

Audit trail on comments and responding actions

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF Secretariat	12 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Regarding the rolling application and resource predictability of the Fund, perhaps change the question: "How has the Fund dealt with the scarcity of (financial) resources?"	Changed: "How has resource predictability, or the lack thereof, affected the Fund's programming?"
GEF Secretariat	12 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Par. 23: Performance assessment isn't completely clear. Are you looking at the project level, macro fund level or both? Needs a rewrite	Par. 23 changed: "The Fund's performance will be assessed at the Fund's macro level as well as the project level. The former would be in terms of the degree to which the LDCF has operated according to the strategic objectives set, informed by the UNFCCC COP guidance and decisions received. This translates, among others, into evaluating the Fund's performance regarding the mainstreaming of adaptation into broader developmental policies, plans and programs, and assessing how NAPAs relate to other GEF focal areas beyond climate change adaptation. The latter would focus on performance related to the achievement of emerging project results against stated goals. The core evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results and sustainability) will be applied as outlined in the previous paragraph."
GEF Secretariat	12 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Data in Tables 1, 2, and 3 needs to be reviewed, to include the latest data.	Comment: This will be done collaboratively with the GEF Secretariat once the evaluation has started. The data has already been reviewed against the progress document to Council, dd. September 2015.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF Secretariat	12 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	The timeframe of the NAPAs materializing as presented in the Annex is open for discussion. Where do these dates come from?	There is a difference between the NAPA report being completed by the country and GEF agency, and it being accepted by the UNFCCC. This will be further explored as part of the evaluation.
Peer Reviewer	12 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Take into account UNDP 2009 evaluation of their LDCF work.	New paragraph added (12): "The UNDP Evaluation Office carried out an independent evaluation of UNDP's work with the LDCF/SCCF resources, published in 2009. The evaluation found that there was justifiable dissatisfaction in the countries concerning the lengthy time periods and complex procedures required to move from the NAPAs to concrete projects. There were also differing expectations amongst the different actors; some countries thought that as soon as the NAPA is completed resources for the follow-up activities would be made available. On the other hand, from the side of the UNDP the NAPAs look more like wish lists and real project identification still needs to be completed"
Peer Reviewer	16 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Include the theory of change for the program.	Theory of change now included before the specific questions. It is linked to the Box of the GEF objectives and strategic pillars.
GEF Secretariat	17 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Par. 1: Change the "from LDCF implementation administration of more than 15 years", given implementation has not taken place over 15 years.	Changed: "The evaluation will also provide evidence on lessons learned from the moment of its establishment as dedicated adaptation fund up to date."
GEF Secretariat	17 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Par. 7: medium- and long-term adaptation needs ,	Changed: "...and implement <i>activities that focus on</i> medium- and long-term adaptation needs,"
GEF Secretariat	17 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Par. 19: See comment par. 1.	Changed: "...major achievements and lessons learned since the Fund's establishment in 2001."

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF Secretariat	17 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	<p>Par. 25 Gender: The first RBM for LDCF and SCCF – Adaptation Monitoring and Tracking Tool - was launched in 2010, and included gender-disaggregated indicators, where applicable.</p> <p>Also “It might be too early to find evidence as to whether this translates into improved performance of NAPA implementation projects”, perhaps conclusions are possible.</p>	<p>Changed: “The Results-Based Management (RBM) Framework Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT) have recently been updated to include GEF's core gender indicators in accordance with the GEF's Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP), though the RBM framework and AMAT already included gender-disaggregated indicators since the AMAT's introduction in October 2010. The focus will be on evidence regarding the use of these indicators and guidance provided, and early evidence as to whether this translates into improved performance of NAPA implementation projects.”</p>
GEF Secretariat	17 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	<p>Par. 25 Resilience: “which often translates into longer term perspectives.” Is this necessarily true?</p>	<p>Comment: Yes, it is true. Especially given we do not say ‘always’, but ‘often’.</p>
GEF Secretariat	18 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	<p>Par. 1: The decision to establish the fund was adopted in late 2001 and the first administrative steps were approved by the Council in the spring of 2002, so it will be closer to 14 years.</p>	<p>See response and adjustment on earlier Par. 1 comment. The new way in which it is described does not reflect a time period, e.g. 14 or 15 years.</p>
GEF Secretariat	18 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	<p>There is a separate governing body for the LDCF and the SCCF – the LDCF/SCCF Council.</p>	<p>The new par. 3 reflects this.</p>
GEF Secretariat	18 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	<p>Par. 7: “NAPs provide a process for LDCs to plan and implement: identify and address “medium- and long-term adaptation needs”. From 1/CP 16</p>	<p>Adjusted to “Formulate and implement” from Decision 1/CP.16, par. 15, Decision 12/CP.18, par. 1</p>

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF Secretariat	18 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Par. 2: The role of the LDCF is broader than adaptation, it was established to support the special needs of the LDCs under the Convention. The original mandate was to support the implementation of the LDC work program, of which NAPAs are just one element. NAPAs came later, as part of the Cancun Adaptation Framework and the guidance to the GEF was provided in 5/CP.17.	Very valid point. The broader role is reflected upon in the box that discusses UNFCCC COP guidance and decisions. Adjustment made to Par. 2: The LDCF is mandated by parties to the UNFCCC to, <i>among others</i> , provide... Also, the box on UNFCCC COP guidance and decisions has been moved to Par 2 and linked to it in the text.
GEF Secretariat	18 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Par. 3: "The GEF acts as an operating entity of the UNFCCC's LDCF financial mechanism": Please review the terminology here. The GEF is an operating entity of the financial mechanism of the UNFCCC. This role dates to COP 2 where the MoU between the Council and the COP was adopted. When the LDCF was established at COP 7 the GEF was entrusted with the operation of the fund.	Par. 3 adjusted: "The GEF acts as an operating entity of the financial mechanism of the UNFCCC and was entrusted with the (financial) operation of the LDCF."
GEF Secretariat	18 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Par. 7: This is important: urgent and immediate does not mean short-term.	The UNFCCC talks about short-term outputs and potential long-term outcomes of NAPAs. Paragraphs 6 and 7 will be adjusted to reflect this.
GEF Secretariat	18 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Par. 9: "...the implementation of elements of the LDC work program other than NAPAs and NAPAs." NAPAs are not part of the work program.	Agreed. Changed to: "other than NAPAs, namely the effective participation in climate change negotiations, and access to and use of climate information."
GEF Secretariat	18 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Par. 19: "...and lessons learned from LDCF implementation" administration "of more than 15 years (14)".	Changed: "...major achievements and lessons learned since the Fund's establishment in 2001."

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF Secretariat	18 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Table 1 (After Par. 10): Please compare with para 11 below and the latest progress report. The approvals here exceed total cumulative pledges to the fund by more than \$100 million. I suggest you use the figures in the aforementioned progress report (dated Sept 22, 2015). I can also review your data against what I have, but that may take more time.	The figures were already corrected with the data from the latest progress report to Council. We will further verify the data once the evaluation gets on its way.
GEF Secretariat	18 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Tables 2 and 3 (After Par. 10): I need more time to review these. I suspect that the large number of cancelled and dropped projects includes projects that were in fact dropped before ever receiving Council approval. I am not sure those projects, or the pending ones, are necessarily relevant here.	Whether they are relevant depends on whether they had financial implications. In PIMS it looks as if a number of dropped projects do have financial implications, or at least in PIMS it shows that way. This will be later verified, and might also explain the 100 M USD difference in Table 1.
GEF Secretariat	18 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Par. 22 (Q.1): "How relevant is LDCF support in the light of UNFCCC COP guidance and decisions, <u>GEF adaptation programming strategy...</u> " We should think carefully whether it is appropriate to assess the relevance of LDCF support since inception against a programming strategy that has only been in place for 18 months.	Noted.
GEF Secretariat	18 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	Par. 23 "Assessing performance". As discussed, please note the use of "performance" in the context of e.g. AMRs.	Par. 23 was changed to reflect this.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF Secretariat	18 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	<p>Par. 22 (Relevance): “To what extent has the LDCF contributed to resilience in the GEF portfolio through Multi Trust Fund (MTF) projects?” The framing of this question is not entirely clear. Are we simply looking at the extent to which LDCF funds are being deployed through MTF projects; or are we assessing those MTF projects to see whether they are contributing towards resilience in the GEF portfolio? Either way, I think it is important to recognize that while the programming strategy emphasizes the potential for synergies across different GEF-managed funds and focal areas, enhancing the resilience of the GEF portfolio is not an objective of the LDCF per se.</p>	<p>The latest LDCF and SCCF results framework, part of the GEF adaptation strategy, states the overarching goal as: “Increase resilience to the adverse impacts of climate change in vulnerable developing countries [...]” The three objectives of the results framework feed into this goal.</p> <p>The contribution to resilience is as such more than an objective it is the overarching goal of the adaptation portfolio of the GEF, which consists of the LDCF for the LDCs.</p> <p>The specific question on MTF projects has been taken out of the evaluative questions, now captured as part of the question “How does LDCF support relate to other GEF focal areas beyond climate change adaptation?”</p>
GEF Secretariat	18 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	<p>Par. 22 (Effectiveness): “How effective is the LDCF in reducing the vulnerability of people, livelihoods, physical assets and natural systems to the adverse effects of climate change?” and “... in supporting the strengthening of ... capacities for effective climate change adaptation?”</p> <p>Effectiveness can be assessed only for projects that have been completed or that are under implementation. Does the current programming strategy represent the best point of departure? While these objectives can be applied to earlier projects, perhaps similar ones can be drawn from COP decisions or from analysis based on the NAPAs?</p>	<p>An updated analysis of the NAPAs will also be part of the evaluation. The NAPA step-by-step implementation guide from the LEG contains a list of criteria to be used to guide the assessment of adaptation projects. A number of these link directly or indirectly to vulnerability reduction.</p> <p>The same guide provides an overview of the elements of the LDC work program, which includes the strengthening of institutional and technical capacities. The evaluation will reflect the fact that these elements are part of both the current programming strategy and the LDC work program.</p>

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF Secretariat	18 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	<p>Par. 25 “The difference between adaptation and resilience lays in the latter’s focus on capacities to not only cope, but also maintain the capacity for adaptation, learning and transformation, which often translates into longer term perspectives.”</p> <p>It may be useful to place IPCC’s definitions of resilience and adaptation side by side. The former refers to a system quality – the latter are adjustments in systems that can strengthen the resilience. The two concepts are not interchangeable, nor are they associated with specific time frames.</p>	Noted.
GEF Secretariat	19 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	<p>I do have a concern with the Evaluation Questions and Coverage, in particular to what extent has the LDCF has contributed to resilience in the portfolio through MTF projects. The LDCF was not designed to do this. This is not the mandate of the LDCF, so I think this is not the type of question which should be asked as it relates to the LDCF. We should really focusing on whether the LDCF is fulfilling its mandate, which is outlined in the guidance which has be received from the COP, rather than issues which are not really in that guidance. How is the fund performing on financing the NAPA priorities, etc.? The LDCF may have MTF projects but this is not its core mandate.</p>	<p>The LEG guide on NAPA implementation indicates that “The two main options are to either pursue funding from the GEF for a single project [...] or, to design a strategy for implementing the whole NAPA. This would be done by designing an integrated or a programmatic approach that would address all of the priority needs [...]”</p> <p>When reading the LEG guide part on co-financing it becomes clear that the use of MTF projects is perhaps not the Fund’s core mandate, but equally it makes sense as one of the options currently being pursued.</p> <p>But concerns are noted and MTF projects will not be regarded as being the core mandate of the Fund.</p>

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF Secretariat	19 Nov '15	9 Nov '15	The second issue relates to the strategic objectives in the current strategy and projects currently under implementation. I think you need to be careful here because many of the projects under implementation were approved using the strategy in GEF 5. So this has to be taken into consideration	Noted. See reply on earlier concerns regarding "Par. 22 (Effectiveness)."
Peer Reviewer	3 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 10 on the LDCF and SCCF results framework: One asks himself why an annex on gender indicators is suddenly mentioned here?	The LDCF and SCCF results framework discussed in Par. 10 provides an overview of output and outcome indicators, but projects also need to report on the set of gender indicators from October 2014 onwards. This has now been clarified.
Peer Reviewer	3 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	On the use of the term "NAPA implementation projects": I wonder on the use of this terminology. Why not simply "priority projects"?	The term "NAPA implementation project" is part of the official UNFCCC COP language regarding LDCF decisions and guidance. It is not a linguistic choice from the side of the evaluators.
Peer Reviewer	3 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 12 on the 2009 UNDP evaluation of their work for the LDCF and SCCF: What did this evaluation recommend?	The evaluation was not very clear as to who was targeted with the recommendations, stating that these "concern several organizations and actors, at various levels."
Peer Reviewer	3 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 23: Although the SPA is not funded by the LDCF, this evaluative piece might be useful. I would add a paragraph on it in the previous section on evaluative evidence. It would also justify its use in designing the TOC.	Noted. The SPA has been added. Though Technical Paper 7 of the FAS was in the end use in designing the TOC. This has been adjusted in the accompanying text.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
Peer Reviewer	3 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 24: Shouldn't the TOC also be used to identify the questions?	Noted. The introduction to the questions has been rephrased to reflect the use of the TOC.
Peer Reviewer	3 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 24 on the strategic objectives: I would concisely mention them.	They are mentioned in Box 2, just before the evaluative question.
Peer Reviewer	3 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 24 on the Fund's efficiency: I would have this sub-question first, and based on the answer go look at the factors, in particular fund predictability (the other two sub-questions)	The sequence of questions has been changed to reflect the logic of first asking about the Fund's efficiency and only thereafter asking about the factors influencing that efficiency.
Peer Reviewer	3 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 24 on results and sustainability: I have read some scattered mention on gender here and there in the paper (which could maybe be expanded a bit more), but I don't understand how gender fits in the catalytic effect. I miss to see a strong logical link between these two.	The specific sentence referred to does not try to make the link between gender and catalytic effect. The questions should not be read as the first one (on catalytic effects) being the main question and the next ones being sub-questions.
Peer Reviewer	3 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 27 on gender: I would move this under the paragraph on the 2009 evaluation, and recall it concisely here.	Noted.
Peer Reviewer	3 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 28 on recommendations: Why not also [provide recommendations] on the future activities? Council might well be interested in this	At current there are only 11 NAPA implementation projects completed and 39 under implementation of the portfolio of 162 projects. We would like to provide recommendations towards the future, but it needs to be seen whether the current state of implementation renders evaluative evidence that is strong enough to form the foundation for future-focused recommendations.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
Peer Reviewer	3 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 32 on limitations: What about using Andy Rowe's RIE methodology? I wrote him after the webinar and as soon as I get the guidance document he promised I will share it with you	Noted. An interesting idea. Though given the rather tight timeline it needs to be seen whether adopting a novel approach – with its own learning curve – would be wise. We do see strong value in the use of the rapid impact evaluation approach once guidance has been developed.
Peer Reviewer	3 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 33 on the state of PMIS: To address this limitation you can do the update with the help of the GEF Agencies as we use to do in CPEs and other evaluations.	Noted.
Peer Reviewer	3 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 36 on presentation of evaluative results: Why not a 20-pages infographic summary as we did with the SGP evaluation instead?	This might be considered, though depends on the financial resources available/needed for the development of infographic materials.
CSO Network	10 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	In the process of achieving overarching goals in a multi – trust or multi-focal area projects; we believe that the following five 'R's of project cycle will be a good benchmark for quality assurance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce - Recycle - Revive. - Reuse - Redistribute <p>According to the report we observed that 'Field Visits' and 'Data Collection' from the locals are two major limitations encountered. We believe CSOs involvement in these activities would improve the efficiency at this stage of evaluation.</p>	Noted.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF Agency	14 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 9 on replenishment: It could be helpful to show what funding was like annually, how it fluctuated and whether the uncertainty had any effect on work at the national level.	This will certainly be looked into as part of the final evaluation.
GEF Agency	14 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 14 on the 2009 joint evaluation: What was the gist of the recommendations? Summarizing it would help if this GEF IOE LDCF evaluation seeks to build on or proceed from the DANIDA study.	The recommendations were quite extensive. Those recommendations of the 2009 joint evaluation that are currently still relevant will be revisited as part of this evaluation.
GEF Agency	14 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 24 evaluative questions: Is there an aim to also "follow-up" or draw on the earlier evaluations of the LDCF described above? It could be clearer here as to whether or not this is the intent, and if it is, you may wish to revisit the questions.	Noted. Past evaluation will certainly inform this evaluation, but the word 'update' should not be read as it being an update of any specific past evaluation, more a question as to; where do we stand right now, x years after the mentioned earlier evaluations?
GEF Agency	14 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 24: Since many of the projects are, according to the tables above, either under endorsement/approval or implementation, much of the analysis may need to be based on the design of the projects. I wonder though if there are other interesting findings you can draw from the design of the interventions. One useful question to consider could be "to what extent have the NAPAs developed been of quality?" Since they are to be the foundation for subsequent adaptation activities in the countries, it could be worth looking into this. I'm not sure if this would be captured in one of the evaluation questions; perhaps it is.	A review of NAPAs has taken place in the past. This review will be updated with the information of the 10 NAPAs completed since that moment in time. This is further explained in Par 30.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF Agency	14 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 24: Also, the draft mentions earlier that many of the NAPAs focus on the agricultural sector. It would be interesting to see from an analysis of the project designs what kind of interventions are being implemented/sought.	Noted.
GEF Agency	14 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 27 on public involvement: Perhaps this could be done through a survey or series of telephone interviews in focus countries. Additionally, how might the study get at the issue of gender mainstreaming apart from the information-gathering approaches outlined below? Would organizations focusing on gender in selected countries be worth interviewing?	Noted.
GEF Agency	14 Dec '15	23 Nov '15	Par 30 on field visits: I understand the evaluation budget is rather limited. It could be challenging though to come up with a basis to choose only a few countries. Perhaps conduct some interviews with national-level stakeholders in a secondary set of countries that will not be examined quite as much in-depth. Out of the visited and "secondary" countries, it could be interesting to examine some in terms of their experience with the LDCF in moving from NAPA development to longer-term actions. Additionally, a few surveys could be used, particularly if an area of focus is to look at civic engagement.	Noted. Regarding the move from NAPA development to longer-term actions. The latter would be captured in the NAPs, but these are only currently developing. It is an interesting question, which we will be taking into account, but it might turn out to be a little too early to find an answer to it at this point in time.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
<p>GEF Agency</p>	<p>5 May '16</p>	<p>27 April '16</p>	<p><i>“Observations during field missions to Haiti and Lao PDR suggested that extensive replication and upscaling generally may not occur during project implementation.”</i></p> <p>This is might be true, however, climate resistant local rice varieties that have been field-tested during the project, have shown positive yield results and the multiplication of these seeds have been observed through farmer- to-farmer multiplication mechanisms at a considerable scale. This information has been provided to the evaluator through the interviews and PIRs. For example, project monitoring recorded that seasonal profits from the project supported rice production increased by 78% and distribution of resistant rice varieties has reached over 100 ha of farm land in the targeted provinces. This is a clear evidence of replication! If the report is concerned with replication of a full methodology of resilient farming (and not only climate resistant rice), it did not happen.</p> <p>Indeed a full-scale adoption of a project tested <i>integrated farming systems</i> at a desirable scale could not happen during the time of project implementation and neither was this the aim or scope of the project.</p>	<p>Noted. Yes, replication was discussed earlier in the same paragraph; this sentence refers to <i>extensive</i> replication and upscaling beyond the target province.</p> <p>Changed to: <i>“Observations during field visits to Haiti and Lao PDR suggested that extensive replication and upscaling beyond projects’ target districts or provinces generally may not occur during project implementation.”</i></p>

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF Agency	5 May '16	27 pril '16	<p>On the sentence: <i>“Data on Lao PDR is cautiously optimistic about the sustainability of project outcomes, but states it will largely depend on successfully transferring project ownership to local stakeholders.”</i></p> <p>This sentence is not quite clear. Not sure how the data can be optimistic or how the data can state that it will depend on transferring project ownership.</p>	<p>Rewritten to:</p> <p><i>“Results from the data of the Lao PDR field visit are cautiously optimistic about the sustainability of project outcomes, but state it will largely depend on successfully transferring project ownership to local stakeholders.”</i></p>
GEF Agency	5 May '16	27 April '16	<p>“Conclusion 10: There are discrepancies in project data from the GEF Secretariat’s Project Management Information System (PMIS).”</p> <p>Is PMIS the same as PIMS?</p>	<p>Yes, the term PMIS is used within the GEF Secretariat. It is possible that GEF Agencies use the term PIMS instead for their specific systems.</p>

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF STAP	5 May '16	27 April '16	Overall, I found that there was a lack on in-depth analysis presented in this evaluation, which the evaluators argue is justified by a lack of data. However, there are a number of lessons which can be learnt from the LDCF, and it is an opportunity for the GEF to lead the way in terms of adaptation funding. For instance, it would have been important to address the way climate risks are assessed in projects, how they influenced the development of project objectives, and how they may affect long-term project sustainability. In my view, the vulnerability reduction objective of the LDCF is the only one where there is an opportunity to create strong baselines supported by science, yet this is seldom done. This is where the risk of maladaptation is greatest as well, and should be investigated in a more rigorous way than it is currently done in this evaluation. Finally, it is felt that lessons could have been learnt on how projects have been differentiating between adaptation and development, if at all.	Noted.
GEF STAP	5 May '16	27 April '16	On p. 4: Has the ceiling per LDC not been recently changed to \$40 million?	Based on the latest information available to the evaluation team it is still set at \$30 million.
GEF STAP	5 May '16	27 April '16	On p.6, Box1: Check grammar of last 2 sentences. Unclear.	Box 1 shows the guidance and decisions of the UNFCCC. The formulation is as is provided in the FCCC Council Documents.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF STAP	5 May '16	27 April '16	On p.18-19: Figures 6 and 7 are somewhat misleading. The more relevant analysis which could be made is that the numbers presented are proportional to the geographical distribution of the 48 LDCs.	Added: "In the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) region the portfolio includes five projects in Haiti, the only LDC in the LAC region.[...] With 36 African and 14 Asian LDCs, the numbers presented are proportional to the geographical distribution of the 51 LDCs.
GEF STAP	5 May '16	27 April '16	Generally: replace the term "extremely largely aligned", it is confusing. Replace with original term of "aligned to an extremely large extent"	Noted.
GEF STAP	5 May '16	27 April '16	Tables 6, 7, 9, 10: Revise the presentation of these tables. Remove the bottom row with the total, and replace with column or title with inclusion of sample size (e.g. n=51).	The sample size, N, has been added in the text for all figures and tables where it applies.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF STAP	5 May '16	27 April '16	<p>On p.29: National stakeholders perceived that there are “longer droughts and more extreme high temperatures and rainfall events”. This statement, if useful, should be accompanied by a form of “disclaimer” clarifying that in fact, these are perceptions, and not climate observations (e.g. droughts could be agricultural or socio-economic, and not meteorological). Several studies have shown that people’s perceptions of changes in the climate are often not correlated with reality (Osbahr et al. 2011; Simelton et al. 2013; Lebel 2014). Hence, it is possible that a greater awareness of climate change linked to mainstreamed discourses is influencing national stakeholders’ perceptions as to the increased importance of the LDCF. That is not to say that such events are not occurring, but climate change is only just becoming perceptible to the average person (Hansen et al., 2012), and other factors such as land degradation can be affecting climate change perceptions.</p>	<p>Noted. We actually do not make the statement that this is a perception of national stakeholders.</p> <p>Rewritten to: “In the subsequent decade the need for adaptation efforts has been repeatedly highlighted; longer droughts and more extreme temperatures and rainfall are examples of climatic events LDCs have to cope with and such events further emphasize the need for and relevance of LDCF support.”</p> <p>Studies like the Economic Commission of Africa report on drought and desertification, the review of droughts on the African continent by Masih et. al, and for example the work of Aiguo Dai on droughts under global warming support this statement.</p>

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF STAP	5 May '16	27 April '16	The analysis done on the “Effectiveness in Achieving Objectives” section seemed to be lacking depth. Specifically, I am still unclear how the reduction in vulnerability was assessed, and what were the findings. If the stakeholders interviewed are involved in the projects, or benefit financially in any way from the projects, how likely is it that they will answer “no” when asked about the likelihood of the project being effective in achieving its objective (i.e. Figure 10 – 96% of stakeholders responded they believed it likely to reach LDCF objective 1 from a large to very large extent). The method used to evaluate the effectiveness in achieving objectives therefore risks introducing significant bias in the analysis.	Noted. The main part of the analysis was the portfolio analysis protocol. Interviews were used for data triangulation. None of the Figures are said to be stakeholder observations or interview data. The Annex further explains portfolio analysis protocol and related data.
GEF STAP	5 May '16	27 April '16	Paragraph 66: “90% of the projects takes into account potential major risks and includes sufficient risk mitigation”. Yes, perhaps this is true for the lifetime of the project, but this is certainly not true of climate risks which affect the timeframe of expected benefits. My experience in reviewing dozens of LDCF PIFs and LDCF project documents is that they hardly ever use climate information, and if they do it is often erroneous or incomplete. This will certainly affect achieving the LDCF’s Objective 1.	Noted. The evaluation looks at the performance of the LDCF portfolio of projects. With currently 13 projects completed it is too early to include an assessment of the Fund’s impact beyond the projects’ lifetime. Par. 66 is as such a quality at entry review.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF STAP	5 May '16	27 April '16	Table 15: I'm curious to know how the M&E rankings were done. I went through the 11 LDCF TEs available on PMIS, and those rankings were generally different from the ones presented in Table 15 (e.g. TEs were more likely to give HS rankings across the board...).	The IEO performance team who develops the Annual Performance Reports does a full review of TE's, which is explained in the Annex. The result can be an adjustment in ratings, which is explained in Terminal Evaluation Review (TER) documents.
GEF STAP	5 May '16	27 April '16	Paragraph 87: change term "transformational shifts" to either "low emission path" or "climate change mitigation". Otherwise confusing/erroneous.	Noted.
GEF STAP	5 May '16	27 April '16	Paragraph 96: Stating big numbers such as 98% of NAPA implementation projects had a high to very high probability of delivering tangible adaptation benefits (at entry) makes me uneasy. It makes it sound as though all projects are extremely successful in the LDCF, while it is quite obvious that the real reason why the numbers are so high are the timing of the data collection (i.e. at entry/CEO endorsement!)... I am not sure how much value such data sources have for the evaluation of the LDCF.	Noted. The document states this to be a quality at entry check and not an analysis of completed projects. In the conclusion it is also stated to have <i>the potential</i> to be significant. Future LDCF evaluation updates will show whether that potential has been reached.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF STAP	5 May '16	27 April '16	I am surprised that climate change itself was not found to be a factor in the sustainability of projects. I suspect that this relates to the way LDCF projects are initially designed (i.e. poorly supported by scientific evidence, and often with climate change being a secondary concern to development priorities), and the lack of long-term monitoring strategies/data? One striking example I can recall from a recent PIF was a project requesting LDCF funds to purchase lifejackets and emergency flares for fishermen. While certainly useful under the country's current context, these products are unlikely to be sustainable climate change adaptation options.	Noted.
GEF STAP	5 May '16	27 April '16	Paragraph 100: Almost 30% of projects completed received a moderately unlikely rating for sustainability of the outcomes. Why is this type of information not more prominently displayed and analyzed in the evaluation? Because of a lack of data/completed projects?	The next paragraph states that "A cohort of thirteen completed projects (MSP/FSP), eleven of them with terminal evaluations (TEs) and terminal evaluation reviews (TERs), is too small to draw Fund-wide conclusions." The Quality at Entry review assessed 116 projects under implementation. The portfolio analysis of consisted of 217 council approved projects.
GEF STAP	5 May '16	27 April '16	On p.53: I am extremely surprised to see only three recommendations here. I might have expected to see something about M&E or even on strengthening the quality of incoming projects. I understand, however, that if only project evaluations were used as data rather than the actual project documents, the results of this evaluation may be biased.	The portfolio analysis consisted of 217 council approved projects, but conclusions and recommendations are towards the functioning of the LDCF portfolio of projects as a whole.