

## Evaluation Audit Trail Template

### Independent Evaluation of the One UN Climate Change Learning Partnership: 2017-2020 Implementation Period

*(To be completed by the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and the Evaluator to document comments and show how they 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.)*

*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	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft evaluation report	Evaluator response and actions taken
Emmanuel Tachie Obeng	1	Executive summary-para 5, lines 5-6	Please consider indicating specific regional hub that is struggling in the Executive summary	Amended Exec Summary wording to say “SICA and Southern Africa regional hubs are struggling with capacity . . .”
Emmanuel Tachie Obeng	2	Executive summary-para 6, line 1	Please provide recommendation for the struggling regional hubs	I don’t think this is high level enough to be a key recommendation – the regional hubs are good and working, but they’re struggling to be sustainable, but have some options they’d like exploring to achieve this. I think this is covered by recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4.
Emmanuel Tachie Obeng	3	2.1.7: para 1, line 3	National climate change policies, as well as NDC and NAPs	Added
Emmanuel Tachie Obeng	4	2.1.7: para 1, line 11	Consider Forestry and traditional authorities as national stakeholders	This varies by country. Those currently listed are the most common ones. The suggestion is too country specific to include.
Emmanuel Tachie Obeng	5	2.1.8: para 1, lines 2-3	Support climate change week celebration as part of national activities of UN CC :Learn in Ghana	I’m only aware of this happening in Ghana and Dominican



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

				Republic. The suggestion is therefore too specific to include as a general statement.
Emmanuel Tachie Obeng	6	2.1.10: para 3, lines 1-5	<p>Please consider redefining current composition of countries of the West African Hub;</p> <p>The West African Hub was originally constituted for Francophone countries, with some Anglophone countries only sharing their experience with the Francophone. In our February meeting in Niger, most of the participants desired to have a West African Hub which include all the West African countries together as it is in ECOWAS</p>	The request made here was noted during the evaluation and is already made within the document in para 5.3.36. This is a request for a change in the project design, not a reflection of the current project status and therefore para 5.3.36 is the appropriate place to note the request. Section 2 describes the current project design which does not yet include Anglophone countries within the West African Hub.
Emmanuel Tachie Obeng	7	5.1.1: para 1, line 3	Please indicate percentage of respondents	It would take some time to go back through the numbers to quantify. However it is noted that this evaluation tries to speak to primarily to Outcome 1, which is where the majority of such comments came from – they all came from Global Partners or consultants. The sentence has been extended to further clarify this.
Emmanuel Tachie Obeng	8	5.1.4: para 1, line 3	Consider adding National CC policies, to NDC and NAPs	Done
Emmanuel Tachie Obeng	9	5.1.4: para 1, lines 7-8	Insert collaborate with UNITAR in devepoing proposals for support from the private sector	This was intended to be implied in the existing wording. However, I have added it. However, this is one of many



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

				possible funding sources.
Emmanuel Tachie Obeng	10	5.2.2: para 9, lines 1-2	Please insert National coordinators training teachers on indicators of climate change and green economy in their new climate change curricula in schools	This is only the case in some countries, so cannot be included as a generic answer.
Emmanuel Tachie Obeng	11	5.2.53: para 9, lines 1-2	Please insert EPA /University of Education. Ghana	This is a Ghana specific statement. The current text is applicable across all countries.
Emmanuel Tachie Obeng	12	5.3.43	Insert Environmental Protection Agency . . .  Insert Science, Technology and Innovation	Added.
Emmanuel Tachie Obeng	13	7.1.1: para 7, lines 3-5	Plaese insert, this remains a challenge to Regional and national Partners to initiate their own project proposal for GEF support in collaboration with UNITAR and other Implementing Entitites	This appears to be a comment / request rather than a recommendation. After TAG discussion I have now added that one national partner requests the Secretariat develop a guide for national partners to make joint applications with UNITAR for GCF funds.
Emmanuel Tachie Obeng	14	7.3.1: para 4, lines 1-3	Active involvement of UNITAR/ Geneva in all national and regional activities in very important, in collaboration with existing local UN Agency. Localized model should be reconsidered.	This is the view of one country partner. The point is already made under bullets 6 and 7 of Recommendation 4.
Emmanuel Tachie Obeng	15	7.4.1: para 15, lines 1-2	There is the need for a single coordination office for implementation of UN CC Learn and PAGE activities at national level, preferably at the office of UN CC Learn Coordinator.	It is beyond the remit of this evaluation to make recommendations on PAGE. However, this suggestion is already supported under Section 8 Lessons Learned and also referenced in the Exec Summary
Jeanette Murry	16	Overall	A very comprehensive and clear evaluation paper. The report makes clear recommendations and follow up actions.	This is a comment. No action is requested.



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

Jeanette Murry	17	Lessons Learned	In lessons learned section it is helpful to summarize positive lessons learned and agree with those findings recently added. Agree also based on our recent meeting that planning shouldn't prevent agile responses. Having an overall objective and then modifying, adding or removing components based on how well they are working toward reaching that objective is an approach that provides flexibility, responsiveness and allows for innovation.	This appears to be a comment for the attention of the Secretariat. No change seems to be requested to the report?
Jeanette Murry	18		Regarding the survey response rate, most people will respond to a survey if you have asked them personally and they have met and interacted with you or if they are passionate about the topic. There are so many surveys now that people just decide they won't respond as a way of managing their time. So agree that, as proposed in the report, more frequent interactions with Partners will probably help lift future response rates.	This appears to be a comment for the attention of the Secretariat. No change seems to be requested to the report?
Jeanette Murry	19	5.1.7.	Suggestion on channels is for Secretariat – if people are not finding where to go for content its worth creating roadmaps for different audience groups.	This appears to be a comment for the attention of the Secretariat. No change seems to be requested to the report?
Jeanette Murry	20	5.1.25	Partnerships may be very useful here. There may be synergies with the NDC groups in other organizations including WBG.	This appears to be a comment for the attention of the Secretariat. No change seems to be requested to the report?
Jeanette Murry	21	5.2.3	Pre course surveys matched with post course surveys are a really solid way of demonstrating results. Note for secretariat – also helpful to use mid-course surveys in longer courses as a way of course correcting.	This appears to be a comment for the attention of the Secretariat. No change seems to be requested to the report?
Jeanette Murry	22	5.2.14	Is this actually bypassing or does CClearn help to identify a need that may not have been apparent to the learner and/or help make those connections? If so, that is a valuable role in helping policy makers etc. to navigate a complex UN system to find the technical information they need. This role could be made clear in the report.	<i>I'm not clear what this comment is suggesting.</i>
Jeanette Murry	23	5.2.22	Perhaps this is a note for the Secretariat also – if respondents don't feel they can take action then its worth including in all of the learning – a “what does this mean for me” and “what actions can I take”. This would help them to have some clarity on their own role and not to assume that it is others that are taking the action.	This appears to be a comment for the attention of the Secretariat. No change seems to be requested to the report?
Jeanette Murry	24	5.2.24	Again, this is a note to the Secretariat related to the comment on visibility. In UNCClearn's communications to stress that a major value-add of educating people is overcoming so much of the	This appears to be a comment for the attention of the Secretariat. No

			misinformation that is out there. This role could be clearer in the report.	change seems to be requested to the report?
Jeanette Murry	25	5.2.41	Should this be included in lessons learned section as a positive outcome of COVID?	Lessons learned are generic, not project specific. How would this be worded to add some generic value to the Lessons Learned section?
Jeanette Murry	26	5.2.60	Is the topic here women and development? Or is it gender? Men have a gender too. And a lot of other gender identities are missing. If the topic is women and development maybe it should state that rather than using the term gender. For the report- perhaps a footnote to clarify.	The topic is gender. The observation in this para is that some greater inclusion of women has been achieved. The implication is that some change for women is a start, but there's more to be done, which I think is said in 5.2.61 and in Qn 20.
Jeanette Murry	27	5.2.68	The data shows that older age groups are poorly represented. Is there any effort to reach these groups? This is the type of activity that can build technology skills etc. with older age groups and ensure they are fairly represented.	The para says that accessibility and inclusion of elderly people has not been specifically addressed.
Jeanette Murry	28	5.3.9	Just an observation – there are so many areas of technical specialization in Climate Change that it would be impossible to represent them all. In this case, shouldn't the partner bring the topic expertise?	As stated in the comment, this is an observation. It's for the Secretariat to discuss with GPs how they address this, not for the Evaluation.
Jeanette Murry	29	5.3.11	I commented here that there seem to be conflicting accounts of course development experiences with UNCClearn. This may be because the comparison is of very different materials and programs. Depending on the topic, the state of knowledge on the topic, and the depth of the materials, it can take huge variations in time to develop. I have worked on training programs where the actual development of the learning helps to articulate knowledge on the topic – this can feel chaotic, messy and time consuming. In other cases, the state of knowledge is solidified, and it becomes a matter of simply choosing what to include.	This is an insightful observation. It reads as though it's helpful sharing of learning with the Secretariat rather than requesting a change to the text?
Jeanette Murry	30	5.5.40	Accreditation is important to a lot of learners and a Masters would be a terrific addition to UNITARs offerings.	This is feedback from a GP to the Secretariat.

			Also keeping an eye on developments in Micro credentialing would be useful - <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J45bWtByGe0">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J45bWtByGe0</a>	
Angus Mackay	31	Cover page 2	While this may be the case because they are upfront and easy to read these quotations hold more weight. I was a little concerned about the last one about CC:learn being a curator only which I feel is a mischaracterisation of CC:Learn's role. The fact that a Global Partner said it doesn't mean it necessarily should be included. The reality is that CC:learn provides high quality learning products on climate change leveraging the technical expertise of the UN system. It is not a technical assistance programme. I would move to 'strike' this comment.	These quotes are overwhelmingly positive. I count four statements here about things that either people would like to see improve or that demonstrate misunderstanding. The evaluator believes this statement from a GP who has close knowledge of UN CC:Learn, (and other GPs in the group said they agreed), demonstrates perception, which is useful to inform the later recommendation that a partnership agreement be developed with GPs to clarify collaboration. I have added one quote as suggested by the Secretariat, and edited down the one quote highlighted by the Secretariat. I think this is a reasonable and balanced compromise.
Angus Mackay	32	Executive Summary	Overall I'd say this is a rather brief exec sum for a report of this length. I'd add another page. Maybe fill out a bit more on Rs and LLs.	The Executive Summary was extended.
Cristina Rekavas / Angus Mackay	33	Executive Summary	UN CC:Learn intends to provide benefits for UN organizations but these are generally not the primary target of the interventions.  Indeed. It is rather policy makers, practitioners and those that engage with the UN on climate change. We don't aim to train the UN although this may happen.	Amended. However, please note this purpose was stated by several Global Partners and UNCTs.
Angus Mackay	34	Executive Summary	I would say development practitioners, which includes UN staff and consultants but many others. I would also add private sector as this is very much an increasing element	amended as I believe that is both the intention and the reality. However, it is

				worth noting that no stakeholder worded it like this - perhaps they used "UN staff" to mean development practitioners eg UN Country Teams.
Cristina Rekavakas	35	<b>2.1.10</b>	Text edited	Edits are fine and will be accepted.
Angus Mackay	36	<b>2.1.10</b>	I would not say that South Africa is a hub like the others ... it is more of a multi country approach as opposed to single country approach. The three work together because they face similar issues. But there is no central point serving multiple countries, as is the case in SICA and West Africa. Perhaps this will happen in the future in which case we would want to engage SAARC	<p>The text refers to them as a sub-region, which is how the interviewed stakeholders presented themselves. They also said that they want to become a regional hub through SADC. From their discussion I believe they view MIET as the coordinator and Malawi govt as key sharer of learning.</p> <p>Members of the Secretariat and donors also referred to them as a sub-region.</p> <p>However, I have added a footnote reflecting your comment in paragraph 2.1.10.</p>
Cristina Rekavakas	37	3.1.1	The regional work is included under Outcome 2 as well as the cross-cutting output.	Thank you. Yes I realise this statement is unclear. I meant that the Outcomes focus on Global and National, not regional, and the Outputs are framed around global or national. Regional is written as if it is secondary, not central. It's my view, from stakeholder input



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

				that regional should be core or much more visible. Have amended.
Cristina Rekakavas	38	3.1.1	This might be a bit too comprehensive. UN CC:Learn “aims to build human capacity in developing and transition countries to plan and implement effective climate change actions, with collective and coordinated support of UN agencies and alliances, and other partners”, without stressing that this will be done at all levels and across all sectors, particularly given that the NCCLS development process is centered around a prioritization process and is country-driven, under the leadership of the Government of a partner country.	Agree it is helpful to clarify. Amended.
Cristina Rekakavas	39	3.1.1	UN CC:Learn’s focus at the global level is rather to “contribute to a growing and critical mass of professionals and engaged individuals globally that have a sufficiently good understanding of the basics of climate change to inform their decisions and take effective action”. UN CC:Learn does not have the ambition to achieve this critical mass alone and through one project only.	I don't believe I've stated that UN CC:Learn intends to do this alone or through one single project. Otherwise, I have restated Outcome 1 wording, rather than just repeating it verbatim. Your comment adds "contribute to", but I don't see this in the Logframe.
Cristina Rekakavas	40	3.1.1	The theory of change/logic behind this phase has been consulted with UN CC:Learn global partners during the 2014-2017 phase when preparing for the 2017-2020 one, including during a dedicated session of the 2017 Steering Group Meeting. The project document for the current phase was also distributed to global focal points for comments, when it was developed, and is made available as a reference document in the list of documents for each Steering Group Meeting during this phase. It may also be noted that various agency focal points for UN CC:Learn have changed during this phase.	Noted. However, a significant number of stakeholders gave this kind of response so it must still be unclear to enough people for them to mention it. Having worked on many ToCs, it is the Evaluators opinion that the ToC included in the project document is missing some fundamental aspects including: a diagram, image or description to articulate the overall goal, impact pathways, assumptions that will be tested, evidence to be





**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

				gathered, external influences, and how the activities, outputs and outcomes work together towards the overall goal. Not all of these elements are required, but some kind of representation of the strategy, objectives, project logic, constraints, and how it will be refined over time are the fundamentals of a ToC.
Angus Mackay	41	4.7.1	Please note that the secretariat had on many occasions pointed out this inconsistency and requested less focus on Outcome 2 in the questions.	Noted and amended.
Angus Mackay	42	4.7.1	Not sure I agree. We do carry out a regular annual survey. It was not obvious to us that a combined approach would make sense at that stage. We showed flexibility in adapting the process to the evaluation.	Comment noted. The survey timing would have been known and could have been shared with the Evaluator before appointment, as it would have affected the evaluation planning.
Angus Mackay	43	4.7.1	Not sure why this is a limitation. This is the process of evaluation. It makes it sound like doing interviews is a limitation.	Noted. The limitation is that some of the responses could not be objectively verified. Agreed this is the nature of many evaluations, but it is still a limitation to consider when interpreting the evaluation findings.
Cristina Rekakavas	44	5.1.1	This perception may be linked to the fact that UN CC:Learn needs to mobilize 2 times its core funding and sometimes does not have resources for activities that would be relevant and of interest, but that are not associated with a funding source.	Absolutely. And the evaluation later concludes that this limits the project's ability to be sustainable and limits some of its activities such as



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

				<p>scaling up YCDs.</p> <p>However, in light of Angus' feedback in the meeting, I have added that this reactive way of working could also be interpreted as adaptive and innovative.</p>
Cristina Rekakavas	45	5.1.2	This would be particularly in the sense that anyone could benefit from UN CC:Learn resources and that some e-learning products (e.g. upcoming course on children and climate change) are designed specifically for development practitioners.	I have changed UN agencies to development practitioners.
Cristina Rekakavas	46	5.1.2	This may be due to the fact that UN CC:Learn needs to mobilize 2 times its core funding.	I would suggest it's due to a number of things including the need for a clearer global agreement with a core group of GPs; clearer / more fully developed ToC; the one-off nature of current MoUs; and yes the need to mobilise funding that is often single activity focused. I think this is sufficiently explored elsewhere.
Cristina Rekakavas	47	5.1.2	Building on a unique collaboration, the process of developing UN CC:Learn courses leverages the experience of the UN System through the Partnership. The UN CC:Learn Secretariat, which is hosted at UNITAR, contributes its expertise in the area of instructional design and learning methodologies, in line with UNITAR's mandate. The other partners contribute technical expertise in the areas for which their organizations have a mandate (e.g. health for WHO, children for UNICEF). This represents the particular added value of UN CC:Learn products and gives them high credibility. While this model is well established since the beginning of the partnership (even before e-learning courses, resources were developed jointly) and is always discussed with partners, sometimes courses are developed with staff from partner organizations that are not the focal points for UN CC:Learn/do not know UN CC:Learn. While arrangements and working modalities are always discussed in advance, it has indeed happened that a few	Noted. I think this explanation is in line with what the GPs said. I have noted in the text that the Secretariat advises that a clearer definition of roles and responsibilities is now included in new agreements.



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

			partners still expected the Secretariat to take the responsibility for technical matters behind its expertise and UNITAR's mandate. When this happened, delays have occurred as the process and work plan were designed based on the standard UN CC:Learn course development model. Based on this experience, a clearer definition of roles and responsibilities is now included in new agreements.	
Cristina Rekavakas / Angus Mackay	48	5.1.2	<p>This is indeed a great suggestion. However, it is also important to remember that UN CC:Learn is a project with a specific logframe, targets, work plan and resource mobilization targets, not an organization.</p> <p>Yes this is very true. This is not 'UNITAR' it is essentially a project that must consistently deliver to its main donor on a clear set of results. In my view we need to do more to set out what kind of partnership it is. There are at least 4 levels from collaboration upwards. This needs to be hashed out a clarified so that GP's know what they are getting into. It's more of a club in fact. There is no legal agreement and no funding implication. GPs come together so that they can have a space to share ideas on learning for climate change. That's about it. Going on from there towards institutional partnership is a very big change and not at all how it was proposed from the outset. Indeed if we had proposed that GPs would not have joined.</p>	Both comments are noted. These comments appear to support Recommendations 3 and 4 - reviewing the operational model and negotiating overarching collaboration terms with partners.
Angus Mackay	49	5.1.3	I would not put it that way. CC:Learn is not set up to 'serve' GP needs. It is a way of external users getting more out of what the UN is offering on learning. GPs agree to take part because they are interested in learning as an additional avenue of work. There is no intent for close integration or collaboration ... but more a light touch engagement.	Noted. Text amended.
Cristina Rekavakas	50	5.1.4	Indeed, climate change learning and capacity-building is an area that still requires a lot of investments. More funding would be needed for larger scale support from UN CC:Learn.	Noted. Thanks.
Cristina Rekavakas / Angus Mackay	51	5.1.7	<p>In our experience, despite explanations, partners at national/regional level often confuse UNITAR and UN CC:Learn, given that UNITAR is the main organizations they interact with.</p> <p>The explanation to the arbitrary array of topics is that everything needs to be funded and you get funds on a need basis. We started with a single course on climate change basics. We could have stopped there at which point this comment might not have been made. However we've a lot more than this and continue to build the offer (all free!). By offering more we appear arbitrary. Needs a bit of adjustment. Again, I</p>	Noted. This is why the evaluation is recommending more sustainable funding; clearer ToC; new collaboration agreements, in support of UN CC:Learn being able to be more intentional in it's work, and build on its innovation, and



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

			realise that this is what the partner said and yet informed comment is what is critical. If it appears that we are somehow presenting an arbitrary offer this undermines the great work done by the team.	not be forced to chase money. The review comment on para 5.1.2 states that the lack of clarity may be due to having to UN CC:Learn having to raise 2/3 of its own funding.
Cristina Rekakavas	52	5.1.10	All UN CC:Learn resources publicly launched on the e-learning platform are still hosted there. There is only one resource, in 2020, that has been made available for 3 months and is currently offline for a certain period until it will be republished. The limited time availability of this course was well announced, even before its launch. Participants were also reminded of its closure closer to the deadline. Could this comment refer instead to the fact that a badge was awarded for a certain period of time to teachers who successfully complete 5 UN CC:Learn courses? This badge is no longer awarded due to modifications in UNITAR policies. However, the 5 courses are still available.	Noted. No mention was made of the badges.  One GP said that they were "forced" to transition the MOOC onto their own platform and create infrastructure to sustain it.
Cristina Rekakavas	53	5.1.12	Changed text : They are aimed at helping delegates understand climate negotiations and look more deeply at specific issues such as: <b>the international legal framework for climate change</b> <del>gender and climate linkages</del> ; health and climate; climate finance; food security; NAP and NDC support; and Water Resource Management.	Change accepted.
Cristina Rekakavas	54	5.1.13	A mechanism to engage the users of the UN CC:Learn e-learning platform is being developed.	Thank you. This is now noted within the text.
Angus Mackay	55	5.1.23	Indeed this is precisely who they are aimed at, and from developing countries. Not sure why this is qualified with a 'However'. This group is the one needing most support.	Apologies, the very first rough draft text did not embolden "however"s and some of them were pointing out positives / qualifying statements. This seems to have been missed as I sought to align the document.  The "however" has been amended to the comment by several stakeholders that the majority of participants are



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

				journalists, NGOs, members of the public.
Cristina Rekakavas / Angus Mackay	56	5.1.24	<p>There are a couple of courses like that because they were part of our first generation, eg the initial one on climate change and the REDD+. There has been a massive evolution and change so that new generation courses are completely different. This kind of reflection needs to recognise this and as currently worded is quite misleading. It basically says that out of 30 course online one or two are boring. The point that we have changed and the most recent ones are not boring.</p> <p>In addition, it is important to note that, while open to anyone interested, the courses have specific target audiences and learning objectives that are meant to address a specific learning gap. Such perception may also be linked to participants from the global public following technical courses targeted primarily at practitioners in a specific field.</p>	Noted. The rest of the para says that most users find them useful, some find them life changing. However, I have amended the text to reflect your points.
Angus Mackay	57	5.1.25	This is not a relevance issue. The fact that there arent sufficient funds does not make something less relevant. The relevance is unchanged, but rather the impact is less because less people are covered.	I understand your point but disagree - some national partners stated this point in response to a question on relevance - they said UN CC:Learn doesn't have the capacity to be relevant to countries they can't partner. I think they meant CC:Learn's relevance to CC learning in a global context is reduced. by its small size - it it was bigger it would be seen as more relevant as an agent of change.
Cristina Rekakavas	58	5.1.28	As noted in the text, this would require much more funding than currently available. The starting point of the UN CC:Learn intervention is to support countries in implementing their national CC policies, which in turn are designed to implement international climate commitments, through identification of the national climate change priorities. Existing policies have generally been developed through consultative processes.	Noted. There are many potential ways to approach CC learning and these partners were suggesting an alternative that they believe would be more thorough and lead to a greater depth of



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

				change, but the cost would be funding / resources. This is a finding, not a recommendation.
Cristina Rekakavas	59	5.2.4	UN CC:Learn also provides support for initial implementation as well as for experience sharing and additional follow-up (e.g. technical support). However, strategy implementation is indeed the responsibility of the national government and UN CC:Learn's involvement is less intense as this process advances and becomes more sustainable.	Noted. I have amended the text to reflect the comment.
Cristina Rekakavas	60	5.2.5	UN CC:Learn is a partnership of 36 organizations. Almost all the content on UN CC:Learn platforms comes from agencies in the Partnership. In addition, in many cases, the dissemination of UN CC:Learn partner content is supported by UNITAR through its expertise in conveying such content in engaging and effective ways.	Noted. Is a change or addition being requested here? The question is asking whether the project contributed to behaviour change and the stakeholders responded that this is not the project's role.
Cristina Rekakavas / Angus Mackay	61	5.2.11	Indeed, more resources would be needed. However, UN CC:Learn, for this phase, aims to contribute to this growing critical mass of people, not to creating it on its own.  I agree with this. CC:Learn is a small global programme. It has clear targets which, by and large, it achieves. But because there are not a lot of comparable programmes out there, there is a tendency to put the whole agenda onto one small initiative. Somewhere this needs to be recognised. Is anyone out there doing a better job?	Noted. the question notes that UN CC:Learn is promoting CC education and literacy and empowering people. The however does not say anything detrimental about UN CC:Learn, only that it would need more funding or a different operational model if it was going to reach substantially more people. I've amended the text to aim to be clearer that this is not a criticism.
Cristina Rekakavas / Angus Mackay	62	5.2.14	It is great that partners use UN CC:Learn resources for their own knowledge, but, with a few exceptions, they are not among the primary targets of UN CC:Learn. Also, indeed, each UN agency retains all technical knowledge related to their own mandate.  Indeed. Not sure what this comment is qualified with a 'However'. CC:Learn is not about	Noted. The ToR required interviewing GPs and this was their response. The question asks to what extent the project is promoting CC



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

			technical expertise, it's about making learning resources more widely available. The technical knowledge for that is not how to design a climate resilient agricultural scheme, but rather how to design a great course (online or face to face).	education and literacy. The answer says this is happening. GPs are responding that they don't necessarily use UN CC:Learn to access learning that they need.
Cristina Rekakavas / Angus Mackay	63	5.2.18	Indeed, UN CC:Learn focus is on education, training and public awareness, plus international cooperation.  And indeed it must ultimately be the work of the countries themselves. The UN is not a substitute for countries taking action, it is a stimulus and an encouragement.	Noted. The evaluation is reporting national partner feedback / requests.
Cristina Rekakavas	64	5.2.25	Text revised: It has participated in Alliance Events at CoPs on education <del>and on agriculture.</del>	Deletion accepted. The original text was taken from an article shared by the Secretariat.
Cristina Rekakavas	65	5.2.25	Proposed these additions : UN CC:Learn has also <b>co-hosted and contributed to One UN</b> events on CC at the last 5 CoPs, including one on Gender and CC at CoP 24.	Accepted. Thank you.
Cristina Rekakavas	66	5.2.27	As mentioned, UNITAR is recognized as a member on the website. UN CC:Learn resources are also included in the knowledge portal.	Noted. This is not particularly visible and GPs observe that they think this has reduced UN CC:Learn's visibility.
Cristina Rekakavas	67	5.2.28	Text revised : UN CC:Learn believes it is the main actor on CC learning <b>supporting the implementation of</b> <del>within the</del> <b>ACE Dialogues and Doha Work Programme.</b>	Accepted.
Angus Mackay	68	5.2.53	Can we have this one as one of the upfront quotes. It's the whole point of development. Sharing good ideas	Absolutely. Done.
Cristina Rekakavas	69	5.2.55	This is indeed at the core of UN CC:Learn work at global and national level.	noted.
Cristina Rekakavas	70	5.2.56	This is true, in the sense that the main entry point at national level is the national government agency with a mandate on climate change. Through such entry point, at national level, UN CC:Learn also engages with learning institutions.	noted.
Cristina Rekakavas	71	5.2.56	Harwood Education wanted to sell UN CC:Learn resources as part of a service package they developed for schools, which is against UN CC:Learn's policy. This is why UN CC:Learn had to stop working with Harwood Education in the framework of the eduCCate initiative.	noted. Text amended to reflect this.



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

Cristina Rekakavas	72	5.2.57	The involvement of learning institutions is very encouraged in all the processes and workshops leading to the development of a national climate change learning strategy; this reported case is an exception, possibly linked to the fact that this workshop was organized in the framework of another project and a larger event in which UN CC:Learn was given the opportunity to contribute and build synergies.	Noted. I think you are correct. Comment deleted.
Cristina Rekakavas	73	5.2.58	As noted in the text, this is not one of the specific principles guiding UN CC:Learn in this phase.	Then why is this an evaluation question? A human rights approach is part of the project design document.
Cristina Rekakavas / Angus Mackay	74	5.2.61	As aforementioned, UNITAR, which provides the Secretariat for UN CC:Learn but is only one of the 36 partners, has expertise and mandate in the area of training and capacity building, not gender. The expectation that partners had, despite multiple discussions, that the Secretariat would provide gender expertise indeed created a lot of confusions and delays that also affected the work of the UN CC:Learn Secretariat, to a point that it took much longer to develop the course, many more resources from the Secretariat, including the need to provide co-financing in order to be able to complete the project.  Not sure How UNITAR could have gender expertise on environment including everything else as well. This is another example of an uninformed comment and I move to 'strike'.	comments are noted - they reinforce the stakeholder feedback that there was confusion around who was providing gender support and who was making technical decisions.
Cristina Rekakavas	75	5.2.62	As mentioned, this is not the role of UNTAR/UN CC:Learn Secretariat, but of the UN CC:Learn partners, when it comes to the content. The UN CC:Learn Secretariat, whose mandate is in the learning methodologies, has focused on the accessibility of its resources and platforms and on taking these considerations into account in the learning experience. With regard to the development of courses focused on how climate change affects specific vulnerable populations, this is, as for all courses, dependent on resource availability.	noted, however I disagree. Every UN agency, possibly every organisation working on development has a responsibility to address inclusion. Moreover this is part of the project design and an agreed evaluation question which suggests evidence was expected to be found.
Cristina Rekakavas	76	5.2.62	While not all resources are translated, UN CC:Learn courses cover overall 8 languages, including Chinese and Arabic. The UN language that is not represented yet, due to lack of resources, is Russian. The e-learning platform is available in 5 languages.	Noted and amended.





**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

Cristina Rekakavas	77	5.2.63	At the moment, many courses can already be downloaded in PPT/PDF for offline learning.	Noted. However respondents were looking for more than pdfs and powerpoint - they want downloadable interactive offline content.
Angus Mackay	78	5.2.66	Again when they say UN CC:Learn it should be clarified that they mean the GPs who are the content providers. This is different than the Secretariat which coordinates and managers, and UNITAR which provides instructional design.	No, they meant the Secretariat should employ specialists. They are recommending that the Secretariat builds some of its own technical capacity so it can lead in CC Learning, not only host other agencies content without the ability to address inclusion.
Cristina Rekakavas	79	5.2.67	The Sustainable Diet course will be fully adjusted with disability in mind and hosted on the UN CC:Learn e-learning platform.	noted.
Cristina Rekakavas	80	5.2.68	Requested "This is a UN CC:Learn / SDC initiative." to be added to "Example" text.	Done.
Cristina Rekakavas	81	5.2.69	This YCD took place during the previous phase.	Noted. Deleted.
Cristina Rekakavas	82	5.2.70	proposed modified text. The UN CC:Learn Secretariat advises that <b>one of the strategic directions for this phase is “leaving no one behind” and efforts are made to</b> <del>it aims to</del> include minority groups and indigenous people and traditional knowledge in <del>all of its resources;</del> <del>and</del> review of on-line e-learning courses and online guides revealed some examples of this.	Accepted.
Angus Mackay	83	5.2.70	I have not been informed about this. I would be grateful to know when and how this was transmitted. By email i assume?	The comments were shared by three interviewees.
Angus Mackay	84	5.2.71	depends who you are comparing us to. PAGE for example has a similar reach as CCLearn but has more than 10 times the budget. I'd say the reach is very significant compared to funds available. Many comments made throughout the report are somewhat aspirational and not always aligned with the funding reality.	Have amended (Added limited largely to a number of African countries (as illustrated in the map below)...) )
Cristina Rekakavas	85	5.3.4	UN C:Learn has two different platforms because they need very different technical infrastructure for their respective purposes, which are unfortunately not interchangeable nor compatible. However, a closer integration has indeed been realized in the revised version of the knowledge sharing platform which is about to be launched.	Noted.



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

Cristina Rekakavas	86	<b>5.3.6</b>	Please see above.	Noted.
Cristina Rekakavas	87	<b>5.3.6</b>	Would it be possible to know for which course this has been reported?	The evaluation upholds the principle of preserving the anonymity of respondents. The comments concern three courses overall.
Cristina Rekakavas	88	<b>5.3.7</b>	This sounds like a very good idea. As a general observation, the use of social media has unfortunately been limited in the past year since social media companies have introduced restrictions around selected content, including climate change, which is now considered a political issue. Despite multiple efforts, it has not been possible to bring the engagement up as desired.	Thank you. This is now noted in the text.
Cristina Rekakavas	89	<b>5.3.8</b>	If this refers to EduCCate, please see comment above.	This does not refer to EduCCate. It refers to the private company provider of the River Basin course.
Cristina Rekakavas	90	<b>5.3.9</b>	As part of the standard UN CC:Learn course development model, the selection of the stakeholders involved in the review of the content is a responsibility of the partners not the UN CC:Learn Secretariat.	Noted. This comment reinforces the Recommendation that some revised or new agreement be developed with Global Partners, which could support a more efficient review / comment process.
Angus Mackay	91	<b>5.3.9</b>	Long descriptions of one partners negative feedback compared with rather short statements on more positive feedback. Both should be included of course but the weighting should also be considered in this matter.	Apologies. Paragraph was longer in order to be clear and comprehensive, not to emphasise criticism. It was also written at speed, in order to meet the deadline which was not extended when requested, despite survey responses being received close to evaluation report submission deadline.



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

				However, the impact of this is noted and the sentences have been amended to be more proportionate.
Angus Mackay	92	<b>5.3.9</b>	But then we could say 'we are surprised that the Partner does not employ an e-learning specialist'. Does really get anywhere.	I think this point demonstrates partners' confusion about the role of UN CC:Learn, and underscores the recommendation that partnership agreement(s) could be written / strengthened.
Angus Mackay	93	5.3.11	So this is the role of GPs to manage but when they don't we have to try to step in, But we don't have the technical expertise on ... say agriculture and climate. My view is that we need to move to a different model of engagement with new clients where the roles are made much more clear up front.	Agree - this is the point recommendation 4 is making.
Cristina Rekavavas	94	5.3.12	It seems, as mentioned above, that some inefficiencies have arisen due to misunderstandings about the UN CC:Learn course development model, which seems however clear to many of the partners.	Further strengthens need for recommendation 4.
Cristina Rekavavas	95	5.3.14	Another example related, for instance, to a course - partners provided resources for the UN CC:Learn Secretariat to read and translate into a module, with no technical support or guidance; once partners received the draft content realized that they had shared the wrong resources and the Secretariat had to redo the analysis with new resources.	Thank you. Have incorporated into the text.
Cristina Rekavavas	96	5.3.17	This is hindered by the fact that some organizations without a mandate in education, training and capacity building have developed their own learning portals.	Comment noted and reflected in revised recommendation R4.
Cristina Rekavavas / Angus Mackay	97	5.3.17	This is limited by the availability of funding.  And then the results are great of course!	Noted
Cristina Rekavavas / Angus Mackay	98	5.3.19	Please see above. UN CC:Learn is a project not an organization, with limited funding.  If we want to move further up the partnership hierarchy this would need to be justified because of the additional cost it would entail. The evaluation should reflect bit more in its recommendations on the implications of doing this. To be clear there are many types of partnership from basic collaboration upwards. Each time you move up the chain there are costs and potential rewards. Where is the	These comments and suggestions have been incorporated into R4.



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

			evaluation suggesting that CC:learn should go on this. It is fine to reflect back views of GPs but what should we actually do?	
Angus Mackay	99	5.3.23	I understand why this statement is being qualified by the evaluator. On the other hand some of the negative statements made are not be qualified, even though they can be quite misinformed.	It's my opinion that this substantial claim needs to be treated with caution.
Angus Mackay	100	5.3.23	This kind of observation comes up a few times. I am not certain that the answer is for NPs to get more funds through CC:Learn. The idea is that our country work inspires other donors to pick up this work and fund the national learning strategies. We should probably look more into how this can be made more likely to happen. It has in some cases as we have seen but how to get this agenda more nationally funded is the question.	Agreed. Perhaps this could be clarified through reviewing standard agreements (MoUs) within National Partners?
Cristina Rekakavas / Angus Mackay	101	5.3.26	Would it be possible to know for which course this has been reported?  Not sure which course but do they mean expertise on climate change? Our expertise is on instructional design and creating and running an e-learning platform. This also needs to be recognised and stated in order for the reader to be able to better interpret this kind of statement.	Point noted. This feedback however demonstrates confusion regarding the role and capacity of the project team. Hence recommendation R4.  The evaluation upholds the principle of preserving the anonymity of respondents.
Cristina Rekakavas / Angus Mackay	102	5.3.35	Please see above.  This repeats the issue of GPs seeing CC:learn as the only programme in this space and assuming, on this basis, that it must deliver game changing reforms on the basis of a very small budget relative to the size of the issue. I certainly agree that further discussions are needed with recently joined GP focal points who are less aware of the history of CC:Learn and where it has come from.	I agree this supports the case for R4, but also for Rs 1, 2 and 3.
Cristina Rekakavas	103	5.3.38	<b>Text revised : West Africa stakeholders</b> reported that UN CC:Learn supported several regional countries in developing their CC learning strategies in the <del>current</del> and previous project <b>phases and promoted experience sharing in this area with new countries in the current phase.</b>	Accepted
Angus Mackay	104	5.3.42	It would be good to know more about this case	No further information was given. The finding was reputed by two respondents.



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

				The evaluation upholds the principle of preserving the anonymity of respondents.
Angus Mackay	105	5.4.50	And this is what gives rise to the comment from GPs that UN CC:Learn would achieve more if it engaged more strategically with them. Of course this is agreed but this kind of statement must always with qualified with a reality check that takes into account funding and staff. Rather than GPs stating that it is 'a crisis', no doubt with some annoyance, the more informed line would be that if CC:Learn could leverage greater resources, this would allow it to achieve even more via a more strategic set of partnerships with leading GPs.	<p>I believe Recommendations R1 makes your point about leveraging more resources, and Rs 2, 3, and particularly R4, make recommendations on how this could be done through more strategic partnerships.</p> <p>I don't read GP's comments regarding "crisis" as any kind of criticism of the project. GPs are stating the urgency of the need for rapidly scaling up learning on CC. I have tried to make this even clearer in the text in para 5.3.35. - I've added "in light of the urgent nature of climate change"</p>
Angus Mackay	106	5.4.56	Added text: 'And UNITAR, which hosts the Secretariat of CC:Learn has an Executive Director who is a gender champion'.	Thank you for the clarification - amended.
Cristina Rekakavas	107	5.4.56	Please see above. As per UN CC:Learn course development model, the responsibility of the content lays with the relevant UN CC:Learn partner(s), which the UN CC:Learn Secretariat may support.	Noted. Hence R4.
Cristina Rekakavas	108	5.5.3	This includes contributions of CC learning materials; Global Partners' specialist staff time and knowledge; countries' education budgets; and other donors' contributions to regional hub activities such as EU funding to <b>SICA CARIFORM</b> .	Accepted.
Angus Mackay	109		There is very little or no funding available for ACE related activities. It is always seen as an 'add on'. This makes getting larger scale funding difficult.	Agreed. This is why Recommendation 1 is the first recommendation - in support of



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

				seeking additional funding and scale up.
Cristina Rekakavas / Angus Mackay	110	5.5.7	Please see above.  Indeed, this is a misperception. We advise that courses are updated after 2 years but we don't take them down.	Noted and text amended. This is a further example supporting R4.
Cristina Rekakavas	111	5.5.18	This is an interesting comment, but it goes beyond UN CC:Learn as a partnership and the UN CC:Learn Secretariat as a team within UNITAR.	Agreed. However, the donor said that they will pull their funding if it is not acted on, which would directly impact UN CC:Learn. Hence it is relevant to include here.
Angus Mackay	112	5.5.20	Important to be specific here. Which elements would work best regionally. Clearly not the global elements and this is infact the main focus on the evaluation.	Sub point added to R3.
Cristina Rekakavas	113	5.5.21	Please see above. The idea of positioning UN CC:Learn as a knowledge connector, beyond its current role, sounds interesting.	No action taken.
Angus Mackay	114	5.5.21	This makes a lot of sense ....	No action taken.
Angus Mackay	115	5.5.22	Important to make the connection that the reason CC:Learn supported EduCCate global was in order to find a way to scale up YCDs. To this point and the one below on training teachers are inter-related.	Noted within the text.
Cristina Rekakavas	116	5.5.23	UN CC:Learn has never developed a MOOC for teachers but the possibility for teachers to complete 5 UN CC:Learn courses and get certificates of completion plus a badge. All of this is still possible with the exception of the provision of a badge, which is no longer in line with UNITAR policies.	Noted and added. However more than one group went into some depth on the MOOC. Do you know what else they could be referring to? They referred to hundreds of thousands of participants at the same time.
Angus Mackay	117	5.5.25	We currently have a partnership with UNCDF which is specifically focused on this	noted - added within the text.
Cristina Rekakavas	118	5.5.27	No modules have been retired from the website, but one resource mentioned above which was made available for 3 months only, as announced, as well as a couple of courses that were hosted on the platform for specific audiences but never announced publicly.	Could it be these that the participants were referring to?
Cristina Rekakavas / Angus Mackay	119	5.5.27	No UN CC:Learn course on negotiations has been retired. Could this perhaps be a UNITAR course? There used to be an e-learning on this topic specifically for negotiators provided by	noted and amended. Such confusion underscores the



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

			<p>another Division at UNITAR, unrelated to UN CC:Learn, which is no longer offered.</p> <p>This is probably a product from Rabih's team. A few years ago we also did some face to face training but there was never an online module.</p>	<p>need for R2 and R4.</p>
Cristina Rekavakas / Angus Mackay	120	5.5.29	<p>The idea of knowledge connection sounds indeed interesting.</p> <p>We have proposed this several times with UNDP as they have a wide range of available materials. So far we have not had any positive response.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Cristina Rekavakas	121	5.5.29	<p>This information is already included but will be clarified.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Cristina Rekavakas	122	5.5.30	<p>UN CC:Learn has reflected on this question, but noted that many resources already exist. However, UN CC:Learn has developed a face to face training on this topic for its key partners.</p>	<p>now noted within the text.</p>
Angus Mackay / Cristina Rekavakas	123	5.5.34	<p>This has been attempted through UNDP in Malawi, and more recently also in Egypt. We have tried a regional approach in Central America.</p> <p>UN CC:Learn has explored this opportunity, which has proved challenging, but will continue to do so.</p>	<p>noted within the revised text.</p>
Cristina Rekavakas	124	5.5.35	<p>This is actually the UNFCCC mandate.</p>	<p>Noted. Perhaps this needs to be made clearer on the website?</p>
Cristina Rekavakas	125	5.5.35	<p>This depends indeed on funds availability. For instance, a concept note for a module on climate change and migration exists since the beginning of this phase, but there are no resources to support its development yet.</p>	<p>Noted. Hence R1 and R4</p>
Cristina Rekavakas	126	5.5.35	<p>Please see above. This perception may be due to the fact that UN CC:Learn is a project and that it needs to leverage twice its core funding.</p>	<p>Agreed. Now reflected in the text.</p>
Cristina Rekavakas	127	5.5.36	<p>Please see above</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Angus Mackay	128	5.5.43	<p>This was done specifically as a means to scale up the YCD experience</p>	<p>have deleted the word "unexpected"</p>
Cristina Rekavakas	129	5.5.46	<p>As mentioned, UN CC:Learn is developing a mechanism to support the engagement of the users registered on the e-learning platform. A hashtag #CCLearnAlumni already exists on social media to engage users who complete their courses; they can share their certificates and comments.</p>	<p>Thank you. This comment is now reflected in the text.</p>
Cristina Rekavakas	130	5.5.50	<p>This has been partially been covered in the latest SGM in May 2020, and will be further addressed as the COVID-19 crisis evolves.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This comment was made by an attendee of the recent SGM, after</p>



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

				attending that SGM.
Cristina Rekakavas	131	5.5.50	This has indeed been done for all countries.	Noted. Stakeholders who made this comment were not aware of this. However I've noted this in the text.
Cristina Rekakavas	132	5.5.52	The UN CC:Learn Secretariat aims at developing a teacher training e-course on climate change in collaboration with UNESCO and other partners.	Noted.
Angus Mackay	133	5.6.3	Text revised : During this fourth phase UN CC:Learn <b>has started to</b> aligned its national learning strategy methodology with NAPs and NDCs.	Accepted.
Angus Mackay	134	5.6.3	This is hard to understand. The NDC partnership is very different. It coordinates among partners across all areas necessary for NDC implementation. Each partner can then bring in its expertise where necessary. In CC:Learn's case we can bring in the learning strategy work. The Zimbabwe NDC experience is the perfect example.	Noted, and now reflected within the text.
Angus Mackay	135	5.6.4	Revised text: Contribution to SDG 17 - Partnerships to achieve the Goals and SDG 4 - Quality Education are also evident, <b>as well as SDG 8 on jobs and growth..</b>	Accepted.
Angus Mackay	136	5.6.5	Revised text: CC:Learn <b>Secretariat</b> staff say that they proactively align their work <b>of the partnership</b> with national policies and international agreements relating to CC learning.	Accepted.
Angus Mackay	137	5.6.5	Do you mean that this is 'not' CC:Learn's mandate. The Sentence does not make sense as written.	Yes. Amended.
Cristina Rekakavas / Angus Mackay	138	5.6.5	This is not the case the e-learning resources, which are co-developed and for the country work, for instance.  Outcome 1 is about hosting materials. Outcome 2 goes way beyond this. So this statement is misperception and needs to be contextualised accordingly.	Amended in the text. Agree this reinforces the need for R4, and also R2.
Angus Mackay	139	5.6.10	Such as.	those noted by participants are listed below.
Angus Mackay	140	5.6.11	How are these competing. They offer very different services. The NDC partnership does not offer global products or national strategies. They offer coordination. I see no confusing at all. The ESD initiative is a global policy forum. Again, no competition that I can see. This statement needs more explanation for it to be valid.	similarities and differences are noted in the text. The Evaluator's task was to review existing project documentation and consult stakeholders by interview and



				<p>survey, not to go and identify every other platform and review them against UN CC:Learn. The Evaluator was careful to clarify this during the appointment process.</p> <p>Reviewing other platforms against UN CC:Learn would have been a substantial additional task, time for which was not allowed within this contract.</p>
Angus Mackay	141	5.7.2	Not sure how this fits with the other statement that no-one is full time at the Secretariat, which is why it is fairly lean compared to other global programmes.	<p>This section is the findings, which summarises and aligns what has been found from interviews, surveys and desk review. It is not the conclusions or recommendations. These come later. There are conflicting views between stakeholders - these are reflected within the Recommendations, noting them as lists of options that could be considered by the Secretariat. Recommendations are in no way prescribed.</p>
Cristina Rekasavas	142	5.7.2	Working with other UN agencies has indeed always been at the core of UN CC:Learn's work.	Noted. Reflected within the text.
Cristina Rekasavas	143	5.7.3	National Partners are not part of the Steering Group though.	noted within the text
Angus Mackay	144	5.7.4	How many have been effective?	I have no knowledge regarding how many have been used and have not surveyed /



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

				interviewed all countries.
Cristina Rekakavas	145	5.7.6	Country partners contribute reflections and ideas but are not officially part of the UN CC:Learn Steering Group.	clarified in the text.
?	146	5.7.7	Don't understand this statement. Not sure what the SGM has to do with updating content. CC:Learn is launching several courses each year and periodically reaches out to 'owners' of existing courses to update. This does not always lead to further investment as it is up to the partner in question to decide whether to re-invest.	the GPs were saying that an effective global partnership would have an agreement whereby GPs, who are members of the SGM would be involved in keeping the content up to date, but this could only happen through clarifying this in MoUs or a global partnership agreement.
Cristina Rekakavas	147	5.7.12	please see above.	Noted. Hence R2 and R4.
Cristina Rekakavas	148	5.7.12	please see above.	Noted, and text amended. Text retained however as clearly there was some significant misunderstanding here and this relates to R2 and R4.
Cristina Rekakavas	149	6.1.2	Regional work is covered by Outcome 2 and the cross-cutting output.	amended to "no central to"
Angus Mackay	150	6.1.3	Actually the classrooms are focused on junior negotiators, so this is correct. It is assumed that senior ones have more experience and less time. They are less likely to engage.	Amended.
Angus Mackay	151	6.2.5	The point is that this has changed over time due to Doha work programme, ACE and CC:Learn.	Absolutely.
Angus Mackay	152	6.2.5	Text revised: With UN <b>CC:Learn's support</b> , Uganda and other countries' support, UN CC:Learn got a CC learning decision <b>on ACE approved at CoP 24. Further, the</b> into the Paris <b>Agreement has a separate paragraph on ACE which was achieved through hard negotiation by countries, led by UN CC:Learn partner countries.</b>	Accepted.
Angus Mackay	153	7.1.1	Text revised: However, it struggles to be sustainable or have impact at sufficient scale and is not funded or structured to meet the need or <b>increasing</b> demand for climate change learning.	Accepted.

Angus Mackay	154	7.1.1	It has helped to stimulate this increasing demand and visibility and is now a creature of its own success. Major restructuring might be necessary but this will depend on get the message out and attracting significant dedicated funding.	Agreed. Text amended to reflect this.
Cristina Rekakavas	155	7.2.1	While the courses are open to anyone interested, each course is designed to respond to the needs of a specific target audience.	Noted. Text amended to respond to this.
Angus Mackay	156	7.2.1	How would we know that the ToC is effective? Maybe some examples of good ones could be useful (I have seen many but they are more than usually disputed and very quickly out of date).	<p>Effective ToCs can be easily articulated by stakeholders.</p> <p>Effective ToCs don't go out of date because they include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A set of clearly articulated assumptions that are tested as part of the project activities and then revised as they are found to be correct or incorrect - thus changing and strengthening the project design whilst it is being implemented</li> <li>- A set of identified risks that are planned for, reviewed and updated regularly.</li> <li>- Related to the above it would have a list of key evidence required that would prove (or disprove) the ToC that would collated as part of the project activities (eg pilots, innovation) - if the ToC is proved correct this is communicated to all stakeholders and they are encouraged to do more of the same and scale it up. If it</li> </ul>



unitar

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

				is incorrect this is communicated as a project success and unproductive project activities are stopped or modified and more effective ones implemented.
Angus Mackay	157	7.3.1	Not sure what this means in practice. It's a global programme so you need some centralised capacity to administer things and, as we have established, the Secretariat is already lean and most comments seem to say it is too small. The national work is not 'controlled' from Geneva and in fact most countries appreciate that it is very much delegated to country level already. The image of a top down centrally controlled programme is not really what stakeholders are saying. Does this mean deploying UN staff to various regions? If so they would have to be fully funded so this would be a much larger programme. Important to unpack the implications of this R a bit more.	<p>Noted. Please note this is not intended to be a prescribed solution, it is merely one of many possible options for the secretariat and partners to explore to jointly decide what would work.</p> <p>It seems that stakeholders mean that people in Geneva can never fully understand the local context or hold sufficiently deep local relationships. Empowerment is noted and appreciated, but local stakeholders are saying they need more resources and greater local decision making abilities to effect change at the rate required. It is this request that needs consideration rather than the specific suggestion to move staff to regions, which is only one of many potential options.</p>
Angus Mackay	158	7.3.1	How do you decentralise a few people who are working 20% to 40%. Not against this but needs a reality check. Are we saying we need a full time P3 in at least 3 regional locations?	Apologies - it appears that you've not understood that the recommendations are linked - so recommendations



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

				2, 3, 4, 5 are all in support of recommendation 1 - getting more funding and scaling up the project. Also it should again be noted that the bullets are "options for consideration" and not at all prescribed solutions. I've sought to clarify this with a new intro to the Recommendations and clarifying the specific text here.
Angus Mackay	159	7.3.1	Quite like this	Noted.
Angus Mackay	160	7.4.1	Could this be explained more. What can be learned from this long term collaboration?	The respondent said that it took quite a bit of negotiation to set up the partnership between three very large powerful organisations, and required the writing and updating of agreements, and required learning to understand and trust each other and learning to represent each other - all of which they though this project could learn from.  Text amended in response.
Angus Mackay	161	Lesson 3	Generally GPs come to us and ask us to help them to prepare a course. The Secretariat does not identify one off partner funded activities itself as such. There seem to be a couple of voices repeated throughout the document here who have an interest in changing the nature of the partnership. I would not agree that they hinder the goals but in fact have massively increased the offer of courses over the years which is much appreciated by the alumni. I am not sure how well the commentators are aware of the 'actual' project goals although I understand that some way want to see these shift towards a larger scale global programme.	Noted. No action taken.

Angus Mackay	162	Lesson 4	Again this is a rather crude characterisation. We do not arrange annual meetings to support one off collaborations. CCLearn meetings are usually held in Feb/March, usually back to back with ACE meetings, and then again at COP. The agendas of these meetings are forward looking but they also feature many 'one off' examples of collaboration as a way of showing how CC:Learn is meeting the requests of its partners.	Noted. Adjustments made.
Angus Mackay	163	Lesson 4	Not sure what this means. Can you provide some practical perspectives.	I have expanded within the text.
Angus Mackay	164	Lesson 4	Not necessarily. I think in many cases the evidence would point to a very high bang for buck. Obviously we want to do more and move up the value chain, and this may imply more resources and presence. It depends what our objective is. CC:Learn is a project. It never aspired so 'fix' climate change learning. Perhaps the best summary might be 'job done on raising awareness of the issue and providing solutions', now we need to do the heavy lifting. What sort of financing and structures are needed to do this. Perhaps the evaluation could reflect	I agree that this project has been efficient in in the collaboration it has achieved at country level. However, there appears to be a need for a step change or at least a consolidation of how this is done if the project is to grow or have greater impact.
Angus Mackay	165	Lesson 4	Only useful if a financial commitment is likely. When we do discuss a financial commitment with a particular entity they tend to make that very specific to a particular product that they need. At no point has any GP come to us and said 'lets have a much bigger strategic partnership and this is how we will fund it'. It feels like one or two somewhat uninformed GPs views are dominating here.	Evidence has shown that throughout the evaluation it has become clear that GPs are either collaborating in a piecemeal way or not engaging or are trying to support but feeling a bit lost as to how this can be sustainable. Many GPs are highly supportive of UN CC:Learn and want it to be stronger. They are merely pointing out that without an overarching agreement or stronger MoUs, then UN CC:Learn is unlikely to grow with the risk that CC learning will not take place at the required scale



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

				to meet the urgent need.
Cristina Rekakavas	166	Lesson 4	There are multiple connections already developed (e.g. e-learning courses and synergies at country level) but more opportunities will be explored.	see response to Angus' comment below.
Angus Mackay	167	Lesson 4	Whats the LL. That opportunities for synergy should not be missed. Needs a bit of thought to bring a richer idea here.	Several stakeholders, including members of the Secretariat noted that there are overlaps between PAGE and UN CC:Learn and that whether or not learning is passed between them is left to the individual. They said they are not being intentionally sought, and there is no overarching plan to get both projects to specifically support each others objectives.
Cristina Rekakavas	168	A2.3 Case Study Findings	Revised text : Good progress was made initially, with countries across the region having developed their <b>regional</b> CC learning strategies.	Accepted.
Cristina Rekakavas	169	A2.3 Case Study Findings	Indeed, no UN CC:Learn supported strategy is being developed during this phase in the SICA region.	Noted.
Patrick Sieber	170	Executive Summary	My comment on further extending both the recommendations/lessons learnt part in the executive summary have already been taken on board - and I perceive the new extened executive summary to provide much more flesh on the bone...	Noted. Resolved.
Patrick Sieber	171	Executive Summary	Abbreviation needs to be introduced - first time it appears in the text.	This is normally done within the main body of the report, not within the Executive Summary".
Patrick Sieber	172	Acronyms and Abbreviations	SICA, FGD, KII, RFI,...	SICA is already defined within this table. FGD, KII, RFI now added
Patrick Sieber	173	3.14	Is it really possible to provide a comprehensive ToC for - or do we have to content ourselves with the fact that criteria and aims are spelled out a bit better still - leaving some more flexibility to adapt to national/regional circumstances when it comes to the implementation activities?	This is responded to against comment 156 in the evaluation audit trail.



**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

Patrick Sieber	174	4.5.1	Pls. see comment on missing elements in table of abbreviations above	Responded to against comment 171 in the audit trail. Included in the table above.
Patrick Sieber	175		Would be good to further elaborate a bit on this assumption/correlation made here: just recalling my own participation in e-learnings over the past few years - there were a number that I actually did down to the wire (despite an impression that they won't be that useful..) - but mainly due to courtesy...	Noted and agreed. Hence use of the phrase "gives an indication" rather than "demonstrates"
Patrick Sieber	176	5.1.18	UNCCCCF -> UNFCCC?	Thank you. Done.
Patrick Sieber	177	5.1.18	Indeed an interesting observation - that might have to be further taken into account when thinking about a mid-term perspective and the question about provision free-of-charge/with a minimal and well-adapted charge to increase ownership?	Noted - comment assumed to be for discussion with UN CC:Learn staff / partners.
Patrick Sieber	178	5.2.5	Has there been any indication by them how they see the role of their respective institutions to bring the initiative forward, or was also their role seen as being rather an opportunistic one? Are they eager to advance on this front, or did they rather convey a 'wait-and-see' attitude?	GPs said they were open to discussion with the Secretariat.
Patrick Sieber	179	5.2.16	Could even be put in bold...	Done.
Patrick Sieber	180	5.2.23	Important statement - but would be useful to further elaborate on how and by whom this might be changed in a collaborative effort to which all the partners need to contribute...	This is addressed in part through recommendation R1 bullet 1 - giving specific funding to CC learning - as specific funding would increase attention given.
Patrick Sieber	181	5.2.25	Might show the limitation of capturing all in the logframe that needs to be available at the outset... Aren't national/regional learning institutions means of implementation for advancing the initiative? Agree with the additional capacity that might be needed - but does it really need additional \$?	National and Regional Academic Institutions noted that their national education budgets are already stretched and their existing capacity is fully utilised in meeting existing defined activities such as providing standard teacher training. They note that most of them have no remit or capacity to raise additional funds or influence government





**unitar**

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

				funding priorities. Hence, they can only take on CC learning work if additional funding is provided or leveraged.
Patrick Sieber	182	5.2.64	This is also a way of looking at this topic... :-)	No action required.
Patrick Sieber	183	5.2.73	A key statement for me - and one on which the recommendation/way forward part of the report should further elaborate and offer a concrete proposal towards operationalization	The Recommendations are designed to give some options towards sustainability and scale-up, including through considering a greater emphasis on regionalisation or localisation.
Patrick Sieber	184	6.6.2	Could even be further highlighted in the text (USP)...	I have now copied this statement into a call-out box.
Patrick Sieber	185	6.7.4	Statement should be further explained: context-specific demand at the national level will be difficult to 'group' - and I am convinced that at least some of the global work can/has to be defined detached from the former	The statement is related to other comments in the report that learning from national learning strategies could be shared at the global level. Learning priorities at the local level could be addressed at the global level. Also existing global level content could be promoted / engaged with at the local level. The point is that local and global work should both inform each other and be connected to jointly contribute towards the overall project goal.