Management Response: Implementation Plan for Evaluation Recommendations

UN environment programme | Evaluation Office

General Information

Eval ID	692
Evaluation Manager	Janet Wildish
Project Evaluation Title	Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP/GEF project "Applying Landscape and Sustainable Land Management (L-SLM) for Mitigating Land Degradation and Contributing to Poverty Reduction in Rural Areas" - Georgia
PIMS #	
GEF ID	5825
UNEP Sub-programme	SP3 – Healthy and Productive Ecosystems
GEF Focal Area	Land Degradation
Project Manager/ Task Manager	Ersin Esen; Niklas Hagelberg
Office/Division	Ecosystems Division
Branch & Unit	Ecosystems Integration Branch
Final PDF Report distributed by Evaluation Office (Date)	10/11/2022
Total # of Recommendations as per Report	3
Implementation Plan Sent to PM/TM (Date)	18-11-22
Implementation Plan Returned by PM/TM (Date)	09-02-23
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	This recommendation is addressing the challenge identified in Conclusion 3 and Paras 125 and 234 of the evaluation report.	Promote human rights-responsive planning, budgeting, implementation and reporting by: a) Building the capacity of the project team and technical staff on human rights-based approaches, including on gender and minority issues' mainstreaming and equity. b) Setting up relevant mechanisms and allocating appropriate resources for identifying, documenting,	Critical	Project	UNEP Project Team: for ensuring the incorporation of human rights approaches into the project documents and for overseeing their implementation. Project executing partners may	Starting as soon as possible and applying it to any ongoing or planned project.	Accepted	The key issues as raised within the Evaluation Report were 1) a lack of gender analysis and 2) language constraints faced by ethnic minorities. and the UNEP Project team is asked for ensuring human rights	We follow UNEP's and UN Secretariat's training modules on human rights approaches. The Projects' social and environmental safeguards are thoroughly reviewed with the new SRIF tool. Planned Actions: 1. Inform the GEF Coordination Unit and ask for detailed

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
		and responding to the needs of marginalized groups to ensure the attainment of equal benefits by men and women, and by minority and other groups.			wish to expand their understanding of human rights-based approaches by participating in relevant online or other courses .			approaches. The Project team follows UNEP's policies and uses SRIF for safeguards purposes. The suggested concerns are already captured in the new SRIF. Needed resources are assessed when the SRIF forms are filled. A stronger focus on gender mainstreaming than in this project's cycle has already been implemented for planned projects, so this specific recommendation has been fulfilled.	guidance and specific traning materials on human rights issues. 2. Once provided, all staff will be required to read the guidelines.
2	The recommendation is addressing the challenge identified in Conclusion 4 of the evaluation report.	Improve the continuity of results and the upscale potential of pilot projects by: a) Paying particular attention to the duration of the pilots to make sure there is sufficient time to demonstrate benefits and allow for the uptake of suggested technologies. b) Properly identifying and assessing the risks to the uptake and continuity of suggested technologies and planning appropriate mitigation measures. c) Developing exit strategies	Important	Project	UNEP Project Team: for promoting the development of exit strategies for individual pilot projects for projects in Georgia and elsewhere. Project executing partners may wish to develop and implement exit strategies for pilot	Starting as soon as possible and applying it to any ongoing or planned project.	Accepted		We cannot reflect the recommendation to past projects or those already developed and implemented. However, this recommendation will be considered for the new projects. Exit strategy should be part of the sustainability, and monitoring and evaluation planning. The Evaluation Unit's standard text provided for project

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
		for each pilot project. These strategies may incorporate such elements as: - the identification of government agencies for the provision of follow-up activities - helping with markets access (for buying relevant inputs or selling obtained yields/crop residues) - helping with value chain development either directly or through connecting with appropriate projects/investors - helping with resource mobilization d) Involving the Rural Development Agency as one of the implementing partners in future projects in LD area, as its territorial units, the ICCs, have relevant responsibilities and experience. (See also Para 217)			projects under GEF-6 and GEF-7 and improving risk management.				documents doesn't include any guidance or consideration for exit strategies. Planned Action 1: Communicate with the Coordination Unit for inclusion of principles of exit strategy formulation in UNEP's monitoring and evaluation planning framework. Planned Action 2: Inform Coordination Unit to include checklist on reviewing exit strategies. Planned Action 3: MTR is an important tool for adaptive management and it is a key milestone to initiate exit strategy development. Initiate discussion with the Evaluation Unit how to ensure MTR provides guidance on exist strategy development. Planned Action 4: For pilots the unit will compile best practices of continuity of pilots and demonstrations and share with the task managers.
3	The recommendation is addressing the challenge identified in Conclusion 4 of the evaluation report.	It is noted that the Executing Agency, RECC, implemented this project and provided narrative and financial reports in accordance with the terms and conditions set out in its agreement with UNEP. However, this	Critical	UNEP-wide	UNEP	Starting as soon as possible and applying it to any ongoing or planned project.	Accepted		This is a lessons learned. We have already started discussions to address this. However this recommendation is beyond the control of the GEF BD/LD

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
		evaluation recognizes areas in which UNEP's processes and requirements should be reviewed and, potentially revised. It is recommended for the UNEP to Improve results-based expenditure reporting and financial oversight by: a) Requiring results-based reporting on expenditures (this is expected to be supported by a new project management system, IPMR); b) Requiring sub-contracted parties to present detailed budgets; c) Requiring sub-contracted parties to report on expenditures and transferring back unspent amounts as relevant; d) Requiring sub-contractors to follow GEF requirements on vehicles' purchase with GEF funds; e) Requiring reporting on actual amounts of co-financing, and f) Providing templates for the proof of co-financing in the Appendices of PCAs							Unit. Planned Action 1: Inform the GEF Coordination Unit to take over this recommendation and coordinate for a corporate level solution