resources, including CIF funding, to catalyze private sector investments, in a way that motivates actors and moves markets, is a priority area of interest for CIF stakeholders and other climate funds.

41. **Key users and uses:** Given the scale of the climate crisis and the broad interest in accelerating private sector investment, the full CIF community including donors, MDBs, CIF AU, private sector actors, and recipient countries, as well as other climate funds, all benefit from gaining practical insights on how greater private sector investment could be stimulated to contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation. The private sector investment theme is similar and inextricably linked to transformation in this regard, again presenting compelling opportunities for collective learning which can inform the wider CIF and climate finance systems.
42. Specific priority users and uses are also important to highlight. For example, investment officers within MDBs can use learning that assists in the identification and implementation of private sector investments, including how they can most strategically catalyze transformational change in market systems. Recipient country decision-makers, including ministries of finance, economic advisors, regulators, chambers of commerce, local governments, and commercial actors themselves, can benefit from further learning on the best use of concessional resources to strengthen and benefit local industries while achieving low-carbon development and resilience at scale. Globally, commercial banks and other financial actors can use knowledge on what works in frontier markets and technologies to inform investments. Donors and other climate funds can use learning on how to make the best use of scarce concessional finance resources for maximum private sector impact in recipient countries.
43. **Illustrative areas of inquiry:**
 - What are the barriers and what CIF approaches work well for stimulating increased private sector investment in certain types of programs or market, country, technology and sector conditions? Where has this occurred, why, and what can we learn from these experiences?
 - How can CIF institutions best contribute to conducive enabling environments for private sector investments in climate mitigation and resilience?
 - How should future dedicated private sector funding windows be structured in order to most effectively scale private sector investments?
 - How can public sector investments under the CIFs work to best mobilize or stimulate the private sector?

¹⁹ These figures are based on current approved pipelines and actual and expected co-financing contributions, May 2016.

- What are the drivers of private sector investment and how can private sector actors more readily access existing MDB and non-MDB financing mechanisms, particularly in low-income countries?

3.4 Priority Theme 3: Local Stakeholder Engagement and Benefit

44. **Rationale:** A hallmark of the CIF model is an emphasis on enhanced participation of local stakeholders in global governance structures and in the design and implementation of country investment plans. It also has dedicated strategies and mechanisms for ensuring that particularly vulnerable or marginalized groups and communities benefit from CIF investments, and a gender-sensitive strategic approach to climate mitigation and resilience activities. It is important for CIF institutions and stakeholders to better understand if and how well these models are translating to meaningful engagement for stakeholders, and whether they are resulting in tangible benefits to end-beneficiaries as envisioned when CIF was established. This theme was identified by multiple stakeholders as a priority for deeper analysis through this initiative.
45. **Key users and uses:** Recipient countries and local stakeholder groups are among the top priority users for evidence in this area. Recipient country decision-makers, including government focal points and others, can use this learning to better design and implement CIF-funded and similar projects at the local level. Local stakeholder groups can use evidence and learning in this area to advocate for policies and programs which improve their conditions and their ability for elevated leadership roles in mitigation and adaptation activities.
46. In addition, MDBs, the CIF AU, donors, and other funds can learn from and with local groups, benefitting from analytical knowledge in this area to improve design and implementation strategies. There may be particular interest in the link between local stakeholder engagement and benefit, and longer-term transformational change. Donors may also be interested in this question from an accountability point of view as well as for learning.
47. **Illustrative areas of inquiry:**
- How well are CIF activities fostering meaningful and productive local stakeholder engagement in country investment plan and project design and implementation processes? How could this be strengthened?
 - To what extent are CIF investments benefitting a range of local stakeholders – including women, indigenous peoples, vulnerable or marginalized populations, businesses, communities, civil society, small-holders, and local government – in different program, project and country contexts, and how could this be improved?
 - What is the distribution and sustainability of benefits to local stakeholders, and how could these be improved? What are the tradeoffs involved?

- What is the impact of the Dedicated Grant Mechanism for indigenous peoples in the FIP? How could it be further improved and what transferrable lessons can be learned?
- How are local co-benefits and shorter-term development outcomes linked to and interact with global mitigation and adaptation goals and/or longer-term transformational change, for certain groups and in different contexts, and what can we learn from this?

3.5 Priority Theme 4: CIF Design and Approach

48. **Rationale:** The CIF institutional and programmatic design is unique. It includes two primary funding mechanisms (SCF and CTF), implementation through MDBs, an intentionally lean Administrative Unit, specific governance mechanisms, and a holistic programmatic approach to planning country investments. The extent to which these design factors have contributed to or limited CIF's influence and effectiveness is a timely question to both inform results to date and to offer an opportunity for improvements. Individuals from each of the CIF stakeholder groups expressed interest in understanding the benefits, challenges, and opportunities around different aspects of the CIF model, and how it can continue to evolve and improve.
49. Learning in this area is linked to transformational change, as the over-arching goal of the CIF. Evidence of how well-suited the CIF model is to achieving this aim is particularly relevant for CIF strategic design as well as in considering the optimal role of the CIF and other climate funds within the evolving climate finance architecture.
50. **Key users and uses:** The priority users in this area are the CIF AU and MDBs, as they weigh the advantages and disadvantages of the programmatic approach and other program designs and implementation modalities, and contemplate strategic enhancements.
51. Recipient countries also expressed high interest in this area, particularly as relates to the efficiency in which Investment Plans are translated into implemented projects and other country-level coordination and implementation benefits and constraints. Donors and other climate institutions can apply learnings to their own funding decisions and operating models.
52. **Illustrative areas of inquiry:**
- To what extent is the CIF design and approach well-suited to support its goal of transformational change? How could it be improved to better achieve this aim?
 - How is the programmatic approach defined or interpreted by different stakeholder groups? To what extent and in what programs or circumstances is it effective, why or why not, and how can this be optimized from design to implementation?
 - To what extent have country investment plans contributed to transformational change? What are the benefits, challenges, and opportunities of this approach?

- What financing mechanisms used by the CIF, with which features and levels of concessionality, are most effective to achieve which aims, under which conditions?
- How does the ‘risk appetite’ of the CIF and partner institutions help or hinder the realization of the plans laid out in the investment plans? Have the greater risk investments paid off?
- What are the lessons from MDB implementation of CIF programs? To what extent has the practice of multiple MDBs working together in a country been effective and leveraged for additional benefit, and to what extent has it proved challenging?

3.6 Additional Thematic Priorities

53. Other broad thematic topics emerged as of particular interest in CIF stakeholder consultations, including financing mechanisms and the role of the CIF in the wider climate finance architecture. Some elements of these themes are embedded in the four topical areas above (e.g., financing instruments applies strongly to both CIF Design and Approach and Private Sector Investment), while others are being analyzed through complementary CIF strategic and analytical work outside of this initiative.
54. The initiative aims to be iterative and adaptive in its approach to prioritizing themes and topics. As such, these or other topics may emerge as additional stand-alone priority themes over the course of the initiative, while existing themes may be deprioritized, depending on user needs and circumstances. For example, key bottlenecks to transformational change, decision-making and/or implementation may be identified at various levels or along different dimensions, which may merit deeper analysis through a new priority learning theme. Future themes may also include other types of thematic areas, such as programs or evaluation and learning approaches that are deemed a priority and pursued accordingly.

4 Implementation Approaches

4.1 Criteria for Assessing Opportunities

55. Upon approval of the Business Plan by the TFC, the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist will develop a work plan and budget to guide the first year of implementation. Implementation will be rapid and iterative, with a balance of immediate “jump-start” activities as well as work that will require longer-term planning and budgeting.
56. Criteria for identifying which evaluation and learning opportunities to pursue within priority learning themes, both in the immediate term and over the next few years, include the following:
- 1) Provides strategic and/or operational value to the CIF community by informing upcoming decisions or implementation on critical areas of work.

- 2) Has the potential for catalytic influence in a program, sector, technology, market, region, institution, etc.
- 3) Has sufficient CIF experience or broader sector experience base to draw upon.
- 4) Provides important learning for the wider climate finance sector, where possible.

57. These criteria will be used to assess and filter ideas for evaluation and learning opportunities against demand-driven user needs and the ability to inform important decisions or strategic directions.

58. At a portfolio level, the initiative will seek to achieve a balance of breadth and depth along a number of dimensions, including by priority learning theme and by program area, although some themes or programs may receive particular attention in any given period based on opportunities to inform important strategies and decisions. Additional attention will also be given to achieving a balance and diversity of approaches and methods, implementing partners, technologies, sectors, and sub-topics within the priority themes according to different user needs.

4.2 Implementation of Activities Within the First Six Months

59. Within the first six months, the initiative will seek to accomplish the following for each priority learning theme:

I. **Undertake initial rapid scoping** to better clarify:

- 1) Priority users of evidence and user needs, based on upcoming decisions or strategic pivot points, and priorities or preferences for different types of information sharing and learning modalities;
- 2) Existing evidence that may be untapped to date, as well as any current or already planned learning activities in this area, to prevent duplication of effort; and
- 3) Anticipated demand for evidence and learning questions for each user based on this analysis.

II. **Identify quick-win opportunities** that could provide value in the near term in addressing these learning questions and informational needs. For example, this may include:

- 1) Latent demand or pre-existing ideas for evaluations of areas that address the priority theme and could be commissioned and undertaken in a relatively short timeframe.
- 2) Existing data, studies, or processes which could be complemented by additional depth of research or more dynamic learning processes to share and apply results.

- 3) Opportunities for knowledge exchange among key groups of stakeholders around time-sensitive, priority issues relate to the thematic learning areas.
 - 4) Real-time learning needs or opportunities that may be addressed through immediate implementation of participatory learning processes or rapid response briefs.
- III. **Develop a more in-depth approach paper** articulating specific options for evaluation and learning activities related to the priority theme, reflecting best practice in evaluating and learning from and for complex contexts. The nature of each approach paper may be different for the different priority themes, depending on the circumstances, but will generally include:
- 1) A more thorough analysis of key users and their needs, preferences, and key strategy and decision-making processes;
 - 2) A review of existing literature and learning processes;
 - 3) An expanded and refined set of priority learning questions for each user; and
 - 4) Recommendations on specific evaluation and learning approaches and opportunities, with considerations of sequencing, budget, and other factors.
- IV. **Begin to implement these approaches** through the development of terms of reference (ToRs) and the drafting or solicitation of concept notes and proposals, and/or through other ongoing CIF implementation processes.

4.3 Implementation of Activities Within 6-12 months

60. Within the 6-12 month timeframe, the initiative will focus on furthering the implementation of select evaluation and learning activities, responding to the identified learning questions for priority learning themes and building on the initial assessments and approach papers. The initiative will prioritize activities with a fast turnaround time, so that results and learning are well-timed to inform strategic decisions and pivot points.
61. For each priority learning theme, the initiative will seek to have accomplished the following within 12 months:
- 1) User engagement, participation, and communication mechanisms are in place with key stakeholder groups;
 - 2) At least 2-3 activities have provided initial learning for key users;
 - 3) At least 1-2 longer-term activities or studies have been planned and/or are underway.
 - 4) Initial indications that users are valuing the early learning produced and applying it to decisions or strategies related to the work of the CIF community, and/or other institutions.

4.4 Implementation of Activities in Years Two and Three

62. In the second year following approval of this Business Plan, the initiative will continue to focus on identifying and implementing evaluation and learning activities related to the priority learning themes. The budgetary spend-rate may be highest in this period, as the portfolio of evaluation and learning activities matures and is scaled-up based on initial experiences and pilot testing of approaches. New priority learning themes may also be identified, and existing themes reprioritized, resulting in a shift in the planning and implementation of activities.

63. In the third year, the focus will be on ensuring the timely completion of activities and the cultivation, sharing, and application of the wider body of learning produced.

4.5 Approaches to Evaluation and Learning

64. The initiative will work with leading experts in the fields of evaluation and learning, as well as subject matter experts in climate change mitigation and adaptation, to deploy a variety of approaches and methods that are considered international best practice in evidence-based learning. In general, the initiative will seek to use approaches that:

- Generate applied learning relevant to key users and their priority strategic or operational decisions and pivot points;
- Utilize evaluative approaches that capture, on a fit-for-purpose basis, progress and results (e.g., *what* happened) as well as explanatory factors (e.g., *why, how, for whom, and under what conditions*) and lessons that can be applied internally to the CIF as well as externally;
- Build collaborative learning partnerships, including amongst CIF partners and evaluators, to facilitate dynamic and responsive research, evaluation, and learning within and across institutions, projects, and portfolios;
- Involve rapid turnaround of initial results and learning (e.g., within 6-18 months); and
- Create or leverage active knowledge exchanges, networks, and communities of practice.

65. A few particularly promising or well-suited potential evaluation and learning approaches, given the mandate of the initiative and the initial stakeholder consultations, are provided in the table below. The initiative will often seek to integrate or complement evaluative processes with learning approaches, to increase the effectiveness of learning and knowledge-building at various levels.

Table 1: Illustrative evaluation and learning approaches and methods/activities²⁰:

<p>Potential <i>evaluation</i> approaches and methods include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Formative evaluation - Outcome evaluation - Peer evaluation - Rapid stakeholder feedback - Comparative case studies - Process tracing - Surveys and focus groups 	<p>Potential <i>learning</i> approaches include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Real-time learning - Peer-to-peer learning - Communities of practice - Knowledge networks - Knowledge exchange visits - Co-creation of learning products - Knowledge sharing events
--	---

4.6 Process for Developing Ideas and Funding Activities

66. Ideas for specific evaluation and learning activities will be generated from a variety of sources, starting with the user needs framework and criteria described above and aligning more broadly to the priority learning themes and their respective approach papers.
67. Building on the initial stakeholder consultations conducted during the creation of this Business Plan, the initiative will undertake a process of continuous consultation with CIF community stakeholders to ensure the relevance and timeliness of learning priorities and activities.
68. All stakeholders and groups in the CIF community may propose ideas for evaluation and learning. Ideas will be screened according to the identified criteria by both the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist and the Advisory Group, and the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist will develop promising ideas further using the approaches cited above.
69. In some cases, targeted calls for proposals and other types of competitions may be used to generate additional ideas and innovations, particularly from or for specific users and on specific priority topics. This could include, for example, proposals from organizations in recipient countries or ideas specifically generated from recipient country governments or other stakeholder groups.
70. The initiative will strive to undertake a wide range of activities which will vary widely in budgetary amount. For example, multi-year evaluations and learning partnerships that engage with a range of topics and actors, using multiple approaches and methods, may entail significant costs, while smaller, one-off and rapid turnaround activities may cost relatively little.

²⁰ For further background on select approaches and techniques, please see: CIF. 2014. "Approaches to Evidence-based Learning Throughout the CIF Project Cycle." https://www-cif.climateinvestmentfunds.org/sites/default/files/meeting-documents/ctf_scf_12_4_approaches_to_evidence_based_learning_in_the_cif_project_cycle_rev.1_0.pdf

71. Participatory and experiential approaches may lead to higher costs in some cases, but can be worthwhile to increase learning retention and application. In all cases, each activity or sub-activity will be assessed according to the criteria and resource efficiency considerations as described in the guiding principles in Section II.
72. Activities may be commissioned and funded directly by the initiative and/or through implementing institutions, following the relevant and established CIF AU and MDB procurement protocols.

4.7 Managing and Reporting on Implementation

73. The Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist has overall responsibility for the implementation of activities within this initiative. He/she draws upon the Advisory Group for high-level guidance, and implements evaluation and learning activities in conjunction with counterparts in the CIF AU, MDBs, recipient countries, and/or external technical assistance providers.
74. Evaluation and learning activities will be planned, tracked, and evaluated according to their specific objectives, milestones, and deliverables. In some instances, the initiative will create formal reference groups, steering committees, and/or peer review mechanisms to provide extra quality and relevance assurance for particularly important, high-budget evaluation and learning activities.
75. The initiative will report annually on its activities and accomplishments to the TFC, including a narrative and financial report.

5 Role of Advisory Group

5.1 Context for Advisory Group

76. A core feature of the evaluation and learning special initiative is the creation of an Advisory Group to provide strategic and expert advice to guide the functioning of the initiative. This section describes further details on the functioning of the Advisory Group, including roles and responsibilities, relationships to other groups, principles for working together, expectations for participation, advisory processes as related to evaluation and learning activities, periodic review of this Business Plan, and the terms of Advisory Group members. A Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Advisory Group is provided in Annex 1.
77. Most of the Advisory Group roles and responsibilities reflected here are based on the original TFC decision of May 2015, with minor adaptations based on inputs by the Advisory Group itself at meetings and discussions between November 2015 and May 2016.

5.2 Roles and Responsibilities

78. The overarching roles and responsibilities of the Advisory Group are as follows:

- 1) Provide guidance to the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist on a proposed work plan and budget, to be prepared by the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist in alignment with the Business Plan.
- 2) Advise the CIF Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist, CIF management, and the CIF Core MDB Committee on priorities and allocation of funds for evaluation and learning.
- 3) Provide ongoing strategic advice and quality assurance for evaluation and learning, work plans, funding priorities, specific proposed strands of work, contracts, and deliverables.
- 4) Propose activities that strategically support the achievement of the aims and objectives of the CIF as referenced in the governing instrument of the CIF, key CIF programming documents, and CIF program results frameworks (see references in Annex 2).
- 5) Provide strategic advice that will enhance the quality and relevance of evaluation and learning work.
- 6) Advise the CIF Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist, as well as CIF management, the CIF Core MDB Committee and others in the CIF community, as appropriate, on integrating evidence-based learning activities into the CIF portfolio of work, thereby promoting collaboration, learning, and knowledge exchange amongst the MDBs and other parties.
- 7) Provide guidance on how the evaluation and learning program can be audience and demand driven.
- 8) Provide high-level guidance and constructive input on implementation of this Business Plan where needed to steer the direction of work.
- 9) Provide strategic advice on how the evaluation and learning line of work should be aligned with international best practice.
- 10) Provide guidance on how to focus on overarching priority themes: e.g., country, program, or thematic themes. (These priority themes could trigger more specific investments through the operational work plan and budget which are to follow the Business Plan.)
- 11) Provide review and guidance on annual reporting on this program of work.

5.3 Relationship to the Joint CTF-SCF TFC, Core MDB Committee, and Other Existing Groups

79. The Advisory Group will relate to other existing groups as follows:

- 1) The Advisory Group will serve an advisory role, advising the CIF AU, Core MDB Committee, and the TFC.
- 2) The TFC is responsible for making major, high-level decisions regarding the Advisory Group's role and responsibilities, including approving the Advisory Group's ToR and this Business Plan. Such decisions can be made at the TFC meetings (held two times per year) or by mail through the approval-by-mail system.
- 3) Upon approval by the TFC of the Business Plan, the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist, in close collaboration with this Advisory Group and the Core MDB Committee, will be responsible for making ongoing implementation decisions and delivering on the Business Plan.
- 4) The Advisory Group may advise on when an independent assessment, peer review, or other kind of external oversight might be useful to ensure impartiality of findings and recommendations (where relevant for particular kinds of evaluations, for example), avoid any possible conflicts of interest, or how to use of the funds to be in accordance with the Business Plan.
- 5) Day-to-day operations will be managed by the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist, supported by the Advisory Group, and overseen by the CIF AU Program Manager.
- 6) Relationships to any other groups will be informal and ad-hoc. Such groups could include, for example, evaluation and learning communities of practices or associations, the MDB independent evaluation units, and third-party consultants. Any potential conflicts of interest should be communicated up front and avoided.

5.4 Principles for Working Together

80. The following principles will guide the Advisory Group's work and communication:

- 1) Respect for and curiosity about different perspectives on evaluation and learning. Advisory Group members agree to disagree on some things. Advice from the Group will reflect a potential diversity of opinions.
- 2) Recognition that there is no single 'right' set of evaluation and learning values, approaches, or methods.
- 3) Collaborative approach to defining terms, where definitions would be needed/useful.
- 4) Collaborative approach to working with the Evaluation and Learning Specialist.
- 5) Recognition that the CIF evaluation and learning function is exploratory and will evolve over time.
- 6) For the purposes of developing this Business Plan, the Advisory Group will work on a consensus basis, with consensus defined as not objecting to the content of the proposal.

- 7) Beyond the Business Plan, for more ongoing advisory work, the Advisory Group will also work on a consensus basis. A diversity of opinions where applicable can be recognized and recorded at any time upon the request of a member. The process of tracking and communicating opinions in this case will follow the process referred to below.

5.5 Expectations for Participation

81. The following are the expectations for participation by Advisory Group members:

A. Expectations of Advisory Group Members

The Advisory Group will meet in person for at least two separate full-day meetings per year.

- 1) The Advisory Group will hold bi-monthly calls to discuss recent developments and activities and provide guidance as needed. Participation would be expected on substantive calls where review and advising are needed. Calls that are more update in nature would be optional. The Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist will provide advance notice on which calls are substantive, therefore required, versus updates, therefore optional.
- 2) Additional calls and input via e-mail may be requested on an ad-hoc basis.
- 3) A designated alternate (identified for each member) can serve in the place of the member as needed. Alternates from the same stakeholder group may be chosen by the member, but representative stakeholder group must be informed and must approve the alternate on a no objection basis. Only official members of the Advisory Group or their alternates (not both) may attend meetings; exceptions to who may attend meetings will be made on based on agenda items that may require additional participation or input and/or as decided on an ad-hoc basis by the Advisory Group. The same alternate should participate anytime the member is not available. If the member cannot commit to a majority of the meetings and monthly calls in a given year, the alternate or a different member can be nominated and appointed to full membership.
- 4) Total time commitment is expected to be approximately 8-14 days per year. The exception is for the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist, who will serve as lead secretariat for the group, working full time on this initiative. The external experts serving on the group may also be requested to provide additional expert review (e.g., on proposals) on an ad-hoc basis.

B. Expectations of the Chair

A Chair will be elected by the Advisory Group members to help shape meeting agendas and serve as point of contact as needed. The Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist is not eligible to serve as the Chair. The term of the Chair will be one year. The responsibilities of the Chair are as follows:

- 1) Co-developing call and meeting agendas or reviewing draft agendas provided by the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist.
- 2) Serving as procedural chair for calls and meetings.
- 3) Representing the Advisory Group at TFC meetings when requested to do so. (In this case, reimbursement for costs incurred would be provided if the Chair would not already be attending the meeting.)
- 4) Managing ad-hoc inquiries or other needs that arise that cannot practically be handled through the routine Advisory Group process.
- 5) A designated alternate Chair will serve as Chair if the Chair is not available.

C. Expectations of the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist

The expectations of the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist in relation to the work of the Advisory Group is as follows:

- 1) The Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist will be a ‘non-advising’ member of the Group.
- 2) The Senior Evaluation and Learning specialist is responsible for both primary facilitation of the calls/meetings and for bringing forward the content to be discussed by the Group.

5.6 Process for Proposing Activities and Commissioning Proposals, Contracts, and Reference Groups

82. The process for proposing activities and commissioning proposals, contracts, and reference groups within the context of this initiative and the work of the Advisory Group, consistent with the processes described in Section VI of this Business Plan, is as follows:

- 1) For proposed activities in the work plan, CIF/MDB procurement policies, and other relevant rules will apply.
- 2) Based on the approved Business Plan, including identified priorities for the upcoming year, the Advisory Group will advise on the subsequent work plan, including what activities should be conducted and how. This will include evaluation and learning activities within the CIF (e.g., at the AU or MDBs, or by implementing partners/entities), or by external parties, including evaluators, reference groups set up to oversee particular evaluations/learning activities, or other consultants or external experts. Advising will include guidance, in accordance with the identified principles and priorities, on resource allocation.
- 3) The following process will be used for tracking and communicating comments from the Advisory Group: Comments will be tracked by the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist. In the case where there are significant divergent views/comments from Advisory Group members, the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist will create a

comment tracking file, including reference to the original source of the comments. In this case, any final dispensation or resolution to divergent comments will also be noted in the same comment tracking file. Any Advisory Group member can request to see these comments, and in the case of requests to share comments more widely, the Advisory Group members will need to agree in advance to do so.

5.7 Periodic Reviews

83. The Advisory Group structure and processes will undergo period reviews according to the following parameters:

- 1) The initial term of this Advisory Group is two years (from November 2015 to November 2017) with the option for the members to renew for a third year subject to a no objection approval from the stakeholder group.
- 2) A year after the Business Plan is approved, the Advisory Group will review its ToR and Business Plan and suggest updates based on experience at that time. The development of the work plan for the second year will occur at this time (after any updates to the Business Plan made following the first year).
- 3) At the end of the second year, the Advisory Group may recommend to the TFC any change to the Group's composition.
- 4) The default decision-making process for the Advisory Group's composition is that the stakeholder groups reflected by the group (as outlined in the Group's ToR) will themselves nominate members.

6 Annex 1: Evaluation and Learning Advisory Group Terms of Reference²¹

Purpose:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To advise the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist in the CIF AU, CIF management, and the CIF Core MDB Committee on priorities and allocation of funds for evidence-based learning. ▪ To develop a business plan for evidence-based learning activities and provide on-going strategic advice and quality assurance for the work plan and strategy. ▪ To review and advise on specific proposed strands of work and to advice on funding priorities. ▪ To ensure that activities are strategic and support the achievement of the aims and objectives of the CIF. ▪ To enhance the quality and relevance of the work on evidence-based learning. ▪ To engage CIF AU and MDB staff on integrating evidence based learning activities into the CIF portfolio of work, thereby promoting collaboration, learning and knowledge exchange amongst the MDBs, but also with other parties.
Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CIF-wide, covering all four CIF programs, including sub-programs such as the private sector set-aside and the dedicated grant mechanism.
Audience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CIF Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist ▪ CIF AU management ▪ Core MDB Committee
Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pilot Advisory Group with an initial two-year term and an option to renew for a third year; ▪ The Advisory Group will be chaired by a member of the Group nominated by the other Group members. The Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist is not eligible to chair the Group; ▪ Independent experts are compensated for their participation; other members receive travel and subsistence only. ▪ The Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist, with additional support from the CIF AU where needed, will act as the secretariat of the Advisory Group.
Frequency and organization of meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At least two full-day meetings per year; the remaining work will be done virtually. ▪ The Advisory Group may be requested to provide inputs in electronic format.

²¹ The original ToR for the Advisory Group is from the decision document: JOINT CTF-SCF/TFC.14/6 May 5, 2015. Minor adaptations were made based on inputs by the Advisory Group at meetings and discussions between November 2015 and May 2016; a version tracking changes to the original ToR is available upon request.

<p>Membership</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nine individuals with expertise in learning and/or evaluation, some of which should have knowledge of climate finance; they should also have the stature to provide peer-level insights: ▪ One member from the CIF AU (the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist); ▪ One member from an MDB; ▪ One member from a donor country; ▪ One member from the CIF observers, ▪ Two members from recipient countries; ▪ Two external experts in the fields of climate change, evaluation, and learning who are not affiliated with the CIF or the MDB independent evaluation offices; and ▪ One member with expertise specifically in the realm of learning.
<p>Conflict of interest policy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Independent experts cannot be considered as a consultant to or a grantee of the CIF as this would potentially bias their advice.
<p>Decision making</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Advisory Group would work very closely with the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist and, in consultation with the Core MDB committee, develop a two-to-three year strategic business plan and provide guidance on a subsequent work plan and budget. ▪ The Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist, supported by the Advisory Group, would present and propose this business plan to the Trust Fund Committee and subsequently develop a corresponding work plan and budget consistent with the approved business plan. ▪ Once the overarching strategic business plan and work plan are approved by the Trust Fund Committee, the Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist, supported by the Core MDB committee, would be responsible for delivering the work plan. ▪ The Advisory Group would continue to inform the strategic direction of the work plan and quality-assure the deliverables. The group would work collaboratively with the MDB Committee.

7 Annex 2: Summary of Stakeholder Consultations

7.1 Context

84. The following is a summary of consultations with 43 individuals on possible priorities for evaluation and learning across the CIF. The consultations were conducted between January and April 2016 with individuals who are associated with the following CIF stakeholder categories: donor countries, recipient countries, observers, MDBs, the CIF Administrative Unit (AU). Anna Williams, an evaluation and learning consultant to the CIF AU, and Joe Dickman, Senior Evaluation and Learning Specialist in the CIF AU, conducted the consultations.
85. Exhibit 1 provides a breakdown of the number of individuals spoken with according to each of these groups. Several other individuals were invited but not able to participate due to scheduling difficulties. These were informal consultations, intended to gather an *initial* set of ideas that could inform the identification of CIF evaluation and learning priorities. The consultations were not a rigorous or comprehensive information collection effort; nor were they designed to be. The conversations were more brainstorming and creative “stream of consciousness” in nature.
86. The resulting information was used by the CIF Evaluation and Learning Advisory Group to inform their recommendations on evaluation and learning priorities, as reflected in the business plan for the evaluation and learning special initiative. The business plan also proposes a series of ongoing stakeholder consultations to continuously inform and update the learning priorities of the initiative.
87. In addition to the individual consultations, a further 26 people provided presentations or plenary group comments at the March 2016 retreat on the Future of the CIF, which were highly relevant to the evaluation and learning initiative and were taken into account when formulating the priority learning areas in the business plan. These include representatives of recipient countries, donor countries, MDBs and external experts. When combining the individual consultations with the inputs gathered from the retreat, a total of 69 CIF stakeholders and external experts have contributed directly or indirectly to the evaluation and learning business plan. These additional inputs, however, are not reflected in the breakdown or the analysis below.

Exhibit 1. Breakdown of Consultations by Category²²

Category	Number (individuals)
Recipient Country	10
Donor Country	4
Observer	6
MDB	11
CIF AU	12
Total	43

7.2 Findings from Consultations

88. CIF stakeholders offered many ideas for possible evaluation and learning priorities and opportunities. From the consultations, it is clear that evaluation and learning opportunities:

- Provide compelling evidence of CIF’s impact (beyond anecdotal evidence);
- Identify lessons from the CIF model and implementation thus far;
- Identify opportunities for improvement to CIF’s design, processes, and investments; and
- Inform the work of other institutions and climate change mechanisms.

89. The most oft-cited high-level topic areas, identified by at least 4 individuals or more and often tying together various closely-related sub-topics, were:

- Transformational change (CIF role in enabling/creating transformational change, barriers and facilitators, dimensions and contexts, lessons);
- CIF programmatic approach (lessons going forward, relevance to other climate finance, investment plans, implementation);
- MDBs (model, role, lessons learned);
- Financing mechanisms (concessionality, what is working/not working, lessons, risk);
- Private sector (DPSP/set-asides; government & MDB role; contexts/programs);
- Reaching local stakeholders (CIF role, process, local benefit/co-benefits, DGM, marginalized groups, lessons going forward);
- Implementation challenges (speed of project financing, lessons, transaction costs);
- Financing additionality/finance leveraged (evidence, lessons);

²² Other individuals were also invited to participate, but did not due to scheduling challenges. The informal consultations were intended to gather a range of perspectives as initial input on evaluation and learning priorities without attempting to be comprehensive. A more detailed breakdown and listing of individuals consulted is available upon request.

90. Other topics mentioned by at least 3 people included: Informing other climate finance institutions such as the GCF; CIF role in helping governments with NDCs; region and sector-level impact; knowledge management and real-time learning; and capacity building.
91. Several program-specific ideas were also offered, relating to specific investments or approaches in the CTF, SREP, PPCR and FIP. Many of these aligned with the broader thematic areas noted above. The above areas were generally prioritized by multiple stakeholder categories, although the specific questions or sub-topic areas differed at times.
92. The full set of sub-topics and program-specific ideas raised through these consultations are available upon request, and will be used along with results from additional information gathering exercises to inform the work plan and related specific evaluation and learning activities after the approval of the business plan by the TFC.