



# Annex 13: Fund Evaluability Summary

Prosperity Fund - Evaluation and Learning

February 2018



HM Government

Prosperity Fund

Evaluation & Learning services delivered by:



## Table of Contents

1. Fund Evaluability Summary	2
1.2 Methodology	2
1.3 Key Findings of the Evaluability Assessment	2
1.4 How the evaluability assessment has informed the approach to the evaluation	3

## Table of Acronyms

Acronym	
CA	Contribution analysis
DKM	data and knowledge management
E&L	Evaluation and Learning (contractor / team)
M&R	Monitoring and Reporting (contractor / team)
PF	Prosperity Fund
ToC	Theory of Change
UFE	utilisation-focused evaluation
VfM	Value for Money

## Version History

Document Title	EL Prosperity Fund Evaluability Assessment		
	WYGEL1-INC-10-1	Revision	1
Revision	Written By	Checked By	Approved By
Revision 0	Azim Manji	Paddy Abbot	
Revision 1	Ann Bartholomew	Michael Schultz, Paddy Abbot	PFMO

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.

## 1. Fund Evaluability Summary

An Evaluability Assessment of the Prosperity Fund was undertaken to inform the Evaluation and Learning Team's (E&L) approach to evaluation and learning at the Fund and programme level. This note summarises the findings and how they will be presented in the Inception Report.

### 1.2 Methodology

The methodology for the Fund-level Evaluability Assessments was adapted from approaches outlined in Davies (2013)<sup>1</sup> and Peersman et al (2015).<sup>2</sup> Three aspects of 'evaluability' were considered:

- i) Intervention design as described in the Theory of Change (ToC) – its adequacy (for an evaluation) and whether it describes how the intervention will be delivered
- ii) Availability of data
- iii) The evaluation environment, including risks associated with lack of stakeholder engagement and security

The assessment was made based on a review of documents and notes from meetings held by the E&L Team during the inception phase.

### 1.3 Key Findings of the Evaluability Assessment

Based on the methodology and evidence collected and assessed, the fund was identified as evaluable. The key findings included:

- i) The Fund Theory of Change is well documented and the Fund's goals, impacts, resources, activities, outcomes and intermediate outcomes are clearly and coherently represented in the programme documentation reviewed.
- ii) Primary stakeholders for the evaluation have been identified and they support the use of the theory of change as a basis for evaluation and learning.
- iii) Prosperity Fund Programmes are generally well aligned to one or more of the five intermediate outcomes of the Fund. If evidence can be organised along the intermediate outcome pathways the intermediate outcomes should be evaluable and while there are interdependencies across the five outcomes, they should be plausible and testable.
- iv) The causal chain is coherent. There is scope for further articulation, particularly related to assumptions and the output-to-intermediate outcome level of the ToC, as programmes come on stream and more information about how they feed into the ToC is available. The current level of detail available is to be expected given the level of maturity of the Fund and programmes.
- v) There is scope to incorporate an analysis of the role that gender and other aspects of social inclusion and exclusion play in the chains of causality in the Theory of Change.

---

1 Davies R (2013) Planning evaluability assessments: a synthesis of the literature with recommendations. Working Paper 40. DFID: <http://bit.ly/Evaluability>.

2 Peersman, G., Guijt, I., and Pasanen, T. (2015) 'Evaluability Assessment for Impact Evaluation'. A Methods Lab publication. London: Overseas Development Institute.

- vi) The Fund Theory of Change would benefit from a clear problem statement and a more explicit statement of the expected primary and secondary beneficiaries.
- vii) The PF structure and governance plays an important role in supporting the achievement of expected results.
- viii) There is a range of existing data sources available to support Fund level evaluation. The data generated by the Monitoring and Reporting system (MR) is expected to support Fund level evaluation by providing information on “what” progress there has been in achieving results. These datasets still need to be compiled and assessed for their quality. Some work was done on this as part of the Report on Secondary Data Quality and Availability. Given the maturity of the Fund and programmes it will support, it is too early to assess if the data available is adequate, but at this stage, it is expected to be. This should be reviewed as the E&L begins to establish baselines against which to measure Fund performance.
- ix) A number of quantitative and qualitative methods are appropriate for the Fund level evaluation, given the range of evaluation activities to be undertaken. Best practice and a review of a range of similar programmes suggests that a mixture of methods and approaches is needed.

#### 1.4 How the evaluability assessment has informed the approach to the evaluation

The Fund level evaluability assessment has informed E&L team activities and the findings have been integrated into the Inception Report and the other approach paper. The table below summarises this.

Finding	How addressed
The timescale for achievement of intermediate outcomes may be beyond the timescale for this evaluation.	Greater articulation of the lower level of the Fund ToC and programme ToCs will support identification of proxies to understand the likelihood of achievement of these outcomes.
User focused and flexible and responsive engagement with relevant stakeholders is important for reducing risks associated with lack of engagement in evaluations.	This finding has been integrated into our overall approach to engaging stakeholders and ensuring that all evaluation activities are user focused. (see <i>E&amp;L Evaluation Framework</i> )
The Fund level ToC is evaluable at this stage, though requires greater articulation of different aspects (i.e. assumptions, output to intermediate outcome pathways).	The ToC has been reviewed in more depth and discussed in the paper - <i>Proposed revisions to and methodology for future revisions to the PF ToC</i> . This outlines how the E&L team will review and revise (as needed) the Fund ToC annually based on evidence emerging from the evaluations.
Evaluability at a programme level could be a useful criterion for sampling for programme/project evaluations	This has been integrated in our approach to the programme evaluations, as articulated in the <i>Generic ToR for Programme Evaluations</i> .
The PF structure and governance plays an important role in supporting the achievement of expected results.	Recognising the important role the PF structure and governance plays, it has been integrated into the evaluation questions. The methodology described in the Inception Report describes how the evaluation will collect evidence to support assessment.
There is scope to incorporate an analysis of the role that gender and other aspects of	Gender has been addressed in the <i>Gender Approach Paper</i> and the <i>Evaluation Framework</i> . These documents outline how the E&L team will consider

Finding	How addressed
social inclusion and exclusion play in the chains of causality in the Theory of Change.	these issues, including making the assumptions in the ToC around gender and equity more explicit. It informed planning for the Year 1 thematic evaluation schedule which includes further assessment of how gender is considered in the programme designs.
It is not yet clear at this stage whether the data will be sufficient to undertake a Fund evaluation. There is a range of data available and the MR contractor is still working on generate core Fund level indicators.	The <i>Report on Secondary Data Quality and Availability</i> considered the data quality and availability to support Fund level evaluation. This report also documents the E&L team's collaboration with the MR contractor to ensure core Fund level indicators, which are still under development, can be used for evaluations.
The assessment generated a list / summary of potential challenges to evaluating the Fund and identified ways they could be mitigated.	The challenges to evaluations at the Fund level and how they will be addressed will be included in the Risks and Limitations sections of the <i>Inception Report</i> . Some challenges identified from this assessment include the timeframe for results to be observed, diversity of programmes/project support, and assessing contribution to PF when the programme/ project funded is part of a larger initiative.
The Fund level evaluation should rely on a range of methods and a mixed methods approach is appropriate.	This assessment identified an initial list of evaluation methods and approaches that would be suitable. The Methodology section of this report and the <i>Fund Methodology Paper</i> drew on this list and other E&L team activities to select the most appropriate methods.
It will be important to clearly articulate different units of analysis for the PF Fund evaluation, why they have been selected and what information will be generated as result.	Greater clarity on the units of analysis for the different evaluation activities has been integrated into the <i>E&amp;L Evaluation Framework</i> document and this <i>Inception Report</i> , as well as information on why they have been selected and what information will be generated.