

## Audit trail on comments and responding actions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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