IEO Independent Evaluation Office
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

Audit trail on comments and responding actions

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	LDCF Background and Portfolio- UNFCCC guidance; "Two things I would perhaps lift out and put in one paragraph: 1.The UNFCCC references the previous LDCF evaluation. Would be good to check in the update whether the GEF really 'continued to enhance capacity development and is enhancing long-term domestic institutional capacities' 2. Linked to this the LDC Work program contains elements that link to the previous."	Have added a sentence on the UNFCCC request based on the 2016 evaluation. Also added to the relevance section the mention that this evaluation will explore LDCF responsiveness to guidance from UNFCCC COP, including guidance based on 2016 LDCF evaluation, and to the LDC Work Program.
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	LDCF Background and Portfolio; "If you discuss the number of projects for NAPAs, I would also say how many projects are covered by the $71.63 million [in support to NAPS]. Also note that later on you talk about a September 2019 cut off for this update!"	Have included the number of projects identified as focusing on the NAP process. This update is based on the April 2019 LDCF progress report to council, which is the most recent available, though it does not correspond with our evaluation cutoff date. Have added language to clarify.
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	LDCF Background and Portfolio- the number of Council approved projects in the LDCF portfolio;	We have amended the language to focus only on projects which have been approved by council. We have also added a footnote on the LDCF project cycle.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
			"Is this true? Based on the next part, and previous parts, there are 51 EA's, 12 PIF (!) stage MSP's and 218 FSPs. Either the stage is wrong here (Council approval) or in the part on the next page (PIF stage). You should perhaps add a footnote on the project cycle, or refer to a document on it, given you keep on talking (Table 1 etc.) about projects that are Council approved or have progressed further. Only people in the GEF / IEO will understand what that means,"	
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	LDCF Background and Portfolio- the number of MSPs reaching PIF approval; "Why from the PIF stage onwards? The 2016 evaluation was from Council approval / CEO endorsement and up. What is the value of going further back in the stages of approval?"	Based on our current records, all projects which have reached PIF approval have also been council approved. As we have made council approval the cutoff for inclusion as part of the LDCF portfolio we have amended the language to reflect that.
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	LDCF Background and Portfolio-on transition from PMIS to Portal; "This could also turn out to be a limitation of the evaluation, and should perhaps be mentioned there."	This is noted in limitations section.
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	LDCF Background and Portfolio-on evaluation cutoff date; "Note that	Addressed above. Earlier in the paper we cite information from the April 2019 LDCF Progress Report to council, however the cut-off date for this

Progrm Evaluotion...Dec 2019

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
			earlier you mention an April 2019 cut-off for this update."	update is September 2019. Language has been added to clarify this.
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	Previous Evaluations of the LDCF-finding that Secretariat should ensure that PMIS data is up to date and accurate; "You already concluded earlier that this has not happened! You need to follow up on this also in the update."	Accuracy of GEF project data in PMIS/Portal is an ongoing issue in the partnership, but not a central line of review as part of this evaluation. We will however address data gaps and the transition from PMIS to the Portal.
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	Previous Evaluations of the LDCF-UNDP 2009 Evaluation of work with LDCF/SCCF resources & 2009 Danida and IEO joint evaluation of the LDCF; "I would recap this in half a page. This is by now so old that relevance becomes an issue."	Have revised and shortened discussion.
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	Purpose and objective-focus on LDCF emerging results; "Not that 'emerging' anymore. Maybe focus on performance instead of emerging results. In our evaluability assessment we look at how many of the projects under implementation have reached the MTR point. If you talk about emerging results then I would also review the number of project beyond their mid-point."	The number of completed projects is still relatively small compared to more mature funds. The emerging results will focus on projects with evidence in the form of final evaluations, rather than projects with only project implementation reports available, thus a review of projects which have reached MTR will not be relevant for our study.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	Coverage and Scope-post completion verification; "Maybe reference the SCCE's..."	Have changed the language to clarify this evaluation will use the approach presented to council this December.
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	Coverage and scope-improvement on LDCF Portfolio gender performance; "Only 14% you say earlier."	Language changed to reflect the low baseline.
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	Coverage and scope -discussion of resilience; "That is a very short sway in another direction with a lot of what-if could-vae feel to it."	Deleted.
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	Key evaluation questions-relevance; "Maybe check relevance to the GEF 'continued effort to enhance capacity development and is enhancing long-term domestic institutional capacities'"	Added note that this will be reviewed as part of UNFCCC guidance.
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	Key evaluation questions-application of GEF's gender policies; "Would be good to indicate whether this is against the new gender policy and implementation. No mention in this doc about the new gender policy."	Application of old and new gender policies will be addressed. The new gender policy is discussed in Coverage and scope.
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	Key evaluation questions-Efficiency & project cycle analysis; "Adaptation Fund would be an interesting comparison!"	We will include the AF for comparison if possible.
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	Evaluation Design-evaluations since 2016 LDCF program evaluation that have reviewed the LDCF;	We have included the evaluations of which we are currently aware of and will assess more as we find

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
			"Well, not reflected in the 'previous LDCF evaluations' part of this document."	them through the literature review and interview processes.
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	Evaluation Design-number of Field Visits; "Low, given the matured portfolio."	The number of field visits is limited based on available resources. The IEO is piloting the pos completion evaluation methodology and aims to include two LDCF projects in the piloting process.
External Peer Reviewer	11/22/2019	11/13/2019	Design limitations; "PMIS transition is a clear limitation."	Noted in this section.
UNIDO Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight	11/25/2019	11/13/2019	General Comment; "On the inclusion/understanding of the criteria No. 5 (Additionality and Scale-up). It would be good to have a clarification (footnote or reference) to the definition of additionality. (which looks more as a component of effectiveness)."	Have included a footnote with the more detailed definition of additionality adopted by the GEF IEO in the 2018 GEF IEO information document, "An Evaluative Approach to Assessing GEF's Additionality"
UNIDO Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight	11/25/2019	11/13/2019	General Comment; "The "scale-up" dimension seems to be a related, but still different one, that may need an separated specific criteria (closer to impact, or progress to impact, which is not there present)."	We have removed scale-up as a separate dimension, because it will be covered through the discussion of additionality