

Evaluation Audit Trail Template

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

To the comments received on (5, 6 and 7 August 2020) from the Mid-line Evaluation of the CommonSensing Project

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

Author	#	Para No./comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft mid-term evaluation report	Evaluator response and actions taken
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	1	Pg 4 – Para2	Consortium references Radiant Earth, as an implementing partner ('is implemented by...', rather than having been conceived by those partners)	Addressed. Text revised accordingly.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	2	Pg 4 – final paragraph	Refers to "lack of tangible results". Does the author mean "lack...results yet"?	There are some results at output level, so it is difficult to say there is a lack of results. It is more at outcome level.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	3	Pg 6 – first paragraph	"very little has been delivered in terms of setting the solution and concerning sustainability" reads as very vague, I'm not quite clear on what is meant here.	Comment addressed.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	4	Pg 6 – Recommendation 1	Presumably this is covered more in detail in the report, but it would be good here too to have an example of what is meant here	Comment addressed.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	5	Pg 7 (2.)	First sentence is very long and not easily read. I would suggest rewording along the lines of: <i>The project is based on the assumption that integrating EO derived services into national strategic programmes can provide the quantity and quality of data needed to enable access to climate funds and effective policy-making processes.</i>	Comment addressed.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	6	Pg 7 (3.)	A word seems to be missing following "amount of climate financing"... is it the amount accessed? Spent? Something else?	Comment addressed by adding the objective.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	7	Pg 7 (4)	Still refers to Radiant Earth as if they are a current partner.	Comment addressed by making clear that Radiant Earth is not anymore a project partner.
Caribou Space -	8	Pg 9 (11)	This is the survey that is administered and used in ongoing project reporting? Can you clarify when it was conducted	Comment addressed with additional information added.

Elise Montano				
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	9	Pg 12 (19.)/Figure 2	Perhaps this is my own confusion, but can you clarify when these survey results are from? As it is my understanding this wasn't a bespoke survey for the midline, I just want to be clear that the responses are from a relevant time period.	This was carried out between December 2019 and March 2020. This is now indicated in the methodology.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	10	Pg 12/13 (21.)	It might be addressed later, but There is good information presented at QPMs about the number of backstopping activities that could be easily added here to give some quant to the statements about where requests have come from.	The number of request received against the number of requested supported was included.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	11	Pg 13 (22.)	Is there any insight into why a minority of beneficiaries have participated in 'awareness raising' sessions? Is it because they aren't aware of what is defined as 'awareness raising' vs. capacity development? Or because the sessions are targeted to other audiences?	Well the number of participations in awareness raising sessions might increase as these sessions are still ongoing. But so far, the limited outreach might be due to the target group that for the moment has focused on leadership/political positions.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	12	Pg 13 (23.)	Perhaps a more general point to this section but is difficult for me as someone who is not deeply integrated in the project to follow the logic of what is an awareness raising session, capacity development, training etc. their purposes, and how the different audiences might vary. If there were a simple schematic that could show this it would be beneficial (but Im not sure if that is easily possible).	A short description clarifying the objectives and audiences of each activities has been added.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	13	Pg 14 (24.)	Any insights into why there were issues with training being (for example) too broad/basic? My understanding is that project team did a fairly extensive skills/gap mapping before embarking so would have expected this to be better targeted. At the same time, it is feedback we have heard in many other projects that they have actually failed to do enough of the general/basic training, so it is quite interesting from a programme level view to hear this.	Difficult to say, but most probably because the needs assessment was too broad or not sufficiently focused/exhaustive, it had issues of targeting audiences. It is very difficult to ensure that the needs of those

				assessed then are involved in the implementation of the project (e.g. there is high turnover). In such specific areas and small countries, maybe it would be worth it to identify a 'critical mass' of staff to be supported and design CD activities through a more academic approach (e.g. as if it was a master degree). In this way, it is possible to ensure the presence of the same people and concrete/specific content.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	14	Pg 15 (28.)	Points here on the in-country partners, and SPC are quite interesting to see.	Noted.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	15	Pg 15 (30)	Do you mean "sex" disaggregated data?	Yes, comment addressed.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	16	Pg 17 (38)	Any further insight into why project hasn't further aligned to national strategies? Currently it reads to me a bit that it is because the national strategies are too broad. Is this right?	Comment addressed by including specific information/examples about it.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	17	Pg 17 (39)	Cases of duplication – do you mean that they also shared satellite images? Or just that the training elements were duplicative?	Both, trainings and provision of satellite images and data analysis. Countries are using satellite images provided by US government and the EU (through the Copernicus programme for example during cyclone Palm).
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	18	Pg 18 (42)	Considered by whom? In country partners?	Stakeholders in general, this is in-country partners, development

				partners and other actors met (e.g. SPC).
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	19	Pg 18 (43)	I think that the point here about partners not feeling they are kept up to date with progress could be better highlighted in executive summary – especially in the relevant recommendation as it seems a bit out of the blue in the recommendations initially.	Comment addressed in the executive summary.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	20	Pg 18 (44-45)	I think all of this could be better highlighted in exec summary as its very useful information.	Comment addressed in the executive summary.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	21	Pg 20 (51)	Is there a clear recommendation, or next steps that could be taken to rectify this discrepancies (between LF and ToC, in capacity targets etc.)	Yes. Please see the recommendations.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	22	Pg 20 (52)	Attribution problems are acknowledged. As advisors for UKSA, we have always recommended projects focus on being able to identify their contribution to impacts, rather than clear attribution of results.	This is the most optimal approach in this case. However, the fact that the project relies on too many assumptions increases the likelihood for attribution issues.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	23	Pg 21 (56)	Footnote 15, formatting seems to have been lost	Comment addressed.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	24	Pg 24 (65)	Any comment on whether or not this structure is seen to be working, or hindering efficiency?	The structure is complex and involves some tensions. But given the different nature of project partners and the large number of consortium members, this seems to be the most adequate management structure to implement the project.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	25	Pg 25 (71)	Some of this could benefit marginally from a bit more evidencing. I.e. when talking about the large number of partners to co-ordinate, how many are you actually referring to? Is there any benchmarking available against similar	According to UKSA, this is the IPP project with the largest consortium and with this type of structure.

			sized projects and how they have managed project management/internal comms type roles that could be learned from?	
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	26	Pg 28 (82.)	Similar to a comment above, when you reference that the project has reached only 40% of stakeholders through awareness raising, does that mean that only 40% of stakeholders identified (how?) have attended awareness raising events? Who are the 'stakeholders'	It refers to the 40% of stakeholders identified by the project. The project has a list of stakeholders and it includes government staff, academia, regional organisations, development partners and some NGOs.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	27	Pg 29 (87.)	Points, raised before, on women showing less improvement than men, possibly linked to higher level of knowledge pre-CS could be better explained in Executive summary.	Comment addressed in the executive summary.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	28	Pg 31 (93.)	"Considered extremely low" – by interviewees? In comparison to other similar projects?	Comment addressed.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	29	Pg 31 (93.)	Comment on Stakeholder engagement being overlooked is interested and while it might be a bit strong to say it like this in executive summary it would be interesting to see it highlighted more clearly as an issue for PM to respond to.	Comment addressed in the executive summary.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	30	Pg 32 (96.)	Again, I think this point on the feedback from interviewees could be better highlighted in executive summary	Comment addressed in the executive summary.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	31	Pg 36 (R 2)	Does this imply having a person (at both orgs?) who is more dedicated to this function?	That would be an option. Another could be to take a more strategic approach and invest time in coordinating internally at delivery level.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	32	Pg 37 (R 3)	Is this a recommendation for UNITAR and Catapult, or rather for them to decide who is best to pick up the work? For example, would it make more sense for this to sit with another partner like the Commonwealth Secretariat?	This is difficult to say by the evaluator. There is a full WP 800 for communication and even a KPI (4), mentioned in the project document. From my point of

				view, all partners should be involved in the communication and visibility of the project too.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	33	Pg 37 (R 4)	What about the role of Devex here as the dedicated comms partner?	That is a suggestion. However, Devex's role is understood to be more research focused.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	34	Pg 39	Interviewee 9 should be Tim Hudson – not sure on the other names, but that one I picked up.	Noted with thanks. It was probably an editing/typing mistake.
Caribou Space - Elise Montano	35	Pg 40 – Annex 2	Charts are missing X-axis titles?	I cannot modify them as they were copied from the M&E Dashboards, maybe Anu can help on this.
UNOSAT – Anudari Achitsaikhan	36	Page 8, Table 1	WP 1000 (M&E) is missing from the table	Comment addressed.
UNOSAT – Anudari Achitsaikhan		Page 14, Paragraph 25	First mention of the SDSS being used as the umbrella term for the CS Platform, data cube, solutions etc. The SDSS is just one part of the overall whole. Best to rephrase to the "CS platform"	Comment addressed.
UNOSAT – Anudari Achitsaikhan	37	Page 20, Figure 5	Image would look better if the text is clean	It is a copy paste from the project document. I do not have the original.
UNOSAT – Anudari Achitsaikhan	38	Page 21, Paragraph 50	Would the "missing link" be an objective assessment to track improvement	Missing link refers to measuring intermediate outcomes that can prove project assumptions are right. Now, there is no difference between intermediate outcomes and institutional outcomes. They are at the same level. An objective assessment of trainings would be a good example.

UNOSAT - Anudari	39	Page 21, Paragraph 53	There will still be more awareness raising events delivered within the project	Comment noted and addressed.
UNOSAT – Anudari Achitsaikhan	40	Page 24, Paragraph 63	WP1000 for M&E added	Comment addressed.
UNOSAT – Anudari Achitsaikhan	41	Page 27, Paragraph 73	Could you please elaborate on the “missing link”	See answer to comment 38.
UNOSAT – Anudari Achitsaikhan	42	Page 29, Paragraph 82	Local communities were indeed engaged through awareness raising events such as the Mapathon events	Noted with thanks and addressed. This was not noted during the evaluation or raised by the field officers or interviewees. Hence, it might not be sufficient.
UNOSAT – Anudari Achitsaikhan	43	Page 32, Paragraph 91	Would it be possible to expand upon how you believe the results chain could be improved. Perhaps by adding onto your ToC in figure 5?	Difficult to do it based on figure 5 because it has some inconsistencies with the Logframe. But some recommendations can be found in the recommendations part (e.g. better defining what it is an intermediate outcome and outcome, include intermediate outcomes).
UNOSAT – Anudari Achitsaikhan	44	Page 32, Paragraph 94	Duly noted. It is planned to add an indicator on stakeholder engagement.	Noted. Please also see KPIs in the project document.
UNOSAT – Anudari Achitsaikhan	45	Page 35, Table 2	Indicator 1.5 can be amended to be on-track.	Comment addressed.
UNOSAT – Anudari Achitsaikhan	46	Page 36, Paragraph 98	See the above comment	Comment addressed.
UNOSAT – Anudari Achitsaikhan	47	Page 36, Paragraph 98	See comment in document	Comment addressed.
UNOSAT – Anudari Achitsaikhan	48	Page 36, Paragraph 100	That indicator would be 4.1	Well, the number of case studies remains a quantitative indicator. I refer more

				to a more qualitative assessment that identifies specific changes (maybe the content of the case studies).
UNOSAT – Oran No	49	Executive Summary	As Anu also pointed out below, it should be corrected as the CS Platform which consists of the Climate Information app, the Risk Information app, the Map Explorer app, and Spatial Decision Support System (SDSS) .	Comment addressed.
UNOSAT – Oran No	50	Page 7, Para 4	Devex works for the outreach communication: WP 810 Development Community. Rather UoP and ComSec are in charge of a number of research tasks including discussion papers, as described in WP 350 Innovation in Risk Science and WP 730 Commonwealth and Climate Finance Sustainability.	Noted, but this did not come up during the interviews in this way. I think there is some lack of clarity about communication and visibility that is worth it to clarify (types of communication, purposes etc.)
UNOSAT – Oran No	51	Page 7, Para 4	Overall, it is UNOSAT leading these two Work Streams. ComSec is in charge of high-level stakeholder coordination and CF sustainability under specific WPs, like other implementing partners. At the project level, ComSec is responsible for Climate Finance components.	Thanks for the information. However, very limited information was provided during the assessment by the documents as well as by the interviews.
UNOSAT – Oran No	52	Page 8, Table 1	Please include Catapult. Upon Radiant Earth's departure, UNOSAT and Catapult shared their workload. ComSec's involvement remains the same.	Radiant Earth is not included in the table.
UNOSAT – Oran No	53	Page 8, para 6	March can be more exact description. (31 st March)	Comment addressed.
UNOSAT – Oran No	54	Page 14, para 25	This describes only the SDSS' function. Please see Anu's comment above. For more info on the full CS platform consisting of different apps, please contact Delia Di Filippantonio Delia.Di.Filippantonio@sa.catapult.org.uk at Catapult.	Well noted. Comment addressed.
UNOSAT – Oran No	55	Page 14, para 26	Regarding the CS Platform, user training and feedback sessions (f-2-f) have been affected, especially with its schedule. COVID-19 is irrelevant to the development itself.	Comment addressed by including this information.
UNOSAT – Oran No	56	Page 14, para 26	To clarify - on Climate Finance	Additional information added.

UNOSAT – Oran No	57	Page 14, para 26	<p>“Climate Finance Advisor” – to avoid confusion with terms.</p> <p>CFA for Fiji has started her work remotely since early June, and it was communicated to and coordinated with the MoEconomy’s Climate Change Division.</p>	Thanks for this information and this is indicated in the evaluation.
Caribou - Tim Hayward	58	Page 16, para 33	This sentence needs clarifying	Noted.
UNOSAT – Oran No	59	Page 18, para 42	on Climate Finance	Information added.
Caribou - Tim Hayward	60	Page 18, para 43	Seems strange given the locally based project resources?	Yes, but it seems their role is seen and understood to be more operational.
UNOSAT – Oran No	61	Page 21, para 53	<p>It is planned to be delivered in Q3 & Q4 2020.</p> <p>Limited time for applying it to climate finance activities is recognised and reflected in the no-cost extension request (to be made).</p>	Noted.
UNOSAT – Oran No	62	Page 25, para 64	Between UNOSAT and Catapult, Project Managers have weekly calls to work closely on coordination, monitoring the progress, identifying opportunities and mitigating risks.	This information is reflected in the evaluation.
UNOSAT – Oran No	63	Page 25, para 64	Not only share the WP progresses, but also discuss the cross-cutting issues to be tackled. (e.g. Stakeholder analysis and Sustainability).	Indeed, but it might not have received sufficient attention or actions have been executed.
UNOSAT – Oran No	64	Page 25, para 65	<p>Within the implementing partners working for a same WP do have discussions to make a decision. However, within WP leaders, there is a lack of communication.</p> <p>Looking at the Figure 1 (p. 8), vertical communication for decision-making takes place, but less at horizontal or diagonal levels.</p>	That's correct. Horizontal or diagonal communication exists by own initiative and not because it is institutionalised like the vertical communication.
Caribou - Tim Hayward	65	Page 27, para 73	Actions to take/recommendations?	Please see recommendations.
UNOSAT – Oran No	66	Page 30, para 83	What type of data here refers to? What type of data here refers to?	The info. /data generated by M&E activities.
UNOSAT – Oran No	67	Page 33, para 94	It varies depending on the in-country experts' involvement and the progress of solutions for each country.	They are two staff from two different countries. There is definitely a problem

				with communicating results.
UNOSAT – Oran No	68	Page 36, para 102	In-country experts have participated in a quite number of regional events/fora. (e.g. Pacific Islands GIS & RS Conference, WFP's workshop on 72-hour Assessment Approach, SPC's regional workshop, among others) - These are informed to the M&E expert through the weekly report.	Yes, indeed, they have participated in these one-shot events. But here we are referring to more continued communication and consistent stakeholders' engagement.
UNOSAT – Oran No	69	Recommendation 5	Such as https://www.devex.com/news/how-meteorology-is-helping-women-lead-disaster-response-in-vanuatu-96644?	This is a good example: capitalise on results/impact and gives visibility to the project.
Caribou - Tim Hayward	70	overall	The evaluation doesn't give much insight into the instances of technical backstopping (e.g. during Cyclone Harold) so far as examples of how the project has (or can) contribute to DRR on the various islands.	General information about backstopping activities has been included (e.g. number of requests/number of delivered) Backstopping activities related to TC Harold were being provided at the time we were carrying out the field work for the present mid-line evaluation. So, it was difficult to include the activities and immediate outcome of these. Nevertheless, the comment has been addressed in the report by adding a couple of specific examples 'a posteriori'.
Caribou - Tim Hayward	71	Logframe	Specifically on LF indicator 9.1 (Lives impacted): in an ideal circumstance this would be a combination of the number of people receiving training + the people in each island benefiting from activities happening. For example, right now one of the concrete activities that has happened has been the technical backstopping, so looking at the list of support provided and seeing if any of them have resulted in tangible actions	Some additional information on the analysis of indicators has been added. However, there are a number of issues to report on this indicator at this stage: 1) The baseline for this indicator has not

			or support. One clear example I can think of is from Cyclone Harold, there is a count of the total population living in high wind speed zones (deemed to be the population most at risk)	been defined yet. Actually, some efforts were still being made at the time of the present evaluation (not clear how to calculate it); and 2) the Evaluation took place at the same time support to Cyclone Harold response was provided, so at that time it would have been very difficult to say.
Tim Hudson	72	Methodology	Provide clarifications on how attribution and biased issues were controlled.	Comment addressed in the methodology.