Topic Comment Response/Actions taken

Topic	Comment	Response/Actions taken
Evaluation Timeline	**STAP: The timeline for delivery in December 2022 is quite ambitious**, especially considering the amount and type of work (involving case studies in two countries) you are planning to do, and the fact that we are already in April. On a related note, I would have expected to see a bit more in the way of contingency planning related to travel and ability to deploy GEF and/or national consultants in light of any potential restrictions imposed as a result of COVID. This includes having a plan B option for either choice of countries or evaluation methods, if plans have to be changed at the last minute.	**Changed. An updated, extended timeline has been added to the approach paper.** The evaluation timeline has been extended to account for an increased number of case studies in agreement with feedback received from the reference group (increase from 2 to 5). The evaluation is now a deliverable for the June 2023 council. Additional language on plans to mitigate risk to mission travel from restrictions related to the pandemic has been added.
Definitions	**FAO:** • **The definition of "Community-based approaches" is still a little bit abstract**. It will help to have specific and practical examples of activities or interventions that have been recognized as good practices of Community-based approaches. It may also be interesting to identify the assumptions that such interventions need to follow to be effective (e.g., an intervention may have a greater impact if it is implemented in a community with a strong and reliable Community Council). • For the evaluation on the "community approach" **what will be important is to define a *"community"* in the context in which a project is applied, as well as the concept of "community-based" in this context**. There may be significant difference between "stakeholders", "communities" and "resource users" within a project or project area. Community-based programs may conflate specific sub-groups of resource users with the "community". Maybe this is the most pragmatic way to run a project, but this does	**Changed. Definitions of 'community-based approaches' and 'community' have been added.** The approach paper now includes definitions of both 'community-based approach' and 'community', including language considering rights. We note the challenges associated with purely spatial definitions of community. A spectrum showing the different levels of community participation across the elements of the definition, providing context and examples, is now included in Annex 1. There is also information on assumptions associated with the approaches, and characteristics/examples of projects using with different levels of community engagement.

		not address insider/outsider issues, may assume a degree of heterogeneity in the community that does not exist, and tends towards a narrow spatially-based understanding of community.	
		• **We consider that it will be important to have a good definition and characterization of "CBAs" in the paper.** Projects that use CBA are not restricted to those using "Community" in their name (Community Based Natural Resource Management, Community Forestry, Community Based Conservation). FAO-GEF projects include Farmer Field Schools, DIMITRA Clubs etc. thus it will also be important to distinguish between the characteristics and results of different approaches (not "putting them all in the same basket" as if they were all equal).	
		• The definition of community-based approaches lacks the acknowledgment of essential Right bundles associated with different peoples living in the communities. This results in approaches of work, that while targeting the community, may fall short of achieving the target of people centric approaches. To have a people centric approach is fundamental to establish clear differentiations between Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Differences between farmers, forest dwellers, fishers, and hunter gatherers. The same for peoples who practice mobile livelihoods and nomadic activities. Their livelihoods are often associated to different food systems, territorial management practices, customaries, cosmogonies and governance systems. Levelling everyone under the Community based approach and not acknowledging the different livelihoods, practices, beliefs but more importantly rights, risk placing the people at the periphery of the decisions in project	

	design and instead centering the efforts on the economic activities. The current definition needs to be expanded, fine tuned to incorporate Right bundles and to take into consideration existing power imbalances between different parties. Only then it will be possible to ensure an effective, active, free, and meaningful participation throughout the entire decision-making process that overcomes the current invisibility that Indigenous Peoples feel under the current approach.)	
Classification of approaches	**FAO:** It will be also important to **clarify what "a spectrum of community involvement" means.** Different kinds or/and levels of involvement/participation? Is it involvement of all categories in the communities (poor, less poor, women/girls, men/boys, ethnic groups, marginalized people, etc). "Inclusive" (involvement) is also crucial (to leave no-one behind) and is missing in the definition. The idea of participation should also include participating in decision-making processes regarding solutions to local problems, if the end of the last part is maintained ("active participants in development interventions"). Being "beneficiaries" real actors of their own development, the idea of accountability is important and might need to be included in the definition. **UNDP:** Characterization of approaches is absolutely critical for this evaluation to be meaningful. The term "CBD approaches" encompasses a wide variety of strategies, objectives and activities ranging from treatment of local stakeholders as relatively passive individual beneficiaries to a strong empowerment narrative in which local stakeholders organize for collective action with the potential for constructive purposeful participation in policy dialogues, market access, value chain development, etc. The variation in CBD	**Changed. A spectrum for classifying community-based approaches has been added to the approach paper.** The spectrum contains information on how the evaluation will classify projects including characteristics (including accountability measures, level of decision making) and criteria. It is presented in the main text and in an expanded version in Annex 1. The evaluation matrix has been adjusted to reflect the intention to look at the different applications of the approach across focal areas.

	approaches across focal areas would be particularly useful in improving the efficacy of CBD in helping to achieve focal area impacts. For example, are local stakeholders treated as passive beneficiaries, perhaps consulted about a program designed and implemented by others? Do local stakeholders have direct access to funding for initiatives they design and implement? Are local stakeholder organizations strengthened to improve market access, value chains participation, policy advocacy?	
Portfolio identification	WWF and FAO submitted their own lists of projects they consider to use community based approaches	**Partially changed.** The evaluation team reviewed the list of suggested projects submitted by WWF and FAO and found that they were not captured in the portfolio because they did not include the keywords that were used for inclusion/exclusion in any of the data fields searched in the GEF Portal (Project title, objective, or components). IEO has to use a defined, replicable methodology to identify projects across the portfolio to eliminate bias. The approach paper includes a description of the intention to expand the search terms beyond "particip*" and "communit*", to include "co-manag*", "comanag*", "inclusi*" and "CBNRM". This will likely increase the portfolio of projects that will be reviewed.
Objectives and audience	**CAF:** Request for IEO to look for applicable and measurable indicators that can be replicated. **IPAG:** • It is maybe just a technicality but I think the objective is not appropriately formulated. It says "The objective of the evaluation is to examine the evidence on the application of community-based approaches in GEF projects and programs, the extent to which these approaches influence the effectiveness and sustainability of GEF interventions, and to provide lessons on their use". But "to examine the evidence" is	**Partially changed.** The objective has been slightly reformulated as suggested. Additional details on how socio-economic indicators will be tracked have been included in the evaluation matrix. IEO notes the recommendation to look for indicators.

	not the objective, it is the "how". The objective could read e.g. "to assess the extent (or the prevalence of, as in question 2) to which community-based approaches are applied in GEF projects and programmes, etc." • I think it is important to clarify the scope and meaning of "social (or socioeconomic) outcomes" (currently described as (livelihoods, poverty alleviation/wellbeing, empowerment). The livelihoods/poverty alleviation outcome is relatively straightforward, but "empowerment" needs to be unfolded or perhaps reframed as "governance outcomes", with appropriate indicators. For example, some projects may have had as an outcome the strengthening or clarification of land and resource rights, which is not necessarily the same as (but linked to) empowerment	
Mandate for community-based approaches	**CAF:** Would be helpful to specify milestones within the GEF related to the evolution of thinking on the human and environment nexus. Would like to see more information on why community-based approaches are not part of the GEF mandate. **IPAG:** The approach paper indicates that no specific mandate exists in the GEF on the use of community-based approaches (I use here the acronym CBNRM for easy reference). This may or may not be true (I have some doubts as I believe recent policy decisions do create mandates), but in any case I hope the evaluation recommends clarifying this. We need a clear mandate saying that whenever a GEF project operates in lands and resource areas of IPLC, inclusion of CBNRM in the respective areas ought to be integrated and applied. Obviously this is for us clearer when it comes to IPs, but should be broader.	**Partially changed.** The intention was always that the evolution of CBA in the GEF be explored in the evaluation, this is now made explicit and reflected in the evaluation matrix under the relevance section. The question of whether the approaches are or should be part of the GEF mandate will be clarified during the analysis of relevance and corresponding recommendations so no changes or additions on this have been made to the approach paper.

Case Studies	**UNDP:**	**Changed. The number of case studies has been changed from two to five.** The approach paper has been updated with language clarifying the case study approach, selection criteria, and questions/topics to be addressed by the case study.
	• Noted that there are only two case studies proposed, which would constitute a tiny sample of the overall portfolio of projects with CBD approaches. Question on how case studies will be run - Is it two country case studies per each country? Or two country case studies overall? The former would seem excessive, but the latter would also seem too small in scope.	
	• *In reference to evaluation question on whether the approaches have contributed to better environmental and socioeconomic outcomes:* While the outcomes are likely to be self-reported or reported as part of a Terminal Evaluation, the two case studies should directly address this with ground-truthed data from community members.	
	• *In reference to evaluation question on tradeoffs or tensions between environmental objectives and economic needs:* It's hard to imagine that this critical information would be available solely from Terminal Evaluations or PIR reports, especially since tensions may not surface for some time. The two case studies proposed could provide some credible information from local stakeholders, though the sample size is too small for much more than anecdotal evidence.	
	World Bank:	
	• Number of countries for case studies : only 2. It will be far from representatives, whereas the results will be considered valid for all projects all around the world.	
	• Number of team members : the 2 local consultant will not be sufficient. Important field visits and interviews will have to be put as second priority with the current team size. It is so crucial, especially that projects always perform quite well on the documents and reports, which might not be the reality in the ground.	

	Additionally, even if field visit are conducted, if it is not diverse enough and not driven by the evaluation team (not the project team), the site visited will be only what has worked well. In that case, the conclusion will be heavily biased.	
Scope, Issues	**GEFSEC:** Many projects applied community-based approaches for chemical and waste and international water. I find that it is beneficial to apply community-based approaches for these focal areas. If it is not too late, it will be beneficial to include some chemical and waste and international water focal areas' projects for this evaluation **UNDP:** • Some assessment of how community-based development (CBD) approaches have been received by communities would be essential, of course, and could be a measure of how engaged they actually were/are. CBD approaches are based on community members' performance, which is essential to impact and sustainability. Assessment of community perceptions of donor-driven CBD activities etc., would be useful in determining future policy and program elements • *in reference to evaluation question on performance:* different projects likely use different CBD approaches, so an assessment of project performance should be done in relation to the CBD approach or aspects of CBD utilized [characteristics, variation, etc.] • *in reference to evaluation question on sustainability:* This is a key question, however, sustainability of impacts will be hard to assess. For community organizations addressing climate vulnerability, for example, it's not so much a question of a final state of vulnerability reduction, since climate change is dynamic, but rather of the capacities of these groups to manage adaptively in coordination with others	**Partially changed.** The portfolio review of the evaluation will focus on Land Degradation, Biodiversity and Climate Change (adaptation) focal areas, this remains unchanged in the approach paper. However, the approach paper has been updated to reflect plans to include the chemicals and waste and international waters focal areas through a combination of purposively sampling the portfolio (for example, looking at co-management in fisheries projects) and through drawing on the previous IEO evaluations on fisheries and on the ASGM program. We take note of the feedback on gathering data on community perceptions, level of engagement and assessing performance and sustainability but have not made corresponding changes to the approach paper because we felt the level of detail currently present is appropriate for the approach paper phase.

	across a landscape [to affect ecosystem function and the services that local stakeholders depend on]	
Evaluation Matrix	**IPAG:** • Question 5 "What factors influence performance of projects using CBNRM" is ok, but it should go beyond project performance and enquire about CBNRM's performance, because then we touch on the crucial issue of enabling factors of the context (e.g. tenure rights, access to information and finance, etc.). A project using CBNRM and performing badly may be attributed such performance to the use of CBNRM, while the reality might be that CBNRM cannot be exercised to its full capacity because of external factors. • The formulation of question 6 "To what extent are the results of GEF projects that use community-based approaches sustainable" includes various important dimensions of sustainability, not just "project results" – e.g. the sustainability of CBNRM itself in a given context, including the "social outcomes", e.g. greater gender equality supported by the project but going beyond the project. Maybe a change from "results" to "outcomes" will help clarify the scope.	**Partially changed.** As suggested, the evaluation plans to look not only at project performance but also at how the community-based approaches performed. Feedback on performance not being tied to the use of community-based approaches is noted but not reflected in the approach paper. Language in the evaluation matrix broadening the criteria considered under the sustainability question has been expanded to include details on socioeconomic results/benefits.
General Comments	**CAF:** *reference to the approach paper's description of the land degradation focal area from GEF-8 framework:* It is important to consider the conditioning of this approach for restoration projects of degraded lands where the community is the trigger of the problem. Although it could be part of the solution, these approaches are not always easy for project implementation. **IPAG:**	**No changes made.** The comment on the consideration of community as the trigger for land degradation issues is noted, but no changes have been made to the approach paper as the cited text refers to GEF strategy. The comment on the recommendation for a tagging system will be taken into consideration but not reflected in the approach paper as we are not yet making recommendations. The contributions CBNRM has made to conservation in the 30x30 context have been noted, but no changes have been made to the approach paper as it is

	• I would also hope the evaluation recommend to sort out is the lack of appropriate tagging in the system to identify CBNRM. • In the background and reference reflections, I think the very important process of recognizing CBNRM's contributions to conservation in the 30x30 context – ICCAs, indigenous territories, etc, should have a prominent place, because I think the evolution of this topic relevant to the GEF is of greater magnitude and importance than the currently described benchmarks in the background section. **FAO:** • We expect that the evaluators and the GEF IEO would organize one or more consultation workshops during the course of the evaluation, for practitioners to exchange and brainstorm. This exercise is an occasion to create a community of like-minded practitioners committed to working with communities across agencies and national partners to learn from each other (from GEF Evaluations as M&E "Monitoring and Evaluation", to a MEL approach - "Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning"). • We also consider that the evaluation can serve to improve the visibility and recognition of Indigenous Peoples in Asia and Africa, where the majority of Indigenous Peoples live and where many of the GEF projects are operating. Also it would be important to have more evidence on how indigenous people are involve during the different phases of the GEF Project cycle, and how to improve it).	intended to be a concise, summary document. The idea to have a consultation workshop is noted and will be considered if resources are available. Evidence on participation of indigenous peoples will be captured as part of the portfolio review, therefore no changes have been made to the approach paper.