

Management Response: Implementation Plan for Evaluation Recommendations

General Information

Eval ID	678
Evaluation Manager	Janet Wildish
Project Evaluation Title	Terminal Evaluation of the "EU-UNEP Africa Low Emissions Development Strategies Modelling, Planning and Implementation Project" (Africa LEDS, 2016-2019)
PIMS #	1721
GEF ID	
UNEP Sub-programme	SP1 – Climate Change
GEF Focal Area	
Project Manager/ Task Manager	Richard Munang/Soraya Smaoun
Office/Division	Economy Division
Branch & Unit	Chemicals and Health Branch
Final PDF Report distributed by Evaluation Office (Date)	30-06-22
Total # of Recommendations as per Report	5
Implementation Plan Sent to PM/TM (Date)	00/00/00
Implementation Plan Returned by PM/TM (Date)	00/00/00
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	<p>• The challenge is that modelling alone will not easily influence policy makers, unless modelling results are amplified by drivers of change; a project should provide or work with a strong platform for drivers of change, including civil society, including private sector. This is not only a challenge for the Africa LEDS project (also for AfLP). This relates to conclusion 1 NB: there are numerous examples of opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many public-private partnerships in the energy/agricultural sector • Kenya advocacy groups campaigning against coal fired plants • Influential movements like Insulate Britain, to better isolate homes 	Ensure the inclusion of policy shakers (civil society, private sector) in key roles of project design and implementation (in the PSC, as Implementing Partners, at country level too)	Critical	Project	Programme formulation needs to design this into projects: country partners are responsible for stakeholder analysis and engaging	Immediate for any project aiming at policy change	Partially Accepted	UNEP has revised its delivery model to address gaps in project formulation and delivery. In this new delivery model, project formulation is led through the divisions and implementation also oversights by the divisions.	N/A

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
					<p>drivers for change: consult them on the scope of modelling to increase support for modelling outcomes.</p>			<p>Regional offices while engaged in both formulation and implementation, play a more supportive role. This has resulted in a "single point for accountability" which rests with the division. As regional office, we will play our role of sharing these recommendations in new project formulations going forward that will be led by our colleagues in the divisions. Considering the accountability rests with the division, and we will not be developing projects going forward, we cannot accept accountability. But we will be engaging the direct responsible individuals in divisions to take this recommendation up. Second, in some countries, "policy shakers" especially from civil society are frowned upon by</p>	

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
								government and in projects where the entry is government ministry, such recommendation then becomes a risk factor to be mitigated and this can then be captured at project formulation.	
2	Where policy processes remain sectoral, any modelling outcome will be difficult to implement. Comparing policy processes (and in what ways these are transformed) should be a key subject in regional peer-learning (whereas exchange of particular LEDS practices should take place at a different level) This relates to conclusion 1 and recommendation 2	In future projects, bring in expertise, e.g. from Mozambique, on how policy processes are transformed to mainstream CCAM; situate modelling in the policy cycle (where need for policy change is identified and demand for modelling projects created).	Important	Project	Programme formulation needs to design this into projects	Immediate for any project aiming at policy change	Partially Accepted	Project formulation is now led by divisions and this recommendation can only be shared with the direct responsible persons, but decision to implement it does not reside at the regional office. Second, we are increasingly working to deliver in countries through the UNCT. This entails cross-hybridization of lessons with other UN sister agencies who may already have the experience in mainstreaming adaptation and mitigation, and there may be no need to outsource expertise.	Bring this recommendation to meetings with direct responsible individuals in the divisions towards facilitating uptake in future projects.

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
3	When transformation of policy processes is not on the agenda, there remains a weak link of modelling to respond to a demand - and to the use of modelling outcomes (translating into policy). This relates to conclusion 4	Country leaders could review and transform policy processes to mainstream CCAM (including LEDS) – not just strengthen intersectoral collaboration but also opening space for civil society ('policy shakers'). With such transformation, a need for LEDS modelling can be better articulated, as well as the need for (adapting) indicators that the modelling needs.	Critical	UNEP-wide	Country-level partners who identify and lead the modelling	N/A	Not Accepted	Countries follow their internal processes in transforming policies and these are external to UNEP. UNEP can only recommend but then wait for country processes to take course. Policy shakers, especially civil society not always welcome on countries and may be difficult to graft into projects, considering all UNEP projects have government ministries as entry points,	N/A
4	There are risks to modelling built on single-issue LEDS practices, and to demonstrate macro-level growth-oriented benefits only. Examples provided in this report indicate that positive or negative (un)-intended effects elsewhere in a value chain or lifecycle could be ignored. This relates to conclusion 2	In future modelling projects a path beyond growth-oriented benefits could be considered. For mainstreaming Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation, it is suggested that some reflection take place on whether partner countries' fixation on growth is relevant or helpful, and what are alternatives. This reflection also takes place in the EU currently.	Critical	UNEP-wide	Country-level partners (policy makers and shakers) who identify modelling needs	Country-level partners (policy makers and shakers) who identify modelling needs	Partially Accepted	Project priorities are mostly country-led and it is countries that specify the kind of "benefits" they intend to see. UNEP responds to member states priorities and while alternatives can be recommended, in the long run the decision to take them up is with the countries.	N/A

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
5	<p>The Africa LEDS Project was to effect changes in countries' policy making processes (for more, or mainstreaming of Pro-LEDS policy). The challenge is to mobilise experts that could assist countries to identify the basis for any LEDS policy discussion and modelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. LEDS-relevant challenges or opportunities in society, and to address these, nail down what change of behaviour of particular stakeholders would be desirable ii. How current or intended policy empowers-or-disempowers which stakeholders towards changing their behaviour in the desired direction, and/or policy with negative effects, or ineffective policy. <p>It need not be overly theoretic or lengthy to identify desired change for LEDS; and there are various tools to help with context analysis; in this project, tools that analyse stakeholders along value chains or lifecycles are particularly relevant (consider the concept for circular economy). It is important to ensure this competence on context analysis, down to country level, for modelling projects are eventually to change the minds of policy makers and shakers (civil society). Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reaching UK net zero target cheaper than we thought, says climate adviser https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/nov/12/reaching-uk-net-zero-target-cheaper-than-we-thought-says-climate-adviser It shows policy analysis (independent critique), suggesting policy gaps, referring to specific stakeholders groups (the poor). • The Association of Biogas Contractors in Kenya lobbies for biogas standards • The Kenya Association of Manufacturers lobbying for policy enabling energy producers to connect to the main grid • In many countries, civil society lobbying for land governance rights of local communities and/or indigenous people, and would advocate for certified sustainable charcoal and improved cookstoves). <p>This relates to conclusion 1</p>	<p>Improve UNEP Project Management competence – or ensure that competence is available and mobilised through Implementing Partners. The suggestion is to build capacity on project cycle management and communication but also specifically on carrying out context analyses.</p>	Critical	UNEP-wide	Resource Efficiency programme	Immediate for any project aiming at policy change	Partially Accepted	<p>New delivery model vests the direct responsibility for project management on divisions. This recommendation will be shared with direct responsible persons at the division.</p>	N/A