

Management Response: Implementation Plan for Evaluation Recommendations

General Information

Eval ID	768
Evaluation Manager	Stephen Baguma
Project Evaluation Title	Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP Project "Capacity Building for National and Regional Environmental Information and Knowledge Management"
PIMS #	2020
GEF ID	
UNEP Sub-programme	Science Policy
GEF Focal Area	
Project Manager/ Task Manager	Jochem Zoetelief
Office/Division	Early Warning Division
Branch & Unit	Climate Early Warning and Capacity Building Unit
Final PDF Report distributed by Evaluation Office (Date)	11/03/2025
Total # of Recommendations as per Report	6
Implementation Plan Sent to PM/TM (Date)	19/06/2025
Implementation Plan Returned by PM/TM (Date)	00/00/00
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
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	While transition was covered briefly in the operational completion report, there ought to be a stand-alone exit strategy that is the culmination of conversations, meetings and workshops to institutionalize the products and services coming out of the Project.	For future projects aiming for long-term transformation, it is crucial to develop a clear roadmap and exit strategy well before the project's conclusion to ensure a smooth handover and transition of services. This recommendation emphasizes the need for a structured approach to	Opportunity for improvement	Project	UNEP Early Warning and Assessment Division / Project Management Team	Next 2-3 years to start at the same time the successor project completes its MTR.			

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
		project closure, where continuity of services and sustainability of outcomes are prioritized. By outlining the steps for transitioning responsibilities to local stakeholders or follow-up initiatives, the roadmap can help avoid service disruption and ensure that the benefits of the project are sustained beyond its lifespan.							
2	Findings from evaluations at the global level have highlighted that mainstreaming and transformation projects require longer time horizons and one needs to factor in the difficult task of aligning on the vision of the project within national governments.	Transforming environmental monitoring functions within a country is a complex, non-linear process, often entangled with political agendas and resistance to change. To address these challenges, it is recommended that such projects adopt a longer time horizon from the outset. This approach allows for greater flexibility to manage political dynamics, build trust, and incrementally achieve the desired transformation. A longer timeline would enable deeper capacity building, stronger stakeholder engagement, and more effective policy influence, enhancing the likelihood of achieving meaningful and sustainable outcomes.	Important	Project	UNEP Early Warning and Assessment Division / Project Management Team for future designs	At project design once the discussions on a follow up to the successor project commence.			
3	The available budget was not aligned to address the problem was trying to solve and could only skim the surface of what is needed at the national level. This was corroborated by multiple interviews.	Although the project successfully established foundational elements for modern environmental monitoring systems, it is evident that more resources are needed to consolidate these achievements. For future projects, UNEP and its partners should consider focusing on fewer countries with a larger budget allocation per country. This strategy would better	Opportunity for improvement	Project	UNEP Early Warning and Assessment Division / Project Management Team for future designs	Next 4 years once the discussions on a follow up to the successor project commence.			

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
		address specific capacity needs and allow for a more tailored, impactful approach to supporting national environmental monitoring and reporting systems, ensuring that the necessary infrastructure and capabilities are fully developed and maintained.							
4	The evaluators have seen too many portals, platforms and data repositories spring up as part of a project and this is not sustainable or cost efficient from a data management and knowledge management perspective. This has also been corroborated by several interviews and the fact that global datasets are not useful to reporting on locally or regionally specific environmental issues.	Many projects create knowledge repositories, databases, or technology platforms that can be costly to maintain and may quickly become obsolete after the project ends. Additionally, global datasets often lack the granularity needed for local-level environmental reporting. UNEP should undertake an enterprise-wide review of the utility and sustainability of new data platforms and technologies, with a focus on consolidating existing ones. This would prevent duplication of efforts, reduce costs, and ensure that platforms remain relevant and useful for end-users. In order to reduce costs, organizations – large and small – need to continuously improve the way they capture, share and deliver their intellectual capital across departments, units, sectors and functions, at headquarters and in the field. Such improvement does not happen systematically and everywhere across not only UNEP, but also the United Nations system as a whole. Some organizations still seem unable to extract themselves from costly functional silos and, instead,	Important	Project	UNEP wide	Start conversations within the next 6 months at senior management level on how streamline the number of portals and instil an organization-wide policy therein.			

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
		tolerate expensive duplications and reinventions of the wheel. The proliferation of uncoordinated or difficult to access repositories has often had a negative impact on staff's and decision makers' ability to find relevant content quickly as well as on the overall cost of content. The evaluators consider that data and knowledge management shifts the emphasis from the creation of vast repositories to the valorisation of tacit knowledge that may be lost when staff members leave an organization, either for personal reasons or due to retirement. The awareness and personal attitude of staff with regard to how knowledge is handled is crucial, irrespective of the existence of specifically designed knowledge management policies.							
5	The evaluators found that the review by PRC at Revision No. 1 was excessive and unrealistic for a project that had already been in implementation for three years. It approximated the level of scrutiny of a project undergoing design and diverted scarce resources away from delivery and created unnecessary friction. This was corroborated by at least three interviews. The issue was more linked to a habit of using consultants that did not know anything about the project and needed to earn their keep in the words of several interviewees.	The UNEP Project Review Committee (PRC) should differentiate its level of scrutiny between new project designs and project revisions. Applying the same rigorous review process to both can be inefficient and unnecessarily consume financial and human resources that could be better spent on actual project delivery. Streamlining the review process for revisions would enhance efficiency and allow for more focused and effective project implementation.	Opportunity for improvement	UNEP-wide	Responsibility: Programme Coherence & Assurance Unit, Policy & Programme Division	At UNEP's discretion to initiate next steps.			

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	Project monitoring and reporting covered other interventions / projects and attributed results from other interventions to the evaluand. In some instances, there was a weak link between what was reported and the expected results.	The Climate Early Warning and Capacity Building Unit should reflect on its monitoring and reporting and seek technical advice from the Evaluation Office on ways to better capture effects such that they can be credibly associated with the defined project's efforts	Opportunity for improvement	Project	Climate Early Warning and Capacity Building Unit	6 months			