

ANNEX M: AUDIT TRAIL OF COMMENTS

Note: The following is a template for the MTR/TE Team to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR/TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR/TE report.

To the comments received on November 21, 2024 (first draft) and December 1, 2024 (second draft) from the Terminal Evaluation of the Strengthening Forest Area Planning and Management in Kalimantan (KALFOR) Project (UNDP Project ID-PIMS: 5029) and The Terminal Evaluation (TE) Team response and actions taken.

Table of comments received from UNDP on first draft report dated November 21, 2024 and TE response.

Author	#	Page No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR/TE report	MTR/TE team response and actions taken
UNDP	1	Cover page	This is about specifying the version in the TE document, from V:2.0 to V:1.0	Change V:2.0 to V:1.0
UNDP	2	Cover page	The corrections include not including the Indonesian flag in the report, correcting the PIMS ID and GEF ID codes, and fixing typos in the document.	The errors have been revised in this document.
UNDP	3	Cover page	This is about the incorrect inclusion of the draft arrangement date.	Include the appropriate date for the initial draft - 25 November 2024
UNDP	4	On the cover page, section 2	Regarding the 'Reviewed by' mention	We have removed the 'Reviewed by' and the names listed, as those individuals are reviewers for a different document
UNDP	5	27	Figure 4 needs to be revised to align with the project's end date.	It did not align with the financial close date and has been corrected.
UNDP	6	27	Regarding the revision of the project's end date	We have revised the project end time.
UNDP	7	51-58	There are several questions regarding pages 51-58 that are marked in red, along with minor corrections and adding the date.	This is about project design/formulation, where we are reviewing the project document design based on the SMART

				criteria: relevance, measurability, realism, and achievability within the timeframe of the project's expected outcomes in KalFor
UNDP	8	73	The financial analysis was not fully included in this document	We have now completed the financial analysis based on the ProDoc design and the project's expenditures.
UNDP	9	108	Additionally, there are still notes about the division of tasks that have not been clarified, as well as page 108.	This has been clarified, and the writing has been completed, addressing the yellow-marked sections that were previously unwritten
UNDP	10	159	The SIGNED UNEG CODE OF CONDUCT FORM has not been included yet.	We have now included the form in Annex Ib.
UNDP	11	167	The information about co-financing has not been included yet.	We have obtained the co-financing document and have added it to the Annex.
UNDP	12	171	We had not included the core indicators in Annex N	We have now added the core indicators to Annex N.

Table of comments received from UNDP on second draft report dated December 1, 2024 and TE response.

Author	#	Page No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR/TE report	MTR/TE team response and actions taken
UNDP	1	Cover page, section 2	The wording in the sentence has been corrected.	The wording in the sentence has been corrected.
UNDP	2	iii	The correction has been made to the document writing process timeline, including the delay period.	We have included the actual period for the

				document writing process based on the delay time.
UNDP	3	6	On page 6, the highest score for sustainability is 4 (likely), but in the table on page 5, it states 'highly likely	The score has been corrected to 'likely' and one score to 'moderately likely.
UNDP	3	7	Is there a summary point that can be included in terms of the projects achievements on gender as this has been significant? Also in terms of inclusion of disabled people, etc	Issues related to gender and disability have been included in this section.
UNDP	4	9	Page 9, Recommendation 4. Based on discussions with the FP Sintang, in the future, the implementation of the EFT mechanism will be attempted using Revenue Sharing Funds (DBH), such as from DBH Palm Oil. Villages managing forested areas in APL in the form of rimba gupung will receive incentives from the DBH distributed to Sintang District. The proportional distribution of DBH to the villages will be determined based on studies and policies from the Sintang District Government.	This has been accommodated in the recommendations section with a more detailed explanation on page 115.
UNDP	5	39	Table 14: Summary of Stakeholder Analysis or Table 13: Assessment of the SRF Assumptions in the Project Document	It has been revised to reflect that it is actually included in Table 15 now.
UNDP	6	60	Page 60, in the table under the evaluation comment column, the MoU example provided pertains to the case in Desa Bangun, MoU with PT Kencana Alam Permai, not Desa Mensiku.	This has been accommodated with the change from Mensiku village to Desa Bangun, as well as the change in the company's name.
UNDP	7	62	Page 62, regarding the sentence 'involve high costs and are perceived as unprofitable,' the suggestion for the TE analysis is to relate it to the company's benefits if they implement the 7% conservation area obligation according to the Kalbar Provincial Regulation No. 6/2018. On the ground, many	This statement has now been included on page 56, as suggested.

			companies are willing to implement HCV in plantations. This not only fulfills the obligation under the regulation but also serves as a requirement for obtaining ISP/RSPO certification.	
UNDP	8		Page 63: 'Law 32' is written without the year (it should be Law 32/2024)	The information has been added.
UNDP	9	73	Possible to add one column on each year's budget (implementation phase) next to 'budget ProDoc; column here?	The questions and suggestions have been accommodated in Table 17.
	10	73	Page 73: In item 127, 'Gov regulation 44' is written without the year.	Page 73: In item 127, 'Gov regulation 44' is written without the year.
UNDP	11	75	Add details of the followings; Whether the project demonstrated due diligence in the management of funds, including periodic audits Observations from financial audits, if any, and a presentation of major findings from audits Any changes made to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions	We have not received any information regarding the financial audit results for this project. We have inquired with the officials and are still awaiting the information.
UNDP	12	76	Do we have 2024 figures?	The co-financing from MoEF was institutionally supported through an official letter until 2023, with no additional contributions in 2024. The difference lies in the exchange rate; I used IDR 15,700, while the project is still using IDR 15,215 per USD. We have corrected the co-financing for this project to USD 61,153,085, in accordance with the PIR document.

UNDP	13	77	Page 77: In the section 'Natural Resources Conservation Agencies,' it states, 'However, the involvement of the BKSDA in the initiation of the KalFor project has been less prominent.' The involvement of BKSDA in KalFor's programs, such as the development of the KELUTAP Masterplan, should be noted. BKSDA Kalbar is the authority for TWA Bukit Kelam, working with KPH Sintang Utara (which is responsible for HL Bukit Luit and HL Bukit Rentap) and the Sintang District government to formulate the KELUTAP Masterplan. The KELUTAP Masterplan is an interconnection masterplan for managing TWA Bukit Kelam, HL Bukit Luit, HL Bukit Rentap, and forest areas in APL surrounding them.	We have accommodated this input and added the information based on the suggestion. It is now located on page 70.
UNDP	14	81	Just to confirm the rating in para #142 on M &E as it reads likes risk log are only captured once a year, instead of QTRly	This has been confirmed in the risk analysis within the QMR conducted up to 2020. It was then transferred to the monthly report, but it covers three months in one file. This report is in table format without information on risk assessment. The risk log is recorded up to 2024.
UNDP	15	116	Please check again in the recommendations section. The recommendations should align with the initial findings and the recommendations that were previously prepared. The 'Entity Responsible' should still include the PMU as it is responsible until December 2024.	The recommendations section has been revised based on the input.

Parameters (newly introduced by IEO in January 2024)		Rating	Comments	Suggestions for improvement	TE Responses
REPORT AND METHODOLOGY					
STRUCTURE	1. Is the evaluation report well balanced and structured? * Does it follow the proposed evaluation report structure detailed in the UNDP Evaluation guidelines (section 4, page 29-30 and Annex 4) * Does it cover all evaluation criteria as requested in the ToR? * Is the length of the main report reasonable for the requirements of the evaluation? * Does the report include all annexes/appendices? (TOR for the evaluation, Evaluation matrix and data collection instruments, List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited, List of supporting documents reviewed)	3	The evaluation report generally followed the proposed evaluation report structured in the TOR and UNDP's "GUIDANCE FOR CONDUCTING TERMINAL EVALUATIONS OF UNDP-SUPPORTED, GEF-FINANCED PROJECTS. Key analytical information/content needs to be included and refined. Required annexes were sighted in the evaluation report except the field mission schedule. The report length is considered too excessive at 120 pages (excluding annexes).	As this is a Terminal Evaluation for a GEF project, the UNDP IEO QA reviewers who will rate this report are likely to be very strict and very rigorous, and will want to see that the report thoroughly meets all criteria. This QA strongly encourages the evaluation to consider addressing all suggestions made here to help improve ratings. Suggestions for improvement are provided below accordingly in this QA to further improve the analytical content and structure of the report for better readability. The report length should be reduced to about 60 pages (excluding annexes). The field mission visit schedule should be in the annex. The evaluation should also refer to the latest UNDP evaluation guidelines (Jan 2024) and the UNDP's "GUIDANCE FOR CONDUCTING TERMINAL EVALUATIONS OF UNDP-SUPPORTED, GEF-FINANCED PROJECTS" to guide its writing of the evaluation report. The evaluation needs to provide more substantive analytical insights with clear reference to evidence in order to justify the high ratings being given and to align with the PIRs. The report Table of Content should follow the proposed report structure mentioned in Section IIF Structure of the Evaluation Report while at the same time Section IIF Structure of the Evaluation Report could be reduced to only highlighting the main sections of the report. An example of this section content at minimum is as follows: The report is divided into four major sections: • Section 1 summarizes the project together with the purpose of the terminal evaluation, scoping and methodology • Section 2 outlines the development context and discusses the problems that the project sets out to address, the strategy adopted, operationalization arrangements and key milestones and stakeholders	

				impacted by the project • Section 3 reports the key findings from the project and presents under the perspectives of project design/formulation, project implementation and project results • Section 4 reveals the summary of the key findings and ratings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations	
	2. Does the report have a high-quality Executive summary that captures the main elements of the report? (Section 4, Annex 4, page 57) * Does it include a brief overview of the purpose and objective- why the evaluation is being undertaken? * Does it include a summary of the evaluation scope and main areas of inquiry - what is being evaluated? * Does it include a summary of key evaluation findings? * Does it include a summary of concluding statements and proposed recommendations?	2	The Executive Summary was too long at 10 pages. There were too many details for the Project Description. Table 4 did not need to be in the Executive Summary. There were too many details on Lessons Learned section. Concluding statements and the proposed recommendations need improvement (highlighted below).	The Executive Summary would need to be significantly revised according to the following sub-sections: (1)A brief overview of the evaluation purpose and objective, (2) Summary of the evaluation scope and main areas of inquiry, (3) Summary of key evaluation findings, (4) Evaluation Rating Table, (5) Summary of concluding statements (QA has suggestions below), (6) Recommendations (QA has suggestions below and to follow the recommendations summary table format as prescribed in the UNDP's "GUIDANCE FOR CONDUCTING TERMINAL EVALUATIONS OF UNDP-SUPPORTED, GEF-FINANCED PROJECTS). Table 4 can be removed. The Lessons Learned content should only have the key messages and should be linked with the concluding statements. Overall the Executive Summary should be only 5-6 pages long	Summary has been revised and shortened to 6 pages
	3. Is the nature and extent of partners' and stakeholder's role and involvement in project implementation explained adequately?	5	The evaluation adequately explained the nature and extent of partners' and stakeholder's role and involvement in project implementation (details found in Table 14)	In the Section IIIG Main Stakeholders, it should be corrected to Table 14 instead of Table 13	

METHODOLOGY	4. Is there an examination of intervention's Theory of Change (ToC)/ results pathway or an attempt to reconstruct the ToC/ results pathway?	2	There was a lack of examination of the project ToC. The evaluation mostly commented on the MTR's insights without providing its own independent assessment on the project ToC.	The evaluation should further examine the project ToC model with the following questions: Was there a clearly defined and robust Theory of Change model? Did the Theory of Change model include: a clear definition of the problem to be addressed and its root causes, desired outcomes, an analysis of barriers to and enablers for achieving outcomes, consideration of how to address barriers, and responses for the project to focus on? In addition to describing the ToC, the evaluation should consider adding a reconstructed logic model or "logic model" narrative (or in the annex) along with a description of the key project activities planned in each outcome component to properly situate the project against which the project results are to be assessed by the evaluation. This is important background information to enable the reader to follow the assessment of results presented later. Ensure the reconstructed logic model included is complete, aligning Outcomes with respective Outputs and Indicators, so that results pathways and the alignment between these and "contributions" are easily seen.	TOC has been revised and completed with the TOC diagram from the ProDoc and a detailed assessment of the TOC in the Annex K.
	5. Is the evaluation's methodological approach clearly outlined? (Section 4 Annex 4, page 58-59) * Did the evaluator explain the general evaluation approach/framework used to answer Evaluation Questions? (i.e., if impact/attribution is to be uncovered, impact assessment methodology; if contribution is to be uncovered other frameworks such as outcome harvesting, contribution analysis, process tracing etc...) * Did the evaluator make a distinction between Methodology adopted for the evaluation and data collection tools (which is	2	The evaluation briefly mentioned the steps and procedures in different phases in implementing the methodological approach but did not clearly explain the methodological approach and lacked substantive details and justification on the methodological approach adopted. While noting that the evaluation proposed to use Mixed Methods approach, this approach may not be considered by UNDP IEO QA as a suitable evaluation methodology.	The evaluation should propose an appropriate evaluation methodology and justify with reasons in selecting this methodology. Some examples of methodological approaches for evaluation include Utilisation-Focused, Realist Evaluation, Participatory Evaluation, Outcome Mapping, Outcome Harvesting, Most Significant Change etc.	The methodology has been revised and improved to make it easier for readers to understand the direction of the work in this document.

	covered under question 6)? * Are any changes from the approach outlined in the TOR detailed?				
DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS	6. Is the data collection and analysis strategy clearly defined? (Section 4 Annex 4, page 59) * Are data sources being clearly detailed? * Are data analysis approaches (including triangulation methods) explained? * Are data collection methods (including sampling strategy) detailed? Note: The evaluator should explain if he/she relied on primary data – their collection or secondary data (the sources from the project documents) whether he/she did surveys, case studies, interviews, focus groups, group discussions, employed geospatial data collection methods etc.	3	The evaluation briefly described the data collection methods used and data sources (list of interviewees provided in the annex). The evaluation did not explain the sampling strategy and did not clearly describe what data analysis techniques were used. The evaluation did not provide clear explanation on the triangulation and data synthesis methods to ensure verification and validation. The Methodology section could be better structured to improve reading flow.	The evaluation should provide more concrete details on all of the data collection methods (including field visit observations), data analysis and sampling techniques utilised. There should be an explanation on triangulation and data synthesis. The evaluation should also include all interview and focus group discussion questions in the annex. The methodology section could be expanded and better arranged for easier readability. An outline example of the section could be as follows: EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY - Evaluation Methodological Approach - Incorporating Cross-Cutting Aspects - Evaluation Data Sampling and Data Collection Method - Evaluation Data Analytical Methods - Data Synthesis and Triangulation/Verification Methods - Evaluation Step-By-Step Phase Approach	
	7. Is the data collection and analysis adequate and sufficiently diverse for the scope of the evaluation? * Are a comprehensive set of data sources included where appropriate? * Is there a clear presentation of data analysis and references to data sources within the report? * Did the evaluator explain how	4	Although there was lack of details in data sampling techniques and data analysis techniques, the data collection and analysis would be considered adequate and the data sources were sufficiently diverse for the scope of the evaluation.	Suggestions for improvement are provided accordingly in this QA to strengthen the evaluation report's analytical content. The evaluation could provide discussion on the use/quality of project monitoring data (or highlight the lack of project monitoring data if the project did not have)	

	project monitoring data was used and verified in the evaluation?				
	8. Are limitations in implementation of the evaluation clearly explained as well as mitigation measures? * Are constraints in access to data (including interviewees and quantitative data sources) explained? * Are explanations provided as to how constraints in access to data were addressed?	3	The evaluation highlighted some limitations/constraints but briefly mentioned the mitigation measures undertaken. Additionally, the effectiveness of the mitigation strategies used could be further explained.	The evaluation could consider expanding more on how the mitigation measures were able to address the limitations/constraints, especially the lack of gender and disability development knowledge, the large volume of data to analyse and the significant delay in engaging the international evaluator. The evaluation should also consider providing more information regarding the effectiveness of the mitigation strategies adopted and the over impact they had in the evaluation and its findings	
CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES	1. If requested in the ToR, does the evaluation adequately include and analyse cross cutting issues such as: * LNOB - Where relevant does the evaluation adequately include and analyse intervention inclusion and impact for human rights, disabilities, minorities and vulnerable groups? Does the report discuss poverty/ environment nexus or sustainable livelihoods issues, as relevant? For further reference: https://erc.undp.org/methods-center/methods/assessing-crossing-cutting-themes/assessing-leaving-no-one-behind * Social and Environmental standards (this is compulsory for GEF evaluations) - Does the report discuss disaster risk	3	The evaluation report had a section on cross cutting issues but the content lacked analytical details on whether project interventions improved the livelihoods/human rights of the affected groups ie. Vulnerable, ethnic/rural, minority, socially excluded and disability groups. The evaluation adequately provided analytical discussion on the project's Social and Environmental standards.	The evaluation should provide more analytical discussion with examples on how project interventions have improved the livelihoods/human rights of the affected groups ie. Vulnerable, ethnic/rural, minority, socially excluded and disability groups as part of social inclusion/LNOB agenda.	

	reduction and climate change mitigation and adaptation issues where relevant? Does the report discuss crisis prevention and recovery issues, as where relevant? For further reference: https://erc.undp.org/methods-center/methods/assessing-crossing-cutting-themes/ses				
	2. Are gender equality and empowerment of women (GEEW) integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and evaluation criteria and questions designed in a way that ensures GEEW related data will be collected? * Does the evaluation include an objective specifically addressing gender equality and/or human rights issues and/or was gender mainstreamed in other objectives? * Was a stand-alone evaluation criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria? * Were one or several dedicated gender equality and empowerment of women evaluation questions integrated into the evaluation? Section 6.10.3, page 11: https://erc.undp.org/pdf/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf	1	GEEW was not integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis. The evaluation did not have any gender-related evaluation criteria/questions.	To ensure integration of GEEW, the evaluation should clearly describe how the methodology, methods and tools, sampling and data analysis techniques selected incorporate gender-responsive aspects. The evaluation should also explain how gender as part of cross-cutting aspects were incorporated.	The revisions to this document have provided more attention and detail regarding gender issues, people with disabilities, the youth, and other marginalized groups.

	UN SWAP Eval Performance Indicator Scorecard: http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2149				
	3. Were gender-responsive methodologies, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques selected? * Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? * Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating gender equality and empowerment of women considerations? * Were diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e., triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? * Do the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected	1	The evaluation had no evaluation matrix questions related to gender. The evaluation did not clearly explain whether its methodology, methods and tools, sampling and data analysis techniques selected were gender-responsive.	As mentioned above, the evaluation report should clearly describe how the methodology, methods and tools, sampling and data analysis techniques selected incorporate gender-responsive aspects. One possible solution is to apply the gender results effectiveness scale (GRES) framework where possible for data analysis.	It has been revised in the context of the GEDSI study results.

	by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate? Section 6.10.3, page 11: https://erc.undp.org/pdf/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf UN SWAP Eval Performance Indicator Scorecard: http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2149				
	4. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis? * Does the evaluation have a background section that includes analysis of specific social groups affected and/ or spelling out the relevant instruments or policies related to gender equality and human rights? * Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/ or disaggregates quantitative data by sex, where applicable? * Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on gender equality and human rights are described? * Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations	2	The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations had no reflections on gender equality and empowerment of women (GEEW). The evaluation did use the GRES scale and provided some high-level comments on the project's contributions to gender equality and women's empowerment and on the project's gender mainstreaming strategy. However there was insufficient analytical insights to understand any anticipated/unanticipated effects of the project interventions on GEEW	The evaluation could assess whether each of the project outputs are gender-responsive using the GRES scale (https://erc.undp.org/pdf/GRES_English.pdf). The evaluation should expand the section on gender equality and women's empowerment to provide analytical details and meaningful insights on how project interventions affect gender equality and women's empowerment. The evaluation could also develop conclusions and recommendations related to gender (but need to be clearly linked to the findings)	We have included the results of the gender and disability study, also referring to the GEDSI study results for the KalFor project.

	addressing issues of gender equality and empowerment of women, and priorities for action to improve gender equality and empowerment of women or the intervention or future initiatives in this area? Section 6.10.3, page 11: https://erc.undp.org/pdf/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf UN SWAP Eval Performance Indicator Scorecard: http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2149				
	5. Does the evaluation include considerations of disability inclusion in the intervention? * Do the evaluation questions cover different aspects of disability inclusion? * Do evaluation findings and analysis provide data and evidence on disability inclusion? * Do the conclusions and/ or recommendations of the evaluation reflect their findings on disability inclusion? Note, this is a new requirement from 2019. Only review this IF the TOR requests inclusion or the report includes an analysis of disability inclusion issues. If there is no request in the TOR mark as N/A Section 6.10.3, page 11: https://erc.undp.org/pdf/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf	1	The evaluation did not provide analytical insights on how the project intervention affected disability inclusion. The TOR did have one criteria with 5 evaluation questions on disability inclusion. There was no conclusion and no recommendations to reflect disability inclusion	The evaluation needs to provide analytical discussion on disability inclusion issues for the project. If possible, the evaluation should develop specific conclusions and recommendations that reflect and address disability inclusion issues	We have added disability issues in this section.

	The UN disability inclusion strategy requires the inclusion of an analysis of the inclusion of disability in evaluations. The strategy and guidance can be found here https://www.un.org/en/content/disabilitystrategy/				
EVALUATION FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS					
FINDINGS/ CONCLUSIONS	1. Does the evaluation report contain a concise and logically articulated set of findings? (Section 4, 4.4.5, p.30; Annex 4, Evaluation template and quality standards, pp.59-60; Section 6, 6.10.4, p.12) * Do the findings address the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions? * Are the findings detailed and supported by evidence? * Do the findings go beyond a summary of activity implementation?	3	The evaluation partially followed the evaluation report template stipulated in the TOR and partially addressed the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions. Some findings were useful insights and supported by evidence while there were other findings what were less substantive. It was noted that the evaluation questions in the evaluation matrix could be more extensive for all evaluation criteria. The evaluation could have developed more questions for more comprehensive analysis. What the evaluation reported in its findings would be reflections/analyses of data	Suggestions for improvement are provided accordingly in this QA. Also as a rule of thumb, the findings content should be written in the past tense, so the evaluation would need to do a thorough editing to correct the grammar.	

			that has already been collected and interpreted. Therefore findings should be written in the past tense.		
	2. Does the Evaluation assess the RELEVANCE of the intervention, if required by the TOR? (As a separate Relevance section or as a discussion within the findings and conclusions) * Does the evaluation draw linkages to the UNDP country programme document outcomes and outputs and/or UNDAF/ UNSDCF? * Does the Evaluation draw linkages to related national government priorities, strategies and plans in the sector/ area of support? * Does the evaluation draw linkages to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated?	4	The evaluation provided sound assessment on the relevance of the project by drawing linkages to UNDP/GEF strategies, national government priorities and plans, and relevant SDGs	The evaluation could further assess the project's stakeholder engagement efforts in the area of (1) Extent to which relevant stakeholders participated in the project formulation, (2) Extent to which the project was formulated according to the needs and interests of all targeted and/or relevant stakeholder groups, (3) Extent to which the project intervention is informed by needs and interests of diverse groups of stakeholders through in-depth consultation. The evaluation could also assess the project's relevance to and complementarity with other project initiatives such as the extent to which lessons learned from other relevant projects were considered in the project's design	

	3. Does the evaluation assess the COHERENCE of the intervention, if required by the TOR (As a separate Coherence section or as a discussion within the findings and conclusions)? Including, but not limited to: * Internal coherence: the synergies and interlinkages between the intervention and other interventions carried out by UNDP. * External coherence: the consistency of the intervention with other actors' interventions in the same context. (Complementarity, harmonization and co-ordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort).	0	The evaluation was not required to assess coherence. The TOR did not request for this		
	4. Does the Evaluation assess the EFFECTIVENESS of the intervention, if required by the TOR? (As a separate Effectiveness section or as a discussion within the findings and conclusions)	2	The evaluation provided discussion in the effectiveness section but it was not clear how these content findings tie back to the project outputs/outcomes. The content appeared to only report what was being done rather than analysing/highlighting what the benefits gained, impact, transformation, changes were as a result of the project interventions. The evaluation comments in the Table 19-22 appear to have more effectiveness insights but they need to be synthesised and the evaluation would need to develop findings based on this information. The lack of meaningful insights would not	The evaluation should revise the content to focus more on project interventions delivered the benefits, impact, transformation, changes. For better readability, the content could also be re-formatted to 4 main sub-sections with reference to the 4 project outcomes. By doing this, the reader could easily attribute/link the effectiveness of project interventions to the corresponding project outputs.	We have revised the entire evaluation comment section based on the feedback provided.

			fully justify the "Highly Satisfactory - 6" rating		
	5. Does the Evaluation clearly assess the EFFICIENCY of the intervention, if required by the TOR? There might be other Efficiency related questions in the ToR which should also be covered by the Evaluation Report, but the Report should always answer the following sub-questions regardless of the ToR: * How well did the intervention use and allocate its human and financial resources? * Does the evaluation detail project funding and provide funding data (especially for GEF)? Are variances between planned and actual expenditures across results/outputs assessed and explained?	3	The evaluation assessed the project's adaptive management and the management of its resources during the COVID-19 period. The evaluation also provided the project financing results and the project utilisation/delivery rate but lacked analytical insights for these results. The current content in the Efficiency section appeared to be more related to Effectiveness. The lack of meaningful insights would not fully justify the "Highly Satisfactory - 6" rating	The current content in the Efficiency section could be amended and moved to the Effectiveness section. The evaluation could provide more justification and analytical insights to explain the reasons for the project financing results and the project utilisation/delivery rate. The evaluation should provide more analytical discussion on the reason(s) behind any of the variances between planned and actual expenditures across results/outcome components assessed for all years to date. The evaluation could also provide deeper analytical discussion on the efficiency of the project management structure, project staff capabilities in delivering the project results. The evaluation should assess the project's efficiency in the areas of financial management processes and management reporting processes.	

	6. Does the Evaluation clearly assess SUSTAINABILITY of the intervention, if required by the TOR? (As a separate Sustainability section or as a discussion within the findings and conclusions)	2	The evaluation provided analytical discussion on the financial sustainability dimension but lacked substantive insights on the sustainability dimensions of (1) institutional framework and governance sustainability, (2) socio-political sustainability and (3) Environmental sustainability. The evaluation also used the incorrect evaluation ratings for the sustainability dimensions of (1) financial risks to sustainability and (2) institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability,	The evaluation would need to use the sustainability ratings as prescribed in the GEF Terminal Evaluation guidelines. The evaluation should provide more analysis on the project sustainability dimensions based on the following guidance questions as follows: SOCIO-ECONOMIC RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY - Are there any political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? - What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? - Is there sufficient public/ stakeholder awareness in support of the objectives of the project? - Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis? - Are the project's successful aspects being transferred to appropriate parties, potential future beneficiaries, and others who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future? INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND GOVERNANCE RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY - Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize project benefits? - Has the project put in place frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that will create mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer after the project's closure? - How has the project developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date? - How has the project identified and involved champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society) who can promote sustainability of project outcomes? - Has the project achieved stakeholders' (including	We have made corrections in this section from pages 103 to 110.
--	--	---	---	---	--

				government stakeholders') consensus regarding courses of action on project activities after the project's closure date? - Does the project leadership have the ability to respond to future institutional and governance changes (i.e. foreseeable changes to local or national political leadership)? - Can the project strategies effectively be incorporated/mainstreamed into future planning? ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY - Are there environmental factors that could undermine and reverse the project's outcomes and results, including factors that have been identified by project stakeholders?	
	7. Does the evaluation include an assessment of the results framework, its reporting and overall quality? (Section 6, p.10) * Is there an assessment of the quality of results framework, its indicators and level of disaggregation by sex and other vulnerable groups?	5	The evaluation provided a comprehensive assessment of the results framework and also noted the final results of the indicators and final achievements in Tables 19-22. However this Table 19-22 was too detailed to be in the main section. The evaluation	The evaluation should place the Table 19-22 in the annex and provide a summary assessment of the results framework on its reporting and overall quality in the main section of the report.	

	* Are all indicators in the Results Framework assessed and analysed by the evaluator with final achievements noted?		also assessed the SMART quality of the results framework indicators		
	8. Does the evaluation include an assessment of the monitoring system of the intervention (projects/ programmes M&E design and implementation) and its overall quality? (Section 6, p.10)	3	The evaluation provided bullet pointers like a checklist in assessing the M&E design which was insufficient to justify the "6" rating. For M&E implementation assessment, the evaluation provided analytical discussion but could have The paragraph "Overall, implementation/oversight by UNDP and execution by the Implementing Partner have been effective, particularly in project implementation, coordination, and addressing operational issues." did not appear to be relevant to M&E issues. The evaluation could have assessed the M&E performance and M&E competencies of the project team. The evaluation could have assessed the implementation of its monitoring strategy by assessing the outputs of the PRODOC monitoring plan.	The evaluation needs to provide more analytical details on the assessment of the M&E system at design stage. Guidance questions could be: (1) Was the M&E plan well-conceived, practical and sufficient at the point of CEO Endorsement? Was it articulated sufficiently to monitor results and track progress toward achieving objectives? (2) Did the M&E plan include a baseline, SMART indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results? (3) Were baseline conditions, methodology, logistics, time frames, and roles and responsibilities well-articulated? (4) Was the M&E budget in the project document sufficient? (5) Did the M&E plan specify how the project will keep the GEF OFP informed and, where applicable and feasible, involved, while respecting the independent nature of the TE process? As the PRODOC had a monitoring plan, the evaluation could also assess the progress of each M&E activity stated in the monitoring plan in a table format. There could be more explicit analysis on the M&E competencies and capabilities of the project team. Essentially the evaluation needs to provide more substantive insights and no issues to justify the "6" rating.	

	9. Is there a discussion and analysis of risk management and the quality of adaption/mitigation measures in the evaluation report including Social and Environmental Safeguards?	4	The evaluation provided analytical discussion of the discussion and analysis of risk management and the quality of adaption/mitigation measures in the evaluation report including Social and Environmental Safeguards. The evaluation also discussed and analysed the project's risk identification process during project design stage (including analysis of the risks and assumptions) and the quality of the risks identified/adaptation and mitigation measures in the PRODOC. ther risks that emerged or evolved during project implementation. The evaluation also provided independent assessment on the quality of the key safeguard implementation measures adopted in the project	The evaluation could provide more analysis on the Project Board's oversight function on risk management	
	10. Does the evaluation report contain a concise and logically articulated set of conclusions which are standalone in nature? (Section 4, 4.4.5, p.30; Annex 4, UNDP evaluation report template and quality standards, p.60; Section 6, 6.10.4, p.12) * Do conclusions build on the findings (supported with data and interview sources)? * Are they clear, concise and well substantiated? * Do they address the objectives of the evaluation?	2	The conclusions highlighted the strengths, weaknesses and summarised results of the project, but lacked concise and logically articulated set of conclusions which are standalone in nature. Additionally, the evaluation conclusions were not clearly built on the findings with clear insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems/ issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the	The evaluation could build on the findings and Lessons Learned to develop conclusions that are standalone to provide clear insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems/ issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF. The evaluation should also link the relevant lessons learned with the relevant conclusions to provide strategic insights for future programming.	We have corrected several points in the conclusion based on the feedback provided.

			GEF. Lessons Learned content were useful		
RECOMMENDATIONS	11. Are the evaluation recommendations clear, concise, targeted (at UNDP and/or implementing partners), realistic and actionable (ie. linked to country programme outcomes and strategies and actionable by the country office) given the size and scope of the intervention? (Section 4, 4.4.5, p.30; Annex 4, UNDP evaluation report template and quality standards, pp.60; Section 6, 6.10.4, p.12)	2	The evaluation proposed 7 recommendations and additional 2 "lesson for the future". It was not clear whether these 2 "lesson for the future" were recommendations to implement. The 7 recommendations lacked timeframe to implement and there were no clear information on which entity would be responsible to implement the recommendations. The recommendations also lacked content on actionable steps (how it should be done) and without clear step details on how to implement them. The recommendations would need to be linked clearly to the basis of the findings and conclusions.	The evaluation should follow the recommendation table format in the GEF TE guidelines and ensure that each recommendation has adequate details on how to action the recommendation, describing not only "what" should be done but also "how" it should be done. Each recommendation should clearly state who would be the responsible entity/entities to implement. There could be clearer sub-headings for each recommendation and the recommendations in the Executive Summary would just have the sub-headings while the details of each recommendation would be found in the main report. The evaluation should consider providing a timeframe and with priority level (High/Medium/Low) for each recommendation. The evaluation should also review the recommendations to link each recommendation to corresponding key findings (to number each key finding for easy reference) and concluding statements. In order to do this, the evaluation would need to consolidate the key findings in a table list and refine the conclusions to have key concluding statements backed by standalone insights. The evaluation could look at inserting a table list of key findings just before the Conclusion section (make sure that the key findings are already appropriately placed in the relevant sections of the report). Each recommendation could then provide information on linkages with the relevant key finding and concluding statement.	We have revised the recommendations as suggested by creating a table and making assessments of the priority scale to be implemented.

	Average rating	2,70			

