

Audit Trail

To the comments received on November 6, on November 18, and November 25, for the Terminal Evaluation of the 10 Islands Project

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft terminal evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Author	#	Comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft report	Evaluator's response and actions taken
UNDP OECS	1	Scope & Methodology	Could we be a little more explicit here? I note there were some issues regarding the availability of personnel for site visits and we also found that there had been several shifts in personnel out of Government that resulted and it was difficult to track them down to get specific comments on project implementation.	Information added.
UNDP OECS	2	Log Frame & Indicators	For clarity, we should say that UNDP-GEF recommended that the indicators be maintained and, instead, reporting should be disaggregated to identify the incremental impact of the GEF resources.	Added.
UNDP OECS	3	Design Formulation	Can we give specific example(s) of how the failure to effectively identify readiness affected implementation in different countries?	Examples added in text and in footnote.
UNDP OECS	4	Design Formulation	As above, can we say what impact, if any, this had on the project outcomes? On the sustainability of the outputs?	Edited.
UNDP OECS	5	Assumptions	Were any specific downside risks identified? Were they reasonable and well-defined?	Risk issues analysis incorporated.
UNDP OECS	6	Partnership Arrangements	Can we comment here on the extent/quality of the engagement with stakeholders? Did stakeholders express satisfaction with the level of engagement? Were outputs (e.g. integrated resource management plans) reflective of broad, structured stakeholder engagement?	Added.
UNDP OECS	7	Feedback From Monitoring And Evaluation	Same comment as before re: UNDP-GEF vs. GEF	Edited.
UNDP OECS	8		I think it would be useful to mention here the Quality Assurance reporting and the extent to which these reports were used to support decision-making.	Quality assurance reporting is mentioned. Yet although have gone back to all the board meetings information [agendas, minutes, and so on] there is nothing there that can support a statement on how these reports were used to support decision – making. Also, it was not part of the evaluation questions nor did it come

				up in interviews on their own. Therefore, do not have information to assess whether or if quality assurance supported decision- making processes.
UNDP OECS	9	Project Finance	There seems to be a problem with this chart. The approved budget is higher than the approved total from the Project Document. If this is an issue in Atlas, suggest removing this chart.	Chart removed. Source was PIR.
UNDP OECS	10	Monitoring And Evaluation: Design At Entry And Implementation	Aside from the exclusion of a mid-term evaluation, was the M&E plan well-formulated? Is there anything we can say here about whether M&E was budgeted for adequately?	The formulation of the plan is indicated in the last sentence already. Sentence moved up so that it was clear. Cannot determine whether the plan was budgeted properly, regretfully. The 'golden rule' for evaluations is 1% of total budget, but is not a written rule as far I know, and it is only for the evaluations, not for the full M & E plan. Would not know how to assess the adequacy of the budget (70 000USD) for a project of this type with such large co – financing.
UNDP OECS	11	Monitoring And Evaluation: Design At Entry And Implementation	ibid	Edited.
UNDP OECS	12	Implementing Partner And Undp Implementation / Execution Coordination, And Operational Issues	This point here should be specified	Specified.
UNDP OECS	13	Implementing Partner And Undp Implementation / Execution Coordination, And Operational Issues	While the idea up to the middle of this paragraph seems fairly clear, I think the last sentence needs some clarification.I am left not being sure of your opinion of the last option identified. Was this a view that was raised during interviews?	Edited.
UNDP OECS	14	Implementing Partner And Undp Implementation / Execution Coordination, And Operational Issues	ibid	Edited.
UNDP OECS	15	Implementing Partner And Undp Implementation / Execution	The complex multicounty operation"" may also be a contributing factor here	Edited.

		Coordination, And Operational Issues		
UNDP OECS	16	Implementing Partner And Undp Implementation / Execution Coordination, And Operational Issues	Can we say here what the result of these weak understandings was? Did this cause delays? What were the impacts of this lack of knowledge.	Results and impact added.
UNDP OECS	17	Overall Results	<p>Can we include a table here with the Outcome and Output targets and actual results achieved? I think it would serve as a good summary and help frame the discussion.</p> <p>I think it help to juxtapose all of the targets and results so we can then critically examine successes related to the full indicator. For example, I think it would be important here to note that some of the indicators and targets focused on how the interventions would benefit underserved communities, but this has not been discussed.</p>	<p>Table added.</p> <p>Issue of indicators regarding serving underserved communities explained at the end.</p>
UNDP OECS	18	Overall Results	<p>I'm wary about this figure for two reasons:</p> <p>It concludes that "reach" and increased capacity are synonymous, but that is not necessarily the case. Can we comment on this and the need for more robust measures of improved capacity?</p> <p>I'm not 100% clear that this number represents active participants (i.e. unique, non-duplicative participants in webinars and other sessions) or if this is just a number of people who have signed up on the platform.</p>	<p>This is clarified.</p> <p>There was a recommendation regarding measuring capacity building. The recommendation has been strengthened.</p>
UNDP OECS	19	Communications And Visibility	Can more be said as to the reasons behind this? Also it would be useful to explain some of the misconceptions referred to	Added.
UNDP OECS	20	OVERALL RESULTS	There are two elements here 1) the NGO factor and 2) the extra regional factor- was any feedback provided by stakeholders or other of how/ or which, of these two factors impacted the challenges mentioned? This would be an aspect of the pilot to indicate further	No, the impact of each factor cannot be determined nor differentiated.
UNDP OECS	21	Recommendations	Any recommendations related to enhancing stakeholder mapping and engagement?	Added.
UNDP OECS	22	Recommendations	Can we say more here on the "How"? Does this require more research during project design? Greater reliance on local and regional expertise to provide intelligence and direct support during implementation?	Added

UNDP RBLAC	1	Executive Summary	Can we affirm (or prove) that this was actually spent? Additionally, I understand that this project was widened and included other regions not covered by the GEF approved grant. Please make sure how many of the 300M was used for the countries included in the LAC regional approved project.	Sources Added. It is not an audit so the question as to how of if actually the funds were used should be posed to auditors not to the evaluator.
UNDP RBLAC	2	Executive Summary	Review!!	Reviewed and source added
UNDP RBLAC	3	Executive Summary	Project Management Cost?	No, what it says. Direct quote from ProDoc, PIF, etc. No change
UNDP RBLAC	4	Executive Summary	Three or four???	Four. Source added.
UNDP RBLAC	5	Executive Summary	Please include a footnote with the rating definitions for ease of reference.	Added
UNDP RBLAC	6	Executive Summary	Three, four or five?? Correct throughout the document.	Edited, but one thing is what was planned and the actual time it took to implement. It is stated in the different sections by verbs (for example, operated, planned, etc.) Also, different documents state different things.
UNDP RBLAC	7	Executive Summary	Not clear	Edited
UNDP RBLAC	8	Executive Summary	Not clear	Edited
UNDP RBLAC	9	Executive Summary	Conclusions seem to be substantive but reading is very confusing, please review. I also perceived that the summary of conclusions are basically the same as conclusion, recomm and lessons learned in the end. Please compile and the most important, specific and relevant ones.	Reviewed. The summary are not the same, they are indeed a summary of the full text. There is no qualification of importance, specificity or relevance of the recommendations. Therefore, they all remain important, yet summarized as the indications and guidance for evaluations state.
UNDP RBLAC	10	Executive Summary	Outcome indicators, output indicators or targets. There´s no target indicators	Although that is what they are called in the project documentation, edited.
UNDP RBLAC	11	Executive Summary	Not clear	Edited
UNDP RBLAC	12	Executive Summary	What do you mean by achievement? Outcome indicators?	Yes, in part. Edited.

UNDP RBLAC	13	Executive Summary	Indicators are subject to adjustment, targets agreed with the donor and related to project main objective aren't. These would need GEF SEC approval (council), a process that UNDP avoided to undertake.	Edited
UNDP RBLAC	14	Executive Summary	You mean monitoring of the application of knowledge acquired?	Edited. It was in the full recommendation, but the commentator did not scroll down to the full recommendations.
UNDP RBLAC	15	Executive Summary	You mean gender analysis and action plan?	Edited.
UNDP RBLAC	16	Introduction	Cite in which annex	Cited
UNDP RBLAC	17	Introduction	Say which annex	Edited
UNDP RBLAC	18	Project Description And Development Context	PMC?	Again, no, the wording is correct, refer to PIF, ProDoc etc.
UNDP RBLAC	19	Project Description And Development Context	Again	Edited
UNDP RBLAC	20	Findings	Are the indicators SMART in the end?	More information added
UNDP RBLAC	21	Findings	TO clarify, IP attempted the reformulation of targets, which were connected to project main objective, therefore it was not accepted.	Added.
UNDP RBLAC	22	Findings	??	Edited
UNDP RBLAC	23	Findings	?	Edited
UNDP RBLAC	24	Findings	Were the assumptions correct? To which extent these impacted in the overall achievement of targets. Please develop further some analysis.	Developed.
UNDP RBLAC	25	Findings	Please consider including an organigram of the final execution arrangements that were in place for this project. This can be updated from the original organigram of the Prodoc (project organization structure, prodoc page 28)	Information is added. Organigram did not change.
UNDP RBLAC	26	Findings	I'd like also to see the main stakeholders of the the TIC countries which were directly involved in the implementation. The framework for stakeholder analysis was implemented as planned	The commentator is giving a comment to an earlier version, not the November 11 version with UNDP OECS comments incorporated.

			in design? Please develop further this session as partnerships were a key element of the project.	Edited for further clarity, but the information asked for is there.
UNDP RBLAC	27	Findings	No mention of PIRs	Correct, there are no mentions of PIRs since it is stated repeatedly that there has been no adaptive management as defined by UNDP/GEF: (CHANGES TO THE PROJECT DESIGN AND PROJECT OUTPUTS DURING IMPLEMENTATION). Therefore, if there is no adaptive management seen than there is not feedback from monitoring (only monitoring since there was no MTR) used for adaptive management.
UNDP RBLAC	28	Findings	Again, indicators were not questioned. Targets were required to be changed without any justification on baseline change.	Added.
UNDP RBLAC	29	Findings	Please clarify how this figures were analysed and the evidences used to draw these numbers...	Reference added. Guidelines followed are: The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.
UNDP RBLAC	30	Findings	This again relates to overall TIC activities, right? Please clarify	Added.
UNDP RBLAC	31	Findings	Mid term reviews are not mandatory for mid-size projects. This can be taken as recommendation for such regional projects, however it would not be fair to consider this a M&V failure in the sense of GEF regulations.	Edited
UNDP RBLAC	32	Findings	TARGETS	EDITED.
UNDP RBLAC	33	Findings	ibid	Edited.

UNDP RBLAC	34	Findings	The idea to disaggregate reporting was to clarify and differentiate RMI TIC activities to the GEF TIC specific actions. The rationale was to make clear that the overall targets stated (and not possible to change as related to project main objective) were being undertaken, while GEF was incrementally being used in more restricted sample (less countries).	Added
UNDP RBLAC	35	Findings	agreed	What the commentator agrees, i.e. Specification, was already there. Unfortunately, comments were made to an earlier version not to the last version of the report.
UNDP RBLAC	36	Findings	Please review throughout the document	Reviewed.
UNDP RBLAC	37	Findings	Completely agree, please summarize results in one table with end of project targets and achievements.	What the commentator agrees, i.e. Specification, was already there. Unfortunately, comments were made to an earlier version not to the last version of the report.
UNDP RBLAC	38	Findings	Please present the total amount and evaluate if those numbers relate to cumulative results related to technology life cycle (10 to 20 years)	The number is clarified (total amount). Yet, the cumulative result question is beyond what this sort of evaluations are supposed to analyse. Suggest the question be posed to the appropriate personnel, and if appropriate hire a consultant to tally this. Will gladly add that number if you can provide/substantiate.
UNDP RBLAC	39	Findings	Not clear	Edited.
UNDP RBLAC	40	Findings	Please share as annex or include a link	Annexed
UNDP RBLAC	41	Conclusions, Lessons Learned, And Recommendations	Please see my comments in the beginning of the report and address them here as well.	Edited in parallel, i.e. edited in the summary and in the conclusions section.
UNDP RBLAC	42	Annexes	Please correct formatting and add tracking tools.	Formatted added.
UNDP RBLAC	43	Annexes	add	Not understood what this comment is about. The ToRs are there in the next page, they are seen by scrolling down one page.

IP	44	Summary	I would like to get clarity on this. Not sure if this is considered co-financing.	Sources: ToR, PIF, etc. Co-financing Includes Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6 and GEF/C.46/09.
IP	45	Summary	We believe this rating is too low; more explanation is included in further comments below.	Guidelines on commenting: Reviewers can produce additional information that they believe is relevant to the evaluation team's assessment of results; however, as an independent evaluation it is the prerogative of the evaluation team to develop its own conclusions, ratings and recommendations.
IP	46	Summary	Have we confirmed these numbers?	Yes, refer to documentation, ProDoc, PIF, PIRs. TOR. Etc
IP	47	Findings	We should clarify that this was the result of UNDP guidance that the indicators would represent pan-Caribbean potential and not be restricted to the participating countries.	Added
IP	48	Findings	Our understanding is that it was not submitted to the GEF.	This is wrong, UNDP-GEF did see this. See comments by UNDP GEF regarding this matter.
IP	49	Findings	Who are considered key stakeholders? Key stakeholders should be listed.	No. An evaluation does not reveal who says what.
IP	50	Findings	We believe that the project's Theory of Change was clear, and shown to be successful. We've noted an example below of its replicability in other regions.	No change. The instrument called theory of change is not part of the planning documents. Nor has one been provided by the commentator as a counterfactual.
IP	51	Findings	We should highlight that the same theory of change / approach used for the TIC was successfully replicated in RMI's Africa program design – including a GEF-7 proposal which will be presented at the GEF Council in December.	The TIC Project being evaluated does not a specific theory of change. None is included in the PIF, nor the ProDoc etc., this is quite a specific instrument that is not there, therefore cannot be highlighted that a non-existent instrument was replicated.
IP	52	Findings	This needs to be clarified and referenced in the Design Formulation section	It is clarified, referenced and commented upon by other actors in the other sections, as relevant.
IP	53	Findings	Should be noted that UNDP had a 6 month delay in disbursement due to internal delays.	Noted.

IP	54	Findings	At the guidance of UNDP.	Added.
IP	55	Findings	We believe this rating is too low, given: 1) UNDP giving wrong guidance around the scope of the project (leading to indicators being set at a regional level rather than for the 5 countries within this project, and the lack of communication around the potential to revise those indicators during the project), and 2) the fact that the energy space was very dynamic in 2015 (during the project design process) and it was impossible to anticipate the political circumstances that negatively influenced the energy sector across the target countries - particularly in Grenada. This was documented throughout project implementation and should be qualified in the report.	As above commentators do not comment on the ratings, according to UNDP/GEF guidelines. Furthermore, this comment is not appropriate to the issue being discussed which is the monitoring/evaluation plan. The ongoing issue of the guidance and who is to blame for the indicators is well developed not only in this section of the report but in other sections. The matter of Grenada, has nothing to do with the M&E plan which is what is being discussed here.
IP	56	Findings	ibid	Revised
IP	57	Findings	ibid	Reviewed.
IP	58	Findings	I don't think this is fair given that most of these conflicts arose during implementation and were well documented.	It is not an issue of fairness but an issue of providing balance information to inform the evaluation. Not only IP information but that from a variety of stakeholders. First of all, the conflict did not arise during implementation since it was there long before, the arbitration is not the only issue since the arbitration is the ultimate expression of the conflict thus far. The view of national stakeholders contradicts this comment; therefore, comment is not validated. The conflicts are not well documented neither at the PIF stage, nor at the Prodoc. There are records easily available that some of these conflicts are there from over a decade ago. There are requests for arbitration in early 2017, which of course have a background since the requests for arbitration need a preparation. There are recorded decisions by Grenada's government from 2016 that signal further conflict. The issue is not included in the risk analysis. PIR 2018: While there have been notable successes in implementation, targets in Grenada

				<p>and the Bahamas have not been met, and while conversations with country stakeholders are ongoing, implementation will not be possible under the current project timeline. In Grenada, progress continues to be made to foster alignment between the government and the utility. In order to move forward, utility participation is critical, and the utility has indicated they will not engage while they are under litigation. A decision has been taken that if no progress is made by the end of September 2018, the resources</p> <p>Lastly: see IP final report “However, in Grenada, the program was never able to get traction due to the fact that the government and private utility are in the midst of arbitration.”</p>
IP	59	Findings	Saint Lucia’s and Belize’s strategies are formally approved by the respective Governments. In SVG, all recommendations are being implemented although the NETS has not been formally approved.	Edited
IP	60	Findings	We should be explicit that they are in legal arbitration over the ownership of the utility. This, however, was not the case at program design, but occurred during implementation.	Added with information on the conflict that gives rise to this arbitration.