

Delivery Model: Formative Evaluation

Assessment of Early Experiences of Implementation

Presented to CPR by Janet Wildish: 12th June 2025

Evaluation Team: Frank Noij, David Simmonds, Michael Spilsbury, Janet Wildish

SCOPE OF THE EVALUAND

Primary Scope: Delivery Model (DM) Policy, Sept. 2022

- Clarifying lines of accountability (*roles and responsibilities*)
- **Regional Offices** = regional and national priorities; strategic and programmatic direction
- **Divisions** = thematic, sectoral and technical coherence and depth
- Delivery as 'One UNEP' at country level

Implementation: DM and Programmatic Approach (PA)

- **Policy:** co-creation; concept approval process; typology/levels of interventions.
- **Presentations/Workshops:** programmatic integration and alignment; Programme Coordinating Projects ('programmatic approach').

Overarching Intention: Strong delivery of MTS/POWs (2022-25)

AIM OF THE FORMATIVE EVALUATION

“This revised Delivery Model will be reviewed by UNEP’s Evaluation Office after a year of implementation.” (Delivery Model Policy, Sept 2022, p13)

Formative Evaluation: launched January 2024

“...to provide information on indications of progress and/or challenges early in the process [of DM/PA] when changes or adaptations can be made to maximise the likelihood of success in achieving the POW results.” (Inception Report, March 2024)

DISCIPLINED INQUIRY

- **Exploratory phase** – document review and inception report
- **Theory-based approach** – set of assumptions developed relevant to evaluation criteria and data gathered to assess their status and implications
- **Participatory approach** – 58 interviews with 81 UNEP staff (52f; 29m) during May 2024
- Interview data **coded** to assumptions and **analysed** from three different perspectives:
 - **evaluation criteria**
 - key features of the DM/PA
 - desired institutional traits

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Assesses progress in optimizing 4 standard evaluation aspects

❖ Strategic Relevance	❖ Effectiveness
❖ Efficiency	❖ Monitoring, Reporting & Evaluation

STRATEGIC RELEVANCE

*... to provide UNEP with a **more strategically oriented programme towards the realization of the MTS and POW results***

Findings 1A; 1B; 1C and 1D

PROGRESS

- Clear vision for transformative change (triple planetary crises) in the MTS 2022-25
- Enhanced engagement with UNSDCF and partnerships offer opportunities to address cross-cutting issues
- Potential to communicate UNEP's 'offer' more clearly at country/regional level
- Concept Approval Group established 'co-creation' as pre-requisite in project design

CHALLENGES

- Staff request guidance on UNEP's 'offer' (normative/operational)
- Concept Approval Group has a stronger 'approval' focus than 'strategic'
- Low awareness/experience of strategic 'exits' to support focus
- UNSDCF/partnership opportunities not yet optimised

EFFECTIVENESS

... to improve UNEP's ability to demonstrate improved programmatic performance and results at the POW level

Findings 2A; 2B; 2C; 2D; 2E; 2F; 2G and 2H

PROGRESS

- Staff open to new thinking; asking constructive questions/engaging
- Strong attempt to 'reframe' subprogramme composition and strengthen integration of programming
- Co-creation concept taken up in pre-existing work relationships and at project level
- Efforts made to establish communities/communication around Programme Coordinating Projects

CHALLENGES

- Complexities of causal and synergistic results planning not yet mastered
- How best to operationalise co-creation processes not yet clear
- Many networks and layers created through the 'programmatic approach' in a relatively small agency
- Quality at project approval stronger than during implementation

EFFICIENCY

... to improve UNEP's ability to achieve greater results with the same level of resources

Findings 3A; 3B; 3C; 3E and 3F

PROGRESS

- Concrete steps taken to align work with new roles and responsibilities
- Evidence of initiatives and commitment to take up changes
- Global Subprogramme Coordinators (GSPC) recognised as technical resource, able to support synergistic work
- Awareness of need for stronger results-focused resource allocation

CHALLENGES

- Efficiency gains not yet evident – transaction costs in co-creation; potential duplications in roles not yet clear
- Changes in operational costs and resources need some reflection and adjustment
- Timely, transparent and results-oriented resource allocation not yet fully-fledged
- Need for sustained change management guidance and leadership

MONITORING, REPORTING & EVALUATION

...to facilitate UNEP's systematic monitoring, preparing to report on and evaluating the results

Findings 4A; 4B; 4C; 4D and 4E

PROGRESS

- Willingness to undertake an independent formative evaluation of the new policy implementation
- Monitoring and reporting systems in IPMR are being maintained
- Knowledge is being generated and shared in digital platforms

CHALLENGES

- Lack of success metrics for change process
- Causal narratives not well articulated or represented
- Outcomes more institutional than directed towards environmental benefits
- Need to ensure indicators are 'SMART'
- Expectations for evaluation below Subprogramme level over-ambitious
- Knowledge management spread across multiple platforms

SUMMARY

- Focus on triple planetary crisis and composition of Subprogrammes in MTS 2022 – 25 is **sound**
- Essence of the Delivery Model is **sound** (regional/country responsiveness; co-creation; accountability and One UNEP delivery)
- Implementation of changes requires sustained guidance, communication opportunities and adaptive management
- Over-extension in the complexity of the programmatic approach
- Maintain a strong focus on monitoring and reporting.
- Next step is to build on early experiences and convert them into more systematic and generalisable approaches
- **UNEP management open to lessons learned, critical reflection and stronger future planning**

RECOMMENDATIONS BY FOCUS AREA

A: Delivery Model Policy and Implementation:

REC 1: Review the DM Policy to add missing roles, incorporate the PA, introduce a set of performance metrics for the DM itself and revise the evaluation approach

REC 2: Review the DM/PA from a partnership perspective

REC 3: Develop and implement a consultative change management process to guide DM/PA implementation beyond the initial workshops and to provide leadership

B: Medium-Term Strategy and Programme of Work:

REC 11: Support the consistent and compelling communication of UNEP's strategic orientation

REC 10: Revise the Medium-Term outcomes and Programme of Work indicators, using a results-based approach

REC 12: Provide subprogramme TOCs (foundational/enabling) and develop causal narratives (all SPs)

REC 13: Review and revise the Programme Coordination Projects (PCPs)

REC 16: Strengthen the social development aspects of the PCPs.

FOUR FOCUS AREAS

C: Project Design, Implementation and Exit :

REC 4: Strengthen the co-creation processes, providing guidelines across the planning and project cycle;

REC 15: Enhance the strategic purpose of the Concept Approval Group;

REC 14: Clearly state the results' link from all funded work to the Project Review Committee approved projects that are visible in the Programme of Work;

REC 5: Develop a set of criteria as part of a mechanism for phasing out work if/when it is not the most strategically relevant work is not, or no longer, a priority;

REC 9: Enhance the quality of project and programme implementation (vs. focus on approval)

D: Fund allocation and knowledge management :

REC 6: Prioritise the transparent allocation, and timely and predictable disbursement of core resources;

REC 7: Ensure allocation of thematic funds is transparent and associated results can be reported to support sustainable replenishment;

REC 8: Develop an institutional knowledge management strategy.

THANK YOU