

Management Response: Implementation Plan for Evaluation Recommendations

General Information

Eval ID	765
Evaluation Manager	Karen Villafana
Project Evaluation Title	Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP/GEF Project "Promoting Sustainable Cities in Brazil through integrated urban planning and innovative technologies investment" GEF ID 9142
PIMS #	
GEF ID	9142
UNEP Sub-programme	SP1 – Climate Change
GEF Focal Area	Climate Change Mitigation
Project Manager/ Task Manager	Asher Lessels
Office/Division	Climate Change Division
Branch & Unit	Climate Change Mitigation Unit
Final PDF Report distributed by Evaluation Office (Date)	16/10/2024
Total # of Recommendations as per Report	8
Implementation Plan Sent to PM/TM (Date)	28/10/2024
Implementation Plan Returned by PM/TM (Date)	29/10/2024
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	The IMS in Recife was not seen as a priority by the municipality and was not delivered. The Capibaribe Park would benefit from using the IMS developed by the project and this could be used as a planning and monitoring tool. At this level, the definition of a set of strategic indicators for the Capibaribe Park project should be developed and the initial framework designed	The Recife Local Government and ARIES should promote the integration of the IMS developed within the project in the Capibaribe Park management structure	Important	Partners	UNEP project staff should pass the recommendation effectively to ARIES / Recife Municipality	1 year	Accepted	N/A	Send email and organize meeting if necessary with ARIES to explore implementation of this recommendation.

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
	by INCITI can be used or adapted.								
2	The SCIO was completed near the end of the project and lacked a strong connection with Brazilian municipalities. To ensure its continued relevance, the platform must be regularly updated, with solutions ranked according to the municipalities' profiles. Given that CGEE is a think tank, it is essential to establish a dedicated management structure and staff responsible for maintaining the connection and providing technical assistance to the municipalities, the platform's end users.	MCTI and CGEE should develop a sustainability strategy for ensuring that SCIO is financially sustainable and maintained relevant and up-to-date	Important	Partners	UNEP project staff should pass the recommendation effectively to CGEE / MCTI	1 year	Accepted	N/A	Send email and organize meeting if necessary with MCTI and CGEE to explore implementation of this recommendation.
3	The project achieved significant milestones despite challenges such as territorial dispersion, a high number of implementation partners, and political instability. However, a more focused approach could have facilitated more consistent progress toward outcomes. Thus, better coordination and a concentrated focus on either territorial or sectoral levels would be beneficial for future projects.	UNEP and its implementing partners should adopt a more focused approach in the design of future GEF sustainable city projects, targeting specific territorial or sectoral levels rather than overly decentralized and sectoral dispersed interventions.	Opportunity for improvement	UNEP-wide/Partners	UNEP / MCTI	continuous	Accepted	N/A	Noted. GEF unit portfolio manager will share this recommendation with the Task Managers currently developing GEF city projects in Kenya and Sri Lanka.
4	The project implementation in Brazilia was affected by the charge of a 5% tax was charged on the entire budget of CGEE + SEMA, totalling over USD \$500,000 in contributions, which were not accounted for in the initial budget. This led to a budget revision and underscores the importance	UNEP and implementing partners should identify and include all the tax requirements in the budget of future GEF projects in Brazil during the project development phase or make timely requests for possible exemptions	Opportunity for improvement	UNEP-wide/Partners	f	1 year	Accepted	N/A	UNEP-wide recommendation

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
	of addressing this issue in future projects. Moreover, there's a need to assess implementing partners capacity to manage these processes, as CGEE demonstrated fragilities in the project management that affected project implementation.								
5	The project tested various implementation models, ranging from direct implementation by government institutions to partnerships with civil society organizations. It is crucial to balance agility and flexibility at the project level with ownership and political leadership by government institutions. Technical committees, like the one promoted by the project in Brasilia, should be established at the outset of project implementation to align activities with local public priorities and promptly identify any necessary adjustments.	UNEP and implementing partners should include stakeholder consultation and coordination mechanisms at the outset of project implementation	Opportunity for improvement	UNEP-wide/Partners	UNEP / MCTI	1 year	Accepted	N/A	UNEP-wide recommendation
6	One of the major setbacks of the project was the inability to connect the actions under components 1 and 2 with the advocacy work under component 3, particularly by the SCP. There are significant opportunities to link political commitments to urban sustainability with financial support for testing innovative solutions. This could enhance innovation processes in urban development. Although the project achieved relevant results in this area, it failed	UNEP and implementing partners should promote a closer connection between political advocacy activities (such as the ones promoted by the SCP) and with pilot project investment support to selected municipalities in future GEF projects	Opportunity for improvement	UNEP-wide/Partners	UNEP / SCP	1 Year	Accepted	N/A	Noted. GEF unit portfolio manager will share this recommendation with the Task Managers currently developing GEF city projects in Kenya and Sri Lanka.

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
	to promote this connection, even in Recife, which was a SCP signatory.								
7	The project lacked a clear theory of change at the outset, and the logical framework included poorly designed indicators. These deficiencies hindered the use of these instruments as effective planning and monitoring tools to guide project implementation. Additionally, they failed to foster a common understanding and shared vision for the project. In future projects, a well-defined theory of change and high-quality logical frameworks should be developed as essential tools for the project monitoring process.	UNEP and implementing partners should develop clear theory of change processes in GEF projects (including ToC diagrams) contributing to a better understanding of the project by relevant stakeholders	Opportunity for improvement	UNEP-wide/Partners	UNEP / implementing partners	1 year	Accepted	N/A	UNEP-wide recommendation
8	The project did not develop a gender plan although the implementing partners have implemented some gender-related strategies. During the terminal evaluation a consistent gender approach or gender guidelines were not visible. Moreover, there were not clear guidelines for social and environmental safeguards management in place.	UNEP and implementing partners should develop clear gender and social and environmental safeguards strategies and mechanisms	Opportunity for improvement	UNEP-wide/Partners	UNEP / implementing partners	1 year	Accepted	N/A	UNEP-wide recommendation