gef IEO **Independent Evaluation Office**
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

GEF CSO Network Evaluation Approach Paper Audit Trail

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
CSO Network	General Comments		There is a need to evaluate the input to the network as well as evaluating the outputs of the Network. Include an estimate of the CSO network contributions e.g. technical expertise, capacity, etc… to show that members provide a lot of resources to the Network.	Questions regarding resources available to the members and outputs of the Network will be integrated into interview protocols and surveys.
CSO Network			Sources of information should include annual reporting from the CSO Network (CSO contribution to each Council) and Audits to the Network.	These documents will be reviewed
CSO Network			During consultation, there should be a separation of regions (example not lumping South East Asia and Pacific together) in order to truly be able to reflect the situations in each region	Noted
CSO Network			There are 5 ECWs between June Council and November Council. The Network is planning to have regional meeting prior to those ECWs – there is an opportunity to have more Network members attend those meetings.	The IEO has accepted the invitation to be a part of the CSO meetings at forthcoming ECWs for information exchange and data gathering.
CSO Network			For the Africa region – relying on internet based sources for the surveys can be difficult. This is an issue of access here, internet is not very reliable in Africa.	Access is something that is being considered. Surveys will be online to the greatest extend possible, but the team will go to the field and both participate in and organize meetings (e.g. the ECWs). It will not just be electronic means.
CSO Network			Context of this evaluation: a. Context that proceeds the network: e.g. many CSOs in the network are playing a different role in the GEF and a more international role. b. Context is very important – how it has changed, context of the level of support of the CSO engagement – was very high with establishment of the network and the Public involvement policy, but how has that changed c. What are the governance structures of this Network and how are they followed? d. Are the objectives of the Network aligned with the objectives from the GEF Secretariat?	Noted. Context will be probed through historical document review and interviews. Questions are included in the survey concerning objectives of the Network and governance structure. These will also be probed in interviews and through review of network documents.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
CSO Network			Recommendations of this evaluation should not impose further work on the Network. The Network can use the evaluation to strengthen the network as we go along. Use it as a self-evaluation and strengthen the network as the evaluation is taking place. Encourage people to participate.	Noted
CSO Network			How will this evaluation be useful to the Network and the Network members? Will this evaluation be conducted with the intention to expand capacity of the Network and focus on capacity of its constituencies?	This evaluation will be presented to Council with conclusions and recommendations to the Council can take decisions on the strategic direction of the Network and the role of GEFSEC and other partners in relation. The evaluation will also be of interest to academics, evaluators, people interested in Networks, etc.
CSO Network			Members of this Network are also members of other Networks. With the SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals), this exercise it timely and it is important for organizations to look at themselves critically. Many activities are replicated between different networks. It is also important to look at other Networks; many similarities can be found with other networks.	The evaluation will include a meta-analysis of other CSO relevant networks.
CSO Network			What is the Council's reasoning behind this evaluation? What kind of network would the GEF and the GEF SEC like to see? Members ask for further clarity on this evaluation and its objectives.	Revised key questions articulate the objectives of the evaluation.
CSO Network			Members expressed interest in turning this process into a documentary and maximizing on lessons learned and critical feedback.	The evaluation may be summarized through different mediums. There could also be peer reviewed documents, journal articles, key deliverables, methods notes, summary of the evaluation itself as a graphic product.
CSO Network			There are 2 levels of CSO engagement and we should make the distinction. The project side of it, is not related to the CSO Network. The CSO network is for influence, policy, advocacy, project is a different category, that is linked to the Network but not via (or through) the network.	Focus of the evaluation is on the role of the CSO Network in the GEF partnership.
CSO Network			There is a large stakeholder group, but I don't find a problem to send surveys by email to the whole group. If there is selection of a sample, then you have to go through what the criteria would be, etc… Administering a 100 or 400 or even to older NGOs (old members of the network) and the ones who participated in Mexico, is not impossible; it has challenges but doable. The central focal point serves the purpose of reaching the whole network, so you should use that.	Noted.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
CSO Network			Some key evaluation questions are too general it need more precision example: What are some key lessons learned from the development and the evolution of the CSO network? Question is contribution? Some indicators should be formulated	Noted. Indicators are developed.
CSO Network			The relation of CSOs Network with others CSOs members, GEF Family, Government… and sharing their experiences, their activities should be one of the evaluation criteria	Suggestion Noted.
CSO Network			Approach tools, I want to add CSOs experiences illustrated by video photos, presentations, etc…	Noted. The evaluation will be gathering presentations from CSO Network meetings.
CSO Network			Our main concern is that a significant portion of the evaluation design appears to be for a generic evaluation of a "Network" - based on experience in evaluation of other networks and not a focused evaluation of the GEF CSO Network functioning with regards to GEF - which from the comments at the council last October appeared to be the desire of the Council members. I believe the heart of the evaluation should be on the key interactions between the Network and the GEF and how effective we have been in bringing the voices of the members to the attention of GEF and influencing decisions, policies and procedures of GEF. We also believe a useful starting point for the evaluation would be the 2005 evaluation - to see how the Network has developed since that time. In addition we believe it is key that the barriers and constraints to our work be assessed and recommendations on how we can enhance our work in partnership with other members of the GEF family. In terms of initial work it may be useful for you or your team to pay a visit to the office of the central focal point in Malaysia for a few days.	Evaluation design clarified to be specific to focus on CSO Network and relations with the GEF partnership as indicated through the tenets of good network functioning. Suggestion re 2005 evaluation are noted. Questions on barriers and constraints will be assessed through interviews and focus group discussions as well as in the survey instrument.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
CSO Network	Para. 1	N/A	Original Sentence The GEF Council at its 47th meeting in October, 2014 requested the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (GEF IEO) to undertake an evaluation of the GEF Civil Society Organizations (CSO) Network (hereafter referred to as "the Network"). Comment To add to the end of the first sentence: With focus on the role of the Network in the context of GEF work. Reason: The GEF Council on October 2014 specifically asked for the evaluation to include the role of the Network in the context of GEF work.	Noted
CSO Network	Para. 2	History	General comment: There is too much old history given here. The evaluation should focus on period from 2005 to 2015, i.e. after the last evaluation.	History section has been revised and clarifications added.
CSO Network	Para. 7, 8	N/A	On the History section it could be useful to include why the Network was established. The 1995 document *Criteria for Selection of NGOs* GEF/C.3/5) states that "The CEO shall invite representatives to attend / observe the Council meetings" based on recommendations from the NGO community through a self-selection process. To respond to this decision, NGOs established the NGO Network to organize themselves and coordinate the selection process, and to disseminate information.	
CSO Network	Para. 13	N/A	Original Sentence The structure consists of elected individuals each associated with an NGO and each of whom represents a region encompassing more than one country, or NGO constituency Comment Incorrect, election is of organization, not individuals.	Error noted.
CSO Network	Para. 13	N/A	It was in 2008 that the Network included three Indigenous Peoples (IP) Focal Points. But IP representatives had been actively participating in the Network, even with some IP representatives being RFPs. The Network later decided to have three IP Focal Points. Thus, their representation was not a result of the Network evaluation in 2005.	*Noted*

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
CSO Network	Para. 18	N/A	These decisions could also be helpful in revising which correctly states that in 1995 "the GEF Council approved a $50,000 budget for each CSO Consultation". This $50,000 included $44,000 for travel and $6,000 for services (interpreters, food, room, etc.) for each meeting. The reference to one annual regional consultation and a maximum of $150,000 may need to be deleted, since these regional consultations were not approved by the Council. Also, the participation of NGOs in the Council meetings was supported through the GEFSEC corporate budget, not the Voluntary NGO Trust Fund. This trust fund was indeed established to support other CSO-related activities based on voluntary contributions from donors. As the paper correctly states in Par. 19, the trust fund was dormant for many years.	Noted. Corrections made to text.
CSO Network	Para. 19	N/A	Need to be revised, to clarify the source of funding for the NGO travel grant: the GEFSEC corporate budget. In addition, the October 2008 paper Enhancing Civil Society Engagement and Partnership with the GEF (GEF/C.34/9) failed to acknowledge a previous increase in the NGO travel budget. This increase was included in the Corporate Budget FY05 (GEF/C.23/9) in May 2004. It was then agreed to increase the travel grant for NGOs from $44,000 to $50,000 per meeting, to allow for two additional NGO representatives to participate, based on the two new focal areas added in 2002. The problem is that the Corporate Budget for FY05 is not available in the GEF website. You may find a reference to this increase in the NGO Consultation Report of the May 2004 meeting at: https://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1668	Noted. Clarification on source of funding added.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
CSO Network	**Para. 21**	**CSO Network Purpose**	Original Sentence Pursuant to the Council decision in February 1995 to formalize the relationship between CSOs and the GEF, the GEF CSO Network was tasked with the responsibility of "disseminating information on the GEF to the NGO community and other stakeholders at the national, regional and international levels". Comment While this may be an objective of the Network, there is nothing the in the Council decision that says this. See https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/GEF.C.3.JointSummary.pdf: Decision on Item 9, paras 13-15, at p. 6. In fact, the decision does not reflect a mandate at all. What can be inferred is that the Network provides inputs to the Council meetings by having observer status. Presumably, this is, as with most such Networks, policy and practices recommendations based on the expertise of participating NGOs as well as their capacities to monitor GEF financed projects in recipient countries and/or to work with other NGOs which take on that monitoring role.	Clarification noted.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
CSO Network	**Para. 24**	**N/A**	Original Sentence An evaluation of the GEF CSO network was completed and presented to the GEF Council at its 27th session in October 2005. The evaluation, which was requested by the Network, concluded that the current model of NGO engagement on both regional and country-level is ineffective. The evaluation also concluded that the "Network lacks a long-term vision, while the GEF Secretariat and Council have no long-term strategy for engaging the NGO Network." The evaluation added that "insufficient resources and a need for capacity building also have been major obstacles to the Network's achievements." Comment To add at the end of the sentence: It further underscored that: "The Secretariat and Council, its implementing partners and the NGO community all have a vested interest to take time and resources to re-energize the Network." Reason: This is key context and justification for current review to include consideration of action taken by GEF to support the network from 2005-2015	Suggestion noted.
CSO Network	**Para. 25**	**N/A**	Original Sentence "The evaluation recommended the GEF and the Network focus on:" Comment The evaluation should assess – to what extent support was received from GEF to implement the recommendations of the previous evaluation.	Suggestion noted.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
CSO Network	**Para. 26**	**N/A**	The reference to the Action Plan to Respond to the Recommendations of the Independent GEF NGO Network Review (GEF.C.28.16) is correct. There was indeed a document prepared by the GEFSEC with concrete actions. However, it was never discussed by the Council. The discussion was postponed for the following meeting. However, the paper was never included in the Council agenda again. Please see Joint Summary of the Chairs of that meeting (https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/JointSummaryoftheChairs_C.28_001.pdf), under: Decision on Agenda Item 27: Other Business: 59. The Council notes that due to time constraints it was unable to consider the following agenda items: (a) agenda item 7, Evaluation Office Progress Report (b) agenda item 18, Review of Financial Statements (c) agenda item 19, Review of the Fee System (d) agenda item 24, Roles and Comparative Advantages of the GEF Agencies (e) agenda item 25, Participation of NGOs in the GEF The Council agrees to consider these agenda items at its meeting in December 2006 and to include their consideration in an earlier part of that meeting.	Noted

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
CSO Network	**Para. 31**	**N/A**	Original Sentence In June 2014 the Network published its revised Rules and Procedures. The revision split the sub-region of West and Central Africa into 2 sub-regions with an RFP for each constituency, thereby adding an additional RFP to the Coordination Committee of the Network and raising the number to 16 RFPs. The Number of Indigenous Peoples representatives remains constant at 3 representatives. Comment Replace with: In 2011 the network split the sub-region of West and Central Africa into 2 sub-regions with an RFP for each constituency, thereby adding an additional RFP to the Coordination Committee of the Network and raising the number to 16 RFPs. In 2012, the Network amended its rules to include procedures for the Indigenous Peoples Focal Points (IPFPs). In Dec 2013, the Network changed its name to GEF CSO Network (as reflected in the June 2014 version of Rules). Reason: Existing para not accurate.	Sentence replaced.
CSO Network	**Para. 33**	**N/A**	Original Sentence Based on a review of the aforementioned literature describing relevant network evaluation frameworks and methods, some of which are summarized in Annex 1 – Literature Review, and focusing on the terms of reference of the CSO Network as articulated by the GEF Council and the Network itself, this evaluation will assess 1) Relevance of the Network; 2) Effectiveness of the Network and 3) Results of the Network. Comment Where is the "TOR of the CSO Network"? Please identify a policy document. Each of these terms does need to be defined. E.g. relevance in relationship to what? How is effectiveness assessed? Indicators need to be fleshed out in a bit more detail here. A comparative study against the input and outputs of the Network should be done.	Suggestions noted.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
CSO Network	Para. 34 (i)	N/A	Original Sentence External factors The evaluation will first describe the context within which the Network has formed, developed and evolved and then draw on previous experiences including that of Smith and Lynott as described in Evaluating Civil Society Networks. Comment External factors eg. support/access provided by GEF Sec, Council and Agencies and OFPs/countries must be reviewed. Reason: the key external factors for the network in the context of GEF are the interactions and support provided by other members of the GEF family Is this necessary to assess relevance, effectiveness and results? Reason: The work of smith and Lynott is related to assessing networks in general. When assessing the GEF CSO network the context of the GEF is key	Suggestion noted.
CSO Network	Para. 36, 37	N/A	There should be a clear indication on methods of measurements.	Noted
CSO Network	Para. 36, 38	N/A	In using qualitative methods, what is the sample size? How many members will be interviewed?	Because the evaluation will be using quantitative data, the IEO can assess if the data is statistically significant.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
CSO Network	Para. 37	Survey	Original Sentence Surveys: Surveys will be developed and implemented online to capture the perspectives of a wide range of stakeholders, including the GEF Secretariat, GEF CSO Network members, GEF Agencies, STAP, national UN convention focal points; GEF beneficiaries and supported institutions, municipal governments and associations, and local communities and authorities; GEF OFPs and other relevant government departments. Comment Include GEF Council. Delete - national UN convention focal points; GEF beneficiaries and supported institutions, municipal governments and associations, and local communities and authorities; and other relevant government departments. Reason: GEF CSO network at global/regional level is not working directly with local communities, municipal governments, Convention focal points. Although most of our network members are working with these groups - there will not be high knowledge of the network.	Suggestion noted.
CSO Network	Para. 38, 39	N/A	Additional Limitations: The Network work within not very conducive environments – Access to countries and OFPs – Council decided that every OFP has to have an annual consultation meeting with CSO network representatives at country level. Up till now there have maybe 5 or 6 meetings in a few countries. The Networks requests from the GEF SEC to write a letter to OFPs to say that it is a council decision. There is also a language barrier: we can help with getting out communication, lessons learned, etc… If the experience, lessons learned, etc… can be collected, network members can help.	Noted. Specific questions on interaction between OFPs and Network members introduced into the survey and interview protocols. Suggestion regarding dissemination of materials in different languages is noted.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
CSO Network	Para. 40	N/A	A good range of stakeholder were identified, need to add council members (although they change regularly), all GEF CEOs (previous and current) Reference Group should also include National SGP coordinators Peer Review Group should include experts on sustainability (e.g. SDGs), not just from GEF Agencies Previous Network CFPs and RFPs (focus on institutional memory).	Range of stakeholders to be consulted is noted.
CSO Network	Evaluation Matrix	Key Evaluation Questions	Row 2 - to add: How has GEF Secretariat, Council, Agencies and countries facilitated or acted as a barrier to the Network's work. Reason It is important to look at the constraints to the work of the network	Survey instrument has a question about barriers/constraints. This will also be probed through interviews/focus group.
CSO Network	Evaluation Matrix	Credibility, pg. 11	Original Sentence Are the original objectives still relevant? Comment Relevant to whom? To add: How relevant are the activities of the Network to the work of the GEF ? Reason the GEF is the key target for the work of the network. How does the working of the GEF-CSO Network compared to similar networks established to work with other environment related financing mechanism, eg. Adaptation Fund, GCF, CIF? Reason: with regard to credibility it is important to compare the network to other similar network to compare organization structure and effectiveness.	Suggestions noted

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
CSO Network	Evaluation Matrix	Connectivity	Original Sentence How effective and efficient are the connections the network makes Comment How is this going to be measured? Compared to what? The assessment of connections should focus on connects to other members to the GEF network and to the members of the network.	Assessment focus is amongst Network members and Network and the GEF partnership. Criteria for effectiveness and efficiency are added.
CSO Network	Evaluation Matrix	Connectivity, Pg. 11	To add: How does the Network interact with GEF Council, agencies and countries? Reason : these are the key groups for the work of the network	Suggestions noted.
CSO Network	Evaluation Matrix	Membership, pg.12	Original Sentence 1st Question: Who participates in the Network? Are women's organizations represented? Comment The evaluation should also consider to CSOs' participation in relation to geographical distribution, in GEF Focal areas (eg. biodiversity, climate change, etc.) and involvement in GEF projects. Why limit to women's organization, how about indigenous peoples or youth organization, etc.?	Suggestions noted.
CSO Network	Evaluation Matrix	Resources, pg.12	To add: How much support has been provided by GEF to the network? Is this adequate? How can this be strengthened in the future? Reason: the previous assessment of the network made a recommendation to GEF to increase its support to the network. Has this been adequate?	Suggestions noted. Information will be gathered through review of documents and perceptions through survey.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
CSO Network	Evaluation Matrix	Capacity, pg.12	Original Sentence Do members have needed non-material resources to advance members capacities & network goals? Comment To change to: Does the Network have needed non-material resources to advance members capacities & network goals? Reason: We assume the assessment is on the capacity of the network not that of members	Suggestions noted. Information will be gathered through review of documents and perceptions through survey.
CSO Network	Evaluation Matrix	Progress towards results, pg.12	Original Sentence Are there clear signals of impact on broader environmental policy and protection of the global environment? Can a case be made as to Network contribution? Comment Change to: Are there clear signals of impact on GEF policy & procedure? Reason: The work of the network is to focus on change to the GEF Policy and procedure – not on broader global environment policy and procedure.	Change made.
CSO Network	Evaluation Matrix	N/A	The questions on gender: The current movement is currently towards Gender Mainstreaming and questions should be framed as such	Noted.
CSO Network	Evaluation Matrix	Network Resources	Finances are a huge impediment to the work of the Network. There should be clearer questions addressing financial resources available to the Network. There is a decline in funding (of about 70%), therefore there is less motivation for engagement when no funds are available to do the work necessary. Resources have not been commensurate with level of engagement needed from CSO members and Network RFPs.	Questions regarding financial resources available to the Network will be integrated into interview protocols and surveys.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
CSO Network	Evaluation Objectives	Pg. 9	Evaluation Objectives The 2005 evaluation should be the baseline for this evaluation. Reason: The GEF EO already undertook the evaluation. The current evaluation should build on this.	Suggestion noted.
Evaluation Expert / Peer Reviewers	N/A	N/A	In the next round, you will have an opportunity to include the dimensions we are looking to mainstream e.g. KM. We could also perhaps make it a little forward looking in terms of looking at the potential contributions to the IAs etc.	Noted. Key questions 3 re-formulated to be more forward looking.
Evaluation Expert / Peer Reviewers	N/A	N/A	I find that the background section is good and gives the necessary background information. As for the methodological section, it may be that some of my questions are implicit in your mention of use of referenced methodological papers, but I think the questions around the effects of having a CSO network are so important that the TORs may merit to be a bit more specific. (i) It is not quite clear to me whether you are interested in the effects of involving single CSOs, or whether you are only interested in evaluating the effect of these various CSOs being in a network? And how are you planning to disentangle the two and find the value added of a network? Maybe spelling out a clear theory of change with underlying assumptions would help. (ii) It is not clear to me whether there is some networking part going on at the national level or is it mainly run at the international level (I am assuming both)? (iii) Presumably the network will function more or less well in different countries, and also at the overall coordination level. At the country level, the political system, the popularity (or not) of the GEF intervention, the way the CSOs were selected, the amount of them being involved in GEF project implementation -- all of these factors will presumably affect the success of	Noted.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
			CSO network involvement. Detailed case-studies of some 'typical and distinct' cases may help. (iv) The main challenge is to establish a credible counterfactual. You could consider several: 1) the same CSOs being involved but separately and not in a network; 2) the network being composed differently (you could try to theoretically replace one of the members at a time and gauge how the members think it would have played out differently then); 3) without CSO network involved; and 4) potentially having some of the CSOs involved in undermining the project when they are not involved in the network. Which of these ones you use may make a huge difference to the conclusions. For example, you may have a network not functioning very well in a country, but if the members would have been involved in actively undermining the project otherwise, then this could actually turn out to be your most effective network (given said counterfactual). I don't know how far network analysis also deals with hypothetical scenarios and game theory, but that would presumably be a way to get at some of these things.	
Evaluation Expert / Peer Reviewers	Para. 33	N/A	Paragraph 33 states that the framework is based on the literature review and terms of reference. I'm not clear why relevance of the network; effectiveness of the network; and results of the network are being used as the pillars in the design. Do these concepts come from the terms of reference, not the literature? I didn't see them in any of the frameworks from the literature. I'm having trouble seeing how these are distinct enough to use as first level pillars of the design. They can be addressed through other means.	Suggestions noted.
Evaluation Expert / Peer Reviewers	Para. 33	N/A	Under point 33 it is mentioned that "this evaluation will assess 1) Relevance of the Network; 2) Effectiveness of the Network and 3) Results of the Network." Perhaps already call them pillars here, as is done in Table 2. The pillars align to some extent with the connectivity / health / results pillars of ONA. Perhaps worth making the link if you would make use of this framework approach as it is part of the literature review.	Noted.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
Evaluation Expert / Peer Reviewers	Para. 34	N/A	Having three overarching evaluation questions seems like a reasonable number of such questions. I would suggest some modifications to the wording of the three questions. I also suggest that a prior question be asked that addresses the context and social systems that are relevant to the Network (see first question below).	Noted
Evaluation Expert / Peer Reviewers	Para. 34	Evaluation Questions	Current Question: The Phase 2 work (further desk review; identification of data gaps; further methods selection) Suggested Modified Question: What are key features of the political, environmental, and social context in which the Network developed? What is already known about the relevant social systems, stakeholders, and stakes? How do they differ across regions? Who are the potential data sources? What are the criteria for saying the objectives have been met? Who are the key decision makers who will be using the evaluation results and what types of decisions do they need to make? How do the answers to these questions vary by region?	Noted
Evaluation Expert / Peer Reviewers	Para. 34	N/A	It would be good to add under point 34 – the key questions – what is being answered by each question, that is; relevance, effectiveness and results (pillars), or explain the focus areas as they now suddenly pop up in Table 2. Looking at the table, I made some smaller changes and split up connectivity, membership and capacities questions to fit under different pillars. I changed the sequence of questions under 'structure' and added 'male/female' when data disaggregation by gender would be needed.	Noted.
Evaluation Expert / Peer Reviewers	Para. 34 (i)	Evaluation Questions	To what extent is the CSO Network meeting its intended goals and strategic objectives? Include here only the three objectives that are currently being used to better build on work that has already been done: 1: To enhance the role of civil society in safeguarding the global environment 2: To strengthen GEF Program implementation through enhanced partnership with civil society 3: To strengthen the GEF NGO network capacity 4. Also add: What other consequences are occurring as a result of the network? (This is to look for unintended/unexpected consequences.)	Noted

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
Evaluation Expert / Peer Reviewers	**Para. 34 (ii)**	**Evaluation Questions**	How are key network features affecting the effectiveness and efficiency of the network in meeting its objectives and having other consequences? Use the seven categories given (i.e., credibility, etc.) (The change in the question is to avoid ending up with a listing of factors without information on the ways that they relate to the results of the network regarding the three current objectives and possible other consequences.)	Noted
Evaluation Expert / Peer Reviewers	**Para. 34 (iii)**	**Evaluation Questions**	What are the implications for the next phase of the development and evolution of the CSO network? (The change in the question is to ensure that this is an evaluative inquiry rather than a general research study. To focus this question appropriately, information is needed up front about who the decision makers are and what decisions they are needing to make in a general sense.)	Considered in learning key question.
Evaluation Expert / Peer Reviewers	**Evaluation Design**	**N/A**	I'm not clear who the users of the evaluation are to be and what decisions are to be made. For example, are both the overall GEF Council and the leaders of the Network making decisions? It would be helpful to clarify what types of decisions by these groups and others are to be informed by the evaluation. Are they related to funding, staffing, redesign of the network structure, purposes, etc.? Getting clarity on this will be important to be able to make decisions about priority questions to ask and who to engage in the evaluation.	Suggestions noted. Approach paper clarified the users of the evaluation and the purposes for which it could be used.
Evaluation Expert / Peer Reviewers	**Evaluation Design**	**N/A**	It also appears that you want the evaluation to contribute to the broad knowledge base about network evaluation. If this is the case, it is especially important to show how you are building on the various frameworks and why these choices have been made.	Suggestions noted. Clarification added to the Approach Paper
Evaluation Expert / Peer Reviewers	**Evaluation Phase 2**	**N/A**	In preparation for addressing the three key evaluation questions, the Phase 2 of the evaluation (to be done in July through further desk review to identify data gaps and further methods selection) would include a focus on the context/system questions given in the table above *(What is the context in which the Network developed? What is already known about the relevant social systems, stakeholders, and stakes? How do they differ across regions? Who are the potential data sources? What are the criteria for saying the objectives have been met? Who are the key decision makers who will be using the evaluation results and what types of decisions do they need to make? How do the answers to these questions vary by region?)* Answers to	Clarification on context and the social systems within which CSO Network members function has been added.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
			these questions will be important in identifying the data sources and methodologies for answering the three key evaluation questions. These questions would be answered to the extent possible through existing documents and a few key interviews. These answers will help determine what more to focus on during the Phase 3 of the evaluation. Of particular importance in this review is understanding the social systems that are represented in the networks. These become important in determining how information flows and the roles of the various parties related to each of the objectives. This phase may also involve more attention to the existing literature on networks to confirm initial choices about the use of the various frameworks.	
Evaluation Expert / Peer Reviewers	**Evaluation Phase 2**	**N/A**	Another critical point to address in Phase 2 is whether all three of the key question need to be answered for each region and/or for the network as a whole. Is there some information you have that can help you determine how much variation exists about the functioning of the networks in the different regions? That could help determine if you need to look at all the regions for all the questions.	Key questions will be asked for all regions because differences in responses amongst regions can help determine degree of variation and determine further political/social/regional/country context needs to be examined for causes.
Evaluation Expert / Peer Reviewers	**Evaluation Phase 2**	**N/A**	Given the information available so far, I'm currently thinking that the evaluation of each of the questions might be organized at the highest level by the three objectives (plus unintended/unexpected consequences) rather than by the topics of relevance, effectiveness, and results. I'm suggesting this under the assumption that there is likely important differences in the design of the network depending on the objective to be accomplished. Do you have enough prior information to know if this is the case?	

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
GEF Agency	**N/A**	**N/A**	The GEF has a value chain and we should be clear as to where the CSOs interact with the GEF in that value chain. I suggest some clarification as to how some questions have been framed; it says "to what extend has the network met its objective?" that's the mandate that they were given by the council. The council mandated them in 3 areas: 1) Policy, 2) Engagement and dissemination, and 3) execution of projects where appropriate. Then within that mandate they can set their goals. These are 2 very different things. Main question to address are: What's the value chain? What is the mandate? Have they fulfilled that mandate sufficiently? Do they function as a network effectively? Have they fed back into the value chain to ask for different mandate and added resources? To me that has been confused a little bit along the way as to their role with the value chain, how they are interacting within that role (fulfilling that role), and how that connects back to the whole GEF Decision making process. Making clear would make it easier to answer question and give targets answer.	Questions regarding the Network's contributions and value proposition will be included in surveys and interviews. The Evaluation Matrix makes clear the objectives as indicated by Council as well as those set by the Network. Both will be evaluated with focus on the Council expectations.
GEF Agency	**N/A**	**N/A**	Are we discussing the relationship of GEF with just the Network or the CSOs at large? And how has the network fulfilled the mandate on engaging CSOs at large?	The scope of the evaluation is limited to the relationship between the GEF and the CSO Network members and CSOs the GEFSEC has engaged at GEF events such as ECWs, Council Meetings and Assemblies.
GEF Agency	**N/A**	**N/A**	The network can't have a role in global environment, it is not mandated or resourced for that	The scope is limited to Network role on GEF policies.
GEF Agency	**N/A**	**N/A**	A lot of stakeholders have been identified for the reference group and it is a multi-stakeholder group. Will the sample size large enough to be able to disaggregate responses according to different stakeholder groups and perceptions? We should look at getting sample size that is adequate to be able to do that and identify significant differences between stakeholder views.	IEO will make efforts to have an adequate sample size and understand if there are perceptional differences amongst different groups.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	WWF is interested in being part of the stakeholder group but would like clarity on expected efforts and time allocated for the group.	The reference group will help finalize the approach paper by the end of the month. The Reference Group will also help access key people and information.
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	IUCN interested in being part of the reference group in order to have input to the comparative analysis with other networks.	Noted.
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	In general terms, the Evaluation has enough elements to move forward. The SNA approach appropriate and important for the evaluation of complex networks.	Noted.
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	The evaluations should use the RFPs to engage with local / national constituency. It is a way of enhancing communication capacity.	Suggestion noted.
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	Include in the last phase time for a Management Response from the Network to the Evaluation in the last phase, this response should be accompanied by an Action Plan that responds to the results evaluation´s conclusions and recommendations. The Action Plan may be included in the final report and also the mechanisms for monitoring the implementation of this. This is relevant in order to ensure the usefulness of the evaluation and will be used to improve the Network performance	Suggestion noted.
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	The network can't have a role in global environment, it is not mandated or resourced for that	Noted.
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	The network evaluation matrix is well designed, but I am sure that those in charge of the actual evaluation know that to cover such large ground including also surveys and several interviews is a challenge even with only a sample of such large GEF CSO network (as pointed out rightly within 'limitations').	Noted
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	On page 13 the ToRs rightly use the word 'could' include… surveys, online SAs, interviews etc. Good to be cautious as the evaluators will have to be very realistic as to what they can actually do within the timeframe and resources (by the way, resource$ aren't explained, which doesn't allow to comment more on feasibility).	Noted
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	The secondary data research seems to be the preferred approach to cover a good % of the evaluation, I am sure there is a lot out there available and researchable.	The IEO will also use primary data collected through surveys, focus groups and interviews.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	My main worry is the size of the reference group. It is fundamental to manage it tightly and with very clear rules of engagement. It is nice to be inclusive, but early this year I completed being a member of a REDD+ reference and peer review group that included a similar number of members and the process got out of control and at the end I counted ~1100 related emails from the RG over 6 months… While that didn't affect me, it did affect the evaluation process where the attention and time had to be diverted from the substance of the evaluation to the management of the formalities of the Reference Group.	Noted.
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	One of the objectives of the network is to contribute to global environment policy, or influence / strengthen it, there isn't a clear evaluation question on that in the matrix (particularly to their role in influencing and strengthening policy).	Noted. Results questions are more specific to Network's influence on GEF policies.
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	UNDP would like to take part in the ref group and will give comments on the approach paper (and the evaluation paper of course). As far as access the entire network – will pose the question to colleagues at UNDP and Nancy Bennit specifically.	Noted.
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	Overall, the evaluation approach is clearly outlined in the evaluation questions matrix and the consideration of background literature on network evaluations is a valuable exercise for this evaluation. Perhaps, the background/history section of the paper could be shortened to allow for a greater focus on the evaluation objectives and the evaluation approach.	Noted.
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	The Approach Paper is well-researched and the section detailing the evaluation objectives and evaluation process is clearly structured and well-planned. The methodological research on network evaluations is a very valuable exercise, and this evaluation should indeed add to the growing body on network evaluations.	Noted. History section has been reduced and information will be included in the Background Annex of the Evaluation Report.
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	However, the Background/History section is very long (nearly 9 pages) and could possibly be shortened to bring greater focus on the evaluation objectives.	Evaluation Objectives have moved forward.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	As GEF Agency, we encourage the process to be inclusive and remain at the disposal of the GEF Evaluation Team for specific feedback needed. Also, we hope that the timeline of the evaluation will ensure that the evaluation findings are shared/being considered by the CSO Network in a timely manner with the objective to inform the draft of the new strategy of the CSO Network, which has been announced in June.	The suggestion will be shared with the CSO Network.
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	One overarching comment: we feel that assessment of results will be a particular challenge given the absence of actual metrics for each of the Network's objectives against which to track change/impact.	Added to limitations section.
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	How it will be possible to arrive at meaningful analysis of, for example, Objective 1: 'strengthening the role of civil society in safeguarding the global environment'. Could a results chain/logic model be developed and introduced as a means to bring further clarity to the exercise?	Logic model/Results chain added.
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	The objectives and structure of the proposed evaluation are clear. We have not specific comments at this stage, except to clarify how you expect to select and organize the reference group and what level of participation you are looking for from the Agencies	Reference group Terms of Reference shared.
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	The document comes across as that it is focusing on how the CSO network is flowing down information through its members. It seems to be less focused on what information is flowing up to the Secretariat and if and how the Secretariat benefits from that. It is our understanding that there is a two way information flow that are equally important but the way it is presented in the paper it seems there is emphasis on how information is flowing down, not up. How much of the information provided by the CSO network has resulted in policy or procedural changes at the GEF? What has GEFSEC gained by inputs from the CSO network (aside from improved implementation on the ground, which is the flow-down part). Are there any recommendations for improvement?	Noted
GEF Agency	N/A	N/A	A major change with the current set of Partner Agencies is that the CSO's are now also represented among the GEF Partner Agencies. Is the CSO network benefiting from this? Are the CSO Agencies using the CSO network similarly, or how has this relationship changed? What could be some recommendations for the future of the involvement of GEF Partner Agencies that are CSOs in the CSO network?	Suggestions noted.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
GEF Agency	Para. 1	Introduction	Could this paragraph be expanded further, elaborating on the definitions of what CSOs/NGOs are and which varieties there are.	Paragraph on CSO/NGO definition added.
GEF Agency	Para. 2, 31	History, Structure, etc…	It might be better to have only a brief summary here (1-2 pages) of the development of the Network and a description of how it currently operates – the detailed history could be attached as an annex.	Noted
GEF Agency	Para. 8	N/A	What is missing here among the criteria (and something I had advocated for when I was an NGO member of the network was the capacity or at least the commitment of the attendee to echo or share relevant discussions and decisions of the Council with the NGOs left back in the home country. One disadvantage of this is that it could bias the attendee to the larger well established and endowed NGOs at national level. The solution could have been to allot particular numbers to grassroots NGOs and provide them some resources to share back discussions and decisions at Council meetings. One critical weakness of the present situation is the lack of this sharing to other NGOs that are not attendees (the evaluation could further check this).	The evaluation will ascertain the degree to which exchange of information occurs beyond attendees at GEF meetings, particularly at the GEF level.
GEF Agency	Para. 9	Last Sentence	Related to my comment above, how much of this has happened? Were there incentives or resources provided by GEF? Or rather the focus ended solely global?	The evaluation will try to ascertain this.
GEF Agency	Para. 11	N/A	Could you elaborate if the CSO actors along commodity and industrial value chains are seen as an integral part of the network (associations etc.) especially in the framework of the IAPs?	The evaluation will profile the membership of the CSO Network and highlight the different types of CSOs that are involved and to what extent, including those that may be CSO actors along commodity and industrial value chains.
GEF Agency	Para. 14	on the sub-committees	Are these really working sub-committees especially between meetings? Would it not be better if there are less but resourced and truly working? Should not resource mobilization a most important matter and deserves a dedicated sub-committee?	The work and appropriateness of the committees will be addressed in the course of the evaluation.
GEF Agency	Para. 15	N/A	This is still an 8-year term which is quite a long one if one aim is to give opportunities to more NGO leaders to participate in GEF work. Furthermore if RFPs are truly effective in their work, other leaders would have come up to take on the next 4 years. One possible option is to allow a second tenure but not by simple majority vote of the network members in the region but by a higher percentage, let's say 80%.	Suggestion noted.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
GEF Agency	Para. 16	N/A	Again, were network members at least linked or known to the GEF OFP and PFP at country level?	This information will be gathered through surveys and interviews.
GEF Agency	Para. 17	N/A	It would be interesting to see a breakdown of the network members according to levels – grassroots NGOs, national NGOs, regional NGOs and international NGOs. How do international NGOs fit under a system with RFPs? With international NGOs becoming GEF agencies, are they still members of the network or could be members of the network or had simply faded away? I remember that I the past when the international NGOs were very active, they provided additional needed resources as well as global influence while the national and local NGOs provide the grounding on needs by developing countries.	Stratification suggestions noted.
GEF Agency	Para. 20	CSO Window	Who is managing this? Who is responsible for resource mobilization for this window?	GEFSEC is responsible and this is clarified in the Approach Paper.
GEF Agency	Para. 22	Last Line	When GEF country portfolio evaluations are done, are network members in the country contacted to provide inputs?	Suggestion noted.
GEF Agency	Para. 23	N/A	These are purposes that both the network and the GEF have to agree on. Is there buy in from the GEF or at least GEFSec on this? The question to ask is whether the Network is a totally independent entity or one that is a support mechanism of the GEF. If the answer is the former, then the Network has to substantially fund itself but then has the mandate to criticize the GEF if need be. Such was the nature of a "World Bank Watch" formed by NGOs in the 70's to 80's and the Network can then take a similar stance in a "GEF Watch". If the latter, then the GEF has to provide it full funding but the Network has to provide its advocacy for changes and improvement in a constructive way. Or is it a hybrid? There must be clarity on this or else the Network will not be able to do the fullest effective action fitted to its true identity. At present, the Network is minimally funded with the rationale that this is to maintain its independence – yet would the GEFSec and Council still be welcoming if the Network is to be critical of the GEF in campaigns and in the media. If the GEF is to strengthen the Network, which of these two possible nature of the Network would it prefer?	Suggestions noted.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
GEF Agency	Para. 31, 32	N/A	Before moving on to Evaluation Objections – Missing Narrative: There seems to be some missing part in the narrative – where is the GEFSec in all of these. There was always a GEFSec staff and a unit that is assigned to "supervise" or "oversee" the GEF CSO Network – Hemanta way back, then another, then Boni, and now Pilar. Their roles and influence is not minor and the way this had worked and should work in the future needs a good look by the evaluation.	Suggestion noted.
GEF Agency	Para. 32	Line 3	What does "post the 1990s" refer to? It might be clearer to say "since the year 2000" or "in the past two decades".	Noted
GEF Agency	Para. 32	Line 5	The consideration of network evaluation literature (and the background research in Annex 1) is a very valuable exercise and provides a very solid methodological basis for the evaluation. This is a very interesting aspect of the approach paper.	Thank you.
GEF Agency	Para. 34 (i)	N/A	Its is a possessive, not a neutral article, suggesting that the goals and objectives are those of the Network and not what the Council tasked (the two of which may diverge). I suggest using	
GEF Agency	Para. 34 (ii)	N/A	I think that there should also be a good look on the aspect of power relations. Frankly, there are lots of politics involved here. The setting up of the GEF CSO Network is not a technical/academic matter but rather a political decision that even differs in terms of final objectives and perspectives of the parties involved, i.e. does GEF really want a strong network to serve as a watch dog? One question that should be asked is what are the expectations of various stakeholders of this network? Are they similar or do they conflict? If they conflict then there is a major problem to be solved	Suggestions noted.
GEF Agency	Para. 34 (ii)	N/A	This seems more oriented to the CSO Network's objectives, which is ok. There should be a look at: 1) has it diverged away to the degree of limiting its value to the GEF Council; 2) has divergence allowed new areas to be identified and agreed with Council that have strengthened the CSTO Network's relevance.	
GEF Agency	Para. 36	Meta-Evaluation	It would be good to mention the 2005/2006 evaluation here.	Noted.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
GEF Agency	Para. 37	N/A	We suggested adding the criteria/methods for how relevant stakeholders will be selected for interviews, focus groups, etc out of the 460 network members located in 120 countries.	Participants will be asked to self-select and register for attendance at IEO consultation during ECWs. The IEO will make a final selection of 10-15 organizations based on regional, focal area, gender representation. For surveys, all CSO Network members and CSOs that have participated in GEF Meetings will be asked to respond. For the interviews, all the Coordinationa Committee members will be interviewed and others selected to have a representative sample. Specific criterial will be developed.
GEF Agency	Para. 37	N/A	The proposed Social Network Analysis method still remains a little unclear. The footnoted document/paper states that, "social network analysis (SNA) is an evaluation approach that uses mathematics and visualization to represent the structure of relationships between people, organizations, goals, interests, and other entities within a larger system." Is this how SNA will be used for this CSO network evaluation?	SNA may be employed if there is enough underlying data to examine the interactions between the Network and the GEF partnership in order to visually depict the structure of the interactions.
GEF Agency	Para. 38	N/A	One of the stated evaluation limitations is the size and scope of the CSO network. Is there a suggested approach to how this limitation will be minimized?	The scope of the evaluation has been further defined to focus on the Network and its activities post 2005 the time of the last evaluation.
GEF Agency	Para. 42	N/A	Perhaps there should be a formal fifth evaluation phase whereby the CSO network is provided an opportunity to create a response, which will also be shared with the GEF Council in early May 2016 and presented at the June 2016 meeting. Otherwise, perhaps this aspect could be incorporated into the fourth evaluation phase.	Suggestion noted.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
GEF Agency	**Para. 42**	**Phase 4**	Important to give time and attention to the recommendations part. Best that both the Network and the GEFSec be given time to comment on the recommendations with the aim of developing a set that are mutually agreed as doable and can be put into action fast. We cannot afford to have this evaluation be like the previous one where there was not much buy in from the key stakeholders involved. May I suggest that there be a stakeholders workshop where the full draft with the recommendations can be presented and the stakeholders, primarily Network members and GEFSec staff, can have a face-to-face discussion and debate and hopefully some agreements on what they could mutually commit to. A process of face-to-face discussion is more the appropriate methodology for getting comments from CSOs rather than asking them to send written comments.	Suggestion noted.
GEF Agency	**Para. 43**	**N/A**	Maybe the approach paper would benefit from one final brief section which outlines the expected evaluation deliverables (e.g. draft evaluation, final evaluation, knowledge management evaluation deliverables, etc).	Noted.
GEF Agency	**Evaluation Matrix**	**Key Evaluation Question 1**	This question is repeated below in the results section of this table. Is there a better way of organizing the questions so that this repetition can be avoided?	The question is mean to be repeated as it supports the evaluation's reporting on results.
GEF Agency	**Evaluation Matrix**	**N/A**	The Evaluation questions are well thought out and the organization of the questions across the three pillars of relevance, effectiveness and results, as well as the different focus areas, is structured and well-planned. The matrix offers a clear and coherent guide for the evaluation process.	Thank you.
GEF Agency	**Evaluation Matrix**	**N/A**	1. Efficiency questions, to look the cost and services of the Network as organizational unit: Is the unit achieving results at a reasonable cost? Are there less costly ways of achieving the same thing? Or are there more cost effective ways to achieve the Network objectives? ; By the review of financial documents of the Network.	Financial documents from both the Network and the GEFSEC will be reviewed for efficiency questions.
GEF Agency	**Evaluation Matrix**	**N/A**	2. Sustainability questions, to review the sustainability of the network as organizational unit or to examine to what extent there is an institutional environment that favors the continuity of the Network as organizational unit.	Sustainability is considered through the financial operations and questions on value and institutional structure/governance of the network.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
GEF Agency	Evaluation Matrix	N/A	The questions below assumes that the Network is a totally separate entity and that the GEF through the GEFSec has no part in it or influence on it. Is this really the situation? If not, then there should also be questions on what GEFSec had done as regards its part, i.e. how has it helped the Network make connections such as with GEF OFPs – here it should also be noted that for the Network to be effective, its connections should not just be with CSOs but also with other key stakeholders in GEF work and in which they need a willing partner such as the GEFSec or GEF agencies in some cases.	Suggestions noted.
GEF Agency	Evaluation Matrix	Key Eval Question: What are the critical factor… In meeting its Objectives?	Again: its objectives, or the mandate given by the Council: these may be different and therefore be articulated differently.	A combination of both Network's articulated objectives and the mandate inferred from Council documents.
GEF Agency	Evaluation Matrix	Key Eval Question: To what extent has the CSO Network met its intended goals and strategic objectives	Again the Networks Goals or the tasks mandated by the GEF Council?	A combination of both Network's articulated objectives and the mandate inferred from Council documents.
GEF Agency	Evaluation Matrix	Credibility: Q "gender mainstreaming"	Only gender? IPs, regional balance, and a variety of other factors are equally significant.	Noted.
GEF Agency	Evaluation Matrix	Credibility: Q 2 "What do GEF Partners think about…."	This is a bit fuzzy and open-ended. It should only be taken in context of the original and added questions below.	Noted
GEF Agency	Evaluation Matrix	Membership: Q1 - What participates in the Network?	It is important to know the key motivations of those that join the Network. The strengthening of a network is dependent on its effective recruitment of committed members. Is the recruitment of such members slow or difficult? Why?	Suggestions noted.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
GEF Agency	Evaluation Matrix	Membership	Add Question: · Have CSO actors along commodity and industrial value chains been included in the network?	Will be reviewed in profile of membership.
GEF Agency	Evaluation Objectives	N/A	This is the most important section of the paper, but it appears after 9 pages of context and background. I would suggest condensing the history/background section to a brief 1 or 2 pages (max) and presenting the evaluation objectives, methodology etc. earlier in the paper. (As suggested above, the detailed history of the Network could be annexed).	Noted. Evaluation objectives brought up in the paper.
GEF Secretariat	Para. 10	N/A	Last line, ADD: *"and the GEF Guidelines for the Implementation of the Public Involvement Policy (*SD/GN/01*)."*	Added.
GEF Secretariat	Para. 12	N/A	For clarity, further explanation should be provided as to why this number was reduced from 660 in 2008.	Noted. An explanation will be provided in the evaluation.
GEF Secretariat	Para. 18	N/A	On the annual regional consultation, the text could clarify if this has ever taken place	Noted. The number and extent of regional consultations will be provided in the evaluation.
GEF Secretariat	Para. 20	Last Line	The "CSO Window": There's a balance still and will go beyond FY2015.	Noted.
GEF Secretariat	Para. 34	N/A	What is the value added of the CSO Network to the GEF Partnership as a whole? This is embedded in some of the questions, however is it possible to have it as an objective of the evaluation or somewhere more relevant in the approach paper.	Questions on value add of CSO Network to GEF Partnership has been clarified.
GEF Secretariat	Para. 35 (i)	N/A	Is it possible to add a higher level objective in terms of determining the value and contribution of the Network to the GEF's mission.	Considered in key question 1
GEF Secretariat	Para. 35 (ii)	N/A	It would be good to have as a result other examples of models for the GEF to work with CSOs. How does this particular Network model compared to other existing ones.	Suggestion noted.
GEF Secretariat	Evaluation Matrix	Connectivity	How are contributions from members channeled upward?	Suggestion noted. Information will be gathered through interviews and focus groups.
GEF Secretariat	Evaluation Matrix	Credibility	Equally important, is the Network perceived as adding value to the GEF partnership? Also, how representative are the members of the Network's Committee?	Question on value has been added and suggestion noted.
GEF Secretariat	Evaluation Matrix	Governance	A question about transparency and accountability should be included. What is the balance of power? How does the governance structure compare to other? Regional elections: what's the evidence in terms of participation? How	Suggestions noted.

Author	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Topic / Paragraph Title	Comment	Reply and actions taken
			active are the members when it comes to voting? How are conflicts resolved?	
GEF Secretariat	**Evaluation Matrix**	**Membership**	On the question: "Who participates in the Network? Are women's organizations represented?" Consider adding IP and Youth	Added
GEF Secretariat	**Evaluation Matrix**	**Membership**	How active are the members in the broader sense? (International NGOs, CBOs,) What's the representation across the board from NGOs and CBOs? Are there any key NGOs missing? Of the existing 400+ members, how many do actually participate or are involved? Also, suggestion of adding a question on "accessibility/membership criteria; how transparent and effective are they"	Suggestions noted
GEF Secretariat	**General Comments**	**CSO Survey Instrument**	I think two additional questions that need to be answered are: 1) What is the value that the CSO Network provides to the GEF partnership? 2) What is the value of the CSO Network to its members? Do CSO Network members receive any benefit from being a part of the Network?	Considered in key question 1
GEF Secretariat	**General Comments**	**CSO Survey Instrument**	When you have your consultation meetings with the CSOs at the ECW as you did in Georgia, is the member of the coordination committee present? If the answer is yes, I would suggest that they are asked to leave as the evaluation, in one way or another, is an evaluation of how those RFP/IFPs have been working. Their presence could inhibit others from offering candid views. Just an idea for consideration.	Suggestion noted