

Color coding:

IEO / IEG	GEF Agency
GEF Secretariat	Peer Reviewer
GEF STAP	CSO Network

Audit trail on comments and responding actions taken

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
IEO	15 Sept '16	15 Sept '16	On the gender question under results and sustainability; "No word has been spent on how SCCF has dealt with gender in the previous sections. While important per se, I feel the approach paper would gain from some mention in the background sections on how gender is (or is not) dealt with in the SCCF."	The section on breadth and depth of coverage has been moved before the main evaluative questions.
IEO	15 Sept '16	15 Sept '16	No need to reiterate the core evaluation criteria under assessing performance.	Deleted.
IEO	15 Sept '16	15 Sept '16	On the resilience section; "I would not give definitions in an approach paper. If it is really considered necessary, I would put this definition in a footnote"	Definition was moved to the footnote.
IEO	15 Sept '16	15 Sept '16	Public involvement section; Comment on definitions in the main text.	Definition was moved to the footnote.
IEO	15 Sept '16	15 Sept '16	Evaluation design; Comment on definitions in the main text.	Definition was moved to the footnote.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
IEO	15 Sept '16	15 Sept '16	<p>Evaluation design, 'real-time learning evaluation'. "I would caution on whether to use this term: the SCCF has been around since a very long time. Real-time. Real-time evaluations apply to relatively young and ongoing interventions."</p> <p>"All evaluation serve learning (as well as accountability) purposes. I don't see why this evaluation should only serve learning purposes, considering it the fact that the SCCF has been around for long and. However, if the focus needs to be on learning, maybe 'formative evaluation' would be a better term to define this evaluation."</p>	The real-time element has been taken out of the description. The text has been adjusted to convey the importance of learning lessons, without being too prescriptive or able to be viewed as favoring learning over accountability.
IEO	15 Sept '16	15 Sept '16	Evaluation design – field visits; "Field visits to two SCCF countries? If that is the case, I guess these will be selected from countries with a sizeable concentration of SCCF investments, so maybe this can already be stated as selection criteria here"	Correct. The paragraph has been adjusted accordingly, giving concise information on country selection criteria.
IEO	15 Sept '16	15 Sept '16	Evaluation design – Triangulation with the aim to test preliminary findings; "This language is misleading. What we test is whether there are gaps in the data, or errors of interpretation."	Correct. The text has been adjusted accordingly.
IEO	15 Sept '16	15 Sept '16	Limitations; "This section should also deal with how the team plans to address the expected limitations mentioned."	The section has been adjusted accordingly.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
IEO	15 Sept '16	15 Sept '16	Limitations due to relative young age; "More than 15 years of operation, young? Perhaps maturity. This should be spelled out more clearly and somewhere in the early sections of the paper."	Agreed. The focus is on maturity and the text has been adjusted to reflect this.
IEO	15 Sept '16	15 Sept '16	Limitations – second paragraph; "I think the problem will be limited time constraining the amount of information that can be collected, I do not see the link to validity, and especially independence of the information that will be possible to gather".	The paragraph has been rephrased.
IEO	15 Sept '16	15 Sept '16	Limitations – on the SCCF-A and SCCF-B windows focus; "This paragraph is not about limitations. It should definitely go under the scoping section. It should also explain why the adaptation activities mentioned will not be covered."	Agreed. Section has moved and the reason why this focus has been further discussed.
IEO	15 Sept '16	15 Sept '16	On quality assurance; "Quality assurance is not due diligence with the audience of the evaluation. I would suggest to include an external peer reviewer to quality assure externally the evaluation."	There is a difference between key stakeholders and audience. The mid-level consultant will have an open peer reviewing function. This text has been adjusted to reflect this.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 3. "The emergence of the GCF is changing the landscape of international climate finance and with it the role of the SCCF." -> Changing it in what way? Would be useful to provide some brief context here.	A new paragraph has been added on the GCF.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Table 1 - attached document for a potential alternative / complementary means of presenting the info in tables 1 and 2.	Noted. The alternative representation style does not take into account the time a project has been in the pipeline. Based on the comment a new figure is added to the annex.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 12. "Activity windows SCCF-C and SCCF-D have not received any contributions to date." -> Pledges or contributions	Adjusted accordingly
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 14. Over what time period was this turnaround calculated? Could the sentence start "The evaluation found that, during the period xxxx – 2009, the average time elapsed...."? Also, add ""(approx. 13-14 months)", to allow for easier comparison with the subsequent 22-month figure.	The UNDP evaluation does not provide sufficient information to provide a time period. Adjusted accordingly.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 14. -> First use of PIF acronym, spell out in full.	Adjusted accordingly.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 14. "The evaluation's recommendations were not very targeted' -> well targeted?	Adjusted accordingly.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 14. "due to a lack of SCCF funding, the project pipeline was on hold for several years." -> how many years?	This is a statement taken over from the evaluation. It does not further review how many years. The text will be adjusted accordingly to show it is conclusion from that specific evaluation.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 15. "...provide lessons and experiences from implementation of the first climate change adaptation strategy supported by the GEF." -> Link it to the SCCF.	The SPA only used GEF Trust Fund money.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 16. "The IEO conducted an evaluation of the SCCF in 2011" -> Suggest placing in brackets "(the predecessor to this current evaluation)"	Adjusted accordingly.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 16. "Since then more projects have been completed and the portfolio as a whole has grown as well." -> Don't think this is needed here.	Changed the sentence.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 17. "Technical Paper 8 provides an overview of COP guidance to the GEF." -> Is this sentence necessary?	Yes. It is COP guidance that also informs this evaluation, which is discussed earlier.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 18. "18. The Fifth Overall Performance Study (OPS5),..." -> "...evidence gathered through the GEF on adaptation..."?	Changed the sentence.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 19. "It concludes that the proportion of multi-focal area (MFA) projects in the LDCF and SCCF is relatively low..." -> Compared to what? Later, it is stated that 30.1% of funds go to MTF projects... what is the typical figure for other (non-SCCF) programmes? "The review also finds that the proportion of projects that combine different Focal Area objectives..." -> My interpretation of this paragraph is that the proportion of MFA projects is apparently low (30.1% of funds), but – in reality – 85% of SCCF projects could / should be regarded as MFAs.	The paragraph has been adjusted accordingly.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 19. -> Additionally, the implication of the paragraph is that the SCCF should be increasing the proportion of MFAs and/or MTF projects. If that is the case, should the text include a short explanation as to why an increased proportion of MFA/MTF projects is desired?	This part of the working paper provides information on previous evaluations, without going beyond the conclusions of those evaluations. The evaluative evidence of this evaluation might provide more insight into what is desirable towards the future.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Stakeholders and audience -> Donors aren't mentioned here: that's not necessarily a problem, but the lack of a reference is noticeable	The LDCF/SCCF Council members are mentioned as primary stakeholders as well as target audience. Donors are part of the LDCF/SCCF Council members who requested this SCCF program evaluation update.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Stakeholders and audience -> I suggest relocating the 'Breadth and Depth of Coverage' subsection to here.	Some elements of the coverage section might be placed below stakeholders and audience, while other sections are better positioned in the next section. The working paper follows the template for working papers. A reference will be added to the next section.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 22. Second sentence -> This is a difficult sentence to understand (there's maybe too much detail). How about: "SCCF-B's adaptation activities can be directly linked to GEF's strategic objectives and results framework. However, SCCF-B's technology transfer component for mitigation falls outside the scope of GEF's strategic objectives and results framework."	The paragraph has been adjusted.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Box 1 – three strategic objectives -> Suggest in brackets “(as included within the TOC)” or similar.	Adjusted accordingly.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Box 1 – two strategic pillars -> It is noticeable that these aren't explicitly represented in the TOC. I think the first objective is reasonably well covered by other TOC elements, but the second objective (expanding synergies) isn't really represented anywhere.	The SCCF portfolio consists of SCCF as well as MTF projects, the latter often being MFA projects. Even single focal area SCCF projects can show synergies towards other GEF focal areas, and this will be part of the portfolio analysis.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 28. -> I would suggest wording that does not exclude C and D entirely. Certainly only windows A and B can be evaluated for results, and C and D are necessarily excluded from results measurement, given the lack of funding and activity. However, I would also suggest not removing C and D entirely from the scope: we may want to explore why C and D haven't received any support (I'd actually suggest that this is a really important EQ to answer).	This section has been adjusted accordingly.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 32. Relevance -> Could the analysis of relevance concentrate on the changing funding environment (particularly GCF) and the extent to which SCCF is likely to remain relevant in the near future? This could extend to an analysis of potential areas of duplication between the various funds.	Part of the analysis will now also focus on the changing climate finance landscape, with the question “What is the niche of the SCCF in the global adaptation finance landscape of multilateral financial mechanisms?”

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 32. Relevance -> why “environmental and sustainability agendas”, and not explicitly “climate change agendas”?	Not all countries have a separate climate change agenda, but it is part of their environmental and sustainability agendas.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 32. Effectiveness -> Suggest just removing this part of the EQ (i.e. EQ would start “How likely is it that...”)	Adjusted accordingly.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 32. Efficiency -> I think the term ‘efficiency’ needs a more detailed description, potentially achievable through more detailed sub-questions, e.g.: “How cost efficient has the programme been?” “How administratively efficient has the programme been?” (or similar broad phrasing, in order to capture elements such as approval timings, project cycle timings etc.)	Refer to the terminal evaluation guideline on the defining of evaluation criteria. Further sub-questions will be developed as part of the evaluation matrix. The analysis of GEF’s efficiency as a host of financial mechanisms is being executed as a study that is part of OPS6, the upcoming overall performance study.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 32. Efficiency -> Should this just be “projects”? Or should this be broadened to “programme” (which by definition would include ‘projects’ but would also ensure we can measure broader programme efficiency)?	There are only three SCCF child projects that are part of broader programmatic approaches. Given the small amount of relevant parents and children, a comparison with standalone projects – the majority of projects – will not be possible.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 32. Efficiency -> How about extending the part of predictability slightly: “How have resource flows and predictability affected the Fund’s programming?”	Adjusted accordingly.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 32. Efficiency -> On predictability: Although the focus of this EQ will be on windows A and B, it could also be the point where we can explore the lack of C and D funding...	Noted.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 32. Efficiency -> Given the 2011 evaluation recommendation, does there need to be an EQ looking specifically at the pre-selection criteria? E.g. "How effective have pre-selection criteria been as a means for managing the Fund's efficiency and effectiveness?"	Adjusted accordingly. "How have pre-selection criteria influenced, either positively or negatively, the Fund's efficiency and effectiveness?"
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 32. Sustainability -> How about an explicit question following up the 2011 evaluation? "To what extent have recommendations from the 2011 evaluation been addressed?"	The recommendations have been followed up in the management action records of the LDCF/SCCF annual evaluation reviews. The recommendation to appeal to donors to adequately fund the SCCF in a predictable manner, preferably through a replenishment process, was graduated without adoption.
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 33. -> Will the evaluation be measuring progress against AMAT indicators (at programme and/or project level)? If so, a brief reference here could be useful.	No, it will not.
	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 34. "most outcomes are forthcoming..." -> Or "...very long-term in nature"?	Not all adaptation outcomes are necessarily long-term in nature.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
Peer reviewer	11 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 36. -> It would be good to establish the exact purpose of these two activities (wider literature review, meta-evaluation review), and the anticipated outputs from these two activities. Looking back at the 2011 evaluation, my view is that both of these elements were perhaps too lengthy and could have been more directly focused on identifying findings / value of clear, direct importance to the main evaluation.	Noted.
IEG	18 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	There is the sense that the draft approach paper over-emphasizes smaller questions and misses some important big picture questions such as governance, global relevance, hosting, and sustainability of funding.	Noted. Individual comments will be reviewed below. It should be noted that the SCCF program evaluation is requested by Council as follow-up to – or update of – the 2011 SCCF program evaluation, with the aim to provide evaluative evidence on the progress towards SCCF objectives, major achievements and lessons learned since the Fund's establishment. This, in a sense, creates or indicates the evaluation's boundaries as to what is requested by the main stakeholders.
IEG	18 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Governance has often been a key driver of partnerships' efficacy, in IEG's experience. Governance pertains to the legitimacy and effectiveness of the governing body and is distinct from the effectiveness of day-to-day management. Governance is absent from the draft approach paper.	Noted. Governance, in the sense of the GEF being the right host for funds, is part of OPS6 – the overall performance study of the GEF, which includes the LDCF and SCCF as adaptation funds governed by the GEF.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
IEG	18 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	<p>The global relevance of the SCCF needs to be assessed; the evaluation questions on relevance currently in the draft approach paper are not broad enough. Does the SCCF offer any particular special value not present in other funds? Given the existence of GCF and to some extent the PPCR, and the limited success in fund raising for SCCF, is it still relevant?</p>	<p>While it is not within the requirements from Council, it is seen as important and an evaluative question has been added.</p> <p>Part of the analysis will focus on the changing climate finance landscape, with the question “What is the niche of the SCCF in the global adaptation finance landscape of multilateral financial mechanisms?”</p>
IEG	18 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	<p>Hosting in the GEF. The evaluation may want to consider how good a host the GEF is.</p> <p>The theory of change in Figure 3 could think more about the specific (institutional, fiduciary, HR, etc.) contributions of the GEF and how these then influence the functioning of the SCCF and its downstream projects.</p> <p>The fund provides financing – but the evaluation could also ask what else the GEF provides institutionally for these projects, how GEF involvement affect project designs, selection, technical quality, etc. In understanding the separate contributions of the GEF, the GEF implementing agencies, and the project teams in leading to the various outcomes areas, the evaluation could help to focus on and critically assess the GEF’s institutional contributions as host.</p>	<p>Noted. Hosting is part of OPS6 – the overall performance study of the GEF, which includes the LDCF and SCCF as adaptation funds governed by the GEF</p>

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
IEG	18 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Funding is a key aspect of sustainability that the draft approach paper touches upon but doesn't tackle heads-on. The relatively modest contributions to the fund, the unpredictability of the funding, and the fact that apparently only 13 operations are complete, 15 years after the establishment of the fund make it important to review issues around the development and funding of the project pipeline and the SCCF more broadly.	The 2011 evaluation's recommendation on funding was retired without adoption. This evaluation will again assess how resource flows and predictability, or the lack thereof, have affected the Fund's programming. While being established in 2001, the Fund only became fully operational after receiving guidance at COP-12 (2006) and receiving contribution. By September 2007 close to \$60 million were received and the first projects started implementation in August 2007.
IEG	18 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	The evaluation could consider some additional evaluation sub-questions. For example, on relevance, the evaluation could consider whether collectively the supported operations focused on the most significant climate change issues facing each country receiving support. How has the portfolio performed in aggregate on relevance? What lessons have been learned at the project level? How adequate are monitoring and evaluation systems for determining whether the climate change goals of the projects are being met? Understanding and assessing the portfolio of projects (in addition to the institutional performance of the fund) will be an important advance beyond the previous SCCF evaluation.	Noted. The relevance of the project portfolio towards FCCC guidance and decisions, GEF adaptation strategy and global environmental benefits will be assessed. Lessons learned at project level will be reviewed for all completed projects. A project review protocol is being developed to review all projects, with specific questions for those projects having been CEO endorsed/approved and/or under implementation, and completed projects.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
IEG	18 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	The team could also explore whether the portfolio is of standalone projects or of SCCF blended with other operations. If there are both, how do they compare? Which strategy seems to make more sense?	There are only three SCCF child projects that are part of broader programmatic approaches. All other projects are standalone. Given the small amount of relevant parents and children, a comparison between blended and standalone projects – the majority of projects – will not be possible. But standalone projects might also address other focal areas, which will be assessed as part of the project portfolio review.
IEG	18 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	The paper states that interviews will be conducted with GEF agencies and government actors; it might be useful to interview project managers in addition to formal GEF counterparts.	Noted. This will be taken into account during site visits.
IEG	18 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	The paper states that field visits will be conducted based on “mutually beneficial synergies explored between evaluations endeavors”. Establishing an upfront criteria for selecting field visits might help to improve the transparency of the evaluation and ensure that project selection is subject to quality assurance procedures.	Criteria will be added, being the maturity of country project portfolios, appropriate mix of implementing agencies and regions.
IEG	18 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	The approach paper contains a significant amount of background exposition, which could potentially be moved to an annex to make the main text more succinct.	The approach paper follows the IEO approach paper template, which places a short meta-evaluation review in the body of the paper.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF Secretariat	20 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Figure 2 shows a set of multilateral entities that among other things also finance adaptation activities. However, the track record of those entities distinguishes them when it comes to the specific types of adaptation activities that have been financed under each of the multilateral funds listed. In particular, the SCCF has focused more on highly innovative approaches in new and emerging adaptation areas, which provide the basis for upscaling by other financing mechanisms. The Adaptation Fund has financed in particular community-based adaptation, focuses on livelihoods and other areas, while the Green Climate Fund has taken previously financed concepts and scaled them up towards achieving transformational impact. This differentiation does not seem to be taken into account here, and then sentence as written puts all the funds on the same page.	The paragraph has been adjusted and now gives examples of focus areas of funds.
GEF Secretariat	20 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 6. -> If one was to consider the first project approvals to be considered for the GCF as entering the fully operational phase, then the time frame would be the end of 2015, rather than 2014.	Noted.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF Secretariat	20 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 7. -> This is not entirely accurate as the LDCF has a different project cycle, and thus the operational procedures are different.	Noted. The paragraph has been adjusted accordingly; ... unless the LDCF/SCCF Council decides that it is necessary for either the SCCF or the LDCF to modify procedures in response to COP guidance, or to facilitate the operations of the Funds to successfully achieve their respective objectives.
GEF Secretariat	20 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 11. [...] According to PMIS... -> Perhaps official Council documents, such as the Progress Report and AMR, could be referenced instead of PMIS?	The text has been adjusted. PMIS data was cross-referenced against official Council documents. Though it should be noted that a project management system should be able to provide reliable data.
GEF Secretariat	20 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 13. And Par. 14. 14.As of March 31, 2016... -> This can be updated to reflect the date of the most recent Trustee Status Report on the SCCF, which has been published on the GEF website ahead of the 21st LDCF/SCCF Council meeting.	The paragraphs and also all Tables have been updated to reflect the most recent Trustee Status reports for the SCCF as well as SCCF progress reports.
GEF Secretariat	20 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 16. On the SPA evaluation -> In how far is this statement [on resilience] related or relevant to a SCCF evaluation? If not directly relevant, perhaps it could be omitted.	It links to the synergistic nature of adaptation interventions that aims to increase resilience to the adverse impacts of climate change.
GEF Secretariat	20 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	Par. 23. -> The adaptation task force is composed of GEF Agencies and STAP, and is therefore included in the first sentence.	Deleted.

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF Secretariat	20 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	<p>Par. 15. [...]the project pipeline was on hold for several years and older PIFs would need to be redefined... -> Please note that there is no “hard” pipeline of SCCF projects. Once projects are submitted, and assessed for technical merit by the GEF Secretariat in collaboration with STAP, they are either approved or not approved. Funding proposals that were not approved are not queued into a pipeline as would be the case in the LDCF. Therefore, the current formulation of this sentence seems misleading.</p>	<p>The text has been adjusted accordingly; The evaluation did conclude that due to “the freezing of SCCF funding, the process [ed. refers to project cycle] process has been on hold for several years [...] and PIFs made previously may become obsolete and need to be redefined, should new funding become available.” It should be noted that currently there is no hard pipeline of SCCF projects. Once projects are submitted, and assessed for technical merit by the GEF Secretariat in collaboration with STAP, they are either approved or not approved. Funding proposals that were not approved are not queued into a pipeline as is the case for the LDCF.</p>
GEF Secretariat	20 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	<p>Par. 30. On gender -> It could be relevant to analyze trends over time as well, in addition to looking at the portfolio overall. The importance of gender mainstreaming, and later gender responsiveness, has become clearer over the years, and the GEF Secretariat has increasingly prioritized gender-sensitive approaches as evidence of their importance has emerged.</p>	<p>This will be done as part of the gender sub-study for OPS6.</p>

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF Secretariat	20 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	<p>Par. 30. On resilience -> The term “resilience” has been used out of context at times, in particular by Council members, for instance when referring to the resilience of investments in other focal areas of the GEF such as biodiversity or land degradation. It should remain clear throughout the document and analysis that the resilience referred to here is related to the adverse effects of climate change.</p> <p>-> The focus cannot be “resilience” in the broadest sense” but has to be whether the portfolio, has enhanced capacity, reduced vulnerability to the adverse impacts of CC and put adaptation measures in place.</p>	<p>Noted. Text has been adjusted accordingly; The focus of the evaluation, in line with the TOC in figure 3, will be on early evidence as to whether completed projects have contributed to resilience to the adverse effects of climate change.</p>
GEF Secretariat	20 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	<p>Par. 33. To what extent are the emerging results of SCCF support sustainable? -> Perhaps we can have a forward looking question here, e.g. How can the SCCF assist the countries, GEF etc. as we move forward to GEF 7. How can the lessons learnt inform the future of the GEF etc.</p>	<p>Noted. The comment will inform the way that lessons learned are analyzed.</p>
GEF Secretariat	20 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	<p>Par. 34. -> As stated here by referring to “among others”, there are several different performance criteria. Is there a specific reason to highlight only the one on mainstreaming adaptation into broader developmental policies, plans and programs?</p>	<p>Noted. The last sentence was provided to give an example, not an exhaustive list. The sentence has been taken out of the approach paper.</p>

Commenter	Date comment	Document version	Comment	Reply and responding actions taken
GEF Secretariat	31 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	<p>16. The 2011 evaluation of the GEF Strategic Priority for Adaptation (SPA) pilot program -> SPA was very different – because it was obligated to combine adaptation and GEBs, it was effectively a multifocal portfolio, with “mainstreaming”. The SPA was funded from the GEF TF.</p> <p>The SCCF has a different mandate and is not obligated to generate GEBs, i.e. link up explicitly with other GEF FAs. Therefore, it is a fair question how relevant and transferrable this recommendation is to the SCCF.</p>	<p>While the SPA was quite different from the SCCF, the evaluation’s recommendation was aimed more generally towards the GEF. The recommendation in itself will not be projected onto the SCCF portfolio, but one of the two strategic pillars “Expanding synergies with other GEF focal areas” partially reflects the recommendation of the SPA evaluation. “The expanding of synergies with other GEF focal areas is one of the two strategic pillars part of the GEF programming strategy on climate change adaptation for the LDCF and the SCCF” has been added.</p>
GEF Secretariat	18 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	<p>20. OPS5 Technical Document 3 (2013) -> Maybe it would be clearer to say that combining of LDCF and SCCF resources with other FAS in MTF projects has only become possible through a new modality introduced in GEF-5. BTW, there was interest in doing so earlier, but there was no modality.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
GEF Secretariat	18 Oct '16	15 Sept '16	<p>33. Question on Results and Sustainability -> How about a question on innovativeness?</p>	<p>Innovation – as part of results – will be reviewed as part of the lessons learned at project level for completed projects.</p>