Management Response: Implementation Plan for Evaluation Recommendations



General Information

Eval ID	679
Evaluation Manager	Myles Hallin
Project Evaluation Title	Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP/UNDP/GEF Project Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) Global Coordination Platform (GCP)
PIMS #	
GEF ID	9675
UNEP Sub-programme	SP1 - Climate Change
GEF Focal Area	Climate Change
Project Manager/ Task Manager	Tania Daccarett; Suzanne Lekoyiet; Ruth Coutto
Office/Division	Economy
Branch & Unit	Economy - Energy and Climate Change Branch
Final PDF Report distributed by Evaluation Office (Date)	03/02/2021
Total # of Recommendations as per Report	5
Implementation Plan Sent to PM/TM (Date)	11/03/2021
Implementation Plan Returned by PM/TM (Date)	12/04/2021
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	The TE welcomes the planned joint UNDP-UNEP/UNEP DTU PMU for both CBIT GCP and GSP, which will significantly enhance the synergies between component 1 and component 2, CBIT GCP and GSP, and the two agencies more broadly. However, for UNEP, this will move the implementation of GSP from UNEP Nairobi to UNDP DTU, and currently, there are no clear provisions for utilising	Bring UNEP's in-house technical expertise into the implementation arrangements for CBIT GCP phase 2 – for example, with provisions for part-time technical inputs from UNEP	Important	Project	UNEP in consultation with UNDP and GEF.	December- January 2020.	Partially Accepted	Following the Global Support Program Mid Term Review Recommendations, and GEF recommendations, the second phase plan to merge CBIT and GSP in a more unified project, with one project coordinator (from UNDP), and with most of activities executed by DTU. Therefore, there is	No action needed.

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
	UNEP's technical expertise and GSP experience.							no UNEP technical activities internally executed, except from the Project Director (UNEP staff, non financed by the project), and a regional position in LAC.	
2	Peer learning was arguably the CBIT GCP element that was most appreciated by CBIT countries. At the same time, countries have different needs, and in some regions, there is a strong preference for regional networking. Moreover, for some countries, sharing is more easily done in Spanish, French or Portuguese. GSP has successful experience with regional workshops and networks as well as with peer learning activities that go deeper than workshops and webinars, such as exchange visits and peer reviews.	Further expand and deepen opportunities for peer learning	Opportunity for improvement	Project	UNEP, UNDP, UNEP DTU, PMU.	Throughout the implementation of CBIT phase 2.	Accepted		Most of these suggestions have been taken into consideration in the design of Phase 2 B (CEO Endorsement Request under development in March/April 2021). Some of these activities such as regional workshops, exchange visits and peer reviews were already done under the Global Support Programme scope, and will continue, by merging with CBIT in phase II, these activities will also benefit CBIT. Regarding the location of the workshops, this is dictated by costs criteria though, also considering travel of all participants. Regarding the workshops for countries at similar stage, we are beginning to track progress of individuals and we aim to select some cohorts for specific workshops, regional networks allow for a closer track of this,

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 thus more tailored trainings.
3	The coordination vis-à-vis transparency and MRV is still limited mainly to information sharing rather than coordinated action and division of labour. CBIT GCP could be used as an opportunity for bringing international partners closer together in a proactive manner.	Enhance the involvement of international partners in CBIT GCP implementation as a means to inspire closer cooperation – for example: • Seeking feedback from MRV Group of Friends and UNFCCC Secretariat on the draft results framework and planned outputs of CBIT GCP phase 2 • Seeking feedback from MRV Group of Friends and UNFCCC Secretariat on draft workshop programmes • Joint workshops, webinars, technical resources with other agencies/members of the MRV group of friends and the UNFCCC Secretariat • Experience sharing workshops and webinars for international partners, including staff working at the regional and country levels • Making the self-assessment tool and the individual country self-assessments available to the MRV Group of Friends, to facilitate their planning of future engagements • Facilitate a joint mapping of the technical strengths and geographical focus of the international technical agencies in the MRV Group of Friends, which can serve as a tool for inspiring cooperation and coordination	Opportunity for improvement	Project	UNEP, UNDP, PMU.	Throughout the planning and implementation of CBIT phase 2.	Accepted		These suggestions are taken into consideration in the design of Phase 2 B (CEO Endorsement Request under development in March/April 2021). During Project Preparation Phase UNDP has consulted both UNFCCC and representative of the MRV Group of Friends. During implementation all suggestions will be followed as part of standard practice, except from workshops for international partners, since the beneficiaries are developing countries.
4	CBIT GCP was not designed to implement any provisions on human rights, despite the linkage between climate transparency and the freedom of information	Explore the link the between climate transparency and the freedom of information principle – for example: • Conducting an analysis of	Opportunity for improvement	Project	PMU.	During implementation of CBIT phase 2.	Accepted		The Phase II B CEO Endorsement Request includes the rights- based principles regarding access to information under 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
	principle. Mainstreaming of human rights and applying a human rights-based approach in implementation are of significant and growing interest to several donors and international agencies, including UNEP.	the links, opportunities and potential synergies and added value • As a workshop topic							discussion of Output 2.2. This topic will be considered as a potential subject of some workshops if considered relevant for the countries during implementation.
5	Most indicators were output indicators, and the progress reporting did not fully capture CBIT GCP's added value and contribution to change.	Capture the added value and contribution to national transparency systems - for example: • Developing a theory of change in adherence with UNEP and UNDP definitions of results (outcomes, outputs) • Establishing and monitoring outcomeoriented indicators • Surveys with CBIT countries on the use of CBIT GCP services and contribution to national transparency systems	Important	Project	PMU.	Throughout the planning and implementation of CBIT phase 2.	Accepted		These suggestions have been taken into consideration during Phase II B results framework design. The project will have indicators that reflect the Outcomes, and deliverable that reflect the outputs. Surveys to understand the use of the services will be undertaken during implementation.