# Management Response: Implementation Plan for Evaluation Recommendations

UN environment programme | Evaluation Office

## General Information

| | |
|---|---|
| **Eval ID** | 770 |
| **Evaluation Manager** | Fabio Fisicaro |
| **Project Evaluation Title** | Terminal Evaluation of European Union Partnership Instrument (EUPI) grant "The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity: Promoting a sustainable agriculture and food sector" |
| **PIMS #** | 2026 |
| **GEF ID** | |
| **UNEP Sub-programme** | Healthy and Productive Ecosystems |
| **GEF Focal Area** | Economics of Nature Unit |
| **Project Manager/ Task Manager** | Salman Hussain |
| **Office/Division** | Ecosystems Division |
| **Branch & Unit** | Economics of Nature Unit |
| **Final PDF Report distributed by Evaluation Office (Date)** | 18/03/2025 |
| **Total # of Recommendations as per Report** | 12 |
| **Implementation Plan Sent to PM/TM (Date)** | 27/03/2025 |
| **Implementation Plan Returned by PM/TM (Date)** | 04/04/2025 |
| **Implementation Plan finalized *(if different from the date above)*** | 10/04/2025 |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rec-No | Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation | Recommendation | Priority level (Please select from the drop-down list) | Type of Recommendation (Please select from the drop-down list) | Responsibility | Proposed Implementation time-frame | Acceptance (Please select from the drop-down list) | Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted | Management Action(s) to be taken |
| 1 | The EUPI TEEBAgriFood Logical Framework and indicators presented in its project (grant) document, did not clearly map on to the TOC presented in the project document for Valuing the Essentials. Given that EUPI TEEBAgriFood was one of the 11 grants under the VtheE, it makes sense for its Logical Framework to be | UNEP should ensure greater compatibility of TOCs and indicators between EU funded projects/grants, UNEP grants and UNEP 'umbrella' projects | Opportunity for improvement | UNEP-wide | UNEP | 12 months | Not Accepted | This is a UNEP-wide recommendation that will be reviewed internally. | Recommendation is UNEP wide and compatibility is best ensured by collaboration across PPD, European Commission Operations Unit of CSD and the counterparts in EU to ensure that results definitions |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | aligned with and embodied within the VtheE TOC. The EU PIMS indicators also do not fully match either the original EUPI grant indicators or the VtheE indicators.<br>The EUPI Grant document tried to satisfy both UNEP and EU reporting requirements which led to a complicated framework / project design. Grant / project designers and staff implementing grants / projects should have a good understanding of how EU Indicators and UNEP indicators (both at the grant and umbrella programme level) relate to each other, seek compatibility between indicators sets and transparently set out and explain any differences. This would facilitate monitoring of grants and umbrella projects and a clearer understanding of progress against a grant/ project's TOC. | | | | | | | | are fully aligned and feasible within the implementation periods set for projects |
| 2 | In order to plan the level of resources and time needed to embed the TEEBAgriFood Framework findings into policy and ultimately behavioral change it is important to be realistic and informed of a range of factors which are likely to impact the speed of the trajectory towards change. Factors to consider are geographic scale (large geographies such as in India and Thailand are unlikely to achieve a policy impact within a 4 year timeframe); how contentious the policy question is (challenging policy interventions, that may not be palatable to the | Future applications of the TEEBAgriFood Framework should set appropriate ambition levels/scope based on an understanding of operating context and likely timeframe to influence policy. | Important | Project | UNEP TEEB project team | 12 months | Accepted | | |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | key decision-maker will take longer (e.g. Thailand, Brazil - low carbon Agriculture workstream), support of Government to policy change being proposed and the available capacity to apply the Framework (see Figure 3).<br>Assessments should build in sufficient time for disseminating findings of the assessment and development of policy briefs to help ensure mainstreaming. | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | In nearly all cases, the businesses working with the Capitals Coalition did not link to the policy priorities selected for assessment. This is a missed opportunity and largely due to timing, as the business component started around a year ahead of the policy work. The IKEA funded follow-on project in India has been more conscious of this need. There is a need to start with a mapping of the private sector and alignment with policies of interest. Greater engagement of the private sector in policy development is critical to attaining national and global agri-food objectives, including sustainable and equitable global value chains. | Follow-on projects/interventions should ensure integration of policy and business components at the outset to increase impact. | Important | Project | UNEP TEEB project team | 12 months | Accepted | | |
| 4 | On-going efforts to strengthen inter-ministerial engagement, underpinned by cohesive working between the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment, is critical to maximize impact and ensure assessments fully reflect the synergies and | Strengthen interministerial engagement including with Ministries of Finance and Ministries of Planning | Critical | Project | UNEP TEEB project team | 12 months | Accepted | | |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | opportunities across the 4 Capitals. This is acknowledged in the IKI Final report, which states that during implementation it became evident that it was critical to widen political support to include the active involvement of Ministries of Planning and Finance and that this required that the analytical approaches used facilitated engagement with these Ministries (e.g. Cost Benefit Analysis for Treasury) and that messaging was targeted.<br>It is also important to link UNEP and ministries of environment with ministries of health, in support of the One Health Agenda and to ensure important health externalities are accounted for in the assessments.<br>There was limited engagement with MoF and Planning (except for BBPANAS in Indonesia). Engagement with the MoF is particularly important moving forward as efforts are required to secure additional finance to upscale the EUPI TEEBAgriFood approach and implement the recommendations of the assessments.<br>It is hoped that increased interministerial engagement will happen organically as the Framework becomes more respected, and its utility in supporting national and international commitments are demonstrated. This requires more studies and on-going efforts to develop inter-ministerial engagement to | | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | bring on board decision makers that may be reluctant to base policies on science / 4 capitals evidence. | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Engagement of the private sector is critical to the transition of sustainable agri-food systems, however the Natural Capital Protocol remains a highly theoretical approach for many. While the Final Guidelines are based on experiences piloting the Draft Guidelines and feature practical business outcomes, they are still considered complex. The guidelines need to be further simplified and localized and disseminated through case studies.More good applications and practitioners who can influence uptake are needed. Future applications could be more targeted at companies with the largest footprint on sensitive areas and /or linked with trade issues. It would be good to support some flagship companies beyond the stage of a capitals assessment of their current business practices, to include support for scenario analysis/corporate planning and links to the policy agenda.<br>Introducing the approach in Business schools' curriculum would be a means of preparing the next generation of business leaders.<br>Engagement with the private sector should include banks and financial institutions to explore ways to leverage | Further simplify the Natural Capital Protocol guidelines in tandem with far greater awareness and capacity building to increase uptake of the guidelines and ultimately shift business practices. | Important | Project | Capitals Coalition, UNEP TEEB project team | 12 months | Partially Accepted | This recommendation is partially accepted. The Protocol was not developed by UNEP and UNEP has no control over its further refinement. The TE recommendation has been shared with the Capitals Coalition. No further action on the part of UNEP is proposed. | It is important that UNEP acts as a catalyst for change, but going as far as is suggested (" It would be good to support some flagship companies beyond the stage of a capitals assessment of their current business practices, to include support for scenario analysis/corporate planning and links to the policy agenda") may be providing direct funded support (using public funds) for activities that the private sector entities should be funding themselves. |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | funding for sustainable practices. | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | South-South and regional cooperation are very important for sustainability. There is a need to build a peer- to -peer learning community, whereby all past, present and potential users of the TEEBAgriFood assessments share challenges and best practices. It was also suggested that cross-country learning could be increased by field visits. It is noted that the NCAVES project helped establish the African Community of Practice on Natural Capital Accounting to support the uptake of the SEEA EA by signatories to the Gaborone Declaration for Sustainability in Africa (GDSA), from which lessons could potentially be drawn and collaboration extended in Africa on TEEBAgriFood approach, if still operational. The EUPI TEEBAgriFood case studies can play an important role in building up understanding and uptake. Accessible material drawing on lessons learned and best practices across studies is needed to reach a broader global audience, beyond the seven EUPI countries. It is understood that TEEBAgriFood is currently working on an overall policy brief for the EUPI project, which will be a good start in increasing global visibility of the approach. There is also a role for the TCA Accelerator in increasing the visibility of TEEBAgriFood case studies. | Build a sustainable learning community and enhance South-South learning opportunities and regional cooperation, supported by accessible knowledge products | Critical | Project | UNEP TEEB project team | 6 -12 months | Accepted | | |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | Research Institutes:<br>Capacity has been built across the research institutes and Government. However, technical capacity needs to be improved before countries can be expected to mainstream the application of the TEEBAgriFood framework. While some research institutes have gained expertise in the Framework, they may still require support on specific aspects, for example - modeling methodologies, value chain assessment, social and human capital and market readiness assessment.<br>•Technical government staff need training on the potential uses of the approach and how to interpret results to answer relevant policy questions.<br>•Decision makers need to better understand the applicability of the analytical results and be clear on how they link to their commitments and national priorities.<br>•New UNEP staff in Country Offices who are not well versed in the approach could benefit from technical sessions and training. Learning groups could be established in country offices to convey the approach to non-TEEB staff. | Undertake capacity building tailored to the different stakeholders, based on a needs assessment in each current and proposed country of operation | Important | Project | UNEP TEEB project team | 12 months | Accepted | | |
| 8 | Sustainable and diversified funding is needed to carry out further assessments and implement the recommendations.<br>An analysis of the financing landscape is needed at both the country and global level. An analysis of the financing landscape at the country | Develop sustainable finance and exit strategies to both finance further assessments and to support uptake of the policy recommendations | Important | Project | UNEP TEEB project team | 12 months | Accepted | | |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | level could be undertaken in parallel with country assessments, as part of an exit strategy (looking at the sustainability of a project's outcomes) or as a separate exercise. This should include an understanding of potential government and donor funds, but also the use of economic instrument to shift towards sustainable agricultural practices – repurposing harmful subsidies, taxes, biodiversity offsets, impact investments. The role of banking / financial institutions in supporting sustainable farming practices should also be considered. | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | While EUPI TEEBAgriFood engaged to a certain extent with other projects and initiatives, existing partnerships need to be capitalized on (e.g. with the True Value of Food initiative and the visibility of TEEBAgriFood through the SOFA reports) and new partnerships identified going forward. To achieve action at scale more institutions / universities need to be involved, more good examples generated, and further capacity built. The expertise of the UNEP TEEB team is necessary to ensure studies are of the quality required to engage and influence policy makers, but there is a need for a similar level of expertise to be built within regions and countries if the approach is to become a standard for assessing agricultural policy.<br>Strengthened engagement with regional offices to | Strengthened partnerships with UN Regional Offices, and other projects and initiatives to increase uptake of approach | Important | Project | UNEP TEEB project team | 1 year | Accepted | | |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | identify opportunities and potential uptake is seen as critical.<br>An updated mapping on on-going related initiatives and possible partners is recommended to identify opportunities for the upscaling of TEEBAgriFood approach and additional funding. Other organizations working in sustainable agriculture could potentially co-finance the work, for example financing pilot and demonstration studies, which would not typically be financed and / or implemented by UNEP. | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | The need for primary data to refine the findings of the assessments / build credibility and thereby lead to action by policy makers was commonly highlighted. On the ground studies are needed not only to derive more accurate figures but also to build rapport with farmers. Hence the integration of demonstration plots as standard practice should be considered as part of assessments, time and budget allowing.<br>There is also scope to increase inputs on traditional knowledge linked to agricultural systems under assessment (also raised by the MTE). For example, hill districts in Assam have unique traditional systems, which should be considered under the IKEA Foundation project. Working with local / indigenous communities is challenging and requires a strong presence and time commitment to build | Increased focus on the generation of primary data, engagement with farmers and indigenous knowledge | Important | Project | UNEP TEEB project team | 12 months | Partially Accepted | This recommendation is partially accepted and those elements that are accepted have already been implemented in project design for new TEEBAgriFood applications. | |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | relationship and trust and to be successful in explaining new and complex issues. Such consideration should be reflected in budget allocations at the design stage. | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Given the complexity of the TEEBAgriFood Approach and the relative unfamiliarity with assessments taking into consideration the 4 Capitals in an integrated manner for major agriculture sectors and issues, clear and timely communication is important and needs to be integral to the process. Communication experts should be engaged at the design stage and be provided with an adequate budget. The use of experimental digital means of communication should be considered. For example, virtual reality tools, where goggles are worn to see different realities illustrating the policy scenarios. | Strengthened communications and engage communication experts early on in the project cycle | Important | Project | UNEP TEEB project team | 12 months | Accepted | | |
| 12 | The grant did not have a focus on gender or human rights as reflected in its design document and during implementation. However, the TEEBAgriFood approach can facilitate the integration of such considerations in its assessments, as demonstrated in Brazil, Thailand and Indonesia. | Strengthen human rights and gender dimensions in future TEEB AgriFood proposal and assessments | Important | Project | UNEP TEEB project team | 12 months | Accepted | | |