

Management Response: Implementation Plan for Evaluation Recommendations

General Information

Eval ID	701
Evaluation Manager	Susanne Bech
Project Evaluation Title	Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP/GEF project "The GEF Earth Fund: Conservation Agreements Private Partnership Platform" - CAPPP
PIMS #	
GEF ID	4259
UNEP Sub-programme	SP3 – Healthy and Productive Ecosystems
GEF Focal Area	Biodiversity
Project Manager/ Task Manager	Ersin Esen
Office/Division	Ecosystems Division
Branch & Unit	Ecosystems - Biodiversity and Land Branch
Final PDF Report distributed by Evaluation Office (Date)	13-09-22
Total # of Recommendations as per Report	3
Implementation Plan Sent to PM/TM (Date)	20-09-22
Implementation Plan Returned by PM/TM (Date)	01-11-22
Implementation Plan finalized (if different from the date above)	

Implementation Plan

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
1	Resources for proposal writing in the design stage were not sufficiently used to design a manageable project with preselected partners and on-site activities and proper monitoring and reporting structures. Project proposals undergo a revision process within UNEP being reviewed in the Programme Coherence & Assurance Unit, Policy & Programme Division. The	Ensure longer project duration of at least five years and three to four years of on-site activities, as appropriate, to allow institution building on the ground in future global GEF biodiversity conservation projects implemented by UNEP. Design projects with a limited number of sub-projects with on-site activities and select sites and implementation	Critical	UNEP-wide	UNEP	Next twelve months	Partially Accepted	The concerns for the project design may not be relevant for future projects, as this project was designed appx. 10 years ago and changes may have since been implemented. Evidence from one project may not necessarily be generalised	- The design stage of this project took place from 2010-2014, and is several GEF cycles removed from current project designs. It is thus possible that the concerns raised have already been fixed. - A review of current protocols is recommended to see if the concerns raised about the design stage have already been addressed - It is important to inspect other under-5-year project reviews to see whether the

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
	project proposal review needs to consider the appropriate number of project partners and on-site activities as well as the timing and duration of the project activities. The review shall also check the theory of change – if project outcomes contribute to global environmental benefits.	agreements for local interventions during the design phase.						for project implementation. See Management Actions to be taken.	problems seen here are overarching among other projects or limited to this style of project. It is also important to consider whether budget saved by not extending the project is overshadowed by loss in project long-term results. There is not full evidence to establish a general rule. We believe that obligating a minimum-5-year period for projects is not a solution without first knowing whether projects with longer periods were more successful. We suggest “A review of project duration on project results by the evaluation unit.” As the first action item under this recommendation. - We will propose to Quality Assurance Unit adding a new checklist item to the Project review checklist: “ Are the number of sub-projects with on-site activities suitable ?” Its explanation will include “Ensure a limited number of sub-projects with on-site activities and select sites and implementation agreements for local interventions. In order to ensure successful delivery of all sub-projects.
2	See lessons learnt. The project showed different ways of supporting community-based enterprises and value chains. Experience from activities can be transferred to other projects with private sector engagement and community	Diffuse Lessons Learnt for Private Sector Engagement in conservation projects with communities, for example, write a flyer with lessons learnt of the project and diffuse it to other GEF-projects like GEF-ID 10341 South Africa, GEF-ID 10192	Important	Project	UNEP /GEF	Within next 12 months	Accepted		• The Lessons Learnt document has already been created and approved, standing at 43 pages. The executive summary is three pages long, providing a solid basis for rewrites into a flyer. Merge the lessons learned of the terminal evaluation and the EA led lessons learnt

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
	involvement like the selected projects from the GEF database.	Zambia, GEF:ID 10285 Panama.							document for as a flyer, contingent on the EA's support. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACTION: Distribute full Lessons Learnt document to relevant GEF Projects • ACTION: Write and distribute flyer summary to relevant GEF Projects • ACTION: Distribute flyer summary to GEF staff for future projects
3	<p>The Project applied an assertive mechanism to get a fair distribution of benefits and inclusion of women and men, young people and elders promoting social organization and community decision making.</p> <p>This approach shall be presented in an article and published on the UNEP or GEF-website.</p>	Lessons learned about engaging communities in conservation, inclusion of gender and vulnerable / indigenous groups should be diffused to the wider public via UNEP or GEF website.	Critical	Project	Conservation Stewards Program of Conservation International, UNEP, GEF	Within the next 12 months	Accepted		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current Lessons Learnt document does not discuss much the lessons learned about inclusion of gender or vulnerable groups, meaning a new document is needed. We will coordinate with the EA whether there is any interest in a joint piece on lessons learned on inclusion of gender and vulnerable groups. - An UNEP story can be written with the support of the EA, based on the accounts in the Terminal Review and with assistance from those at the ground floor of implementation, about how the assertive mechanism was implemented, to be distributed to the wider public. The article will cover design, implementation, and effects. This story will be published on the UNEP's GEF web site.