

MFAT Management Response to Climate Finance Capacity Support Programme, Formative Review

May 2026

Evaluation Report Recommendation	MFAT Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)
Consolidate and sustain gains 1. Prioritise implementation and institutionalisation of Phase 1 outputs rather than commissioning substantial new design work. Across the case studies, many policies, frameworks, systems and diagnostic products have already been developed. The strongest value in the remaining period is likely to come from helping partners operationalise these outputs, embed them into routine systems and ensure staff can use them effectively.	Partially Agree – current phase will work toward embedding sustainable outcomes as best as possible. However, progressing work for a future phase will support MFAT’s consideration of the approach to technical assistance through review of other types of national-system technical assistance delivery modalities that may be consolidated into a future phase. The intent is to consider continuing with the same scope of work, but extend technical assistance to other national ministries aligned with strengthening the overall ability to deliver climate finance, and other types of finance, through national systems. Anticipate a future phase could go into implementation July 2027.

Evaluation Report Recommendation	MFAT Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)
Consolidate and sustain gains continued 2. Provide greater continuity of support where reforms depend on embedded or long-term advisers. Uncertainty about continuation risks losing capable personnel before systems and roles are stabilised. In small labour markets, replacement is difficult and momentum can be quickly lost. A six-month extension would provide the necessary continuity while a decision about Phase 2 is made and implemented. Future phases should use longer-term commitments to countries and specific support where institutional support is central to the delivery model. This may be a minimum of three years, but in many cases may be five years.	Agree – MFAT is extending current phase by six months to maintain momentum, support sustainability, protect investments, and enable a smooth transition to a future phase. This will minimise the loss of long-term advisers and provide time to enable a more considered decision regarding a future phase. A future phase will consider a more stable, longer-term delivery approach of five years.
Refine delivery model and governance 3. Clarify governance arrangements early, simply and consistently. Stakeholders seeking clearer articulation of roles, reporting lines, communication expectations and decision-making authority, particularly where personnel are embedded in government agencies but contracted externally. A concise governance protocol at country level would likely improve accountability and reduce friction.	Agree – a future phase will maintain strengths of country-led and agile governance, while adding greater clarity and institutional resilience. The Activity implementing partner will develop a governance protocol, with input from MFAT, that documents roles and escalation pathways, clarifying supervision of embedded staff, broadening cross-government participation where relevant, and periodically reviewing whether governance arrangements remain fit for purpose.

Evaluation Report Recommendation	MFAT Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)
Refine delivery model and governance continued 4. Continue to tailor future support to country-specific system constraints rather than applying a uniform model. The case studies showed that constraints differ significantly: Tuvalu requires help managing overall climate finance workload and emerging governance mechanisms; Solomon Islands benefits from embedded institutional capacity; Cook Islands is more ready for implementation support and selective specialist inputs. Future phases should maintain flexibility to reflect differing country maturity and needs.	Agree – a future phase will maintain the CFCSP’s flexibility, responsiveness and consistent focus on addressing institutional constraints that limit climate finance access and delivery. This modality is highly relevant, operationally effective in priority areas, and well aligned with Pacific country needs.

Evaluation Report Recommendation	MFAT Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)
Refine delivery model and governance continued 5. Improve partner ownership of staffing decisions. Partners were generally involved in recruitment decisions. However, this was not consistent. Consistent partner involvement in recruitment, prioritisation and performance feedback would improve ownership and sustainability, especially where roles may transition into government structures.	Partially Agree – Partner governments are involved in key stages of the recruitment process and this has generally been consistent across the programme. However, where gaps have occurred, these have reflected specific in-country circumstances such as where a non-focal Ministry has directed the programme to lead direct recruitment, with a preference for greater engagement expressed after the process concluded. The programme acknowledges the value of more structured partner involvement, with documented touchpoints at each recruitment stage, noting that some stages, such as contracting, necessarily exclude partners due to commercial confidentiality. On performance feedback, concrete mechanisms will be explored to ensure partner perspectives are systematically incorporated, including partner counterpart check-ins and incorporating partner perspectives into LTA reviews. The programme recognises transition into government structures as a longer-term sustainability goal. While this has been constrained by contract periods in the first phase, it will be a key focus going forward, with transition pathways incorporated more explicitly into programme design.

Evaluation Report Recommendation	MFAT Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)
Refine delivery model and governance continued 6. Design any future phase explicitly as a facility rather than a conventional programme. The review found that CFCSP has operated most effectively where it functioned as a flexible, demand-responsive facility able to tailor support across countries, modalities and changing needs. Explicit facility design would better align governance, investment decision-making, monitoring and adaptive management with how the model operates in practice.	Agree – CFCSP is nominally currently operating as a flexible, demand-responsive facility; however the future phase would look to provide clarity about how it works and the outcomes that can be achieved.
Strengthen monitoring, learning and GEDSI integration 7. Strengthen monitoring to capture outcomes, not only activities and outputs. Current monitoring was commonly perceived by stakeholders as activity and outputs focused. Future delivery should better track outcomes, in particular capability gains, use of systems, behavioural change, ownership and institutional performance. This is particularly important for institutional support models where value is often indirect and spread across multiple climate finance initiatives.	Agree – outcome-level evaluation, monitoring and learning will focus on contribution to change across a system with GEDSI incorporated as a design driver (shaping prioritisation, scopes of work and outcome expectations), not just a delivery or compliance consideration.

Evaluation Report Recommendation	MFAT Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)
Strengthen monitoring, learning and GEDSI integration continued 8. Integrate GEDSI more deliberately into technical delivery and adaptive management. Across the portfolio, GEDSI commitments were generally stronger in plans, reporting and compliance processes than in the core logic of technical assistance. Future phases should require clearer GEDSI application in scopes of work, implementation methods, data systems and review processes.	Agree – CFCSP has an updated GEDSI Strategy and Action Plan (GSAP) incorporating the GEDSI Transformative Climate Change Action (GTCCA) approach. CFCSP technical advisors are well positioned to enable and advance the GSAP through modelling inclusive, accessible, and equitable approaches in their technical work; embedding GEDSI considerations into analysis, planning, and decision-making processes; supporting partner governments to interpret and apply GEDSI-related frameworks and commitments; strengthening the quality and inclusiveness of climate finance outcomes; and helping create enabling conditions for meaningful participation across diverse groups.