Management Response: Implementation Plan for Evaluation Recommendations

UN environment programme | Evaluation Office

General Information

Eval ID	757
Evaluation Manager	Janet Wildish
Project Evaluation Title	Mid-Term Evaluation of the UNEP Project Sustainable Cities Impact Programme - Global Platform (GP) GEF 10452
PIMS #	
GEF ID	10452
UNEP Sub-programme	SP1 – Climate Change
GEF Focal Area	Climate Change Mitigation
Project Manager/ Task Manager	Katarina Barunica
Office/Division	Climate Change Division
Branch & Unit	Climate Mitigation Unit
Final PDF Report distributed by Evaluation Office (Date)	13/12/2024
Total # of Recommendations as per Report	
Implementation Plan Sent to PM/TM (Date)	08/01/2025
Implementation Plan Returned by PM/TM (Date)	07/02/2025
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	Make the next cycle of GEF countries aware of the GEF process and GP activities beforehand so that they can get effective benefit from GP and avoid delays in implementation of child projects. GEF countries/cities should be made aware of the benefits they can get from GP activities. This helps in overall success of the GEF cycle by: • Helping the child projects	Initiate child project related negotiations much before the signing of the global platform program. This will help to complete the homework beforehand and hence launch the child projects soon after the global project is initiated. This situation will also allow both GP and child progress to make progress in parallel.	Opportunity for improvement	Project	UNEP / World Bank	6-12 months	Accepted		A workshop on lessons learnt will be co-organized by the GEF, WB and UNEP (2025-06). UNEP will suggest to raise this recommendation during the meeting.

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 be more aligned with GEF project's requirements. • Preventing mismatch of implementation timeline of GP and child projects. If child projects start years later than GP, its knowledge and capacity building products may need to be updated. • Encouraging countries/cities to develop more meaningful interaction with GP activities								
2	Based on the experience of GEF7 project cycle, GP should have a longer timeline than of the child projects. This way, it will allow GP to provide continued assistance to child projects even they close late.	As an alternative to Recommendation 1, increase the timeline of GP for the next GEF cycle. The total project period of GP should be more than child projects if they are starting together.	Opportunity for improvement	Project	UNEP / GEF	12-24 months	Accepted		A workshop on lessons learnt will be co-organized by the GEF, WB and UNEP (2025-06). UNEP will suggest to raise this recommendation during the meeting.
3	Some of the GP modules can be too technical or too general. Non-contextual GP offers do not improve the knowledge level and capacity of the beneficiaries.	Consider more flexibility in offers made by GP (selection and delivery of modules) to make them more suitable and contextual to city level local needs and realities.	Opportunity for improvement	Project	UNEP/Partners	12-18 months	Accepted		No further action needed.
4	There is a limit to number and quality of city level activities offered by GP. Prioritizing more city-based activities and encouraging cities to allocate matching funds from their side. This will help: • To implement a greater number of GP activities in partner cities • To improve contextual relevance of the GP activities • To foster local engagement and improve ownership of the project • To help ensure sustainability and continuity	GP should plan and implement more city-based activities and encourage matching funds from cities to enhance local engagement, secure local ownership and also address resource constraints.	Important	Project	UNEP	12-18 months	Partially Accepted	Since most of the funds are already committed it is difficult to change the delivery approach of the platform at this stage. Moreover, the GEF expects from the Global Platform to play a coordinating role and steer exchanges and lessons learnt between different cities, and it is the Country Project that has the role	No further action than the ones planned in the design.

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 GP offers • To ensure the actual beneficiaries (cities) are well benefitted from GP activities							of organizing more city level activities. Having the expected role of the GP in mind, we consider UrbanShift does already offer many in-depth city level activities such as the Peer Exchanges, the City Labs and the Light Touch Technical Asistance (LTTA) which have specific geographical and operational scope. Most of the LTTA had not happened during the first years of the projects and the beneficiaries wre probably not fully aware of this offer at the moment of the analysis.	
5	There is no concrete exit strategy in place for GP. With the help of this recommendation, GP can have a smooth exit. At the same time, there can be better scaling and dissemination of GP activities. GEF could provide seed money to IA, EA or any other relevant institution (with appropriate capacity) to retain and continue offering GP activities in cities. The terms for providing seed money could include matching funds by the cities or retaining organizations themselves.	Select appropriate IA, EA, private institutions or universities to host the GP activities (modules) and sustain it in the long run. Provide seed money (with matching funds from institutions) and Training of Trainers (ToT) to develop necessary resource persons if necessary.	Important	Project	UNEP / GEF	12-24 months	Partially Accepted		No further 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
6	GP activities have been able to include technical city officials quite well. When it comes to engaging political leaders like the mayors and ministers, who are key decision makers, there is a need for improvement. This will help to improve ownership and drivenness of the project, prevent differences during execution of activities, increase likelihood of impact, enhance prospect of institutionalization, and encourage sustainability of the project activities.	Include more numbers of decision-makers/city-leaders in GP activities in order to intensify the quality and ownership of the intervention.	Important	Project	UNEP	6-12 months	Accepted		No further action than the ones planned in the design.
7	Some GP assessments like ISUDAs which were done much earlier than beginning of child projects become outdated by the time child projects begin. There is an important need to update these.	Use the monitoring system to check for assessments becoming outdated.	Important	Project & Partners	UNEP and GEF partners	6-12 months	Accepted		No further action needed.
8	While GP has been involving cities outside of GEF 6 and GEF 7, as well as partnering with various local, regional, and global organizations (through Partnership Engagement Group), there is a need to expand the scope of involvement in order: • To improve effectiveness of the project by scaling-up the impact. • To add to knowledge base and sustainability of the project by expanding the network of cities and partners • To diversify perspectives, experiences, funding opportunities, and resources	Involve and engage more cities (other than GEF 6, GEF 7 cities) with priority to secondary cities and more global organizations (like GFDRR, IFC, IDB, EBRD, including academic and research institutions etc) in UrbanShift GP activities. Request for more funding if required.	Opportunity for improvement	Project & Partners	UNEP, GEF and GEF partners	6-12 months	Accepted		No further 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
9	At present, GP does not have direct access to the funds for city officials to participate in GP activities. It is controlled by the EA of child projects. Providing GP with the funds (at least partially) would save time in logistical activities, allow more meaningful participation, prevent issues like officials not getting visa/documents ready or not booking flight/accommodations on time. GP is better positioned to coordinate these things. EA of child projects are more concerned about the child projects than prioritizing support to GP activities.	Provide GP with funds for city officials to participate in GP activities in order to ensure participation of people with decision making authority.	Opportunity for improvement	Project	UNEP / GEF	6-12 months	Partially Accepted	This recommendations is accepted but the set up of the GEF grants distributions between Global Project and Country Projects cannot be changed at this stage. This can be considered for future GEF phases.	A workshop on lessons learnt will be co-organized by the GEF, WB and UNEP (2025-06). UNEP will suggest to raise this recommendation during the meeting.
10	Capacity building activities should be implemented more frequently at city levels to build capacity of local stakeholders to implement projects aimed at attaining reduction of GHG emissions, prevention of land degradation, and improved resilience against climate change impacts and so on. Certificate should be provided to encourage participants and improve authenticity of the courses. GP should motivate partner municipalities to implement such events on cost-sharing basis. In the long run, the cities may plan such activities on their own.	Plan GP activities more frequently at city levels with provision of certification against participation.	Opportunity for improvement	Project	UNEP	6-12 months	Partially Accepted	Since most of the funds are already committed it is difficult to change the delivery approach of the platform at this stage and add more City level activities. Moreover, the GEF expects from the Global Platform to play a coordinating role and steer exchanges and lessons learnt between different cities, and it is the Country Project that has the role of organizing more city level activities. Having the expected role of the GP in mind, we consider UrbanShift does already offer	A workshop on lessons learnt will be co-organized by the GEF, WB and UNEP (2025-06). UNEP will suggest to raise this recommendation during the meeting.

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
								many in-depth city level capacity building activities such as the Peer Exchanges, the City Labs. Resources of the GP are limited, but this recommendation will be considered for future phases.	
11	Gender equality and responsiveness to human rights are not well represented by numerical values. While GP collects disaggregated data of participants of each event, the actual effectiveness of GP activities in responding to gender needs is not reflected by this alone. Some other means may also be needed to be devised to increase participation of women in GP activities	Include qualitative indicators to monitor gender equality and responsiveness to human rights. Some examples of qualitative indicators are : a) Personal accounts from participants on the inclusiveness and accessibility of the activities, particularly for marginalized or vulnerable groups b) Testimonials and follow-up stories from participants on how the knowledge and skills gained from the GP activities have empowered them to address human rights issues in their communities or work c) Qualitative feedback from participants on how well the activities respect and incorporate diverse cultural backgrounds and human rights principles d) Feedback from women participants on the availability and quality of mentorship and networking opportunities during GP activities/deliverables.	Opportunity for improvement	Project	UNEP	6-12 months	Accepted		Concrete questions on gender/equity/human rights focused will be added to surveys carried out by the GP team (perhaps aligned with 2025 Annual Report child project questionnaire process) to identify how the country projects have integrated gender and ensured equitable outcomes from their work, and attribution to capacity built from the GP activities.
12	PIR FY 2023 mentions that work on impact estimates for objective level indicators are to be advanced during the next PIR reporting period. However, it does not	Add notes about how the objective level indicators are being tracked in the PIR.	Opportunity for improvement	Project	UNEP	6-12 months	Accepted		Reference to the revised methodology will be included in the next PIR (July 2025).

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
	mention how they are being tracked.								
13	While GP partners have been effective in delivering their activities and building capacity of beneficiaies, there is a lack of knowledge sharing among the GP partners. There is no effective mechanism for idea sharing and knowledge sharing among ICLEI, C40 and WRI, except partially in regional forums.	Strengthen internal knowledge sharing among partners,	Opportunity for improvement	Project	UNEP	6-12 months	Partially Accepted	We partially accept the suggestion of strenghtening internal knowledge sharing as there is always room for improvement. However, we consider UrbanShift has a strong knowledge and lessons sharing amont core partners that has continuously improved during implementation. We share feedback after key events, we build these lessons into learning loops that we use in our risk mitigation strategies, which we report on every 6 months and which UNEP Mitigation Unit and WRI have quarterly review meetings on. We have multiple partner meetings (full team, director , and ad-hoc managers level) where we discuss ideas and opportunities for improvement and the progress is visible during project implementation. As an example of	At least one pause and reflect moment (July 2025).

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
								proper knowledge sharing we can mention that experts from different institutions are invited to present at any UrbanShift event despite of what partner leads the event. Similarly, knowledge documents and tools from partners are disseminated in any UrbanShift event, also disregarding who is the key partner leading the activity. The recent webinar co-orrganized by UNEP and WRI on is a concrete illustration of these synergies and the upcoming Africa Forum will also show how strong the GP team is sharing among partners.	