

**Audit Trail on the comments received on the Draft Report of the
FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF THE GEF INTEGRATED APPROACH TO ADDRESS THE DRIVERS OF ENVIRONMENTAL DEGRADATION
19 May 2021**

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
<i>Comments from the GEF Secretariat</i>				
1	General comment	<i>The need for an Executive Summary</i>	<p>This is a very comprehensive and informative evaluation. However, it lacks an Executive Summary. The richness of the information is overwhelming and can't be digested without an executive summary. If an executive summary is being produced, GEFSEC should have the opportunity to comment on it as well.</p> <p>On that point, the conclusions from the paras 154-166 about the relevance of design, coherence of design, M&E systems, process, and results can provide the groundwork for such a summary. However, there are other elements that are also important to highlight, such as the findings of the evaluation that the GEF integrated approach has not negatively affected country's abilities to report (para 27).</p>	<i>Added to the final report. As per IEO standard practice, draft reports are circulated to stakeholders for comments without executive summary to ensure the full draft reports are actually read.</i>
2	General Comment	<i>The IAP/IP programs are put forward as a comparison rather than an evolution, and there is also inconsistent/incorrect use of IAP versus IP</i>	<p>The document has many inconsistencies, as highlighted in the comments below, and the attempt to go back and forth between IAP programs and IPs does not capture the relevant evolutionary aspects from GEF-6 to GEF-7.</p> <p>In some instances, reference to IAPs and IPs are used interchangeably. For example, in para 63, the reference is to IPs, but the example is on IAPs. Please check for consistency on this score throughout the document.</p>	<i>Noted. Inconsistencies between IAPs and IPs have been corrected throughout the document.</i>
3	General Comment	<i>Data errors throughout the document</i>	There are some fundamental data errors throughout the document. These are highlighted in detailed comments accordingly below.	<i>Corrected.</i>
4	General Comment	<i>A heavy reliance throughout the document on the case study of Kenya with the Water Fund</i>	It may come from the methodology, but the case study of Kenya with the Water fund is used and reflected in several boxes too often, and there are places where there can be different (and sometimes) better examples of the program, such as on the private sector.	<i>Noted. The report also includes other examples.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
5	General comment	<i>Conclusions and Recommendations</i>	<p>This section is currently written more like a “Discussion” section. Conclusions should be more concise.</p> <p>They also bring new issues into the discussion that are mentioned for the first time and seem not to be fully based on the findings (e.g. in paras 157, 162), as highlighted in some specific comments below.</p> <p>They also lack some important findings, such as on gender. The Recommendations also seem to bring up new points that are not based on findings and conclusions, such as the actions recommended in para 168 and 169.</p>	<i>Addressed.</i>
6	Para 5	<i>In 2000, the GEF began to implement the crosscutting initiatives operational program 12 on integrated ecosystem management, where socio-economic benefits were a key part. The multifocal area portfolio (MFA) has been supported since 2002, and cross-focal area integration has been increasingly adopted across the GEF.</i>	<p>Between these two sentences, a reference to the Country Partnership Programs could be made. These country-based programs, initiated in GEF3 and GEF4, laid the groundwork to develop land-based integrated approaches at country level (Cuba, Burkina Faso, Namibia, India, China...).</p>	<i>Noted, no action taken as this does not alter the strong points made on the history of integration in the GEF.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
7	Para 6	<i>The evolution from the previous predominant support modality – consisting of single focal area interventions – to a more systemic approach is motivated by the overarching strategic objective to support transformational change and achieve global environmental benefits on a larger scale (GEF 2015).</i>	<p>We suggest replacing the “support modality” with “manner of support” as modality has a GEF specific meaning referring to the 4 GEF modalities for programming.</p> <p>In this paragraph, it should also be noted that the new integrated approach used the existing programmatic approach modality in the GEF project cycle. (Otherwise it sounds as if the IAP came with a new project cycle modality).</p>	<i>Noted.</i> Added an explanation that IAPs and IPs are executed under the programmatic approach modality. Corrected where relevant throughout the report.
8	Para 10	<i>A considerable share of GEF-7 funding (18%) is invested according to the new integrated approach modality in a series of Impact Programs.</i>	<p>What is the significance of adding “considerable” with respect to funds invested in the program? How is the term defined in this context?</p> <p>As reflected in a comment above, it is not a “new” modality in terms of the GEF project cycle. Better to use another term, e.g. “focus”.</p>	<i>Addressed.</i>
9	Para 10	<i>Three Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) IPs expand GEF support from individual countries, an approach applied to precedent REDD+ projects under the climate change mitigation focal area</i>	<p>It also precedent to the SFM program from GEF-4 & GEF-5, not only REDD projects. We suggest amendment accordingly.</p>	<i>Addressed.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
10	Box 1	<i>“The Good Growth Partnership IAP is focused ...”</i>	The formal name of the program is ‘Taking Deforestation out of Commodity Supply Chains.’ This has been rebranded by the partners but not in the GEF system. This should be mentioned at least once in the report.	<i>Included in the Box.</i>
11	Para 11	<i>Table: Congo IP</i>	There are 5 GEF Agencies involved in the IP as GEF agencies, not 4: UNEP, WB, IUCN, WWF-US, and UNDP. The transfer of the Gabon project to UNDP was officialized on October 13, 2020 (date of the CEO letter). What is the significance or rationale for counting LDCs and MICs? The rationale is unclear.	<i>Corrected the number of Agencies. Data on programs by country categories is basic information on participation.</i>
12	Para 11	<i>Table: Congo IP and note</i>	If the IP resources come from the PFD, as is written in the footnote, the co-financing for the Congo IP should not be 207, but 387 millions of US\$.	<i>Corrected.</i>
13	Para 11	<i>Note</i>	It is confusing to provide the project grants, without the fees, for the IAPs and provide project grants + Agency fees for the Impact Programs. It artificially increases the resources of IPs. In view of comparison, the same way of presenting the information would be preferable.	<i>Corrected.</i>
14	Box 2	<i>The Sustainable Cities IP aims “to support cities pursue integrated urban planning and implementation that delivers impactful development outcomes with global environmental benefits (GEBs).” This will include support for terrestrial and marine protected areas and biodiversity through improved planning and management practices (Sustainable Cities IP</i>	The PFD doesn't explicitly state the highlighted part. As per the PFD, the suggested sentence could be reworded as follows: <i>This will include support for policy development, innovative financing and capacity building for sustainable and integrated low carbon, resilient, conservation and land restoration investments in cities.</i>	<i>Addressed.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
15	Table 1	<i>GEF Trust Fund Financing for SC IAP is mentioned as 131. In other places of the document, it says 139 million.</i>	The report should refer to proper documents of SCIAP for the correct amount. The SCIP amount (160 m) is correct and is inclusive of Agency fees and PPG.	<i>Corrected.</i>
16	Table 1	<i>SCIP number of countries is mentioned as 7 and number of child projects is mentioned as 8. The co-finance amount is mentioned as 174 million</i>	This is not correct. There are in total 9 countries. The total number of child projects are 10. (9 country child projects + 1 global project). The portal doesn't include the countries which haven't asked for PPG. The co-financing amount is 1.7 billion. The IEO should refer to the PFD of the SCIP for these numbers.	<i>Corrected.</i>
17	Table 1	<i>GGP number of agencies involved is listed as 6</i>	There are five agencies involved in the GGP program: UNDP, UNEP, CI, WWF and the IFC/WB.	<i>Corrected.</i>
18	Table 1	<i>FOLUR number of agencies involved is listed as 6</i>	While IFAD and UNIDO are not lead agencies, there are 8 IAs receiving funding under FOLUR: CI, FAO, IFAD, UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, World Bank, WWF-US.	<i>Corrected.</i>
19	Table 3	<i>Total</i>	Total should be 1344, please check the comment provided to Table 1 above.	<i>Corrected, based on data clarifications provided by the GEF Secretariat.</i>
20	Para 12	<i>A third newly introduced feature is a competitive selection process amongst countries through the preparation and evaluation of expressions of interest.</i>	This is inaccurate. EOIs were introduced in GEF-6 for the IAP programs. There was a competitive process for the IAPs with candidatures from countries. The difference is that in GEF6, the selection committee was only internal to the GEFSEC. In GEF-7, for more transparency, external reviewers and the STAP joined the GEF Secretariat.	<i>Clarified here and later in the report.</i>
21	Figure 1		FOLUR funding should be: LD 55M, CC 27M, BD 110M	<i>Corrected, based on data clarifications provided by the GEF Secretariat.</i>
22	Para 28	<i>"as an increasingly prominent programming modality"</i>	As already discussed in comments above, this is not a new programming modality, just an increasing focus on integration in GEF programming. We suggest amendment of the text accordingly.	<i>Addressed.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
23	Para 29	<i>The quality at entry analysis also showed that all IP country child projects (n=43) are aligned with national government’s environmental priorities.</i>	All IP country child projects are 60, but n=43 is used throughout the report (Table 4, 5, 13, para 129, 135, 142). There should be a clear definition of cutoff dates provided in the report.	<i>Noted.</i> Added cut-off date of February 3, 2021. At that date, 43 CPs were either CEO endorsed (n=9) or the request for CEO endorsement was submitted (n=32).
24	Para 29	<i>GEF-7 IP child projects are aligned with national environmental priorities, programs, and initiatives including those of other donors in the environment sector.</i>	There is an opportunity in this section to include more IP examples, which have strongly demonstrated alignment with national environmental priorities etc.	<i>Noted, no action taken.</i> The report has a number of good examples.
25	Para 34	<i>“The Drylands IP specifically aimed at the Miombo, Mopane and Fynbos woodlands, and the Savanna tropical grasslands and open woodlands of Africa; the Gran Chaco ecoregion, the Dry Central Andes grassland and shrublands, and Cerrado, Caatinga, and Mato Grosso seasonal forests in South America; and the Central Asian rangelands and steppe forests.”</i>	It should be noted that the intended scope of the Drylands IP could not be fully met due to the limited funding available for the program. Eventually, the available funding was only sufficient to cover 3 out of 5 prioritized geographies. Perhaps consider adding a footnote to this effect.	<i>Footnote added.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
26	Para 34	<i>“Notably, certain countries and geographies have not yet benefitted from the GEF’s integrated approach— such as Small Island Developing States where a history of regional cooperation and “whole of island” approaches seem well-aligned with the intention of the GEF integrated approach modality.”</i>	It should be noted that PNG is a SIDS and a part of the FOLUR portfolio, so to say that no SIDS are benefiting is not entirely accurate.	<i>PNG exception mentioned in a footnote.</i>
27	Para 34	<i>For example, FOLUR’s design targeted the tropical forests and peatlands of Southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America where production of agricultural commodities and staples is a major driver of land use change and environmental degradation.</i>	Thinking of the external reader and for accuracy, we suggest flipping this sentence as follows: <i>“FOLUR’s design targeted the major drivers of degradation related to commodity and food production which are largely seen in tropical forests and peatland regions- Southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America.”</i>	<i>Suggestion accepted and addressed.</i>
28	Para 35	<i>The new competitive expression of interest (EOI) process rolled out in GEF-7 was inclusive and utilized a criteria-based approach to select relevant countries to participate.</i>	As reflected in a comment to paragraph 12 above, this is inaccurate. EOIs were introduced in GEF-6 for the IAP programs. There was a competitive process for the IAPs with candidatures from countries. The difference is that in GEF6, the selection committee was only internal to the GEFSEC. In GEF-7, for more transparency, external reviewers and the STAP joined the GEF Secretariat	<i>Clarified and addressed.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
29	Para 36	<i>For the FOLUR IP, the GEF Secretariat and World Bank together managed the EOI process to ensure that the program covered a substantial market share for each targeted commodity.</i>	This seems to imply the process was only applied to FOLUR, which is inaccurate. The Lead Agency was involved in the EOI process for all the IPs. We suggest clarification accordingly.	<i>Clarified and addressed.</i>
30	Para 36	<i>“This pointed to the need for countries selected to be larger players in the commodity chains with substantial experience. The first round of EOIs did not fully meet these expectations.</i>	<p>That countries selected had to be large players is not true. Being a large player wasn’t the only factor that went into selection. “Frontier” countries were an explicit entry point for participation in the FOLUR program (see associated comments below on box 4). Additionally, countries were also assessed on, among other things, whether they offered something unique to the program that could be scaled to other similar countries, and/or were located in a region where exchange with other countries could be beneficial. As this was the case, countries like Burundi, Guatemala, Liberia, PNG, Tanzania, none of which are large players in the commodity chains, were included in the portfolio in round one.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is important to highlight here that the program was also targeting countries with ‘frontier landscapes’ who are not necessarily large players but have the potential to head in that direction. The idea being the program would get ahead of any expected negative externalities.</p> <p>It is also not accurate to say that the first round didn’t meet expectations. 47 EOIs were received, which exceeded expectations, and 18 countries were included in the portfolio as a result of round one, which aligned well with expectations. That 2/3 of all countries that were ultimately accepted into the program were selected in round one is confirmation of this. Considering the size of the program envelope, it was never the expectation that every country submitting an EOI would be a part of the program or that only one round would be required to complete the country portfolio.</p>	<i>Noted. Clarified that interviewees explained that the portfolio of selected countries should include larger players in the commodity chains—not that being a large player was the only selection factor. Added reference to the targeted also of frontier landscapes. Removed sentence stating “The first round of EOIs did not fully meet these expectations.”</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
31	Para 36	<p><i>Many EOI countries also had relatively small markets and few experiences and were rejected for these reasons. At the conclusion of the first round, FOLUR was missing certain commodities, such as soy, and larger players. These gaps were not specifically articulated in subsequent calls for EOIs, although they were understood internally among the committee.</i></p>	<p>The intended purpose of the last statement is unclear. It creates the impression that the Committee/GEF was not transparent, which was not the case. We suggest deletion or amendment accordingly.</p>	<p><i>Clarified and addressed.</i></p>
32	Para 38	<p><i>Entire paragraph</i></p>	<p>the explanation in this para raises question about the relevance or value-add of the entire geospatial analysis. At the end of the day, country “readiness” as demonstrated in the EOIs was an overriding factor as long as the relevant commodity / staple food was determined to be adequate.</p>	<p><i>Addressed.</i></p>
33	Figure 3	<p><i>Result of Global GeoSpatial Analysis</i></p>	<p>Graphics like these are supposed to simplify findings and make them more easily understood. This figure does quite the opposite. This Figure is difficult to interpret, even by those who have intimate knowledge of the programs being analyzed. If a more easily understood figure can’t be developed, this should just be deleted as it will raise more questions than it gives answers.</p>	<p><i>Addressed.</i></p>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
34	Box 4	<p><i>FOLUR IP: There are three countries with child projects that have very low spatial relevance for both indices—Kenya, Papua New Guinea, and Uzbekistan. These countries have a mix of low amounts of forest and therefore low deforestation and area suitable for reforestation (Uzbekistan and to a lesser extent Kenya) and low areas of commodity production (Papua New Guinea). Four other countries—Burundi, Kazakhstan, Peru and Uganda—have low spatial relevance in one of the indices (total or normalized) and very low in the other.</i></p>	<p>A footnote should be included that also considers that (i) the focus of the FOLUR project (unlike GGP) went beyond forests/deforestation, but broadly looking at the impact on agro-ecosystems; and (ii) the FOLUR program also targeted frontier landscapes, where there may be low production currently, but anticipated increases in production in the future.</p>	<p><i>Noted, and mention is made of the fact that the spatial layers do not readily allow analysis of potential frontier landscapes.</i></p>
35	Box 4	<p><i>RFS IAP</i></p>	<p>The relevance of the global geospatial analysis beyond the FOLUR IP is not clear. The geography of the RFS for instance was defined by a study connecting the types of agroecosystems and food security. The main identified regions were the Sahel, the Horn of Africa, East African highlands, and Southern Africa. All countries ultimately selected were from these regions.</p>	<p><i>Noted, no action taken. The analysis focuses on food systems related programs, as explained in the methodology section.</i></p>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
36	Box 4	<i>GGP IAP: Large countries that have high spatial relevance but no child projects include China, India and Russia, while Malaysia, Cambodia and El Salvador are smaller countries that have high normalized spatial relevance but no child projects.</i>	This is misleading and misses the entire point that the GGP program was not designed to have country child projects. No EOIs were issued.	<i>Addressed.</i>
37	Figure 4	<i>Entire Figure 4</i>	The Drylands IP has been omitted from the figure. Please add.	<i>Corrected.</i>
38	Figure 4	<i>Numbers</i>	Program sizes should be corrected - refer to comment to Figure 1	<i>Corrected.</i>
39	Box 4	<i>“These countries have a mix of low amounts of forest and therefore low deforestation and area suitable for reforestation (Uzbekistan and to a lesser extent Kenya) and low areas of commodity production (Papua New Guinea). Four other countries—Burundi, Kazakhstan, Peru and Uganda—have low spatial relevance in one of the indices (total or normalized) and very low in the other.”</i>	As was pointed out in the original review of the geospatial methodology applied, it misses out one of the stated entry points and foci of the FOLUR program, which is to target 'frontier' countries in order to get ahead of environmental problems before commodities production becomes highly degrading. PNG is a high forest/high bd-cc country where production of commodities is growing rapidly and runs the risk of significant future deforestation if safeguards aren't put in place. In any case, the entry point of frontier country should be explained in the evaluation. Also, worth mentioning again that PNG is a SIDS and thus adds something to the portfolio that can be shared with similar countries and would otherwise be missing.	<i>Noted. Please refer to response to #34.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
40	Para 43	<i>There is a risk that impact pathways in the aggregate PFD Theories of Change are not yet sufficiently specific to guide coherence and contextual alignment in CPs.</i>	How is this a “risk”? Or how is “risk” being defined? Please clarify accordingly.	<i>Addressed.</i>
41	Para 45	<i>To take just one example, for the Congo IP, one interviewee explained that the IP is “relatively little resources for a complex region, we have to maintain a focus on certain key issues.</i>	How does this relate to the statement in Para 10 about “considerable” resources being invested in the programs?	<i>Noted and addressed.</i>
42	Para 48	<i>In the Kenya subnational study, the two western counties near Mt. Elgon where the FOLUR IP child project (GEF ID 10598) plans to work have generally moderate spatial relevance due to high amounts of maize production but low deforestation and area of potential reforestation.</i>	It would probably be worth mentioning that this is a transboundary site where FOLUR projects in both Kenya and Uganda will work, adding to the regional coherence, sharing of lessons, etc.	<i>Noted, no action taken.</i> Although this may be true, the country case study looked only at the FOLUR projects in Kenya in detail.
43	Para 50	<i>The need to transition to the GEF-7 core indicators mid-way through the development was a complicating factor, and the RFS IAP has taken until 2020 to complete the results framework.</i>	This seems to imply that the Council-approved PFD for RFS lacked a results framework, which is inaccurate. The transition to GEF-7 Core Indicators is in fact an innovation.	<i>Noted, no correction made.</i> The two sentences are factual. The transition to GEF-7 core indicators was a challenge as it was a requirement, as correctly stated in your comment # 46

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
44	Para 50	<p><i>The GGP global coordination project misses such an overarching, synergistic results framework, in particular lacking the inclusion of systemic integrated change indicators beyond the mostly 'execution' oriented individual outcome indicators for each of the other four CPs.</i></p>	<p>This statement is inaccurate and disregards the Integrated “supply chain” approach that underpinned design of the entire program.. The original council approved PFD included a program level results framework that ultimately defined the different child projects. The GGP has also recently developed a program level results framework using a participatory process (with the GEF Sec and GGP Agencies) to capture overarching results. This correction should also be made throughout the document.</p>	<p><i>Addressed and clarified that the GGP has not fully operationalized its program-level results framework although efforts are underway.</i></p>
45	Para 50	<p><i>For SC-IAP, no common results framework has been developed, and interviews indicated that aggregation of higher-level results (including GEBs) has been extremely challenging for the program as a result. The SC-IAP provides separate outcomes for the World Bank-led GPSC, for the WRI-led Resource Team in the GPSC, and the country child projects.</i></p>	<p>The WB team has initiated a process to build a common results framework, submitted the preliminary results to the GEF Secretariat for the preparation for the 2020 AMR, and will continue develop based on it. Contact: llewis3@worldbank.org, xwang5@worldbank.org</p>	<p><i>Addressed.</i></p>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
46	Para 52	<i>A related challenge for aggregation of program results is the prevalence of different ways of interpreting and measuring key indicators within and across programs</i>	Please note that RFS and the GGP were GEF-6 IAPs: the main challenge in terms of reporting has been the requested changes from GEF6 indicators and RFS tracking tools to the GEF7 Core Indicators. See: Guidance for Monitoring of Ecosystem Services, Socioeconomic Benefits, and Resilience of Food Security for the Resilient Food Systems programme	<i>Noted, no action taken. See reply to comment # 43.</i>
47	Para 52	<i>In the RFS CPs, GEB indicators were interpreted and reported very differently, particularly land-based GEB targets.</i>	It should be noted that this is an issue of the past and the learning has been internalized to clear improvements, since the GEF-7 core indicators (on which all GEF-6 projects, including child projects of programs, now have to report) are accompanied by clear guidelines for calculations. See here .	<i>Noted, addressed.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
48	Para 53	<p><i>Issues related to the calculation of GHG emission reductions that were raised in the IEO’s 2018 Formative Review have persisted into IAP implementation. While coordination projects (such as the RFS) have increasingly supported and trained child projects on this task, few midterm reviews so far have concretely and reliably reported GHG reductions, although it may also be too early. Very few SC-IAP are making clear attempts in their results frameworks to track and present a methodology for a reliable measurement of this indicator at completion.</i></p>	<p>Same comment as above – clear guidelines now accompany the GEF-7 core indicators, including guidelines for GHG emission calculations. See here.</p>	<p><i>Noted, addressed.</i></p>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
49	Para 56	<p><i>Still, across all IPs, the preliminary plans for describing and monitoring the intermediate outcomes that tackle the root causes and drivers of environmental degradation, rather than GEBs alone, are still insufficient.</i></p>	<p>This is a general statement that is not substantiated. I do not fully agree with this statement as a general statement for several reasons: (i) not substantiated, check e.g. the Mozambique CP in the DSL, it has an excellent intermediate outcome monitoring, (ii) the monitoring of intermediate outcomes to root causes and drivers of environmental degradation goes beyond GEF project/programs and is/should be done at national scale, e.g. LDN targets monitoring must be done at national level and can't be done by the GEF project alone, (iii) I also see the comment not in the spirit of earlier IEO evaluations on indicators and monitoring, that recommended to focus GEF monitoring on a simpler set of core indicators.</p> <p>This statement is also not supported by the analysis of its paragraph, which states that the GEF-7 IPs are in fact doing a good job than the GEF-6 IAPs on this dimension.</p>	<p><i>Noted, addressed. We checked the Mozambique example, it's the only one. The point of insufficient intermediate outcomes monitoring remains valid, with few exceptions noted.</i></p>
50	Para 57	<p><i>Still, challenges for program-level reporting remain unaddressed—including related to the approaches for determining GEBs from coordination projects and aggregating results across the projects within the programs. A contributing factor is that while the 2019 policies help to clarify roles and responsibilities in program and child project level M&E reporting, program-level M&E has not yet been formally codified in the project cycle, according to the GEF Secretariat.</i></p>	<p>Challenges remain, but they are not “unaddressed”. We are addressing these challenges e.g. through estimating the catalytic effect of the integrated approach strengthened/enabled by the GCPs. The main difficulty is that the current set of core indicators does not measure ‘catalytic effect’ (such as scaling, partnerships, policies), an area where we work on to include in the monitoring in GEF-8.</p> <p>It is inaccurate to state that there is no formal codification of program-level M+E in the project cycle. The Monitoring Policy (here) includes a section on program-level reporting requirements, and the recently updated guidelines to the Project and Program Cycle Policy (here) also contains guidelines on this.</p>	<p><i>Addressed. Deleted ‘unaddressed’ and added ‘practices’ after ‘project cycle’. The latter highlighted sentence references an interview with the Secretariat that addressed the lack of standardization in project cycle practices for aspects of program-level M&E.</i></p>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
51	Para 58	<i>there is no agreed-upon methodology for determining the additional GEBs from coordination projects.</i>	The issue is not the methodology, but the problem is that the indirect generation of GEBs through the policy, institutional, and knowledge ('catalytic effect') is not part of the core indicator system in GEF-7. Only if this would be included in the core indicators, we can agree on which methodology to use.	<i>Agreed, addressed, and reflected in the recommendations.</i>
52	Para 58	<i>In contrast, the Drylands IP coordination project will calculate its own platform targets as 5 or 10 percent on top of the total aggregate of the individual child project targets, with the percentage depending on core indicators</i>	The Drylands IP is now also using an approach similar to Amazon and Congo IP. The earlier 10% estimate has been replaced by estimated contributions of the 3 geographic sub-clusters of the IP in the scaling-out effect that will be facilitated by the respective Regional Exchange Mechanisms (REMs). The GCP/REM increments are now conservatively assumed to apply only to core indicators 4.1, 4.3, 6.1 and 11, as these are the variables that are most susceptible to scaling out effects.	<i>Addressed. Additional information reflected in the text.</i>
53	Table 6	<i>Entire table</i>	Consider a footnote informing that the figures in this table are w/o agency fee. (The totals in Table 1 have been presented including agency fees and are therefore higher)	<i>Addressed and corrected.</i>
54	Table 9	<i>Entire table</i>	It is unclear what added value this table provides in the context of this evaluation. All projects will be endorsed within the project cycle policy provision for submission deadlines, cancellation policies, and force majeure exceptions in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. No conclusions with regard to efficiency can be drawn from those data. Further, the data are outdated (February 2021) and they are changing every day. For example, we expect all 12 CPs of the DSL IP to be endorsed by the June 13, 2021 deadline.	<i>Noted, no action taken. The table reflects the project status as per the cut-off date.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
55	Para 69	<i>“As noted previously, FOLUR held several rounds of EOIs because it experienced challenges with the quality and coverage of key commodities and countries among the EOIs received.”</i>	It is again unclear why undertaking several rounds of a proposal review to build the portfolio for very large program is being portrayed as a negative. The iterations of the EOI process weren't 'a challenge' for the program but fully expected and due to adherence to a process that called for consistency in the standard to be met. This is generally viewed as a positive in competitive review processes.	<i>Noted and addressed. See also reply to comment # 30.</i>
56	Para 71	<i>Figure 6. Integrated programming by country category</i>	The country categories in this graph are hard to understand. LDCs and MICs are not mutually exclusive categories, as several LDCs are in fact LMICs. Furthermore, why does the “other” category reference “regional and global”? It may be more useful to simply use the 4 income categories, and a separate graph for LDCs and SIDS. Please note inconsistency in data: the FOLUR funding should be: LD 55M, CC 27M, BD 110M, Set-aside 126	<i>Corrected.</i>
57	Table 7	<i>Footnote “*Brazil, Peru, and Indonesia have also benefitted from global GGP IAP projects, although per-country break-downs are not provided.”</i>	This is inaccurate. Peru isn't a GGP country and hasn't benefited from GGP IAP projects.	<i>Corrected.</i>
58	Para 73	<i>Interviewees explained that World Bank management refused to delegate major project management functions and to act as a "pass-through" agency for the three CBOs.</i>	This is misleading. There was no indication by the GEFSEC to delegate the “ project management ” role for CBOs. As mentioned in the first couple of sentences in this para, the role envisaged was: <i>major role for city-based organizations—seen as critical for engaging with city leaders and “crowding in” expertise and knowledge that goes beyond GEF Agencies—influenced the selection.</i> Therefore, the statement is not true and should be deleted.	<i>Addressed and clarified. Replaced ‘project management functions’ with ‘major functions as executing entities’</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
59	Para 73-75	<i>Entire paragraphs</i>	The narrative text in these paras do not include all of the factual information, or any credible reference including reports submitted to Council. The fact is that a core component of the SC program is the “global platform,” which includes a specific function for engagement with city-based organization. This is a requirement, and not a negotiable option, for the child project that is de facto managed by the Lead Agency.	<i>Noted.</i> Reference is now made to the fact that the integral role of CBOs in the GPSC was envisioned in the GEF-7 programming directions. The phrase ‘assign management to’ has been replaced with ‘deliver the functions of the GPSC’ as directly quoted from the Call for Proposal.
60	Table 8	<i>The SC component of the table</i>	The SC IP number of child projects is incorrect. It should be 10, instead of 12.	<i>Corrected.</i>
61	Box 9	<i>Entire Box</i>	The arrangement is not described appropriately. The major coordination function remains with the Lead Agency. The CBOs, as identified in this box, have distinct roles of knowledge management, finance and national/city engagement. These are additional and incremental inputs to country child projects which will ensure that the overall program result goes beyond the sum of individual projects. The point - "oversees child projects" isn't presented appropriately. Their role is not to oversee or manage the child projects, instead, it is to provide additional technical support to cities by reaching out to them in a proactive manner with global knowledge and expertise. The overall management and coordination lies with the lead Agency UNEP.	<i>Addressed and clarified the roles.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
62	Para 82	<i>Efficiency: Another 34 IP CPs have CEO Endorsement Pending, while 20 are CEO PIF Cleared. For comparison, the 2018 Formative Review found that it took 26 months to bring all IAP child projects to the stage of CEO endorsement from PFD Council approval.</i>	It is not clear what is the added value of the comparison with the IAPs. A reflection on how the efficiency has evolved from the IAPs to the IPs would be more useful. This is in line with a general comment made above.	<i>Noted.</i> The data and comparison show the similarities between IAPs and IPs timelines.
63	Para 83	<i>Entire paragraph</i>	A point of accuracy: There is no PIF clearance for child projects, they were approved as a part of the PFD. This should be corrected throughout the document. Length of time it is taking for CEO Endorsement: This may be better received if put into context-which is that the projects were being developed during a pandemic. Yes, it is, mentioned in the paragraph below, but it is important to think about the reader and make the connection in the moment.	<i>Corrected.</i> <i>Noted, no changes made for comment on COVID.</i> This context is mentioned in the sentence directly following that on the length of time for CEO endorsement.
64	Table 9	<i>IP Child Project Approval Timeline</i>	It may be useful to expand this table to other categories such as CEO Endorsement Pending, to which para 82 above refers. Table 16 in Annex 3 does that, perhaps that Table can be elevated to the main text, or at least referenced in this section?	<i>Added.</i>
65	Table 9	<i>CEO Endorsed projects</i>	FOLUR currently has 4 CEO endorsed projects and 5 in the council review period.	<i>Noted, no action taken.</i> The table reflects the status as of the cut-off date of February 3, 2021.

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
66	96	<p><i>Some IAP PIRs/MTRs report progress towards achieving broader adoption of project outcomes within the project period, mainly through institutional sustainability of interventions (71 percent), supporting scaling-up (39 percent), enabling conditions for replication (29 percent), and mainstreaming (32 percent). Less progress is noted to date toward deep changes (e.g., market change, systemic change, behavioral change, addressing the root cause of environmental problems) (13 percent)</i></p>	<p>With only a few projects even reaching MTR, it seems very early days for progress on “deep changes”. We suggest this be clarified accordingly.</p>	<p><i>Addressed.</i></p>
67	Para 119	<p><i>Despite this level of support, multiple interviewees expressed the view that the role for GGP was insufficient in FOLUR.</i></p>	<p>It should also be mentioned that GGP partner agencies are recipients of over \$135m in FOLUR grant financing for the implementation of country child projects. In addition to their role (and the additional funding that they will receive) as a core partner in the global child project, this would seemingly indicate a significant role for the GGP partnership in the FOLUR program. That they would want more may be expected but isn’t necessarily reasonable.</p>	<p><i>Clarified.</i> Explained that interviewees opined that the role of GGP was insufficient in the FOLUR global project, although GGP partner Agencies are also FOLUR CP recipients.</p>
68	Para 119	<p><i>The GGP (led by UNDP with IFC, UNEP-FI, CI, WWF, and ISEAL Alliance) is a core partner of the FOLUR Global Platform working across the three pillars</i></p>	<p>This is not correct. ISEAL is a program executing partner and not a GEF agency, core partner, or formal member of the Steering Committee. ISEAL shouldn't be included in this listing of project partners.</p>	<p><i>Corrected.</i> Removed mention of ISEAL.</p>

69	Para 121	<p><i>The GPSC is planned to be sustained by the World Bank under its own branding and funding after the child project closes, a unique situation which presents a risk of two GEF-funded knowledge platforms running in parallel for a two-year period. These two platforms are the current GPSC managed by the World Bank, and the new one soon-to-be launched by WRI on behalf of UNEP. Both platforms are funded by GEF, both are addressing issues of urban sustainability, and both have the mandate to support Sustainable Cities program stakeholders as well as the broader COP. All involved parties (including the GEF Secretariat, World Bank, UNEP, and WRI) are aware of the situation and expressed the view that it was less than ideal. Consultations are apparently ongoing to work out practical issues, such as how to avoid confusing city</i></p>	<p>The first sentence reflects a clear misunderstanding of how the two programs are linked. GPSC is branding for the global platform under the SC IAP program; it was not a brand for the entire program. So it will be considered a product of the program and not the program by itself, and we see no “risk” if the WB decides to maintain the brand going forward.</p> <p>Consultations are going on systematically and with proactive engagement of GEFSEC and all GEF Agencies. Therefore, the word “apparently” in the last sentence is suggested to be deleted. A key priority of the consultation is an overall branding for the entire SC program, which was not done for the IAP program in GEF-6.</p> <p>The new platform to be launched by WRI on behalf of UNEP is not factually correct. WRI is an executing agency of the global project for UNEP, which is the lead agency. Suggested revision is: <i>“and the new one soon-to-be launched by UNEP as the lead agency in partnership with executing agencies WRI, C40, ICLEI and UNEP Cities division”</i>.</p> <p>The IEO should also note that the global project followed the GEF programming policy of distinguishing and limiting the Execution Function of GEF Agencies in this case.</p> <p>In addition to highlighting the challenges linked to the change of lead agency between SC-IAP and SC-IP, the report should also take into account the rationale behind this change and acknowledge the efforts made to ensure a smooth transition. (partly touched on in para 114)</p> <p>The same abbreviation “COP” is being used for different things, which may be confusing.</p>	<p><i>Noted.</i> The first comment does not seem relevant to the point raised. The qualifier “apparently” has been deleted. The suggested revision for describing the launch of the new platform by UNEP has been accepted. The sentence about ongoing consultations acknowledges efforts for a smooth transition. The abbreviation COP was spelled out here for community of practice.</p>
----	----------	---	--	---

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
		<i>stakeholders and manage branding at international events such as the UNFCCC COP.</i>		
70	Para 130	<i>Overall, resilience has been considered in the GEF-7 IPs from both a climate and non-climate risk perspective. In the GEF-6 IAPs, the RFS IAP offers a good practice example of how to consistently consider and measure resilience across a program. The evolution of the consideration of resilience in GEF integrated programming is described below.</i>	It would be helpful to expand on the contextual background in relation to systemic resilience being a new concept for the GEF at the start for the IAPs. This would heavily influence the ability of lead agencies to incorporate this concept comprehensively. This should be factored in here for balance.	<i>Noted, no action taken.</i> The suggested text does not change the main finding that resilience is considered as climate and non-climate related risk.
71	Para 138	<i>Several lessons have been learned in the GEF-6 pilots related to private sector engagement that are relevant for the GEF-7 IAPs.</i>	Error: Should be GEF7 IPs.	<i>Corrected.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
72	Box 19	<i>Members of the Soft Commodities Forum—a global platform of leading commodity companies including Cargill, Bunge, Louis Dreyfus Company (LDC), Archer Daniels Midland (ADM), Glencore Agriculture, and COFCO International, a Chinese firm—have agreed to monitor and publish data...</i>	This is a poor description of COFCO, which is the largest Soy trader in the largest soy importing country in the world, not a nebulous Chinese firm.	<i>Noted, removed ‘a Chinese firm’. Since no descriptions are provided of the other leading commodity companies listed, this partial description was also removed.</i>
73	Para 148	<i>Across both the IAPs and IPs, aspects of good environmental governance are widely considered and incorporated in child project activities but are not described as such.</i>	It is not clear where or how such a description should be provided. Please clarify.	<i>Addressed, changed as ‘not reported as such’.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
74	Para 151	<i>“The reality of putting together effective participatory multi-stakeholder platforms for integrated landscape management is considered more difficult in practice than on paper in Vietnam and Indonesia, but experience with multi-stakeholder platforms in these countries has shown that the tradition of top-down approaches can be mitigated.”</i>	Does this relate to the IAPs as would be understood through the subheading? Vietnam isn't a GGP IAP country, so it's unclear why it would be included in this description on integrated landscape management.	<i>Addressed, deleted ‘Vietnam’.</i>
75	Para 151	<i>The Drylands IP also sees a critical role for well-designed environmental governance in landscape management but draws attention to the need for GEF and Agencies to carefully monitor to what extent established and supported environmental governance institutions have actual decision-making powers.</i>	This section focuses on IAPs, so reference to Drylands IP should be in the IP section.	<i>Addressed, sentence moved down to section on IPs.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
76	Para 154	<i>Entire paragraph</i>	As also stated in a general comment above, it would be useful to rephrase to show the evolution of integrated approaches rather than making a comparison between IAPs and IPs. The comparison is not helpful, whereas the evolution shows growth overtime which we aim to continue into GEF 8.	<i>Noted, no action taken.</i> Evolution can only be seen using the IAPs versus the IPs, as these are the application of the concept of integrated approach to address the drivers of environmental degradation introduced in 2014 by the GEF 2020 Strategy.
77	Para 155	<i>The lack of SIDS in IAPs/IPs also represents a missed opportunity ...</i>	See earlier comment on paragraph 34 about PNG. This should be re-worded.	<i>Addressed, changed to limited participation</i>
78	Para 155	<i>Although the Amazon and Congo Basin IPs consider freshwater systems, virtually no GEBs related to marine systems are anticipated from the IAPs or IPs ...</i>	It could be worth noting that e.g. the SC-IP Indonesia child project (ID 10494) includes 38,248 hectares of marine habitat under improved practices (excluding protected areas) under core indicator 5. (See the Indonesia project concept submitted together with the PFD).	<i>Noted, exception added in a footnote.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
79	Para 157	<p><i>“Integration can be pursued through several modalities in the GEF—not only the IAPs and IPs. Previous IEO evaluations have demonstrated that multifocal area (MFA) projects can also deliver the multiple benefits of integration, outside of the structure of programmatic approaches such as the IAPs and IPs. The limited evaluative evidence on the outcomes of the IAPs and IPs does not allow for a comparison of MFA approaches vis-à-vis the programs.”</i></p>	<p>It is unclear why this paragraph is included here as a prominent conclusion of the evaluation. This conclusion is not from the current analysis but rather seems to be based on earlier evaluations and is therefore out-of-place here. We suggest that this paragraph should be included in the methodology section as an explanation, rather than a conclusion of the report.</p>	<p><i>Removed.</i></p>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
80	Para 158	<p><i>“...insufficient consideration is given to the roles and responsibilities for linkages between program and country project theories of change in the integrated programs that focus on value chains. For example, global/regional coordination projects may engage with multi-national companies through multiple Agencies and partners, which will need to link with other Agencies implementing child project specific activities at national and subnational levels.”</i></p>	<p>Is this critique that agencies will be forced to work together? If so, that's a fairly weak statement and hard to translate into a useful recommendation.</p>	<p><i>Noted, no actions taken.</i> The sentence provides an example to illustrate the point made, it does not necessarily lead to a recommendation forcing agencies to work together.</p>
81	Para 159	<p><i>“several lingering challenges remain unaddressed”</i></p>	<p>Consider rewording. We agree that “challenges remain” but they are neither “lingering” or “unaddressed”.</p>	<p><i>Addressed.</i></p>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
82	Para 162	<p><i>The design of the GEF integrated approaches places huge responsibility on the Lead Agency to deliver programmatic results and value added.</i></p> <p><i>The design of the GEF-7 approach better recognizes the critical role of the Lead Agency and global/regional coordination project in this regard. GEF-7 expands the role for the Lead Agency to involve program coordination, program integration, and program reporting—building on an important lesson from the IAPs that ensuring clarity of roles and responsibilities between the global/regional coordination projects and country child projects is a critical aspect of good program governance.</i></p>	<p>It is not clear why the term “huge” is used here. The roles and responsibilities of lead agencies are clear, and all in accordance with GEF project cycle guidance.</p>	<p><i>Addressed, ‘huge’ replaced with ‘considerable’: it’s still a considerable amount of responsibility for the Lead Agency.</i></p>

83	Para 166	<p><i>Among the integrated programs, perspectives on and performance of the Sustainable Cities IAP has been mixed</i></p>	<p>It is not clear why the SC program has been singled out in this section in the concluding section. this concluding section misses a number of features identified in the evaluation and therefore presents a misleading message. In particular the sentence below doesn't align with the findings of IEO in this report itself: <i>“ Interviews and survey respondents have polarized perceptions in terms of the extent to which the Sustainable Cities IP and IAP are designed for transformational change”</i></p> <p>a) It contradicts IEO's finding in para 31 and 65 below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 31: The overall alignment of the SC-IAP with country priorities and donor initiatives is strong, as all countries have articulated policies to address urban sustainability, as well as ones to mitigate GHG emissions. SC-IAP has enabled countries to develop projects which combined local and global environmental benefits, making the GEF grants potential catalysts for change. • Para 65: Integrated programming shows evidence of designing for transformational change at the program <p>b) The title of this section should also make an explicit link with COVID-19 as it has direct effect on progress of the SC-IAP. Currently, it downplays the severity of impact of COVID-19.</p> <p>c) There are a number of examples provided in the evaluation report indicating that the integration approach is benefiting countries and cities and also leading to innovation, scalability and sustainability.</p> <p>d) This paragraph draws a conclusion just based on the issue related to transition from GEF 6 and GEF 7, for which proactive efforts are being made by GEFSEC and Agencies. It only identifies the risk of confusion, but ignores the efforts to make the transition smooth and avoid the confusion for participants. The platform participants (particularly cities) will be different in two phases anyways.</p> <p>e) The issue of multi-level working is shown only as a challenge and not as a unique proposition for delivering systems change.</p>	<p><i>Addressed, moved to the results section.</i></p>
----	----------	--	--	--

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
			f) The uniqueness is highlighted but in a very light touch and misses on the integration approach of urban planning, investments and governance which will address some of the key systematic challenges cities are facing in planning and implementing sustainability solutions.	
84	Para 168	<i>“The GEF Secretariat should ensure that global/regional coordination projects are designed and endorsed prior to child projects or at minimum with some logical staging so that they are not fully in parallel. Appropriate funding should be available for Lead Agencies to support the coordination and integration role that begins immediately after Council approval of the PFDs.”</i>	<p>This could be problematic for several reasons: (i) in parallel has proven to work, (ii) the evaluation itself notes this as an advantage in earlier paragraphs, (iii) it is unrealistic to achieve as all child projects of a project are approved by Council at the same time, and then face the same tight deadline for submission and endorsement.</p> <p>This was at least the case on FOLUR, where the WB’s global platform child project was the first CP endorsed, which happened several months after the first country CP was. We suggest amendments and clarifications accordingly.</p> <p>The lead agency receives PPG funding for the Global Coordination Project immediately after council approval – why is that not considered “appropriate”? The recommendation also seems not to be based on any paragraph in the earlier text.</p>	<p><i>Addressed, and ‘and endorsed’ was removed.</i> The emphasis is on the importance of front-loading the design of the coordination project.</p> <p><i>Noted on ‘appropriate’ and clarified.</i> Recommendation language was amended to clarify that ‘appropriate’ may mean ‘additional’ to PPG.</p>
85	Recommendations	<i>It says two recommendations</i>	There are three recommendations in the report.	<i>Corrected.</i>
86	167 (Recommendation)	<i>Whether global/regional coordination projects should report on GEBs should be reexamined.</i>	The report contains interesting analysis on the role of the coordination projects in the achievement of GEBs. However, we do not believe that there needs to be a reexamination of <u>whether</u> they should report on GEBs, but rather, a closer attention paid to <u>how</u> those GEBs are calculated.	<i>Noted.</i> As discussed during the due diligence meeting with the GEF Secretariat, the recommendation was strengthened to state that ‘global and regional coordination projects should not be required to report on GEBs in all cases.’

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
87	168 (Recommendation)	<i>The GEF Secretariat and Lead Agencies should ensure and demonstrate the value addition of a programmatic approach to integration</i>	It is not clear how value-addition can be “ensured and demonstrated”. We suggest an alternative text such as: “ <i>work to further catalyze the value addition of a programmatic approach to integration...</i> ”	<i>Addressed.</i>
88	168 (Recommendation)	<i>The GEF Secretariat should ensure that global/regional coordination projects are designed and endorsed prior to child projects or at minimum with some logical staging so that they are not fully in parallel. Appropriate funding should be available for Lead Agencies to support the coordination and integration role that begins immediately after Council approval of the PFDs.</i>	<p>The sustainable cities impact program followed this exactly. The global project which provides funding to the Lead Agency for coordination and integration was approved immediately after the PFD approval by the Council. The PPG was approved immediately within a month or two and the child project was CEO endorsed ahead of the endorsement of the country projects.</p> <p>The recommendation should be reviewed and if it is generic for the entire integrated approach, it will be good if the recommendation acknowledges how the Cities program has followed this particular recommendation.</p>	See response to comment #84.
89	Annex III	<i>Table 16: CEO PIF Cleared</i>	This should be rephrased: although the project status is ‘CEO PIF Cleared’, programs do not have PIFs.	<i>Corrected.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
90	Annex IV	<i>Geospatial analysis</i>	<p>This entire analysis is difficult to comprehend because GEF does not require ex ante analyses for financing, neither at global nor regional or national level because it is country-driven. Such spatial analysis will require a top-down approach in targeting geographies for GEF investment, which would run counter to the expectations that countries must decide how to best program their limited resources. For this reason, the criteria for country selection under IAP programs and IPs did not require any such spatial analysis by the countries. At end of the day, the caveats highlighted in paras 38 and 216 played a much greater role in shaping the program, especially with respect to country-drivenness and ownership.</p> <p>Application of the analysis to the commodities IAP program is particularly problematic because it ignores the fact that the program was not designed to target countries per se. Rather, the focus was on entire supply chains for the three commodities that together account for over 70% of tropical deforestation. The engagement by Brazil, Indonesia, Paraguay and Liberia was by virtue of their strategic importance for tackling deforestation due to these three commodities. Since the program did not require any use of STAR resources by countries, the design also did not require country child project. Brazil was the only exception to this because of a formal request by the government, which also presented an opportunity to structure the supply chain approach within the country.</p>	<p><i>Noted.</i> The analysis only serves to compare the outcome of the country selection process with locations of high relevance from the standpoint of location of environmental drivers and commodity locations. A sentence was added to paragraph 216 to note that programs operate with limited resources. Also clarified that GGP IAP had child project activities in certain countries, like Indonesia, not country child projects.</p>
<i>Comments from FAO</i>				
1	10		<p>Page 4. Para 10 highlights that the GEF-7 FOLUR IP builds upon the GEF-6 RFS. In reality, the two programs seem to have very little interactions, particularly in terms of leveraging on existing knowledge and coordination platforms, such as the RFS's regional hub and corresponding regional knowledge platforms. The RFS Regional Hub helps to address institutional and policy barriers for the inclusion of ecosystem services' approaches into policies and investments for improved and sustainable smallholder agriculture and food value chains. Something the FOLUR could surely benefit from, as 10 African countries participate in both programs (GEF-6 RFS and GEF-7 FOLUR IP). In addition the FOLUR IP could benefit from the RFS experience in developing comparable indicators and measurements across the CPs (including integrated monitoring tools and approaches).</p>	<p><i>Clarified that FOLUR built on the 'themes in the' RFS and GGP IAPs.</i> Because this is the introduction, it is not the place for evaluative judgements on the extent of interaction etc between the IAPs and IPs.</p>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
2	34		<p>Page 17 para 34 refers to the specific (pre-selected) biomes targeted under the Dryland’s IP. The expected impact in line with the IP’s overall objective (“<i>maintaining the ecological integrity of entire biomes by concentrating efforts, focus, and investments, as well as ensuring strong regional cross-border coordination</i>”) can only be achieved through direct interventions within the Miombo/Mopane ecoregion in Southern Africa where the majority of child projects (7) are located. In contrast, the other regions do not have a ‘critical mass’ of countries participating to achieve the desired impact at transboundary scale through direct child project interventions (for example, in East and West Africa only one child project participates in the program respectively and only two child projects participate in Central Asia). A different approach in selecting participating countries during the EOI process could have avoided this fragmentation (e.g. by placing a stronger weight on the biomes criteria as suggested by the lead agency).</p> <p>Additionally there is no follow up of the IP DSL in GEF-8 (through a dedicated integrated program), a seemingly lost opportunity in view of the global coordination structures and networks that will be put in place (in form of the IP DSL Global Coordination project) and countries’ interest in participating in this program (22 in total submitted EOIs, including eligible countries from South America dryland biomes).</p>	<p><i>Noted</i>, and a footnote was added to explain that the Drylands program did not fund projects in all five biomes, and that the child projects are concentrated in the Miombo/Mopane.</p> <p><i>Noted, no changes made on GEF-8.</i> GEF-8 programming is outside the scope of this evaluation.</p>
3	67		Page 34, Para 67 is missing that the IP DSL call for submission of EOIs was open to all countries.	<i>Added Drylands to list.</i>
4	Box 10		Page 43, Box 10 (RFS/Kenya Water Fund) is incomplete.	<i>Noted, no changes made.</i> Comment is not clear in what way the Box is incomplete.
5	117		Page 56, Para 117, the Mozambique child project, implemented by the World Bank will also fall under the Southern Africa (Miombo/Mopane) REM (missing in the text).	<i>Clarified.</i>
6			Page 268: “ South-East Asia regional Sustainable Rice Landscape Initiative (SRLI)” <u>replace by</u> “ Asia regional Sustainable Rice Landscape Initiative (SRLI)”.	<i>Corrected.</i>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
7			<p>Page 270: “There are no special institutional mechanisms planned so far to ensure participation and decision-making of all parties that have a stake in environmental outcomes, apart from some value chain platforms.” add “and food and land use collaboration mechanisms whose nature is yet to be defined in more detail”. (As per CEO ER, the project plans to establish “<i>food and land use collaboration mechanisms at national and provincial level</i>” (Output 1.1.1). <i>These mechanisms are aimed at bringing together public and private sectors to support cross-sectoral planning and scaling up of interventions aimed at optimizing land use and food systems in the target counties and beyond in view of enhancing environmental sustainability.</i>)</p>	<p><i>Added text as suggested.</i></p>
<i>Comments from the World Bank</i>				
1			<p>Recommendations, lessons learned, and explaining the significance of conclusions. The conclusions are clear and based on in-depth empirical analysis, and it would be beneficial for the reader to better understand their implication for the GEF’s future operations (IP-related and beyond). However, the recommendations seem to be limited. They could be expanded, possibly on the basis of conclusions. An alternative could be formulating lessons learned from the IPs (so far) or even adding statements to the conclusions that would clarify their significance. In particular, what is the significance of the conclusion that the marine systems were not covered and the SIDs were not presented in the country selection, should such missed opportunities be mitigated in the future or, if so, how? What can be learned from a very interesting conclusion that integration can be pursued through several modalities in the GEF—not only the IAPs and IPs? As a general statement, this is very true, for example, multi-sectoral approaches had been used in the GEF before the IAs, and multi-focal projects, as the conclusions state, also deliver integration, but what are the lessons for future operations? Similar questions come to mind in relation to several other conclusions.</p>	<p><i>Noted, no action taken. We think the implications of the conclusions should be discussed in the GEF-8 negotiations. The conclusion on marine systems and SIDS illustrates that there are opportunities ripe for integration that have not yet been seized. The conclusion on integration through other modalities has been moved to the Introduction, per the response to comment #5 from the GEF Secretariat.</i></p>
2			<p>A short executive summary would benefit the report audience.</p>	<p><i>Refer to response to comment #1 from the GEF Secretariat.</i></p>

#	PARAGRAPH NUMBER	REFERENCE TEXT	COMMENTS	IEO RESPONSE AND ACTION TAKEN
3			<p>The report describes different types of additionality and of innovations in IPs. The conclusions in both cases is that institutional innovations, as well as institutional additionality are most common in IPs, while technological additionality and innovations are observed significantly less frequently. These conclusions need an explanation, as the GEF is known and praised for its specific role in the global environmental finance community, i.e., for supporting early stage (mostly technological) risky innovations up to the point when the risk of investment in lowered and the government is ready to take on loans. Most likely, the explanation is in the definitions used for technological, as well as institutional innovations. These definitions are not presented explicitly, and the links (in two footnotes) to full definitions do not work. The report refers to institutional innovation as “provided though strengthening capacities for decision-making, supporting multi-stakeholder participation, and promoting cross-sectoral planning processes”. If these three concepts are combined in the definition, and possibly more is included, the definition is indeed very wide, and it would be useful to understand, if possible, the distribution of the numbers presented for additionality and innovations by these three areas, even if it is an estimate.</p>	<p><i>Noted, we acknowledge the potential discrepancy. We view this as food for thought for the GEF-8 replenishment, discussing which kinds of innovation the GEF wants to promote through integrated approaches. The upcoming IEO evaluation on innovation will also offer insights.</i></p> <p><i>Broken footnotes fixed.</i></p>
4			<p>The report outlines three main challenges faced by the IPs: (1) changes in government administration and/or priorities; (2) challenges related to implementation arrangements; and (3) challenges to overcome sectoral mandates or coordinate among ministries and agencies. It is noted in the report that “interview partners [said that]... there is not sufficient attention to these political drivers in the GEF integrated approaches and child projects as part of planning for systemic changes”. This message in the report may not be consistent with the earlier point about the prevalence of institutional additionality and institutional innovations in the IPs. If so much has been done to support capacities for decision-making, multi-stakeholder participation, and cross-sectoral planning, with additionality achieved, is it possible that these are external factors, either outside of the GEF’s control or requiring a long time to be modified?</p>	<p><i>Noted, no action taken. This is related to your previous comment. These challenges may be due both or either to external or internal factors, and multiple interpretations are possible. But we do not think that forcing an interpretation would better inform the negotiations of future integrated programming in the GEF.</i></p>