

Management Response: Implementation Plan for Evaluation Recommendations

General Information

Eval ID	766
Evaluation Manager	Fabio Fisicaro
Project Evaluation Title	Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP/GEF Project 'Strengthening South Africa's Capacity to comply with enhanced transparency reporting requirements under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement' (GEF ID 9673) 2019-2024
PIMS #	
GEF ID	9673
UNEP Sub-programme	SP1 – Climate Change
GEF Focal Area	Climate Change Mitigation
Project Manager/ Task Manager	Julien Lheureux
Office/Division	Climate Change Division
Branch & Unit	Mitigation Branch / GEF Climate Mitigation Unit
Final PDF Report distributed by Evaluation Office (Date)	07/07/2025
Total # of Recommendations as per Report	4
Implementation Plan Sent to PM/TM (Date)	21/07/2025
Implementation Plan Returned by PM/TM (Date)	29/07/2025
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	For the next project design, due diligence and technical capacity assessments should take place at the design phase. A project governance structure should be discussed in more detail and agreed upon - finding a strong balance between sustainability and project management capacity, which should include a full-time technical position within the project management unit. Capacity assessment of governance structure should	In case of a future phase (CBIT 2) or a similar project(s) in South Africa, due diligence and capacity assessments of the Executing Agency should be conducted at project design and then re-evaluated at inception.	Critical	Project	UNEP project team	12 months	Accepted	N/A	In the event that the country expresses interest for a CBIT 2 project, the UNEP Climate Mitigation Unit team will work with the government of South Africa to identify a partner (NGO, parastatal, etc.) that has the capacity to implement such a project, particularly for the procurement /

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
	also identify the role and commitments of the Project Steering Committee. Identification of prospective third-party support organisations should be done jointly by UNEP and DFFE at design and assessed based on the above, including how the implementation modality would work. Preferably the project management unit should be housed at DFFE, but the procurement could be outsourced, administratively managed by the entity, but content and oversight conducted by DFFE; the project management unit should have technical full-time staff and include DFFE staff for oversight and implementation. It is important that DFFE has the ownership of the project, but that administrative management of the unit is supported by a third-party modality.								contracting of consultants, experts, consultancy firms and/or service providers. A due diligence and capacity assessment shall be conducted on the identified partner(s).
2	The Project Steering Committee has an important role in enhancing synergy through programmatic approaches, as well as guiding the project implementation, particularly when there are problems and challenges to be addressed and navigated. The PSC in the case of CBIT had a lot of turnovers, and while institutions were represented, members were more observers than active members, with a few exceptions. Retaining those active members who participated regularly, and identifying specific technical people to become members should already be conducted at design if CBIT-2 or other UNEP implemented projects are to be done with DFFE.	The Project Steering Committee should consist of a manageable number of people who retain ownership and are technically relevant	Critical	Project	EA-level	12 months	Accepted	N/A	This recommendation is addressed to the DFFE. The UNEP GEF Climate Mitigation Unit team will convey it to the DFFE in writing (by email) for future consideration. In the event that the country expresses interest for a CBIT 2 project, the UNEP Climate Change Mitigation Unit will make sure that this recommendation is considered into the Project Document, in the section on Institutional Arrangements.

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
3	Key output deliverables which were managed through procurement by UNDP SA did not include the GEF nor UNEP logos, despite these being products of a UNEP/GEF project. The PCA with DFFE was clear and had a clause regarding logos, but the UN-to-UN agreement did not. The key deliverables that came from the project should have had consistent branding, and if UNDP SA had supported implementation, it could have added its logo to this branding. There should be clear guidance on this integrated into the UN-to-UN agreement template.	UN-to-UN agreement template should be adjusted to include a clause regarding logos to ensure branding of project outputs and their deliverables	Critical	UNEP-wide	UNEP Legal Unit	12 months	Partially Accepted	Since this is a "UNEP-wide" type of recommendation, we believe the Evaluation Office should take the lead in conveying it to UNEP's Legal Unit in CSD, for it to have more impact. We are open to further discuss this with you, if needed.	
4	While different Chief Directorates are receiving funding and managing projects, these are working together towards a common goal. A programmatic approach as a unified entity while implementing different roles, specifically in what are inter-linked climate actions - adaptation, mitigation, reporting - will go a long way in increasing efficiency and effectiveness of the different projects and support-interventions to the Climate Branch at DFFE. Key Chief Directors or their nominated officials should sit regularly on combined project steering committees, meet regularly to discuss synergies in implementation and reporting.	Chief Directorates of the DFFE Climate Branch in South Africa should co-plan and co-implement projects, and take a programmatic approach	Critical	Partners	DFFE	At the discretion of the EA	Accepted	N/A	This recommendation is addressed to the DFFE. The UNEP GEF Climate Mitigation Unit team will convey it to the DFFE in writing (by email) for future consideration. In the event that the country expresses interest for a CBIT 2 project, the UNEP Climate Change Mitigation Unit will make sure that this recommendation is considered into the Project Document, in the section on Institutional Arrangements.