Final evaluation of the project "Climate Policy and Finance Integrity: Safeguarding the Climate and Climate Finance against Corruption"

Submitted to: Transparency International Secretariat (TI-S)

FINAL REPORT | **JANUARY 2019**

UNIVERSALIA

Executive Summary

Context

The Climate Policy and Finance Integrity project of Transparency International (TI) is supported by the German Federal Ministry for Nature, Conservancy, and Nuclear Safety. It aimed to promote greater transparency, accountability, and integrity in decision-making processes and operations of climate financing institutions and mechanisms at global and national levels. The project started in August 2015 and ended in December 2018 (35 months), with a total budget of EUR 2.5 million. At its launch, it involved six participating National Chapters (NCs) within the TI movement and expanded to include three additional ones in 2017. It included activities at the local and national levels, conducted by the NCs, and at the global level, towards international climate funds, realised by the Korea NC and the project team at TI Secretariat (TI-S).

This final evaluation of the Climate Policy and Finance Integrity project was conducted by Universalia Management Group Limited (UMG) between November 2018 and January 2019. Taking place in the final stage of the project, the evaluation was designed for the purposes of learning, to inform future TI work in climate and environment integrity more broadly. For TI-S and the NCs, and additionally the donors and broad TI movement, this evaluation has sought to provide insights on the design of the project, its results, expected as well as unexpected, and their sustainability and scalability.

Methodology

The evaluation team adapted the TI Impact Monitoring approach for this evaluation, and undertook data collection through semi-structured interviews with a total of 29 individuals in-person and virtually. Interviewees included TI-S programme team, NC representatives, staff of multilateral climate finance institutions, and select country partners. The evaluation team undertook a field mission to the Maldives to participate in a validation meeting with NCs and conduct additional interviews and focus group discussions with in-country partners. The evaluation team also undertook an extensive review of project and programme documentation. While there were several challenges and limitations underpinning this evaluation related to the project scope and timeline, the evaluation team remains confident of the rigour of the findings in this report.

Findings

Relevance

The project was highly relevant to the global context in light of increasing climate finance as made evident by the establishment of the GCF. At country level, the project was highly relevant to the 9 countries where it was implemented, either from a strategic perspective or for a combination of high climate vulnerability, climate finance and corruption. The project was rendered especially relevant, given the unique nature of the project, positioned at the rare intersection of climate governance and integrity. Regarding, the project contributed significantly to three core areas of TI Strategy 2015-2020, although the Strategy itself did not prioritise thematic work.

Effectiveness

The project was successful in reaching its activities, exceeding the targets for the majority of indicators. The only area that suffered shortcomings was sustainability, as external funding was not secured for all NCs. The project approach, combining national and global levels, was appropriate and effective for the achievement of outputs and outcomes, leading to effective global-national collaboration and cross-NC learning. An excellent relationship between the staff at TI-S and NCs also favoured swift and personalised problem solving,

contributing to effectiveness. Different factors affected the project's effectiveness: internally, delay at launch and limited learning from other TI thematic programmes had a negative effect, while the project benefitted from initial climate finance mapping, selection of NCs, and the embeddedness of NCs within networks. Among the external factors that had varying effects across contexts, project effectiveness was found to be strongly linked to country contexts and the reputation of TI.

Efficiency

Efficiency for the project was high, as it operated in a lean manner, with high value for money. Because of the decentralised design of the project, structural and personnel changes within project team at TI-S did not affect the efficiency and the implementation of the project. Several anticipated risks emerged variably during the course of the project. External risks included security and political risks, while internal ones included isolation within the TI Movement and low priority for funding. The management of risks was mostly successful, ranging from complete adaption of project activities to more ad-hoc approaches.

Impact

The project made significant progress towards achieving its objectives. The project contributed to global advocacy, as well as national and local capacities for monitoring and addressing integrity concerns in climate finance delivery. Contributions of the project were moderate at the global level, and significant at national level. Beyond the project-tracked outcomes, the project also allowed TI to strengthen its reputation as an trusted partner in climate finance integrity. The project resulted in increased capacities and networks for many NCs, allowing them to assert a stronger profile.

Scalability and Sustainability

Among project results, the policy outcomes are deemed sustainable in their respective policy cycles, but require continued monitoring. Awareness raising and behaviour changes have relatively low likelihood for sustainability, as the continuity of these results is subject to context and continued efforts to promote integrity in climate finance. In the absence of explicit mechanisms of sustainability, and without the security of additional funding for scalability, sustainability of these results is not universally ensured. Among factors of sustainability and scalability, the project was negatively affected by reliance on only one donor, and faces an opportunity for strategic communication efforts, which impact the scalability of the project activities.

Recommendations

As climate finance is set to increase, many NCs are also faced with contexts where risk of corruption is high on the one hand, or on the other hand where governments are promoting climate finance integrity. In either case, the potential for the project continues to be immense, and ambition high among NCs. The evaluation found the following areas for consideration for future iterations of the project:

Recommendation 1:   The project should consider articulating more actively its clear niche in the climate finance sector, as well its niche within TI.

Recommendation 2:   Project design should consider a component for communication and outreach, targeted not only at the broader public level in the countries, but also at the global levels and within TI.

Recommendation 3:   The current project approach is considered appropriate, and needs to be built upon, so as to address the root causes of corruption in climate finance. In many contexts the project is ready for scale-up, with potential outcomes at global and national levels.

Recommendation 4:   There is a need to actively seek and explore multiple channels of funding for the project including at the NC-level, and early in the life cycle of the project.

Recommendation 5:   Better monitoring and management of risks is essential for the project, potentially with cross-learning from comparable thematic work at TI.

Acronyms

ALAC	Advocacy and Legal and Advice Centre
BMU	Bundesministerium für Umwelt (German Federal Ministry for Nature, Conservancy, and Nuclear Safety)
BMZ	Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (German Federal Ministry for Cooperation and Development)
CFII	Climate Finance Integrity Initiative
CFIP	Climate Finance Integrity Programme
COP	Conference of the Parties (to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change)
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
Danida	Danish International Development Agency
DFID	Department for International Development
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIZ	Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (German Agency for International Cooperation)
NC	Transparency International National Chapter
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OECD-DAC	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
TI	Transparency International
TI-S	Transparency International Secretariat
ToC	Theory of Change

ToR	Terms of Reference
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
VfM	Value for Money

Contents

Tables

Appendices

1 Introduction

1.2 Background of the Project

The Climate Policy and Finance Integrity project of Transparency International (TI) was designed to promote greater transparency, accountability, and integrity in decision-making processes and operations of climate financing institutions and mechanisms at all levels. This project was part of the Climate Governance Integrity Programme (CFIP) which was initiated in April 2011 alongside the launch of the Global Corruption Report on Climate Change. The current phase (2015-2018) of the project built on a previous one, to favour cooperation and partnership development among TI National Chapters (NCs) and with other stakeholders, as well as to engage more citizens through monitoring of climate finance projects and accountability mechanisms.

The project undertook activities at three levels: monitoring and addressing risks, building capacity for transformative change, and support to victims and witnesses of corruption. The project monitored outcomes in two areas: firstly, the adoption and implementation by key global and national climate finance institutions of policy or practice changes and secondly, the increase in civil society capacity to monitor and resolve governance weaknesses. The second outcome area also aimed at the constitution of three sustainable civil-society "Communities of Practice" in areas of REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation), Adaptation, and clean energy/ technology finance. Through these actions and outcomes, the project aimed to generate results in the following ways: improved transparency and participation in climate governance, increased accountability globally and nationally, enhanced protection of victims and witnesses of corruption. The project started in August 2015 and ended in December 2018 (35 months), with a total budget of EUR 2.5 million. At its launch, it involved six participating NCs and expanded to include three additional ones in 2017[1].

1.3 Purpose of Evaluation

This final evaluation was commissioned to provide an external and independent performance review and an assessment of achievements along expected results and positive changes. Conceived as a learning exercise, this evaluation assessed unexpected results, positive or negative. The evaluation was informed by past evaluations and was designed to inform future TI work in climate and environment integrity more broadly.

The overall objectives of the evaluation were identified as the following:

- Compile and provide an objective assessment of the achievements and results, weaknesses and strengths of the project.

- Generate lessons learned and good practices from the project's work under each of the three respective objectives.

- Provide clear and forward-looking recommendations that can guide Transparency International Secretariat (TI-S) and NCs in developing strategies for implementation of projects with similar objectives.

---

[1] Although partners of this project had diverse accreditation status with TI, for the purpose of this report, they are referred to as 'National Chapters' (NCs).

With the learning orientation of the evaluation, its primary audience are the TI-S, and NCs. In addition, the donors and broad TI movement are also to be considered an important audience. The evaluation report will be made available publicly by TI-S, and the general public is considered a tertiary audience of the evaluation.

2 Methodology

Evaluation Approach

Guided by Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development- Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) Evaluation Standards (OECD-DAC, 2010), the design and conduct of the evaluation was **utilisation-focused** and **participatory,** and used a **mixed-methods** approach.

TI utilises an Impact Monitoring Approach, which provided a highly relevant and effective framework for this evaluation (TI-S Monitoring Guide, 2015). While the Impact Monitoring Approach is useful for the measurement of impacts, the evaluation adapted and built on the approach of TI in order to address questions related to relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. In undertaking this assignment, the evaluation team adapted the steps of the methodology in the following ways:

a) **Mapping the Changes**: With this first step, the evaluation team examined the evaluation questions based on preliminary document review and interviews. This preliminary analysis considered the gender dimensions of the project, where applicable. Examination of key evaluation questions, discussion and reflections on impact were undertaken through virtual interviews with key programme stakeholders. The inception meeting served as a 'preliminary mapping meeting', or Step 1 of the impact monitoring approach of TI. The meeting was used to highlight a list of possible hypotheses and explanations.

b) **Strengthening the Evidence**: This step was undertaken through interviews with relevant stakeholders within TI-S, the participating NCs, as well as other relevant actors. The interviews strengthened the evidence for identified results and outcomes. While the bulk of the questions focused on data gaps, the evaluators also validated hypotheses that had been developed. This step also included a review of the project documents to further strengthen the findings. Once collected, the data was analysed and triangulated to inform the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

c) **Validation**: A workshop of participating NCs was organised by TI-S, where a session was led by the evaluation team to triangulate the evaluation findings and generate feedback from TI-S and NCs. Participants were provided with the emerging findings from the evaluation, along with lessons learnt and recommendations. Participants were then requested to provide appreciative and critical feedback on the evaluation, enriching the Evaluation Report. The workshop was held on 6-7 December 2018, in the Maldives.

Evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations are herein presented in a Final Report, with appendices included.

Note on TI Impact Monitoring Approach Methodology

As mentioned above, this evaluation adapted and built on the Impact Monitoring Approach of TI. While the TI Impact Monitoring Approach is designed to measure impact, the evaluation additionally considered questions related to relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The evaluation questions placed emphasis on learning for TI-S and NCs, rather than a primarily accountability purpose. Therefore, the approach was used only to inform the design and evaluation process, whereas the evaluation questions were independent of the approach and were specific to the project needs. Data collection tools were adapted to answer all the evaluation questions, rooted in this adapted methodology. Specifically, Impact Monitoring Approach uses a scale to monitor the organisation's contribution to the impact. Although this step remained out of the scope of the present evaluation, the step was nevertheless undertaken to collect data for project management purpose.

Methods and Data Sources

This mixed-methods evaluation drew on qualitative and quantitative data sources to answer the learning questions for this evaluation. The data was primarily collected through a review of documents and semi-structured interviews/ focus group discussions (FGDs). The evaluation team reviewed a variety of documents, including: project proposal, monitoring documents, donor reports, evaluation reports, programme theory of change, budget documents, annual reports, strategies and alignment documents, and TI corporate documents. In particular, the evaluation was mandated to draw on previous evaluation reports. This was done by assessing and comparing the insights with the 2013 CFIP Evaluation, the 2016 Learning and Sustainability Review of the Climate Finance Integrity Initiative (CFII) and the 2018 Final evaluation of the "REDD+ Governance and Finance Integrity for Africa" project[2]. Stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation

---

Individuals Interviewed (Total: 29)

TI-S Staff (Total: 3)

Global Coordinator, Project Coordinator, Former Project Officer

Participating NCs Staff (Total: 13)

Bangladesh, Costa Rica, Kenya, the Maldives, Mexico, Nepal, Peru, Rwanda, South Korea

Global Level Respondents (Total: 3)

Global Climate Fund (GCF), Global Environment Facility (GEF), German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ)

National-level Respondents in the Maldives (Total: 10)

Government, international partner, civil society actors, beneficiaries

---

included: TI-S, NC representatives, donor representative, staff of multilateral climate finance institutions, and select country partners. In conjunction with the validation meeting, additional interviews and FGDs with in-country partners were undertaken in the Maldives, contributing to external validation in one participating NC. In total, the evaluation reached 29 participants, including virtually and in-person.

Ethical Considerations

Following the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Code of Conduct (UNEG, 2008), this evaluation recognised the ethical principles in evaluation and upholds the obligations of evaluators: independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, honesty and integrity, and accountability. In addition, the evaluation team recognised the obligations to participants, and upheld the rights to provide information in confidence and made participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality. As a result, data was collected with informed consent, and reported in a way so as to provide confidentiality to participants and organisations. The data collection tools were designed to respect differences in cultures, local customs, ethnicity, age, and gender roles. Data collection tools were adapted to specific contexts and participants. Disruption was minimised, for example, by providing notice to participants for interviews, optimising demands on time, and respecting rights to privacy. It should be noted that this evaluation did not foresee any risks or harm to any individuals or organisation; there is no evidence to suggest that risks or harm had materialised.

---

[2] The REDD+ project was also part of the Climate Finance Integrity Programme at TI and aimed at improving the governance and financial integrity of the REDD+ projects being run in six African countries. It began in 2014 and finished in 2018.

Limitations

The evaluation recognises certain limitations in data collection and approach. Firstly, the evaluation was undertaken on an expedited timeline and therefore faced limitations in the collection of data. Secondly, the evaluation team was not able to access certain key respondents, including the donor. Thirdly, as the project continued over two phases, many respondents did not necessarily make the distinction between phase 1 and phase 2. As a result, some of the interview data may be confounded with the previous phase. Fourthly, the evaluation was designed to collect data primarily from the project staff, and therefore external validation in countries was limited.

The evaluation made an effort to overcome these limitations through a period of intense data collection, undertaking a validation workshop with all of the NCs represented, continued effort to reach out to external respondents, and triangulation of interview data with document review. In addition, the evaluation undertook external validation with project partners in the Maldives. The evaluation team is confident in the robustness of the evaluation findings, although the limitation remains in reaching a large body of external partners, particularly the donor.

3 Findings

3.1   Relevance

> **Finding 1:**   **The project was highly relevant to the global context in light of increasing climate finance. The project was highly relevant to the 9 countries where it was implemented, either for a combination of high climate vulnerability, climate finance and corruption, or a strategic advantage. The project was especially relevant because of the unique nature of TI work in climate finance.**

Due to the developing landscape of international climate finance, the Climate Policy and Finance Integrity project was, and remains, highly relevant to the international climate finance landscape. The project was launched in the context of adoption of the Paris Agreement and establishment of the GCF. GCF made its first disbursement in 2016, soon after the beginning of the project. While previous climate finance projects within TI were found to be ahead of their time (2013 CFIP Evaluation), the beginning of GCF disbursements in 2016 (GCF, 2017) changed the context and increased the relevance of climate finance transparency efforts. With USD 4.6 billion committed to projects and more than USD 17 billion in the pipeline for the GCF alone (GCF, 2018), the project was launched in the context of high risk of corruption and embezzlement (GIZ, 2017). All global-level respondents recognised the need for continued effort to ensure transparency and accountability at all levels, as international climate finance is expected to reach its full scale in the coming years. With the ongoing development of the GCF's institutional architecture, the project was relevant as an irreplaceable source of external feedback. A respondent from a multilateral agency stated, "TI's work is extremely relevant [to us]. There have to be organisations who keep us accountable." Furthermore, an external partner said, "[it] is very important to have projects like this one, because they give civil society a voice in the face of very complicated and gigantic climate finance programmes. They give the civil society a seat at the table".

The project was undertaken in nine countries. In seven of these countries the amount of externally-supported climate finance was already high, along with either high vulnerability to climate or high level of corruption. This combination of factors meant that these countries were or would be recipients of substantial climate finance while being vulnerable to challenges of corruption and embezzlement. Two project-countries were of different profiles than the rest: South Korea and Costa Rica. The former, as the host country of the GCF, allowed the project to benefit from continued representation at the Fund in Songdo, South Korea. The latter was integrated in the project on account of an explicit and continued commitment by the government to reducing carbon emissions. In 2018, the President of Costa Rica announced a plan to reach carbon-neutrality by 2021. Costa Rica was therefore strategically and opportunistically selected, as it contributes to diversifying the panel of participating countries, as a leader in both environment and transparency. Table 3.1 below displays a summary of country contexts, with indicators of climate finance, climate vulnerability, and perceived level of corruption. A more detailed comparison of national contexts is presented in Appendix II .

Table 3.1   Relevance per Country (Summary)

COUNTRIES	ESTIMATED SIZE OF CLIMATE FINANCE AS REPORTED BY NCS	ND-GAIN VULNERABILITY SCORE (2016) (HIGHER SCORE REPRESENTS HIGHER VULNERABILITY TO CLIMATE CHANGE)[3]		LEVEL OF CORRUPTION (CORRUPTION PERCEPTIONS INDEX) 0 (HIGHLY CORRUPT) TO 100 (VERY CLEAN)[4]		
		SCORE	RANK	YEAR[5]	SCORE	RANK
Bangladesh	USD 683.43 million (cumulative) as of June 2013	0.547	149	2012	26	144
Costa Rica	Data unavailable	0.397	73	2016	58	41
Kenya	USD 2.566 billion between 2009 and 2012	0.553	151	2012	27	139
Korea	Data unavailable	0.375	47	2012	56	45
Maldives	USD 171.04 million in funds and commitments between 2011 and 2013	0.556	154	2011 (not rated in 2012)	2.5 (i.e. 25 in the current rating system)	134
Mexico	USD 2.742 billion between 2009 and 2012	0.382	56	2012	34	105
Nepal	More than USD 96 million in active projects as of June 2018	0.520	136	2016	29	131
Peru	USD 630 million between 2009 and 2013	0.426	93	2012	38	83
Rwanda	About USD 122 million in 2015	0.555	153	2016	54	50

A key element that contributed to relevance of the project was the unique nature of TI's activities in climate finance. Respondents both within and outside TI agreed that TI is the only independent non-profit to address corruption and promote transparency in climate finance at global as well as national scales. An external partner stated: "there are no other entities working on climate finance transparency" at the global level. At the national level, NCs similarly reported that the project filled a void in their respective contexts, as a respondent said, "[Climate finance integrity] is the calling of TI, somebody should be doing that." In addition, a NC impact mapping narrative report read: "In fact, there are no Korean environmental groups or institutes

---

[3] The highest score in the 2016 index is Niger, with 0.680 (rank 181). Source: Notre Dame Global Adaptation Initiative (2016). Country Rankings – Vulnerability. Available at: https://gain-new.crc.nd.edu/ranking/vulnerability

[4] Transparency International Secretariat. (2011). Corruption Perceptions Index 2011. Berlin, Germany: Transparency International Secretariat.

Transparency International Secretariat. (2012). Corruption Perceptions Index 2012. Berlin, Germany: Transparency International Secretariat.

Transparency International Secretariat. (2016). Corruption Perceptions Index 2016. Berlin, Germany: Transparency International Secretariat.

[5] The year the NC joined the project.

that monitor the GCF except for some environmental institutions (including private ones) which are directly doing something for the GCF or working with international firms, such as the KPMG"[6]. Indeed, *all* external respondents interviewed in the Maldives attested that TI-Maldives was the only organisation in the country working on integrity and climate finance. In anticipation of increased climate finance activity and potential for corruption, national level stakeholders emphasised that TI-Maldives filled an important void that would be even more crucial for the future climate finance trajectory.

Finding 2:	The project was well aligned with TI Strategy 2010-2015, which was prevalent during project design. TI Strategy 2015-2020 does not identify thematic areas, and therefore climate is not an explicit focus therein. Yet, the project contributed to TI Strategy 2015-2020 in varying ways.

The Climate Policy and Finance Integrity project was well aligned with TI Strategy 2010-2015. The strategy included six priorities and it referred specifically to climate finance and environmental policy as examples of the first two of these priorities: *increased empowerment of people and partners around the world to take action against corruption,* and *improved implementation of anti-corruption programmes in leading institutions, businesses and the international financial system*. In addition to the six priorities, the strategy also emphasised thematic work, priorities for which would be determined based on an analysis of the NCs' strategic plans and supported through seed funding. In other words, thematic work was encouraged strategically as well as financially by the 2010-2015 strategy. The strategy also explicitly recognised the relevance of climate finance and environmental policy efforts: "Governance gaps combined with the commitment of huge amounts of resources also make corruption a risk in several key social, economic and environmental policy areas, from climate change, to humanitarian assistance, to poverty reduction and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals" (Strategy 2010-2015). The project proposal was submitted and approved, and the project launched in 2015, while the strategic period was near conclusion.

The current TI Strategy (2015-2020) is structured differently and prioritises three broad areas: 1) People and partners 2) Prevention, enforcement and justice and 3) Strong movement (Strategy 2015-2020). The Strategy does not identify thematic priorities, whether climate finance or the environment. Despite the change in TI Strategy and different prioritisation of thematic work, the project made diverse contributions to the three main strategic areas in the following ways.[7]

People and partners. An important part of project activities contributed to this area of the TI Strategy, where the project was designed to undertake trainings and workshops with members of civil society, communities and others. The project design included activities to raise awareness and build the capacity of civil society, create and consolidate climate integrity networks and work in solidarity with environmental activists. Advocacy actions were also realised in partnership with CSOs, which allowed for capacity building. In some countries, the NCs focused on climate finance project monitoring, resulting in behaviour change among local communities (Bangladesh, the Maldives, Peru, Rwanda). For instance, in the Maldives specific training events were targeted to build capacities among civil society organisations and journalists, for monitoring of climate finance.

Prevention, enforcement and justice. The project was particularly geared towards creating an impact at policy level, globally and nationally. The project undertook advocacy for the adoption and implementation of key anti-corruption policies and took measures to increase accountability of multilateral climate funds and governments. For instance, at the outset the project targeted the GCF, whose establishment was underway,

---

[6] Transparency International Korea. (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report*. (10/2018), p.11

[7] See Appendix III Additional Information: Effectiveness

as an opportunity for policy influence. The project therefore made an important contribution to this area of the 2015-2020 Strategy.

Strong movement. Directly related to the strategic areas above, the project was designed to share knowledge within and outside the movement, build the capacity of the NCs and support NCs in taking the lead on key topics. The project design did not specifically focus on movement, yet contributed to the building of a climate governance integrity movement within TI and beyond, through building of expertise, and raising awareness in a sector which otherwise does not focus strongly on integrity.

3.2 Effectiveness

Finding 3: **The project achieved nearly all of the planned interventions, exceeding the targets for the majority of indicators. The project was not able to achieve targeted results in the area of sustainability, as external funding was not secured for all NCs.**

All in all, the project achieved, nearly achieved or exceeded all its targets but one[8]. Out of 12 indicators of progress on outputs, one target was nearly achieved, two were achieved, eight were exceeded and one target was not met (please refer to Table 3.2 for a summary of effectiveness and to Appendix III for more details).

The project exceeded many targets for the outcome-level indicators, with a total of 36 policy/practice changes executed (target of 18) and 20 cases of best practice identified, or corruption corrected (target of 6). It is also noteworthy that the project made 50 policy interventions to international climate finance bodies (target of 30). The 2013 CFIP Evaluation recommended that links with other NGOs be better reported; the modification was implemented and this target was met[9]. As a

Table 3.2 Achievement of Outputs (Summary)

OUTPUT	STATUS
Output I: Policy inputs and monitoring of multilateral climate funds, with prioritisation of the Green Climate Fund, and global climate and sustainable development agreements are strengthened.	
Indicator I.1	Beyond target
Indicator I.2	Beyond target
Indicator I.3	Beyond target
Indicator I.4	Beyond target
Output II: Policy advice to reform or improve national policies and practices in project countries is strengthened	
Indicator II.1	Nearly achieved
Indicator II.2	Target achieved
Output III: Increased scale and focus of TI project Chapter actions to monitor the implementation of climate financed projects	
Indicator III.1	Beyond target
Indicator III.2	Beyond target
Output IV: Increased capacities, leadership and sustainability of civil society communities of practice	

---

[8] Data updated as of January 15, 2019. While data from NCs were being received and analysed by TI-S, they were not considered beyond this date.

[9] Indicator IV.2: By 06/2018, TI project Chapters support and build the capacity of 3 new civil society organisations (CSOs) to take on anti-corruption policy advocacy and monitoring work in the fields of clean energy/technology, REDD and adaptation. Against a target of three organisations, a total of three organisation supported and trained.

result, the project achieved the majority of its stated interventions.

Indicator IV.1	Beyond target
Indicator IV.2	Target achieved
Indicator IV.3	Beyond target
Indicator IV.4	Target not achieved

The only objective not achieved was for NCs to secure funds to ensure sustainability of the project activities. Activity IV.4: Development of business plans was implemented through the support of TI-S, but it proved challenging for the NCs to secure funds. At the end of the project, only two NCs had secured external funding, viz. Bangladesh (Department for International Development, DFID) and Kenya (Danish International Development Agency, Danida, and BMZ). In addition, two other chapters secured funds at smaller scales: Mexico (Canada-Mexico Collaboration Platform on Climate Change and Green Growth) and Peru (Global Witness UK, Citizen Participation with NC Dominican Republic, Sea Shepard Legal).

At NC level, targets were established by each NC in three broad categories corresponding to the TI theory of change: policy and institutional change, behaviour change, and outreach and awareness[10]. The achievement of outcomes was generally appreciated by NC teams and external partners. The majority of NC teams reported high satisfaction with the achievements, while two indicated that their initial targets had not been met due to delays in project launch or lack of financial resources (but were ultimately met or were on track during the evaluation). An external partner stated: "[w]e are very happy with the work [the NC] has done, so are the [beneficiaries]. [The NC] are doing a great job."

Finding 4: **The project approach was appropriate and effective for the achievement of outputs and outcomes, leading to effectiveness in global-national collaboration, and cross-NC learning. Gender was not considered explicitly in the project approach.**

The project approach was two-pronged, with national level work as the first level and global advocacy as the second. This approach was well-established, with a clear division of responsibilities, as was suggested in the 2013 CFIP Evaluation. The two-pronged approach included context-specific activities at the national level in the NCs (for instance, training of journalists and communities, and monitoring of projects), with global level advocacy undertaken by TI-S and the NC in Korea (including engagement with international climate finance bodies, through observer status and active pursuit of best practices). This approach offered many advantages.

Firstly, the global level advocacy was informed by specific experiences of NCs at the national and local level. For instance, using examples from Mexico, TI-S was able to undertake advocacy with the GCF to clarify a procurement policy. This on-ground experience was highly appreciated by global-level respondents. Indeed, a global-level respondent stated: "It would be great to get inputs from TI across all beneficiary states". Secondly, and reciprocally, TI global advocacy provided strong background to enable strong engagement with governments at the national level. As a NC representative said: "It was a message to the government that if they don't listen to us locally, we have an international platform". By linking national-level work with global discourse (as per the 2016 Learning and Sustainability Review of the CFII), both project levels reinforced and strengthened the other and increased effectiveness, which funders and other stakeholders perceived positively also in the 2013 CFIP Evaluation. Thirdly, the approach allowed NCs to benefit from the experience of others.

Cross-NC learning was made possible chiefly through Communities of Practice, favouring exchange and capacity building on a set of themes (adaptation, REDD+, transparency and open data, human rights, clean

---

[10] For details of the MEL framework used by the NCs, please refer to Appendix V . For the portfolio-level MEL used for donor reporting, please refer to 4Recommendation 5: Appendix III .

energy). Half of the NCs interviewed considered the cross-fertilisation of ideas and joint development of expertise to be a key strength of the project. The creation and fostering of Communities of Practice corresponded to recommendations made by the 2016 Learning and Sustainability Review of the CFII, which proposed "forums and networks for peer-to-peer learning", and by the 2018 Final evaluation of the "REDD+ Governance and Finance Integrity for Africa" project[11], which recommended the facilitation of cross-NC coordination on key themes from the earliest possible opportunity. These recommendations were integrated, as the project successfully built "sustainable partnerships across themes and regions" (3 sustainable ones, target of 3) (TI-S Interim Report, 2018).

Gender was not an explicit component of this project and efforts to integrate gender in project activities varied among NCs. While three NCs used disaggregated data and made special efforts to increase female participation in project activities, three other NCs presented gender as an "interest" that was not incorporated into the plan of activities. The remaining three NCs did not integrate gender in any way. Further, marginalised groups constituted a specific focus in two NCs: in Peru, the project worked with indigenous communities to address deforestation in the Amazon rainforest; in the Maldives, part of the project activities addressed the relocation of vulnerable families to a different island. However, more than half of the consulted NCs argued that climate change had a disproportionate impact on women and that a clear gendered approach was essential. Thus, there is an expressed interest among NCs in making the link between climate change, corruption and gender more visible.

Finding 5:	The project benefitted from an excellent relationship between the staff at TI-S and NCs. Despite staff turnover, the strong relationship was maintained, allowing TI-S to provide effective support with flexibility.

All interviewed respondents reported the relationship between the NCs and the project team at TI-S as highly positive. A NC representative said: "[the support from TI-S for this project] was far beyond our expectations". This relationship was variously described by different NCs to have positive dimensions:

Horizontal. The relationship among TI-S and NCs was developed through an equal partnership. A NC representative described it as a "fruitful collaboration based on respect and complementarity", a perception that drew upon the clear division of tasks. While NCs operated autonomously, they benefited from continued engagement with TI-S project and programme staff on a number of elements.

Flexible. The support received was project staff at TI-S was deemed by NCs to be flexible: hands-on when the NCs needed assistance, for instance during the process of joining the project, and hands-off when they required autonomy. All NCs agreed that in the case of unexpected changes in national circumstances, the team at TI-S demonstrated understanding and adaptability, notably by proposing to adjust the planning of activities and reporting deadlines.

Swift and personalised. Compared to support received from TI-S for other projects (outside of the CFIP), the support for this project was considered better than usual in terms of swiftness and personalisation – two dimensions that contributed to effectiveness. The TI-S team made an effort to remain aware of country circumstances and project progress, leading to quick and tailor-made support (technical, logistical, financial, project management advice, etc.) when required by NCs.

Consistent. Importantly, the positive relationship among NCs and TI-S endured even as TI-S underwent staff turnover. During the course of the project, project staff at TI-S changed on many occasions. Although this turn-over created other challenges (addressed below), positive relations were maintained with NCs.

---

[11] SDG Lead. (2018). *Final evaluation of the "REDD+ Governance and Finance Integrity for Africa" programme*, p.5.

The 2018 Final evaluation of the REDD+ project reported similar satisfaction regarding the support received, but underlined the challenges met by TI-S in supporting the variety of activities, geographies and timelines. Such difficulties did not emerge as concerns in the current evaluation.

Finding 6:	**Internal factors had variable effects on the project. The project suffered from delay at the launch due to administrative challenges. The project did not benefit from the experience of other TI thematic programmes. However, the project benefitted from initial climate finance mapping, selection of NCs, and the embeddedness of NCs within networks.**

Internal factors of effectiveness created opportunities and challenges in different ways: delay at the launch, learning from other themes, project design, selection of NCs as well as embeddedness in networks.

Delay at the launch

The project suffered from delay at its launch, and then when it integrated additional NCs. At its launch, the project was behind schedule because of a delay in obtaining an administrative approval and realising the initial transfers of funds between the donor, TI-S and the NCs. The project was expected to start in August 2015 but was delayed until January 2016.

Delays were also experienced by the NCs that were included in the project at a later stage. While Brazil was expected to join the project in 2016, this was no longer possible due to a shift in donor priority. As a result, in its stead Costa Rica was integrated into the project in April 2017, again a few months later than the initially planned date. At the same time, Nepal was included in the project, however, the launch was delayed until July 2017 due to the government's project approval process. Positively, a no-cost extension of the project allowed NCs to meet their remaining targets, as expressed in a NC impact mapping narrative report: "The extension of project deadline until the end of December 2018 assisted [us] in completing 2 huge events, report launch and capacity building program for district-based participants."[12]

Learning from other themes

Within TI-S and in many NCs, the programmes on Climate Finance Integrity, land and mining work in programmatic silos, even though they address similar issues and face similar challenges. The 2016 Learning and Sustainability Review of the CFII recommended that Climate Finance Integrity projects be better aligned with other programmes and projects of the NCs. This suggestion was made in light of the potential for cross-learning, as well as for increased impact and sustainability. As a response to the recommendation, the programme developed new collaborations internally, for example with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and grand corruption teams. However, the potential for greater collaboration remained underutilised, notably with the land and mining thematic areas, in order for the project to explicitly learn from other TI themes, and compound the impact and sustainability.

Project design

The project design included certain features that allowed the project to excel. For instance, the project provided for each NC to undertake climate finance mapping at its launch. This allowed for objectives and activities to be grounded in their respective national contexts from the start of the project. The mapping was used in both phases of this project, as well as in other projects within the CFIP. It can be regarded as a best practice within the Programme (also regarded similarly by 2016 Learning and Sustainability Review of the CFII, 2018 Final evaluation of the REDD+ project). The NC-led mapping process was described in NC interviews

---

[12] Transparency International Nepal. (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report*. (10/2018), p.9

as an effective way of systematising dispersed and hard to access information, identifying greater areas of impact, connecting the NCs to a wide-ranging network of actors and enhancing their involvement in the regulatory frameworks themselves. The mapping therefore produced an awareness raising tool while developing capacity and recognition. As a NC representative said, "Now that we had the data and understood the stakes, we were ready to act".

Selection of NCs

The selection of NCs was based upon relevance of the context, NC experience from the previous phase and the NC commitment to the thematic area. A particular challenge encountered in the previous phase was related to recruiting suitable staff in a field that was very new, as explained in the 2013 CFIP Evaluation. The current phase avoided the challenge by retaining NC staff that had accumulated experience from the previous phase and by providing robust training to newly added but highly motivated NCs. For instance, newly added NCs received in-person trainings from TI-S and took part in capacity building visits to learn from other NCs (TI-S Interim Report, 2018). Therefore, the selection of experienced and motivated NCs allowed for dedication and high standards of project work, resulting in high project effectiveness. This is consistent with a finding from the 2018 Final evaluation of the REDD+ project according to which "[c]ompetent and committed teams are engaged within TI at local and global level. They have recognition in the area of anti-corruption and climate finance and are actively sharing knowledge between themselves".

Embeddedness of the NCs in networks

For many of the NCs, the networks in which the project team was embedded played a role in the "ripple effect" of the activities accomplished. The presence of district-level community partners (Bangladesh, Nepal) and of an anti-corruption legal advice centre (ALAC) within the NC (Maldives, Kenya, Rwanda, Peru) influenced the effectiveness of the project. As stated in the 2018 Interim Report to BMU, "[t]hese centres and community partners are essential for carrying out community level awareness raising, training, advice, project monitoring and hearing complaints that TI chapters can then feed up the chain for the policy and practice changes". For example, in the case of Bangladesh, the collaboration with community partners enabled a presence in 45 districts and generated a multiplier effect in capacity building amongst 6,000 members. In the case of the Maldives, the project team was able to identify opportunities for intervention owing to the social and professional networks of the staff. On the other hand, NCs that worked without these two assets (e.g., Mexico, South Korea) oriented their project design differently and invested more energy in national-level than community-level work, for greater effectiveness.

> **Finding 7:**   **Among the external factors, project effectiveness was found to be strongly linked to country contexts and the reputation of TI. Both factors created challenges and opportunities in different contexts.**

Two key external factors of effectiveness were identified: country context and the reputation of TI. In different contexts, these factors affected project effectiveness in different ways.

Country context

The national political, policy, and security environments were found to be determining factors of the project's effectiveness across the contexts. These circumstances varied widely among countries and over time, affecting the project contents and implementation by NCs. Correspondingly, the 2018 Final evaluation of the REDD+ project also found that the in-country situation required a tailored and diplomatic approach and affected greatly the NCs' effectiveness in engaging with the public sector. For instance, in Costa Rica, the government presented two official Executive Decrees on "Transparency and access to public information in the state and its dependencies" and on "Open Data", and has a stated commitment to the promotion of transparency and carbon neutrality. Here, the government was regarded an active partner in the project, and in this case the context favoured the achievement of results (Partnership on Transparency, 2017; OECD,

2017). In case of the Maldives, on the other hand, the relationship with the government underwent a drastic change during the project course. For the majority of the project's duration, the NC experienced challenging political conditions, resulting in repression and security threats. In order to remain as effective and safe as possible the project was reoriented towards the grassroot level, thereby impacting the project's effectiveness in the Maldives.

Reputation of TI

The branding and convening power of TI, garnered by its reputation for credibility and fairness, was experienced by NCs as both an enabling and hindering external factor of effectiveness. This became evident in stakeholder interviews and during the document review, which pointed to examples such as in South Korea, where TI's reputation was useful to gain a strong audience at the GCF, resulting in effective advocacy efforts. However, in the Maldives, TI is regarded to be a watchdog that monitors government processes. This reputation in some ways hindered the NC's effectiveness as the NC found itself facing political risks, and slowing down project activities, if not stopping them altogether for a brief period. In this way, the reputation of TI created opportunities and challenges, variably dependent upon context.

3.3 Efficiency

Finding 8: The project operated in a lean manner, with high value for money. Despite structural and personnel changes within TI-S, the efficiency of the project and its implementation were not affected.

The project supported six NCs for 35 months and additional three NCs for 21-22 months, even with relatively modest funds (EUR 2.5 million). Generally, each NC had a project team composed of one or two members. Through stakeholder interviews, the project has been assessed as fiscally judicious, providing a high degree of value for the money spent. The project was managed financially in a lean manner, as efforts were made to monitor expenditure and limit expenses within TI-S as much as possible.

This evaluation considered the DFID Value for Money Framework (DFID, 2011), which was also used by the 2013 CFIP Evaluation in the absence of another TI value for money benchmark at project level. Under the three "E's" of the framework, the project was regarded as economical by purchasing inputs (in this case, services, salaries, project expenses) at par with the market. It was also efficient, by having good conversion of inputs into outputs (demonstrated by the variety and breadth of activities accomplished by very small project teams in each NC). The project was considered effective, in how outputs produced deliverables at the outcome level, as made apparent through the outputs and outcomes reported in the logical framework. Administrative costs amounted to 10% of total funding, in line with TI processes. Additionally, the project was highly cost-effective due to its ability to have a large impact across multiple countries with limited financial inputs.

As noted earlier in this report, the project was undertaken through a decentralised approach, where NCs were largely autonomous in project design and implementation within the overall project framework, with strategic support and global advocacy undertaken at TI-S. This corresponded to a recommendation made by the 2013 CFIP Evaluation, which suggested that NCs responsibilities related to project design and management, leaving the Secretariat in the role of a central service point. The recommended approach was used for this project, as well as in the REDD+ Governance and Finance Integrity for Africa project (according to the 2018 Final Evaluation of the REDD+ project), and yielded high efficiency and effectiveness, along with high ownership of the project by NCs.

The decentralised nature of the project also allowed it to avoid serious impacts resulting from shifts and staff turnover within TI-S. Over its 3-year course, and particularly towards its end, the project experienced extensive staff turnover at TI-S. The changes in project staff resulted in minor communication gaps and confusion among NCs regarding the project's future. However, major effects on the project's implementation were avoided, both at the national and global levels, as all activities and outcomes were achieved. As a NC representative said, "[t]he turnover had a psychological impact but at the practical level, it did not have any impact".

Finding 9:	**Several anticipated risks emerged variably during the course of the project. External risks included security and political risks, while internal ones included isolation within the TI Movement and low priority for funding. The management of risks ranged from complete adaption of project activities to more ad-hoc approaches.**

The project proposal submitted to BMU in 2015 identified various risks, several of which materialised, and had an impact on implementation: project administrative delays, unfavourable political context, insufficient safety for whistle-blowers. Response to risks was uneven, however.

Risks were appropriately mitigated in the majority of cases, for instance with changes of government and difficulty in accessing data. For example, when project-associated civil society members faced security threats in the Maldives, the NC and its partners utilised the TI training in field-based security. Further, the NC activities in the Maldives were completely adapted to respond to such risks by de-emphasising national-level activity and increasing focus on community-based activities. These new circumstances are consistent with a Background paper on contributions to TI 2020 Strategy Implementation Plan which states that: "As climate finance advances, this [protecting anti-corruption activists] will become more of an issue for our NCs – special attention may need to be paid depending on the approach of the NCs and the security status in the country. Direct support from the Secretariat is needed in this respect." However, the response to safety and security issues of NC staff and activists in the case of Peru was regarded as insufficient. When the NC in Peru publicised emblematic cases through journalistic investigation, it resulted in increased visibility, and the team experienced high vulnerability. The sensitivity of the topic had been underestimated: the project team within the NC and the whistle-blowers reported receiving threats at certain points, compromising their physical and digital security. The support from TI-S (outside of the project team) to these developing risks was perceived as minimal.

In addition to these, at the project level, several internal risks were acknowledged in the 2013 CFIP Programme Document (see the risk assessments from the proposal and the programme document in Appendix IV). The programme document identified internal risks such as isolation of the programme within the TI Movement and insufficient priority given to fundraising. Five NCs suggested that this isolation indeed existed within TI: "If the project has been so good for five years, why is it still so difficult to have more TI support? […] The environmental project is seen [within TI] as a satellite that works by itself". The project proposal did not identify such risks, and these were not mitigated through any strategic interventions.

3.4   Impact

> **Finding 10:   The project made significant progress towards achieving its planned outcomes, at the global as well as national and local levels. The project made moderate contributions at the global level, and significant contributions at the national level outcomes (in the country visited).**

The project outcomes were established in three broad areas: policy, capacity, and Communities of Practice. According to project-level data, outcomes in all indicator areas were surpassed, except a sub-part of the first indicator:

- The project contributed to the adoption and implementation by key global and national climate finance institutions of 35 fund policy or practice changes that effectively safeguard against corruption in climate finance delivery, as well as of 18 specific text changes reflecting best practice in global climate funds. (Target: 10 policy changes and 20 text changes).

- It built capacity within the civil society to actively monitor and resolve governance weaknesses and to identify best practices to prevent such weaknesses occurring: 16 multilateral climate finance projects across six countries were monitored and 20 cases of poor governance in project implementation were highlighted. (Target: 6 projects monitored).

- It established four sustainable Communities of Practice (adaptation, REDD+, transparency and open data, human rights) and an additional one which is not yet deemed sustainable (clean energy). (Target: 3 sustainable Communities of Practice).

Through the contribution of project activities in all NCs, communities and CSOs are more aware of, and understand better, climate finance context and challenges. In addition, some NCs have focused on climate finance project monitoring and have trained and supported communities that were seeking redress against corruption (Bangladesh, Maldives, Peru, Rwanda). Although the evaluation did not seek to list all of the outcomes of the project, some of the illustrative examples of project outcomes include:

- At the global level, TI-S monitoring and advocacy efforts contributed to the practice of webcast of GEF Council meeting and GCF Board meetings.

- TI contributed to the drafting of Policy on Prohibited Practices and the Policy on the Protection of Whistleblowers and Witnesses for the GCF. These are to be considered by the GCF Board.

- In Bangladesh, the NC's research on adaptation finance governance standards has been incorporated into national and international institutions.

- In Peru, the NC led the establishment of a roundtable to monitor climate finance, and that instigated investigative media coverage on environment preservation.

- In Costa Rica, the NC co-developed a yearly action plan with the multi-sectorial Citizen Advisory Council on Climate Change (5C), which is being implemented.

Besides the outcomes already identified, other results and impacts of the project are likely to become evident with time. For instance, in the Maldives, the project helped start and is providing support to an ongoing court case related to relocated families. Further, it is supporting civil society actors and journalists to monitor climate finance projects in different islands of the Maldives. The results of such activities are not immediately available, but are deemed on track.

The project was deemed by external partners to have a moderate/ medium contribution to global level outcomes. The process for policy change in global funds requires the combination of several factors, including: a widely recognized need, an appetite for change, and a platform for engagement. TI made important contributions to changes in global funds, for instance, drafting of GCF policies on whistleblower, money laundering, and others, and the webcast of GEF proceedings. While these changes may have happened of their own accord, external respondents asserted that in the absence of project activities the changes may not have been of the same quality. At the national level, however, TI contributions have been significant. While this evaluation did not seek external validation across NCs, in the case of the Maldives, all external respondents suggested that in the absence of TI activities, the outcomes would not be achieved. The external partners found the support of TI to be instrumental to their activities, and would not have acted without support of the project.

> **Finding 11:** Apart from the project-tracked impacts, the project also allowed TI to consolidate its reputation as an actor in climate finance integrity. The project resulted in increased capacities for many NCs, allowing them to assert a stronger profile.

The project allowed TI to assert its reputation in the field of climate finance and anti-corruption, coupled with the success of the REDD+ project (2018 Final Evaluation of the REDD+ project). As a direct contribution of project activities, TI-S and NCs in many countries are now recognised as legitimate and leading actors in the area of climate finance integrity. To illustrate: at the global level, TI assessment of transparency in global funds is considered authoritative by the UNFCCC and its subsidiary bodies. The project publication 'A Tale of Four Funds' is regarded by interviewed external partners as a key document for benchmarking of multilateral climate finance bodies. TI was identified by GEF to participate in the CSO network. As the GCF is under development, and TI has engaged in the drafting of several policies, including on procurement, whistle-blowers, and integrity. A global partner stated: "TI is a trusted partner". At the national level, the project consolidated all NCs' reputation as climate finance stakeholders, making them points of reference – and in the majority of cases the leaders – within their countries. A NC representative stated: "We went from being an actor zero in terms of climate change, to being a visible actor. Now we know clearly what we can propose, what is our niche". A quarterly report from Costa Rica stated: "It can be said that in one year, the project is positioned among actors creating the spaces of climate governance, playing the role that was designed from the beginning: to be an articulator and a hinge between civil society and the government, to establish transparency and contribute to the fight against corruption in the management of climate finance in Costa Rica." To illustrate further, all external partners in the Maldives regarded TI as a unique and important champion of transparency in the country.

In continuing the previous phase, the project also provided an opportunity for NCs to deepen or develop an expertise in climate finance integrity, especially for those NCs participating in Communities of Practice (adaptation, REDD+, transparency and open data, human rights, clean energy). Out of the five Communities of Practice, three had identified topics and NC-lead(s) in the project proposal. The choice of topics and NC-leads was based on varying combinations of three factors: country context and type of climate finance, prior experience in the first phase of the project, and interest in topic. The remaining two Communities of Practice emerged organically through the project. A NC representative said: "There is a before and an after to this project – we did a mapping [climate finance mapping] and then specialised in climate finance". Their improved capacity and reputation allowed NCs to increase their networks and develop partnerships with other CSOs, institutions and the media.

3.5   Sustainability and Scalability

> **Finding 12:**   **Among project results, the policy outcomes are deemed sustainable in their respective policy cycles, but require continued monitoring. The sustainability of awareness raising and capacities are varied, subject to context and continued efforts to promote integrity in climate finance. However, in the absence of explicit mechanisms of sustainability, and without the security of additional funding for scalability, these dimensions are not universally ensured.**

The project influenced policy adoption at national level (Bangladesh, Costa Rica, Kenya, Mexico, Peru) as well as at global level (for instance, 9 recommendations implemented by global funds). Such results are considered sustainable in the life cycle of policy changes. However, as expressed by respondents and as stated in the project proposal to BMU, the sustainability of such policy changes is subject to the continuation of monitoring and other project activities by TI. The 2017 progress report to BMU reads: "there is still much to be done in terms of policy effectiveness, and the focus TI would like to have in the future is on ensuring policies are implemented properly".

In terms of awareness raising, NCs have accomplished important results among communities and CSOs. These results are primarily in the areas of increased capacity for climate finance monitoring and seeking redress. The sustainability of these results is contingent upon continued efforts to encourage and steer engagement. A Chapter representative said, "We work with volunteers - if there is no extension [of this project] and therefore no follow-up, we risk returning to the starting phase". An external partner at country level corroborated: "I participated in the climate awareness programme; it opened my eyes. If suddenly [the NC] stops working on climate finance, the engagement will go down." This is consistent with a finding from the 2016 Learning and Sustainability Review of the CFII.

Therefore, the sustainability and scalability of the project activities are contingent upon continuation of project activities. Indeed, the activities of the project were based on the tacit assumption that project activities would continue, and explicit mechanisms for sustainability were not designed. However, at the time of the evaluation, the project had not secured funding and risked sustainability of its outcomes and impacts. The limited success related to funding is on account of two related factors: a) climate governance integrity is not conventionally attractive for donor agency. While many donor agencies support climate finance, they are typically known to prioritise projects with measurable reduction in carbon emissions over those that relate to governance and integrity. And, b) while NCs may be able to access bilateral donors, such donor agencies generally accord less priority to areas like climate governance integrity. In other words, in the specific area of climate governance integrity, there may be a limited pool of donors. While the TI-S led approach has proven successful in raising funds in two phases of this project, an NC-led approach has had less success. Without the ensured continuation of the project, the sustainability and scalability of project results were not universally ensured, save for NCs where project activities are to continue through additionally sourced funds.

> **Finding 13:**   **Among factors of sustainability and scalability, the project was negatively affected by reliance on only one donor. The project faces a strong opportunity for scaling up of the project results, by focusing on strategic communications particularly at the global level and within the climate sector.**

Two key factors of sustainability and scalability were identified: reliance on one donor, and outreach/communication. Both presented challenges and opportunities for the sustainability and scalability of the project.

Reliance on One Donor

The project relied exclusively on BMU for future funding, creating a specific challenge. Without clear information related to the future of the project, reliance on a unique donor created a relationship of dependency and weakened the project's financial sustainability. The 2013 CFIP Evaluation recommended that TI-S expand their activity in global NGO networks and develop productive collaborations to secure funds. During the course of the project, the team made efforts to network with donors (GIZ, USAID, BMZ, etc.), however these efforts did not yield additional funding. As a result, by December 2018 only a few NCs had secured funding while the rest were actively supported by TI-S in their fundraising efforts. More seriously, and as stated in the 2013 CFIP Evaluation, should the project discontinue, it will be faced with the risk that, "the capacity and knowledge gained will leave the NCs" in the absence of an extension or follow-up project, thereby jeopardising the already developed expertise and the strengthened profile for the participating NCs (Finding 11:).

Communication

The project included communication as a planned activity, for instance: support was provided by the TI-S communications team; a communications consultant was recruited for media related activities; the project published a journalist toolkit and organised trainings[13]. Yet, a member of the project team said, "We should have worked harder on communications and fundraising from the get-go, internally and externally. We should have planned for this." Many interviewed participants suggested that the project did not invest sufficient resources in strategically communicating its successes, globally and within the climate finance sector.

At the global level, respondents recalled TI as being present but not completely wielding its convening power. An external partner stated: "I believe the project could have been improved by increasing its presence at international events. If there is an activity at the national level [within the NCs], it could be presented at a global event like the COP, instead of relying mostly on reporting. That would really make TI *the* spokesperson on climate integrity at the global level." In other words, an opportunity exists for TI to clearly communicate the strength of its work, and increase the scale and sustainability of project results at the global level. For instance, an external partner suggested: "TI has a great opportunity to set the bar for integrity and climate finance by pooling all the entities together [or bringing multilateral funds to a common table]."

There is also an underutilised opportunity for clear communication within the climate finance sector. A NC representative illustrated this as: "if you want to talk to someone about climate change, they have some understanding. When you talk about climate governance or how corruption and climate change are related, they don't really know. [With this project] we don't bring the topic out to the world, we just speak with a few, we preach more to the converted. We need a lot of media presence and capacity building." More than a quarter of NCs perceived the need for broad TI communications on climate finance integrity to be user-friendly, as the theme is technical and needs to be made more accessible. Therefore, an opportunity exists for the project to engage the climate finance sector broadly, and increase the scale and sustainability of its results.

---

[13] In other examples, TI-S initiated a collaboration with the DeutscheWelle, Germany's public international broadcaster, which led to the production of a short video on the case of land trafficking in the Amazon, with the Peru NC. With the Bangladesh NC, the broadcaster produced a documentary on ongoing adaptation projects and complaints mechanisms. As stated in the 2018 Interim Report to BMU, "[t]he reach of the video gave great exposure to TIB's work and the complaints made by vulnerable communities about the use of climate funds."

4 Concluding Thoughts and Insights for the Future

The Climate Policy and Finance Integrity project of Transparency International (TI) is operating in a global context that is preparing for an increase in climate finance. Even as this report is being first drafted in December 2018, the UNFCCC is debating measures to operationalise the Paris Agreement, while the GCF is engaged in discussions on the replenishment. As climate finance is set to increase, many NCs are also faced with contexts where risk of corruption is high on the one hand, or on the other hand where governments are promoting climate finance integrity. In either case, the potential for the project continues to be immense. Indeed, although country contexts and NC activities are widely varied, they are bound by a shared ambition to continue and scale up the project. Each participating TI NC of this project continues to be interested, and additional NCs have stated an interest as well. This bodes well for the future of the project.

Yet, in practical terms, this evaluation finds that the project has certain areas for improvement. The recommendations identified by the evaluation are presented below. The recommendations were presented to NCs at a validation workshop on December 6, 2018, and NCs and TI-S representatives were asked to score the recommendations on a priority scale on 1-10, 10 being high priority. These scores awarded by project staff are also presented.

Recommendation 1: **The project should consider articulating more actively its clear niche in the climate finance sector, as well its niche within TI.**

(Priority score awarded by project staff: 7.9/10)

While there is no dearth of actors in the areas of climate finance and integrity separately, the project and programme are the only ones at the intersection of these two areas. Very clearly, the project and the programme occupy a specific niche, although not always recognised for it. NCs consulted for the evaluation expressed strong ambition to be recognised as the rightful champions of climate finance integrity. This recognition may first require a clearer discussion of what the project includes and what it does not. For instance, NCs have oriented the project on various identities: climate and environment integrity, climate governance integrity, climate finance integrity, or climate integrity. The second step in this recognition would be communication of the niche, which would unlock opportunities at various levels. At the global level this is likely to strengthen the TI reputation, so that its interventions continue to be regarded seriously. At the national level also, a clear articulation would increase effectiveness of activities, where NC social capital would be consolidated, and stronger partnerships established. Part of this effort needs to focus on TI itself. As NCs seek higher priority and recognition within the TI Movement, a clear articulation of the project niche and contribution to TI strategy would be key to obtaining such increased recognition and support.

Recommendation 2: **Project design should consider a component for communication and outreach, targeted not only at the broader public level in the countries, but also at the global levels and within TI.**

(Priority score awarded by project staff: 7.2/10)

As stated by NCs during the evaluation, communication and outreach were not an extensive priority through the life cycle of the project. Along with a clear articulation of the niche (above), the project could consider expanding the communication and outreach activities at various levels – to global/ national stakeholders, for project activities, and within TI. While this will contribute to building a constituency for the project, it will also afford TI and the NCs the stature they seek. Communication and outreach is also part of project effectiveness, and will contribute to better networks and partnerships.

Recommendation 3:   The current project approach is considered appropriate, and needs to be built upon, so as to address the root causes of corruption in climate finance. In many contexts the project is ready for scale-up, with potential outcomes at global and national levels.

(Priority score awarded by project staff: 8/10)

During the first two phases the project has made many an investment, experimented with different approaches, and garnered confidence among NCs. The approach of the project has found much appreciation and can be continued for another iteration. This is unique for TI, as the project would likely continue to be administered by TI-S, while NCs operate within countries. In many contexts, the NCs are ready to scale up the activities. If additional resources, staff and time become available, NCs are looking to undertake more activities at community and national levels. Indeed, this is likely to maximise returns, as many of the trained communities and civil societies can only now begin their monitoring in earnest as climate finance are likely to start flowing. There is also a need to continue monitoring of the global funds, in order to reap the impacts of work already undertaken. Scaling up of the project is likely to yield impacts and returns of the previous phases of the project.

Recommendation 4:   There is a need to actively seek and explore multiple channels of funding for the project including at the NC-level, and early in the life cycle of the project.

(Priority score awarded by project staff: 9.7/10)

Without the security of continued funding, the sustainability of the project is at risk in two ways. Firstly, at the outcome - the capacity built among communities, and the established policy monitoring processes - are unlikely to sustain without continuation of the project. Secondly, without continued support, the project is at risk to lose experienced staff members and with them, social capital accrued over 3 years with communities, partners, and across the project.

The project could expand efforts at fundraising through: diversifying the pool of donors to include bilateral and multilateral agencies, along with Foundations; paying attention to fundraising early on in the life of the project; sharing learning and experience on fundraising across NCs; allotment of more clear project, programme and TI resources to support fundraising; more focused networking with potential donors to identify funds without necessitating responses to Calls alone; and more clear effort by NCs (especially those with the capacity to do so) to raise funds at the NC or a NC-consortium level. A clear niche within the TI-Movement (earlier recommendation) is also likely to make available additional corporate support in seeking funding.

Recommendation 5:   Better monitoring and management of risks is essential for the project, potentially with cross-learning from comparable thematic work at TI.

(Priority score awarded by project staff: 6.8/10)

The Climate Policy and Finance Integrity project treads new ground for TI. There are few precedents for TI and NCs in their interventions. While many expected risks were encountered by this project, additional new risks may yet emerge. It is essential for any project to manage security and personnel risks, and plan better for unanticipated risks.

Further, other themes at TI have undertaken activities with similar themes and across similar contexts: mining, forest, and land. The project could consider cross-learning opportunities, focusing on effectiveness, impact, and risk management. There is a strong appetite among NCs to learn from one another, and this has been of value in the past. The project could continue to establish these linkages.

Appendix I List of Findings

Finding 1:   The project was highly relevant to the global context in light of increasing climate finance. The project was highly relevant to the 9 countries where it was implemented, either for a combination of high climate vulnerability, climate finance and corruption, or a strategic advantage. The project was especially relevant because of the unique nature of TI work in climate finance.

Finding 2:   The project was well aligned with TI Strategy 2010-2015, which was prevalent during project design. TI Strategy 2015-2020 does not identify thematic areas, and therefore climate is not an explicit focus therein. Yet, the project contributed to TI Strategy 2015-2020 in varying ways.

Finding 3:   The project achieved nearly all of the planned interventions, exceeding the targets for the majority of indicators. The project was not able to achieve targeted results in the area of sustainability, as external funding was not secured for all NCs.

Finding 4:   The project approach was appropriate and effective for the achievement of outputs and outcomes, leading to effectiveness in global-national collaboration, and cross-NC learning. Gender was not considered explicitly in the project approach.

Finding 5:   The project benefitted from an excellent relationship between the staff at TI-S and NCs. Despite staff turnover, the strong relationship was maintained, allowing TI-S to provide effective support with flexibility.

Finding 6:   Internal factors had variable effects on the project. The project suffered from delay at the launch due to administrative challenges. The project did not benefit from the experience of other TI thematic programmes. However, the project benefitted from initial climate finance mapping, selection of NCs, and the embeddedness of NCs within networks.

Finding 7:   Among the external factors, project effectiveness was found to be strongly linked to country contexts and the reputation of TI. Both factors created challenges and opportunities in different contexts.

Finding 8:   The project operated in a lean manner, with high value for money. Despite structural and personnel changes within TI-S, the efficiency of the project and its implementation were not affected.

Finding 9:   Several anticipated risks emerged variably during the course of the project. External risks included security and political risks, while internal ones included isolation within the TI Movement and low priority for funding. The management of risks ranged from complete adaption of project activities to more ad-hoc approaches.

Finding 10:   The project made significant progress towards achieving its planned outcomes, at the global as well as national and local levels. The project made moderate contributions at the global level, and significant contributions at the national level outcomes (in the country visited).

Finding 11:   Apart from the project-tracked impacts, the project also allowed TI to consolidate its reputation as an actor in climate finance integrity. The project resulted in increased capacities for many NCs, allowing them to assert a stronger profile.

Finding 12:   Among project results, the policy outcomes are deemed sustainable in their respective policy cycles, but require continued monitoring. The sustainability of awareness raising and capacities are varied, subject to context and continued efforts to promote integrity in climate finance.

However, in the absence of explicit mechanisms of sustainability, and without the security of additional funding for scalability, these dimensions are not universally ensured.

Finding 13: Among factors of sustainability and scalability, the project was negatively affected by reliance on only one donor. The project faces a strong opportunity for scaling up of the project results, by focusing on strategic communications particularly at the global level and within the climate sector.

Appendix II Additional Information: Relevance

COUNTRIES	SIZE OF CLIMATE FINANCE (FROM CLIMATE FINANCE COUNTRY ASSESSMENT)	CLIMATE VULNERABILITY (FROM CLIMATE FINANCE COUNTRY MAPPING ASSESSMENT)	LEVEL OF CORRUPTION AT ENTRY IN PROJECT (CORRUPTION PERCEPTIONS INDEX) 0 (HIGHLY CORRUPT) TO 100 (VERY CLEAN)
Bangladesh	Bilateral: By December 2012, USD 170 million were invested – additional funds were added later Multilateral: USD 61.55 million in pledges National: USD 340 million allocated from the national budget Total = USD 683,43 million as of June 2013	Bangladesh has been assessed as the most vulnerable country in the world to the effects of climate change. The worsening intensity of extreme weather events is already being felt by Bangladesh's population, and will have an increasingly detrimental effect on socio-economic development, poverty reduction and security in the coming years.	In 2012, it scored 26 (144th rank)
Costa Rica	No assessment report (planned)		In 2016, it scored 58 (41st rank)
Kenya	Based on available data, climate finance – both loans and grants – entering Kenya between 2009 and 2012 from external sources totalled USD 2.5 billion. A number of climate change-related projects are also funded from the national budget. Figures received from the National Treasury show a total investment of USD 66 million between 2009 and 2012.	Climate change and climate variability is already being experienced in Kenya. The population is feeling the impact on their livelihoods, security, health, and in extreme cases their lives. In 2010, Kenya's National Climate Change Response Strategy set out a range of current challenges - including rising temperatures throughout the country, increasingly irregular and unpredictable rainfall, flooding, and outbreaks of infectious diseases such as malaria and cholera. These are already manifest in successive seasons of crop failure, increasing food insecurity, livestock deaths and dwindling water resources.	In 2012, it scored 27 (139th rank)
Korea	No assessment report (planned)		In 2012, it scored 56 (45th rank)

COUNTRIES	SIZE OF CLIMATE FINANCE (FROM CLIMATE FINANCE COUNTRY ASSESSMENT)	CLIMATE VULNERABILITY (FROM CLIMATE FINANCE COUNTRY MAPPING ASSESSMENT)	LEVEL OF CORRUPTION AT ENTRY IN PROJECT (CORRUPTION PERCEPTIONS INDEX) 0 (HIGHLY CORRUPT) TO 100 (VERY CLEAN)
Maldives	Approximately USD 2.87 million was allocated from the national budget through 2011-2013 and that USD 168.17 million was committed for various adaptation and mitigation projects and related research through externally funded grants and loans during 2011-2017.	The Maldives is a coral reef based archipelago of 1192 islands, 80 per cent of which are less than one metre above the mean sea level. The largest island has a surface area of less than six km2. The country is extremely vulnerable to the effects of climate change, in particular sea-level rise, storm surges, beach erosion and rises in sea surface temperature.	In 2010, it scored 2.3 and in 2011, 2.5. The country was not rated in 2012.
Mexico	USD 763 million in bilateral, USD 1,900 million in multilateral, USD 68 million from the national budget, and another USD 11 million Total = USD 2742 million for 2009-2012	Mexico faces significant challenges both in terms of addressing the problems that climate change is posing for the country as well as reducing its contribution to global warming. A recent study has shown that 15 per cent of Mexico's territory, 68 per cent of its population and 71 per cent of its Gross Domestic Product are highly exposed to the adverse effects of climate change, including drought, floods and hurricanes.	In 2012, it scored 34 (105th rank)
Nepal	More than USD 96 million in active projects as of June 2018. Examples of executing agencies: World Food Programme, World Bank, African Development Bank, Food and Agriculture Organization.	Nepal ranks 14th in the countries that are vulnerable to impacts of climate change. (2014)	In 2016, it scored 29 (131st rank)
Peru	USD 211 million in bilateral, USD 57 million in multilateral, USD 298 million from the national budget, USD 64 million in other/unknown funding Total = USD 630 million	Peru, responsible for only 0.4 per cent of global greenhouse gas emissions, is one of the world's most climate vulnerable countries. The impacts of a changing climate, rising temperatures and sea levels, extreme fluctuations in weather patterns, and the accelerated rate of glacier melt in the Andes, are already being felt.	In 2012, it scored 38 (83rd rank)

COUNTRIES	SIZE OF CLIMATE FINANCE (FROM CLIMATE FINANCE COUNTRY ASSESSMENT)	CLIMATE VULNERABILITY (FROM CLIMATE FINANCE COUNTRY MAPPING ASSESSMENT)	LEVEL OF CORRUPTION AT ENTRY IN PROJECT (CORRUPTION PERCEPTIONS INDEX) 0 (HIGHLY CORRUPT) TO 100 (VERY CLEAN)
Rwanda	In 2015 Rwanda received mitigation fund from multilateral and bilateral donors, World Bank (USD 28.120 million) and Belgium (USD 14.452 million), followed by Germany, the Netherlands, and USA, while UK, African Development Bank, Sweden, Norway, France and Japan have also made smaller contributions. In the same year Rwanda has also benefited from adaptation funds from the United Kingdom (USD 35.416 million) as its greatest development financial partner, from the Netherlands (20.596 million), followed by the Nordic Development Fund, Korea, Belgium and USA. Total = about USD 122 million in 2015	Due to change in the temperature and heat episodes, shift in rainfall start dates and change in the amount of rainfall, the national climate change vulnerability index shows that vulnerability is located in all part of the country1. Rising temperatures in some districts with higher average daytime temperature than the Rwandan average and decreasing rainfall, which sometimes lead to droughts, are beginning to affect agriculture particularly in parts of the Eastern province and southern province which causes a significant decrease in agricultural productivity, worsen food security situation, malnutrition and poor health.	In 2016, it scored 54 (50th rank)

Appendix III Additional Information: Effectiveness

OUTPUT[14]	UNIT	BASELINE	FINAL TARGET VALUE	ACHIEVED VALUE AT THE END OF THE PROJECT[15]	PLANNED DATE OF ACHIEVEMENT (PROJECT PROPOSAL)	DATE OF ACHIEVEMENT
Output I: Policy inputs and monitoring of multilateral climate funds, with prioritisation of the Green Climate Fund, and global climate and sustainable development agreements are strengthened *						
Indicator I.1: By 06/2018, 30 policy interventions will have been written in advance of multilateral fund meetings and/or oral intervention at fund meetings	Policy Intervention	10 different policy interventions to the GCF, UNEP, AF, CIFS, GEF. FCPF, UN REDD, the SCF and others.	30	50	12/2017	Achieved 2017
Indicator I.2: By 06/2018, TI will have assumed 4 observership roles to international climate finance institutions.	Number of CSO observership roles	2 (CTF Developed country observer, GEF RFP Europe)	4	6	12/2017	Achieved 2016
Indicator I.3: By 06/2018, TI will have made at least 15 policy interventions (written/oral) in advance or as part of relevant global meetings (High Level Political Forum, Post-2015 Summit, COP21).	Policy Interventions	5 interventions to support governance and anti-corruption in the SDGs and financing for development	15 + 1 for Costa Rica	26	12/2017	Achieved 2017

---

[14] The output related to the project's global level is identified with an asterisk (*). The remaining ones are related to the national level.

[15] Information compiled from the project's monitoring framework. Transparency International Secretariat. (2019). MEL Status Check. (01/2019)

OUTPUT[14]	UNIT	BASELINE	FINAL TARGET VALUE	ACHIEVED VALUE AT THE END OF THE PROJECT[15]	PLANNED DATE OF ACHIEVEMENT (PROJECT PROPOSAL)	DATE OF ACHIEVEMENT
Indicator I.4: By 06/2018, TI will have monitored the implementation of commitments in 3 countries under global agreements related to transparency and accountability of climate finance/sustainable development.	Assessment of commitments	0	3	5	12/2017	Achieved 2017
Output II: Policy advice to reform or improve national policies and practices in project countries is strengthened						
Indicator II.1: By 06/2018, TI Chapters will have provided policy advice to further reform or improve national policies and practices in project countries. It is anticipated that their policy recommendations are delivered at least once annually, or a total of 15 interventions by the end of the project (This assumes that not all interventions will result in the 10 policy and practices changes aimed in Outcome Indicator 0.1)	National inputs	5 policy recommendations for national level reforms by the Chapters through their national assessments	10 per TI project Chapter nationally, plus 1 for Costa Rica	Bangladesh: 2 + 3 + 2 **(7)** Kenya: 5 + 6 + 4 **(15)** Maldives: 2 + 8 + 4 **(14)** Mexico: 1 + 7 + 5 **(13)** Peru: 1 + 8 + 7 **(16)** Costa Rica: **1** Total: 66 13 national policy changes	12/2017	Nearly achieved[16]
Indicator II.2: By 12/2016, TI Chapters will have documented in 3 separate publications, the best practices in monitoring adaptation, mitigation and REDD+ projects and in advocacy for optimum policy reforms in each area.	Thematic publications	0	3	3	12/2016	Achieved 2018
Output III: Increased scale and focus of TI project Chapter actions to monitor the implementation of climate financed projects						

[16] This target is considered nearly achieved because while some NCs went beyond their target in terms of national inputs, but one did not meet it.

OUTPUT[14]	UNIT	BASELINE	FINAL TARGET VALUE	ACHIEVED VALUE AT THE END OF THE PROJECT[15]	PLANNED DATE OF ACHIEVEMENT (PROJECT PROPOSAL)	DATE OF ACHIEVEMENT
Indicator III.1: By 06/2018, TI National Chapters and their partners will have monitored up to 17 multilateral climate financed projects.	Climate projects monitored	1 (TI Kenya has been monitoring geothermal projects under the CIF SREP)	17	19	12/2017	Achieved 2018
Indicator III.2: By 06/2018, up to 12 cases/studies (at least 2 per country anticipated) of corruption and governance findings in project implementation identified and reported	Cases/studies reported	0	12	21	12/2017	Achieved 2017
Output IV: Increased capacities, leadership and sustainability of civil society communities of practice						
Indicator IV.1: By 06/2018, TI project Chapters have participated in at least 15 training and peer learning exercises to increase their capacities to input on anti-corruption and integrity policies for clean energy/technology, REDD and adaptation for national and global reforms	Training and peer learning exercises	0	15	17	12/2017	Achieved 2017
Indicator IV.2: By 06/2018, TI project Chapters support and build the capacity of 3 new civil society organisations to take on anti-corruption policy advocacy and monitoring work in the fields of clean energy/technology, REDD and adaptation.	Organisations	0	3	3	12/2017	Achieved 2017
Indicator IV.3: By 06/2018, TI project Chapters lead or engage in 3 thematic climate policy communities of practice concerning clean energy/technology, REDD and adaptation for improved transparency, accountability and anti-corruption.	Thematic communities of practice	0	3	4 (7-8 plus other partnerships)	12/2017	Achieved 2017

OUTPUT[14]	UNIT	BASELINE	FINAL TARGET VALUE	ACHIEVED VALUE AT THE END OF THE PROJECT[15]	PLANNED DATE OF ACHIEVEMENT (PROJECT PROPOSAL)	DATE OF ACHIEVEMENT
Indicator IV.4: By 06/2018, TI project Chapters have secured resources to ensure sustainability of anti-corruption policy advice and monitoring work in fields of clean energy/technology, REDD and adaptation.	Resources mobilised	0	Each partner has at least 1 dedicated climate finance staff in current and new project countries.	2	06/2017	Not achieved
Capacities[17]						
Capacity Policies	Number of political frameworks	0	11	11	12/2017	Achieved 2017
Capacity Institutions	Number of structures and processes	0	10	8 (and 2 ongoing)	12/2017	Nearly achieved
Capacity Methods	Number of methods	0	3	4	12/2017	Achieved 2018

---

[17] The BMU reporting template includes a section on standard indicators for the aggregable recording of project outcomes. It includes three "capacities". The first one is Capacity Policies and refers for this project to the number of new or improved policy frameworks developed to address climate change and/or conserve biodiversity. The second one is Capacity Institutions and refers to the number of new or improved institutionalised structures or processes to address climate change and conserve biodiversity. The third one is Capacity Methods and refers to the number of new or improved methodological tools developed to address climate change and conserve biodiversity.

OUTPUTS SUMMARY	STATUS
Output I: Policy inputs and monitoring of multilateral climate funds, with prioritisation of the Green Climate Fund, and global climate and sustainable development agreements are strengthened.	
Indicator I.1: By 06/2018, 30 policy interventions will have been written in advance of multilateral fund meetings and/or oral intervention at fund meetings.	Beyond target
Indicator I.2: By 06/2018, TI will have assumed 4 observership roles to international climate finance institutions.	Beyond target
Indicator I.3: By 06/2018, TI will have made at least 15 policy interventions (written/oral) in advance or as part of relevant global meetings (High Level Political Forum, Post-2015 Summit, COP21).	Beyond target
Indicator I.4: By 06/2018, TI will have monitored the implementation of commitments in 3 countries under global agreements related to transparency and accountability of climate finance/sustainable development.	Beyond target
Output II: Policy advice to reform or improve national policies and practices in project countries is strengthened	
Indicator II.1: By 06/2018, TI Chapters will have provided policy advice to further reform or improve national policies and practices in project countries. It is anticipated that their policy recommendations are delivered at least once annually, or a total of 15 interventions by the end of the project (This assumes that not all interventions will result in the 10 policy and practices changes aimed in Outcome Indikator 0.1).	Nearly achieved
Indicator II.2: By 12/2016, TI Chapters will have documented in 3 separate publications, the best practices in monitoring adaptation, mitigation and REDD+ projects and in advocacy for optimum policy reforms in each area.	Target achieved
Output III: Increased scale and focus of TI project Chapter actions to monitor the implementation of climate financed projects	
Indicator III.1: By 06/2018, TI National Chapters and their partners will have monitored up to 17 multilateral climate financed projects.	Beyond target
Indicator III.2: By 06/2018, up to 12 cases/studies (at least 2 per country anticipated) of corruption and governance findings in project implementation identified and reported	Beyond target
Output IV: Increased capacities, leadership and sustainability of civil society communities of practice	
Indicator IV.1: By 06/2018, TI project Chapters have participated in at least 15 training and peer learning exercises to increase their capacities to input on anti-corruption and integrity policies for clean energy/technology, REDD and adaptation for national and global reforms	Beyond target
Indicator IV.2: By 06/2018, TI project Chapters support and build the capacity of 3 new civil society organisations to take on anti-corruption policy advocacy and monitoring work in the fields of clean energy/technology, REDD and adaptation.	Target achieved
Indicator IV.3: By 06/2018, TI project Chapters lead or engage in 3 thematic climate policy communities of practice concerning clean energy/technology, REDD and adaptation for improved transparency, accountability and anti-corruption.	Beyond target
Indicator IV.4: By 06/2018, TI project Chapters have secured resources to ensure sustainability of anti-corruption policy advice and monitoring work in fields of clean energy/technology, REDD and adaptation.	Target not achieved

OUTPUTS SUMMARY	STATUS
Capacities	
Capacity Policies	Target achieved
Capacity Institutions	Nearly achieved
Capacity Methods	Beyond target

Appendix IV Additional Information: Efficiency

Risk Assessment from the 2015 Project Proposal to BMU

RISKS	LIKELIHOOD	AVOIDANCE STRATEGY
Access to information is restricted	Medium	Use of access to information laws. Approach to report both known and unknown data.
No political will and/or government capacity to act on basis of evidence provided.	High	TI policy of constructive criticism and engagement: Identifying capacity deficits enables capacity support actions as an enabling factor.
Logging interests of powerful actors undermine REDD+.	Medium	Awareness and proactive engagement, Plan for safety of staff.
Politics impede implementation	High	Up-coming elections included in project planning
Public perceives climate action at low priority.	High	Project outreach actions, visibility, multi-stakeholder approaches.
Public perceives poor governance as "normal."	Medium	Project outreach actions, visibility, multi-stakeholder approaches.
Political/economic instability.	Low / medium	Close monitoring of country context, delay or postponement of actions with donor.
Natural disasters.	High	Flexible planning – delay and redirect resources to other countries until situation improves.
Insufficient safety and security for campaigners, whistle blowers, Project Partner office, staff	Medium	Active monitoring of security situation project countries. Security plans among Project Partners. Roll out of SAFE (internal legal and administrative support to protect TI staff ad Chapter staff from danger) in priority countries.
Delays of Project actions in Project partner countries.	Medium	Strategic and flexible planning, team building, peer pressure, incentives.
Delays in staff recruitment/turnovers	Medium	Strategic and flexible planning.

Risk Assessment from the 2013 CFIP Programme Document

INTERNAL RISK	RISK MITIGATION STRATEGY/ ACTION REQUIRED
Inability of TI-S to manage complex and shifting operational model of the Programme effectively.	Clarity over roles and responsibilities of TI-S and Chapters to be defined in a strategy for the developing operational model of the Programme. Strategy to be developed over 2013 with active input from Chapters and the Institutional Network. Strengthening Programme and other Networks and Initiatives (e.g., TI UK Defence Programme).
Insufficient priority given to raising funds for the Programme.	Clear direction from Management Group as to importance of the Programme. Continuous contact between Programme and Resource Development Department.
Isolation of the Programme within the TI Movement, TI-S and the Chapters.	Active engagement with project partner staff and senior management to ensure relevance and integration of climate work within Chapters' strategies. Ensuring the programme focuses primarily on anti-corruption/ transparency, accountability and integrity aspects of Climate Finance, rather than Climate Finance as a whole Induction of project staff on both anti-corruption and climate issues to ensure complete understanding of the Programme focus and TI's contribution Current pilot Chapters to act as champions of the Programme within the Movement. Proactive internal communications on the products, outputs and outcomes of the Programme within the Movement.
Unprepared for shift in focus from learning/developing capacity to implementing actionable solutions.	Solutions work driven by the existing strengths of the Chapters. Integration of climate work with broader Chapter work. On-going learning and support between project partners and TI-S on actionable solutions.
EXTERNAL RISK	RISK MITIGATION STRATEGY/ ACTION REQUIRED
Lack of political will and/or capacity of key stakeholders to engage with the Programme and act on basis of evidence provided to tackle corruption in climate finance.	General TI policy of constructive criticism and engagement. Active engagement of all stakeholders through participatory methods/decision-making. Capacity support actions as an enabling factor. Targeted focus and clear messaging on anti-corruption solutions focus of the Programme.
Legal, security and operational constraints in (increasingly) restrictive political environments.	Prevention and security training for Chapters. Strengthening of SAFE response mechanism (including clarity and communication on scope TI-S services). Strengthened risk management and awareness of Chapters (including legal).
Negative impact of economic crisis on fundraising.	Diversifying fundraising approach (targeting private sector actors and non-traditional donors). Increased focus on Chapter fundraising support (both direct assistance in preparation of applications and capacity building through RMSP).

Appendix V Additional Information: Impact

OUTCOME	UNIT	BASELINE	FINAL TARGET VALUE	ACHIEVED VALUE AT THE END OF THE PROJECT[18]	PLANNED DATE OF ACHIEVEMENT (PROJECT PROPOSAL)	DATE OF ACHIEVEMENT
Climate policy-making, climate finance decision-making and climate finance sources and delivery are safeguarded and not undermined by corrupt, unethical behaviours and corruption at all levels.						
Outcome indicator 0.1: Global and national anti-corruption policy By 06/2018, key global (GCF, FCPF, AF, GEF, CIFs, UN REDD) and national climate finance institutions will have adopted and implemented 10 fund policy or practice changes that effectively safeguard against corruption in climate finance delivery, as well as 20 specific text changes reflecting best practice in global climate funds.	Fund/national policies, and/or practices	8 new policy reforms by climate funds and 6 policy reforms in project countries to date	10 additional general policy or practice changes 20 specific text changes	36 policy/practice changes (12 national) 18 text changes	12/2017	Nearly achieved[19]
Outcome indicator 0.2: Increased Civil Society Capacities By 06/2018, civil society capacities increase to actively monitor and resolve corruption/governance weaknesses and identify best practices (based on strict criteria) to prevent such weaknesses occurring in at least 6 multilateral climate financed projects for adaptation, mitigation and REDD+ thus acting as an early warning mechanism for corruption through programme/process and project monitoring actions	Number of cases of best practice identified or governance weakness / corruption corrected	0	6	20	12/2017	Achieved 2017

---

[18] Information compiled from the project's monitoring framework. Transparency International Secretariat. (2019). MEL Status Check. (01/2019)

[19] This double-barreled target is considered nearly achieved because the first part was realised, and far beyond the target, but the second fell short of doing so.

OUTCOME	UNIT	BASELINE	FINAL TARGET VALUE	ACHIEVED VALUE AT THE END OF THE PROJECT[18]	PLANNED DATE OF ACHIEVEMENT (PROJECT PROPOSAL)	DATE OF ACHIEVEMENT
Further, 3 sustainable civil society "Communities of Practice" in areas of REDD+ (led by TI Peru), Adaptation (led by TI Bangladesh and Maldives) and Clean energy/ technology (led by TI Mexico and Kenya) finance are operating.	Sustainable civil society "Communities of Practice"	0	3	4 sustainable communities of practice (adaptation, REDD+, transparency and open data, human rights – clean energy begun but not yet sustainable)	12/2017	Achieved 2018

OUTCOME SUMMARY STATUS	
Climate policy-making, climate finance decision-making and climate finance sources and delivery are safeguarded and not undermined by corrupt, unethical behaviours and corruption at all levels.	
Outcome indicator 0.1: Global and national anti-corruption policy By 06/2018, key global (GCF, FCPF, AF, GEF, CIFs, UN REDD) and national climate finance institutions will have adopted and implemented 10 fund policy or practice changes that effectively safeguard against corruption in climate finance delivery, as well as 20 specific text changes reflecting best practice in global climate funds.	Nearly achieved
Outcome indicator 0.2: Increased Civil Society Capacities By 06/2018, civil society capacities increase to actively monitor and resolve corruption/governance weaknesses and identify best practices (based on strict criteria) to prevent such weaknesses occurring in at least 6 multilateral climate financed projects for adaptation, mitigation and REDD+ thus acting as an early warning mechanism for corruption through programme/process and project monitoring actions.	Beyond target
Further, 3 sustainable civil society "Communities of Practice" in areas of REDD+ (led by TI Peru), Adaptation (led by TI Bangladesh and Maldives) and Clean energy/ technology (led by TI Mexico and Kenya) finance are operating.	Beyond target

While the project team at TI-S used the reporting framework above to report to the donor on aggregated project- level progress, different NCs used the criteria similar to TI Impact Matrix[20] to report on the activities conducted quarterly at their level. Compilation, summarising of information and conversion of formats was undertaken by the project team at TI-S.

---

[20] Transparency International Secretariat. (2015). *Are We on the Road to Impact? – Transparency International Monitoring Guide*. Berlin, Germany: Transparency International. Available online at: https://www.transparency.org/files/content/ouraccountability/2015_TIMonitoringGuide_EN.pdf

Results from the TI Impact Methodology workshop

During a workshop in December 2018, participating NCs and TI-S identified three main achievements of the project and scored the achievements following TI Impact Matrix. The workshop was used as an opportunity to discuss and validate the findings of the current evaluation.

Appendix VI Resources Consulted

TI-S Resources

- Pellini, K. (2016). *Learning and Sustainability Review: Civil Society Capacity Building for Preventive Anti-Corruption Measures in Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (2011-2013) and Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation Governance and Finance Integrity Project (2013-2016)*.

- SDG Lead. (2018). *Final evaluation of the "REDD+ Governance and Finance Integrity for Africa" programme*.

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2011). *Corruption Perceptions Index 2011*. Berlin, Germany: Transparency International Secretariat.

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2011). *Strategy 2015*. (03/2011)

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2012). *Corruption Perceptions Index 2012*. Berlin, Germany: Transparency International Secretariat.

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2013). *Climate Finance Integrity Programme - Programme Document (Final)*. (03/2013)

- Transparency International. (2013). *Climate Newsletter: Issue 1*

- Transparency International. (2013). *Climate Newsletter: Issue 2*

- Transparency International. (2014). *Climate Newsletter: Issue 3*

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2014). *Transparency International's Climate Finance Integrity Programme Evaluation – Management Response*.

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2015). *Are We on the Road to Impact? – Transparency International Monitoring Guide*. Berlin, Germany: Transparency International. Available online at: https://www.transparency.org/files/content/ouraccountability/2015_TIMonitoringGuide_EN.pdf

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2015). *Building Integrity in REDD+ – An Introduction*. Berlin, Germany: Transparency International Secretariat.

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2015). *Building Integrity in REDD+ – An Introduction Training Guidance*. Berlin, Germany: Transparency International Secretariat.

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2015). *Climate Governance Integrity – A Handbook for Getting Started*. Berlin, Germany: Transparency International Secretariat.

- Transparency International. (2015). *Climate Newsletter: Issue 4*

- Transparency International. (2015). *Climate Newsletter: Issue 5*

- Transparency International. (2015). *Climate Newsletter: Issue 6*

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2015). *Project Budget for Proposal to Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz, Bau und Reaktorsicherheit (BMUB) for Project 15_II_132_Global_A_Climate Governance Integrity*.

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2015). *Proposal to Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz, Bau und Reaktorsicherheit (BMUB) for Project 15_II_132_Global_A_Climate Governance Integrity*. (26-02-15)

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2015). *Together Against Corruption - Transparency International Strategy 2020*. (12/2015)

- Transparency International. (2016). *Climate Newsletter: Issue 7*

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2016). *Corruption Perceptions Index 2016*. Berlin, Germany: Transparency International Secretariat.

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2016). *Implementation Plan for Together Against Corruption: Transparency International Strategy 2020*.

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2017). *A Handbook for Communicators & Journalists on Climate Change and Corruption*. Berlin, Germany: Transparency International Secretariat.

- Transparency International. (2017). *Climate Newsletter: Issue 8*

- Transparency International. (2017). *Climate Newsletter: Issue 9*

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2017). *International Climate Initiative – Interim Report: 15_II_132_Global_A_Climate_Governance_Integrity*. (30/04/2017)

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity - Background, Situation, and Future*. (11/2018)

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2018). *Financial Report for Project 15_II_132*. (10/2018)

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2018). *Financial Report - Report Period: Sept 15 - Oct 18*. (10/2018)

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2018). *International Climate Initiative - Current Project Information: 15_II_132_Global_A_Climate Governance Integrity*. (27/04/2018)

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2018). *International Climate Initiative - Current Project Information: 15_II_132_Global_A_Climate Governance Integrity*. (15/10/2018)

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2018). *International Climate Initiative – Interim Report: 15_II_132_Global_A_Climate_Governance_Integrity*. (30/04/2018)

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2019). *MEL Status Check*. (01/2019)

- Transparency International Secretariat. (2018). *Updated Financial Report - Report Period: Sept 15 - Oct 18*. (10/2018)

- Transparency International Secretariat. (s.d.). *Climate Integrity - Background paper on contributions to TI 2020 Strategy Implementation Plan*.

- Transparency International Secretariat. (s.d.). *Global Summary Baseline*.

- Transparency International Secretariat. (s.d.). *Global Summary – Mid-Project*.

- Transparency International Secretariat. (s.d.). *Project Information Summary: Global Climate Finance Integrity*.

- Transparency International Secretariat. (s.d.). *Public Demand for Accountability of Climate Finance & Action*.

▪ Transparency International Secretariat. (n.d.). *Safeguarding the Climate through increasing public demand for accountability*. Berlin, Germany: Transparency International Secretariat.

▪ Transparency International Secretariat. (s.d.). *Transparency International Strategy and Climate Finance Integrity Programme Actions and Results*.

▪ Triple E Consulting. (2013). *Climate Finance Integrity Programme (CFIP) Evaluation – Final Report*.

External Resources

▪ DFID. (2011). *DFID's Approach to Value for Money (VfM)*. Available at: https://bit.ly/2D06HgA

▪ GAIN. (2016). *Country Rankings – Vulnerability*. Available at: https://gain-new.crc.nd.edu/ranking/vulnerability

▪ GAIN. (2016). *About the Index*. Available at: https://gain-new.crc.nd.edu/about/methodology

▪ GIZ. (2017). Anti-Corruption in National Climate Finance Processes – Perspectives for the Green Climate Fund (GCF). CF Ready Climate Finance Webinar. Available at: https://www.giz.de/fachexpertise/downloads/giz2017-en-climate-finance-webinar-anti-corruption.pptx

▪ Green Climate Fund. (2017). *GCF in Brief: About the Fund*. Available at: https://www.greenclimate.fund/documents/20182/194568/gcf-in-brief-about-the-fund.pdf/872ab945-1bbc-43af-91a9-00dc17f52d9d

▪ Green Climate Fund. (2018). *The Ambition*. Available at: https://www.greenclimate.fund/how-we-work/resource-mobilization/replenishment#the-ambition

▪ OECD. (2017). *Country Fact Sheet – Costa Rica*. Available at: https://www.oecd.org/gov/lac-costa-rica.pdf

▪ OECD Development Assistance Committee. (2010). *Quality Standards for Development Evaluation*. DAC Guidelines and Reference Series. Secretary-General of the OECD. Accessed on November 15, 2017. Available at: http://www.oecd.org/development/evaluation/qualitystandards.pdf

▪ Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement. (2017). *Tribute to carbon neutral organizations under Costa Rica's carbon neutrality country program*. Available at: https://www.transparency-partnership.net/news/tribute-carbon-neutral-organizations-under-costa-ricas-carbon-neutrality-country-program

▪ United Nations Evaluation Group. (2008). *UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System*. Available at: http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100

Climate Finance Assessments

▪ Proética. (2013). *An Assessment of Climate Finance Governance – Peru*. (11/2013)

▪ Transparencia Mexicana. (2013). *An Assessment of Climate Finance Governance – Mexico*. (11/2013)

▪ Transparency International Bangladesh. (2013). *An Assessment of Climate Finance Governance – Bangladesh*. (11/2013)

▪ Transparency International Kenya. (2013). *An Assessment of Climate Finance Governance – Kenya*. (11/2013)

- Transparency International Nepal. (2018). *Climate Finance Governance in Nepal*. (06/2018)

- Transparency International Rwanda. (2018). *Promoting Transparency and Accountability in Climate Change Finance in Rwanda – Part I: Climate Change Finance Mapping*. (03/18)

- Transparency International Rwanda. (2018). *Promoting Transparency and Accountability in Climate Change Finance in Rwanda – Part II: Citizen Report Card survey*. (03/18)

- Transparency Maldives. (2013). *An Assessment of Climate Finance Governance – Maldives*. (08/2013)

2017 Narrative Reports

- Costa Rica Integra. (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report*. (01/2018)

- Proética. (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report*. (01/2018)

- Transparencia Mexicana. (2017). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report.* (12/2017)

- Transparency International Bangladesh. (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report*. (02/2018)

- Transparency International Kenya. (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report*. (01/2018)

- Transparency International Korea. (2018*). Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report.* (01/2018)

- Transparency International Nepal. (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report*. (01/2018)

- Transparency International Rwanda. (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report.* (01/2018)

- Transparency Maldives. (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report*. (01/2018)

2018 Narrative Reports

- Costa Rica Integra . (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report*. (08/2018)

- Proética. (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report*. (07/2018)

- Transparencia Mexicana. (2017). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report.* (10/2018)

- Transparency International Bangladesh. (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report*. (10/2018)

- Transparency International Kenya. (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report*. (10/2018)

- Transparency International Korea. (2018*). Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report.* (10/2018)

- Transparency International Nepal. (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report*. (10/2018)

- Transparency International Rwanda. (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report.* (05/2018)

- Transparency Maldives. (2018). *Climate Governance Integrity Impact Mapping Narrative Report*. (10/2018)

Appendix VII Evaluation Matrix

	EVALUATION QUESTION	SUBQUESTION	SOURCE
Relevance	To what extent was the project suitable to the priorities and policies of the target groups, TI-S and the donor organisation?	How relevant was the project in the wider context of the fight against corruption and enhancing climate finance integrity?	Document review, interviews (donor, partners)
		How has the project been contributing to TI's strategy?	Document review, interview (TI-S)
		To what extent was the used approach suitable to addressing the climate change mitigation/adaptation and REDD+ corruption risks in the target countries?	Document review, interview (NCs)
Effectiveness and Results	How far the intended outcomes were achieved in relation to target set in the original project proposal and in the national plans?	Have the interventions achieved or are they likely to achieve objectives?	Document review, interview (all stakeholder groups)
		How effective and appropriate was the project approach?	Document review, interview (all stakeholder groups)
		What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?	Document review, interview (NCs, TI-S)
		With hindsight, how could it have been improved?	Document review, interview (NCs, TI-S)
		How effective was the support of the TI Secretariat in terms of enabling Chapters achieving the project's goals?	Document review, interview (NCs, TI-S)
		Overall, what are the strengths and weaknesses of the project?	Document review, interview (all stakeholder groups)
Efficiency	How far funding, personnel, regulatory, administrative, time, other resources and procedures contributed to or hindered the achievement of outputs?	How well did the partnership and management arrangements work and how did they develop over time?	Document review, interview (NCs, TI-S)
		How were implementing partners involved in project management and how effective was this and what have been the benefits of or difficulties with this involvement?	
		Were the risks properly identified and well managed?	Document review, interview (NCs, TI-S)
		Overall, did the project represent good value for money?	Document review, interview (NCs, TI-S, donor)

	EVALUATION QUESTION	SUBQUESTION	SOURCE
Impact	What were the positive and negative changes produced by the project, directly or indirectly? This involves the main outcomes and impacts resulting from the project, both intended and unintended outcomes and impacts.	What have been the key outcomes achieved so far as a result of this project and how does this compare with what was expected?	Document review, interview (all stakeholder groups)
		What changes has the project achieved in terms of strengthening the implementing partners and civil society as leading actors in addressing climate change mitigation/adaptation and REDD+ corruption issues?	Document review, interview (all stakeholder groups)
		How did the project add value to the outcomes/impact achieved?	Document review, interview (all stakeholder groups)
Sustainability and Scalability	What is the potential for the continuation of the impact achieved?	To what extent are the TI implementing partners able to ensure the sustainability of project outcomes through integrating aspects of the work in their future work, i.e. advocacy strategies/project design?	Document review, interview (NCs, TI-S, donor)
		What were the major factors, which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?	Document review, interview (all stakeholder groups)
		What are the mechanisms in place (or planned) to ensure that achieved results are maintained and built upon by the implementing partners, governments and / or other relevant stakeholders?	Document review, interview (NCs, TI-S)

Appendix VIII Stakeholders Consulted[21]

TI-S Staff

TITLE	ORGANISATION
Climate Governance Integrity Lead	Climate Governance Integrity, Transparency International
Project Coordinator	Climate Governance Integrity, Transparency International
Former Project Officer	Climate Governance Integrity, Transparency International

International Partner Organisations

TITLE	ORGANISATION
Advisor Anti-Corruption & Integrity	German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ)
Partnerships & Resource Mobilization Coordinator	Global Environment Facility (GEF)
Head of the Independent Redressal Mechanism	Green Climate Fund (GCF)

Participating NCs

TITLE	ORGANISATION
Vice Presidente II	Costa Rica Integra (TI-Costa Rica)
Programme Coordinator	Proética (TI-Peru)
Programme Manager	TI-Bangladesh
Senior Programme Manager	TI-Bangladesh
Deputy Programme Officer	TI-Kenya
Project Manager	TI-Korea
Executive Director	TI-Maldives
Senior Project Coordinator	TI-Maldives
Program Officer	TI-Nepal
Executive Director of Chapter and former contact point for the project	TI-Rwanda
Programme Manager	TI-Rwanda
Project Coordinator	Transparencia México (TI-México)
Project Manager	Transparencia México (TI-México)

---

[21] Names have been withheld to ensure confidentiality.

Stakeholders in the Maldives (Field Mission)

TITLE	ORGANISATION
(Beneficiary)	(Beneficiary)
(Beneficiary)	(Beneficiary)
Assistant Resident Representative	UNDP
DDG	Environment Protection Agency
Director	Environment Protection Agency
Engineer	Environment Protection Agency
Journalist	Addu Live, Eedhigalikihi
Lawyer	Hisaan, Riffath & Co.
Member	Save Maldives Movement
Member	Save Maldives Movement

Appendix IX Terms of Reference

STANDARD TEMPLATE FOR TENDERS

GENERAL INFORMATION

Title of Consultancy: Final evaluation of the project "Climate Governance Integrity: Safeguarding the Climate and Climate Finance against Corruption"

Application Closing Date: 14/10/2018 COB

Duration: 25 days

Consultancy Start and End Date: 22/10/2018 –10/12/2018

Location of Consultancy: remote, with travel to Costa Rica and possibly another country (tbc)

BACKGROUND

Transparency International (TI) is the global civil society organisation leading the fight against corruption. Through more than 100 Chapters worldwide and an international secretariat in Berlin, Germany, TI raises awareness of the damaging effects of corruption and works with partners in government, business and civil society to develop and implement effective measures to tackle it.

The Transparency International Secretariat (TI-S) in Berlin is seeking to commission a final project evaluation of the BMU-funded "Global Climate Governance Integrity" project to an external Consultant.

TI's overall Climate Finance Integrity programme aims to promote better transparency, accountability, and integrity in decision-making processes and operations of climate financing institutions and mechanisms.

TI's project aims to ensure that corruption and corrupt behaviour cannot and do not undermine climate change mitigation ambition, effective and equitable allocation of climate finance and ultimately the delivery of climate projects and their intended adaptation and mitigation targets. This outcome is pursued by focused global and national advocacy, monitoring and capacity building actions aimed at policy and practice improvements for better transparency and accountability and for effective and fair responses when things go wrong. At the national level, the project builds on country-level work in 5 countries: Bangladesh, Kenya, the Maldives, Mexico and Peru and since August 2016, in Nepal and Rwanda.

Through country-led initiatives, the project aims to strengthen global and regional cooperation and partnerships of civil society actors engaged with adaptation, REDD+ and clean energy/ technology policies and finance. In doing so, it aims to support improved networks or communities of practice in each climate thematic area with a view to achieving greater impact and sustainability of civil society.

The specific objectives are:

Key global and national climate finance institutions will have adopted and implemented 10 fund policy or practice changes that effectively safeguard against corruption in climate finance delivery, as well as 20 specific text changes reflecting best practice in global climate funds.

Civil society capacities increase to actively monitor and resolve corruption/governance weaknesses and identify best practices (based on strict criteria) to prevent such weaknesses occurring in at least 6 multilateral climate financed projects for adaptation, mitigation and REDD+ thus acting as an early warning mechanism for corruption through programme/process and project monitoring actions. Further, 3 sustainable civil

society "Communities of Practice" in areas of REDD+ (led by TI Peru), Adaptation (led by TI Bangladesh and Maldives) and Clean energy/ technology (led by TI Mexico and Kenya) finance are operating.

The project started 01 August 2015 and ends on 31 December 2018.

The project has a budget of EUR 2,4 million and is mainly funded by BMU (the German Ministry of Environment).

OBJECTIVES

The main purpose of the evaluation exercise is to provide an external and independent review that assesses the performance and achievements in meeting the expected results and contributing to positive changes. Additionally, the evaluation will assess whether the project lead to any unforeseen positive or negative results. The assessment will stimulate learning and inform TI's future work on the topic, building on previous evaluations.

The overall objectives of the evaluation are the following:

- Compile and provide an objective assessment of the achievements and results, weaknesses and strengths of the project.

- Generate lessons learned and good practices from the project's work under each of the three respective objectives.

- Provide clear and forward-looking recommendations that can guide TI Secretariat and National Chapters in developing strategies for implementation of projects with similar objectives.

KEY ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

The following questions could be addressed during the project evaluation but are subject to discussion and agreement with TI-S during the period of designing the evaluation approach. The evaluator is free to further prioritize these questions in the proposal and suggest others it deems necessary.

Relevance: To what extent was the project suitable to the priorities and policies of the target groups, TI-S and the donor organisation?

- How relevant was the project in the wider context of the fight against corruption and enhancing climate finance integrity?

- How has the project been contributing to TI's strategy?

- To what extent was the used approach suitable to addressing the climate change mitigation/adaptation and REDD+ corruption risks in the target countries?

Impact: The positive and negative changes produced by the project, directly or indirectly. This involves the main outcomes and impacts resulting from the project, both intended and unintended outcomes and impacts.

- What have been the key outcomes achieved so far as a result of this project and how does this compare with what was expected?

- What changes has the project achieved in terms of strengthening the implementing partners and civil society as leading actors in addressing climate change mitigation/adaptation and REDD+ corruption issues?

- How did the project add value to the outcomes/impact achieved?

Effectiveness: Assessment of how far the intended outcomes were achieved in relation to target set in the original project proposal and in the national plans:

- Have the interventions achieved or are they likely to achieve objectives?
- How effective and appropriate was the project approach?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- With hindsight, how could it have been improved?
- How effective was the support of the TI Secretariat in terms of enabling Chapters achieving the project's goals?
- Overall, what are the strengths and weaknesses of the project?

Efficiency: How far funding, personnel, regulatory, administrative, time, other resources and procedures contributed to or hindered the achievement of outputs

- How well did the partnership and management arrangements work and how did they develop over time?
- How were implementing partners involved in project management and how effective was this and what have been the benefits of or difficulties with this involvement?
- Were the risks properly identified and well managed?
- Overall, did the project represent good value for money?

Sustainability: Potential for the continuation of the impact achieved:

- To what extent are the TI implementing partners able to ensure the sustainability of project outcomes through integrating aspects of the work in their future work, i.e. advocacy strategies/project design?
- What were the major factors, which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?
- What are the mechanisms in place (or planned) to ensure that achieved results are maintained and built upon by the implementing partners, governments and / or other relevant stakeholders?

METHODOLOGY

The evaluator is ultimately responsible for the overall methodological approach and design of the evaluation and is expected to propose methodologies that they consider most appropriate to achieve the aims of this evaluation. However, the evaluation should use a participatory and gender-sensitive approach engaging relevant staff at TI-S and implementing partners and beneficiaries through structured methods and selected field visits. Both quantitative and qualitative data should be utilised to assess the programme. Data collection methods may include among others interviews with internal and external stakeholders, survey questionnaires, field visits, and desk review of relevant documents.

The evaluator is expected to refine the scope and methodology of this evaluation during the inception phase in cooperation with TI-S and provide a detailed evaluation plan. The evaluation expert should present a detailed statement of the proposed review methods in the technical proposal.

The evaluator is expected to directly link the methodology to TI's impact monitoring approach, see here.

EXPECTED DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINE

The evaluator (or team) is expected to deliver:

- A concept note outlining the proposed methodology, timeframe of planned actions including scheduled country visits for approval by TI-S.

- A workshop or virtual meeting with the project team in Berlin (if possible).

- Conceptualising and running of an evaluation meeting with all project partners in San Jose, Costa Rica in November.

- A draft evaluation report for review and comments by TI-S including annexes covering conducted interviews, questionnaires and list of reviewed documents.

- A validation workshop or virtual meeting with the project team in Berlin and key staff to discuss findings (tbc).

- A final review report, including clear lessons-learned and recommendations.

All evaluation deliverables are to be submitted in English, in electronic form (in word and excel for OS Windows compatible), in accordance with the deadlines stipulated below. The consultant is responsible for editing and quality control of language. The final report should be presented in a way that directly enables publication. TI-S retains the sole rights with respect to all distribution, dissemination and publication of the deliverables.

Report structure

The Final Evaluation (max 30 pages, including annexes) must include the following sections:

a. Title Page
b. Table of Contents
c. Abbreviations/acronyms
d. Executive Summary
e. Brief description of the project
f. The Evaluation Methodology
g. Findings in relation to standard review criteria (see above)
h. Lessons Learned
i. Summary of Recommendations
j. Annexes

In addition to the Final evaluation, a PowerPoint presentation should contain a more visual synthesis.

The expected deliverables and timelines are set out below:
- Interim report by 26/11/2018.
- Final report by 07/12/2018.

SELECTION CRITERIA

Essential profile:

- University degree in social sciences or a related area. A post-graduate degree in project management, and/or related fields would be an advantage

- At least 7 years of proven relevant professional experience in an international development environment, preferably carried on within international organisations (i.e. European Commission) of which at least 3 years should be in Monitoring & Evaluation of multiple country projects & programmes

- Expert knowledge of climate finance, REDD+ and/or forestry sector

- Excellent drafting and report writing capacities

- Highly motivated and committed to the values of transparency and integrity
- Availability to carry out most of the work in November 2018

Desirable experience:

- Knowledge of good governance and anti-corruption issues is desirable
- Familiarity with the activities and procedures of TI Secretariat and TI National Chapters is an advantage
- Experience in monitoring and evaluation of BMU projects and programme an advantage

Working language:

- The working language will be English
- Knowledge of Spanish is highly desirable

REMUNERATION AND COSTS

The Consultant should provide a detailed breakdown, before any VAT or other charges, of all their estimated costs, including but not limited to; total fee as a lump sum or standard daily or hourly rates, (if applicable), work materials. Any costs related to international travel will be separately covered by TIS.

The expected number of working days are expected to be around 20-25 days.

Transparency International e.V. (Secretariat), (TI-S) is registered as a Business Entity in Germany with VAT identification number DE273612486. In order to determine the Value Added Tax (VAT) implications of this tender, we kindly request that the Consultant fill out the VAT Form for Tenders/Vendor Form (instructions inside the form) and submit the completed and duly signed form along with their email application.

OTHER INFORMATION

Additional reading on TI's work on climate governance and REDD+ can be found on our website here.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Applications (in English) must be sent by email to Charlotte Dawirs at cdawirs@transparency.org by close of business of **14/10/2018.** Please indicate "BMU final project evaluation" in the subject line.

The application should contain the following documents:

- A cover letter outlining motivation and evidence that the evaluator is qualified to undertake this evaluation
- Curriculum Vitae with full description of the applicant's profile and experience
- One sample of previous work (confidentiality guaranteed)
- The approach and proposed data collection methods based on the information provided in these Terms of Reference including timeline
- Financial Offer for undertaking the work, with estimation as to the number of days that will be spent on each task
- Contact details for at least two independent referees with in-depth and proven knowledge of the applicant's expertise and relevant work experience.
- Completed VAT form for tenders (can be found at www.transparency.org/whoweare/work)

Please note that only shortlisted applicants will be contacted. TI retains the right to reject any or all of the applications and/or to enter into additional negotiations with one or more of the tendering parties.