**End-of-Project Evaluation of the Sudan NAPA Follow-up Project: Implementing NAPA Priority Interventions to Build Resilience in the Agriculture and Water Sectors to the Adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Sudan**

**Report Audit Trail (7 April 2015)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Commenter and Location in 16 March draft** | **Comment** | **Response, action (and, if appropriate, location in final draft)** |
| Ms. Hanan (UNDP). Section heading, 4.5.1. | Will appreciate revisiting the financial data below. As per the most recent financial report generated today, the Total Budget for LDCF is USD 3,300,000 M; Total LDCF expenditure is USD 3,273,618.03 .  As for the project’s UNDP (TRAC) resources, the total Budget is USD 0. 5 M and the total expenditure for UNDP resources is 515,200 (so there is an over expenditure). | Noted.  Action: Paragraphs 128 and 129 were modified accordingly. |
| Ms. Hanan (UNDP). Para 109. | This comments is not a true one as the Secretary General denies UNDP’s role in providing quality assurance and he considers this as intervention. | The comment referred to is a comment in the report made by the Secretary General to the Evaluation Team, and so is presented as evidence. The paragraph gives a balanced summary of the evidence observed. The paragraph also states that the Evaluation Team was unable to assess this issue in detail, however, it is an important issue, and must be mentioned.  Action: no modification required. |
|  |  |  |
| Mr. Adil (PCU). Para 120, | 7 villages in River Nile, not 6. | Action: Paragraph 156 has been modified accordingly. |
| Mr. Adil (PCU). Para 146. | This is a very general comment describing the whole area and not limited to the NAPA villages. The new project (CIDA) is now working in new villages | The paragraph has been modified accordingly.  However, this paragraph (now 184) and other paragraphs present much other evidence to suggest that most villages have not yet reached sustainability. This should not be considered a failure.  Action: Several changes have been made to 184. |
| Mr. Adil (PCU). Para 149. | Most of the VDCs are now registered as CBOs at the stats level….. | Action: Para 187 has been modified accordingly. |
| Mr. Adil (PCU). Box 5. | Some of these issues were covered in the Best Practices Study, and now they are being covered by the documentation activity carried out by the ARC | No evidence of this was presented to the Evaluation Team. The stakeholders met did not refer to any such work, nor to any available figures or data. The best practices study was not referred to by any stakeholder during the Evaluation. The TOR for the study to be undertaken by ARC did not suggest that this would be done. Hence, the evidence presented and the finding stated in Box 5 remain valid.  Action: no modification required. |
| Mr. Adil (PCU). Para 176, sixth bullet. | Technical advice was provided to the TC through the coordinators and direct meetings with the TC members. The TCs participated in the annual meetings held to discuss progress, challenges and the way forward beside provision of some training | This is the Conclusion section of the report, it is not the place for presenting evidence.  The overall finding of the evaluation is that, due to the many sites covered, of many different natures, with complex challenges, the Project was not able to provide all the technical support needed to villages and States. Ample evidence was collected for this, and it is presented at the appropriate sections through the report. This should not be seen as a failure (except, perhaps, of Project design, that was too ambitious in attempting to cover four states.)  Action: The fifth bullet point of para 213 has been edited. |
|  |  |  |
| Mr. Min (UNDP). Page 1 table with general info. | **UNDAF OUTCOME 2:** Populations vulnerable to environmental risks and climate change become more resilient and relevant institutions are more effective in the management of natural resources; | The Project stretched over two programming periods for UN and UNDP in Sudan. Hence the project is aligned to two sets of UNDAF and UNDP CP results framework. The Project document refers to the 2009 – 2012 programming period.  Action: The table on Page 1 now provides both references. |
| Mr. Min (UNDP). Page 1 table with general info. | 2.1 Needy communities to climate change and climatic risks adapted comprehensive sets of adaptation measures | See previous point. |
| Mr. Min (UNDP). Para 1. | We have a series of NBSAP report and you can quote actual data from those reports. | The Evaluation team thank the commenter for the comment. In this document, in this background section, it is not necessary to provide detailed data on the biodiversity situation.  Action: no modification required. |
| Mr. Min (UNDP). Para 2. | 2nd NC has been launched in 2014. You can quote the data from 2nd NC too. | This section (1.1) describes the background to the project and the project history/starting point. The INC was a key factor in the Project history, and hence it is more pertinent in this section. The second national communication was not available until the Project’s 4th operating year.  Action: A footnote has been added to para 34 advising the reader that the SNC has been approved. |
| Mr. Min (UNDP). Para 17, 3 bullet. | I would suggest that please put your opinion on his performance – i.e. he participated as national consultant in TE as independently or dependently | This is not the appropriate document to assess the consultant’s performance. That is external to this report. Further, evaluation reports should be based on evidence, not opinions.  Action: the text has been clarified (para 50, final bullet). |
| Mr. Min (UNDP). Para 20, final bullet. | Update on Sudan ranking on HDI | Action: a modification made as requested (para 54, final bullet). |
| Mr. Min (UNDP). Para 26. | Remove of word ‘temporary’ as description of comprehensive agreement. | Action: a modification made as requested (para 59). |
| Mr. Min (UNDP). Box 2. | In the State Level, there has a technical committee and provided technical assistance to the targeted beneficiaries before, during and after the project activities. At the same time, the project focal person in consultation with the project team and provide the management support. However, the focal persons are not staple and moved frequently to another place. | The addition information provided by the comment is noted. This additional information does not change the finding quoted in the report, as supported by the evidence in Box 2 and Box 4.  Action: no modification required. |
| Mr. Min (UNDP). Para 73 | It is not correct? Show evidence by Adil – i.e. list of TC members; again, the project team did gender assessment as a result of mid-term evealuation? | We have reconfirmed the number of women on the TCs. Overall, five of the TC members are women (out of a total of over 40).  Action: the wording in para 107 has been slightly modified. |
| Mr. Min (UNDP). Para 82. | It is NOT correct and do NOT agree. For example: IFAD, AFDB and FAO team normally visited to UNDP and shared their experiences, and learn lessons from UNDP before they develop the project documents for GEF/LDCF and their own funds. The UNEP has the same approach and we normally invite our inception meetings and events. They normally participated in our events. | The statement in the comment (‘IFAD, AFDB and FAO … shared their experiences, and learn lessons from UNDP’) requires independent verification from said partners, and the Evaluation Team did not meet them.  This section (4.3) deals with partnership arrangements for Project implementation, it does not deal with general coordination amongst international partners in Sudan. The data collected by the Evaluation Team did not reveal evidence of such partnerships at the Project level (shared activities, inputs, outputs). However, it is recognised that the statement was unnecessarily harsh.  Action: The final sentence of Para 116 has been edited and a footnote has been added. |
| Mr. Min (UNDP). Para 103. | There has only 3 staff in the project management but the project team recruited a numbers of national consultants and provided the technical assistance to the State and village level (page – para 80) | This point has been addressed and covered adequately, including in this para (139) and inpara 114.  Action: no modification required. |
| Mr. Min (UNDP). Para 109. | Let’s get any example or clarification for this? | The concerned statement was not intended as a criticism.  Action: The para (145) has been edited and clarified. |
| Mr. Min (UNDP). Table 5. | I do not agree and please see updated information of the project activities in ALM. Here is link <http://www.undp-alm.org/projects/ldcf-sudan/videos> | This comment contests a finding of the Evaluation. However, the concerned finding is supported by the evidence collected by the Evaluation Team as summarized in the two bullet points lying above the statement. As stated elsewhere in the report, there is confusion between ‘communications’ material and ‘lesson learning’ material.  Action: The first bullet point in the cell has been edited to clarify the argument. |
| Mr. Min (UNDP). Para 176. | Who are they? | This is the conclusion section, not the place for presenting evidence. Concerned evidence is presented in the substantive section, e.g. in para 192. |