

Annex E: Evaluation Audit Trail Template

(To be completed by the Project Management to show how the received comments on the draft report have (or have not) been incorporated into the report of the evaluation. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final evaluation report.)

To the comments received in September 2024 from the “Endline Evaluation of the Strengthening Capacities in the Use of Geospatial Information for Improved Resilience in Asia-Pacific and Africa”

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

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft evaluation report	Evaluator response and actions taken
Marion Barthelemy	1	Overall report	My main point is that I think it would not be good to cover the project’s no cost extension and the activities being currently undertaken. I realize that the activities are on-going, but some of them address the conclusions and recommendations of the draft evaluation report. One example relates to the knowledge platform. The report states that this platform can help ensure the sustainability of the project (which could be reflected in the recommendations) and we are in the process of strengthening it.	The evaluation covers activities up to July 31 st , which I believe was the original closing date. The report notes the extension but does not evaluate its activities. To this date, the knowledge platform has not yet fulfilled its role and I think it is important to note it. There are several petitions to include new or planned activities in the report.
Marion Barthelemy	2	Executive summary	This could be clarified (referring to “mobilizing funding”): “The project has attained or surpassed its output level targets, making significant progress since the midline review, especially in developing the web applications, delivering capacity-building activities and establishing the knowledge hub. However, the project struggled in fully implementing recommendations related to mobilizing funding and effectively raising awareness at the level of decision-makers, which limited the integration of GIT tools.”	The paragraph has been altered further below in the Executive summary to reflect the fact that additional funding would have enhanced results in some countries.

Marion Barthelemy	3	Executive summary	This is not very clear? I guess Einar was engaged, referring to “UNOSAT leadership” in Value of High-Level Engagement: Early and sustained high-level engagement, particularly involving UNOSAT leadership, can facilitate smoother project implementation by overcoming bureaucratic obstacles.”	It is a lesson learned that early and sustained engagement can facilitate. The related recommendation is: “Establish early contact with national governments, involving UNOSAT/UNITAR leadership, to streamline official approval processes and reduce delays in project implementation”
Marion Barthelemy	4	Relevance, evaluation question 1.2	I do not think that this is reflected in the conclusions and recommendations part, referring to “By developing user-friendly web-based applications and decision support systems“	Thank you. This has been added to conclusions
Marion Barthelemy	5	Relevance, evaluation question 1.3, Finding 3	We could mention that a proposal developed by Fiji with the help of UNOSAT and the Commonwealth Secretariat was approved for funding by the GCF	Indeed, this project strongly contributed to the Adaptation Fund Strengthening the Adaptive Capacity of Coastal Communities of Fiji to Climate Change through Nature-Based Seawalls, as described in the corresponding section. here were are discussing relevance. However, the paragraph now reflects the actual mobilization of resources, rather than mere proposals as <i>support to beneficiary organizations for strengthened disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and natural resource management</i>
Marion Barthelemy	6	Efficiency, evaluation question 4.2	I think this should be also reflected in the conclusions further down, referring to “Additionally, the project adjusted its financial strategies to cope with external factors like significant exchange rate fluctuations[1], which affected the budget heavily [1] The disbursements are made in Norwegian Kroner. However, the operations are done in US dollars. The exchange rate changes according to the market and these are guided by the United Nations Operational Rates of Exchange. The Norwegian krone	Added at conclusions

			was worth 7,044,734.06 USD on 2 July 2021 (1USD= 8.517 NOK) and is worth 5,715,918.83 USD on 19 June 2024 (1USD= 10.497 NOK) using the official UN exchange rate.	
Marion Barthelemy	7	Likelihood of impact, evaluation question 5.1	Was it similar in Bangladesh?	In Bangladesh the impact remained potential. During the evaluation mission in June, shortly after cyclone Remal hit in May 26, 2024 (16 people killed, 4.6 million affected), there was expectation of gathering evidence of project capacity being deployed to assess damage. However, SOP continued to be paper-based as confirmed by the stakeholders. There is evidence of higher use of the flood AI web app in August 2024 (Flooding linked to monsoon rains beginning in June have affected an estimated 3.74 million people), but no confirmation has been sought from focal point organization. Government functions were also severely affected by the July events.
Marion Barthelemy	8	Likelihood of sustainability, evaluation question 6.4	This is an important point that should probably be featured among the recommendations (referring to knowledge platform)	Third recommendation: 1. Increase engagement on the knowledge platform and support ToT participants in applying the knowledge and skills when delivering training. Support countries to develop a structured plan for continued use of the knowledge platform, ensuring ToT participants have access to resources and mentorship for delivering effective training. Sustainability: UNOSAT should maintain the platform with input from national experts,

				ensuring its relevance and usability over time.
Marion Barthelemy	9	Conclusions, efficiency	The issue was that implementation was possibly a bit slow to start and that there was a need to truly accelerate work in the end. Could we say: « the financial execution rate ... reflected delays in starting implementation and underutilization of resources in the first phase of the project, which was addressed by accelerating implementation in the last year of aiming for close to 100 per cent financial delivery by December 2024.	Paragraph modified to reflect comment: The relatively low execution rate by July 2023 of 50.7% was due to the delayed inception of the project in some of the countries. The accelerated implementation rate in 2023 and 2024 makes closing to 100 per cent financial delivery by December 2024 likely, as shown by project financial execution projections. Besides administrative delays, the project was affected by exchange rate changes.
Marion Barthelemy	10	Conclusions, likelihood of impact	We should say that a large Fiji project on the building of nature based sea walls was approved by the Green Climate Fund thanks to the support provided through the NORAD project	The USD 5.75 million sea wall project funded by the Adaptation Fund and the contribution to the USD 6 million GEF electric bus project in Solomon Island are acknowledged here lump together as mobilization of USD 12 million. The section on climate finance provides more details. However, the overall finance trends have not changed, yet, as strong proposals is but one factor affecting climate finance
Marion Barthelemy	11	Lessons Learned	I thought Einar was quite engaged in this project. If he was not, we should take into account the fact that he was sick so this should be handled carefully	Precisely, it is a lesson learned from the project that UNOSAT management should be engaged. Lessons learned can be both positive and negative. We also learn from positive experiences.
Jelinke Wijnen	12	Primary Sources - Surveys	Could we add a disclaimer whether this is high or low? Because I believe this is around the expectation of the number of participants?	This is a very interesting question, but I am not sure that it makes to

				<p>evaluate the response rate here. Social science online surveys response rate average at 40% and market research surveys at 30%, so it would seem that the response rate is low. As the respondents were project participants, indeed we could have expected more participation. In my experience however, a sample of more than a fifth of the respondent population is a valid response rate. Quantitatively, if population size is 344, CI=95% and a 10% margin of error, sample size should be 76, which is not far from our 74. On the other hand, response rates were much lower for some sections, for instance awareness raising and climate finance. We may need to, at least for future evaluation involving surveys, include a technical annex to cover all these considerations. Added in the footnote that this is satisfactory compared with other surveys administered by UNITAR to participants.</p>
Jelinke Wijnen	13	Relevance – Evaluation question 1.2	Maybe we could rephrase this sentence? Now it seems that the misalignment is caused by UNOSAT’s limited staff pool, which I would believe is not the case.	Sentence changed “staff pool” to “number” to ensure clarity in reference to staff of focal point and beneficiary organizations
Jelinke Wijnen	14	Effectiveness – Evaluation question 3.1.	A third training will still happen through the KH. Maybe Khaled could advise here.	Will need documentation on training. The training is not included in accomplished outcomes as delivered after the evaluation. However, planned number was corrected.

		(Table 11-for Uganda)		
Jelinke Wijnen	15	Effectiveness – Evaluation question 3.1. (Table 12)	I believe more web solutions have now been released that are still scope of this evaluation. Is more recent data shared?	Latest data entry: September 10. Footnote added to the table.
Jelinke Wijnen	16	Effectiveness – Evaluation question 3.1.	What about Bangladesh?	Added here. Bangladesh is discussed below
Jelinke Wijnen	17	Recommendations - Medium Priority	The technical team has done trainings on the subnational level in Vanuatu, is the positive impact of those trainings assessed in this evaluation?	Yes. Unfortunately the interaction with Vanuatu respondents was limited, but those were indeed positive. Other countries insisted in the dire need to expand towards the field level. Vanuatu experience acknowledged and added.
Khaled Mashfiq	18	Executive summary	I agree a bit clarification needed, when referring to the comment of Marion related to “UNOSAT leadership” in Value of High-Level Engagement: Early and sustained high-level engagement, particularly involving UNOSAT leadership, can facilitate smoother project implementation by overcoming bureaucratic obstacles. All senior management was actively engaged from very beginning to support smooth implementation. Some bureaucratic hurdles are systemic can't be resolved.	It is a lesson learned that early and sustained engagement can facilitate. The related recommendation is: “Establish early contact with national governments, involving UNOSAT/UNITAR leadership, to streamline official approval processes and reduce delays in project implementation”
Khaled Mashfiq	19	Effectiveness – Evaluation question 3.1 (Table 11, Planned Output for Lao PDR)	I think target was 3. One training per country per year according to logframe.	Sorry for the mistake, it was actually three trainings (not counting ToT): Introductory Training on the Application of GIT for Rapid Response Mapping - Advanced Training on Geospatial Information

				Technologies for Disaster Risk Reduction - GIT for Decision-Making Training Workshop (Utilisation of Web Application 2) Color coding and training list changed
Khaled Mashfiq	20	Effectiveness – Evaluation question 3.1 (Table 11, Planned Output - for Uganda)	Correct. But target was also 3, when referring to Jelinke’s comment: “A third training will still happen through the KH. Maybe Khaled could advise here”.	Will need documentation on training. Planned number corrected
Khaled Mashfiq	21	Effectiveness – Evaluation question 3.1 (Table 12, Planned Web Apps- for Uganda)	Target was 2. We delivered more than target. The SLM DSS idea was quite complex which was initially identified to implemented in the subsequent phase.	Inception report includes a 1 web-based decision support system on land management. However, two unplanned (not in inception) web apps acknowledged
Khaled Mashfiq	22	Effectiveness – Evaluation question 3.3 (First paragraph)	A series of workshops were conducted that boosted the use of DSS in pacific and in other countries, when referring to “effectively raising awareness at the decision-making level”.	This is well noted, yet, no tangible results reported by the evaluation sources.
Khaled Mashfiq	23	Effectiveness – Evaluation question 3.3 (Challenges and Partial Implementation- Mobilizing Funding)	As far as I'm aware from management, the donors did not cite this (“The failure to communicate effectively at the decision-making level in the countries likely contributed to this outcome, as key decision-makers were not fully informed or engaged in the project's potential benefits in all countries”) as the reason for not funding the subsequent phase. It was more related to their national strategy.	Paragraph refers to national decision-makers, not international funding. Focal point and beneficiary organization have limited control over budgets allocated for them and several informants agree that the low level of awareness among decision makers, e.g. finance, planning ministries, MPs, etc challenges increasing budget which would, according to the informants, enable effective deployment of project capacities. I have now separated the two issues: external funding (next

				paragraph), which, based on different sources, was mostly due to dependence on one donor, and national allocation and awareness (as explained above)
Khaled Mashfiq	24	Effectiveness – Evaluation question 3.3 (Challenges and Partial Implementation-Awareness Raising and Decision-Maker Engagement)	The project did organise separate event to engage decision makers in pacific and in Bangladesh. The limited funds of the project poses challenges to organise such events	Fair point. The evaluation reflects the stakeholders' opinion on limited awareness by national decision-makers. Added: Key decision-makers were not fully informed or engaged in the project's potential benefits in all countries, affecting budget and resource allocations of the project's technical partners (focal and beneficiary organizations). Networking events were held between May and June at least in Bhutan, Fiji, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu with uncertain effects on awareness outside the focal point and beneficiary organizations.
Khaled Mashfiq	25	Efficiency - Evaluation question 4.1 (Table 15)	Can this figure be rechecked (2,900.09 USD)? When referring for the amount granted for the IP "Disaster Prevention Division, Social Welfare Department, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, Lao PDR".	If KIP/USD rate was 0.00004513 as of August 15, 2024, then amount in USD is USD 2,910.40
Khaled Mashfiq	26	Likelihood of Impact – Evaluation question 5.4 (Progress towards institutional outcomes)	We do not have this component for some countries, when referring to "Institutional Outcome 2.3: The endline scores reflect a strong increase in the likelihood of accessing additional climate finance directly linked to the project's applications and the assistance provided by Commonwealth CFAs. However, the results must be interpreted carefully considering the missing endline data for Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands and the fact that the project has not influenced the overall climate finance trend".	Indeed, Outcome 2.3 only for the three Pacific countries. Noted added in brackets.
Khaled Mashfiq	27	Likelihood of Impact – Evaluation question 5.4	How this score was calculated? Is 55% progress considered below par?, when referring to the mean % progress for Solomon Islands.	The percentage is calculated as endline score-midline score/ midline score. The indicators for the institutional outcomes were based on the scorecard. I agree,

		(Table 18- for Solomon Islands)		more than 50% should be moderate, hence yellow
Khaled Mashfiq	28	Lessons learned (Number 4)	My observation as stated previously high level engagement and guidance was always present. Some bureaucratic hurdles were beyond senior managements capacity to resolve.	Precisely, it is a lesson learned from the project that UNOSAT management should be engaged. Lessons learned can be both positive and negative. We also learn from positive experiences.
Shaswati Das	29	Executive Summary (First paragraph)	As per the Project the 6 Capacity Development tools were: Technical Training, Technical Backstopping, Awareness Raising, Web Application Solutions, Knowledge Platform & Climate Finance (only for the 3 Pacific Countries).	Acknowledged and included: the project focuses on building geospatial information technology (GIT) capacities for effective planning and decision-making through targeted technical training, backstopping services, awareness raising, and development of web-based GIT applications, including geospatial decision support systems (DSS) and a knowledge platform. Together with the Commonwealth Secretariat's Commonwealth Climate Access Hub, the project asl provided support to access climate finance in the tree Pacific small island states of Fiji, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.
Shaswati Das	30	Executive Summary (Third paragraph)	("However, some areas, such as deeper integration with UNOSAT's ongoing activities and exchanges with Resident Coordinator Office teams, could have been more robustly developed") Can be written: However, while efforts were made to engage, certain areas -----did not fully materialize as expected.	Acknowledged and sentence modified along those lines. However I would need more evidence regarding efforts as interviews suggest more engagement with UNCTs could have been positive
Shaswati Das	31	Executive Summary (Second page, first paragraph)	The Knowledge Platform was established since the start of the project. The KH which is a tributary to the KP was launched early 2023 and since then until July 2024 delivered 5 webinars connecting about 80+ countries with about 100 participants.	So my understanding is that the KH is the final product. Precision added on KH content

			Besides this the KH also hosts 30 publications, extensive training materials and informative videos.	
Shaswati Das	32	Executive Summary (Second page, end of first paragraph)	Do not really agree besides the words are quite imposing.	Indeed it sounded as the project had the obligation of securing funding and failed. The paragraph has been altered to reflect the fact that additional funding would have enhanced results in some countries.
Shaswati Das	33	Executive Summary (Second page, second paragraph)	Not only for the Writeshop Workshops but for all the training programmes as well.	Indeed. This has been corrected
Shaswati Das	34	Executive Summary (Fourth paragraph)	UNOSAT's SLB Country Expert has played a crucial role in developing the 17 th Pacific Games 2023 Disaster Response Plan, when referring to the examples of the project in improving disaster management capabilities.	Unfortunately not mentioned during interviews, hence, more documentation and context needed
Shaswati Das	35	Executive Summary (Lesson learned No.5.)	The recent Proposal, "Nature Based Seawalls to Enhance Coastal Resilience" from Fiji got approved for funding securing \$5,764,000. This journey took almost 2 years (2022 April/May -2024 April). There were multiple actors who played their roles.	Agreed. Please note that this is a lesson learned from the project.
Shaswati Das	36	Introduction (first paragraph)	To name a few: OHCHR, UNHCHR, WHO, UNDP, UNESCO, WFP, ICRC, when referring to the programmes to whom UNOSAT provides with their services.	indeed, but formulation kept for simplicity and to avoid diverting focus from the project
Shaswati Das	37	Introduction (second paragraph, first line)	And later from NORAD, for correcting the line "and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD)"	Same
Shaswati Das	38	Introduction (second paragraph, third line)	From its Regional Liaison Office based in BKK and NBO, for correcting the line "from its Bangkok and Nairobi offices, respectively".	Acknowledged and added
Shaswati Das	39	Introduction (third paragraph)	Not very clear when referring to the statement "The project also aims to provide solutions tailored to beneficiaries' needs and establish a community of practice and knowledge platform that includes UNOSAT technical backstopping and support from peers".	Paragraph "The project also aims to provide solutions tailored to beneficiaries' needs and establish a community of practice and knowledge platform that includes UNOSAT technical backstopping and support from peers" with the

				following comments: Not very clear and Subject & Object has been eliminated as it does not add relevant information to the project's objective and the project strategy is described in detail in the next section
Shaswati Das	40	Introduction (third paragraph)	Subject & Object when referring to "solutions tailored".	Paragraph "The project also aims to provide solutions tailored to beneficiaries' needs and establish a community of practice and knowledge platform that includes UNOSAT technical backstopping and support from peers" with the following comments: Not very clear and Subject & Object has been eliminated as it does not add relevant information to the project's objective and the project strategy is described in detail in the next section
Shaswati Das	41	Introduction (fourth paragraph)	The project aimed to, for correcting "The project aims to ..."	The report refers to the project in the present tense throughout the document
Shaswati Das	42	Introduction (fourth paragraph)	Land-Use Planning, for correcting "land planning".	Acknowledged and changed
Shaswati Das	43	Introduction-Project logical framework	Six ("work packages") : Technical Training, Technical Backstopping, Awareness Raising, Web Application Solution, Knowledge Platform and Climate Finance. CF is only for the 3 pacific countries and if we add the ' Needs Assessment" which was carried out during the Inception Period then can be counted as 7. Inclusion of gender is an aspect which the project has always prioritized ensuring the most vulnerable populations were better equipped to face future challenges.	The number of WP has changed since the proposal (4 parent and 10 "offspring" WP) to the 6 capacity components of the inception and progress reports. The 7th package tried to capture the separate gender activities, e.g. webinars. Corrected from 7 to 6.
Shaswati Das	44	Introduction-Project logical framework	Government officials, to replace "technical officials".	Changed from "technical" to "government"

Shaswati Das	45	Introduction-Project logical framework (Output 2.2.2)	Has been always part of the 6 Capacity Building Tools and was established with the idea to facilitate continuous collaboration and information sharing among all the stakeholders, regardless of their geographical distances.	Correct. This is only listing the outputs and hence not changed.
Shaswati Das	46	Introduction-Project logical framework (output 3.1)	Referring to it solely as "CF" limits the recognition of the technical support provided by UNOSAT to the Pacific countries.	Output as formulated in log frame
Shaswati Das	47	Methodology – Primary sources	If this sentence (“During the interviews, however, UNOSAT in-country experts mainly acted as focal point organization representatives given that most of the in-country experts are seconded government officials”) can be reframed: Recognizing the importance of bridging gaps and maximizing the value of in-person meetings, the Country Experts played a vital role in streamlining communication and saving time. Their contributions were instrumental in ensuring efficient collaboration.	This refers to their dual role as UNOSAT and host organization staff, so from the evaluation’s methodology their position must be clarified.
Shaswati Das	48	Methodology – Limitations (first paragraph)	The Endline Evaluation Exercise coincided with the Project End of Year activities in many project countries, such as the technical trainings and release activity for the Web Application Solution.	Conflicting schedules are always an issue. However, this paragraph strictly discusses the validity of the scorecard results.
Shaswati Das	49	Relevance – Evaluation question 1.4	The 2 webinars hosted on the International Women’s Day and World Environment Day, should be included, when referring to the project promotion of gender balance.	Acknowledged and added
Shaswati Das	50	Effectiveness – Evaluation question 3.1 (Table 11, for Nigeria’s Accomplished Outputs)	Recently 1 Backstopping request from Nigeria’s National Agency from the Great Green Wall was delivered, which was registered during the technical training session	Acknowledged following provision of documentation.
Shaswati Das	50	Effectiveness – Evaluation question 3.1	Nigeria National Election 2023, when referring to the “bureaucratic delays” of Nigeria	Elections not mentioned in interviews when discussing delays. Moreover, all other project countries underwent electoral processes during the project’s implementation timeframe: Uganda and Lao PDR (2021), Vanuatu and Fiji (2022), Bangladesh and the Solomon Islands (2024).

Shaswati Das	51	Effectiveness – Evaluation question 3.1	There was no staff turnover in Uganda, when referring to the statement “However, like in Lao PDR, Uganda faces challenges related to staff turnover and the retention of trained personnel”.	Not UNOSAT expert. Report is based on multiple sources. Added «government» to clarify that it does not concern UNOSAT in-country expert.
Shaswati Das	52	Effectiveness – Evaluation question 3.2	The Covid19 restrictions also played a reason for delay at the beginning, when referring to the “Factors contributing to project performance”	Despite specifically asking for COVID 19 effects, agreement among stakeholders that COVID 19 had no or minimal effects
Shaswati Das	53	Effectiveness – Evaluation question 3.2 (Second factor contributing to project performance)	Not necessary all the Country Experts were Government Officials, when referring to the statement “The presence of in-country experts who were government officials familiar with local contexts..”	Will appreciate list. Stakeholder interviews highly valued fact some experts seconded public servants. Precision added. Above we say «most».
Shaswati Das	54	Effectiveness – Evaluation question 3.2 (first factor hindering project performance)	Only two of the project countries, Lao and Nigeria, experienced staff turnover. In Lao, the Country Expert, Soulixay Inthasone, sadly passed away, and in Nigeria, the Country Expert moved on from his position.	Staff turnover does not refer exclusively to UNOSAT. Staff turnover at focal point or beneficiary organization, even at higher government levels cited by a significant proportion of stakeholders.
Shaswati Das	55	Effectiveness – Evaluation question 3.2 (Challenges and Partial Implementation)	(“Moreover, the project team relied on a single donor and had limited engagement with other potential donors”) If can be phrased: The project team maintained a strong partnership with the principal donor to effectively align with shared goals. However, the donor’s unexpected shift in priorities restricted the project team’s ability to engage with other potential donors.	That is the project team point of view. However, the evaluation draws from several sources. Reference to the donor’s change of priorities was made.