


Q1 The 2018 SCF Forum met my expectations.

Answered: 44 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	27.27%	12
Agree	40.91%	18
Partly agree	27.27%	12
Disagree	4.55%	2
Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
TOTAL		44


#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	I expected a richer dialogue	8/3/2018 11:06 PM
2	Some break out sessions were too short to cover the given topic.	8/3/2018 4:29 PM
3	I liked the format a lot.	7/30/2018 5:50 AM
4	The forum highlighted a lot of problems that exist and although the examples of good cooperation and how Parties are able to use international resources in the national context presented in the different sessions were excellent, most of the plenary discussions didn't focus on solutions or getting more clarity on the exact nature of the problems. Because of this most of the problems voiced by participants remained anecdotal and not substantiated.	7/26/2018 1:54 PM
5	The forum provided a good update of the status of Climate finance and discussions were honest and very rich	7/26/2018 8:09 AM
6	Its got a lof of experience but needs new financial knowledge, science breakthroughs, institutional investors, etc.	7/25/2018 11:16 PM
7	While I very much appreciated the breadth of issues discussed, I think it could have been great to focus on some questions more in depth, and on some issues also more critical -- f.ex. the engagement of the private sector has good and bad impacts, depending on the structure of the involvement, but this was not reflected in discussions. Likewise, the challenge to get from "country ownership" as government ownership to more "citizens' participation within countries as right-holders" was a bit neglected, including broader issues of sustainability and human rights contextualization	7/25/2018 8:13 PM
8	The areas covered were very insightful and beneficial to participants	7/25/2018 5:24 PM
9	Bteakout groups wete very useful	7/25/2018 4:21 PM

Evaluation of the 2018 SCF Forum

10	Hardly any new information. The most useful and engaging presentations were by outside actors. The SCF Forum should allow for more of those and less time for negotiators.	7/25/2018 2:18 PM
11	Good participation, active engagement, balanced representation, good format	7/25/2018 2:03 PM
12	The discussion stayed rather general instead of coming up with concrete actionable items	7/25/2018 1:45 PM

Q2 The 2018 SCF Forum was successful in meeting its objectives. Forum objectives: To identify trends, developments and challenges under the climate finance architecture at international and national level with a view to:(a) Improving climate finance flows from international to national levels;(b) Enhancing collaboration between the UNFCCC climate funds and other actors;(c) Exchanging experiences and identifying opportunities for further collaboration at international and national level.

Answered: 44 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	11.36% 5
Agree	54.55% 24
Partly agree	27.27% 12
Disagree	4.55% 2
Strongly disagree	2.27% 1
TOTAL	44


#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	Although the event was well-structured, it wasn't clear how the activities (panels, breakout groups, etc) linked up with the Forum's objectives.	8/4/2018 4:14 PM
2	I think the forum did not go far in addressing the objectives , partially because it was hijacked by the GCF board mood, in addition the event felt more descriptive of what is going on than collaborative or able to go in depth in identifying the trends of mobilizing climate finance.	8/3/2018 11:06 PM
3	It was important the presence of members of the boards of UNFCCC climate funds, in particular the GCF, to hear their views and for them to hear other views and the work of the SCF	7/30/2018 4:23 PM
4	I agree that the last objective was met but not sure about the first two - I would say that they were not met.	7/30/2018 5:50 AM
5	These were discussed at length,	7/25/2018 11:16 PM

Evaluation of the 2018 SCF Forum

6	See above; collaboration among funds is important; however the questions of collaboration should be more focused on "best practice" expectation (efforts to learn from experiences and apply the best standards and procedures) rather than just looking and working on the "lowest common denominator approach". Even with a focus on collaboration and complementarity, it would have been useful to talk a bit more about unique approaches of various actors, including lessons learned from newer funds/funding approaches vs. longer experience and the role of "transformative" funding approaches (= not equating innovation or transformation solely in bringing in the private sector more...)	7/25/2018 8:13 PM
7	In my experience the 2018SFCT Forum was very helpful and useful in terms of exchanging experiences and identifying trends and challenges under the climate finance architecture.	7/25/2018 6:46 PM
8	There were lots of lessons learnt from other countries experiences	7/25/2018 5:24 PM
9	It was focused on GCF and not the broader climate finance architecture and how to enhance collaboration between the different funds, as well as the funds and other actors. A missed opportunity.	7/25/2018 2:18 PM
10	Meeting the objectives of the Forum partly depends on the recommendations by the SCF on the forum.	7/25/2018 2:09 PM
11	Interesting presentations and open and transparent discussions	7/25/2018 2:03 PM
12	not many representatives of GEF, AF and GCF Secretariats with active role in the discussion. The discussion was still very political and dominated by single board members agenda	7/25/2018 1:45 PM

Q3 The presentation was useful to set the scene for the Forum and provoke further thoughts for subsequent sessions.

Answered: 39 Skipped: 5




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	41.03% 16
Agree	48.72% 19
Partly agree	10.26% 4
Disagree	0.00% 0
Strongly disagree	0.00% 0
TOTAL	39

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	This presentation introduced a question that hung over the entire Forum: what is climate finance? It was difficult to have a sense of CF architecture if there's no working definition of what CF is.	8/4/2018 4:35 PM
2	In my opinion it was very UNFCCC oriented and missed the big financial flows	8/4/2018 2:09 AM
3	The presentation could have gone more into the actual numbers and trends in finance flows and instruments.	7/26/2018 1:55 PM

Q4 The case study presentation within the breakout group was useful to trigger the discussion.

Answered: 39 Skipped: 5




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	17.95% 7
Agree	61.54% 24
Partly agree	20.51% 8
Disagree	0.00% 0
Strongly disagree	0.00% 0
TOTAL	39

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	Time was short to go into details	8/3/2018 5:52 PM
2	some presentation was focused only to the limited topic; it was supposed to be a 'case study' but the following discussions somehow focused on some parts of the 'case study' presentation, which didn't serve the purpose.	8/3/2018 5:30 PM
3	I attended the session on country needs and priorities. It was useful but not made by a national representative and was more focused on a particular project, though was very interested and showed how a gap is being addressed.	7/30/2018 5:53 AM
4	The experience shared were very useful to compare with what other countries are experiencing.	7/26/2018 8:12 AM
5	Hard to have a comparison across "case-studies" since usually one attended only one of the break out sessions. Some of the case studies (more generally, not just for this session) seemed a bit "random" -- to the reference back to the overarching topic/abstraction and lessons learned was in several cases not done sufficiently by the presenter or through the discussion/summary...	7/25/2018 8:27 PM
6	Balanced representation of views	7/25/2018 2:11 PM

Q5 The breakout group discussion was facilitated well and it enhanced my understanding of the topic.

Answered: 39 Skipped: 5




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	30.77%	12
Agree	56.41%	22
Partly agree	12.82%	5
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
TOTAL		39

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	It was an exchange but a trained facilitator and a methodology can deliver more targeted outcomes	8/4/2018 2:09 AM
2	it was difficult to cover all the important topics in 'a word' which I was doubtful on how effective or efficient to summarize the discussions.	8/3/2018 5:30 PM
3	It was enough time to give participants the possibility to voice their view	7/25/2018 2:26 PM
4	Very good choice of facilitators who are knowledgeable on the topic. A good mix of institutions , civil society , and SCF mmmbers	7/25/2018 2:11 PM

Q6 The plenary report-back discussion was useful to further elaborate on the topics at hand, building on the outcomes of the breakout groups.

Answered: 39 Skipped: 5




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	33.33%	13
Agree	46.15%	18
Partly agree	20.51%	8
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
TOTAL		39

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	There was real opportunity to create dialogue, but some speakers (e.g Sergio) focused on their talking points instead of engaging directly with the ideas, perspectives, and questions that others raised.	8/4/2018 4:35 PM
2	I think the concept on the report-back sessions was ingenious.	7/31/2018 10:57 AM
3	The plenary report back discussions were very important to socialize the themes and group discussion with the whole audience.	7/30/2018 4:26 PM
4	The quality of the report back from various sessions depended very much on the "quality" of the person moderating the working group session and summarizing its content. There were vast differences noticeable....	7/25/2018 8:27 PM
5	It is important to encourage interaction and open, transparent discussions	7/25/2018 2:11 PM

Q7 The presentation was thought-provoking and useful to set the scene for the discussions that followed.

Answered: 39 Skipped: 5




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	23.08% 9
Agree	61.54% 24
Partly agree	15.38% 6
Disagree	0.00% 0
Strongly disagree	0.00% 0
TOTAL	39

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	Again, the speakers seemed to talk past each other without meaningfully engaging with each others' points.	8/4/2018 4:35 PM
2	Thought some of the panel discussants were rather weak...	7/25/2018 8:27 PM

Q8 The panel discussion was well-facilitated and it enhanced my understanding of the topic.

Answered: 39 Skipped: 5




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	20.51% 8
Agree	61.54% 24
Partly agree	17.95% 7
Disagree	0.00% 0
Strongly disagree	0.00% 0
TOTAL	39

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	It lacked the perspective on how to engage with the wider public	8/4/2018 2:09 AM

Q9 The presentation was thought-provoking and useful to set the scene for the discussions that followed.

Answered: 39 Skipped: 5




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	12.82%	5
Agree	71.79%	28
Partly agree	10.26%	4
Disagree	5.13%	2
Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
TOTAL		39

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	The Lab appears to be using business-as-usual approaches to climate change rather than "deploying new climate instruments."	8/4/2018 4:35 PM
2	Liked that there was some disagreement on the panel (Sethi) which was thought-provoking and meant a bit more reflecting than just presenting "approaches" and instruments... Also, there was very little "honesty" about the plus and minus of some of these financing approaches -- it was more along the line that innovative financing approaches are good because they are innovative --> a better understanding on who benefits from what (private sector vs. communities; banks vs. governments etc.) would have been helpful....	7/25/2018 8:27 PM
3	It is necessary to focus on the difference between roles of voluntary organizations and commitments under the Convention and its related legal instruments	7/25/2018 2:11 PM

Q10 The panel discussion was well-facilitated and it enhanced my understanding of the topic.

Answered: 39 Skipped: 5




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	10.26% 4
Agree	69.23% 27
Partly agree	17.95% 7
Disagree	2.56% 1
Strongly disagree	0.00% 0
TOTAL	39

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	The panel discussion was almost entirely disconnected from the scene-setting presentation, making it appear that the panel had no prior exposure to projects at The Lab and were therefore unprepared to evaluate their work.	8/4/2018 4:35 PM
2	Good choice of facilitators from all relevant actors	7/25/2018 2:11 PM

Q11 The case study presentation within the breakout group was useful to trigger the discussion.

Answered: 39 Skipped: 5




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	15.38% 6
Agree	69.23% 27
Partly agree	12.82% 5
Disagree	2.56% 1
Strongly disagree	0.00% 0
TOTAL	39

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	again, only possible to follow one of three possible breakout sessions, thus, this is not a reflection on the experience in all (mine was country experience)...	7/25/2018 8:27 PM
2	The case study was not well suited for the topic and did not allow for a discussion on the topic.	7/25/2018 2:25 PM

Q12 The breakout group discussion was facilitated well and it enhanced my understanding of the topic.

Answered: 39 Skipped: 5




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	17.95% 7
Agree	61.54% 24
Partly agree	12.82% 5
Disagree	7.69% 3
Strongly disagree	0.00% 0
TOTAL	39

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
	There are no responses.	

Q13 The plenary report-back discussion was useful to further elaborate on the topics at hand, building on the outcomes of the breakout groups.

Answered: 39 Skipped: 5



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	15.38% 6
Agree	66.67% 26
Partly agree	17.95% 7
Disagree	0.00% 0
Strongly disagree	0.00% 0
TOTAL	39

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	The word clouds were a creative idea for audience participation, but their utility as a discussion/report-back tool was unclear.	8/4/2018 4:35 PM
2	see caveat above -- utility of report back very dependent on who was summarizing the session prior....	7/25/2018 8:27 PM


Q14 Do you have any additional feedback on Day 1?

Answered: 9 Skipped: 35

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	As I mentioned before, there seemed to be a real disconnect between the various speakers that created a disjointed feeling to the whole day.	8/4/2018 4:35 PM
2	-	8/3/2018 5:52 PM
3	No, I thought it was well organized but could have include more focus on the objectives of the Forum.	7/30/2018 5:53 AM
4	No	7/27/2018 4:16 PM
5	Might have been useful to also discuss the implications of what it means for various funds/instruments to be outside/inside the UNFCCC framework in terms of opportunities for equal decision-making, participation, transparency etc. thus not just looking at the funds itself within the architecture but also what it means for some of those larger issues such as: -- climate finance transparency -- stakeholder participation -- decision-making structures -- additionality of financing provided etc.	7/25/2018 8:27 PM
6	nil	7/25/2018 5:33 PM
7	No	7/25/2018 4:23 PM
8	No.	7/25/2018 3:23 PM
9	I appreciated a lot the presentations and discussions of this first day.	7/25/2018 2:21 PM

Q15 The case study presentation within the breakout group was useful to trigger the discussion.

Answered: 33 Skipped: 11




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	24.24%	8
Agree	66.67%	22
Partly agree	9.09%	3
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
TOTAL		33

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	Case study provided useful details for engaging with broader themes.	8/4/2018 4:46 PM
2	was useful to trigger the discussion, but could have provided a bit more abstracted contextualization -- what is transferable to other countries, what was country-specific...	7/25/2018 8:32 PM

Q16 The breakout group discussion was facilitated well and it enhanced my understanding of the topic.

Answered: 33 Skipped: 11




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	12.12%	4
Agree	72.73%	24
Partly agree	12.12%	4
Disagree	3.03%	1
Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
TOTAL		33

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	the breakout session (budgeting) was very weakly facilitated...	7/25/2018 8:32 PM

Q17 The plenary report-back discussion was useful to further elaborate on the topics at hand, building on the outcomes of the breakout groups.

Answered: 33 Skipped: 11




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	18.18% 6
Agree	63.64% 21
Partly agree	18.18% 6
Disagree	0.00% 0
Strongly disagree	0.00% 0
TOTAL	33

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
	There are no responses.	

Q18 The presentation was useful to provoke thoughts for the discussions that followed.

Answered: 33 Skipped: 11




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	30.30% 10
Agree	54.55% 18
Partly agree	12.12% 4
Disagree	0.00% 0
Strongly disagree	3.03% 1
TOTAL	33

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	Speaker wasn't engaging, and the case focused on traditional development approaches (loans, private sector projects, etc.) rather than ways to address underlying drivers of vulnerability to climate change.	8/4/2018 4:46 PM
2	Regional coordination is important to enhance cooperation and find synergies among countries.	7/25/2018 1:52 PM

Q19 The panel discussion was well-facilitated and it enhanced my understanding of the topic.

Answered: 33 Skipped: 11




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	18.18% 6
Agree	63.64% 21
Partly agree	15.15% 5
Disagree	3.03% 1
Strongly disagree	0.00% 0
TOTAL	33

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	Panelists did not engage at all with the case study in Mongolia.	8/4/2018 4:46 PM
2	It was clear that the national climate finance architecture is an extremely complex element of the broader picture. Beyond highlighting difficulties and challenges, more focus could have been created on possible opportunities and best practice.	8/3/2018 4:41 PM

Q20 The presentation was thought-provoking and useful to set the scene for the discussions that followed.

Answered: 33 Skipped: 11




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	33.33%	11
Agree	48.48%	16
Partly agree	18.18%	6
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
TOTAL		33

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	Presentation was stimulating, well-organized, and on-point.	8/4/2018 4:46 PM
2	The presentation was very engaging.	7/30/2018 5:54 AM
3	Very dynamic and well-thought through presentation	7/25/2018 8:32 PM

Q21 The panel discussion was well-facilitated and it enhanced my understanding of the topic.

Answered: 33 Skipped: 11




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	18.18%	6
Agree	69.70%	23
Partly agree	12.12%	4
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
TOTAL		33

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	As above.	8/3/2018 4:41 PM

Q22 The case study presentation within the breakout group was useful to trigger the discussion.

Answered: 33 Skipped: 11




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	15.15%	5
Agree	69.70%	23
Partly agree	12.12%	4
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly disagree	3.03%	1
TOTAL		33

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	Case study presentation was a long, undirected, and poorly structured. The speaker burdened the audience with details without explaining their broader significance.	8/4/2018 4:46 PM
2	looked at two of the three breakout group (attended both partially)	7/25/2018 8:32 PM

Q23 The breakout group discussion was facilitated well and it enhanced my understanding of the topic.

Answered: 33 Skipped: 11




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	15.15%	5
Agree	75.76%	25
Partly agree	6.06%	2
Disagree	3.03%	1
Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
TOTAL		33

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
1	Discussion was completely disconnected from the presentation.	8/4/2018 4:46 PM

Q24 The plenary report-back discussion was useful to further elaborate on the topics at hand, building on the outcomes of the breakout groups.

Answered: 33 Skipped: 11



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	18.18% 6
Agree	66.67% 22
Partly agree	12.12% 4
Disagree	3.03% 1
Strongly disagree	0.00% 0
TOTAL	33

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED	DATE
	There are no responses.	


Q25 Do you have any additional feedback on Day 2?

Answered: 6 Skipped: 38

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	overall the suggestion is to make sure that the SCF is a platform to talk to other actors like previous years events	8/4/2018 2:37 AM
2	The issue of national CF architectures was a relatively new area for me and very interesting to explore. I felt a number of useful high level messages came out including the importance of country ownership/responsibility, and the importance of engaging central and finance ministries. I felt that a bit more could have been brought out on the best practice in how the national actors should best engage with the global actors, and where harmonization of either global or national systems could lead to a more effective overall architecture.	8/3/2018 4:41 PM
3	I thought it was very interesting and helped understand the gaps, needs and how they are being addressed. It would be interested to see now how those gaps can be addressed.	7/30/2018 5:54 AM
4	Overall the forum was very interactive, but I think that a little more time could have brought out more ideas.	7/27/2018 4:20 PM
5	Just a general comments of the events. Eventhough the concluison is the finance government arqitetcture is a country driven process and most of the experience came from developing countries I would have liked to know the experience of developed countries or middle income countries during the forum	7/25/2018 6:53 PM
6	National coordination mechanisms has been very interesting and rich of practical lessons.	7/25/2018 2:28 PM

Q26 How did you like the stage settings? (Scene-setting presenters and report-back discussants were invited to keep standing, with an aim to resemble arrangements similar to the TED-talks and television presidential debates. Panel discussants had seated arrangements.)

Answered: 33 Skipped: 11




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Excellent	51.52%	17
Very good	42.42%	14
Satisfactory	6.06%	2
Unsatisfactory	0.00%	0
Poor	0.00%	0
TOTAL		33

#	HOW CAN THIS BE IMPROVED FURTHER? PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED.	DATE
1	It is advisable to have less panels and panelists and have more time for report back joint discussions. It is important to keep a representation of civil society organizations and academia within the panelist to seek outside views.	7/30/2018 4:33 PM
2	I really liked the format a lot. I thought it helped shake things up and kept people a little more engaged.	7/30/2018 5:58 AM
3	Make sure WiFi is working whenever we need it for interactive discussions	7/26/2018 8:17 AM
4	The change in the way issues were discussed brought some dynamics into the event... Thought it was good...	7/25/2018 8:39 PM
5	Although both settings has their advantages and disadvantages . This must be discussed further in organizing the next SCF forums	7/25/2018 2:21 PM

Q27 I found the usage of wireless ear-set microphones by the discussants conducive for the discussion.

Answered: 33 Skipped: 11




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	54.55%	18
Agree	42.42%	14
Partially agree	3.03%	1
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
TOTAL		33

#	HOW CAN THIS BE IMPROVED FURTHER? PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED.	DATE
	There are no responses.	

Q28 Did you find the usage of Wordcloud useful and interesting in gathering the views of the participants?

Answered: 33 Skipped: 11



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	36.36%	12
Agree	45.45%	15
Neither agree nor disagree	15.15%	5
Disagree	3.03%	1
Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
TOTAL		33

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	The word clouds were creative but didn't prove to be useful in terms of capturing the main ideas of the breakout sessions.	8/4/2018 4:49 PM
2	I wasn't able to connect to the platform so couldn't provide my feedback but I enjoyed seeing the inputs from others.	7/30/2018 5:58 AM
3	It was an interesting addition but not when one of the presenters started using the live voting as a rating for the performance of participants. I saw it made the participants feel uncomfortable and it didn't add to the discussion.	7/26/2018 1:57 PM
4	Need to ensure a better WiFi connectivity	7/26/2018 8:17 AM
5	I think it was a helpful tool, but maybe given a bit too much prominence. Obviously, given the relative small number of participants, the word cloud could be also distorted (or potentially manipulated)....	7/25/2018 8:39 PM
6	I think is a very interesting tool, but you need too encourage participation. SOme words were common places	7/25/2018 6:57 PM
7	The presumption is that everybody had the ncessary technical equipment to participate and as this is an innovation , it should have been explained further to the audience .	7/25/2018 2:21 PM

Q29 Please list three positive elements from the 2018 SCF forum

Answered: 26 Skipped: 18

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
1.	100.00%	26
2.	100.00%	26
3.	84.62%	22

#	1.	DATE
1	Connecting with new people	8/4/2018 4:49 PM
2	New format ted talk	8/4/2018 2:40 AM
3	Ted-Talk like stage setting	8/3/2018 5:35 PM
4	Hearing accounts from domestic/national action and experience in the feedback and breakout sessions	8/3/2018 4:48 PM
5	Diverse representation of institutions	7/30/2018 4:33 PM
6	Ted style presentations	7/30/2018 5:58 AM
7	Good discussions	7/29/2018 11:00 PM
8	Informative	7/28/2018 1:53 PM
9	instructive	7/27/2018 7:24 PM
10	Very interactive	7/27/2018 4:23 PM
11	Interactive format	7/26/2018 1:57 PM
12	Interactive discussions	7/26/2018 8:17 AM
13	TED-like format	7/26/2018 2:12 AM
14	Excellent and professional presenter	7/25/2018 9:57 PM
15	efforts to engage a wide range of stakeholders, including as presenters and discussants	7/25/2018 8:39 PM
16	State of art of climate finance governance	7/25/2018 6:57 PM
17	Interactive	7/25/2018 4:25 PM
18	Exchange of views	7/25/2018 3:26 PM
19	active discussions	7/25/2018 3:15 PM
20	Good interaction	7/25/2018 3:12 PM
21	Opened dialogue	7/25/2018 2:44 PM
22	active engagement by all	7/25/2018 2:43 PM
23	Good balance in participation and excellent opening remarks , especially from the co-facilitators, Pieter and Mohamed	7/25/2018 2:21 PM
24	Summary of discussions (one line, word cloud)	7/25/2018 2:14 PM
25	community of practice	7/25/2018 1:50 PM
26	High relevance of key themes	7/25/2018 1:15 PM
#	2.	DATE
1	Excellent facilities	8/4/2018 4:49 PM
2	break out groups	8/4/2018 2:40 AM
3	diverse themes covered in breakout sessions	8/3/2018 5:35 PM
4	The balance between plenary presentations and breakout discussions	8/3/2018 4:48 PM
5	very well logistics organization	7/30/2018 4:33 PM

Evaluation of the 2018 SCF Forum

6	Breakout groups that were more intimate and invited more discussion and interaction	7/30/2018 5:58 AM
7	Interesting presentations	7/29/2018 11:00 PM
8	Productive	7/28/2018 1:53 PM
9	well prepared	7/27/2018 7:24 PM
10	Lots of contributions	7/27/2018 4:23 PM
11	Break-out sessions	7/26/2018 1:57 PM
12	Good presentations	7/26/2018 8:17 AM
13	Country driven discussion	7/26/2018 2:12 AM
14	Efficient operation of the meeting	7/25/2018 9:57 PM
15	ensuring that there was sufficient/equal weight given to national/sub-national experiences	7/25/2018 8:39 PM
16	Networking	7/25/2018 6:57 PM
17	Informative	7/25/2018 4:25 PM
18	Active participation	7/25/2018 3:26 PM
19	well chosen topics	7/25/2018 3:15 PM
20	Good diversity in participation	7/25/2018 3:12 PM
21	Sessions very well structured	7/25/2018 2:44 PM
22	pace of meeting was good	7/25/2018 2:43 PM
23	Excellent presentations	7/25/2018 2:21 PM
24	Active participation in BoGs	7/25/2018 2:14 PM
25	rare to have the time to discuss this topic at length	7/25/2018 1:50 PM
26	Good balance between presentations & discussions	7/25/2018 1:15 PM
#	3.	DATE
1	Good opportunities for audience participation	8/4/2018 4:49 PM
2	location	8/4/2018 2:40 AM
3	The organisation	8/3/2018 4:48 PM
4	Diverse views from different quarters	7/30/2018 4:33 PM
5	Follow up discussions with moderators to capture key points in an interview style format	7/30/2018 5:58 AM
6	Good mix of delegates	7/29/2018 11:00 PM
7	Good for networking	7/28/2018 1:53 PM
8	to be repeated	7/27/2018 7:24 PM
9	Great organization and planning to move participants around	7/26/2018 8:17 AM
10	enough time for interaction	7/26/2018 2:12 AM
11	Various stakeholder participation	7/25/2018 9:57 PM
12	efforts to make it more engaging to audiences outside of Songdo	7/25/2018 8:39 PM
13	Resourceful	7/25/2018 4:25 PM
14	Many elements to well inform the negotiations	7/25/2018 3:26 PM
15	timely	7/25/2018 3:15 PM
16	Good organization by the UNFCCC finance team	7/25/2018 3:12 PM
17	Quality of participants.	7/25/2018 2:44 PM
18	presentations provided basis for participation and discussion	7/25/2018 2:43 PM
19	Good presentations	7/25/2018 2:21 PM
20	Attendance by SCF members	7/25/2018 2:14 PM
21	logistical organization was impeccable	7/25/2018 1:50 PM
22	Use of report backs facilitate lesson learning across discussions	7/25/2018 1:15 PM

Q30 Please list three areas of improvement for the future SCF Forums

Answered: 22 Skipped: 22

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
1.	100.00%	22
2.	77.27%	17
3.	54.55%	12

#	1.	DATE
1	Clearly explain goals of the Forum: what do you want out of each session and who is the audience for this information	8/4/2018 4:49 PM
2	Engagmeent with wider audiences and actors	8/4/2018 2:40 AM
3	time management in each breakout session	8/3/2018 5:35 PM
4	Participation (numbers of attendees) - potentially linked to location	8/3/2018 4:48 PM
5	to bring some panelist at higher levels from the Funds and institutions	7/30/2018 4:33 PM
6	It would be good to get information more in advance for moderators and presenters	7/30/2018 5:58 AM
7	More time	7/29/2018 11:00 PM
8	Sessions on linkages with SDGs	7/28/2018 1:53 PM
9	French translation	7/27/2018 7:24 PM
10	Little more time for both group and plenary sessions	7/27/2018 4:23 PM
11	Use of the word-cloud and other interactive elements	7/26/2018 1:57 PM
12	focus on 'action'	7/26/2018 2:12 AM
13	Extended days of the forum	7/25/2018 9:57 PM
14	time zones -- Songdo made it very hard for folks to follow	7/25/2018 8:39 PM
15	organization of panel ans question for panelist	7/25/2018 6:57 PM
16	ensure more private sector participation	7/25/2018 3:15 PM
17	More practical application	7/25/2018 3:12 PM
18	Time allocated insufficient	7/25/2018 2:44 PM
19	Choice of participants knowledgeable on the topic chisen	7/25/2018 2:21 PM
20	Attendance of private sector	7/25/2018 2:14 PM
21	there were no real dialogues nor debates but rather a list of political statements	7/25/2018 1:50 PM
22	A little less movement for dispersed breakouts could help strengthen focus	7/25/2018 1:15 PM


#	2.	DATE
1	More diversity in participation	8/4/2018 2:40 AM
2	selection of the topic of case study	8/3/2018 5:35 PM
3	Avoid a narrow focus on the UNFCCC and Financial Mechanism, taking into account the broader development picture, including related initiatives e.g. sustainable development goals, and MDBs	8/3/2018 4:48 PM
4	the lenght of the Forum	7/30/2018 4:33 PM
5	The venue felt a little stiff, though there is nothing the organizers could do about this would have been nice to have a more intimate venue	7/30/2018 5:58 AM
6	More Pacific delegates	7/29/2018 11:00 PM
7	How the Green Funding helped achieve sustainable development	7/28/2018 1:53 PM
8	Diversity of speakers	7/26/2018 1:57 PM

Evaluation of the 2018 SCF Forum

9	Increased participatants	7/25/2018 9:57 PM
10	more of a back-and-forth --> not just presenting but also more of a policy discourse, including with disagreement about right approaches	7/25/2018 8:39 PM
11	more representatives from middle income countries	7/25/2018 6:57 PM
12	mobilise more participants	7/25/2018 3:15 PM
13	Greater involvement of on the ground practioners	7/25/2018 3:12 PM
14	No table in the plenary conference room for a good use of lap top.	7/25/2018 2:44 PM
15	More time for plenary discussions	7/25/2018 2:21 PM
16	Sometimes repetition of same issues in different BoGs	7/25/2018 2:14 PM
17	no concrete outcomes	7/25/2018 1:50 PM
#	3.	DATE
1	More looking forward and out the box thinking approach	8/4/2018 2:40 AM
2	A little more focus on the first two objectives of the Forum would have been good to see a concrete outcome	7/30/2018 5:58 AM
3	Longer breaks	7/29/2018 11:00 PM
4	Capacity development for developing and implementing climate change related projects	7/28/2018 1:53 PM
5	Early circulation of meeting record and outcomes	7/25/2018 9:57 PM
6	more variety in case studies (f.ex. including community perspectives and experiences, not just "official" ones such as MDBs, Funds, private sector, governments	7/25/2018 8:39 PM
7	ensure more equal participation/moderation	7/25/2018 3:15 PM
8	More use of IT and innovative applications	7/25/2018 3:12 PM
9	Absence of flag on tables to recognise easily participants and their countries.	7/25/2018 2:44 PM
10	Further study of useful formats for the Forum	7/25/2018 2:21 PM
11	Deviation of focus on the topic in some BoGs	7/25/2018 2:14 PM
12	unclear how the forum will be used by SCF members	7/25/2018 1:50 PM

Q31 What is your overall assessment of the 2018 SCF forum?

Answered: 33 Skipped: 11



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Excellent	18.18% 6
Very good	57.58% 19
Satisfactory	24.24% 8
Unsatisfactory	0.00% 0
Poor	0.00% 0
TOTAL	33

#	PLEASE ELABORATE AS NEEDED.	DATE
1	The topics, presentations, and interventions were broad, interesting, relevant and of high quality, however the slightly low level of participation limited the impact of the event.	8/3/2018 4:48 PM
2	Would give it a satisfactory to very good; many great elements, enjoyed that the organizers approached it with a broader understanding. Would have wished for it to be more "political" on some of the discussions....	7/25/2018 8:39 PM
3	Content-wise it could have been much stronger. Important that recommendations will be action-oriented.	7/25/2018 2:30 PM
4	Would also like to note great and valuable coordination by secretariat, as well as useful panelist preparation beforehand-- many thanks!	7/25/2018 1:15 PM

Q32 Thank you for completing this survey. If you have any additional comments, please feel free to leave them anonymously in the textbox below, or contact the secretariat at standingcommittee@unfccc.int.

Answered: 2 Skipped: 42

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	overall the suggestion is to make sure that the SCF is a platform to talk to other actors like in previous years (eg. infrastructure or loss and damage communities)	8/4/2018 2:41 AM
2	Congratulations to the Cochairs and Secretariat of the SCF for the logistics and substance of the Forum	7/30/2018 4:34 PM