

## Management Response: Implementation Plan for Evaluation Recommendations

### General Information

Eval ID	722
Evaluation Manager	Janet Wildish
Project Evaluation Title	Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP/GEF Project "Enhanced cross-sectoral land management through land use pressure reduction planning" (GEF ID: 5822 – SLM Serbia)
PIMS #	
GEF ID	5822
UNEP Sub-programme	SP3 – Healthy and Productive Ecosystems
GEF Focal Area	
Project Manager/ Task Manager	Ersin Esen; Marieta Sakalian
Office/Division	Ecosystems Division
Branch & Unit	
Final PDF Report distributed by Evaluation Office (Date)	27-01-23
Total # of Recommendations as per Report	6
Implementation Plan Sent to PM/TM (Date)	20-02-23
Implementation Plan Returned by PM/TM (Date)	00/00/00
Implementation Plan finalized ( <i>if different from the date above</i> )	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	To increase public awareness and pressure for remediation, and to continue the use of the website. (a) Hold meeting between NPC and SEPA, as well as some key stakeholders to identify, based on the key knowledge products delivered by the project, a set of 5-10 key messages (short, snappy, to the point). What are the key pieces of information the public needs to know that	Support SEPA with key messages and improve website for public engagement	Important	Partners	PM, NPC and SEPA	As soon as possible.			20.02.23 JW: The Evaluation Office requests evidence that the UNEP project team has effectively shared this recommendation with a relevant representative of the Partner.

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>affects them directly - why should they care about remediation? Each message should be linked to the knowledge products (i.e. the message is a teaser to learn more and attract readership to the product).</p> <p>(b) Refine these messages, and put them up on the website, add links to the messages and connect those to the knowledge products delivered by the project for easy access and downloadability. [These could be used to attract people to the website, here the website now needs to be reformatted slightly to encompass these key messages and pull the information/publications/videos etc around these so that people who go there can find out more information.]</p>								
2	Hold meeting with key project partners to discuss remediation opportunities (NPC to facilitate only)	<p>To sustain and move toward action on remediation.</p> <p>It would be beneficial for the project to host a small informal discussion with key partners, this should include the relevant decision-makers at Ministry of Environmental Protection, the IMELS, UNDP, representatives from the Environmental Accession to the EU project, (SEPA - although not dealing with remediation, could observe), and other bi-lateral agencies interested. Without any concrete commitment, this could be</p>	Important	Project	NPC to convene	This year/early next year (of piggy-backing off the TE report being sent out)			

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
		an open, honest discussion on what could feasibly be done in terms of taking this information for remediation forward. The NPC should, if possible, facilitate, but not lead. Ideally, leadership should come from the Ministry of Environmental Protection but the feasibility of this will depend on the interest from the new leadership.							
3	The local authorities, despite the law being in place, are not registering and updating the cadaster. SEPA should attempt to gain support (financial, external if need be) to run more trainings on the updating of the cadaster among key stakeholders across the country, and provide more technical support follow-up to this process.	SEPA to continue championing the cadaster and to provide support to local government to update	Opportunity for improvement	Partners	SEPA	Their prerogative (as soon as possible, ongoing)			20.02.23 JW: The Evaluation Office requests evidence that the UNEP project team has effectively shared this recommendation with a relevant representative of the Partner.
4	The partnerships were strong and there was a good sharing from different experts and practitioners at various different events, conferences, papers published, etc. The key partners should continue spreading the message and using the platforms the project created for them to share the results and outputs of the project widely.	Continue strong partnership and sharing of project results on various platforms	Important	Partners	All key partners and implementers	Ongoing			20.02.23 JW: The Evaluation Office requests evidence that the UNEP project team has effectively shared this recommendation with a relevant representative of the Partner.
5	The project design, as stated, had an excellent example of stakeholder mapping at design (using a timeline of how partners are connected, what they had already achieved so far, where gaps are). This likely	Take note and learn from stakeholder mapping done through this project (in the design)	Opportunity for improvement	UNEP-wide	UNEP Evaluation Office	This year.			

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>laid a good foundation for the strong partnership framework on which the project operated.</p> <p>The UNEP Evaluation should take this example and table it for support to project design by UNEP in other, relevant and appropriate projects.</p>								
6	<p>In future projects, avoid using GEF funds to pay 100% of the cost of adding staff, whether to Government entities or to NGOs. This is rarely sustainable. Graduated cost sharing over the period of a project is most helpful in promoting sustainability, and negotiations should be done at PPG phase as part of co-financing to make sure that any GEF investment into capacity and staff is retained post-project. Otherwise, funds can be used to pay people who obtain important experience over the project period but who are then "let go" once GEF funds are no longer available, as is what happened in this project.</p>	<p>Introduce graduated cost-sharing for understaffed government or NGO implementing partners</p>	<p>Opportunity for improvement</p>	<p>UNEP-wide</p>	<p>UNEP Evaluation Office</p>	<p>As appropriate.</p>			