Evaluation Audit Trail Template: "Independent Baseline Evaluation of the Strengthening capacities in the use of geospatial information for improved resilience in Asia-Pacific and Africa" Evaluation Report

(To be completed by the Project Management.)

Following submission, the evaluator will consider and respond to all comments. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final evaluation report.

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

Author	#	Paragaph No.	Type of comment (e.g. observation, question, wrong data, etc.	Comment/Feedback on the draft report	Evaluator response and actions taken
Khaled	1	4	Wrong data	This is according to the initial project proposal. However after consultation with project focal points implementation team decided to drop food security from considered primary target. So for Laos, Bangladesh, and Uganda > "Disaster Resilience through the use of GIT"	removed
Aline	2	19	observation	Except by Fiji - we identified the need to raise awareness about GIT to some extent in all countries. Bhutan, for example, have strong GIS capacity. However, still data is not being used in decision-making and there is the need to raise awareness - specially of management level and other policy/planning division. In Bangladesh and Lao - there is a lot of need for awareness raising. Government officials in Lao have not yet even trust about reliability and security of GIT. Uganda - Top management understand there is potential - but other technical staff no. Solomon Islands - although there is an increased awareness in comparison to a few years ago, country officer mentioned that it is still important to constantly show how GIT can help.	Added "partially" and reformulated

Luca	3	21	observation	to strengthen technical capacities in the use of geospatial information technology applications for improved disaster risk management and natural resource management operational planning and decision making.	Change made
Oran	4	21	question	This applies to the Pacific countries too, any reason not to include them in this Finding 1 at all?	In the project document, PICs' primary goal was enhanced climate finance with evidence-based proposal. In finding 2 below, a baseline description of those countries is provided
Oran	5	25	observation	This is more descriptions of the focal agency, not all stakeholders. And prioritized needs and previous support provided by UNOSAT, the below doesn't really sound like expected project results.	Yes, it refers to focal agencies (changed). The paragraph below does not refer to project results but is a diagnosis of the current situation based on the interview and secondary sources.
Aline	6	25	observation	Important to notice it is paper-based and excel format.	Incorporated
Khaled	7	25	observation	Opposite to finding 20, Finding 1	The evaluation respondents were very clear and aware about GIT potential
Aline	8	25	observation	Capacity to collect, analyse, and utilize geospatial data in their operations/decision-making. In general terms, yes, we also identified the needs in this direction.	Sentence based on interviews.
Aline	9	26	observation	Disaster Prevention Division (DPD) of the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare.	This information from the interview and other supporting material, e.g. https://sentinel-asia.org/meetings/SA3JPTM7/agenda/Day1/Session3/3-7_Disaster%20Flood%20Risk%20Management%20thai.pdf Footnote added.

Khaled	10	26	observation	Lao PDR does not have an NDMO	According to the interview and other reports, Lao's main actor in response to disasters is the National Disaster Management Organization/ Office (this is unclear, maybe due to translations?). Footnote added.
Khaled	11	26	observation	Same Comment. Opposite to 20, Finding 1	Overlapping with project team's findings: very limited integration of this technology in operational workflow, - Bangladesh, Laos....
Aline	12	26	observation	Similar to our findings: There is no technical capacity to use GIS and RS. GIS is not being used to support operations (DRM/Emergency Response).	No answer required
Aline	13	26	question	This is unclear to me what means - conduct disaster risk assessment? Or monitoring impact after disasters?	Yes, the word came from an English translation from the 2019 Law on Disaster Management. Assessment is a much better word. Change made.
Oran	14	28	question	This meant, the project activities will be refined and delivered based on the consultation with stakeholders? (scoping study) This sentence sounds unclear to me. If this referred to planned outputs and outcomes, those can be found in the logframe.	The sentence is just a placeholder for information that must come from the interview with the focal agency Sentences in red are placeholders for missing information During meeting with the project team, it was confirmed that interviews would not be pursued anymore, and information would be retrieved from the inception reports.

				Better to place this after Para. 22? Doesn't seem logical to be here	Yes, but it also refers to the counterfactual countries, that's why I decided to put it after the discussion of the DRR target countries. I would not have a problem changing its placement
Oran	15	Figure 1	Request		The graph tries to illustrate the assertion in the text that all target and counterfactual countries are exposed to floods linked to the monsoon and tropical cyclones, so they tend to be affected similarly, with events approximately coinciding in time and magnitude
Khaled	16	Figure 1	Request	Not sure fully understand the message the graph supposed to convey. Maybe an explanatory note is required. Bangladesh was hit by a major flood this year 2022. Also Pakistan.	Yes, my database only covers up to 2021, I would need to download more data And Lao too. In fact, I used data up to March 2022, the floods just occurred in May (BDG), and July (LAO and PAK). I downloaded the new events (assessment still ongoing for Pakistan) and prepared the graphs, including name of event, victims, damage… Added 2022 data. Related to population, BGD flash floods had the most impact. The following note has been added: Main disasters induced by hydrometeorological hazards tend to coincide in all target and

						counterfactual countries, as events are related to the same drivers: tropical cyclones and the Asian monsoon for Asian countries, and the onset of the rainy season in African countries.
Khaled and Luca	17	Figure 2	Request	UNDRR recommends to avoid the term natural disasters. It is a common practice in the UN and DRR community as a whole now. Disasters from Natural Hazards or something like that can be used. The correct term should be: natural hazard-induced disasters		Changed
Khaled	18	31	Additional information	Couple other info/stats maybe relevant for land management context - It is one of the carbon negative countries, - Their policy mandates them to conserve at least 60% forest - they only have 7% arable land		Noted and incorporated. Bhutan may no longer be a net sink (Fiji is), yet its emissions are very low and with a decisive institutional support
Aline	19	31		There are differences to our findings: We identified that there is the need to build capacity to use UAV and also an application to process UAV data. One of their main concerns is monitoring of land use and land encroachment - mostly state land. We didn't find the focus to be on wetlands only. After rounds of consultation - we narrowed down the need to a decision-support system to support land management - not a full geoportal or Land Management System. Also considering that they were discussing with other partners the development of the geoportal. They don't have a geoportal at the moment. The server was burned after a storm.		I agree. Wetlands were stressed in the NORAD proposal of 2021, but this is not supported by the interviews.
Oran	20	33	observation	Please see the comment on Para.29		Sentences in red are placeholders for missing information
Oran	21	36	question	Who are 'we' here? Used this index for what purpose?		edited
Oran	22	Figure 3	question	These graphs may not deliver the message clearly.. What do the x and y-axis values mean here? (e.g. 6,00 to 12,00) What are the other blue dots not named? If they are irrelevant countries, why not removing them?		Yes the graphs could be removed or moved to the annex (in preparation). The other dots represent countries and the graph

					illustrates that the selected counterfactuals are closed to the target countries in this two-dimensional space of variables relevant to DRR or NRM
Khaled	23	Table 1	question	What is the source please?	added
Oran	24	Figure 4	observation	The graphs below are not about this…	corrected
Oran	25	Figure 5	observation	Unclear what message/analysis of these figures are	Merely illustrative. Maps can be removed
Khaled	26	Figure 5	observation	Data source reference missing	added
Oran	27	Figure 9	question	What's NGAIN exporsure index? what do these value mean?	ND-GAiN (sorry for the typo) is a vulnerability to climate change index developed by the Notre Dame University: https://gain.nd.edu/our-work/country-index/ The purpose of this exercise was to demonstrate that, to my surprise, there is a relationship between vulnerability and climate finance, even when different vulnerability indeces are used. Since INFORM risk index is more widely known, I am using it now to show that there is a case to be made that countries that can attest their vulnerability (and generate more data) tend to receive more funds relative to the size of their economy
Aline, Khaled	28	Finding 4	observation	Correct. Also applies to SLB and VUT. Climate Finance capacity might be only 25%-50% of what we are trying to achieve in the project in Pacific.	Correct. Also applies to SLB and VUT. Climate Finance capacity might be only 25%-50% of what we

				To add, Overall goal is climate resilience. In addition to increased climate funding the project tries impact evidence based decision making for building resilience as well	are trying to achieve in the project in Pacific. Reformulated as suggested. However, no interviews yet with SLB or VUT
Oran	29	Finding 4	request	Better to rephrase it? To highlight then what else is expected to meet the priority needs of the partner gov.	Rephrased
Khaled	30	Finding 5	request	SFDRR to be added.	added
Luca	31	Finding 5	request	I would suggest to refer also to the Sendai framework 2015-2030	added
Aline	32	Finding 7	observation	Climate Finance yes, but it is only part of what we will achieve - which will be delivered by ComSec. There is a lot related to build GIT capacity for DRM.	See sentence on Fiji below. Since interviews did not occur with SLB and VUT I cannot say anything yet about them.
Luca, Khaled	33	59	observation	Enhanced evidence based decision making to support disaster response and early recovery planning Uganda may fall in this category We are supporting full cycle DRR - Preparedness, Response, Recovery.	Text adjusted
Aline	34	60	observation	Different for ours - this was identified as being potentially addressed by other international organisations in the short/medium term. We are focusing on applications to help specific decision-making/operations within NLCS.	Modified accordingly
Oran	35	60	observation	Also the deployment of climate finance advisors (CFAs) for the Pacific who are also sitting at the focal ministry's office	Added: In Pacific countries seeking to enhanced climate finance flows, the project deploys a climate finance advisor . I thought the CAF=Technical expert. in PICs, would there be 2 national project experts?

Aline	36	62	question	This paragraph is unclear for me. Are we talking about how much the government will need to invest to sustain their capacity acquired through the project? Or the cost is about estimating how much they would have needed to invest to acquire the skills/technology UNOSAT is providing vs the actual cost of UNOSAT project? Other consideration: often, purchasing high-resolution satellite images is not necessary. When we teach that they can use free available satellite images for certain analysis, we are saving them a lot of resources - not increasing their maintenance costs. Please kindly clarify.	The paragraph refers to costs involving in covering the outputs (project deliverables) into outcomes (government operations). I assume new images would need to be purchased during future events.
Oran	37	62	observation	We plan to support the additional recruitment of technical staff only for Fiji MoE	*Why only Fiji?*
Katinka, Khaled	38	64	question	Or even before? UNOSAT exists for more than 20 years Indeed @Luca DELLORO can add since when UNOSAT started capacity building systematically.	adjusted
Aline, Khaled	39	Finding 9	request	Correction: we are developing Web applications using geospatial information and they are hosted mostly in the cloud - most countries do not have a server or IT infra-structure In-premise hosting is another issue where we did extensive research on, We did notice previously developed in-premise geoportals in many countries were not sustainable and not-active at the moment owning to the issues mentioned by Aline above.	*Who will cover the server and other associated costs after project ends?*
Luca	40	Finding 9	request	I would use the term: Geospatial Platforms	changed
Aline	41	Finding 9	observation	Correct - and we mapped projects in each country to avoid duplication when refining our plan during inception phase	Indeed, this project is very well targeted
Aline, Khaled	42	Finding 10	observation	To some extent yes - we learned from COVID-19 and are open to apply it when needed. However, we also heard from focal agencies the preference to have in-person trainings. There is a saturation about online learning. And 90% of our trainings are expected to be in-person.	The contingency aspect of online training deployment and the blended nature of the capacity development envisioned added

				To emphasise all focal points expressed their preference of having face2face trainings. Thanks to the lessons learned during COVID-19, team has eLearning as contingency.	
Oran	43	76	request	Technically it was 'blended' mode of delivery. Some lectures were converted to online sessions and webinars were additionally organized, however, the locally deployed in-country experts supported the on-site facilitation and group activities.	added
Aline	44	76	question	Unclear. Kindly explain. We eliminated face-to-face training during CS or from this project? Also the issue of improving field data collection is pressing across many countries.	From the final evaluation of CS. Sentence added for clarity
Aline	45	Finding 11	observation	In our assessment it was not identified as a priority by focal agencies in Bhutan and Fiji. But - we will aim for gender parity in trainings to all.	In the baseline evaluation I asked about gender specifically
Aline	46	78	observation	Sometimes the government departments simply don't have enough female staff to be able to join the trainings.	Precisely.
Oran	47	78	observation	Although GIS domain is heavily male dominant in most Pacific island countries, women technical staff tend to be more equipped with technological knowledge compared to the average male ones. Also, the objective assessments we conducted during the IPP project proved that female participants have equal or more technical understanding compared to male participants. Thus I'd consider rephrasing this sentence. FYI. It'd be interesting to read this doc: https://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1298&context=hc_pubs *Glover explains, "In horizontal segregation, women and men are concentrated in distinctive scientific fields. In vertical segregation, women and men within the scientific fields are not distributed equally in the hierarchy of jobs, with women typically being concentrated in the lower-level jobs and men in the higher-level ones" (2002, 29).* *p.52* *While it could be argued that internships are important for both men and women, if it is a goal to increase diversity in GIS, then women and*	I will seek to rephrase it, but it means that, for historical reasons, the female professional pool tends to be smaller in those countries, which is bound to change in the near future

				other underrepresented groups should be further encouraged to pursue internships **p.58.**	
Aline	48	81	question	For which country?	For any country
Oran	49	82	request	You may want to read and further include the recent info about Fiji: https://reliefweb.int/report/fiji/womens-resilience-fiji-how-laws-and-policies-promote-gender-equality-climate-change-and-disaster-risk-management **P9. "Impacts of TC Winston"** *There were <u>no significant gender differences in death or injury rates</u> during Winston due to effective early warning systems. Differential impacts from Winston <u>were heavily economic and disproportionately affected women</u>* … *The PDNA also identified* **increased GBV**—*especially domestic violence—as a high risk for all women in emergency shelters and their communities when their families had suffered the loss of income and damage to their homes, crops, and food gardens*	Added
Oran	50		observation	If the online course is provided without the options of the computer lab and stable internet connection at work, participants may need to take the course at home out of office hours. (e.g. covid time owing to the distancing rules). Women tend to have more duties relating to domestic and care work at home, thus feel less encouraged to take this learning opportunity. During IPP project, UNOSAT/Focal ministry did offer the computer lab at the gov facilities where the situation allowed.	I tried to capture this in the paragraph: the IPP CommonSensing project identified gender and socioeconomic digital divide as a barrier preventing the delivery of capacity development activities
Oran	51	85	observation	Our CapDev activities focused only improved access to CF but also the advanced use of GIT for DRM and Climate Resilience.	deleted
Katinka, Aline	52	87	Request, observation	Yes! Maybe this could even be developed further. In the CS project a ToT was organised only in the end, which did not allow for accompanying trained trainers later on and hence influenced the rate of trainers who would actually train. This ToT evaluation could help with	Developed a bit further and referred

				some general recommendations: Cluster Evaluation of UNITAR's Training of Trainers Programming | UNITAR The challenge we face is that we also need to first develop the GIS technical skills and raise awareness - before we are able to have the candidate for the TOT.	
Khaled	52b	84	observation	Indeed, in this project we assess needs and design interventions in such way sustainability can be achieved by simply implementing different capacity building components.	*As opposed to?*
Oran	53	87	observation	Besides ToT, national/regional workshops will contribute to buy-in/sustainable impact	Workshops would rather raise awareness than develop capacities
Aline, Khaled	54	87	observation	A difference from CommonSensing is that we are thinking about knowledge sustainability in the onset of the project through the inception reports - when we are designing the service delivery plan we are already thinking how are building capacities in the long-term and how the focal agency will be able to maintain it (knowledge and technology). It is not a separate work package to be planned and implemented towards the end of the project. Indeed, in this project we assess needs and design interventions in such way sustainability can be achieved by simply implementing different capacity building components.	*I would need all inception reports.*
Roxana, Oran	55	88	question	What about the knowledge platform? Can this somehow contribute to sustainability? Are the national agencies also able to nurture it? yes	Need more info on the knowledge platform
Luca	56	90	observation	Not sure to understand this paragraph.	Paragraph modified
Aline	57	90	observation	Please see previous comment. Governments most of the time prefer face-to-face.	Corrected
Katinka, Oran	58	91	request	I would argue that this is an activity, not an outcome. Yes, this needs to be rephrased as an outcome	reformulated

Khaled	59	Figure 11	observation	This table does not have the software application, web based decision support systems we are going to develop. In our solutions design we have the above 5 components. Component 4 will be increasing efficiency of the beneficiary agency operations. It needs to be included in the Logframe.	I don't think that component was on the proposal. *Can you share the solutions design?* *Is the web based decision support systems is not related to the "knowledge platform"?*
Aline	60	Figure 11	Question, request	Impact - not applicable for countries not focusing on DRM/Climate Resilience, correct? This needs revision. A big element missing is the web applications (2 per country). The Knowledge platform is relatively minor component (yet important) in comparison to the 16 web applications. Some countries also already have their own institutional knowledge portals.	The graph is based on the project proposal
Oran	61	Figure 11	request	Outputs to be rephrased: e.g. Training delivered -> Transferred GIT knowledge/skills/support Access to climate funds -> CF workshops and on-the-job support	Done
Aline	62	Finding 16	observation	Biodiversity is very peripheral topic even for our focus in Nigeria and Bhutan.	The indicator is in the project's logical framework. I am arguing here not to use it
Aline	63	109	question	Source?	Added
Aline	64	110	observation	Also - outputs include web applications and knowledge platform. Technical backstopping and awareness raising activities also tackle key challenges that undermine the institutional GIT capacity of the focal agencies to fulfill their mandates. Such as lack of data/databases, lack of awareness of management, etc. We are not looking at capacity development as individual capacity only - it is not about how many people are trained.	Any modifications from the 2021 project proposal and log frame?
Aline	65	110	request	Natural resources management.	Adjusted.

Aline	66	Figure 17	question	I think we need a revision here of activities and outputs to include web applications, knowledge hub, awareness raising, etc. On outputs we are not providing equipment or data infra-structure. Outcome and Impact are only illustrative, correct?	*Any modifications from the 2021 project proposal and log frame?*
Aline	67	113	question	Question: Our technical team in the project developed an GIT Institutional Capacity framework, having 2 domains, components, and subcomponents that we wanted to access during inception phase. Also, we defined the issues and needs we will address through this project. In terms of outcomes, I see we can have influence on building up GIT institutional capacity (more in general - see framework in report) and/or (more specifically) by addressing the priority needs and issues identified. So my question is - when we will measure the outcomes of this project are we measuring by saying, for example, now the focal agency is conducting internal capacity development activities autonomy (instead of relying on external support) or by saying more specifically now the focal agency has embedded land suitability analysis in decision-making for land allotment (related to the priority issues we identified)? Would a scorecard measure institutional GIT capacity or the increased institutional capacity to solve priority problems.	now the focal agency has embedded land suitability analysis in decision-making Yet other dimensions could be included
Luca	68	Table 12	request	Improved disaster assessment reports with evidence-based information from GIT analysis	changed
Luca	69	Table 12	observation	TBC	indeed
Aline	70	Annex 6	observation	We are asking 2 questions here: legitimacy (how far this organization is recognized by stakeholders in general/or in policy as legitimate/having the mandate to x) and clarity regarding the mandate (if the roles/activities regarding x are clear or not to the organization itself/stakeholders or if, for example, there is no clarity and different organizations have duplicated/conflicting mandates). I think we cannot have any influence on these 2 through this project. We can influence on the capacity of the focal agency to fulfill its mandate.	Indeed. It would measure the degree to which the project has selected the right (relevant) agency (answers evaluation question 1), not the outcomes. Therefore, I am taking this question out
Aline	71	Annex 6	observation	We noticed a difference between being aware "about GIS as a useful tool" and on "how GIT can be a useful tool".	Yes, that is being addressed by the questions below

Aline	72		observation	In this one there are a few different subcomponents within: A) Data: 1) access/availability of geospatial data; 2) Quality of existing data; 3)capacity to use geospatial data; 4) influence or not of data in decision-making; 5) status of data sharing; 6) status of data management; B) GIT/Technology: 1) access to software/hardware/IT instructure/web applications; 2) capacity to use it; 3) capacity to maintain it. C) Institutional: 1) if operations/procedures/methods allow for/use GIT or not; 2) if organisational culture allow for the use of GIT/values it/ understands it) 3) if there is enough GIS experts, etc. In different countries we might have some impact in some of these elements, not others. And the situation of these elements vary within each country too. For example, Quality and access to data is very high in Bhutan. But yet data is not being used to inform decision-making in many situation in land management. So we might not have great impact in improving data quality (because is already high). Our impact might be more on improving the use of geospatial data by creating an user-friendly decision support system. That is why, if we use a score card, we need to reshape the questions.	Questions added and reshaped
Aline	73	Annex 6	observation	I don't think we can influence regulatory and policy frameworks. Even SOPs I think might be challenging. What we could potentially impact is if the focal agency establish internal mechanisms on GIT capacity development - like regular workshops. Or if they are connected to other organisations to support capacity development/Knowledge Exchange on GIT. Backstopping mechanism is our support to them - I think once we live, they don't need backstopping, they need their staff to be able to use GIT.	Indeed, not the national policies. The question modified to collect the sustainability dimension of the organization capacity development structures
Aline	74	Annex 6	observation	A few subcomponents here: level of technical skills/knowledge; how far the focal agency is dependent on external/foreign sources; if technology is available or not; technology transfer - if they are engaged on it or not; if they have or not internal capacity development mechanisms to (a) develop or (b) update technical GIT capacity; (c) develop or (d) maintain technologies. I think in general the agencies have some clarity about their needs. They might not be aware of GIT potentials, uses, possibilities. That can change in the project. But I am not sure if measuring awareness about their own needs is relevant in comparison to other points.	I believe the new questions capture these dimensions

Aline	75	Annex 6	question	We have a similar question about this when we designed the service delivery plan for each country - will be this web application be possible to be maintain after the project? However, if we are measuring outcomes of this project, I don't think we can have any influence on this - except for climate finance, but that is below.	I think the beneficiary organizations should have or develop access to sufficient resources to maintain the project's outputs
Aline	76	Annex 6	question	These are qualitative questions - how is this connected to the scorecard scales?	Through the evaluation questions
Aline	77	Annex 6	question	Same questions as for the survey on other thematic areas.	Addressed above
Luca	78	Logframe annex	question	Perhaps we might also consider this SF indicator (G5)? "Number of countries that have accessible, understandable, usable and relevant disaster risk information and assessment available to the people at the national and local levels"	G5 indicator linked to project results in new proposed framework