



Joint Meeting of the CTF and SCF Trust Fund Committees  
Washington D.C. (Virtual)  
Tuesday, January 25, 2022 – Wednesday January 26, 2022

**CIF MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND LEARNING (MEL)  
POLICY AND GUIDANCE**





CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS  
1818 H Street NW  
Washington, D.C. 20433 USA  
T: +1 (202) 458-1801  
[climateinvestmentfunds.org](http://climateinvestmentfunds.org)

Joint CTF-SCF/TFC.25/4.1  
December 22, 2021

---

## **PROPOSED DECISION**

The joint meeting of the CTF and SCF Trust Fund Committees has reviewed the document Joint CTF-SCF/TFC.25/4.1, *CIF Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) Policy and Guidance*, and welcomes the contribution it will make towards unifying the monitoring, evaluation, and learning approach of existing CTF and SCF programs with new CIF programming areas under a single policy.

The Committee acknowledges the importance of MEL within the CIF business model and appreciates the guidance offered to MDBs, recipient countries, contributor countries, and other CIF stakeholders to clarify and strengthen the role of MEL within CIF programs and projects.

## Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
2	Background and Objectives.....	2
3	Principles.....	3
4	Roles and Responsibilities .....	5
5	Core Functions.....	7
5.1	Monitoring Function .....	7
5.2	Evaluation Function.....	10
5.2.1	Unique Features of CIF Evaluation.....	11
5.2.2	Evaluation Approaches and Methods.....	12
5.3	Learning Function.....	13
5.3.1	Approach to Learning.....	14
6	Minimum Requirements and Quality Standards.....	16
6.1	Monitoring.....	16
6.1.1	Minimum Monitoring Requirements .....	16
6.1.2	Monitoring Quality Standards .....	18
6.2	Evaluation.....	19
6.2.1	Minimum Evaluation Requirements.....	19
6.2.2	Evaluation Norms.....	20
6.2.3	Evaluation Quality Assurance .....	21
6.3	Learning.....	21
6.3.1	Minimum Learning Requirements .....	21
6.3.2	Learning Norms.....	22
7	Data Governance, Standards, and Ethics .....	23
8	Conclusion .....	24

# 1 Introduction

1. This document sets out the Climate Investment Funds' (CIF) Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) Policy, which is intended to define, guide, and strengthen the coherence of CIF's approach toward results management, accountability, and learning across all programs and activities. The policy directly builds on the experience of implementing MEL for CIF's four initial programs and provides cohesive guidance on the systems in place. At the same time, the policy provides a framework for designing and incorporating MEL into CIF's new programming and activities, enhancing common elements across programs, and strengthening the synergies and complementarities of MEL as functions.<sup>1</sup>
2. Monitoring, evaluation, and learning are distinct yet interrelated functions within CIF, each with its own set of activities but each supportive of programmatic accountability and learning. As a whole, CIF approaches MEL through a common set of principles, the use of integrated results frameworks for programs<sup>2</sup>, and an emphasis on collaboration and coordination across MEL activities. Embedded within these principles, integrated results frameworks, and MEL activities is a commitment to gender responsiveness and social inclusivity. MEL activities, when implemented in complementary ways, can build on one another to produce compelling evidence, knowledge, and learning opportunities for key stakeholders, in support of CIF's overall goals and program objectives.
3. As the climate crisis grows more dire and the need for evidence on how to effectively address it more essential, CIF's commitment to rigorous, strategic MEL is an integral part of its overall business model. The approach articulated in this policy can serve as a critical tool for advancing effective climate finance delivery in developing countries, leading to enhanced transformational impact.

**CIF Impact Statement:** Accelerated transformational change toward net-zero emissions and inclusive, climate-resilient development pathways

---

<sup>1</sup> This policy emphasizes MEL as *functions*, rather than as specific teams or organizational units within the CIF. This underscores that various CIF teams and stakeholders are involved in different and overlapping MEL activities. Specific organizational arrangements may shift over time, but CIF's MEL functions will remain a collaborative enterprise.

<sup>2</sup> CIF's four initial programs—the Clean Technology Fund (CTF), the Scaling-Up Renewable Energy Program (SREP), the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR), and the Forest Investment Program (FIP)—utilize program results frameworks that were approved around the time of these programs' launch. *Integrated* results frameworks seek to apply a more unified MEL approach within CIF's newer programs—integrating both MEL and other results features, such as gender—in line with the tenets of this policy.

In the context of this CIF policy:

**Monitoring** is the systematic collection and analysis of information to track outputs, outcomes, and impacts from projects and programs, throughout implementation.

**Evaluation** is the systematic and rigorous assessment of an intervention (for example, program, project, policy, or activity) or a set of interventions for the purposes of learning, accountability, and/or decision-making.<sup>3</sup>

**Learning** is the acquisition of knowledge or skills through experience, studies, or teaching, and can be considered to have occurred when new knowledge is being used to shape behaviors, as manifested in decisions or actions.<sup>4</sup>

## 2 Background and Objectives

4. CIF was established in 2008 to provide and leverage transformational investments for low-carbon, climate-resilient development in targeted low- and middle-income countries. The CIF business model is characterized by a country-led, programmatic approach with strategically linked, large-scale investments, which are aligned with national priorities and designed and implemented using a participatory, multi-stakeholder approach.
5. In addition to its role as a multilateral climate financing mechanism, CIF was founded with a mandate to serve as a learning laboratory and to ensure accountability for the results of its investments. This commitment has been renewed and strengthened over time through various CIF Trust Fund Committee (TFC) decisions and related initiatives.<sup>5</sup>
6. The purpose of the CIF MEL Policy is to define and guide a coordinated approach to MEL applicable to all current and future CIF programs and related activities, in support of CIF's goals. The specific objectives of the CIF MEL Policy are to:
  - a. Strengthen the ability of CIF and its partners to leverage experience, results, and lessons learned to improve the transformational impact of current investments, future investments, and climate action more broadly;
  - b. Adopt a more integrated MEL approach across CIF by defining and clarifying the common principles, roles, functions, and other considerations required for undertaking MEL in CIF.

---

<sup>3</sup> Adapted from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) and the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES), 2013, <https://evaluationcanada.ca/what-is-evaluation>.

<sup>4</sup> Carla O'Dell, Cindy Hubert, and APQC, 2011, *The New Edge in Knowledge*, Hoboken: Wiley.

<sup>5</sup> In [May 2015, the Joint CTF-SCF TFC](#) endorsed a proposal to enhance the generation of knowledge from evaluation for learning in the CIF to complement the current annual monitoring and reporting (M&R) across CIF's programs and the evaluation work undertaken independently by each of the MDBs. This led to the creation of the special three-year Evaluation and Learning (E&L) Initiative in 2015. In January 2019, per the [decision of the CTF and SCF TFCs](#), this initiative was extended as a core function of CIF's Administrative Unit.

### 3 Principles

7. CIF's MEL approach is guided by a set of principles that inform how activities should be carried out to support CIF's overall mission and strategic direction.

**a. Integrated MEL Approach**

CIF has adopted an integrated MEL approach, with activities designed to complement each other in the pursuit of a cohesive body of evidence for results management, accountability, and learning.<sup>6</sup>

**b. Programmatic MEL with Country Ownership**

CIF MEL serves and follows the CIF business model, which relies on programmatic, country-driven investment plans and joint-MDB (multilateral development bank) project delivery to help countries meet their underlying Paris commitments and sustainable development objectives in a coordinated, multi-sectoral manner.

**c. MDB Harmonization**

As implementing entities for CIF projects, MDBs follow their own MEL policies and procedures at the project level. CIF MEL strives for harmonization across CIF-implementing MDBs, without impeding MDBs' own systems or creating redundant, parallel MEL systems. CIF MEL further supports MDBs with new approaches, tools, and resources to enhance MEL related to climate finance investments.

**d. Multi-Stakeholder Engagement**

The CIF business model upholds the importance of broad stakeholder engagement across governments, MDBs, civil society, the private sector, and local stakeholder groups. CIF's MEL approach seeks to engage stakeholders from across this spectrum and strengthen their role(s) as producers and users of MEL knowledge and evidence.

**e. Applied Learning**

MEL activities directly support CIF's mandate as a learning laboratory for climate finance. This involves a strong focus on generating knowledge and evidence related to new and emerging topics in climate finance, as well as directly applying and disseminating the knowledge generated.

**f. Inclusive Transformational Change**

CIF's MEL approach recognizes the tremendous scale, scope, and speed of transformation needed for a global net-zero emissions, inclusive, climate-resilient, and sustainable future. Furthermore, CIF MEL activities are aimed at supporting the wider CIF mission of systems-level transformation through inclusive climate action that improves the opportunity and capacity of marginalized and vulnerable

---

<sup>6</sup> Newer CIF programs carry this vision forward through their use of an integrated results framework and other activities. First-generation CIF programs seek to enhance MEL integration by building upon the earlier CIF results frameworks, tools, systems, and other instruments.

individuals and groups to participate in and influence change processes and outcomes.

**g. Gender and Social Inclusion**

CIF’s MEL approach places a particular emphasis on gender responsiveness—of and through MEL activities—and is closely aligned with the *CIF Gender Policy*<sup>7</sup> and the *CIF Gender Action Plan*<sup>8</sup>. It focuses on social inclusion, with elements to support multiple aspects of social inclusivity and equitable distribution, such as the direct participation of vulnerable social groups in MEL activities and targeted analyses of the distributional impacts affecting them.

**h. Climate and Development Alignment**

CIF MEL supports the examination of interlinkages between climate finance and broader sustainable development objectives. At the policy level, CIF MEL seeks alignment with relevant MEL features of the Paris Agreement, Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), along with core development objectives of MDBs and countries. CIF also actively participates in the Climate Funds Collaboration Platform and other initiatives to enhance the harmonization, coherence, and complementarity of MEL among climate funds.<sup>9</sup>

**i. Innovation**

CIF MEL pairs well-established approaches with innovative ones, linking quality and rigor with the idea that knowledge and evidence in climate finance are best generated through innovation across a wide range of quantitative and qualitative methods. In turn, CIF’s MEL approach further aims to help drive innovation in climate action.

**j. Timeliness and Cost-effectiveness**

CIF reports annual program results in a timely manner to inform the discussions and decisions of CIF’s TFCs and Sub-Committees. Evaluative findings and learning activities are produced within a reasonable time frame, demonstrate cost-effectiveness and resource efficiency, and are appropriately timed to inform CIF strategies and decision-making.

**k. Ethical Execution**

High ethical standards and practices are required, planned, and carried out in all CIF MEL activities. This includes but is not limited to cultural sensitivity and respect for the dignity, privacy, and agency of all individuals and groups involved.

---

<sup>7</sup> [https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/sites/default/files/meeting-documents/joint\\_ctf-scf\\_17\\_4\\_rev.1\\_cif\\_gender\\_policy\\_rev1\\_2\\_final.pdf](https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/sites/default/files/meeting-documents/joint_ctf-scf_17_4_rev.1_cif_gender_policy_rev1_2_final.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> [https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/sites/cif\\_enc/files/meeting-documents/ctf\\_scf\\_22\\_7\\_rev.1\\_cif\\_gender\\_action\\_plan\\_phase\\_3\\_final.pdf](https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/sites/cif_enc/files/meeting-documents/ctf_scf_22_7_rev.1_cif_gender_action_plan_phase_3_final.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> Members of this Collaboration Platform are the Adaptation Fund, CIF, the Green Climate Fund (GCF), the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and the NAMA facility.

## I. Transparency

CIF is committed to ensuring the transparency of MEL results, studies, and findings, in line with the information disclosure policies of MDBs and other CIF stakeholders. This serves to promote accountability and learning on a broad basis by ensuring that information is easily and widely available.

## 4 Roles and Responsibilities

8. MEL is a shared responsibility within CIF, since it is implemented by several CIF units in coordination with MDB partners and other stakeholder groups. The key MEL-related roles and responsibilities of CIF's main stakeholder groups are described as follows:

### a. Trust Fund Committees

CIF's Trust Fund Committees [Clean Technology Fund (CTF), Strategic Climate Fund (SCF), and the Global Climate Action Program (GCAP) Sub-Committee<sup>10</sup>] determine and oversee CIF's strategic direction, operations, and other activities, as well as the policies driving those activities. The committees meet regularly to make consensus-based decisions to ensure that CIF funding flows, activities progress, and learning is shared. They are responsible for reviewing operational and results reports, requesting independent evaluation reports, and holding CIF stakeholders accountable for the implementation of the MEL approach stipulated in this policy. CIF recipient and contributor countries play a vital role in shaping the agenda and demand for specific MEL activities and as users of MEL products that inform their own decision-making.

### b. CIF Administrative Unit

#### i. *Monitoring and Reporting (M&R)*

The M&R unit is the main custodian of CIF's results. It is responsible for the design, implementation, and oversight of CIF's monitoring approach, including the integrated results frameworks, annual reporting process, programmatic M&R systems, results data management, and analysis. Annual program results are analyzed and aggregated as either standalone results reports, or as part of CIF Operational and Results Reports,<sup>11</sup> which are submitted to the respective CIF Trust Fund Committees for review. The M&R unit also leads strategic enhancements of portfolio, program, and project results analytics, based on stakeholder demand, and directly supports CIF recipient countries with M&R-related trainings, guidance, and other technical assistance.

#### ii. *Evaluation and Learning (E&L)*

The E&L unit is responsible for creating a strong body of applied evidence for use within and beyond CIF. It leads, designs, and implements strategic, thematic, and

---

<sup>10</sup> Including, under SCF, the SCF Sub-Committee(s) and Technical Committees.

<sup>11</sup> Some of CIF's TFCs require standalone Results Reports (for example, CTF), whereas others require combined Operational and Results Reports. The committees maintain the flexibility to adjust their preferred approach over time.



program evaluations; knowledge and research studies; strategic learning partnerships; along with engagements at the country and institutional levels. Based on extensive stakeholder consultations and with guidance from its independent Advisory Group, it develops multi-year, demand-driven business plans and annual work plans that are approved by the TFC. It manages independent evaluations mandated by the TFC, other analytical studies implemented in partnership with CIF's stakeholders, and leads global learning activities and partnerships to cater to all of CIF's stakeholders and external partners, including other climate funds and their respective evaluation units.

*iii. Program Coordination Teams*

Program coordination units lead the overall management and day-to-day operations of the different CIF programs and are directly involved in the planning, coordination, review, dissemination, and communication of MEL activities covering their respective programs. They lead select MEL activities and are especially involved in promoting programmatic learning among stakeholders.

*iv. Thematic Leads*

CIF's thematic units (i.e., gender, stakeholder engagement, communications, etc.) are involved as leads, co-producers, reviewers, and disseminators for specific MEL activities that are directly relevant to these respective thematic areas. In addition, the gender unit provides upstream technical support to CIF projects and activities to help strengthen their gender and social inclusion elements, such as by advising on expected results and indicators related to gender and social inclusion. The stakeholder engagement unit supports the participation of diverse stakeholders in CIF MEL activities, whereas the communications unit plays a critical role in helping to disseminate MEL findings, results, and knowledge products.

**c. MDBs**

As the implementers of CIF-funded projects, MDBs are key partners for most of CIF's MEL activities. They are responsible for incorporating CIF MEL minimum requirements (such as core indicators) and standards into projects during the design phase, fulfilling all of CIF's annual M&R requirements for their projects, and sharing all relevant project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) reports<sup>12</sup> that are available for public disclosure, as produced via their own M&E systems throughout the project lifecycle.<sup>13</sup> MDBs are responsible for CIF projects' terminal evaluations, per their own project evaluation policies, and may include CIF projects in other MDB-led evaluations. With respect to CIF's E&L activities, MDBs provide evaluation support, engage in CIF learning forums, and conduct joint knowledge and learning activities

---

<sup>12</sup> This includes project log frames, supervision/implementation status reports, mid-term reviews, and project completion reports. The exact name of these reports may vary per MDB.

<sup>13</sup> For private-sector projects with sensitive information, MDBs may elect to redact sections of reports and/or submit only the MEL-related components to CIF.

with CIF and CIF recipient countries. They play a coordinating role in any CIF MEL activities related to the projects in their respective CIF portfolios.

**d. Recipient Countries**

CIF recipient country focal points and other in-country actors have the crucial role of adapting CIF's MEL approach to their country's context and needs. Country program focal points lead some national and program-level M&R components,<sup>14</sup> and ensure that a strategic MEL perspective is integrated in all of CIF's programmatic activities for the country, such as in diagnostics and investment planning. They can be both producers and users of E&L activities. Recipient countries also help host field missions, facilitate access to information and resources, share knowledge with other countries/stakeholders, and engage in CIF's facilitated learning opportunities. Other in-country stakeholders may include additional government agencies, civil society organizations, Indigenous Peoples, local communities, the private sector, and academia.

**d. CIF Observers**

Non-state actors from civil society, the private sector, Indigenous Peoples, local communities, and other groups act as CIF Observers. Observers are expected to stay engaged with CIF operations, progress, and results through information-sharing, consultations, learning activities, and partnerships. Through their participation in CIF TFC meetings, they fulfill a watchdog function, which can include providing feedback on results reports and evaluations. In some CIF programs,<sup>15</sup> non-state actors are directly involved in reviewing data on project implementation and contributing direct inputs to annual program results reporting. They actively participate in other MEL activities relevant to their countries and areas of thematic interest.

## 5 Core Functions

9. The scope and volume of MEL activities have expanded substantially since CIF was first established in 2008. As the urgency and severity of the climate crisis continue to escalate, CIF's role as a climate finance learning laboratory has become increasingly critical. As CIF's portfolios continue to mature alongside the emergence of pressing new topics in climate action, new opportunities also arise to strengthen analyses of the results achieved and related outcomes of interest.
10. Within this changing and emergent climate finance landscape, CIF's approach to MEL is anchored by several core functions.

### 5.1 Monitoring Function

11. **Annual Results Reporting:** The heart of CIF's monitoring approach relies on annual results updates reported through CIF's programmatic M&R systems. Based on their respective

---

<sup>14</sup> Country focal points lead the national reporting processes for PPCR and FIP but not SREP or CTF. They will drive the national impact monitoring and the CIF/national climate change M&E alignment in the newer CIF programs.

<sup>15</sup> This is primarily the case for PPCR, and to a lesser extent, FIP.

integrated results frameworks—the core programmatic MEL document—and their respective program design, each CIF program deploys its own M&R system fit for purpose. This approach is intended to reinforce CIF’s overall programmatic approach, while providing distinct mechanisms for reporting on country progress, investment plans, and core project outcomes.

12. In addition to having some program-specific features, CIF’s programmatic M&R systems are united by a common framework comprising several key elements:

- a. *Integrated results frameworks*: Each CIF program is governed by a single framework that describes the key results the program intends to achieve; indicators to measure them; along with integrated evaluation, learning, and gender considerations. The integrated results frameworks are approved by the CIF TFC at program inception. As “living documents”, they can be adjusted over time at the request of the TFCs, based on CIF’s experience implementing them.
- b. *M&R toolkits*: Each CIF program’s M&R system is comprehensively described through a unique M&R toolkit. Toolkits include, among other features, precise indicator definitions, methodologies, measurement guidance, and reporting protocols.
- c. *Core indicators*: Each CIF program measures its primary results via a concise set of mandatory core indicators that are tracked and reported for all projects within the program. Typically reported by MDBs, core indicators are approved by the relevant CIF TFC.<sup>16</sup>
- d. *Expected results*: All core indicators and other indicators reported by CIF projects and programs must first establish their expected results.<sup>17</sup> Expected results can cover annual, project lifetime, and/or investment lifetime periods, as defined per M&R toolkit. CIF measures the total results achieved by each project.<sup>18</sup>
- e. *Co-benefit indicators*: Defined per program,<sup>19</sup> co-benefit indicators measure outcomes that are central to the economic, social, and/or environmental outcomes of a CIF investment beyond the primary climate and sector goals of the program.
- f. *Optional, project-specific indicators*: These indicators measure project-specific outcomes that are central to a given CIF project’s objectives, although not represented in the core indicators.
- g. *MDB project reports*: CIF optimizes the use of MDBs’ own MEL function(s) at the project level by collecting and collating project log frames, supervision reports, mid-

---

<sup>16</sup> The PPCR and FIP M&R Systems rely, in part, on country focal points to report on some core indicators. All other CIF programs rely exclusively on MDBs to report on the core indicators. Core indicators are usually situated at the outcome level of each project.

<sup>17</sup> CIF refers to “expected results” and “targets” interchangeably.

<sup>18</sup> As opposed to pro-rated results based on the levels of co-financing contributed

<sup>19</sup> Projects are typically required to identify, monitor, and report on at least one co-benefit indicator, should the program design specify co-benefits. Specific requirements are outlined in each program’s M&R toolkit.

term reviews, project completion reports, and other project M&E documents from MDBs.<sup>20</sup>

- h. *CIF Collaboration Hub (CCH)*:<sup>21</sup> Results from all of CIF's programmatic M&R systems are reported online in the CCH portal—an integrated online information management system.
- i. *Operational and results reports*: Annual program results are aggregated, analyzed, and written up for CIF's TFCs per program in a results report or operational and results report—the main annual outputs produced from the M&R systems.<sup>22</sup>
- j. *Qualitative and narrative reporting*: CIF's M&R systems rely on qualitative and narrative reporting approaches to fill information gaps and complement the quantitative results reported.

**13. CIF Impact Monitoring:** Building on the indicators already embedded in the programmatic M&R systems and other available data, this policy establishes four CIF impact-level indicators to be tracked across CIF's programs:<sup>23</sup>

- a. *Mitigation*: Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduced, avoided, or enhancement of carbon stocks (tCO<sub>2</sub> eq)
- b. *Adaptation*: Strengthened climate resilience of people (#), land (ha), and physical assets (\$)
- c. *Beneficiaries reached* (direct and indirect, disaggregated by sex)
- d. *Co-finance leveraged* (by source and by mitigation/adaptation)

14. This approach will allow CIF to better estimate high-level achievements at the core of its mission without compromising the essential features of its programmatic approach.

**15. Results Analytics:** CIF's monitoring function supports strategic enhancements of results analysis and learning at the portfolio, program, and project levels to complement the main results data directly tracked through CIF's programmatic M&R systems. The exact scope and character of these enhancements may shift as CIF's portfolio and strategic positioning shifts, or in response to the CIF TFCs' decisions. CIF monitoring supports enhanced results analytics on several fronts:

- a. *Alignment with SDGs and other international frameworks*: All CIF projects are analyzed in terms of their contribution to SDGs;<sup>24</sup> other aspects of CIF programming are analyzed vis-à-vis recipient countries' NDCs, the Energy Sector Management

---

<sup>20</sup> MDBs may have their own terminology for these reports. As stated above, reports for private-sector projects can be redacted or excerpted in line with the MDBs' privacy and information-sharing standards.

<sup>21</sup> <http://clientconnectionfifs.worldbank.org/CIF>

<sup>22</sup> CTF utilizes a standalone results report. All other CIF programs utilize combined operations and results reports. FIP and PPCR also utilize standalone country results reports submitted directly by CIF recipient country focal points.

<sup>23</sup> Specific modalities for M&R on CIF-level impact indicators are to be determined.

<sup>24</sup> As part of the investment criteria under CIF's newer programs, projects must specify their expected contributions to the SDGs. The SDGs are also included in the Integrated Results Frameworks for newer CIF programs.

Assistance Program Multi-Tier Framework (ESMAP MTF),<sup>25</sup> the Regulatory Indicators for Sustainable Energy (RISE) scores,<sup>26</sup> or other relevant international metrics.<sup>27</sup>

- b. *Development co-benefits of climate finance/impact modeling*: Co-benefit indicators are tracked directly in some CIF programs. Impact modeling<sup>28</sup> is used elsewhere to estimate CIF projects' contributions to a suite of social and economic development impacts beyond CIF's primary goals.
- c. *Real-time monitoring*: For select CIF programming where limited results are expected to materialize during the initial annual reporting years,<sup>29</sup> an active "real-time" monitoring approach is deployed to better capture early outcomes and close the interim knowledge gap.
- d. *Geographic, thematic, and/or sectoral analyses*: CIF dissects results monitored and reported by geography, thematic topic, and/or sector, to provide further insights on how key variables within the portfolio are performing.

**16. Non-Programmatic M&R**: Some specialized CIF initiatives and funding windows with specific M&R needs may fit either within, outside, or across CIF's programmatic approach to M&R.<sup>30</sup> CIF deploys tailored monitoring solutions to capture results from these areas,<sup>31</sup> while maintaining the programmatic M&R systems as the foundation of CIF monitoring.

**17. Capacity Building**: Recognizing that CIF recipient countries have a broad range of available resources and institutional capacity with respect to monitoring and reporting on climate finance delivery, CIF's monitoring approach includes further capacity-building support, training, and engagement opportunities to countries, based on interest and demand. In-country M&R training support is provided on a yearly basis to select recipient countries.

## 5.2 Evaluation Function

**18.** The purpose of CIF's evaluation function is to generate evidence and insights that stimulate learning to inform and enhance current and future climate finance investments. CIF's approach to this function is unique amongst climate funds, as it strikes a balance between applied learning undertaken in close partnership with the programs and the use of strategic independent evaluations to synthesize broader lessons from programs and projects, including for accountability and the provision of open information to stakeholders and the

---

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.esmap.org/node/55526>

<sup>26</sup> <https://rise.esmap.org/>

<sup>27</sup> As part of the Joint-IFI (International Financial Institution) Technical Working Group led by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), CIF encourages MDBs to adhere to joint-IFI standards, such as climate finance metrics and HIPSO (Harmonized Indicators for Private Sector Operations) indicators, in relevant CIF projects.

<sup>28</sup> <https://www.jointimpactmodel.org/>

<sup>29</sup> Such as the Global Energy Storage Program (GESP)

<sup>30</sup> For example, the Dedicated Grant Mechanism (DGM); the CIF Climate Ventures (CCV); GESPP; the Technical Assistance Facility (TAF); COVID-19 Green Recovery; the Dedicated Private Sector Program (DPSP); and the Business Development for Resilience Program (BDRP)

<sup>31</sup> For example, complementary mandatory indicators, third-party monitoring, real-time learning, optional indicators, case studies, etc.

public. Its activities are guided by an Advisory Group that helps to ensure its independence and wider strategic relevance.

### 5.2.1 Unique Features of CIF Evaluation

19. **Evaluation and Learning Advisory Group:** To ensure transparency, accountability, and flexibility, as well as to maximize quality and relevance, the TFC established the Evaluation and Learning (E&L) Initiative Advisory Group in 2015. The Advisory Group advises the E&L team and the TFCs on priorities and allocation of funds for evaluation approaches and evidence-based learning. It provides ongoing strategic advice and quality assurance for the E&L work plan and strategy.
20. The Advisory Group is made up of individuals with expertise in learning, evaluation, and/or program implementation in CIF or related climate finance contexts. Specific membership includes representatives of recipient countries; donor countries; MDBs; CIF observers; the CIF Administrative Unit; as well as external experts in the fields of climate change, climate finance, evaluation, and/or learning who are not affiliated with CIF or MDBs' independent evaluation offices.
21. **Strategic Business Plans and Annual Work Plans:** There are two important operational documents governing the selection and planning of CIF's evaluations:
  - a. *Business plans:* CIF develops strategic, multi-year E&L business plans to guide its work, both in terms of the themes and topics to explore, as well as the formats in which publications will be delivered and disseminated. The business plans, developed through extensive consultations with CIF's stakeholders and external experts across multiple organizations, include priority activities and outcomes. Each business plan is approved by the TFC in accordance with the E&L business plan cycle, which can be 3–5 years.
  - b. *Annual work plans:* Annual E&L work plans are developed based on the business plans, ongoing consultations, and experience. These plans specify E&L activities and associated annual budgets. Work plans are also approved by the TFC.
22. Following extensive consultations with key stakeholders, five outcome areas were determined as key to achieving the objectives of the CIF E&L Initiative. These outcome areas are: (a) evaluations and research for a stronger evidence base; (b) deepened facilitated learning with key partners and stakeholders; (c) the development of tools and guidance to drive operational use; (d) contextualized country- and institutional-level uptake; along with (e) strengthened partnerships for collaborative learning.
23. Priority themes and topics identified by key stakeholders include transformational change; the mobilization of private-sector finance; the development impacts of climate finance, including just transitions; local stakeholder engagement; as well as program- and sector-specific priorities. These outcomes and priority areas have been approved by the TFC and provide a framework to guide the business plans and annual work plans. Important cross-

cutting themes, including gender and inclusivity, are mainstreamed into all E&L activities to the extent relevant and feasible.

## 5.2.2 Evaluation Approaches and Methods

24. CIF approaches evaluation as the systematic and rigorous assessment of an ongoing or completed program, project, or policy, including its design, implementation, and results. This means evaluating both processes and results, as well as why or how they have occurred, and what this means for stakeholders. To support both its usefulness and timeliness, evaluative work is linked to programs and projects through feedback loops, which ensure that the design of future programs and projects benefit from the results and lessons of past and current experiences. While MDBs have their own independent evaluation offices with periodic commitments for accountability, CIF complements these activities with programmatic and thematic evaluations and studies that analyze results and lessons across and within CIF programs and projects. The following types of evaluative work are potential contributions by CIF:

- a. *Diagnostic assessments* clarify context, risks, opportunities, and/or issues prior to program and project design, thereby contributing to the development of country investment plans, strategies, and projects.
- b. *Design evaluations* enhance the design of programs and projects by assessing context and guiding design features, while ensuring that context and design are relevant and coherent.
- c. *Implementation evaluations* are conducted at various points during the implementation of programs—most often as mid-term evaluations or formative evaluations—to support the periodic or ongoing refinement of programs.
- d. *Economic evaluative approaches*, assessing the costs and associated benefits of program and project implementation, are implemented as part of larger evaluations.
- e. *Outcome/impact evaluations* tend to be summative evaluations that take place toward the end of a program or project (outcome), or some time after the project or program implementation. These evaluations may serve accountability and/or learning functions.
- f. *Experimental and quasi-experimental impact evaluations* aim to build evidence on the causal attribution of specific interventions in climate finance to their observed impacts.<sup>32</sup>
- g. *Thematic/synthesis evaluations* analyze evidence and experiences across multiple existing evaluations, studies, and other inputs to generate higher-level insights and

---

<sup>32</sup> These include partnerships with agencies, such as the World Bank's Development Impact Evaluation (DIME) group, to produce real-time impact evaluations of select CIF projects; see <https://www.worldbank.org/en/research/dime/overview>.

learning on key cross-cutting issues or thematic areas. These insights are particularly important for informing new program and project development, as well as providing broader insights for accountability, learning, and systemic (or transformative) change.

*h. Real-time evaluations* provide immediate (i.e., real-time) feedback to those planning or implementing a project or program so that they can make improvements while the project or program is still under implementation. Hence, they are formative evaluations of intermediary results and lessons.

25. CIF's user-focused and demand-led approach to evaluation, guided by the Advisory Group and the TFC, both ensures timeliness within the program or project lifecycle and enables the use of a range of methods to generate practical, applied insights. The goal is to create value for priority audiences and users of the evaluative work. The selection of evaluative methods is informed by the guiding [principles](#) of MEL. The use and uptake of lessons from evaluations and studies by key stakeholders are systematically documented and analyzed to help enable further learning and enhance decision-making related to future activities.
26. In response to user needs, recognizing the complexity of climate action, and following the MEL principles, CIF favors a mixed-methods approach to evaluative work, drawing on both quantitative and qualitative data and using a range of data collection techniques. The use of mixed methods: increases confidence in the validity and reliability of evaluation results by providing opportunities for triangulation across data sources; creates opportunities to reveal unanticipated results; provides a deeper understanding of why change is or is not occurring as planned; and solicits a wider range of perspectives than might be captured by a single method. The methods chosen describe, on a fit-for-purpose basis, progress, results (for example, what happened), explanatory factors (for example, why, how, for whom, and under what conditions), and lessons that can be applied internally to CIF, as well as externally.

### **5.3 Learning Function**

27. CIF has a strong commitment to ensuring that both monitoring and evaluation activities contribute to learning at multiple levels as a means to support the broader objectives of climate finance, including improved program and project design, management, and impact.
28. By integrating learning processes with M&E processes, CIF grounds operations in relevant insights and supports the deepening of systemic change. Monitoring data can help reveal implementation issues and track emerging results year-on-year, whereas evaluation is positioned to generate deep insights into systemic structures, along with underlying causes or mechanisms that shape program and project outcomes. In combination, the application of monitoring and evaluation to learning can deepen learning processes, help find ways to overcome challenges, and build capacity for transformational change.



### 5.3.1 Approach to Learning

29. CIF-supported learning involves the systematic reflection on and the application of experiences and knowledge, with the aim to improve practices linked to climate action and sustainable development. Learning approaches and methods, driven by users and intended uses, as well as by learning questions and needs, are tailored to different contexts. There is a deep focus on enhancing learning and the uptake of insights at the country and institutional levels through various tools and modalities. Several of CIF's learning approaches provide direct feedback loops with the programming and design of new projects, while other activities contribute indirectly and focus on learning at different points in the programming cycle.
30. Learning is supported through a variety of tools, mechanisms, and functions:
- a. *South-South learning platforms*: CIF recipient countries and in-country stakeholders are brought together virtually or in-person to share and learn from each other's experiences. South-South learning can take place multilaterally (for example, CIF's program-specific pilot country meetings), bilaterally (for example, country-to-country thematic exchanges), or regionally (for example, regional resilience forums). CIF also supports select South-North and North-South learning opportunities, depending on stakeholder demand.
  - b. *Targeted analytics and/or studies*: CIF supports strategically targeted analytics and/or studies to directly fill knowledge gaps articulated by CIF stakeholders and partners over time. These may be thematic, sector-driven, country-driven, or exploratory in nature.
  - c. *Delivery case studies*: To fill the knowledge gap on how to implement climate finance effectively on the ground, CIF supports project-level delivery case studies, which help generate practical insights on project delivery solutions, challenges, and lessons for climate and development practitioners.
  - d. *Facilitated learning partnerships*: Diverse stakeholders engage with key themes on a systematic and periodic basis, sharing and discussing thematic issues and their challenges. Facilitated learning leads to the co-creation of content and tools while also providing a platform for stakeholders to contribute to shared learning and change processes.<sup>33</sup>
  - e. *Real-time learning*: For select CIF programming where interventions may be novel and core results are only expected to materialize over longer time horizons,<sup>34</sup> a real-time learning approach strengthens short-term feedback loops by generating

---

<sup>33</sup> Two examples of this are the [Transformational Change Learning Partnership](#) and the [Just Transitions Initiative](#). Both bring together diverse organizations to share knowledge and learning, create tools and guidance, as well as move the discourse on how to design for, implement, assess, and evaluate key thematic areas of relevance to climate action.

<sup>34</sup> Such as in GESP

learning on emergent issues throughout early- to mid-stages of implementation. This helps to close interim knowledge gaps and enable course-correction while CIF pipelines are taking shape.

- f. Learning resources:* Learning resources, such as reports, briefs, guidance documents, and toolkits, enable the purpose-driven dissemination of knowledge to a broad set of users. CIF's learning resources help support specific aspects of its operations, inform the design of future investments, and contribute relevant climate finance knowledge to the global public commons. They are made widely available in the knowledge repository section of the CIF website.
- g. Workshops (virtual or in person):* Workshops can be used to both generate and disseminate learning. Half-day to multi-day workshops provide sustained amounts of time for participants to generate new insights, absorb material, and cement learning through exercises and conversations with speakers and other participants.
- h. Webinars:* Webinars can be used to both generate and disseminate learning. They enable global access to learning events, particularly when recordings and resources are made available online.
- i. Training and capacity building:* On-demand training modules, such as packaged online courses,<sup>35</sup> enable a broad audience to access information at a time that suits them. CIF also supports targeted training and capacity-building activities, such as in-country, instructor-led training, and other engagements, to support countries and MDBs with MEL, gender, or other CIF priority areas.
- j. Cross-climate fund and joint-IFI platforms:* As a pilot multilateral climate fund, CIF's mandate includes sharing lessons with and disseminating knowledge to other climate funds<sup>36</sup>. CIF also engages within joint-IFI technical working groups, such as those aiming to harmonize global climate finance results measurement metrics.
- k. Innovative exhibitions and experiential learning:* CIF creates innovative exhibitions and experiential learning experiences—for example, virtual reality videos of CIF projects, site tours, street exhibits, and interactive virtual storytelling—to deepen strategic learning engagements among select audiences.
- l. Knowledge newsletters:* Newsletters enable the broad dissemination of learning resources and information about learning events—both upcoming and past.

---

<sup>35</sup> For example, CIF's M&R training modules are available for the FIP and PPCR countries in English, French, and Spanish.

<sup>36</sup> For example, GCF, GEF, the Adaptation Fund, and the NAMA Facility

*m. Participation in partner events:* CIF and CIF stakeholders also participate in global events and events hosted by partner organizations, which enables the dissemination of knowledge to new networks.

31. CIF produces a range of dissemination and outreach tools, including briefs, summaries, blogs, social media engagement, posters, webinars, workshops, and presentation slide decks to support learning approaches. With support from the CIF communications team, the aim of dissemination and outreach is to use pull and push communication strategies to ensure that both broad and targeted audiences are able to easily access the outputs from CIF's MEL work. Efforts are made to ensure that the materials are accessible—written in clear and concise language, translated into local languages, and compliant with accessibility standards for persons with disabilities. Efforts are also made to benefit from the complementarities and coherence between climate funds and partner MDBs such that outreach efforts are strengthened and lessons disseminated to broader audiences.

## 6 Minimum Requirements and Quality Standards

32. CIF strives to both exemplify and enhance international norms and standards in climate finance MEL as a leader in the field. To deliver on its MEL objectives, CIF therefore adheres to essential minimum requirements and quality standards. These requirements and standards apply in principle to all CIF stakeholders, although stakeholder groups fulfill differentiated [roles and responsibilities](#) with respect to their application.

### 6.1 Monitoring

#### 6.1.1 Minimum Monitoring Requirements

33. The majority of CIF's minimum monitoring requirements relate to the annual program results reporting function [described](#) previously. Other relevant monitoring activities should meet the same minimum requirements and quality standards if applicable. While comprehensive guidance on annual reporting can be found in CIF's M&R toolkits, the following requirements establish an essential minimum threshold:

- a. All CIF recipient countries, MDBs, and CIF-funded projects are required to participate in annual results reporting by fulfilling their roles and responsibilities, as specified in each program's M&R system.<sup>37</sup>
- b. MDB Board approval triggers the formal requirement for CIF projects to begin reporting their annual results to CIF. Upon their MDB Board approval, CIF projects must establish their expected results for all applicable core, co-benefit, and optional indicators.<sup>38</sup> Projects must also have prepared a full project log frame by this date, in line with their respective MDB's standards and protocols. All expected results and

---

<sup>37</sup> CIF's M&R systems are introduced in the programs' (integrated) results frameworks and established within the programs' M&R toolkits.

<sup>38</sup> Expected results should already have been established prior to a project's submission to the CIF TFC for approval. However, these expected results may be refined up until the MDB Board's approval, at which point they are officially reported for CIF's M&R purposes. Expected results cannot be changed after this period unless the project undergoes an approved re-structuring.

the full project log frame should be reported to CIF during the first annual results reporting period that follows the MDB Board approval date.

- c. During the annual reporting period, CIF projects<sup>39</sup> must report achieved results from all core indicators relevant to their design and intended outcomes. For CIF programs with co-benefit indicators, projects must report on at least one co-benefit indicator.<sup>40</sup> Projects are not required to report on optional CIF indicators but are highly encouraged to do so when a CIF optional indicator matches closely with their design and intended outcomes. In addition, CIF projects must share the most recently available results in the project log frame,<sup>41</sup> per the timelines and standards of the respective MDB.
- d. At project completion, CIF projects must report the final results achieved on the relevant core indicators, co-benefit indicators, and optional indicators. The projects must also share the project completion report<sup>42</sup> generated through their respective MDB's protocol. Once the report is shared and a project is closed in CIF's portfolio management system, the annual results reporting ceases for that project. In some cases, CIF may apply the value reported in the final year to a projected lifetime result.<sup>43</sup> Country-driven reporting [see (h) below] ceases when the last CIF project in a country's investment plan reaches completion.
- e. All results reporting should take place in the CCH—CIF's online information management system—by the agreed-upon annual deadline.
- f. All data reported should be accompanied by the relevant unit(s) of measurement. Where indicators may be reported using different methodologies,<sup>44</sup> CIF projects must identify the baseline methodology and report any methodological changes undertaken during the annual results reporting period that follows the change.
- g. Disaggregated reporting on CIF core indicators is required, per the disaggregation stipulated in each program's M&R system. CIF project indicators measuring people must be disaggregated by sex if feasible, in accordance with the *CIF Gender Policy*.<sup>45</sup> For CIF project outcomes or outputs that are directly relevant to the social inclusion

---

<sup>39</sup> It should be noted that FIP and PPCR have some national- and program-level core indicators that are reported by the CIF country focal point rather than by each project. All other CIF programs have core indicators that must be reported per project. The latter are then aggregated at the program level by CIF.

<sup>40</sup> MDBs may select a co-benefit indicator from the list provided by CIF, or they may propose another viable co-benefit indicator.

<sup>41</sup> Log frame results might be found in supervision reports, other implementation reports, mid-term reviews, etc. Terminology may differ across MDBs.

<sup>42</sup> The terminology in "project completion reports", i.e., end-line project evaluations, may also differ across the MDBs.

<sup>43</sup> For example, GHG emissions reductions achieved through renewable energy projects, which continue to generate renewable energy well beyond the lifetime of the project

<sup>44</sup> CIF follows joint-IFI approaches when possible and encourages harmonized methodologies to the greatest extent feasible via direct guidance in M&R toolkits. However, since the CIF projects rely on MDBs' own policies and implementation standards for project delivery, some divergence in methodologies is inevitable. Similarly, some core indicators have significant flexibility built into their measurement protocols to accommodate the broad range of project types possible within a single program.

<sup>45</sup> World Bank Group, 2018, [CIF Gender Policy](#).

of other sub-populations,<sup>46</sup> disaggregation by these sub-populations is highly encouraged.

- h. Country focal points must report to CIF in accordance with the stipulations of each program's M&R system.
  - i. All FIP and PPCR country focal points representing recipient countries with investment plans/SPCRs under implementation<sup>47</sup> must submit annual country results reports to CIF by the agreed-upon annual deadline, following their annual M&R stakeholder workshops.
  - ii. All recipient country focal points in newer CIF programs are, in collaboration with CIF and MDBs, expected to identify metrics from their national climate change policies and planning frameworks, national M&E, and/or related statistical systems that are relevant to their country's CIF investment plan. Each country should report the annual progress of these metrics per the national monitoring approach established at the time of the CIF investment plan's endorsement.
  - iii. In all CIF programs, MDBs must coordinate with country focal points throughout the investment plan lifecycle, thus enabling country focal points to access, validate, and review results on a regular basis.

### **6.1.2 Monitoring Quality Standards**

34. CIF's monitoring quality standards cover multiple foci in the M&R ecosystem.
35. The data quality of project results is ultimately the responsibility of MDBs, based on their respective standards, policies, and protocols. At their point of submission to CIF, results data are entered into the CCH, a centralized information hub with built-in quality assurance mechanisms.
36. CIF provides guidance to MDBs on indicator definitions, measurement approaches, and reporting protocols during the design phase. When aggregating results data across projects for a program in a given results reporting period, CIF validates unclear reporting issues with MDBs, verifies values reported year-on-year for consistency, and triangulates the results achieved across CIF projects in the program to identify potential outliers. CIF also engages in relevant cross-climate fund and joint-IFI communities of practice and technical working groups to ensure that monitoring approaches remain relevant and innovative in the field.
37. CIF TFCs review annual results achieved to ensure that programs and funds are making progress. Contributor countries review and track CIF's results for their own purposes and may also ask for further clarifications when needed.

---

<sup>46</sup> For example, historically excluded or marginalized groups, indigenous peoples, local communities, youth and elderly persons, ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities, and/or other vulnerable groups

<sup>47</sup> One exception relates to PPCR countries that only have BDRP projects approved. These countries are not required to report.

38. In the participatory approaches used to monitor and report on FIP and PPCR, annual multi-stakeholder workshops enable diverse constituencies<sup>48</sup> to weigh in and validate the overall results presented<sup>49</sup> in a dual quality assurance and watchdog function. For all CIF programs, CIF Observers also have a chance to review annual operations and results reports and raise issues related to the quality of program delivery during the TFC meetings.

## 6.2 Evaluation

39. The E&L Initiative enables both independent and participatory assessments of strategic cross-cutting areas using robust evaluative inquiry processes and multiple methodologies.

40. Through its positioning within CIF, and under guidance from the Advisory Group, the Initiative leverages CIF's institutional and governance structure to deliver evaluative insights and learning that are relevant both strategically and operationally. The E&L Advisory Group provides independent oversight and ensures broad strategic relevance, thus enhancing CIF's ability to prioritize evaluation themes and issues that are relevant not only to CIF but also to the wider climate finance architecture. The Initiative's multi-year business plans and annual work plans, including key E&L activities, are developed collaboratively with the E&L Advisory Group and approved by the TFCs.

### 6.2.1 Minimum Evaluation Requirements

41. In order to enhance the quality and relevance of evaluative studies, key stakeholders are required to select members to serve on the E&L Advisory Group as follows:

- a. Two members from recipient countries;
- b. One member from a donor country;
- c. One member from an MDB;
- d. One member from the CIF Observers;
- e. One member from the CIF Administrative Unit (the Senior E&L Specialist);
- f. Three external experts not affiliated with CIF or a MDB independent evaluation office.

42. The E&L Initiative, working with the Advisory Group, identifies and prioritizes evaluation activities. The specific timing of evaluations is then determined by the relevant TFC body, in line with the approved E&L annual work plans. At a minimum,<sup>50</sup> CIF's program-level mid-term evaluations should occur approximately 5–7 years into CIF program implementation, as/when appropriate and subject to TFC approval. Furthermore, program-level, end-of-term evaluations should occur approximately 8–12 years into CIF program implementation, as/when appropriate and subject to TFC approval. In addition, every few years, the TFC can

---

<sup>48</sup> For example, national and local government agencies; project management teams; MDB representatives; non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society; academia; local communities; the private sector; and other stakeholder groups

<sup>49</sup> These programs also rely on a second channel of M&R data directly sourced from MDBs' project log frames. CIF harvests several relevant categories of project indicators across projects and analyzes them at CIF's program level to serve as a complement to the more limited data available through the country's reporting channels.

<sup>50</sup> Existing CIF programs created, prior to the approval of this policy, are not universally subject to this minimum requirement; however, the relevant TFC body and/or individual members can still instigate or recommend evaluations of existing programs through the TFC's decisions and/or inputs into the E&L annual workplans.

request an independent evaluation of CIF, including its MEL systems. The minimum evaluation requirements for CIF projects (versus programs) are governed and implemented by MDBs. However, these MDB project evaluations should be shared with CIF upon completion.

43. Three different modalities are used to conduct CIF's evaluations and studies:

- a. Commissioning of independent evaluation firms and/or individuals, in line with CIF procurement policies;
- b. CIF Administrative Unit-led evaluative studies; and
- c. CIF partner-led studies (including from MDBs and recipient countries).

44. MDBs, recipient countries, and the implementers of CIF projects are required to participate by providing information for CIF evaluations<sup>51</sup> and facilitating field or headquarters (HQ) visits for evaluation consultants or other implementers, as relevant and appropriate.<sup>52</sup> During the evaluation process, CIF projects must report on all the required information relevant to the evaluation, as determined by the evaluators. This includes providing access to M&E data, interim and final project reports, along with any other relevant project-level information. In addition, MDBs should facilitate access to key stakeholders, including task team leaders (TTLs) and project counterparts, to fulfill evaluation data collection requirements.

### 6.2.2 Evaluation Norms

45. The CIF conducts evaluations in adherence to the guiding [principles](#) of MEL, as well as international evaluation norms and professional standards,<sup>53</sup> and with guidance from leading experts in the fields of E&L and subject matter experts in climate change mitigation and adaptation. A variety of approaches and methods considered to be international best practices in evaluation and evidence-based learning are used.

46. General norms for CIF evaluations include the following:

- a. *Utility*: The commissioning and conducting of evaluations is based on the relevance and timeliness of the contribution to internal and external learning, innovation, decision-making, and accountability.
- b. *Credibility*: Transparent evaluation, consultation, and review processes, as well as relevant methodological approaches, enhance the credibility of CIF evaluations. Credibility requires that evaluations examine both what has and has not worked well. It also requires that the stakeholders who are directly impacted by the programs and projects being evaluated be fully engaged throughout the evaluation process.

---

<sup>51</sup> Subject to each MDB's access to information policy

<sup>52</sup> Considerations related to timing, logistics, safety, and other factors will be discussed and agreed with MDB and recipient country counterparts, on a case-by-case basis.

<sup>53</sup> See, for example, OECD DAC's International Evaluation Criteria, as well as those from the American Evaluation Association (AEA), the Environmental and Social Standards (EES), the African Evaluation Association (AfrEA), CES, etc.

- c. *Ethics*: Evaluations are performed with integrity, honesty, and cultural sensitivity, with evaluators respecting cultural, language, gender, and other differences throughout the evaluation process.

### **6.2.3 Evaluation Quality Assurance**

- 47. Technical evaluation staff help design, manage, and oversee the implementation of CIF evaluations for quality and relevance, in conjunction with independent evaluation firms and other partners or stakeholders. In addition to the E&L Advisory Group, CIF also uses reference groups and peer reviewers, particularly in large independent evaluations, to advise on the design and implementation of evaluations. These consist of CIF constituencies and external groups, including representatives from recipient countries, contributor countries, MDBs, CIF Observers, the CIF Administrative Unit, and external experts. CIF's program and thematic units (for example, gender), MDBs, project staff, recipient country focal points, and independent reviewers—in addition to any reference groups established for specific evaluations—are given the opportunity to review draft reports containing information relevant to their institutions, projects, contexts, or thematic areas before publication.
- 48. Comments and feedback received by reviewers are systematically tracked and responded to by the evaluation staff. For major independent evaluations, a consolidated management response approved by senior leadership in the MDBs is further included, if/as appropriate. All these groups help to ensure the relevance of operational learning and decision-making, the quality of interim and final deliverables, the dissemination of evaluation outputs, along with the use and uptake of key findings and lessons emanating from the evaluations within relevant networks and institutions.

## **6.3 Learning**

### **6.3.1 Minimum Learning Requirements**

- 49. CIF's learning requirements cover both specific learning engagements (for example, facilitated learning platforms, events, and webinars) and learning products (for example, knowledge products, studies, and other non-evaluative pieces). At a minimum, they should adhere to the following:
  - a. Learning activities should be of clear relevance to CIF's core mission, programs, and/or investment areas.
  - b. Learning should be grounded in CIF's business model, helping to inform the design and delivery of country investment plans and/or disseminating lessons generated thereof.
  - c. Learning activities should seek broad participation and inclusion of CIF stakeholders and other participants from diverse backgrounds. Efforts should be made to ensure accessibility for marginalized social groups, including through the provision of translation and interpretation services as feasible. Learning activities should enable



- opportunities not only for participation but also as a platform for diverse voices to be heard.
- d. Active participation should be encouraged within a safe environment where participants exhibit respect for differences in opinion or understanding.
  - e. Learning should be demand-driven (i.e., rather than supply-driven) to ensure that it is fulfilling direct or indirect needs of CIF constituencies, as relevant to CIF's core mission, programs, and/or investment areas.
  - f. CIF learning activities should seek to fill global knowledge gaps with unique contributions, ensuring that they are not directly replicating pre-existing studies or bodies of evidence.
  - g. As a learning laboratory for climate finance, CIF should ensure that the lessons and learning activities are made available both to other climate funds and other non-CIF stakeholders relevant to the area of climate finance.

### 6.3.2 Learning Norms

50. CIF places a strong emphasis on organizational<sup>54</sup> and social learning,<sup>55</sup> because climate action and transformational change require collaboration among a large number of diverse actors. Such a focus acknowledges that individuals and organizations operate within larger social and ecological systems. Learning processes thus need to support both an understanding of these larger systems<sup>56</sup> and the ability to generate new knowledge to change these systems. CIF's MEL approach supports learning processes that encourage both first order-learning, which leads to incremental change at the operational and project levels, and second-order learning, which can transform underlying assumptions and thus lead to more fundamental strategic changes at the programmatic level.<sup>57</sup>
51. Given the complex, contested, and context-specific nature of the climate crisis, MEL processes support collective reflection and action amongst individuals and organizations, while acknowledging the structural arrangements and power relationships that enable and constrain climate action and transformational change. CIF is well-positioned to mediate and support such organizational and social learning within and across MDBs, countries, and institutions, thereby supporting climate finance and associated climate action both globally and locally. Processes related to the programmatic approach, cross-sectoral collaboration,

---

<sup>54</sup> Mark Easterby-Smith, Luis Araujo, and John Burgoyne, eds., 1999, *Organizational Learning and the Learning Organization: Developments in Theory and Practice*, London/Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

<sup>55</sup> Arjen E. J. Wals, ed., 2009, *Social Learning towards a Sustainable World: Principles, Perspectives, and Praxis*, Reprint, Wageningen: Wageningen Acad. Publ.

<sup>56</sup> Peter M. Senge, 2006, *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*, Revised and Updated, London: Random House Business Books.

<sup>57</sup> Chris Argyris, 1976, "Single-Loop and Double-Loop Models in Research on Decision Making," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 21 (3): 363–75.

country investment plans, project design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation all provide opportunities for learning. MEL processes, in particular, bring diverse interests together in situations of collaboration, mutual respect, and trust to enhance possibilities for learning and change.

## 7 Data Governance, Standards, and Ethics

52. Data are the essential building blocks of all CIF MEL activities. In a rapidly evolving global data landscape, data have both tremendous potential to drive transformational change and inherent risks that could cause harm.<sup>58</sup> This section sets out CIF’s standards and ethics related to MEL data security, data usage, data access and transparency, data integrity, and citation considerations. They are intended to both guide and protect CIF stakeholders involved in MEL activities.<sup>59</sup>

53. **Data Security:** As a Multi-Donor Trust Fund hosted within the World Bank Group, CIF adheres to all World Bank Group policies pertaining to data security and data privacy, including but not limited to the *Personal Data Privacy Policy*<sup>60</sup> and the *Information Security Policy for Contractors*.<sup>61</sup> CIF’s data security standards apply broadly to primary data or information gathered by CIF directly; data or information submitted to CIF through correspondence; and data or information uploaded to the controlled-access CCH as part of the annual results reporting or other CCH data transmission processes.

54. As stipulated by the World Bank Group’s data security and privacy policies, all personal data collected through CIF MEL activities must be protected to ensure privacy. Persons providing such data should provide informed consent based on their awareness of how the data will be collected, stored, and used. Only personal data that are directly needed should be collected. CIF’s data governance must also ensure safe and secure data collection and storage, as well as a reasonable plan for data tenure and destruction following the intended lifespan of the data.<sup>62</sup>

55. **Data Usage:** CIF is committed to optimizing the use of available data to support transformational climate action. Data gathered should contribute to, and be necessary for, fulfilling this purpose. Broadly, a growing recognition of data as a valuable factor for supporting development needs<sup>63</sup> is to be balanced with emerging legal frameworks for personal data protection.<sup>64</sup> While adhering to applicable World Bank Group policies, CIF promotes the following ethical considerations for responsible data usage:

- a. Additionality from data usage;
- b. Necessity of data usage;

---

<sup>58</sup> World Bank Group, 2021, [World Development Report 2021: Data for Better Lives](#).

<sup>59</sup> This includes both direct CIF actors—the CIF Administrative Unit, MDBs, country focal points, project teams—and outside actors involved in CIF’s MEL activities, for example, research consultants and contractors.

<sup>60</sup> World Bank Group, 2020, [Personal Data Privacy Policy](#).

<sup>61</sup> World Bank Group, 2016, [Information Security Policy for Contractors](#).

<sup>62</sup> For example, all personal data should be destroyed following its immediate purpose. Non-personal data related to results, evaluation findings, or learning activities may be stored and used later if in service to CIF’s mission/mandate.

<sup>63</sup> For example, World Bank Group, 2019, *Information and Communications for Development*; World Bank Group, 2018, *Data-Driven Development*

<sup>64</sup> For example, European Union (EU), 2016, *General Data Protection Regulation [(GDPR) (EU) 2016/679]*

- c. Respect for the data usage policies of MDBs and other partners;
- d. Informed consent;
- e. Data transfer, sharing, and ownership; and
- f. Responsive procedures in the case of a data breach.

56. **Data Access and Transparency:** Transparency is an essential element of CIF MEL’s ethical execution ([Principle 9](#)), which can help establish trust, enhance stakeholder ownership, and increase public accountability and learning. CIF aims to maximize access to information, while setting out a clear list of exceptions, in line with tenets of the World Bank Group’s *Access to Information Policy*.<sup>65</sup> All CIF program results are published online annually for a public audience. Independent evaluations, studies, analytics, and other learning-related publications are also made available online for a public audience. Specific requests from CIF stakeholders and outside parties for additional access to MEL data are considered on an ad hoc basis, per the stipulations of this policy and other applicable CIF governance policies.
57. **Data Integrity:** CIF MEL results and findings may, at times, lead to discrepancies or dissatisfaction amongst stakeholders. To mitigate this occurrence, all key stakeholders who provide information to a CIF MEL report should have the opportunity to validate the presentation of results or findings for accuracy. Should disagreements persist after the validation period, CIF follows the World Bank Group’s Code of Ethics<sup>66</sup> and related procedures<sup>67</sup> to protect the integrity of MEL results and findings.
58. **CIF Results Citations:** CIF results reporting follows an annual cycle. All results data for a given results year are validated within the annual results reports submitted to CIF’s TFC members during the following year. CIF uses the most recent annual results reported for all official citations in internal and external communications, events, official documents, and other channels until new annual results reports become available.

## 8 Conclusion

59. This policy will enter into force upon approval from the CIF Joint CTF-SCF TFC. While the policy seeks to define and guide the common principles, roles, functions, and other considerations as a blueprint for undertaking MEL in CIF, more specific MEL approaches and activities may evolve over time in response to CIF’s maturation, emerging priorities, lessons learned, and TFC decisions. Detailed guidance and plans of action to implement holistic, integrated MEL in new CIF programming may be further developed following the adoption of this policy.

---

<sup>65</sup> World Bank Group, 2015, [Access to Information Policy](#).

<sup>66</sup> World Bank Group, 2020, [Code of Ethics](#).

<sup>67</sup> These might include publicizing non-retaliation policies (for example, WBG Staff Rule 8.02) to staff and consultants, and encouraging the reporting of concerns through a variety of channels (for example, the Ombudsman Services and Ethics Helpline).



## THE CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

c/o The World Bank Group  
1818 H Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20433 USA

Telephone: +1 (202) 458-1801  
Internet: [www.climateinvestmentfunds.org](http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org)

## The Climate Investment Funds

The Climate Investment Funds (CIF) were established in 2008 to mobilize resources and trigger investments for low carbon, climate resilient development in select middle and low income countries. To date, 14 contributor countries have pledged funds to CIF that have been channeled for mitigation and adaptation interventions at an unprecedented scale in 72 recipient countries. The CIF is the largest active climate finance mechanism in the world.

