

Management Response: Implementation Plan for Evaluation Recommendations

General Information

Eval ID	708
Evaluation Manager	Susanne Bech; Michael Spilsbury
Project Evaluation Title	Evaluation of the UNEP Environmental Governance Sub-Programme
PIMS #	N/A
GEF ID	N/A
UNEP Sub-programme	SP4 – Environmental Governance
GEF Focal Area	N/A
Project Manager/ Task Manager	Yassin Ahmed
Office/Division	Law Division
Branch & Unit	N/A
Final PDF Report distributed by Evaluation Office (Date)	06/01/2023
Total # of Recommendations as per Report	5
Implementation Plan Sent to PM/TM (Date)	08/06/2023
Implementation Plan Returned by PM/TM (Date)	26/10/2023
Implementation Plan finalized (if different from the date above)	00/00/00

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	UNEP has a leadership role in environmental governance already but at present the SPEG is more responsive and reactive than proactive, leading to a fragmented portfolio. There is no clear accepted definition of EG within SPEG, or UNEP more broadly. This has led to many legitimate and different understandings and interpretations. Consequently, the SPEG	UNEP's leadership role and approach to environmental governance needs a clearer focus, strategic priorities and more specific outcomes.	Critical	UNEP-wide	Law Division, PPD	2024-25 PoW			UNEP Leadership: UN Environment Programme led by the Senior Management Team works through divisions, regional, liaison and out-posted offices, plus a growing network of collaborating centres of excellence. UNEP also hosts several environmental conventions, secretariats and inter-agency coordinating bodies. There is an opportunity within this leadership structure to incorporate this "UNEP-Wide" recommendation and already the Law Division has initiated a process, MTS Readiness and restructuring of the law division

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>provides aspirational directions rather than a planning and results-based paradigm.</p> <p>Advocacy for good EG practice is not a clearly stated priority of the SPEG; yet this is essential to achieve wider impact. Catalytic action in EG and leverage through other UNEP and UN processes occurs to a limited extent but is not optimized. Further, the resources and processes for working with regional and national partners are stretched and not systematic.</p> <p>There is insufficient attention paid to a strategic and coherent approach to the SPEG portfolio, that rather tends to be responsive to funding opportunities. There is not a clear link between EG activities and the MTS 2022-2025 thematic ToC. Consequently, the portfolio priorities for the SPEG are not clearly articulated. Furthermore, results of projects within the SPEG portfolio do not explicitly contribute to SPEG causal pathways to expected MTS outcomes.</p>								<p>whose aim is to drive the divisions' interactions around the MTS 2022-2025.</p> <p>The Law Division Management developed draft vision and mission statements as well as core values for the Division around environmental rule of law and the triple planetary crisis of climate change, biodiversity loss and pollution additionally in an all staff retreat the division invited each global coordinator who presented their perspectives on the connections and role/contributions of the Law Division to their respective sub-programme. The aim is to have these discussions regularly including with Division Directors and UNEP senior management to continuously clarify the focus for environmental governance.</p> <p>The intent of MTS Readiness is not to re-articulate priorities and outcomes which have already been defined in the MTS 2022-2025 and POW 2022-2023 rather implement a process that will see (1) Law Divisions capacity embedded across MTS implementation (2) enhance communication between divisions and sub-programmes and (3) develop a PoW monitoring plan that will measure indicator progress across the organization and not just the sub programme.</p> <p>Sub Programme Strategy: While we are implementing the MTS 2022-2025 the sub programme is cognizant that substantive implementation must continue between and with every iteration of the MTS. Since the MTS 2010-2013 the sub programme has strived to maintain some continuity between MTS periods while</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
									<p>simultaneously reacting to requirements from UNEP Leadership to implement new organizational directives. Previous MTS' would have a specific strategy but in MTS 2022-2025 the organization is focused on the 3 pillars of climate, nature and pollution action and the sub programme is working to deliver these three pillars through (1) Increased frequency of meetings between global coordinators, (2) analysis of Programme Coordination Projects (PCPs) to determine where the sub programme can act as a supplier, react to demands and or foster synergies.</p> <p>Results Framework: UNEP with the support of the project review committee and sub programme coordinators are already ensuring that projects at the review stage are getting connected to appropriate pillar ToCs and indicators.</p>
2	<p>EG is positioned as a foundational and cross-cutting sub-programme in the new MTS. EG is relevant to all Divisions and all SP. There are governance-related activities being pursued in other SPs that lack proper linkage to the SPEG and, as a result, opportunities for greater coordination and synergy are missed.</p> <p>It is not yet clear how the foundational aspect of the SPEG would be operationalized. Division leadership is understandably focused</p>	<p>Environmental Governance requires a more cross-cutting and mainstreamed approach to developing its PoW to achieve the MTS 2022-2025 vision of SPEG as a foundational sub-programme.</p>	Critical	UNEP-wide	Law Division, PPD	2022			<p>Strategic Review: The Subprogramme has in 2022 undertaken an assessment of results since 2014 with the aim of understanding the connection of our results to the 3 pillars or the MTS 2022-2025. We confirm that 70% of our results are cross cutting and that the distinctive strength of SP4 emanates from this cross-cutting foundation that is also vital for law and governance. The assessment also showed that our results for Climate Change, Biodiversity and Pollution are at 3%, 25% and 3% respectively. Thus, we agree that more needs to be done specifically for Climate Change and Pollution. The recommendation of adding value as an entry point for synergies with other sub programmes including meetings, forward planning</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
	<p>on division activities rather than SP activities. The boundaries and resource allocations for lead division priorities and SP priorities are unclear. The respective added value of the structure could not be articulated either within or beyond the SPEG, leading to fragmented implementation that has not reached its potential.</p> <p>Environmental governance needs to be considered as a synergistic function across divisions rather than as a separate SP that makes synergy difficult to achieve. Consequently, the SPEG is orphaned rather than embedded and foundational as projected for the next MTS.</p> <p>There is little leadership of SPEG across UNEP to work with other divisions and sub-programs to optimize the opportunities for progressing environmental government across UNEP.</p>								<p>sessions, reviews and engagement of staff will be improved noting that global coordinators already have these sessions weekly at Policy and Programme Division (PPD.)</p> <p>POW development: The POW 2022-2023 development was a consultative process between PPD, Divisions, Coordinators, regional offices etc and as possible attempted to mainstream the cross-cutting nature of governance into the plan.</p>
3	UNEP leadership in environmental governance has been led through supporting global technical expertise and identifying	Environmental Governance key functions require amended structure, linked to the ToC and outcomes	Critical	UNEP-wide	PPD with SPs	2023-2025			Strategy: Previous POWs have advocated policy coherence as a higher-level outcome and this is still a key goal of the sub programme at the strategic level and at the project implementation level. The law division

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
	gaps that need attention. The Law Division is well-established and mature with existing links into other SPs. The Law Division, as the lead division for legal aspects of environmental governance, demonstrates clear alignment but laws are often in place but not sufficiently implemented. This is being addressed through the SPEG, but not in a coherent manner. The structure of the SPEG needs to create clearer strategic and causal lines to improve outcomes.	identified in Recommendation 1.							<p>as DRI for the sub programme undertook a restructuring aimed at defining the law and governance niche of the division within UNEP on the premise that other divisions are also engaged in policy, law and governance related work.</p> <p>MEA support: Law Division has a dedicated branch dedicated to MEA support. However there is a need to clarify the structure for MEA support within the matrix of UNEP as MEA related work is replicated and our housed in other divisions as well</p> <p>Regional Offices: The MTS 2022-2023 proposes the UNEP delivery model as a new implementation modality where divisions as primary owners and regional offices to focus on the capacity strengthening for Member States and other political and intelligence gathering activities.</p>
4	Environmental governance covers legal, policy, institutional and coordination for critical environmental governance decision-making processes. The relationship between the Law Division as lead division for the SPEG needs to be more clearly developed, particularly as a foundational programme. Improved coordination across SPs is required to improve efficiency and to understand where legal expertise in the Division is available to support other SPs, or where other SPs should seek external	The SPEG needs to be proactive in its supporting role across UNEP and clarify and seek the specific expertise required to fill roles in support of cooperation, skills enhancement activities and establishing specific coordination mechanisms.	Critical	UNEP-wide	PPD with SPs SPEG with UNEP HR and Communications functions required for detailed implementation.	2022-2023			<p>Enhanced HR Function: Agree that skills review, training, Mobility and capacity development is vital for the value addition it can bring to UNEP.</p> <p>Budget Tracing: The Subprogramme has developed a dashboard that looks at the historical data of the SP, how projects and regions have been performing and how much has been spent. We believe this would help to improve coordination and communication and inform better decision making for the SP and its work. Furthermore, the uptake of IPMR should play a role in improving budgetary, monitoring (including joint indicators) and evaluation process and as such support effective management of SPEG and the achievement of desired EG results</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
	<p>expertise. More active coordination through PPD to optimize synergy for the SPEG, and potentially other SPs is required. Regional SPEG coordinators' reporting lines are complex and would benefit from simplification.</p> <p>The lack of a SPEG ToC, clear indicators and units of measure undermines effective management arrangements. The current budgetary, monitoring and evaluation processes do not support effective management of the SPEG nor the achievement of desired EG results.</p>								Improved communication: A communication strategy is in its final stages of development in addition to strategic partnerships with the communication division by law division project managers.
5	<p>The UN Reform process has presented important opportunities to leverage EG at the national level. UNEP regional offices have been actively engaged with positive results in gaining responses from countries and development partners to EG approaches and MEA priorities. Yet, the resources to support this work are limited and staffing levels are low. The opportunity is potentially declining as national agendas are established and resources aligned.</p>	<p>UNEP should make more of the opportunity of UN Reform to mainstream EG initiatives as well as other UNEP activities at the national level. This requires a more active initiative to engage with key countries in the CCA and UNSDCF to leverage activities in EG and build learning to support future UNCT, MEA and MS initiatives.</p>	Critical	UNEP-wide	Executive Office with the Sub-Programme and Regional Sub-programme Coordinators	2022-2023			Structural Adjustment: Various workstreams of UN reform are being implemented across UNEP in divisions, PPD, SPEG, Science Policy Sub programme and regional offices. Of note is PPDs UNEP's knowledge exchange network on UNCT engagement that covers UN Reform matters with a particular focus on Country-level engagement, while also covering the regional and global aspects that impact UNCT engagement, such as IBCs and global initiatives. It is comprised of the members of UNEP's UN Reform Advisory Group, UNCT Focal Point Network and UNEP colleagues worldwide working with or interested in country-level and regional activities/engagement in line with UN Reform.

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>The SPEG is not currently set up to engage sufficiently with the UN Reform process. UNEP does not allocate sufficient resources for the SPEG and other SPs to sufficiently engage with the UN Reform process. This means that the opportunity for delivery of EG work through UN and MS partners is not reaching its potential.</p> <p>A contact point between the United Nations Development Coordination Office and the SPEG to engage with on-going UNSDCF's would be a strategic point of contact to align schedules.</p> <p>Current SPEG work is active and is generating lessons, but there is no mechanism for harnessing these lessons and mobilizing resources to capitalize on the urgent and important work being carried out in line with the UN Reform process.</p>								<p>Additionally Member states concur with the evaluation assessment on underfunding the foundational sub-programmes, which if increased may help this UNEP wide recommendation.</p> <p>The SPEG tracks indicators related to mainstreaming environment into sustainable development and cooperation frameworks embedding the work of UNEP into the UNCT process is a narrative linked to recommendation 1 above that requires a coordinated organizational approach to achieve, grateful for recommendations on the same.</p>