

Response to GEF Secretariat Comments on draft report of the “*Evaluation of Community-Based Approaches at the GEF*”

Paragraph references correspond to the posted council document: https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/documents/council-documents/c-66-e-02_0.pdf

COMMENTS

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
General comment		We welcome this review, which is based on getting on the ground to visit a number of projects and to understand some of the many complexities in project development. This evaluation raises a number of key questions for the GEF to consider. The many examples are very helpful for any future analytical work/guide/tool kit the GEF Sec and/or partners would undertake on this topic.	Thank you.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
1	<i>“Development finance institutions use community-based approaches (CBAs)”</i>	The use of the word “use” in this sentence, and throughout the paragraph when referring to DFI and GEF funding of projects to support communities to engage in the stewardship and conservation of natural resources, has a strange connotation or feel that isn’t quite accurate (e.g., potentially sounding like DFI’s “use” communities themselves in some way). Suggest rephrasing and reframing as “support CBAs” throughout the document.	Relevant changes made.
1	<i>“most notably in the Small Grants Programme”</i>	The connection of CBA with the SGP can be understood, but the size of the project is a wrong entry point to characterize CBA. We use Community-based Approaches indistinctly in MSP and FSP. If we were adding the projects using CBA approaches, SGP may not represent the biggest share. How significant is the use of community-based approaches in Natural Resource Management (NRM) projects? It is recommended to rephrase this section.	Text edited to clarify.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
2	<i>“CBAs play an important role in enhancing governance, peacebuilding in postconflict areas, and the inclusion and empowerment of communities—all of which can contribute to the durability and ownership of investments.”</i>	This headline statement doesn't match with subsequent description. While the headline talks about the role of CBA approaches, the subsequent description is about the objective of this study and its illustration as the first of its kind, excluding SGP. Also, further clarity on highlighting “peacebuilding in post conflict areas” is needed. Data and analysis are drawn extensively from countries that has not necessary been in the conflicts. It will be helpful to understand the full rationale and linkages between the GEF intervention and peacebuilding exercise within the scope of this report.	Text edited to clarify, reference to peacebuilding has been removed to reflect the lack of emphasis on projects with peacebuilding activities in the evaluation.
3	<i>“...systematically assesses whether CBAs are present in GEF projects and programs...”</i>	Unclear about what would characterize “systematically assess.” How is systems defined for the purpose of this evaluation?	A systematic assessment is one that uses a methodological approach, please refer to methodology section.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
3	<i>“In addition to looking at how CBAs affected and influenced the environmental outcomes of GEF projects, the evaluation also examines the impact of CBAs on socioeconomic co-benefits, gender, and inclusion in the GEF. “</i>	Replace gender with gender equality.	Relevant changes made.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
4	<i>“...especially in countries with weak law enforcement capacity....”</i>	Please provide good study/literature to back up this claim. While it is true that top-down approaches are not desirable on many fronts, they could have positive outcomes (for environmental causes) in those places where there is a strong top-down approach, even if the law enforcement capacity is weak. At the same time, from a BD perspective, this is a logical and broadly understood statement. Weak law enforcement means that rules around sustainable natural resource management are not enforced. Many studies have shown that IPLC lands can be as or more effective in preventing deforestation as national parks. The sentence, though, is rather awkward as CBA is important for many reasons and contexts.	Relevant changes made. Text has been revised to remove reference to weak law enforcement capacity, the remaining text emphasizes the emergence of CBAs as a response to top-down approaches.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
5	<i>“A CBA is “generally described as a bottom-up and strengths-based approach to strengthening community-level adaptive capacity, focused upon vulnerable communities” (Kirkby, Williams, and Huq 2018).”</i>	The headline statement paints a picture of a large “substantial literature...” describing CBA. However, the current description from Kirkby, Williams, and Huq (2018) is restrictive to community-level “adaptive capacity” only. As the subsequent section of the report presents the value of CBA much beyond the “adaptive capacity” of the community, it might be worth broadening the description as appropriate. The focus on adaptation and vulnerable communities is very limiting.	Relevant changes made. A footnote has been added to clarify that the description comes from the adaptation literature but is interpreted more broadly. The rest of the paragraph 21 contains references to literature that isn’t specific to adaptation.
5	<i>CBA definition</i>	It would be really helpful to have a definition of CBA for this paper. Many activities are CBA without using those exact words. It would be helpful to understand what does and does not “count”.	Addressed in paragraph 41. Additional language on how the evaluation defined the approach as well as common features has been added to the paragraph.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
5	<i>“In fact, indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs) manage at least 17 percent of the global carbon stored in forestlands, even though IPLC organizations receive only a small fraction of the donor funding disbursed for climate change (RFN 2021). Unfortunately, they receive only 1 percent of the benefits.”</i>	This point is important but different from the rest of the paragraph. This gets at the issue that ODA and other financial flows often don’t reach the communities delivering the benefits.	Relevant changes made. Text added to tie the sentence in with the rest of the paragraph.
10	<i>“CBAs have been mentioned in GEF programming documents and focal area strategies since GEF-4 and with increasing frequency through GEF-8.”</i>	The Climate Change Adaptation Strategy for the GEF-8 period has identified the Whole-of-the-Society approach as one of the entry points under the LDCF, where community-led climate adaptation action is placed at the center of this approach. Kindly refer to the strategy for inclusion, as appropriate.	Relevant changes made. Reference to this strategy and whole of society approach has been added.
10	<i>References to “Impact Programs”</i>	In GEF-8, we have Integrated Programs. The wording “Impact Programs” is connected to GEF-7. Please correct it accordingly (five times in this section).	Relevant changes made.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
10	<i>"Integrated Programs"</i>	Before naming the Integrated Programs, we suggest referring to the Land Degradation Focal Area (sections 542 and 546 of the GEF-8 programming strategies): 1) the main recommended field intervention – Sustainable Land Management- calls for a focus on five aspects, including "strengthening community-based natural resource management and 2) community-based approaches are recommended for restoration and SFM interventions.	These sections are meant to give an overview of presence of CBA and related concepts in GEF Strategy. More detail (including some of the content referenced in the comment) is provided in the findings section under the heading of GEF strategies and programs.
14	<i>"CBAs have also been used in GEF projects by several GEF Agencies"</i>	This sounds like several agencies haven't used them at all, which seems unlikely.	Relevant changes made.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
15	<i>“earlier GEF IEO and GEF agencies have highlighted the important role played by communities”.</i>	Consider going beyond “evaluations from GEF IEO and GEF agencies”. There is nothing on decentralization policies. This is an important guiding element, as GEF agencies include community-based approaches because it is included in the law: see evaluations from decentralization processes from IIED, and community-based natural management evaluations in West Africa (FFEM, IUCN). CBA is not only a technical issue but a political one as well.	While we agree that including decentralization policies would have been an interesting guiding element, this was not raised when the Approach Paper was circulated.
15	<i>“Earlier evaluations by the GEF IEO and GEF Agencies have highlighted the important role played by communities in influencing environmental and socioeconomic outcomes”</i>	The IEO’s 2020 Program Evaluation of the LDCF also hinted towards the role of communities. This has contributed to adopting a “whole-of-the-society approach” in the current adaptation strategy. This IEO report may also be added here.	There is insufficient information or evidence on the important role of communities in the 2020 LDCF evaluation so it was not included.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
21	<i>“In addition to looking at how CBAs affected and influenced the environmental outcomes of GEF projects, the evaluation examined the impact of CBAs on socioeconomic co-benefits, gender, and inclusion in the GEF.”</i>	Replace gender with gender equality.	Relevant changes made.
23	<i>“The SGP was also excluded because it has been evaluated separately (most recently in GEF IEO and UNDP IEO 2021); lessons from these previous evaluations of the SGP have been drawn on, including examples of where CBAs in the SGP have been scaled up to larger interventions.”</i>	This is somewhat contradictory as a lot of reference is made to SGP and included under many headings.	Relevant changes made.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
25	<i>"The evaluation developed a framework of key dimensions of CBAs in environmental interventions, as identified in the existing literature, that are relevant for the GEF. The framework was used to assess the alignment of GEF CBA projects with good practice (see Annex B)."</i>	Please clarify if the framework was "developed for key dimensions of the CBA," particularly for the purpose of this study, or adapted from the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) Spectrum of Public Participation as mentioned in the later section of the report. How is annex B different from IAP2?	Relevant changes made. Changed 'developed' to 'adapted' and adjusted the text. For those readers that want to see the original spectrum, added the citation and weblink in the annex with the adapted spectrum.
25	Definition of CBA	Does this include working with a certain segment of a population but at the small/community scale? For example, does working with farmers' or fishers' cooperatives at the local level count? (It seems like the answer should be yes, but it's not clear).	Yes, it would include working with farmers or fishers if the included activities to support the transfer of decision making power to these communities. See updated definition in Paragraph 41.
26, 27 & 34	References to "Reviewer and Reference group"	For the purpose of transparency in methodology, please clarify who the reviewer and reference group are. How was it decided? Paragraph 34 mentions, "Representatives from the GEF Secretariat, the IPAG, the STAP, the GEF Agencies, and the GEF-CSO Network were invited to participate." Is this the composition of the reference group?	Formulation of the Reference Group is addressed in the Approach Paper. Paragraph 42 describes the process for formation of the reference group. The external reviewer and internal reviewers are named in the acknowledgements section of the report. Names of participants in each reference group meeting are found in the meeting minutes posted on the evaluation webpage, following IEO protocol.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
32	Country case studies	Please confirm if all the relevant projects from GEF-4 to GEF-7 from 5 selected case study countries are considered in the portfolio for the study.	All relevant projects from GEF-4 to GEF-7 were considered. More details can be found in the technical annexes, including case study selection methodology and the case studies themselves, with a list of projects considered.
37	<i>“Multifocal area projects had the largest share of GEF funding in the portfolio (64 percent), followed by biodiversity (22 percent) (Figure 2). By region, projects in Africa accounted for the largest share of funding (41 percent), followed by Asia (30 percent) (Figure 3).”</i>	It would also be good to see how this is compared to the total funding available in each focal area or the number of projects in each focal area. There is much less LD money than BD, for example, so it would be expected to have more BD projects in the cohort.	There is some narrative text in the paragraph that is meant to provide a comparison with the shares in the overall portfolio where it differs notably from the evaluation portfolio. Additional text has been added on focal area.
40	<i>“The six dimensions are devolved decision making, devolved financial and technical resources, incorporation of local institutions and customs, legitimacy in the eyes of users, accountability of implementors to users and human rights and equality.”</i>	Regarding the reference to equality, if this refers to gender equality, please indicate it as such.	“Equality” here refers to equal treatment between different groups. This statement does not relate only to gender equality, however is gender equality was mentioned in project documents it was recorded as a reference to equality.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
43	<i>“The largest share of comprehensive CBA projects was in the Europe and Central Asia region.”</i>	Previously, it was stated that ECA projects only make up 4% of the portfolio. Therefore, can you make this statement with any statistical significance? It seems like only a few projects are included, so they are not comparable.	Relevant changes made. Project numbers for each category have been added for Figure 6 and Figure 7 and text has been edited.
42		Understanding that there is overlap, could SIDS and LDCs be assessed?	Approach paper was circulated, this was not raised.
44	<i>“While the use of CBAs is not mandated in the GEF and there is no GEF document or strategy that defines CBAs or provides guidance for their application, elements supportive of CBAs are evident in GEF policies and strategies. This section assesses the relevance of CBAs vis-à-vis the multilateral environmental agreements, GEF focal area strategies and programs, GEF policies, GEF Agencies, and national strategies.”</i>	The point that CBA is not mandated at the GEF is not relevant. Also, this point is repeated over and over again. Some review on the repetition of this is warranted.	Thank you for noting this. The goal was to ensure that it was clear that the evaluation was not holding the GEF accountable for something that isn't in the mandate.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
45 & 47	<i>"This orientation is most evident in the UNCCD."</i>	How was this assessed? The GBF has many references to various forms of community focus, such as sustainable use. It's probably better to take such a statement out. Analysis shouldn't be limited to the text of the convention but also more recent decisions, goals, and texts.	Text has been revised to de-emphasize the UNCCD.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
47 & 48	After the sections 47 and 48	It would be recommended to highlight that Community-based approaches are in the DNA of UNCCD: - Article 2 of its objective <i>“Achieving this objective will involve long-term integrated strategies that focus simultaneously, in affected areas, on improved productivity of land, and the rehabilitation, conservation and sustainable management of land and water resources, leading to improved living conditions, in particular at the community level”.</i> - Article 10 on Principles: <i>“promote policies and strengthen institutional frameworks which develop cooperation and coordination, in a spirit of partnership, between the donor community, governments at all levels, local populations and community groups, and facilitate access by local populations to appropriate information and technology”</i>	Relevant changes made. Article 2 is already referenced in paragraph 64, including the suggested text provided in the comment. Suggested text on Article 10 was added to paragraph 65.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
49	<i>“This is especially the case for the biodiversity and land degradation focal areas, but also in the international waters focal area.”</i>	While it is pleasing to note that other focal areas, such as international waters, have taken up CBA, it might be best to treat this with caution to ensure consistency, as IW portfolio are not included in this study. Having said that, are IW projects part of MTF for this analysis?	This section provides a review of CBA in GEF programming, regardless of focal area. A description of the coverage of the evaluation portfolio is found in the methodology section and does not cover IW projects. Scope is limited to BD, LD, CCA and MFA projects that include the aforementioned focal areas.
50	Review of programming strategies	This overall feels a bit scattershot and missing some of the major areas of work (nothing on the largest area of work in the BDFA, mainstreaming, which does a lot of CBA). The plan is for significant CBA work as part of the BGI IP, for example, but only community-based fisheries management is mentioned because it’s a standard term. This is an admittedly hard assessment to undertake as the programming directions are sort of a menu for countries to choose from rather than a prescription, but it might be worth having a caveat.	Unclear what action is specifically suggested in the comment.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
51	<i>“There is limited mention of CBA or related terms in GEF-6 Programming Directions biodiversity focal area strategy (GEF 2014a).”</i>	This is a surprising assessment given the projects that were supported by the BDFA during GEF-6. The text of the programming directions is inherently limited compared to what is supported, and the amount of text does not reflect the amount of attention given to the topic.	The statement in the reference text is factual, objection is noted.
52	<i>“An introduction to a financing window for IPLCs is presented through the Inclusive Conservation Initiative (ICI).”</i>	The ICI is not a financing window. That term has a specific connotation in the GEF language. It would be better to rephrase this sentence as something like, <i>“Programming targeted to IPLCs is presented through the Inclusive Conservation Initiative (ICI).”</i>	Relevant changes made.
53	<i>“GEF-8 includes increased financing for the Inclusive Conservation Initiative introduced in GEF-7,..”</i>	GEF-8 ICI is the same size as GEF-7. Perhaps it would be better to say, “another round of funding” rather than “increased”.	Relevant changes made.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
61	<i>“There is no mention of community-based adaptation in the 2018 strategy”</i>	This omission is voluntary to avoid confusion and duplication with the LDCF and SCCF strategies. This omission should be seen in association with the notion of resilience in the context of lands, landscapes, and value chains, which is mentioned several times.	Relevant changes made, suggested clarifying text has been added.
62	GEF Policies	It might be worth looking at/referencing GEF’s guidelines on these policies, including principles on IP.	Guidelines for the most recent policies, including stakeholder engagement policy and the policy on gender equality are referenced in paragraphs 82 and 83.
62	<i>“but they do not require that GEF projects use a design that centers communities in project activities. The policies do require that all GEF-financed activities, at a minimum, inform or consult with communities regarding their activities; however, the level of community engagement required is not considered a CBA as defined in this evaluation.”</i>	“Centers communities” is perhaps a bit imprecise in this context because it does not necessarily mean community leadership, decision-making, etc. First, many GEF activities, such as legislative and regulatory drafting, would not make sense to be CBA by the paper’s definition and, therefore, should not be required to be such. It would be hard to have a policy requiring CBA. It may help to focus on activities that are with communities but not necessarily driven by them or co-designed as what could be focused in this way.	We agree that there should not be a policy requiring CBA, and have underscored that CBA is not mandatory across the evaluation report.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
64	<i>“One of the gender gaps the policy aims to address is unbalanced participation and decision making in environmental planning and governance.”</i>	One potential tension between CBA, particularly related to the devolution of decision-making and other GEF policies, is when certain groups are excluded from existing power structures, which is how communities make decisions. It would be helpful to recognize this challenge and highlight any good practices found to work with it.	Good practices for addressing group exclusion from power structures could be addressed through recommendation 2.
68		It could be helpful to note that this is a policy/desk review and not the conclusions/findings of this study.	Relevant changes made to clarify.

Box 1	<i>“Access funding and technical resources in the GEF...”</i>	Kindly exercise caution in using the phrase “Direct Access”. For many countries, it generally means that countries can access the GEF resources directly without having to use GEF Agencies, which is not the case in the current GEF business model. The term “direct access” can be defined in many ways; however, it would be hard to define any of the ways that an FSP would work with communities as “direct”. It would be better to find a different term that focuses on resources being managed by community organizations and supporting their priorities and approaches. The country-driven nature of GEF support means that support to the community depends on the government's priorities, and it is challenging to ask countries to work directly with communities. The GEF has provided programming direction in the Programming strategy to encourage CBA. Asking governments to work directly with communities is something we could emphasize more in the programming	Relevant changes made. References to direct access have been changed to align with the good practice dimension ‘devolved financial and technical resources’.
-------	---	---	---

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
		directions so it is possible. However, having finances managed by communities is a significantly greater ask. Many community groups may not even have a bank account, much less be able to meet the fiduciary requirements of donors.	
Box 1	<i>“This box discusses findings on direct access to funds and technical resources from country case studies, and also from other GEF funding opportunities, including any linkages between the GEF’s flagship CBA project, the SGP and the evaluation portfolio (comprised of MSPs and FSPs).”</i>	SGP is not a project but a corporate program that is funded through projects. The last part of the sentence could be clearer.	Relevant changes made to clarify.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
Box 1	<i>“Another mechanism for providing direct financing to communities is the Inclusive Conservation Initiative (ICI).”</i>	In GEF-7, we started Challenge Programme for Adaption Innovation with two rounds of call for proposal. Also, for GEF-8, we had an inclusive GEF Assembly Challenge program, where funding was allocated to 23 local organizations (although this may be beyond the scope of this evaluation). Going to the questions of what is direct and what is community, it is unclear whether ICI would qualify. Indigenous Peoples Organizations, yes, are receiving funding directly from a GEF agency to support their self-developed initiatives. However, the IPOs supported are organizations that work with many communities and, in some cases, many peoples.	Relevant changes made. Text has been edited to align with good practice dimension of ‘devolved financial and technical resources’.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
Box 1	<i>“In GEF-5 through GEF-7, the SGP provided an option for grants through MSPs and FSPs, allowing countries to use their System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) allocations for projects targeting critical landscapes at the country level in its Upgraded Country Program. This program has been discontinued in SGP 2.0 (GEF 2022a); however, elements of its landscape approach have been retained to some extent.”</i>	This is confusing. All countries have the option to allocate STAR resources, up to 10%, to SGP, which isn't included here. The Upgraded Country Program really focused on countries that graduated from core support from the SGP for their programs and, thus, had to allocate their STAR to SGP if they wanted to have any SGP in their country at all. In GEF-8, the Upgraded Country Program was eliminated, meaning that these countries were again eligible for core funding.	Relevant changes made to clarify. Text identified as confusing has been removed.
Box 1	<i>“Within the GEF partnership there are additional mechanisms for allocating GEF financing directly to ground level stakeholders. The first is through the SGP, which allocates small amounts of financing directly to communities. In GEF-5 through GEF-7, the SGP provided an option for grants through MSPs and FSPs”</i>	Factually wrong to use the word ‘option’. These are upgraded countries that could not receive SGP core resources. The option is related to whether these updated countries wanted to allocate STAR to continue/open an SGP program. Also, how is this relevant to supporting CBA? Also unsure how it is relevant to direct financing on the number of SGP activities that have been scaled up.	Relevant changes made to clarify. See response to comment immediately preceding this one.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
Box 1	<i>“Another example is from the Strategic Investment Program for SLM in Sub-Saharan Africa (GEF ID 3403) which included a target of identification and promotion of three Small Grant Programmes (SGP) for SLM scale-up.”</i>	It seems it was meant to be “three Small Grant Program <u>projects</u> for SLM scale-up”. Also, in many cases, the connections are not articulated by project documents or are developed during project implementation.	Relevant changes made. The paragraph includes a sentence about lack of specificity in project documents about linkages to SGP which addresses the second part of the comment.
Box 1	<i>“Through the GEF Inclusive Conservation Initiative, financial and technical support is provided to projects that involve and empower IPLCs in the decision-making processes related to natural resource management and conservation.”</i>	Correction: “Through the GEF Inclusive Conservation Initiative, financial and technical support is provided to subprojects developed and executed by Indigenous Peoples Organizations. The ICI is directed by Indigenous peoples, and the subprojects were selected by Indigenous peoples.” It is very important to highlight that these are not just projects that work with Indigenous peoples but are projects of Indigenous peoples. (Note on language: ICI is a project that, in some ways, operates like a program with child projects but is called subprojects. We designed it as a project to avoid multiple layers of agencies.)	Relevant changes made.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
Box 1	<i>“GEF financing also reaches communities directly through support to conservation trust funds, for example through supporting the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, among others.”</i>	Please elaborate on how GEF’s support to CEPF enabled reaching communities directly. CEPF is not a conservation trust fund, as the sentence sort of implies, but both conservation trust funds and CEPF are good examples of mechanisms providing resources for community-based approaches.	Relevant changes made.
Box 1	<i>“The GEF-7 allocation for the Inclusive Conservation Initiative was \$22,535,780 with the majority of funds allocated to direct financial support to IPLC-led initiatives in priority areas that achieve global environmental benefits.”</i>	It was \$25 million. Of the \$22.5 million for the activities of the project, 80% is going to IPLCs.	Relevant changes made.
Box 1	<i>“A global steering committee comprised of senior IPLC representatives (nominated by IPLCs) leads the governance of the project, including the selection of activities to finance.”</i>	Suggestion: “A global steering committee comprised of IPLC representatives from the subprojects leads the governance of the project. An Interim Steering Committee of senior IPLC representatives guided the design of the project and selected the subprojects.”	Relevant changes made.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
84	Rating of CBAs	The discussion of ratings is a bit confusing as rating is used in IEO context of whether project is good or not. Projects were classified on their CBA, not rated. Greater CBA does not necessarily equal higher results (and rating).	We note the comment but feel that the methodology and description of the section adequately conveys that what is being rated in this section is the application of good practice dimensions, not project performance (which is addressed in another section).
85	<i>“Within each committee, a total of 36 subcommittees were created, with equal gender representation.”</i>	Please ensure that “gender representation” refers to multiple genders – i.e., beyond women-men. If what is measured/counted is women-men representation, please revise it to “equal representation of women and men.”	Relevant changes made.
86	Legitimacy in the eyes of users	This term doesn’t quite match what was actually assessed here.	The project example provided in the reference paragraph speaks to the criteria presented in the preceding paragraph (project designed in accordance with community norms and customs).
86	<i>“A lower rating was given for projects that make an effort to describe how the project to be partially in accordance with community norms and customs, but with some omissions.”</i>	This is confusing – maybe a word was missed.	Relevant changes made.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
89	<i>“The highest rating was given to projects whose documents describe sanctions that may be levied by users on implementers in case of malfeasance or failure to comply with agreed-upon actions or policies.”</i>	This standard seems quite high and not actually feasible for most projects. It seems rather difficult to outline potential sanctions prior to the project and understand what the transgression is. For many types of projects with CBA, the idea of pre-determined sanctions may not make sense or be aligned with traditional justice systems.	The objection is noted, the standard comes from the literature on good practice along this dimension.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
91	Heading of this paragraph – <i>Human Rights and Equality</i> and the text below: <i>“The dimension relates to the extent to which a project takes specific actions to address human rights and equality. A low rating was given to projects that simply mentioned the concept; higher ratings were given for projects that mention specific actions or objectives for either human rights or equality. The highest rating was given for projects that report specific transformational changes related to human rights or equality. Figure 13 shows that there has been a slight improvement in the design of the newer cohort of projects relative to the older cohort, but none of the GEF projects report specific transformational changes related to both human rights and equality.”</i>	If referring to Gender Equality, please revise and reflect accordingly, both in the heading and in paragraphs under this section. Regarding reference to transformational changes related to human rights or equality (gender equality?), is there any reference to what transformational changes mean in this context? An elaboration is needed (or a footnote to explain examples of transformational change measured). It’s important to note that many projects are working on these issues and human rights. In particular, projects are not asked to report using this terminology but are still taking action on things such as access to land and resources, food security, water, etc. Also, in reference to projects reporting on both, how can a project that improves equality not also address human rights?	Relevant changes made, text added regarding the important point raised that some projects are working on these issues but asked not to use the terminology. Thank you for this addition. The dimension does not refer to gender equality specifically, however if gender equality is mentioned in the project documents, this was reflected in the rating as a discussion of equality. Upon reflection, we agree that ‘transformational change’ in this context is unclear. The category has been removed and the graph an analysis has been updated (there were no projects that were rated in this category). In relation to reporting on both, we assessed whether a project discussed both equality and human rights (for example, if a project explicitly referenced both equal access to resources for different groups and rights for resource users). There were projects that only discussed one concept or the other.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
94	<i>“GEF projects in Cameroon, Indonesia, Madagascar, Peru and Timor-Leste showed limited local-level stakeholder involvement during project design.”</i>	Please confirm if the analysis under this section is for case studies countries only. If so, how can we ensure the completeness of the evaluation just by looking at projects from the case studies countries?	Findings are presented and associated with the data source. Case studies are not presented as representative of the entire portfolio. As described in the methodology section, they are one of multiple data collection tools used by the evaluation. More information on case study selection criteria, methodology, and findings can be found in the technical annexes.
94	<i>“This was noted particularly for Securing Tenure Rights for Forest Landscape Dependent Communities: Linking Science with Policy to Advance Tenure Security, Sustainable Forest Management and People’s Livelihoods (GEF ID 5796).”</i>	Tenure projects can actually be a good example of where the goals are very much in service of communities and support their self-determination, but much is done centrally. Legal work to establish community ownership may not be something the community can do but rather requires a lawyer working with them, which is a capacity that isn’t available in the community. In some of these cases, it is worth highlighting the specific opportunity of the GEF as an institution that works with and through governments to support changes that might not be possible for NGOs.	Relevant changes made. Added language at the end of the referenced text to highlight the specific opportunity represented by working with the GEF as an institution that works with governments.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
98	<i>"In the evaluation portfolio, the prevalence of participatory M&E was moderate,9 but the monitoring of processes associated with CBAs was weak."</i>	This is a bit confusing. The paragraph talks about measuring sort of "how well did this do as a CBA," but the topic sentence sounds like it's about the outcomes of the project.	Changes made to clarify. The topic sentence cover the following two paragraphs, the second paragraph speaks to the monitoring CBA processes.
100	Inclusion in CBA project	It is still unclear what constitutes a CBA project or an approach/strategy in a project. Perhaps this could be further clarified under this heading.	See response to previous comment on definition of CBA.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
100	<i>“GEF projects using a CBA have become more inclusive of women, IPLCs, and youth over time. For example, there is a difference between closed and ongoing projects in describing main stakeholders. In projects designed during GEF-6 and GEF-7, 62 percent described women described as main stakeholders, compared to 43 percent in the cohort for GEF-4 and GEF-5. Similarly, 46 percent of projects in the newer cohort described IPLCs as main stakeholders, compared to 14 percent; and 33 percent described youth as main stakeholders, compared to 11 percent.”</i>	What are the parameters for considering a group as the <i>main stakeholder</i> ? Please define/specify.	Relevant changes made.
101	<i>“The evaluation portfolio shows improvements in incorporating gender.”</i>	Please add <i>perspectives</i> or <i>dimensions</i> after gender.	Relevant changes made.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
102	<i>“Projects made specific efforts to include women in project activities, but the extent to which any structural issues that might prevent women’s full participation and benefit sharing of women were addressed is less certain.”</i>	Any insights on types of “structural issues” that need to be addressed?	Relevant changes made, text has been changed to “systemic inequalities”.
102	<i>“In Madagascar, stakeholders reported challenges in integrating gender into project activities.”</i>	Please add <i>perspectives</i> after gender.	Relevant changes made.
102	<i>“prior to designing a CBA project to ensure adequate attention to gender.”</i>	Please add <i>issues</i> after gender.	Relevant changes made.
102	<i>“implementers in Peru emphasized the need to be able to monitor qualitative indicators such as the empowerment and well-being of women and men”</i>	Can the evaluation team elaborate on what qualitative indicators mean in this context? What is a qualitative indicator with respect to the empowerment and well-being of women and men? How are these qualitative indicators “measured”?	Reference text deleted.
106	<i>“Stakeholders from indigenous groups highlighted the necessity for CBA projects working with IPLCs to include special considerations”</i>	Any insights/examples on types of “special considerations”?	The paragraph below this heading contains two examples of the unique needs for IPLCs, including territoriality land claims and right to use their own governance systems.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
106	<i>“CBA projects also should reflect the right of IPLCs to use their own governance system”</i>	Governance systems – please remember that Indigenous peoples are not one group.	Relevant changes made.
108 & 109	<i>“Though not a main stakeholder in most of the projects reviewed, there are examples of private sector support contributing to the sustainability of CBA projects in case study countries”</i>	Welcome these paragraphs, as they carry important lessons on how to improve project impact and sustainability.	Noted.
111	<i>“Table 3 shows 92 percent of GEF-5 CBA projects were in the positive range, compared with 83 percent of GEF-5 projects.”</i>	Please check if it is supposed to read as “Table 3 shows 92 percent of GEF-5 CBA projects were in the positive range, compared with 83 percent of GEF-4 projects” instead of repeating as GEF-5.	Correction made.
111	<i>“Land degradation and climate change adaptation projects also had higher share of projects in the satisfactory range (92 percent) in the positive range relative to the other focal areas.”</i>	There are almost three times as many BD projects as the other focal areas, and BD projects overall performed worse (same with MSPs and FSPs). Does that mean more CBA projects mean lower ratings? Also, how do these figures compare to the portfolio as a whole (e.g., All LD projects versus CBA LD projects)?	There are more BD projects, but given the small sample size it’s unclear if adding more projects to the other focal areas would change the pattern. The other comment has been addressed by adding a statement comparing the presented figures to the rest of the portfolio.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
112	<i>“rehabilitation of endangered species;”</i>	Does this mean the rescue of individual wild animals? This is not a very common activity supported by GEF. If you want to say a population more broadly, you could say “recovery of threatened species”. Please note that there are multiple categories of endangerment, and we generally refer to threatened species as the umbrella term.	Relevant changes made.
Figure 15	<i>Categorization of socioeconomic outcomes</i>	Is there a relationship between projects that have socioeconomic benefits and any of the measures of project performance above? The categorization of these co-benefits is unclear. What about other co-benefits such as capacity building, empowerment, and income/livelihoods? If there is an error, please replace the figure with the correct socioeconomic outcome figure.	Relevant changes made. Correct table has been inserted.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
Box 3	Cote d'Ivoire project	Thanks for the highlight of the Cote d'Ivoire project. However, the GEFIEO team seems to have missed that a similar approach has been used in most West African countries (Ghana, Benin, Togo, Burkina Faso, and Cote d'Ivoire). It is, thus, surprising to read that CBA has decreased in the GEF portfolio. It is not verified in this sub-region.	The evaluation doesn't find that CBA has decreased, only that alignment with good practice has decreased along one dimension. Paragraph 58 discusses how funding for CBA activities within projects has increased.
Box 4	<i>"Sahanala has a distinct advantage in Ambavarano where vanilla production and international trade have been established for some time."</i>	The relation of this with the previous text is unclear.	Relevant changes made. Confusing text has been deleted.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
121	<i>"The importance of taking a long-term approach..."</i>	While it is true that implementing CBA can be time-consuming, it is not clear when a long-term approach should be considered. It is likely that a long-term approach would be useful during the project planning phase rather than during the implementation. It is essential that the country and agency use timeframe allocated to the PIF and PPG phases to come up with CBA project concepts and its details that outline a long-term view of its impact. The long-term approach is looking beyond the actual project phase and looking at these communities well beyond project closing.	Relevant changes made, additional text has been added to include this point.
121	<i>"such as linkages to markets"</i>	It is notable that an activity like building market linkages could often be something that the community can't do themselves, and thus, these activities would not be considered CBA according to this evaluation.	No action taken. The meaning of this comment is unclear, building market linkages could be one of multiple components or activities of a CBA project where not every activity would be community based but this evaluation would still consider the project to use a CBA. See paragraph 58 which describes how much GEF financing within the CBA projects went towards CBA activities, this demonstrates how other (non-CBA tagged) activities are included within CBA projects.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
	IV. Lesson	In the preceding section, an important point has been made on the alternate livelihood, private sector engagement, and access to markets. This is a very good lesson that cannot be ignored. Please include.	Relevant changes made, added text to paragraph 141.
124	<i>"Involving the right people"</i>	CBA is about communities, not individuals, which is similarly true for governments and private sector CSOs. Also do not agree that technical expert groups is the approach to go for CBA strategies and approaches. This is somewhat contradictory to the premise of this evaluation.	Relevant changes made, text heading has been changed. Text has been further clarified to include the information that the technical experts were either from the communities or represented organizations that worked in the communities.
Box 5	<i>GEF-PRC partnership</i>	Suggest writing out the abbreviated words/terms the first time in this box for ease of comprehension.	Relevant changes made.
136	<i>"consultations to actively involve communities in decision making, incorporation of local institutions and customs, ensuring the accountability of implementors to users, and recognition of human rights and equality."</i>	Reference to equality – please amend if this refers to gender equality	This reference to equality generally, but if gender equality was mentioned in the project documents it was interpreted as a reference to addressing equality.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
136 & 137		A notable observation is that there are indeed several CBA projects with good practices. However, the recurrent challenge comes from the sustainability of proposed community-based mechanisms tested in 3-5-year projects. This is why this kind of approach should be first owned by the governments (national and local), reflected in decentralization policies, including the transfer of local resources (See CREMA in Ghana).	Relevant changes made, text added to paragraph 135.
142	<i>“projects explicitly address structural issues”</i>	Please elaborate on what these structural issues are (or do we mean systemic inequalities?).	Relevant changes made, changed text to systemic inequalities.

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
	Recommendations	The recommendations can be framed based on the Lessons learned (for example – the issue of sustainability is beyond the project duration, role of factors such as poverty, other systemic issues, enabling conditions that impede or support CBA and sustainability of results) It would be helpful if the recommendations also specified (if possible) which actor/set of actors the recommendation is directed towards (i.e., who is/are expected to act on them)	Relevant changes made. Recommendations have been revised as follows: <i>Recommendation 1: The GEF Secretariat should review its policies and project cycle requirements and timelines to ensure that co-design of projects with communities is possible for projects where community partnership is a critical element. This review should be done in anticipation of the proposed ‘whole of society’ approach in GEF-9 which emphasizes stakeholder engagement across different segments of society.</i> <i>Recommendation 2: Building on earlier guidance, GEFSEC, together with STAP, should provide more clarity and guidance on when CBAs should be used in GEF projects to ensure alignment with good practice standards. This would include recommended indicators for monitoring progress, and a tool kit to facilitate the use of CBA.</i> <i>Recommendation 3: The GEFSEC should develop an approach for tracking devolved technical and/or financial resources to the local level for GEF projects as appropriate and in alignment with good practice. Such tracking could differentiate between resources allocated to CSOs, IPLCs, local community groups, etc. as relevant.</i>

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
147	CBA Dimension	To a large extent, these recommendations are drafted based on the premise that GEF should be using the framework adopted for this report. While this framework is very useful, it merits debate at the higher decision-making level on its practical application to the GEF projects and its utility.	Please see above on changes to recommendations
147 & 149		Unclear what these paragraphs are. Are these findings? Preceding the recommendation?	Paragraphs have been deleted

148	<i>“Recommendation 1. The GEF Secretariat, building on the wealth of expertise in the GEF STAP, the SGP, the ICI, and the GEF Agencies, should provide more clarity on when CBAs should be used in GEF projects, options for project design, and guidance or a toolkit to ensure that the Agencies adopt a consistent approach based on good practice including recommended indicators for monitoring progress.”</i>	From CCA perspective, given the adaptation strategy for GEF-8 (it contains detailed strategic entry points for a whole-of-the-society approach for LDCF support), projects that are considering adopting CBA have begun. However, given the country-driven nature of support, GEFSEC cannot force countries to use CBA. The recommendation is also problematic because: 1. Not sure if the GEF Secretariat has the authority to adopt the framework 2. If the GEFSecretariat is the right party to design and implement the toolkit. Shouldn't this be STAP? It may be addressed by replacing the word “should” with “could”. The detailed experiences around these approaches (when and how to apply) are with agencies and countries. Considerations could be made to review/ revise guidelines on relevant GEF policies to provide specific	Please see above on recommendations
-----	---	--	-------------------------------------

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
		guidance around CBA, not new strategies and toolkits. In addition, on principle, there is no objection to clarifying when CBAs should be used in GEF projects. However, before finding examples or lessons from the SGP and/or the ICI, it is a question of safeguards, especially about resource management and fiduciary standards.	
148	<i>"This guidance should ensure that any lessons learned from two GEF phases of scaling up the SGP through the Upgraded Country Program."</i>	See earlier comment on upgraded SGP countries – upgraded country programs are not about scaling up. This seems not relevant to the recommendation.	Please see above on recommendations
149	<i>"Robust community-led development can be difficult to carry out within the current GEF project cycle."</i>	This paragraph seems out of place in the recommendation section.	Deleted

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
150	<i>“Recommendation 2. The GEF Secretariat should consider allowing flexibility during early stages of project implementation for projects using a CBA. Projects that meet certain criteria—such as proven community capacity to manage funds, and projects with a high percentage of funding directly allocated to communities, etc.—should be allowed to use their first year of implementation and a first tranche of funding to carry out participatory activities. These activities could include socialization, identification of communities and groups, participatory needs assessments, capacity building, and other activities that require time and resources to carry out effectively when working directly with local communities. This may mean that project design documents submitted at</i>	Flexibilities for the project implementation have to be built into the project during the design phase and implemented as part of the adaptive management. There is already a level of flexibility for projects to outline a process at PIF and a stakeholder engagement plan that would allow for this kind of flexibility. However, the idea of providing “ambiguous” flexibilities during the project implementation is problematic at various levels, including the risk of manipulating project activities for political gains, especially in places where there are weak legal or accountability systems. Relatedly, the term ambiguity is not what we’re looking for. Projects could include processes and procedures for co-design during the first year. The time lags between even PPG and implementation can undermine trust with communities, as far as executing parties have been accused of stealing money	Please see above on recommendations

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
	<i>CEO endorsement contain indicative plans rather than predefined, prescriptive plans. Adopting a flexible approach that accepts some ambiguity at CEO endorsement would allow project implementers to respond to community needs that may not be evident or known at the project design phase. The flexibility also would provide the time and resources required for local stakeholders to be actively involved in project design, an important element of CBA that is currently difficult within the constraints of the GEF project processes."</i>	because they were waiting for things to start. Community leadership can also change, and processes redone. With particularly remote and difficult-to-visit communities, there may only be certain times of year that the project team can visit, which may not line up with PPG and/or provide sufficient time for FPIC or co-design. This is why we do not require documented FPIC at CEO Endorsement (per the recommendation of IPAG). It is crucial to note that, pre-PIF, a project is not guaranteed. Therefore, upstream consultations and participatory activities might be about something that will never happen, or be revised out of the project, or happen far in the future. One potential recommendation could be to support planning processes and/or build on existing planning processes for project design and development. The project team can use existing consultative processes to get a	

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
		project moving until implementation gets going. We suggest revisiting the text of this recommendation in accordance with the comments above.	
151	<i>“Recommendation 3. The GEF has agreed to an aspirational target for the Global Biodiversity Framework Fund, allocating 20 percent of programming to IPLCs by 2030, and has also agreed to monitor and track the level of funding allocated to IPLCs (GEF 2023). Given this evaluation’s finding of a decrease in funding and technical resources allocated directly to communities in recent projects, it would be a good time to expand the tracking exercise to collect data on the amount of GEF funding directly allocated to communities. This effort should differentiate among various stakeholder groups (e.g., indigenous peoples,</i>	There are several errors in this text of the recommendation: <i>“The GEF has agreed to an aspirational target for the Global Biodiversity Framework Fund, allocating 20 percent of programming to IPLCs by 2030, and has also agreed to monitor and track the level of funding allocated to IPLCs (GEF 2023).”</i>. For example, it is the GEF Council that agreed to an aspirational target, not the GEF. Therefore, please use the exact text from the GBFF Programming Directions and its decisions in the 64th Council. It will be problematic to have a single GEF-wide system based on the aspirational goal of GBFF, as some of the GEF managed family of funds may face difficulties in implementing such a system. In any case, is this not	Please see above on recommendations

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
	<i>local communities, CSOs, women's groups, youth). This baseline data will help the GEF understand how much of its funding is reaching the ground level in MSPs and FSPs, and will allow the GEF partnership to make data-driven decisions as to whether current efforts are adequate or if targets are needed to increase direct funding for communities."</i>	an evaluation of the GEF Trust Fund only? While there are lessons that can be learned across the funds, it may be best to allow the Secretariat the space to design and program systems that are specific to the goals and aspirational targets of the GBFF. Perhaps, instead, the recommendation can look at the decentralization policies and how CBA is included. In addition, engagement of communities is project specific. The fact that it has decreased could be due to the fact that the projects we are doing are less demanding in terms of community engagement. As mentioned in other comments to the document, "Direct" is a really tricky concept. In addition, there is no clear reason to expand tracking to collect data on "communities" as we don't have a mandate to determine or increase a particular level of community	

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
		engagement or direct funding to communities in the GEF Trust Fund - unlike the GBFF with its aspirational goal to IPLCs, which (1) is not the GEF Trust Fund, and (2) IPLCs is not the same as “communities”. It is also worth noting that policy and regulatory reform and technical support would not count as CBA but have the potential to make very significant differences for communities. On the proposed differentiation among stakeholder groups, please note that separating IPs and LCs is not a simple exercise in Africa and Asia and is not the preference of at least some African IP leaders based on our direct experience. Therefore, we suggest deleting this component of the recommendation, or alternatively, revising the language to make it more open-ended and context specific so that the Secretariat has the flexibility to apply it in appropriate settings.	

PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
Annex A	Annex A	Please consider adding a column that has information on “Funding Source”.	Relevant changes made

Comments received from Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group (IPAG)

REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
	The methodology and scope of this evaluation is clear, but it would good if the report clearly mentions that direct participation of IPLC was not evaluation as a separate category in the selection. The team used a broad definition of community in which women and IPs were included, however, for further analysis, it would be good to consider that Indigenous communities as separate groups with very different needs when it comes to project design and implementation.	Future work will consider distinguishing between IPLCs and other stakeholder groups.
	The reports do not discuss or evaluate intersectionality between ethnicity, gender and place of implementation of the projects. It discussed briefly, IPLC and gender as separate dimension without considering that indigenous women living in rural areas are the most vulnerable of all potential beneficiaries or impacted by GEF projects.	This is outside the scope of the evaluation as presented in the Approach paper, but would be an interesting topic for future analysis

REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
	Considering that UNDP, WB, and FAO have the top 3 top 3 spots in the portfolio distribution by agency (38, 22 and 12% for a total of 72% of the total), is there any analysis or recommendation to these agencies based on the evaluation. One thing that the report does not mention or briefly is the how prepare are these agencies to implement work integrating any CBAs. Most of the analysis and conclusions put most of the pressure on the time and resources and capacity building communities needs but does not mention much on the role of the agencies and how ready they are in terms of integrating professionals with the right sets of skills to work with communities to implement CBAs.	Data collection did not uncover any agency specific issues that were deemed widespread and impactful enough to warrant a recommendation on this topic.
	It would be good if the report clearly defines what the team understand as community-based vs community-led. Are those the same, one is a dimension of the other? Same thing with multi-focal area, what is the definition of those would help the reader. In relation to multi-focal is important to see that a combination of focal areas represent better chances to increase CBAs, is there any analysis done as part of the evaluation to argue the reason this area has the higher % of CBAs, 12%.	The evaluation used a broad definition of community-based to be as inclusive as possible of GEF activities that should be included in the evaluation.

REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
	Is there any analysis or conclusion why climate change adaptation has no CBAs, why is it so challenging to do CBAs in this area? Is there any reason behind this finding?	CCA projects do comprise a portion of the evaluation portfolio, see Table 3 for example.
Paragraph 68.	This is an interesting finding with a key recommendation to GEF, it would be good if this is included in the set of recommendation at the end.	This should be taken into consideration as part of the response to updated Recommendation 2.
Figures 6 and 7	Figures 6 and 7 would explain better the context if they are cross referenced to see how many of the comprehensive CBA in land degradation were done in Latin America for example and vice versa.	We decided to separate figures by region and focal area so they were simple and easy to digest

REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
Paragraphs 106 and 109	Paragraph 106 indicates GEF projects using CBA have become more inclusive over time. Likewise, pa 109 says that only a few projects of the closed project did explicitly target IPLC? To what we attribute this change? Any clues or analysis on this? what has changed?	The analysis of inclusion didn't just focus on IPLCs, as described in the paragraph, the analysis also considered inclusion of women and youth in addition to IPLCs. The text about explicitly targeting IPLCs refers to projects where IPLCs targeted as a main stakeholder for project activities. As mentioned before, this evaluation did not explicitly focus on IPLCs so there was not an in-depth analysis of this but one could be considered in the future.
	The report makes a case of the need to have a long-term approach and argues based on the finding that 3-5 years is a brief time given the limited time and resources for these purposes. This argument is addressed in several parts of the reports (pa 146 and 151). However, I would agree that 3 years is short but five is a significant amount of time, but it all depend on what we are trying to accomplish and if there are any prior actions as the report also informs. It feels like the argument on time and resources 3-5 years is used by some stakeholders to justify the lack of CBA in a more comprehensive way. The report needs to carefully navigate this since pa 128 correctly argues that the burden of achieving global environmental benefits should not be placed solely on communities when commitment from the start out to make this work is also important.	Noted, this is a good point.

REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
	Paragraph 139 mentions that CBAs are seen less relevant for projects to address policy and central governance and where main activities revolves around large procurements such as major roads and large infrastructure. We would advise to revisit this paragraph. In my experience, these projects require a level of CBAs to consider how certain policies will play out with local communities and large infra projects tend to affect sometimes a large number of communities in a positive and negative way.	Text has been rephrased.
	Paragraph 148 mentions structural issues. Please expand on what the report means by this.	Text has been revised to say ‘systemic inequalities’

REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
	The report presents several conclusions but a limited number of recommendations. It would be important if the team elaborates additional recommendations based on some of the conclusions. Recommendation 1 focus on GEF providing more clarity on when CBAs should be used, guidance and toolkit. However, what about being more specific at policy level? Related to recommendation 2, perhaps the team can include some references to the FIP/DGM program in terms of allowing flexibility and resources distribution. I would be happy to liaison on this to bring that experience into this evaluation discussion as an experience to consider.	Recommendations have been revised after consultations with the GEF Secretariat. IPAG would likely be consulted as part of the updated Recommendation 2.
	On paragraph 154, please add IPAG as some of the groups within GEF with expertise on CBAs, particularly in the context of IPLCs.	Recommendations have been revised.