Annex 16: Context Mapping Report

Prosperity Fund - Evaluation and Learning

February 2018

HM Government

Prosperity Fund

Evaluation & Learning services delivered by:

wyg. LTS INTERNATIONAL INTEGRITY

Table of Contents

Version History

Document Title	Context Mapping Report		
	WYGB7-INC-06-02	Revision	4
Revision	**Written By**	**Checked By**	**Approved By**
Revision 0	Joel Burman	Toby Pragasam	
Revision 1	Joel Burman	Paddy Abbott, Michael Schultz	
Revision 2	Joel Burman	Toby Pragasam	PFMO
Revision 3	Joel Burman	Toby Pragasam, Michael Schultz	PFMO
Revision 4	Joel Burman	Toby Pragasam	PFMO
Revision 5			

This report was prepared during the inception phase of the Prosperity Fund Evaluation and Learning contract. It forms an annex to the main Inception Report.

It was produced and approved by the Prosperity Fund Management Office before the main Inception Report and Workplan were finalised and agreed.

If there is any inconsistency between this annex and the main Inception Report and Workplan, the main Inception Report and Workplan provides the agreed position.

Acronyms

ACP	Asia Climate Partners
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AECF	Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund
AIIB	Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank
AMC	Asset Management Company
AMP	DFID Aid Management Platform
APR	Annual Performance Report
BEIS	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
BER	Business Environment Reform
BERF	Business Environment Reform Facility
BMUB	German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety
CAF	Development Bank of Latin America
CDB	Caribbean Development Bank
CDC	CDC Group
CIAT	International Centre for Tropical Agriculture
CIF	Climate Investment Funds
CLA	Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting
CMO	Central Management Office
COs	Country Offices
CP3	Climate Public Private Partnership Programme
CSSF	Conflict, Stability and Security Fund
CTF	Clean Technology Fund
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DCED	Donor Committee for Enterprise Development
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs
DEG	German Investment and Development Corporation
DFID	Department for International Development
DGGF	Dutch Good Growth Fund
DIT	Department for International Trade
E&L	Evaluation and Learning (contractor/team)
EAIF	Emerging Africa Infrastructure Fund
EcHo	UK Economic Horizons Programme
EDF	European Development Fund
EMU	Evaluation Management Unit
EnDev	Energising Development

EQUALS	Evaluation Quality Assurance and Learning Service
EU-AITF	EU-Africa Infrastructure Trust Fund
FCO	Foreign and Commonwealth Office
FGMC	Forest Governance, Markets and Climate Programme
FIP	Forest Investment Program
FLEGT	Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade
FMO	Dutch Development Bank
FY	Financial Year
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GCPF	Global Climate Partnership Fund
GCRF	Global Challenges Research Fund
GEC	Girls' Education Challenge Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GGF	Good Governance Fund
GIF	Global Innovation Fund
GLAM	Global Learning for Adaptive Management Programme
GPR	Corporate Policy Project Rating (Geschäftspolitische Projektrating)
HMG	Her Majesty's Government
HMT	HM Treasury
IATI	International Aid Transparency Initiative
ICAI	Independent Commission for Aid Impact
ICF	International Climate Fund
ICT	Information & Communication Technology
IDC	International Development Committee
IEG	World Bank – Independent Evaluation Group
IEO	Independent Evaluation Office
IEU	Independent Evaluation Unit
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IGC	International Growth Centre
IPA	Infrastructure and Projects Authority
KFW	KfW Entwicklungsbank (from Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau)
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LMICs	Low or Middle-Income Countries
LSE	London School of Economics and Political Science
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
M&R	Monitoring and Reporting (PF contractor/team)
MDBs	Multilateral Development Banks
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning

NAMA	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (Facility)
NAO	National Audit Office
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisations
Norad	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NSC	National Security Council
ODA	Overseas Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OeEB	Development Bank of Austria
OGD	Other Government Departments
PF	Prosperity Fund
PIDG	Private Infrastructure Development Group
PMST	Programme Management Support Team
PPCR	Pilot Program for Climate Resilience
PSD	Private Sector Development
QA	Quality Assurance
RTE	Real Time Evaluation
SDGs	UN Sustainable Development Goals
SECO	State Secretariat for Economic Affairs
SIFEM	Swiss Investment Fund for Emerging Markets
SMEs	Small and Medium-sized Enterprises
SREP	Scaling Up Renewable Energy in Low Income Countries Program
TA	Technical Assistance
TFC	Trust Fund Committees
ToC	Theory of Change
UFE	Utilisation-Focused Evaluation
UKCIF	UK Caribbean Infrastructure Partnership Fund
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VfM	Value for Money
WB	World Bank

Executive Summary

This report maps other programmes and initiatives relevant to Prosperity Fund (PF) Evaluation and Learning (E&L). The report focuses on evaluations and activities which are likely to intersect with the PF E&L in the future, rather than reviewing past experiences and lessons learned from similar funds (which feature in other elements of the E&L design).

Programmes have been chosen because they have similar aims and approaches to the PF: budgetary scale and fund/portfolio approach; cross-governmental function; and the inclusion of secondary benefits. The report also covers activities which are likely to intersect with the PF E&L, including UK government oversight processes and the work of government departments with mandates that overlap with that of the PF.

The context map separates HMG funds/initiatives from other bilateral and multilateral programmes. In respect of the former it is worth recognising that while some funds offer less thematic overlap with the PF, their cross-governmental and fund-based approach makes them relevant to the PF E&L, especially given the interests of wider UK stakeholders such as Parliamentary oversight bodies. For example, the recent (December 2017) International Development Sub-Committee on the work of the Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI)[1], convened jointly around the PF and the Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) and made recurrent reference to other UK funds including the Ross Fund, Newton Fund and the Conflict, Stability and Security Fund (CSSF). All of these funds are included in this report.

Among UK-led funds and programmes there are several with high relevance to the PF E&L, due to similarities in criteria, as well as notable evaluations on the horizon which the PF E&L will need to take note of and look to interact with. This includes, for example, the Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMA) facility which, like the PF E&L, will undertake a theory-based and utilisation-focused evaluation of its programme (focused on climate protection including within emerging economies).

The CSSF is another UK-led fund similar to the PF. Both: are accountable to the National Security Council (NSC); are relatively new instruments building on the experiences of predecessor funds; and have the majority of their resources (currently) channelled through the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO). The CSSF also uses external suppliers for monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and the manner of this undertaking – blending support to programmes with centralised evaluation efforts – offers important lessons for the PF E&L.

The Business Environment Reform Facility (BERF), UK Economic Horizons Programme (EcHo) and International Climate Fund (ICF) all offer strong thematic, geographic and operational overlaps with the PF. As the PF E&L progresses, and individual programme and thematic evaluations move towards implementation, there will be important points of synergy on topics such as business environment reform (BERF), secondary benefit (EcHo) and disaster risk reduction (ICF) emanating from these funds.

In addition to the UK, several other countries also have portfolio facilities and/or investment mechanisms aimed at growth promotion in emerging markets. The €700 million Dutch Good Growth Fund (DGGF), which includes a specific focus on working with both Dutch and host country business partners, will also undertake a theory-based evaluation running until the

[1] http://www.parliamentlive.tv/Event/Index/32b95b45-baa8-42df-828d-153d53a6dfee

programme ends (currently set for 2021). By contrast, the Danida Market Development Partnerships commits to a “Real Time Evaluation” (RTE) of its projects (in Kenya, Nigeria, Myanmar, Ethiopia), with reports likely available in the lifetime of the PF E&L.

Among a wide range of multilateral funds, several focus on growth promotion and areas of strong programmatic and geographic interest to the PF E&L. The $10.5 billion Private Infrastructure Development Group (PIDG), to which the UK contributes, is likely to generate several E&L outputs relevant to PF programmes – with some already planned for early 2018. Similarly, the $118 million AgResults, to which the UK also contributes, will produce theory-based and synthesis evaluations of its work catalysing agricultural markets.

The multilateral space also offers many examples of fund/portfolio operating frameworks which are likely to offer important lessons for the PF. The $8.3 billion Climate Investment Fund (CIF) is particularly relevant given its scale, geographic range and the fact that it operates through Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs). During 2018, several notable evaluative outputs from CIF’s independent Evaluation and Learning Initiative will be relevant to the PF E&L (see below). Both the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and Green Climate Fund (GCF) also have independent evaluation units, with the GCF Unit focused on undertaking a similar range of evaluations to the PF E&L, i.e. overall, portfolio, country, thematic, and programme evaluations.

This report also includes a selection of non-programmatic initiatives which need to be accounted for as part of the PF E&L context. This includes the work of the International Growth Centre (IGC), which focuses on research and policy advice around key growth challenges, and the Global Learning for Adaptive Management programme (GLAM) which is a centre of research and practice to support adaptive management in DFID and USAID programmes.

The report below is structured in four main sections:

- Section 1 briefly outlines the purpose of the report and methodology used.
- Section 2 visually summarises the findings of the horizon scanning and context mapping process, mapping Fund/Programmes against key PF criteria.
- Section 3 provides greater detail on each of these funds, programmes, initiatives and activities, highlighting where possible their respective focus and specific evaluation approaches and timelines.
- Section 4 concludes this report and outlines next steps for context mapping activities during the remainder of the inception period and into implementation. This section also outlines some of the potential synergies identified by the context mapping process, including: supporting learning and building on existing knowledge; refining evaluation methods; and supporting cross-HMG learning. Relatedly, this section also highlights risks for the PF E&L including: duplication of efforts and stakeholder fatigue; de-contextualised PF programmes; and missed opportunities for learning. Next steps following this report cover four key areas including: further coordination and engagement; ongoing comparison and learning; programme-level context mapping; and annual reviews of this Context Map.

1. Introduction

The objective of the context mapping process is to map the Prosperity Fund Evaluation and Learning (E&L) approach and process against other similar programmes and their E&L activities, so that any synergies can be identified, and duplications avoided.

This mapping is intended as a living document which will continue to grow as further evaluations of relevance are scoped, and as such will be added to as inception progresses. Additionally, as inception moves to implementation and specific programme evaluations take shape, further detailed thematic and/or geographic context mapping will follow. The mapping below therefore provides a strategic look at the most relevant E&L elements attached to funds/programmes within the 'prosperity space'.

The context map also links to another inception deliverable – the Stakeholder Map Briefing Note. The funds/programmes included in the context map also constitute wider stakeholders to the Prosperity Fund E&L process. These stakeholders are likely to maintain an interest in the Prosperity Fund due to thematic and/or geographic overlaps, but also because the Prosperity Fund model represents a new approach within UK development policy. As such, this report should be read alongside the Stakeholder Map Briefing Note.

1.1 Data sources and method

The context mapping draws on the E&L stakeholder engagement process as well as desk-based research to identify other relevant funds/programmes and their evaluation approaches and plans. The mapping also draws on the knowledge and networks within the E&L team.

The context mapping approach for E&L has coordinated with that of the Monitoring and Reporting (M&R) supplier, noting the differences of each – with the M&R context concentrated on other data and reporting platforms and organisations[2], and E&L on the evaluative approach and focus of other funds and initiatives. There are also a number of initiatives captured in both context maps, including: Newton Fund, ICF, Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED), Global Learning for Adaptive Management (GLAM), PIDG, Green Climate Fund (GCF), Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI), World Bank Group, and IMF. The initiatives respectively captured by the M&R and E&L Context Maps are detailed in Table 1 below.

1.2 Defining relevant Funds/Programmes

The key criteria for scoping relevant funds/programmes and their respective evaluations are focused on the following features of the Prosperity Fund:

- Thematic focus
- Budgetary scale and fund/portfolio approach
- Cross-governmental function
- Inclusion of secondary benefit

[2] Initiatives captured in the M&R Context Map, but not in the E&L Context Map include: Aid Management Programme, Development Tracker, Open Aid Sweden, CAF, Findeter, Innovate UK, CIAT, DFID Aid Management Platform (AMP), UK Statistics Authority, OECD, UNAIDS, UN Sustainable Development GOALS (SDGs), X Point, Donor Tracker, International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), The Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund. See Annex 1 for full list.

Funds/programmes below are included on the basis of matching two or more of the criteria above.

The context mapping focuses predominantly on the fund/portfolio level, rather than reviewing evaluations at the scale of individual PF programmes unless particularly relevant or of notable scale. The exception to this is with regard to programmes run by MDBs, where understanding around how these programmes will be evaluated, and how PF E&L might interact with the evaluations, is included where available.

Lessons learned from individual evaluations are not captured as part of this forward-looking context mapping. The exception to this is reference to the ‘original’ (FCO) Prosperity Fund, which is included due to its particular relevance to the successor Prosperity Fund.

E&L only	Both M&R and E&L Co	M&R only
1. Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund (AECF)	1. Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED)	1. Aid Management Programme 2. Development Tracker
2. AgResults	2. Global Learning for Adaptive Management (GLAM)	3. CAF
3. Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB)	3. Green Climate Fund (GCF)	4. DFID Aid Management Platform (AMP)
4. Business Environment Reform Facility (BERF)	4. International Climate Fund (ICF)	5. Findeter
5. CDC Group	5. IMF	6. Innovate UK
6. Climate Investment Funds (CIF)	6. Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI)	7. International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI)
7. Climate Public Private Partnership Programme (CP3)	7. Private Infrastructure Development Group (PIDG)	8. OECD
8. Danida Market Development Partnerships	8. Newton Fund	9. Open Aid Sweden
9. Department for International Development (DFID)	9. World Bank – Independent Evaluation Group (IEG)	10. Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund
10. Department for International Trade (DIT)		11. International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)
11. Dutch Good Growth Fund (DGGF)		12. UK Statistics Authority
12. Emerging Africa Infrastructure Fund (EAIF)		13. UN Sustainable Development GOALS (SDGs)
13. Energising Development (EnDev)		14. UNAIDS
14. Enterprise Development for Jobs (Norway)		15. X Point 16. Donor Tracker
15. EU-Africa Infrastructure Trust Fund		
16. Forest Governance, Markets and Climate Programme (FGMC)		
17. Girls' Education Challenge Fund (GEC)		
18. Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF)		
19. Global Climate Partnership Fund		
20. Global Environment Facility (GEF)		
21. Good Governance Fund (GGF)		
22. HM Treasury (HMT)		
23. International Finance Corporation (IFC) 24. NAMA facility		
25. National Audit Office (NAO)		
26. 'Original' (FCO) Prosperity Fund		
27. Conflict, Stability and Security Fund (CSSF)		
28. Empowerment Fund		
29. Global Innovation Fund (GIF)		
30. Infrastructure and Projects Authority (IPA)		
31. International Growth Centre (IGC)		

E&L only	Both M&R and E&L Co	M&R only
32. Ross Fund		
33. Swiss Investment Fund for Emerging Markets (SIFEM)		
34. UK Caribbean Infrastructure Partnership Fund		
35. UK Economic Horizons Programme (EcHo)		

Table 1: Initiatives captured in the M&R and E&L Context Maps

2. Context Map

The table below summarises the findings of the horizon scanning and context mapping process, mapping funds and programme against the key PF key criteria noted above. Further detail on all the funds, programmes and activities is detailed in the following section. The table shows whole and partial relevance to each of the criteria, where applicable, and summarises the evaluation approach articulated under each of the programmes.

Summary	Prosperity Fund E&L Relevance								
	Geographic Focus	Thematic Focus	Fund-mechanics	Cross-Govt Fund	UK-Oversight	Evaluation Approach	Secondary Benefit	Support Modalities	Programme Budget
UK Government Departments and Agencies									
Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI)			-	-	●	Mixed			-
Infrastructure and Projects Authority (IPA)			-	-	●	Assurance			-
Department for International Development (DFID)	●	●	-	-	●	Mixed	◗	◗	-
National Audit Office (NAO)			-	-	●	Audit			-
HM Treasury (HMT)		●	-	-	●	Mixed			-
Department for International Trade (DIT)		●	-	-	●	Mixed	◗	◗	-
CDC Group		●	-	-		Summative	●	◗	£3.9bn
UK-led Funds and Programmes									
‘Original’ (FCO) Prosperity Fund	●	●			-	None	●	●	£30m
NAMA facility	●	●	●		-	Theory-based and utilisation-focused		●	€346m
Girls’ Education Challenge Fund (GEC)	◗		●	●	-	Meta-analysis of project-level evaluations			£355m
Conflict, Stability and Security Fund (CSSF)	◗		●	●	-	Mixed			£1.2bn (FY 17/18)

Summary	Prosperity Fund E&L Relevance								
	Geographic Focus	Thematic Focus	Fund-mechanics	Cross-Govt Fund	UK-Oversight	Evaluation Approach	Secondary Benefit	Support Modalities	Programme Budget
Good Governance Fund (GGF)		●	●	●	-	TBC			£20m
Empowerment Fund (UK)			●	●	-	TBC		●	£700m
Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF)			●	●	-	TBC	●	◗	£1.5bn
UK Economic Horizons Programme (EcHo)	●	●		●	-	TBC			Unspecified
Business Environment Reform Facility (BERF)	●	●	●	●	-	Synthesis			Unspecified
UK Caribbean Infrastructure Partnership Fund		●	●	●	-	Summative		◗	£300m
International Climate Fund (ICF)	●	●	●	●	-	Mixed		●	£9.7bn
Newton Fund	●		●	●	-	RTE, Summative and Formative	●	●	£735m
Ross Fund			●	●	-	TBC	●	◗	£1bn
Global Local Adaptive Programme (GLAM)		●			-	N/A			-
International Growth Centre (IGC)		●			-	N/A			-
Other Bilateral-led Funds and Programmes									
Dutch Good Growth Fund (DGGF)	●	●	●		-	Theory-based approach	●	●	€700m
Danida Market Development Partnerships	◗	●			-	RTE	●	●	£7m
Enterprise Development for Jobs (Norway)		●	●		-	Summative	●	●	£45m
Swiss Investment Fund for Emerging Markets (SIFEM)	◗	●	●		-	Summative and Theory-based evaluation	●	●	$687.5m

Summary	Prosperity Fund E&L Relevance								
	Geographic Focus	Thematic Focus	Fund-mechanics	Cross-Govt Fund	UK-Oversight	Evaluation Approach	Secondary Benefit	Support Modalities	Programme Budget
Multilateral Funds and Programmes									
Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB)	●	●	●	-	-	TBC		●	-
World Bank – Independent Evaluation Group (IEG)	●	●	●	-	-	Mixed		●	-
International Finance Corporation (IFC)	●	●	●	-	-	Mixed		●	-
Forest Governance, Markets and Climate Programme (FGMC)	●		●	-	-	Theory-based			£250m
Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund (AECF)	●	●	●	-	-	Theory-based		●	$244m
Donor Committee for Enterprise Development		●		-	-	N/A			-
Global Environment Facility (GEF)	●	●	●	-	-	Mixed		●	$17bn
Private Infrastructure Development Group (PIDG)	●	●	●	-	-	Mixed		●	$10.5bn
Emerging Africa Infrastructure Fund (EAIF)	●	●	●	-	-	Summative and Case studies		●	$600m
Energising Development (EnDev)	◗	●		-	-	Process Evaluation		◗	€350m
Climate Public Private Partnership Programme (CP3)	◗		●	-	-	Theory-driven approach and Case studies		◗	£110m
Climate Investment Funds (CIF)	●	●	●	-	-	Mixed		●	$8.3bn
AgResults	◗	●	●	-	-	Theory-based and Synthesis			$118m
Global Climate Partnership Fund	●	●	●	-	-	Unspecified			$335m
Green Climate Fund (GCF)	●	●	●	-	-	Mixed		●	$10.3bn

Summary	Prosperity Fund E&L Relevance								
	Geographic Focus	Thematic Focus	Fund-mechanics	Cross-Govt Fund	UK-Oversight	Evaluation Approach	Secondary Benefit	Support Modalities	Programme Budget
EU-Africa Infrastructure Trust Fund	◗	●	●	-	-	Summative		●	€812m
Global Innovation Fund (GIF)	◗	◗	●	-	-	TBC	◗	◗	$200m

3. Context Map: Detail

3.1 UK Government Departments and Agencies

3.1.1 Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI)

ICAI scrutinises UK aid spending, operating independently of government and reporting to Parliament through the House of Commons International Development Committee (IDC) or their ICAI Sub-Committee. ICAI carries out independent reviews of aid programmes and of issues affecting the delivery of UK aid. ICAI's mandate covers all ODA, regardless of the spending department.

Evaluation An ICAI rapid review of the Prosperity Fund was conducted in February 2017, and a joint ICF and Prosperity Fund ICAI review is planned for 2018. ICAI is also currently undertaking or planning several reviews of relevance to the Prosperity Fund, including: DFID's approach to building resilience to natural disasters, Winter 2017/18; Global health threats, Winter 2017/18; DFID's approach to value for money in programme and portfolio management, Winter 2017/18; Conflict, Stability and Security Fund, Winter 2017/18; Procurement II: Does DFID maximise value for money through its tenders and contract management, Summer 2018; Infrastructure, Summer 2018; The CDC's engagement in low-income countries, Autumn 2018 (see CDC below); The UK's engagement with multilateral organisations, Autumn 2018; UK aid to mitigating and adapting to climate change, Winter 2018/19; Newton Fund, Winter 2018/19 (see Newton Fund below).

3.1.2 The Infrastructure and Projects Authority (IPA)

The IPA "operates as the home of the Project Delivery function across government, helping government to deliver projects better and bringing specialist project delivery skills to the Civil Service"[3]. The IPA looks at the 'overall project delivery system', namely the projects (de-risking and Value for Money (VfM)), people (developing skills and capability) and processes (set the processes, standards and tools over the whole project life cycle). It aims to measure how well the system is performing, so it can learn lessons and continuously improve project performance over time.

Evaluation The Prosperity Fund will have an IPA review in April/May 2018, with MREL having an IPA review in January 2018. The IPA process will likely involve senior civil servants reviewing the PF and its viability to deliver successfully.

3.1.3 Department for International Development (DFID)

The Department for International Development (DFID) leads the UK's work on ODA with an overall goal "to promote sustainable development and eliminate world poverty". DFID's current five strategic priorities include:

[3] 'About the IPA'. Available here: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/652340/IPA_Narrative_document_WEB.pdf

- Strengthening global peace, security and governance
- Strengthening resilience and response to crisis
- Promoting global prosperity
- Tackling extreme poverty and helping the world's most vulnerable
- Delivering value for money

DFID's evaluations can broadly be categorised into three types: (1) Impact evaluations to establish causal attribution in relation to an intervention and its effects (2) Performance evaluations to evaluate the effectiveness of an intervention and its contribution to development outcomes and impacts (3) Process evaluations to provide deeper understanding of the quality of implementation including integrity, relevance and coherence.

These three types of evaluation are not mutually exclusive, and impact evaluations will often include performance and process evaluation components.

Evaluation Evaluation within DFID is largely decentralised, with all spending units (country, policy, or thematic) being responsible for independently determining evaluation needs and commissioning evaluations. Some evaluations are commissioned centrally through centrally managed programmes (e.g. thematic areas which lack evidence, or DFID strategic or geographic priorities). DFID's central Research & Evidence Division also runs a QA programme for all evaluations. The Evaluation Quality Assurance and Learning Service (EQUALS) is an external service established to deliver independent quality assurance of evaluation products and provide a range of specialist evaluation and monitoring technical advice. Its primary user is DFID, as well as other government departments (OGDs) with responsibility for ODA funded programmes. EQUALS is currently implemented through a four-year contract (from 31st October 2016) between DFID and a consortium led by IOD PARC[4]. Within the contract, a capped proportion of the budget has been set aside for OGDs.

It is also worth noting that 'Evaluation' sits within the Research & Evidence Division within DFID, and several areas of research could also be read as evaluative studies. These are shaped by an annual Research Review which drives forward-looking strategy.

A key thematic overlap with the PF is the work of the Private Sector Development Division (PSD). PSD has been without an M&E Adviser for the best part of a year and is currently in the prioritisation process for near-term PSD evaluations. Longer-term evaluations (5-10 years) will be defined as part of a wider strategy which will begin to be formed from March 2018. Evaluations are likely to tackle the challenge of evaluating the impact of development capital investments (such as evaluating CDC (see below)), how to generate evidence to prove/disprove this form of financial aid, as well as how to capture downstream impacts (jobs, investment etc.).

Owing to the decentralised nature of DFID evaluations and the breadth of thematic and geographic coverage relevant to the PF, further scoping will inevitably be necessary as part of individual programme evaluations.

[4] EQUALS is an external specialist support service provided by IOD PARC in partnership with LTS International, IPE Triple Line, BetterEvaluation, International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie), Ecorys UK, Statistical Services Centre (University of Reading) and NutritionWorks.

3.1.4 National Audit Office (NAO)

The National Audit Office (NAO) scrutinises public spending for Parliament in order to hold government to account and improve public services.

The NAO undertook a review on ‘Managing the Official Development Assistance target – a report on progress’ which identified the Prosperity Fund as one of five departments that did not meet ODA spending targets within the previous financial year.

Evaluation ‘Work in progress’ by the NAO (up to Spring 2018) covers a wide range of UK public spending. Of some relevance to the PF as a cross-governmental fund, is the forthcoming NAO review of the £9 billion “Cross-government funding of research and development” programme, led by the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS). This review will examine the effectiveness of HMG’s arrangements for coordinating research activity and maximising the value of HMG’s investment in research and development.

3.1.5 HM Treasury (HMT)

HM Treasury is the government’s economic and finance department, maintaining control over public spending, and as such holds the institutional responsibility for VfM across government.

The UK Aid Strategy was jointly produced by DFID and HMT. Both monitor ODA expenditure by other government departments and funds. As part of the Spending Review 2015, HMT asked departments to bid for new activities that might be funded through ODA. In 2016, HMT put in place departmental targets for spending of ODA allocations.

Evaluation Annual Spending Reviews and Autumn Statements will continue to have a bearing on PF-linked departments and may directly impact the ODA budget/approach across government. Given the emphasis of the previous two Spending Reviews on spreading ODA expenditure across government, and the PF’s mandate as a cross-governmental Fund, further Reviews may put focus on the share of PF funding disbursed through different departments and the effectiveness of cross-governmental funding mechanisms – such as the Prosperity Fund.

3.1.6 Department for International Trade (DIT)

DIT is responsible for promoting British trade and investment across the world. This includes: helping businesses sell overseas; getting local market help to sell overseas; helping overseas businesses locate in the UK; and connecting overseas buyers with UK businesses.

DIT has a key role within the Prosperity Fund. It is represented on the PF Board and is one of the departments involved in programming, with a particular focus on secondary benefits.

Evaluation DIT has commissioned Frontier Economics to assess the value for money (VfM) of their services to exporters. This work includes developing an Excel model for VfM of services to exporters and finalising the review by June 2018. DIT are also reviewing their data collection systems related to secondary benefits, including data related to service delivery to exporters and export/business wins. E&L is engaging with DIT on the availability and validity of data relating to secondary benefits, inward investment to the UK, export and business wins.

DIT, as part of the GREAT programme, and following a recommendation by the NAO, has also been gradually enhancing its approach to measuring impact of trade promotion on the basis of a comprehensive sectoral approach. The GREAT programme team has been heavily involved in trialling and implementing new areas of measurement and evaluation, including the impact of soft power/return on influence, digital analysis and brand valuation (using private-sector best-practice standards). Further engagement with DIT will also expand dialogue on these related areas.

3.1.7 CDC Group

CDC Group is a development finance institution owned by the UK government. DFID is responsible for CDC, with shareholder duties managed by the Shareholder Executive. It has an investment portfolio valued around £3.9 billion and has been focused since 2012 on supporting the "building of businesses throughout Africa and South Asia, to create jobs and make a lasting difference to people's lives in some of the world's poorest places".

Evaluation The CDC regularly commissions independent evaluations to understand important themes in their work, to bolster knowledge and guide future investment strategies. The themes of these evaluations are outlined in the Annual Review, which is published every July. In 2016/7, these evaluations were scheduled to look at the links between: power and jobs in Uganda; job quality and business performance; and access to finance and business growth. Evaluations are available here: http://www.cdcgroup.com/The-difference-we-make/Performance/.

3.2 UK-led Funds and Programmes

3.2.1 'Original' (FCO) Prosperity Fund

The FCO Prosperity Fund ran from 2011 to 2016. It was a fully devolved, outcome-focused programme, with responsibility devolved to Heads of Mission and a small central team based in London (three members of staff for £30 million programme expenditure in FY 15/16).

Evaluation Although no further evaluation is planned, a lessons-learned exercise was conducted in Summer 2015 based on the FCO Prosperity Fund team's experience of managing funds over a number of years, plus the various independent reviews that were conducted on the PF, and feedback from across the network. Some of these lessons were later reflected in the design of the current Cross-Whitehall Prosperity Fund.

Recommendations from the 'original' FCO Prosperity Fund covered Governance, Programme Delivery, Evaluation and Institutional learning.

3.2.2 NAMA Facility

Announced during the 2012 climate negotiations in Doha, Qatar, the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety and the UK BEIS jointly established the NAMA Facility. In 2013 they contributed jointly an initial €69 million of funding to support developing countries and emerging economies[5] that show leadership on

[5] Current NAMA countries include: Brazil, Colombia, China, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, South Africa, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Peru, Philippines, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia and Uganda.

tackling climate change and that want to implement ambitious climate protection measures (NAMAs). With new donors joining in 2015, a total of €346 million has been pledged to date.

Evaluation NAMA Support Projects may be evaluated upon request by the donors. The NAMA Facility will be subject to at least a mid-term (conducted by LTS in January 2017) and an ex-post evaluation (estimated in 2022).

It is expected that at least one evaluation per NAMA Support Project will be carried out. This provides an assessment of the overall project performance and its contribution to the overarching objective of the NAMA Facility. Results from the project evaluations provide another input into the continuous learning process of the NAMA Facility.

3.2.3 Girls' Education Challenge Fund (GEC)

GEC is a DFID-funded £355 million investment over a four-year period targeting 22 countries[6]. GEC aims to provide 650,000 marginalised girls with a complete, six-year cycle of primary education and one million girls with three years of junior secondary school. GEC uses the Payment by Results modality.

The GEC operates through three different funding windows:

- Strategic partnerships - investing in business innovation and partnership for girls' education.
- Step change window - supporting projects worth up to £30 million.
- Innovation window: allocated to 'innovative' small-scale projects worth up to £2 million that pilot new ideas.

Evaluation GEC is planned to end in March 2019 (expected to roll over into a Phase 2) and will include an end-line evaluation of projects and funding windows as a follow-up on the mid-line evaluation and lessons learning recommendations, and as an assessment of the value for money of GEC projects. The design of Phase 2 will also include evaluation design[7].

3.2.4 The Conflict, Stability and Security Fund (CSSF)

The Conflict, Stability and Security Fund (CSSF) provides development and security support to countries which are at risk of conflict or instability. It is the only government fund which uses both Defence spend and Official Development Assistance (ODA) to deliver and support security, defence, peacekeeping, peace-building and stability activity. The CSSF is a cross-HMG Fund overseen by the National Security Council (NSC) and managed by an inter-departmental Joint Programme Hub.

[6] Afghanistan, Burma, DR Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

[7] The GEC is managed by a consortium led by PwC in alliance with FHI 360, Nathan Associates and Social Development Direct. A GEC Process Review Report produced at the end of 2015 by the Evaluation Manager (Coffey International Development Ltd is leading the GEC EM consortium, which includes Research Triangle International (RTI) and Opinion Research Bureau (ORB)).

Evaluation Evaluation of the CSSF occurs mainly at the programme/country level, with limited central synthesis at present, although there is interest in this going forward. All programmes also undergo an annual review in the first quarter of the financial year, conducted either by a cross-government team (relying on DFID predominantly) or by an external agency. Evaluation is also carried out at the portfolio (country) level. The annual reviews include questions on 'Lessons Learned', which are shared by the Joint Programme Hub and the Stabilisation Unit at an annual Framework Supplier workshop (in July/August), and which in turn feed into the decision-making process for programme allocations in September. The focus here is on aligning the reporting and decision-making cycles. The most recent Joint Committee on the National Security Strategy review of the CSSF was in January 2017.

Itad, along with Altai Consulting, has been contracted by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) to deliver monitoring and evaluation (M&E) services across UK Conflict, Stability & Security Fund (CSSF) programmes in East Africa[8]. The Itad contract blends capability building into M&E delivery with a view to laying the ground for more embedded evaluative work – which speaks to current capacity levels across the programmes.

3.2.5 Good Governance Fund (GGF)

The Good Governance Fund is a DFID/FCO multi-year programme (funded under the CSSF) to provide expert advice, training and assistance to the governments of several middle-income countries across Eastern Europe and the Western Balkans.

The GGF focuses on: anti-corruption measures, improvement of business environment, justice system reform, key sector reforms (e.g. banking and energy), strengthening the rule of law and support to independent media.

Evaluation Established in 2015, the GGF has funding approved until March 2021, with a current allocation of £20 million. The Joint Unit for the GGF is aiming to have the M&E provider in place by the end of 2018 to: support monitoring of GGF to support an adaptive programming approach; help facilitate learning across the GGF (within and across countries); and to conduct a mid-line and end-line evaluation of the portfolio by March 2020.

3.2.6 The Empowerment Fund

The Empowerment Fund was announced in February 2017 as a £700 million fund aimed at promoting democracy globally to leverage the UK's soft power and strengthen its global influence. The Empowerment Fund was intended to be cross-governmental and available over four years, led by the FCO.

Evaluation The operational approach (including MREL) attached to the Empowerment Fund will be shaped by the outcomes of an ongoing capability review of three aid funds managed by the National Security Council – which includes the CSSF, Prosperity Fund and Empowerment Fund. Spending on the Empowerment Fund has not yet started, and work has been paused while the review takes place. For E&L, it will be important to take account of the

[8] http://www.itad.com/projects/provision-of-monitoring-evaluation-services-for-the-conflict-stability-security-fund-in-east-africa/

findings emanating from key reviews of the Fund – both the (as yet unpublished) capability review and the previous review undertaken by the NAO (see above).

3.2.7 Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF)

The Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) is a five-year £1.5 billion fund and a key component in the delivery of the UK Aid Strategy: “tackling global challenges in the national interest”. The Fund aims to ensure that UK research takes a leading role in addressing the problems faced by developing countries through: (a) challenge-led disciplinary and interdisciplinary research, (b) strengthening capacity for research and innovation within both the UK and developing countries; (c) providing an agile response to emergencies where there is an urgent research need.

The Global Challenges Research Fund is an initiative led by the BEIS which operates through a number of delivery partners, including the UK Research Councils, UK Higher Education Funding bodies, the Academy of Medical Sciences, Royal Society, British Academy, the Royal Academy of Engineering and UK Space Agency.

Evaluation The GCRF had an ICAI review in September 2017 which concluded (*inter alia*) that: “The GCRF is yet to develop a theory of change, an evaluation framework or methods for assessing value for money. These core tools for learning at the portfolio level have been contracted out to an external evaluation provider… The tender for the foundation stage evaluation gives the service provider the option of using the DFID ‘4E’ framework for value for money (based on economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity)”.

And furthermore, it revealed that “The devolution of learning means that BEIS has missed an opportunity to draw lessons from other UK ODA funds. Both the **Prosperity Fund** and the International Climate Fund chose to contract out the evaluation function. However, a lesson that the GCRF could usefully learn from these other funds is that, while external evaluation expertise may be needed, the learning function cannot be entirely outsourced.”

Further to the ICAI review, the Foundation stage of evaluation for the GCRF will develop a pathway to impact and evaluation framework, drawing on best practice. The Foundation stage will include the overall theory of change and a process evaluation of the first year’s calls. Once the foundation stage is completed and the evaluation approach is agreed, a further procurement exercise will take place to appoint a team to undertake the main evaluation work.

3.2.8 UK Economic Horizons Programme (EcHo)

DIT has established ‘Economic Horizons (EcHo)’ for a more joined-up approach across government. The goal is to boost inclusive development and unlock opportunities for increased UK trade and investment in ‘horizon’ markets. Pilot countries for 2017-18 are Ethiopia, Kenya, Pakistan, Tanzania and Myanmar.

This Programme is a rebrand of ‘future’ in UKTI’s strategy of ‘volume, value, future’. The team is headed up by the ex-head of Myanmar’s Prosperity team in the Embassy – Tony Preston. There is a strong focus on Myanmar’s financial services and access to finance.

Evaluation No detail on the evaluation approach for EcHo has been made available as yet. This will be an area for further follow-up with DIT which has not been possible during inception to date.

3.2.9 Business Environment Reform Facility (BERF)

The Business Environment Reform Facility (BERF) was launched in January 2016 as a central facility to assist DFID Country Offices (COs) to expand and improve business environment reform programmes in DFID's 28 priority countries[9]. Support is provided in four areas – evidence and learning, technical support, policy research and innovation in stakeholder engagement.

Evaluation BERF produces an annual evidence synthesis of Business Environment Reform (BER) themes relevant during the preceding year. The three synthesis themes for 2016 were Value for Money, Public Private Dialogue and Gender. Each Annual Synthesis is planned to be finalised, quality assured and submitted to DFID each January.

BERF also has as one of its objectives to "achieve cross-DFID learning and exchange of knowledge about effective Business Environment reform through appropriate dissemination of lessons learned and learning events, including case studies illustrating learning points". BERF also produces a number of key resources of relevance, including: How to Measure Value for Money in DFID Business Environment and Investment Climate Reform Initiatives Delivered by the IFC: an Evidence and Learning Note; and Gender Evidence Mapping Tool July 2017.

3.2.10 International Climate Fund (ICF)

The International Climate Fund (ICF) is the primary channel of UK climate change finance. It currently funds over 230 programmes focused on adaptation, mitigation and forestry in low- and middle-income countries throughout Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Caribbean. Three government departments contribute to the ICF: DFID, BEIS and DEFRA.

The UK government will provide £5.8 billion of ODA budget to the ICF between April 2016 and March 2021. This is in addition to the support for the current phase of the ICF - £3.86 billion between April 2011 and March 2016.

Evaluation The 2015-2019 ICF MEL programme aims to redesign and test the Fund's KPIs, conduct macro evaluations across the portfolio, and communicate key messages and programme learning to enhance the utility and effectiveness of climate finance in the future.

Further details of the ICF MEL process and approach were discussed with key stakeholders attached to the ICF from DFID and BEIS, as part of the E&L engagement process. Key lessons and messages of relevance to the PF E&L are outlined below.

The programme-level commissioning and management process for ICF evaluations starts in the business case, which encourages programme designers to think about the evaluation design early on, becoming heavily involved in the setting of the questions and provides some

[9] Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Southern Africa (Region), Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe, DR Congo, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Burma, Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Caribbean (Region), Jordan, Lebanon, Montserrat, Multi-country (FCAS), Multi-country (Business Environment Reform Diagnostic Process).

management flexibility while ensuring core standards are met. However, this also poses challenges in that ICF donors look for different processes and evaluation outcomes which opens room for confusion around the delivery processes. Additionally, given the diversity of commissioning processes, questions around independence of the evaluations can arise.

At the Portfolio level, COMPASS – the M&E contract for ICF[10], commissioned by DFID/BEIS and implemented through a consortium led by IMC Worldwide - provides a cross-governmental MEL programme supported by a management steering group. The evaluation approach is realist synthesis, i.e. rather than undertaking primary research, ICF Compass syntheses evidence that already exists (from programmes and a wider literature base). In respect of evaluation from within the ICF, the portfolio level evaluation is primarily a synthesis of programme evaluations, with a focus on strengthening the evidence base beneath the portfolio.

The process for selecting evaluation questions was originally aimed to be very demand-driven by individual stakeholder learning interests. However, this approach was revised because of an unwieldly number of stakeholders involved, resulting in a revised focus on a few key stakeholders for each evaluation question. Evaluation questions nevertheless remain user-focused and linked to filling specific knowledge gaps, rather than addressing traditional review questions. The ICF also undertakes portfolio level thematic evaluations, e.g. capacity development, transformational change, funding modalities, and delivers annual synthesis reports.

The ICF experience also demonstrates the tension between portfolio- and programme-level evaluations, with stakeholders identifying the risk of evaluations losing their value at the programme level if they become too focused on delivering portfolio level findings. An additional challenge for the portfolio-level evaluation of ICF has been the breadth of the overarching ToC which has enabled different Departments to programme in very different directions.

The ICF reports against 16 KPIs, although just 6 (2 further planned) output KPIs are published, as they are easier to collect, aggregate, validate and publish with confidence. Outcome KPIs have proved harder for partners to report against, difficult to aggregate, and do not provide enough confidence for donors to publish these. Some of the other indicators on capacity building, institutions, transformational change etc. are well-liked by programmes but have also proved hard to use for accountability for the same reasons i.e. aggregation and confidence. This challenge has its roots in the way in which KPIs were developed over a long period, by programmes unsupported by a baseline framework. Programmes have continued to develop, adding projects, with a widening range of KPIs. Some KPIs focus on accountability, communications and transparency; however, these are almost all seen as too broad to be meaningful for programmes from a learning perspective. Other KPIs are more useful for learning but are impossible to use for accountability and reporting, due particularly to the aggregation challenge. This clearly demonstrates the tension between reporting to the portfolio level and supporting programme-level learning. In addition, the focus on what is possible to aggregate means some things which programmes are doing well may be lost in portfolio-level reporting since their indicators cannot cover the breadth of other programmes. Finally, not every programme reports against all of the 16 KPIs, as programmes are able to

[10] ICF also has a contract in place with Gaiasoft for delivery of a “knowledge platform”

select which of the KPIs they wish to report against (although each ICF project should report against at least 1 of the 16 KPIs). This poses a challenge for evaluation synthesis across the portfolio.

3.2.11 Forest Governance, Markets and Climate Programme (FGMC)

FGMC aims to bring about governance and market reforms that reduce the illegal use of forest resources and benefit poor people who depend on forests for their livelihoods. FGMC has supported governance related activities in over 20 timber producing and processing countries, with a particular focus on countries where the UK is the lead EU Member State supporting the FLEGT process. FGMC is entering into a third (2018-2021) phase.

Over the 10-year period 2011 to 2021, the FGMC programme has a total budget of £250 million funded from UK International Climate Finance (ICF). For the period from April 2018 to March 2021, the Programme has a budget of £87 million, which will be allocated primarily through accountable grants, service contracts and Memoranda of Understanding.

Evaluation DFID has appointed a Programme Management Support Team (PMST) to provide programme management support to the delivery of FGMC. This service is provided by KPMG and is supported by M&E from ITAD and Triple Line Consulting. Operating under an overarching M&E framework for the Programme, the M&E team will conduct a series of annual reviews in Africa, Latin America and Asia and will engage with FGMC grant holders to gain an in-depth understanding of the achievements of the Fund to date. A synthesis review, desk-based with case studies, has been prepared that assesses programme level progress and learning, as well the internal coherence of programmes (i.e. how well NGO/Research grantees and service contracts have acted on the observed change).

3.2.12 UK Caribbean Infrastructure Partnership Fund (UKCIF)

DFID is providing up to £300 million grant financing between January 2016 to March 2020 to establish a UK Caribbean Infrastructure Partnership Fund with the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB). The UKCIF is intended to support eight ODA-eligible Commonwealth Countries and one ODA-eligible Overseas Territory to create critical economic infrastructure in the Caribbean to set the foundations for growth and prosperity, reducing poverty and increasing resilience to climate change. The CDB administers the Fund and has set up a dedicated team for that purpose.

Evaluation DFID funding provides £4 million for TA on M&E and wider Economic Development and Evaluation and Impact Assessments. CDB will also conduct a post-evaluation of the activities financed from the grant that will focus on the results achieved, efficiency, effectiveness of implementation and quality of administration. This will be provided to DFID within six months of the agreed programme end date (currently March 2020).

3.2.13 The Newton Fund

The Newton Fund aims to develop science and innovation partnerships that promote the economic development and social welfare of partner countries (incl. Brazil, China, Colombia, Chile, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, South Africa, Turkey, Malaysia, Egypt, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam and Kazakhstan).

The Newton Fund was launched in 2014 and originally consisted of £75 million of ODA each year for five years, to be led by BEIS. In the 2015 UK Spending Review it was agreed to extend and expand the Fund. The Newton Fund was extended from 2019 to 2021 and will expand to £150 million per year by 2021, resulting in a £735 million UK investment by 2021, with partner countries providing matched resources within the Fund.

Evaluation The evaluation function contract[11] runs from 1/7/2015 – 1/12/2019 to capture the Fund's on-going impact and delivery processes over five years. Drawing on monitoring data from Delivery Partners, BEIS and Newton Fund country teams, the evaluation is intended to also consider the delivery mechanisms and management processes of the Newton Fund. One final report is expected in 2019, with several interim reports throughout the life of the Fund. Each report should address the Fund's summative and formative impacts to date, its value for money and its delivery processes, along with recommendations to improve the Programme.

The Newton Fund will also be subject to an ICAI review in Winter 2018/19 on the theme of “Beyond aid”.

3.2.14 The Ross Fund

The £1 billion Ross Fund is aimed at developing, testing and producing new products to help combat serious diseases in developing countries. The £1 billion fund was announced in November 2015 for research and development into products for infectious diseases and to strengthen delivery of new products, bringing together several Government investments.

The Ross Fund is a portfolio of programmes managed by DFID and the Department of Health and Social Care, scheduled to run between 2016-2021.

While the Fund supports research (including that undertaken in the UK), the Ross Fund is funded by ODA and as such “must have the primary purpose of promoting the economic development and welfare of Low or Middle-Income Countries (LMICs) on the DAC list of ODA recipients as its main objective”.

Evaluation DFID’s Research and Evidence Division manages the global health research portfolio, overseen by DFID’s Chief Scientific Adviser and Director of Research. The Research and Evidence Division has an operational plan that sets out its vision and strategic priorities for a five-year period. The current plan runs from 2011 to 2016 and a new one is currently in development (as of March 2017). Further detail on the evaluation approach planned for the Ross Fund is not yet available.

3.2.15 Global Learning for Adaptive Management Programme (GLAM)

The Global Learning for Adaptive Management (GLAM) programme supports adaptive management in DFID and USAID programmes. It aims to establish a centre for learning about adaptive management. Programme duration will be up to five years (ending May 2021), with a budget of up to $7 million. GLAM builds on the work of USAID’s Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting (CLA) Programme.

---

[11] Delivered by Coffey International

Evaluation GLAM will produce a range of resources, guidance notes and monitoring data looking at Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning for Adaptive Management across DFID and USAID from 2018 onwards.

3.2.16 The International Growth Centre (IGC)

The International Growth Centre (IGC) aims to promote sustainable growth in developing countries by providing demand-led policy advice based on frontier research. The IGC aims to generate high quality research and policy advice on key growth challenges. Based at LSE and in partnership with the University of Oxford, the IGC is funded by DFID. IGC currently operates in 15 countries across Africa and Asia[12].

Evaluation IGC research themes are of relevance to the PF E&L, specifically: Firms; Cities (Cities that Work), and Energy. Details of research and Impact reviews are available here: https://www.theigc.org/research-themes/.

3.3 Other Bilateral-led Funds and Programmes

3.3.1 Dutch Good Growth Fund (DGGF)

The DGGF was established by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign as a revolving fund designed to help SMEs that wish to invest in developing countries and emerging markets. The DGGF comprises three tracks with a total budget of €700 million over a period of 10 years.

DGGF is specifically designed for SMEs in low- and middle-income countries and in the Netherlands, which generally experience a lack of appropriate finance for development-related investments and trade. It will ultimately fund SMEs located within the total of 68 developing countries[13], giving special attention to female entrepreneurs, young entrepreneurs and entrepreneurs located in fragile states.

Evaluation Itad and SEO Economic Research will perform the impact evaluation of the first five-years (2014-2019) of DGGF, to be completed in 2021. The results measurement for the Fund includes transactional processes (e.g. number of investments made) as well as downstream impacts such as changes in job creation, disaggregated by gender, age and firm size. The indicator framework and a (proposed) scorecard approach for the DGGF is intended to demonstrate how firm level outputs contribute to social impact for target sectors, including positive externalities firms may create for the sector as a whole, such as, the number of firms/people reached for trainings, number of companies and associations affected.

[12] Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Ghana, India (Bihar), India (Central), Kenya, Liberia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Pakistan, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia.

[13] Afghanistan, Egypt, Libya, Rwanda, Algeria, Eritrea, Madagascar, Sierra Leone, Angola, Ethiopia, Malawi, Sao Tome and Principe, Armenia, Gambia , Mali , Senegal, Bangladesh, Georgia, Moldova, Somalia, Benin, Ghana, Mongolia, South Africa, Bhutan, Guatemala, Morocco, South Sudan, Bolivia, Guinea, Mozambique, Sri Lanka, Burkina Faso, Haïti , Myanmar , Suriname, Burundi , India, Nepal, Tanzania, Cambodia, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Togo, Cape Verde, Jordan, Niger, Tunisia, Chad , Kenya, Nigeria, Uganda, Colombia, Kosovo , Pakistan, Vietnam, Côte d'Ivoire , Laos, Palestinian Territories , Yemen, Democratic Republic of Congo , Lebanon , Peru, Zambia, Djibouti, Liberia , Philippines, Zimbabwe

3.3.2 Danida Market Development Partnerships

Danida Market Development Partnerships contributes to sustainable market development that promotes the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. Focusing on SDG 8, the main objective is to promote sustainable local economic growth and employment in developing countries. The Partnerships programme aims to deliver an innovative approach to involvement of the business sector and contributes to motivating and mobilizing investments from the private sector.

Evaluation A "Real Time Evaluation" (RTE) of the five projects (in Kenya, Nigeria, Myanmar, Ethiopia) in the pilot phase will be conducted. The RTE will be conducted by an externally recruited specialist who will follow and support the refinement of the results framework and the monitoring mechanisms and track progress towards outcomes of the partnership projects in the first three years of implementation (mid-2017 to mid-2020). The Evaluation Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will manage the RTE.

A Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the Programme will be developed based on the early results and experience from the RTE. As part of the Programme monitoring a review will be conducted in 2019 with the aim of assessing overall programme performance.

The Partnership Programme results framework includes five key indicators:

1. Employment creation (decent jobs) for women, men and youth.
2. Beneficiaries reached and creation of sustainable income opportunities.
3. Viability of the project's business case (long-term sustainability).
4. Awareness of responsible business conduct and capacity to work aligned to responsible business conduct within the partnerships.
5. Investment leverage (additional capital raised).

On top of these, each project will have more project specific outcomes related to e.g. nutrition, environment, farming practices etc., all with direct links to the SDGs.

3.3.3 Enterprise Development for Jobs (Norway)

Enterprise Development for Jobs aims to contribute to job creation in developing countries by stimulating the establishment of new business enterprises or expansion of existing ones. Implementation will begin in 2018, with NOK 500 million (£45 million) available over five years.

Norad is managing the grant scheme that provides support to companies that can demonstrate willingness and ability to create jobs in developing countries through sustainable investments. Grants are provided to reduce risk prior to an investment decision. This includes support to feasibility studies, partner search, trial production, training of local staff, strengthening of local suppliers and local infrastructure investments.

Evaluation Norad's planned evaluations are indicated in a two-year evaluation programme. The programme is revised once a year, and new evaluations may be added and already listed evaluations may be removed. The Enterprise Development for Jobs programme is not currently included in planned evaluations for 2017-2018.

The following indicators are to be used to measure results under this scheme. Norad requires reporting from the projects on the following:

- Total investment amount triggered by the support.

- Number of new private sector jobs in developing countries that the support has generated, by gender.
- Net increase in the generation capacity of renewable energy for projects (measured in Megawatts).

3.3.4 The Swiss Investment Fund for Emerging Markets (SIFEM)

SIFEM is the development finance institution of the Swiss Confederation and a “cornerstone of Swiss development cooperation”. The focus of SIFEM is to promote long-term, sustainable and broad-based growth in developing and emerging countries. This is achieved by providing financial support to assist the growth of commercially viable small, medium and fast-growing companies. SIFEM was established in 2005 and took over the investment portfolio of SECO (State Secretariat for Economic Affairs) which had been built up since the late 1990s.

SIFEM’s active portfolio as per 31 December 2016 includes 488 companies (direct investments, loans and underlying portfolio companies of funds) located mostly in priority countries and regions of Swiss development cooperation. It currently has fund commitments mounting to $687.5 million.

Evaluation The Economic Cooperation and Development Division of SECO is responsible for commissioning independent evaluations of SIFEM. Independent evaluations focus on assessment of sectors, programmes, strategies, instruments, country assistance strategies, cross-cutting issues or themes and impact evaluations. No evaluations on SIFEM are currently publicly available.

SIFEM uses the Corporate Policy Project Rating (GPR) developed specifically by the German Investment and Development Corporation (DEG), as well as its own specially developed indicators, to assess and measure the development impacts generated by its investments. The following development indicators, amongst others, are used to appraise the investments:

- *Employment*: The proportion of jobs created and maintained by SIFEM.
- *Equality between men and women:* Positive effects stemming from affirmative action towards women, such as the promotion of women to leadership positions. The measures need to go beyond the requirements of local legislation.
- *Training and professional development*: Offers to employees for training or professional development.
- *Mobilization of additional funding*: Amount of additional capital released by other private, public and institutional investors.
- *Mobilization of local capital for investment*: Amount of local capital which complements SIFEM investments.
- *Diversification of credit*: Provision of finance to business segments (for example SMEs, microfinance, export financing) which have been insufficiently serviced in the past.
- *Establishment and development of fund management companies*: Support provision to funds and financial institutions by SIFEM through a strengthening of the organizational structure and management, through changes leading to improvements in monitoring systems and risk management and the establishment of an environmental, social, governance management system.
- *Development of portfolio companies*: Support provision to portfolio companies by fund managers, for example during the introduction of new technologies, improvements to

production, marketing, distribution, customer service, corporate governance, environmental and social standards, as well as accounting and reporting.
- *Taxes*: The amount of taxes that are generated by the investment for local governments.

The GPR is used throughout the life cycle of an investment for the collection and analysis of data. Prior to the investment a list of the expected development effects is compiled. During the investment term the actual effects are measured every two years and then compared with the objectives previously set.

3.4 Multilateral Funds and Programmes

3.4.1 Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB)

The AIIB is a multilateral development bank headquartered in Beijing with a focus on investing in sustainable infrastructure and other productive sectors to better connect people, services and markets for long-term social and economic impact. The AIIB is a relatively new institution having commenced operations in January 2016. It is now supported by 58 member governments from around the world (who sit on its Board). The AIIB Special Fund, under the Prosperity Fund, is one mechanism within the AIIB. It is funded by the UK Government (HMT) ($50 million), China ($50 million) and the Korean Development Bank ($8 million).

Evaluation The Rules and Regulations of the AIIB Special Fund provide that "(a) The Bank shall report on the Fund in its Annual Report. (b) The Bank shall provide the Contributors [which includes HMT] with an annual report on the current status and anticipated use of the resources of the Fund".

The E&L team is in the process of exploring in detail the opportunities to evaluate the programmes that will be implemented in whole or in part by Multilateral Development Banks. Initial indications from one of the programmes suggest that while there may be an opportunity to instruct the monitoring, reporting and evaluation commitments made in the initial agreements signed with the MDB, typically, the evaluation function is tightly controlled.

3.4.2 World Bank – Independent Evaluation Group (IEG)

The Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) evaluates the development effectiveness of the World Bank Group. IEG provides evaluative evidence to help deliver better services and results to its clients. This includes deepening the evidence around results and generating evidence on the early implementation experience of World Bank work. IEG is independent of the Management of the World Bank Group and reports directly to the Executive Board.

The IEG undertakes a range of evaluations to: address strategic or systemic issues; focus on specific countries or projects; ensure a systematic assessment of portfolio performance; and promote greater learning from IEG's work.

Evaluation The IEG's 'Proposed Major Evaluations for FY18–20' includes a number of relevance to the PF E&L, notably: Facilitating Trade (FY 18), Carbon Finance (FY 18), Creating New Markets (FY19), Renewable Energy (FY19), Resilient Cities (FY19), Reaping Digital Dividends (FY20), Strengthening Bank Stability and Intermediation (FY20) and Role of Cities in Growth and Development (FY20). The IEG will also undertake several Country Programme Evaluations which includes one PF beneficiary country – Mexico. IEG also conducts Project Level Evaluations and Validations, which may also extend to PF Programmes implemented by or with the Bank.

The E&L team is in the process of exploring in detail the opportunities to evaluate the programmes that will be implemented in whole or in part by Multilateral Development Banks. Initial indications from one of the programmes suggest that while there may be an opportunity to instruct the monitoring, reporting and evaluation commitments made in the initial agreements signed with the MDB, typically the evaluation function is tightly controlled.

3.4.3 International Finance Corporation (IFC)

The IFC, a member of the World Bank Group, is the largest global development institution focused exclusively on the private sector in developing countries. IFC's offerings are designed to meet specific needs of clients in different industries, with a special focus on infrastructure, manufacturing, agribusiness, services, and financial markets. This typically includes both financial products and technical support – working with the private sector. The IFC currently has over 4,000 projects either active or pending approval, with a project footprint in every PF beneficiary country.

Evaluation The IFC conducts impact, process, and meta-evaluations, with a focus on learning what has worked effectively and what has not. The IFC produces 'thematic evaluations' as part of this process, including several of relevance to the PF, e.g. Evaluating the Development Impact of Private Sector Operations, March 2017. Most evaluations are carried out in collaboration with external experts and IFC teams. IFC evaluations are intended to complement evaluations conducted by the Independent Evaluation Group (see above).

For the FY17-19 period the IFC will undertake a number of evaluations of relevance to the PF, including: Joint IFC-WB Education programming (focused on the employability of graduates); Implementing the improvements in IFC's Results Measurement Framework – which includes looking at concrete evaluative evidence to articulate the pathways through which the private sector contributes to economic development and poverty reduction; and sector-level evaluations in ports, airports, SME banking, retail chains, and commodity traders.

The E&L team intend to follow up engagement with the IFC around evaluation, and specific horizon scanning which intersects with the PF from Q1 2018.

3.4.4 Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund (AECF)

The Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund (AECF) is a $244 million fund that awards grants and repayable grants through competitions to private companies that wish to implement innovative, commercially viable, high-impact projects in agribusiness and renewable energy in Africa. The AECF was established in 2007 as a special partnership initiative of the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa based in Kenya, which hosts the Fund and has fiduciary responsibility. The AECF is supported by Australia, Canada, Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the International Fund for Agricultural Development, with day-to-day management provided by KPMG.

Evaluation An independent Evaluation Management Unit (EMU) commissioned a Mid-term Evaluation of the AECF in 2014 (undertaken by Ecorys and Carnegie Consult) and a Final Evaluation of the AECF was originally planned for 2017, but as of writing no final date for this evaluation has been set. Evaluations are made available through the donor websites.

3.4.5 The Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED)

The Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED) is a membership group of donors and intergovernmental agencies focused on private sector development (PSD). The DCED has developed a Standard for Results Measurement which provides a practical framework for programmes and projects to monitor progress towards their objectives and better measure, manage, and demonstrate results. 153 programmes and projects globally currently apply the DCED standard.

Further details are available at: https://www.enterprise-development.org/.

3.4.6 Global Environment Facility (GEF)

GEF is a Multilateral Trust Fund established in 1992 to help tackle global environmental problems through work on mitigation, adaptation, forestry and energy. Since 1992, the GEF has provided over $17 billion in grants and mobilised an additional $88 billion in financing for more than 4000 projects in 170 countries. DFID has provided £210 million for the 6th replenishment of the GEF 6 programme, to be paid in yearly instalments until FY17/18.

Evaluation The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the Global Environment Facility has a central role in delivering the independent evaluation function within the GEF. The Office is responsible for undertaking independent evaluations that involve a set of programmes and projects from more than one GEF Agency. These evaluations are typically at the strategic level, on focal areas or on cross-cutting themes. Institutional evaluations, such as assessing the resource allocation mechanism, or governance, are also undertaken. The IEO also delivers a rolling process of ‘Thematic & Impact Evaluations’ and ‘Corporate & Country Evaluations’.

The Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (“OPS6 - CEG6”) was completed in October 2017 with a view to informing the GEF replenishment period. The report provides a specific assessment of the GEF’s trend and ratings on quality of M&E design and implementation. The report is available via: www.thegef.org.

The Annual Performance Report (APR) 2016 is also intended to provide a detailed overview of the performance of GEF activities and processes, key factors affecting performance, and M&E within the GEF partnership. This should also include an in-depth assessment on the GEF tracking tools. The report will be available here, once published: http://www.gefieo.org/evaluations/.

3.4.7 Private Infrastructure Development Group (PIDG)

The Private Infrastructure Development Group (PIDG) mobilises private sector investment to assist developing countries in providing infrastructure vital to boosting their economic growth and combating poverty. Since 2002, PIDG has supported more than 130 infrastructure projects to financial close. For every $1 of PIDG member contributions, it mobilises $23, $17 of which comes from private sector financing. PIDG operates through a Governing Council, a Central Management Office (CMO) and the PIDG Trust. MDY Legal has been appointed as the current CMO.

Evaluation The PIDG monitors development impact at three levels: (1) on an overall PIDG basis (2) on an individual PIDG Company basis (3) on a project specific basis. In addition, independent progress reviews and/or evaluations of each PIDG Company is commissioned by PIDG every three to four years to assess performance and development impact. Development impact of the PIDG overall, and of the PIDG-supported projects, is updated quarterly through the PIDG Results Monitoring Database. The development impact data collected by the PIDG's Results Monitoring System is subject to an independent quality assurance audit every two years.

From time to time, independent impact evaluations are designed and commissioned by a PIDG donor (preferably in collaboration with the other PIDG donors) aimed at analysing the long-term impacts and sustainability of PIDG supported projects. In 2017, PIDG commissioned studies into the affordability of infrastructure and the effects of infrastructure investment on the development of financial markets. The evaluations programme is also commissioning studies to investigate PIDG's additionality in more depth (see EAIF below).

3.4.8 Emerging Africa Infrastructure Fund (EAIF)

EAIF is part of the PIDG, which is a multi-donor organisation with members from seven countries and the World Bank Group. The current total capital of the EAIF is approximately $600 million, substantially funded by the governments of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Sweden and, the German development finance institution, KFW and its Dutch equivalent, FMO. In addition, two private sector banks, Standard Bank and Standard Chartered Bank, are commercial lenders to EAIF.

Evaluation In November 2017 PIDG sought proposals from consultants to deliver two in-depth case studies on the effects of PIDG company activities on financial systems, assessing if, how and in what ways the EAIF (and GuarantCo) have contributed to wider change in financial systems, particularly whether investee companies have positively influenced other actors in the financial market to invest in long-term infrastructure investment. The final presentation of this evaluation is expected from March 2018.

3.4.9 Energising Development (EnDev)

Energising Development (EnDev) is an energy access partnership currently financed by six donor countries: the Netherlands, Germany, Norway, United Kingdom, Switzerland and Sweden. EnDev promotes sustainable access to modern energy services that meet the needs of the poor. EnDev works in 25 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Since 2005, €350 million has been allocated to support access to energy for the poor. Endev is currently scheduled to run until 2019.

Evaluation EnDev was externally evaluated in 2014 by RebelGroup and ecol GBR and will have an end-line evaluation once the programme closes (currently planned for 2019).

3.4.10 Climate Public Private Partnership Programme (CP3)

The UK Government has committed £130 million to the CP3 programme to invest in developing countries across Africa, Asia and Latin America, of which £110 million is invested in two commercial private equity funds[14]. Through CP3, the UK is also providing £20 million in the form of grants. Funds are managed by professional private equity Fund Managers that research and select promising investments in areas such as water, renewable energy, energy-efficiency, low carbon transport and clean technology.

CP3 is a long-term programme and its development-focused (non-financial) results - clean energy generating capacity installed, jobs supported, and greenhouse gas emissions reduced – are expected to take five to seven years to start materialising.

Evaluation The CP3 programme is supported by a long-term monitoring and evaluation agent that supports results reporting and evaluation of the programme's performance. One evaluation midway through CP3's life cycle is planned for 2018 to assess the early financial leverage, the additionality of the CP3 investment and demonstration impacts (i.e. those related to the private equity market in general), and to synthesise emerging results and evidence undertaken by other donor partners or funds. A second mid-term (2021/22) and full and final evaluation (2025-6), including data requirements and gaps which would need to be filled, are also expected.

LTS provides M&E services to CP3, for both accountability and learning, with the intention of informing on-going delivery and helping to mitigate some of the risks associated with this highly innovative programme. These services use a theory-driven approach using case studies, portfolio level analysis to understand emerging trends, a tailored approach to assessing the additionality of the CP3 programme and ongoing context mapping of climate finance flows and investor sentiment.

3.4.11 Climate Investment Funds (CIF)

The $8.3 billion Climate Investment Funds (CIF) is providing 72 developing and middle-income countries with urgently needed resources to manage the challenges of climate change and reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. The CIF operates through the Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) - African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Inter-American Development Bank, and World Bank Group - and outside the guidance of the UNFCCC.

The CIF is comprised of four programmes: (1) The $5.6 billion Clean Technology Fund (CTF) provides middle-income countries with highly concessional resources to scale up low carbon technologies in energy and transport (2) The $1.2 billion Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) is helping developing countries integrate climate resilience into development planning (3) The $780 million Scaling Up Renewable Energy in Low Income Countries Program (SREP) (4) The $775 million Forest Investment Program (FIP).

Evaluation The CIF design provided for an independent evaluation by the independent evaluation departments of the MDBs after 3 years of operation[15]. The 'CIF Evaluation and Learning Initiative' (E&L Initiative) was further approved by the Joint Meeting of the Trust Fund

---

[14] The Catalyst Fund is managed by the International Finance Corporation's (IFC) Asset Management Company (AMC), to invest in developing countries across Africa, Asia and Latin America. Asia Climate Partners (ACP) created a consortium that involves the Asian Development Bank (ADB), Robeco and Orix (Dutch and Japanese Investment houses).

[15] ICF International was selected as the consultant to perform the evaluation in 2014.

Committees (TFC) in May 2015. The overarching purpose of the E&L Initiative is to capture evidence and lessons to inform both ongoing CIF activities and future climate finance investments.

The E&L Initiative Business Plan, approved in June 2016, commits to undertaking catalytic evaluation and learning activities that are demand-driven, relevant, and applied to important decisions and strategies. The FY18 Business Plan identifies four priority learning themes to guide a focused learning agenda through the first years of the Initiative: (1) Transformational change (report will be available by December 2018) (2) Private sector investment (demand-driven evaluations actions through Call for Proposals); (3) Local stakeholder engagement and benefit (demand-driven evaluations actions through Call for Proposals); and (4) CIF design and approach (final report due in February 2018).

3.4.12 AgResults

AgResults is a $118 million multi-donor, multi-lateral initiative incentivizing and rewarding high-impact agricultural innovations that promote global food security, health, and nutrition through the design and implementation of pull mechanism pilots. AgResults is funded by the governments of Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States, in partnership with the World Bank and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. AgResults is currently planned to run until March 2024.

Evaluation Abt Associates is contracted as the External Impact Evaluator for the AgResults pilots. Abt’s role is to determine on a scientific basis if the AgResults pilots’ pull mechanisms achieve their objectives. The evaluations use a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods to assess whether the pilots produce private sector behaviours and social outcomes different from, and better than, what would have happened in the absence of the pull mechanism. Where possible, evaluations also assess pilot outcomes in comparison to push mechanisms, which provide up front funding for specific paths to achieve the development goals. The evaluation also assesses the cost-effectiveness of the pull mechanism pilots and sustainability of the results once the pilot incentives are removed.

3.4.13 Global Climate Partnership Fund (GCPF)

The GCPF uses public funding to leverage private capital in order to mitigate climate change and drive sustainable growth in developing and emerging markets. GCPF mainly invests through local financial institutions but also invests directly. GCPF finances projects targeting energy efficiency and carbon reductions, and renewable energy generation. The current Fund volume is $335 million as of the end of 2016.

GCPF has the backing of institutions including: German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB), KfW Entwicklungsbank, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark (Danida), UK BEIS, International Finance Corporation (IFC), Development Bank of Austria (OeEB), and Dutch Development Bank (FMO), as well as private investors.

Evaluation The Mid-Term Evaluation of Global Climate Partnership Fund is expected from 23rd November 2017. Reports will be available here, once published: https://www.gcpf.lu/investing-in-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency.html.

3.4.14 Green Climate Fund (GCF)

Green Climate Fund (GCF) is a fund established within the framework of the UNFCCC to assist developing countries in adaptation and mitigation practices to counter climate change. The GCF is planned to run from 2013-2023 with a current resourcing of $10.3 billion ($1.2 billion from the UK).

GCF aims to catalyse a flow of climate finance, using public investment to stimulate private finance, to invest in low-emission and climate-resilient development, driving a paradigm shift in the global response to climate change. The GCF project portfolio is implemented by partner organisations, known as Accredited Entities.

Evaluation GCF has set up three Independent Units to make sure the Fund meets the highest standards of integrity, while also ensuring it pursues organizational self-improvement. One of these Units - The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) - evaluates GCF activities and policies independently, and provides strategic information about the Fund's impact, effectiveness and efficiency. The IEU ensures GCF is accountable and is open to continuous learning.

The IEU undertakes independent overall, portfolio, country, thematic and programme evaluations that inform GCF strategic result areas. In key cases, it will also support and undertake project evaluations. The IEU is also mandated to independently peer review and attest the quality of GCF self-evaluation. The IEU supports the GCF in its learning function by ensuring that recommendations from independent evaluations are incorporated into the Secretariat's functioning and processes.

The IEU will undertake evaluations in 2018 including: Independent Evaluation of the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme; and formative project evaluations for four projects/programmes focused on forestry and climate information services.

3.4.15 EU-Africa Infrastructure Trust Fund (EU-AITF)

The EU-Africa Infrastructure Trust Fund (EU-AITF) is an instrument of the wider EU-Africa Infrastructure Partnership. Its role is to mobilise additional finance for key infrastructure projects in sub-Saharan Africa, thereby increasing access to energy, transport, water and sanitation, as well as communication services.

The total EU-AITF resources amount to €812 million, of which €647.7 million comes from the European Development Fund (EDF) and the remaining funds come from EU Member States participating in the Trust Fund.

Evaluation A mid-term evaluation of the EU-AITF was conducted in 2012, following commencement in 2007, a final evaluation will be undertaken from the end of 2017 onwards (subject to funding extensions).

3.4.16 The Global Innovation Fund (GIF)

The Global Innovation Fund is a non-profit innovation fund. GIF was launched in September 2014 with a $200 million commitment over five years supported by DFID (£50 million), the United States Agency for International Development, the Omidyar Network, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, the Department for Foreign Affairs and Trade in Australia and the Department of Science and Technology in South Africa.

GIF has a wide-reaching mandate "to solve any major development problem in low- or lower-middle-income countries". GIF manages a portfolio of evidence-based and innovative investments, spanning a wide range of sectors, geographies[16], stages and types of funding.

Evaluation DFID's 2017 Annual Review of GIF outlined that "DFID will assist GIF to shift towards the sort of analysis typically required in evaluating development impact". GIF is currently scheduled to end in November 2019.

[16] Current projects include: Kenya (Energy), Uganda (Transport), Tanzania (Energy), Malawi (Nutrition), Bangladesh and Nepal (Financial and Health rights), China and Philippines (Health), Mali (Agriculture), Kenya, Uganda, Pakistan (Finance), India (Clean Energy), Cote d'Ivoire, Senegal, Benin, Togo and Cameroon (Finance), Philippines, Malaysia, Vietnam, Thailand (Health), Uganda (Entrepreneurship), Burkina Faso (Health), Pakistan (Health), Botswana (Health), Burundi, Kenya, Malawi, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda (Agriculture), Guatemala, Bangladesh, Indonesia and the Philippines (Tax compliance), Bangladesh and India (Fisheries), Nigeria (Agriculture), Ghana (Education).

4. Conclusion and Next Steps

The sections above have outlined the key features of the PF E&L and how these relate to prominent funds, programmes and initiatives which exist across the UK, bilateral and multilateral aid space. The table in section 2 provides a summarised mapping of these characteristics as well as their E&L focus, such as evaluative methodologies and fund size. In addition to contrasting the PF E&L with similar initiatives elsewhere, specific areas of overlap –thematic, geographic, as well as with respect to the timing of E&L outputs – have been highlighted.

While all the initiatives above hold relevance for the PF E&L, the mapping exercise has identified a number of initiatives of particularly high relevance to the PF E&L, as well as some specific potential synergies and risks for the PF E&L process both during design and implementation. This section further outlines these opportunities, related risks and next steps.

4.1 Potential synergies

4.1.1 Supporting learning and building on existing knowledge

As detailed in the sections above, several of the funds and initiatives of relevance to the PF have already produced lessons learned from their implementation to date. For example, BERF resources on: 'How to Measure Value for Money in DFID Business Environment and Investment Climate Reform Initiatives'; 'What Works in Business Environment Reform in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia'; and the 'BERF Adaptive Programming and Business Environment Reform Learning Note'. Similarly, relevant learning-focused resources are available from AgResults, IGC, and EAIF to name just a few. Such resources would be valuable contributions into the PF E&L's learning and knowledge management systems.

4.1.2 Refining evaluation methods

A number of the funds and initiatives mapped also employ theory-based and/or utilisation-focused approaches to evaluation. Strengthening linkages and scoping opportunities for collaboration may support the strengthening of evaluation designs, by broadening the discussion around what works, where and when for similar aid instruments. Additionally, exploring the results frameworks of other bilateral funds (detailed in the section above), offers relevant comparisons and contrasts to the theory of change and results framework of the PF and further enables the identification of the overlapping learning interests of other bilateral donors.

4.1.3 Supporting Cross-HMG learning

The PF is a cross-HMG fund intended to share learning and experience between departments, and to demonstrate the strengths (and potential challenges) attached to this emerging modality. As can be observed in recent UK Parliamentary Committee meetings[1], the PF may be viewed as part of a 'family' of cross-HMG instruments, where the experience of one raises consequences and opportunities for others. Building linkages between the PF E&L and similar efforts with other UK cross-HMG funds may help generate a broader narrative – useful for senior stakeholders - on the role and capability of cross-HMG instruments.

4.2 Risks

4.2.1 Duplication of efforts and stakeholder fatigue

At the programme-level, given thematic and geographic overlaps between the PF and other initiatives and their evaluative plans, similar questions and learning will be occurring alongside PF E&L implementation. This may also extend to engaging with some of the same stakeholders, such as counterpart ministry officials or UK country-office staff, at country-level. This is also relevant at the fund-level, for example, given different process evaluations and reviews within the UK government interacting with the PF. In such cases there is a risk of stakeholder fatigue from E&L, and an appreciation of the wider context to mitigate against this becoming highly necessary.

This is also closely related to the findings and next steps outlined in the Stakeholder Map Briefing Note, and reflects the connected approach to embedding these processes within E&L implementation going forward.

4.2.2 De-contextualised PF programmes

Related to the point above, PF programmes will be implemented through UK missions as part of a wider portfolio of projects and initiatives unconnected to the PF. This may include overlap in terms of thematic focus, and almost certainly in terms of staff and stakeholder interactions. Effective E&L relies on an understanding of this wider operating context for primary users of PF E&L processes. Without this, there is a risk of overburdening programme teams with E&L activities unconnected to their wider roles and priorities.

4.2.3 Missed opportunities for learning

Should the E&L team evaluate programmes, identifying challenges or issues which have been reported by similar or related initiatives supported by other donors or other parts of the UK government, this may highlight missed opportunities for prior collaboration or interactions. This may include missed opportunities to: influence PF adaptive management; further focus evaluation of these programmes; and/or make linkages between the PF's learning products and those of other partners. Relatedly, when developing E&L outputs under such circumstances, there is a risk that these outputs may not be seen as adding-value to wider sector learning – particularly for cross-cutting thematic reports (such as 'what works for infrastructure development projects'). This would be effectively mitigated by situating such reports within their wider context at the programme or individual evaluation-level (see Next Steps).

4.3 Next Steps

4.3.1 Further coordination and engagement

The PF E&L Team has already engaged with other initiatives to draw out lessons for the PF E&L design and implementation. In addition to several UK government departments listed above (DFID, DIT, HMT, etc.), in-depth discussions have been held with the ICF and AIIB. Selecting from the range of wider initiatives above it is possible to identify additional opportunities to explore synergies and to mitigate risks above, through further in-depth discussions and possible coordination going forward.

While this further engagement and coordination is beyond the scope of this report, some areas of most relevance can be identified across the initiatives captured above. Examples include:

- Given wide stakeholder interest in the cross-governmental nature of the PF, another cross-governmental UK fund - the **Newton Fund –** offers potentially valuable opportunities for learning and collaboration. The Newton Fund also provides some thematic overlap with the PF, and by working specifically with UK delivery partners it also provides some relevance to secondary benefit considerations in the PF.
- The **NAMA Facility** is a UK-led fund which, like the PF E&L, will undertake a theory-based and utilisation-focused evaluation of its programme. As such the Facility would be a valuable target for further technical engagement. The NAMA Facility also deals thematically with climate protection in emerging economies, which offers both thematic and geographic overlap with the PF.
- Another UK-based initiative - The **Business Environment Reform Facility (BERF)** - offers strong thematic, geographic and operational overlaps with the PF. The BERF also has a dedicated approach to learning and synthesis of its programme evaluations. As the PF E&L progresses, and individual programme and thematic evaluations move towards implementation, there will also be important points of shared-interest around business environment reform.
- In addition to the UK, several other countries also have portfolio facilities and/or investment mechanisms aimed at growth promotion in emerging markets. The €700 million **Dutch Good Growth Fund (DGGF)**, which includes a specific focus on working with both Dutch and host country business partners, will also undertake a theory-based evaluation running until the programme ends (currently) in 2021. Interacting with the DGGF as well as the other bilateral funds detailed above (from Norway, Denmark and Switzerland) may offer useful insights into how the UK experience, on issues such as secondary benefits and ODA, contrasts with other national efforts.
- One of the largest funds captured in this Context Map is the $10.5 billion multilateral **Private Infrastructure Development Group (PIDG)**, to which UK is a contributor. PIDG's focus on growth promotion through infrastructure development is of strong programmatic and geographic interest to the PF E&L and would be particularly relevant at the programme level going forward (see 4.3.3. below).
- As noted above, further engagement is planned in 2018 to strengthen links and understanding of E&L interests and influences within the **World Bank Group (incl. IEG).** This engagement will look at the Bank both as an important PF-implementing stakeholder, as well as an influential and experienced player in the wider development space, operating numerous initiatives (unconnected but relevant to) the PF E&L.

4.3.2 Ongoing comparison and learning

As noted above there are several questions being asked by non-PF evaluations that are of relevance to the PF E&L, particularly at the fund-level. Where the PF E&L evaluates issues such as the effectiveness of cross-government relationships, or questions around processes and functions of 'a fund model', these other sources of evaluation may offer useful comparators for PF evaluations (where relevant). The context mapping conducted as part of this report provides a framework and highlights key initiatives of interest to support this kind of learning going forward.

4.3.3 Programme-level Context Mapping

While this report has principally focused at fund-level context for the PF E&L, several of the programmes and funds detailed above have strong overlaps and relevance to PF programmes. It will be particularly important, for future engagement with programmes and programme evaluations, to recognise the thematic and country-level contexts attached to other donors as well as other parts of the UK Government, and understand the landscape(s) within which the programmes and projects are working.

Coordination both within and beyond the Fund has been a clear priority emanating from stakeholder engagement discussions. As such, linking and contributing to the wider programme-level context will enable the PF E&L to add value as part of a development community. This would include PF programmes being able to learn from similar programmes, as well as PF programmes feeding experiences and lessons into the wider community (across the range of evaluation questions the PF E&L will address). Figure 1 below, highlights some initiatives of relevance to the wider programme-level context for specific PF programmes.

Theories of change at the programme level should also include reference to contextual political economy factors likely to have an influence on outcomes, alongside PF investments, such as government sectoral policies, other donor programmes, as well as other UK government programmes etc. PF programmes may well be relatively small investments relative to these other activities, so it will be important to bring this sense of scale to evaluation findings, and to support understanding of the PF ToC as a catalyst alongside other government and donor activities and investments.

Programme-level context and stakeholder analysis will therefore consider those initiatives and stakeholders that may: use the evaluation; need to be engaged as part of the evaluation; and/or have an influence on the causal pathways of the PF programme/interventions within the countries and sectors that programmes are working.

Finally, it should be noted that programme-level context (and stakeholder) mapping covering both linkages with the ToC, supporting coordination within and beyond the Fund, and contextualising PF E&L with wider thematic and country-level activities, is not expected to be a stand-alone task, but rather form an integral part of each programme-level evaluation.

4.3.4 Annual Reviews of Context Map

The context around the PF E&L will change over time as new initiatives start-up and existing evaluation timetables complete. As such this context map should be seen as a living document intended to form the basis of a continually evolving understanding. In addition to the processes connected to specific programme-level evaluations (see below), this context map – focused principally at the fund-level – should be reviewed and updated on an annual basis as part of PF E&L Implementation.

Infrastructure and AIIB Programmes (plus Infrastructure elements in other programmes)

- Private Infrastructure Development Group
- EU-Africa Infrastructure Trust Fund

Business Environment Reform Programme (plus elements in other programmes)

- Business Environment Reform Facility
- DFID - Private Sector Development Division
- DIT - GREAT programme

Global Insurance & Risk, SE Asia Clean Energy (plus elements in other programmes)

- Energising Development
- Climate Public Private Partnership Programme
- Global Climate Partnership Fund
- NAMA facility
- International Climate Fund
- Global Environment Facility
- Climate Investment Fund
- Green Climate Fund

Education Programme

- Girls' Education Challenge Fund (GEC)
- Joint IFC-WB Education programming

Figure 1: Programme-level context examples

Annex 1: List of context organisations for M&R

- Aid Management Programme
- Development Tracker
- Open Aid Sweden
- ICF
- CAF
- Findeter
- Innovate UK
- CIAT
- DFID Aid Management Platform (AMP)
- UK Statistics Authority
- OECD
- UNAIDS
- World Bank Group
- IMF
- UN Sustainable Development GOALS (SDGs)
- X Point
- Green Climate Fund (GCF)
- Donor Tracker
- International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI)
- Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI)
- PIDG
- Global Learning for Adaptive Management (GLAM)
- Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED)
- Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund
- Newton Fund