

UNDP-GEF TE Report Audit Trail

To the comments received in February 2015 on the first draft of the Terminal Evaluation of Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change (PACC) Project (UNDP PIMS #2162) and responses that shaped the second draft

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

The following aggregated comments were provided to the TE consultants on the draft Terminal Evaluation report via email and in tracked changes; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and comment (“Comment location & number”). Minor comments to grammar, editing, corrections, etc. were omitted here:

Author	Comment location & number	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken
S. Ullrich, UNDP-GEF Directorate	In email, Comment # 1	In the introduction, the evaluation criteria used in the TE (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact) should be discussed. The TE evaluation timing (in terms of when the project's planned/actual closing date is/was) should also be mentioned.	Explained in detail
S. Ullrich, UNDP-GEF Directorate	In email, Comment # 2	Project financing should also be discussed in terms of planned vs. actual financing and co-financing.	Co-financing is discussed in para 38 ; see table 3 for planned / actual
S. Ullrich, UNDP-GEF Directorate	In email, Comment # 3	Throughout the report rating categories should be clearly labeled to avoid confusion. For example on pg. 15 it appears the Satisfactory rating given is associated with a UNDP category, but this is not entirely clear. Also in this example, it should be clarified what aspect of UNDP the evaluators are rating? I believe in this case they mean Quality of UNDP Implementation?	Amended
S. Ullrich, UNDP-GEF Directorate	In email, Comment # 4	Ratings that require further discussion, justification, and supporting evidence include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M&E design at entry (section 3.2.5): analysis should be separated out from 'M&E Plan Implementation' and justified with more evidence • M&E Plan Implementation(section 3.2.5): analysis should be separated out from 'M&E design at entry' and justified with more evidence • Overall quality of Implementation / Execution: missing justification for given rating • M&E Plan Implementation: missing justification for given rating • Overall quality of M&E: missing justification for given rating • Effectiveness (section 3.3.3): analysis should be separated out from 'Efficiency • Efficiency (section 3.3.3): analysis should be separated out from 'Effectiveness' and justified with more evidence Additionally, as per the UNDP-GEF TE Guidance, Efficiency is a measure of how resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results, so this part of the report should discuss results in relation to resources spent	Done Amended Done Done Done No separation as per TORs See explanation in paragraph 53
S. Ullrich, UNDP-GEF Directorate	In email, Comment # 5	On pg. 22 there is a Satisfactory rating given for what appears to be ³ 3.3.1. Overall results (attainment of objectives) ² as cited on pg. 15- this category should be re-named to align with the required rating name: Overall Project Outcome Rating.	Amended
S. Ullrich, UNDP-GEF Directorate	In email, Comment # 6	The analysis on Impact (section 3.3.7) doesn't seem to go beyond the level of project outcomes analysis. As per the ToR, the impact discussion should analyze the project's level of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable improvements in policy for vulnerability-reduction related to emerging climate risks • Verifiable demonstration measures in pilot communities to reduce vulnerability in coastal areas, crop production and water management • Verifiable improvements in capacity to plan for and respond to changes in climate 	This is extensively discussed in ANNEX 3 for each country (including per outcome wherever relevant)
S. Ullrich, UNDP-GEF	In email, Comment # 7	As per the ToR, the evaluators need to make recommendations. These should not overlap with the conclusions and lessons learned. Currently, the recommendations	We have made the following: 1. Lessons

Directorate		(pg. 39) could use more work to be formed into suggestions for corrective actions and design for future projects.	learned; 2. practical / operational country recommendations (with scenario – alternatives – chosen alternative as requested on the last day), 3. Overall recommendations for future interventions; 4. Best practices; 5. conclusion
S. Ullrich, UNDP-GEF Directorate	In email, Comment # 8	As per the ToR, the TE should also address the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, and gender. The draft report has limited discussion on these topics and needs some improvements in this regard.	Paragraph added
S. Ullrich, UNDP-GEF Directorate	In email, Comment # 9	I assume that areas left blank will be filled in in the final report? I note that these blank areas include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Summary: empty except for the rating summary table • Annex 3: Summary of field visits • Annex 4: List of documents reviewed • Annex 7: Evaluation consultant agreement form 	Executive summary to be written for the final version after major modifications are made Annex 3: done Annex 4: done Annex 7: done
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	In email, not numbered	We have suggested to Vincent at the debriefing meeting at his Samoa mission to systematically analyze how the Management response (formulated to main findings of MTR that was a key undertaking) have been followed up and what were the results of key response actions, which is not well reflected in the report, suggest to do so (sources available: various reports on MTR Mgt Resp updates issued at MPRs to AusAID).	This was reviewed
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	In email, not numbered	A key comment that needs to be recognized and incorporated in 3.1. project design and related evaluation statements (explained explicitly to consultants and not reflected in report): In 2010 an overall Multi-year Work Plan has been prepared with streamlined structure of regional and national outputs and generic set of activities and corresponding time schedules. This has been specified and adopted to each country along a harmonized frame. This was a major undertaking supported by SPREP/RPMU and UNDP and set a consistent frame for work planning and related M&E actions.	See paragraph 37
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	In email, not numbered	For UNDP's role, I think the overall assessment is certain: UNDP has been proactive in supporting SPREP/RPMU and the countries in setting appropriate frames and procedures for work planning M&E and tech support and iteratively respond to operational and financial management issues (e.g. bringing in operational specialist support, or through systemizing direct payments). UNDP had to overstep its IA role often (oversight and tech backstopping) to help SPREP and countries to implement these measures. There was a key issue of a very weak capacity Regional Project manager (Taito Nakalevu) - needing lots of direct support and engagement (including e.g. regularly doing heavy revisions or rewriting ToRs, docs, concepts and reports, PIRs presented with very low and inconsistent quality - this might not be fully recognized by SPREP management as RPMU regularly presented them documents after obtaining in-depth UNDP revisions and inputs - I had to send a note on it one time asking him to send us docs after cleared by his supervisors - was not followed through consistently). This situation improved with Naheed and Peni coming more upfront and higher responsibilities towards end of project.	Noted
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	In email, not numbered	Efforts to improve operational issues and financial management: in various parts of the report improvements are mainly or only attributed to the recruitment of a Financial Specialist to RPMU in 2013. It is true the recruitment of this financial specialist (coming actually from UNDP Fiji office and highly versant on regional projects) resulted in major improvements. However, there have been continuous efforts made to simplify and streamline WP, reporting and financial procedures, facilitated by UNDP and jointly with RPMU and NPMUs, that needs to be recognized. These key efforts included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intent to set a standard Q reporting and advance disbursement timeline from 2010 onwards (seldom managed to meet) • Bringing in a high level operational specialist (Sammy Ngera - ex UNDP) in 2010 	This was added in paragraph 60

		<p>conducting consultations and a regional operational WS with all NPMUs present, that resulted in a guide on OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES. This guide have not been systematically applied and followed up. E.g. a useful practice was introduced on using a simple tracking table on outputs and activities implemented on QWPs. This supposed to be a simplified and user-friendly tools, but NPMUs do not prepare and send it to RPMU systematically, nor RPMU demanded it consistently and its use became rather adhoc and was discontinued. E.g. we found round 2011 that only half of countries sent such tracking table with Q reports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • huge efforts made by UNDP Samoa MCO and SPREP/RPMU in expediting delivery through application of direct payment. This was a key measure that had good result, esp in latter project stages when most country investments were realized. • Bringing in another operational specialist (Mariana Simoes) 2012-2013, who was based at SPREP and worked hand in hand with RPMU and SPREP Financial management helping to streamline processes 	
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	In email, not numbered	Table 2: PACC budget outcome table: please check if it is correct that project management component represented 16% of overall budget - this should not be more than 9 %, many project management related tech activities should be pro-rated through outcomes (e.g. including NPMU and RPMU salaries)	This is correct
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	In email, not numbered	Attach a thorough stocktake table I have prepared on tangible results achieved by countries in Outcomes 1 and 2 , think it is more comprehensive than table 4 in the report , plus contains info on demo measures, the consultants can use or adapt this to the report. I have prepared this recently actually for a proposed PACC phase 2 PIF draft as baseline.	Pls. forward the document
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	In email, not numbered	The whole section on Sustainability is generally shallow and overly simplistic, on analyzing efforts made by countries to institutionalize project results, leveraging and linking with other initiatives and intents on further resource mobilization. Perhaps most effective is to take this up in management response and use the process of its formulation for countries to chart follow up actions towards enhanced project sustainability (e.g. as per exercise done at last Nadi MPR 2014 Aug on TE and sustainability measures). Consultant team can be also made aware of UNDP effort of submitting a concept to SCCF for PACC phase 2 integrated with OWRM and R2R.	Enhanced (there was however very little useful information in the MPR)
SPREP	not numbered	Suggestion to change the rating of "executing agency" from Moderately Satisfactory to Satisfactory.	Changed by the TE team.
unknown	unknown	Unknown	Changed the rating for outcome "efficiency" from Moderately Unsatisfactory to Satisfactory.
unknown	unknown	Unknown	TE team created a new section at the end of the report, with specific country evaluations, from p90-p181
P. Leavai	Page vi	consolidated comments) This was MS. We have changed it to S. As discussed below in the Executing Agency section on SPREP	We agree on it
P. Leavai	In tracked changes, Comment #2, par. 1	Suggested revision: "To provide an external (independent) assessment of the project (hence rating table), and to provide decision makers with lessons learnt and recommendations to inform future investment"	This was changed in the report
P. Leavai	In tracked changes, Comment #4, par. 1	Refer to the project document. this project has 3 outcomes not 2. To be consistent with the 3 outcomes that are mentioned in the rest of the document.	This was changed in the report
P. Leavai	In tracked changes, Comment #5, par. 7	Reword sentence – not clearly written at present	Done
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	In tracked changes, Comment #6, par. 18	Regarding, "Therefore, changes were made to (i) reformulate the PACC project document into a capacity development and institutional strengthening type intervention...": What is the source of this info? Has this been cross-checked with Inception WS report findings? The approved PACC prodoc has been already focusing	See document 'INCEPTION PHASE REPORT Final 09'

		on capacity development and institutional strengthening type interventions	
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	In tracked changes, Comment #7, par. 19	Suggest to add here the latest update on project extension of GEF funds	OK ; done
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	In tracked changes, Comment #8, par. 19	PACC was originally a 4 year, 48 month project that was extended in one year in 2012. At the beginning, the competition date was simply adjusted.	OK; done
N. Pelesikoti	In tracked changes, Comment #9, par. 20	What's the significance of this year [2000]? CC impacts was felt/seen before 2000 in the PICs and there are reports to that effect.	Need to have a starting point for intervention... there were few / no significant interventions before the 2000s
N. Pelesikoti	In tracked changes, Comment #10, par. 21	I think it is important to state what year(s) was this	Done
P. Leavai	In tracked changes, Comment #11, par. 21	The development of the PIFFAC was an important initiative and could be mentioned	INDEED ; added
P. Leavai	In tracked changes, Comment #12, par. 26	Inception workshop was end of June and going into July. 30 June - 4 July 2009. Not August 2009 as mentioned in these brackets. The inception workshop signaled the STARTING of the INCEPTION PHASE. not the end of it.	OK ; changed
P. Leavai	In tracked changes, Comment #13, par. 26	The primary reason for considerable time [before the sets of indicators for all demonstration projects were indeed formulated and validated] was because many countries did not have national project management units established nor the project coordinators on board to focus on identifying, developing and setting indicators. Existing officers were either CEOs, ACEOs, other projects officers that were overloaded with their program work that no little effort was made by them to concentrate on indicators of a new project. They found out that it required concentrated, dedicated effort. NOT because they lacked any understanding of what CC is and what it does, etc.	Amended
N. Pelesikoti	In tracked changes, Comment #14, par. 29	PACC are government support thus their lead and support are a must for the success of the project	We agreed
N. Pelesikoti	In tracked changes, Comment #15, par. 26	[Any evidence for this assumption that] "this was primarily the result of an actual lack of knowledge in climate change national stakeholders including within PACC coordination units?"	Modified
Sinonw	In tracked changes, Comment #16, par. 33	[Regarding expected results:] "Be absolutely clear on what the outcomes where expected to be. Short sharp statements of outcomes (not strategies or activities)"	Amended
N. Pelesikoti	In tracked changes, Comment #17, par. 35	Logframe (vs log frame approach); not sure the LFA was conducted, rather straight to a logframe matrix?	Yes, you are right ; the text was changed
N. Pelesikoti	In tracked changes, Comment #18, par. 36	SRF, logframe, indicators are at objective and outcome level. Output indicators are defined in MYWPs, AWPS and QWPs.	Yes we consider
	In tracked changes, Comment #20,	This is an overly simplistic statement, please check how results are quantified and qualified in PIRs, reporting on tangible results. As the overall SRF intended to report on regional level and cumulative results, many indicators are nominal type, yet still very	We checked ; no change

	par. 36	valid in evaluating overall results.	
	In tracked changes, Comment #19, par. 37	The objective of the project cannot be revised per GEF rules. Once the project has commenced. so this sentence is incorrect. It was not the revision of the objective. Rather it was the revision of the AWP which set up the results framework.	Sentence changed
N. Pelesikoti	In tracked changes, Comment #18, par. 36	How can you deal with water management without incorporation of precipitation information including projections, demand including number of tourist facility in the demo site, sea level rise, technology. What else is being discussed in this para? Practically the amount of time and resources available in this project did not allow for comprehensive integration. There was some integration but only what can be done in the space and resources provided. This para is misleading and typically do not reflect the situation on the ground and that of the project. PACC in Tuvalu, Cook Islands, Marshall Islands and Nauru supported the JNAP development thus integration of DRM and CC was carried out.	Noted
P. Leavai	In tracked changes, Comment #19, par. 36	Disasters formed a key component of PACC because CC exacerbates the impact of disasters. As such, disasters mentioned in awareness activities of the PACC project, etc. To get the communities more understanding of CC and how it impacts their daily lives. as such, disaster was considered cross-cutting within the PACC. As such, not singled out as a sector to be addressed under the PACC. This could not be included in the PACC explicitly as a sector as the review shows, it either conflicted with or duplicated disaster project efforts carried out by the countries under the HFA frameworks, PDRR & DRM Framework for Action. At the same time, there were already more disaster-related projects versus climate change adaptation projects. It is important for evaluators to appreciate the 'situation at the time' back in 2006-2008 when the PACC was being developed.	Reformulated
P. Leavai	In tracked changes, Comment #20, par. 36	L&D was not clearly defined and not a substantial issue when the project was developed. It was an emerging issue. so it was not deliberately left out. Suggest deletion.	This was reformulated
P. Leavai	In tracked changes, Comment #23, par. 36	This is a misleading interpretation. Please give a real example. One cannot work on food security when we don't know the climate and weather patterns and how it impacts on food sources, supply chain to market, capacity, etc. we are looking at interconnectedness with other sectors here and not in isolation. that was the experience on the ground for the PACC here. please provide examples.	This was reformulated
P. Leavai	In tracked changes, Comment #25, par. 36	(1) This seems to be a statement after the fact. PACC selected. It experienced. It learned. This statement is saying PACC should have learned the lesson before the lesson came into fruition. This report states this is the first regional project of its kind. How could it's beneficiaries possibly learned these things without having experienced it first. which leads to (2) The subject in this sentence (the beneficiaries) cannot therefore be who you say the reasons stated are attributed from. (3) another point: Who are the beneficiaries here? Is it the farmer at the community level or is it a country or is it the technical working group? Farmers, men and women in communities are the key beneficiaries of the project. Be specific please. Suggest deletion of this last sentence as proposed in track here.	This was reformulated
P. Leavai	In tracked changes, par. 36	Inserted: In terms of sectors, water resources, food security and coastal management were selected for support. This selection appeared highly relevant at the time, but experiences and results suggest that as the project progressed, changes in the design leaned more towards a multifaceted approach. The selection process nonetheless led to important sectors such as energy, health, education and tourism being left out. What was lacking from the sectors' selection was integration: climate change is multifaceted and can impact many different sectors even at community level; therefore, singling out one sector only per country and demonstration measure is not the most efficient strategy to combat climate change: demonstration measures can be maladaptive if adaptation interventions do not consider multi-sectoral impacts and causes of current vulnerabilities.	Insertion was kept in next draft.
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	In tracked changes, Comment #27, par. 36	SRF, logframe, indicators are at objective and outcome level. Output indicators are defined in MYWPs, AWPS and QWPs.	Noted
Sinonw	In tracked changes, Comment #30,	Somewhat contradictory statements.	This is not contradictory

	par. 36		
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	In tracked changes, Comment #31, par. 36	This is an overly simplistic statement, please check how results are quantified and qualified in PIRs, reporting on tangible results. As the overall SRF intended to report on regional level and cumulative results, many indicators are nominal type, yet still very valid in evaluating overall results.	This is our opinion based on the discussions with the stakeholders
P. Leavai	In tracked changes, Comment #32, par. 37	The objective of the project cannot be revised per GEF rules. Once the project has commenced. so this sentence is incorrect. It was not the revision of the objective. Rather it was the revision of the AWP which set up the results framework.	Yes ; changed
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	In tracked changes, Comment #33, par. 37	KEY COMMENT: In 2010 an overall Multi-year Work Plan has been prepared with streamlined structure of regional and national outputs and generic set of activities and corresponding time schedules. This has been specified and adopted to each country along a harmonized frame. This was a major undertaking supported by SPREP/RPMU and UNDP and set a consistent frame for work planning and related M&E actions.	Changed
P. Leavai	In tracked changes, Comment #37, par. 40	Further, I am unaware of any misunderstanding between PACC & Tonga community on water meters. Two issues I was aware of : 1 original survey undercounted the number of households that required water meters and thus there was a shortfall. I don't think this has anything to do with time delay. I think Bapon and I discussed this re: there were some people surveyed with multiple dwellings. Recommendation: involve town officers and leaders to do survey work. 2. Contractor installing water meters did not communicate to households that they needed to mark out where there existing water line was so they could place meter at best location to enable easy connection.	Changed to mismanagement
P. Leavai	In tracked changes, Comment #38, par. 40	Many is not one, one is not many. if we are to state many, do give examples of more than one country to emphasize this point.	Changed
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	Comment #47, par 44	KEY comment: it is important to distinguish that regional logframe was adjusted in 2009-10, and country-specific logframes developed from 2012 MPR meeting onwards. Outputs have been streamlined through the MYWP formulation exercise 2010 onwards, and revised as needed in annual and Q WP and reporting processes. Please see GV33 comment above. Generic note: GEF rules do not allow modifications at objective and outcome statements, but outputs and activities can be modified as far as they produce the cumulative results at outcome and obj. levels.	Paragraph amended to specify changes to regional v country-specific logframes.
Netatua Pelesikoti , Director CCD, SPREP	Comment #48, par 47	There were national partnership created as well. Are they covered else where?	Added
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #49, par 47	Does this contradict para 42 stating PACC did not become the reference intervention?	Corresponding para above has been changed accordingly (para 41)
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #50 par 49	Coordinators needed to cover multiple roles; technical expertise for implementation, finance and admin, and M&E; for such large project, strongly suggest national coordination should include one person with technical expertise for implementation, working alongside someone with admin/finance/M&E coordination role	Amended paragraph accordingly – regarding limited capacity of national coordinators to focus on M&E with multiple responsibilities and improvements after hiring of administrative assistants. See recommendations as well
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #51, para 50	Also see previous comment- split into two roles at national coordination level. This lesson has been taken up with new GIZ-administered ACSE programme.	Added following sentence: ...the

			allocation for at least two staff in national PMUs - one project coordinator and one admin assistant - would have greatly improved national capacity to monitor and evaluate progress ; see recommendations as well
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #52, para 51	please check figures again. The correct figure is proposed in the track changes here. 13.125m OK (but there are many documents with different figures - not clear)	Figure changed to \$13.125m
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #53, para 51	it is to increase capacity, part of which includes knowledge	Amended sentence: The logic behind the PACC was to increase capacity through a bottom-up approach...
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #54, para 51	Suggest using another word than capacitate. Propose using the word 'inform'	Amended as suggested
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #55, para 51	By this 'beneficiaries' do you mean (outcome 2? If so, then say outcome 2. If you do mean outcome 2, then I am not sure what the problem is with allocating ½ of the funds to this outcome. To me this makes logical sense due to the high capital cost of implementing demonstration measures compared to the lower cost of staff training / policy work & communications.	Yes ; just to say that weak Gov capacity was least addressed in PACC (impacting on ownership and empowerment
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #56, para 51	this is technically incorrect. With significant resources to beneficiaries (which is the sound weighing of resources of this project), do note that the RE resources balances the shortfall by investing highly on building government capacity through training and building capacity of the coordinators, technical committee members in countries on carrying out on-the-ground assessments and building their skills. e.g., sub regional SEA assessment training workshops; sub-regional CBA for climate change trainings, on-the-field hands-on training, assignment submissions. The resources are provided from UNDP and SPREP directly. Suggest to rewrite this technical inaccuracy please. I can provide all evidence to support this. THIS WAS NOT BALANCED ENOUGH (source of info = most GOV STAFF)	See comment below
Gabor Vereczi, UNDP RTA	Comment #57, para 51	It is normal that investment components are more budget heavy (as for the demos) than TA and training type of budget items (as for outcome 1), so this argument is not really relevant. Plus Outcome 1 and 2 deliverables were linked (e.g. policy frames providing enabling env. For demos and demos informing national processes	Amended; the idea was that resource allocation has to be balanced ; between beneficiary support and Gov capacity building for potential appropriation and dissemination
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #58, para 51	Depending on the project closure process. The project closure process that PACC will be undertaking is to ensure government divisions that own the project results and those activities that are not completed are assured continuation of these activities	no change ; this might be done in the future ; there were no/few

		under those government ministry corporate plans and budget. Countries such as Niue has been proactive in this regard by bringing on board another project EU GCCA: PSIS project to continue this monitoring. At the same time, it is incorporating monitoring and continued implementation under its corporate plans. The key lesson here seem to be that governments of the Pacific continue to look for projects after projects to basically 'fund' these activities that other projects started. Which is often the option ministries choose.	signs during the mission of effective continuation of PACC by other sources of funding
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	In tracked changes, Comment #58', par. 52	KEY COMMENT: PACC resources have been parts and parcels of work plans of target ministries and integrated with other projects and lines of actions (e.g. IWRM, or Palau PACC related questions were integrated to a national survey), also in various countries systematic efforts have been made to align PACC resources with other resource mobilization opportunities, best examples are Niue (PACC and PACC plus Australian resources combined with EU-GCCA for whole of country coverage of water tanks), FSM (PACC team prepared follow up proposal for Adaptation Fund with SPREP)	Amended
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	Comment #59, para 53	KEY comment: This correct, but also please recognize huge efforts made by UNDP Samoa MCO and SPREP/RPMU in expediting delivery through application of direct payment. This was a key measure that had good result, esp in latter project stages when most country investments were realized.	Amended
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #60, para 54	did TE investigate countries and questioned the reason why coordinators left? it is important to note so, either personal vs professional. This is one point that we don't need to say 'possibly', but can say, as what is on record reasons why most left are due to (personal, professional, i.e., promotions, taking jobs with better pay, scholarship study opportunities. etc). avoid the use of yet another 'possibly' let us know what information you need, which coordinator moved and why. we'll provide a list.	paragraph was made clearer
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	Comment #61, para 54	There has been lot more complex political, institutional and personal issues behind, this cannot be simplified as such	Amended
Netatua Pelesikoti, Director CCD, SPREP	Comment #62, para 57	SPREP and UNDP were a team thus I don't agree with two different ratings. It should be both satisfactory. UNDP does not have capacity as well. The Multi Country Office in Apia have junior staff and staff turnover also affected the project thus UNDP and SPREP had to work as a team to fill in the gaps in both organizations – thus it should be both satisfactory toward the end of the project. The assessment didn't show how the CCD as a division stepped in to fill the gaps for the RPMU because of its short staff and provided necessary technical input. There was significant input from all CCD staff. Each staff were assigned a country to follow up on progress reports and provide technical advisory support. This was done so the RPM and Project Officer (APO) could concentrate on fixing the finances and getting it up to date, with the recommendation of a clear Finance & Operations Officer to take on the dedicated role and heavy responsibilities.	There must be 2 ratings (requested by GEF) Our opinion is that in relation to the overall implementation of PACC, UNDP's contribution (e.g. to support SPREP/PMU was higher than the contribution of SPREP to the overall implementation of the project
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #63, para 57	At the programmes' start; a specialist finance officer was added later - the Finance & Operations Officer - refer to its JD/TOR.	Amended to say Finance & Operations Officer
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #64, para 57	In Nauru or Marshal Islands? In this case, it would be Nauru. Please be specific and say Nauru. There is a Jan 2015 survey to back this up.	Amended to say Nauru
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #65, para 58	Has this register created a re-usable resource for future projects? If so, still a good long term project outcome. In our books, yes, because we are still using them at the moment and has shown to be	Amended with additional sentence: Should it be

		very effective. This is a lesson from the project, that we have shared with the Regional Technical Support Mechanism (RTSM) of the World Bank PPCR project. ongoing.	maintained and improved by SPREP, it might become a critical source of expertise in the region on CC and an important lesson for the development of the Regional Technical Support Mechanism (RTSM).
G. Vereczi, Regional Advisor, UNDP	Comment #67, para 60	It is true the recruitment of a financial specialist (coming from UNDP Fiji office and highly versant on regional projects) in 2013 resulted in major improvements. However, there has been continuous efforts made to simplify and streamline WP, reporting and financial procedures, facilitated by UNDP and jointly with RPMU and NPMUs, that needs to be recognized. These key efforts included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intent to set a standard Q reporting and advance disbursement timeline from 2010 onwards (seldom managed to meet) - Bringing in a high level operational specialist (Sammy Ngera – ex UNDP) in 2010, that resulted in a guide on OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES. This guide have not been systematically applied and followed up by RPMU or NPMU. E.g. a useful practice was introduced 	Reformulated
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #68, para 64	Following the additional paragraphs of reasoning's of why SPREP should be given S rating, the suggestion is that national coordinators rate SPREP as 'satisfactory' a well. The interview guide (in annex) does not specifically ask a question on comparative rating of UNDP and SPREP (just UNDP). Both should nonetheless have the same rating. It is important to be conscious that a S + MS does not equate to an S overall. Rather, an S+S is more logical and sensible to conclude an overall S rating. Otherwise a clear explanation of reasoning for the different ratings must be provided with justification that is beyond reasonable doubt. So far, there is no justification of an MS presented.	this is the opinion of the evaluators based on discussions with both UNDP and SPREP staff
N.Hussein, Finance and Operations Officer, SPREP	Comment #69, para 64	It was not a challenge for SPREP only but UNDP as well. They were not able to find solution on how to resolve the issue of 80% rule application to Regional Project which at that time was becoming the biggest hindrance. This was evidenced when help was requested by UNDP Samoa Colleagues from UNDP Fiji in 2011/2012 on how they have managed to resolve the issue of 80% for IWRM project.	Noted
N.Hussein, Finance and Operations Officer, SPREP	Comment #70, para 64	This needs to be carefully looked at. Should also be stated under the RPMU/SPREP assessment that RPMU not only supported but performed the functions for National Coordinator's in doing their multiyear work plan, in some cases narrative report and definitely Financial Report. In this way, RPMU ended up performing these functions and therefore it fell back on UNDP to do quality assurance in reviewing and revising it. That was the challenge. That at many cases became some sort of overlapping in function. RPMU partially performing National Cordinator's function and UNDP backstopping SPREP in managerial support was the order of the day to move the project forward in all aspects.	Noted
N.Hussein, Finance and Operations Officer, SPREP	Comment #71, para 64	Please note these functions are also defined under the NEX modality which was followed. It is not a function but "services" that UNDP is mandated to provide in recovery of fee. Therefore these are defined as fee paid services performed by UNDP and guided as recommended practice under NEX guideline. These were more of services paid for.	Noted
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #72, para 64	and somewhat? so as evaluators you cannot find what the somewhat is??? when the somewhat is all over this document. you are mentioning it everywhere but here?	Deleted ; this is the evaluator's opinion on

		Refer to Naheed's comment n69 please. thanks.	the support of UNPD to SPREP
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #73, para 64	remember there are 3 stakes here - UNDP/GEF, SPREP and COUNTRIES. They interrelate and inseparable. We cannot attribute one to the other without the 3rd party involved. refer to naheed's comment under NP72.	we do not agree ; this affirmation is like nobody (or everybody together) is responsible
Netatua Pelesikoti, Director CCD, SPREP	Comment #74, para 64	Refer to my earlier comment – it was staff shortage the rest of the sentence (national level support) done by UNDP is misleading – It was done jointly	We do not agree ; UNDP provided support
Peniaminal	Comment #75, para 64	agree totally. 100%	Noted
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #76, para 64	Focus this sentence on UNDP. We are under the UNDP paragraph. if not anything but RPMU lacking. which is a half conceived assumption.	No change ; this is about the support of UNDP to RPMU
Netatua Pelesikoti, Director CCD, SPREP	Comment #77, para 67	What about Tuvalu and Tonga water was in the Tonga and Tuvalu approved JNAP - in Tuvalu revised Te Kake'ega II as well	Tonga and Tuvalu approved the Joint National Action Plan (JNAP) added in the para
Simon Wilson, SPREP	Comment #78, para 68	Using what metric or rationale?	Success is measured by the metric of how many national/ local/ sectoral policies integrate CCA (as per project logframe indicator). 3/4 coastal projects had limited success in this regard. Paragraph is amended to reflect this.
Simon Wilson, SPREP	Comment #79, para 68	Is this a measure of success against this outcome?	See above – amended with additional explanation of contributing factors to limited success in mainstreaming.
Simon Wilson, SPREP	Comment #80, para 72	and develop technical guidelines based on them	Outcome description is amended as suggested (with addition of coastal countries).
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #81, para 73	are we referring to water catchment systems here?????? if so, make this explicit please. Suggest to read the proposed language and changes suggested here. These are up dated from the progress update email from Tokelau in early Jan 2015.	Amended
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #82, para 73	we follow the 'results-based' language of UNDP . i.e., reporting evaluation of results achieved. again refer to the whole paragraph proposed in track changes here.	Amended
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #83, para 73	I have no idea what this sentence means. please re phrase. is it something to do with the project? what 'reservoirs' are we referring to? suggestion to be clear with the sentence. rather than '...these reservoirs;' say '...government reservoirs' if / should you be referring to the water supply system of the government that is connected to the reservoirs.	Amended - 420 rainwater-tanks manufactured (5,000lt) (100% of target completed) with 100 additional tanks manufactured for homeowners wanting an extra (paid) tank. The

			supplier made these in Niue for Niue, Galloways international Limited based in Auckland, New Zealand. 272 tank bases completed in 14 of the 14 villages on Niue (65% of target).
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #84, para 73	demo guide are now finalized, published by mid-Feb	Amended
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #85, para 73	But on track for completion by March 2015	Amended
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #86, para 74	a preliminary environmental assessment report (PEAR) was called for by MNRE and was carried out by the contractor - Isikuki Punivalu & Associates (IPA). This is an example of a site-specific investigation. Consider the tracked changes proposed here.	Amended – replaced “without any” site specific investigations to “without adequate” site specific investigations. Key point here is that climate change impacts and upland flood risks were not sufficiently considered in the design.
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #87, para 74	repeat of the above points.	Deleted
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #88, para 75	why? Might be delays	Explained
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #89, para 75	<p>this contradicts early responses from farmers immediately following a flood event in 2011, that saw the clearance dredging work meant low inundation of the farmlands, as the water was running straight through. and helped them save their crops from those floods. This was in a news article in the Fiji Times as well.</p> <p>the 'very low' rating here seems to have been a recent one, following the back growth of waterway plants on the creeks due to a lag period of clearance by the government and no plans with communities to clear their secondary water ways. this is expected therefore, and relative explanation on the two different periods need to be made explicit here.</p>	<p>There is no contradiction: drainage was done at the start of the project with farmers satisfied</p> <p>There was no maintenance after 2011/2 with resulting additional waterlogging and more inundation risks ; no change</p>
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #90, para 75	<p>The evaluation conclusion here of the result of the gender-specific activities of the project has no logic. What the farmers want does not dictate the approach of the project. Therefore, one cannot conclude that because the beneficiary wanted this out of the project, but was not the case, can therefore use that as a fact to compare the project's approach (gender) was not the right approach.</p> <p>Having said that, the project did focus on the issue of land water logging. This is mentioned in the next paragraph after this paragraph.</p>	This is the opinion of beneficiaries ; these were extra activities that were not focusing on the real issues / problems (waterlogging) that are specific are not gender specific
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #91, para 75	<p>Training farmers to sell is what this sentence implies. this is incorrect, as there was no training on farmers 'for selling...'. but to plant materials.</p> <p>The training of farmers was on planting the new varieties that grow well on water-logged land. the real issue here was from the farmers - how can they take this further</p>	Reformulated

		and mass produce / have a big farm, and be able to sell on the market? they needed mass production and a market. can the project take this to this level. Answer no. no funds.	
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #92, para 75	Just commenced in Temotu, as in meetings about projects just completed. Implementation to commence.	Amended as suggested
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #93, para 75	And for Ontong Java	Added
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #94, para 75	Temotu has not commenced implementation. Also Ag officer in Lata, which is 2.5-3hr boat ride to Reef Islands. There has been minimal govt programmes in Reef Islands to date due to remoteness and difficulty of access (sea conditions)	Text was amended to take that into account
P. Leavai, SPREP	Comment #95, para 75	Is there evidence for this? we have worked closely with Mika and I never recall him saying that farmers were not interested in the proposed low-tech irrigation. PNG also delivered. Farmer training also led to 20 farmers using Integrated farming systems by end of 2014 . PNG also established Kivori Cooperative Society – set to transpire income generation activity in agriculture and other sectors with marketable resources in Kivori. Suggest to delete this if there is no explicit evidence to back this up.	Deleted (only 1 source of info – not crosschecked)
Peniaminal	In track changes, Comment #96, par. 74	PNG also delivered 3 food processing workshops targeting mainly women to make chips, jam and flour.	Amended
Peniaminal	Comment #97, para 80	National coordinators	Changed
Peniaminal	Comment #98, para 82	Or poor quality of groundwater (either due to salt intrusion or human pollution).	Amended
Peniaminal	Comment #99, para 82	SWP were PACC+; focus for PACC in MI was increased supply through increased capture and retention in Majuro	Added
Peniaminal	Comment #100, para 82	Again, the community’s main issue (in Aiwo) is poor groundwater quality, and poor rainwater quality due to phosphate dust. SWP were selected but the technology seems more applicable in remote island communities, or perhaps as a more centralized system, rather than at HH level. It is also a habit / behavioral trait we see. People are not relying on the system because of the good rain they have been receiving. Respondents of the recent survey have said, these will become useful to them once drought hits.	Paragraph was modified
Peniaminal	Comment #101, para 84	And saline soils. so please add this in as well.	Added
Simonw	Comment #102, para 85	This section is muddled and does not provide a clear assessment of effectiveness or efficiency	This section was drafted as requested in the TORs: effectiveness & efficiency together
Simonw	Comment #103, para 85	Define on what definition of efficiency this statement is made	Added below
Peniaminal	Comment #104, para 85	Increased water supply in Majuro (PACC) and alternative water supply in remote islands (PACC+)	Modified in the text
Peniaminal	Comment #105, para 85	An example of PACC as a reference project Good example	Noted
Peniaminal	Comment #106, para 85	Setting up new committees for each new project has its own overheads and in small island states, experience with projects suggest it is best to reuse existing networks and committees. Otherwise the same people (usually) are invited on to a new committee and either don’t attend or fully participate due to having too many other commitments (existing committees etc). It is a fact in all countries in many projects.	Modified

Peniaminal	Comment #107, para 85	No issues were reported to RPMU and SPREP. No reporting effort from national due to outgoing coordinator and incoming admin assistant who had no project mgt experience nor technical background. first hand supervision is the Project Director on the ground - in this case - the Secretary of CIE. This may / may not have been provided or supported. Every effort by the RPMU was made but no responses for six months was possible from the country including director and admin assistant.	Amended
Peniaminal	Comment #108, para 85	18 systems in total	Amended
Peniaminal	Comment #109, para 85	Nauru, under PACC+ is installing larger arrays of solar water purifiers to serve 10 of Nauru's 14 communities Community water shelters will soon be constructed to mount the water purifier units on to process polluted groundwater and store purified water in water tanks for use by the community.	Added
Peniaminal	Comment #110, para 85	GCCA:PSIS project is one project. not 2 different things. delete 'and'.	Done
Peniaminal	Comment #111, para 85	Evaluation period, project still being implemented. So this should be mentioned as a constraint if not already done so early on, re: PACC+ implementation still going on until March 31 2015, yet evaluation conducted Nov / Dec 2014.	Reformulated
Peniaminal	Comment #112, para 85	This seems like an exaggeration to me. Given the state of the old water system, the new system, even when not fine-tuned (with resorts taking in water) has not made the water 'crisis' worse. There were times of the day when the water pressure was insufficient (e.g if resorts were over extracting), but really same result as the old system that was not working all the time due to breakdowns and leaks and other issues.	Reformulated
Peniaminal	Comment #113, para 85	This para seems more relevant to outcome 3. PACC Tuvalu was effective and efficient by completing 2 concrete water tanks and building shelters with additional PACC + funds. It is also mentioned earlier in this report, that the project extended the number of days that communities had access to water in drought conditions (especially with use of a plan to ration water when drought conditions were identified). Please re state these key points here under this sub heading clearly and succinctly thanks.	Reformulated
Peniaminal	Comment #114, para 85	Solar dryers?	Added
Simonw	Comment #115, para 85	The above content provided little if any basis for an assessment of efficiency.	This is our own opinion
Peniaminal	Comment #116, para 85	Rating of moderately unsatisfactory is not justified by the text above, it should be overall SATISFACTORY. The MS rating here poses the question: Does this rating reflect the chosen projects, the way they were implemented? OR is it also reflecting the high cost of CCA in remote small island states?	Changed
Peniaminal	Comment #117, para 89	Unlike?	Changed
Peniaminal	Comment #118, para 91	Strong provincial govt ownership of CC policy through consultations	Reformulated
Peniaminal	Comment #119, para 91	this finding is contradictory. A lot of the costs incurred for implementing activities on atoll islands included payment of time of line ministry expertise (soil scientists, farming specialists, perma-culture experts). This has improved the capacity of the Ministry to respond to the needs of the people through this PACC project. As a result, there was a lot of integration. Suggest to re-word please. There was more, not less. actions speak louder here. refer to progress reports of the Solomon Islands.	This was (very) extensively discussed between the national coordinator, line ministry and evaluator No change

Peniaminal	Comment #120, para 92	These are being finalized now. Perhaps worth noting as a constraint in evaluation that the evaluation was conducted prior to project completion. Where it warrants in this report - do make mention of the fact that this evaluation was conducted prior to project completion. It makes a difference to make mention of this vividly.	Added
Peniaminal	Comment #121, para 92	Agree with Peniamina's comments	See below
Peniaminal	Comment #122, para 92	Would like to see these justified. Hard to see link from the paragraphs above and these ratings.	Amended
Peniaminal	Comment #123, para 93	Suggest that overall, hard to assess impact at the end of funding period. Evaluation was undertaken before end of funding period, where activities are still being implemented. Impact best assessed through longitudinal evaluation (e.g. 1-2 yrs post project)	It is true ; pls. contract the team again
David Sheppard	Comment #124, para 93	Incorrect, the system is functional	Paragraph entirely rewritten
Peniaminal	Comment #125, para 93	Does this belong in parra above for SI?	Sentence was kept
Netatua Pelesikoti	Comment #126 before para 94	Refer to earlier comments	Noted
Peniaminal	Comment #127, para 94	There needs to be training in logical framework approach before project design. Skipping straight to creating a logframe matrix results in selecting issues and solutions that may not be appropriate.	Amended in the text
Peniaminal	Comment #128, para 96	Because there was no problem/solution tree, because logical framework approach not used, rather choose an issue (e.g. water or CZM) and develop a project idea then logframe it.	Amended in the text
Peniaminal	Comment #129, para 100	Regional agencies have the links and relationships with countries. This is clear with the case of PACC. Relationships are key in Pacific projects, and a survey of national coordinators would disagree with the recommendation to have an international PMU under UNDP that is not regional and locally owned and locally driven. It will fail.	Noted ; this is your own opinion
Peniaminal	Comment #130, para 101	There should be at minimum 2 staff at national coordination unit; one with technical expertise, other to conduct finance/admin and M&E function (linking direct to RPMU needs). This lesson has been taken up with ACSE programme. Further, some coordinators also required assistance from a Comms person. This resource may not need to be a part of the team, but it is often a lacking skill and existing Comms people in a department or Govt, are often already over-worked with little time for additional project work.	Amended in the text
Naheedh	Comment #131, para 103	This is subject to Budgets and as per GEF requirement, cap is given for Project management Cost. In many cases, the cap is not sufficient to attract high profile candidates which project wish to. And if allowed, then we have in the Pacific, the issue of relevant technical people available in the country (competent). Having high profile is not an issue and is not the case here.	We disagree on that assertion
Peniaminal	Comment #132, para 103	Would high profile coordinators overcome some of the island politics? Also, a high profile coordinator would not overcome issues with admin/finance and M&E issues at national level.	A High profile coordinator will facilitate implementation because he has his contacts' agenda for

			that purpose
David Sheppard	Comment #133, para 103	Competence rather than profile is the most important criteria	Of course but both functions are prerequisite to ensure a smooth implementation
Peniaminal	Comment #134, para 103	It is also subject to availability. Capability (knowledge, skills, experience) is often limited for many reasons in PSIS. The PACC provided opportunities to train up 'low profile' staff and build their confidence and profile. E.g. CI PACC Co-coordinator now promoted to Acting (of full time) role as director of Infrastructure in his Ministry - a big promotion. - Example of building capacity	Noted
Peniaminal	Comment #135, before para 104	for M&E at national level: limited skills and focus in M&E, no formal structure or guidance (until 2014 logframe). There needs to be a person tasked with M&E at national coordination level (future projects to deliver M&E training at start).	Included in para. 105 now
Peniaminal	Comment #136, before para 137	Good point, but sometimes countries are limited by procurement guidelines requiring them to put things out for tender – 3 quotes – best value & demonstrated experience.	Noted
Peniaminal	Comment #137, para 145	Note for later if not covered elsewhere. I don't really see much mention of KM throughout the report, yet PACC produced 12 Tech guidelines, experience series, vid doco, & web-site	Extensively covered in outcome 3 – para 76
Peniaminal	Comment #138, para 151	Try another word, not sure if this is appropriate here.	Amended