

Final Programme Evaluation of Joint UNDP – UN Environment Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI) – 2013-2018

Final Report- Annexes

12 April 2019

Camille Bann

Table of Contents

1.1	ANNEX 1: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	2
1.2	ANNEX 2: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED	5
1.3	ANNEX 3: EVALUATION MATRIX	9
1.4	ANNEX 4: GLOBAL PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS MATRIX – ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS	14
1.5	ANNEX 5: SUMMARY OF PROGRESS AGAINST OUTPUTS AT REGIONAL LEVEL	21
1.6	ANNEX 6: KEY LESSONS BY REGION	25
1.7	ANNEX 7: RECOMMENDATIONS AT REGIONAL LEVEL, PEI FINAL REGIONAL PROGRESS REPORTS	30
1.8	ANNEX 8: PEI SCALE UP PHASE EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS AND STATUS	35

1.1 Annex 1: List of Documents reviewed

Annual Progress Report, UNDP-UN Environment PEI, 2013

Annual Progress Report, UNDP-UN Environment PEI, 2014

Annual Progress Report, UNDP-UN Environment PEI, 2015

Annual Progress Report, UNDP-UN Environment PEI, 2016

Annual Progress Report, UNDP-UN Environment PEI, 2017

Bangladesh Draft Final Progress Report

Bangladesh Environmental Statistics Framework (BESF) 2016-2030

Bangladesh Project Document – Capacity Building for the Planning Commission: Poverty Environment and Climate Mainstreaming

Choi, S. Gankhuya, U and Meinjes, R. 2017. PEI Mongolia Internal Review Report 2014-2017.

Dalison, D and Kwambisi, M. 2018. Terminal Evaluation of the Poverty Environment Initiative Phase II (2013-2017) Malawi.

DFID Annual Review 2014

DFID Annual Review 2015

DFID Annual Review 2016

DFID *Draft* Project Completion Review (March 2018)

Final PEI Business Review, 2012

Halcyon, L. 2018. UNDP-UNEP Rwanda Phase 3 Evaluation.

IIED, 2009. Evaluation of the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI). Partnership with Norway 2004-2008. Report to Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Joint Programme Proposal, 2013. Joint UNDP-UNDP Poverty- Environment Initiative

Joint UNDP-UN Environment Poverty-Environment Initiative Project Revision 2. December 2017

Joint UNDP-UN Environment Poverty-Environment Initiative. Template for Project Revisions. Revision 1 (undated)

Kamtchouing, P. 2018 Evaluation finale de la Phase II du project IPE Mali du 27 November 2017 au 8 Decembre 2018

Martinho, M.J. 2017. Terminal Evaluation Report of Sustainable Management of Natural resources for Resilient and Equitable Growth and Development in Mozambique

PEA Joint Project Document, 2018

PEI 2017. Accelerating Sustainable Development in Africa – country lessons from applying integrated approaches.

PEI 5th Donor Steering Group Meeting, Meeting Report (7 October 2013)

PEI 8th Donor Steering Group Meeting Summary Report (28 April 2015)

PEI 9th Donor Steering Group Meeting Summary Report (10-11 May 2017)

PEI Ad-hoc meeting to follow up on Donor Steering Group Meeting Summary (28 January 2015)

PEI Africa Region – Final Joint Project Progress Report 2018

PEI Asia - Pacific Final Joint Project Progress Report 2018

PEI Bangladesh – Internal Review Report (2013-2016) and Theory of Change

PEI Evaluation update spreadsheet on Management Response, September 2018

PEI Financial Report 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016

PEI Indicator sheets, 2015

PEI Indonesia. Internal Review Report (2014-2016) and Theory of Change

PEI Indonesia. Sustainable Development Financing Phase 1. Internal Review report 2014-2017 Indonesia

PEI JMB Minutes (September 2014)

PEI JMB Minutes (February 2015)

PEI JMB Minutes (December 2015)

PEI JMB Minutes (January 2017)

PEI JMB Minutes (September 2018)

PEI M&E 5th and 6th Working Groups – Global Retreat 2015

PEI M&E Working Group Meeting Reports – 11 December 2014, 19 January 2015, 10 March 2015, 23 March 2015, 23 June 2015

PEI Management Response to scale up evaluation

PEI Provisional Financial Report 2017

PEI Tanzania Annual Progress Reports 2015, 2016, 2017

PEI Tanzania mid-term Internal review

PEI Tanzania, 2018. Final Joint Program report

PEI, 2016. Sustaining Impact beyond 2017. PEI Sustainability Strategy

Poverty-Environmental Accounting Framework (PEAF): Application to Inform Public Investments in Environment, Climate Change and Poverty.

Producto 3: Informe final PEI Peru – Gestion Integral de residuos solidos para el desarrollo sostenible e inclusive

Producto 4: Informe Borrador PEI Paraguay ‘Economica Verdee Inclusiva para reducir la brecha entre desarrollo sostentible y reduction de la pobreza.

Project Document Tanzania – Pro-poor growth and Environmental Sustainable Development.

Reyes, H. G. 2018. Producto 2 Informe Finale PEI Guatemala – Valorizacion de los servicio ecosistemicos en los procesos de planificacion del desarrollo en Gutemala.

Seybatau Alpha Djigo. 2017. Mission D’Evaluation Finale du Project IPE, Mauritanie

Syaka Sadio and Michel Kabore. 2018. Evaluation Finale du Project Initiative Pauvrete-Environment, Bukino Faso.

Tavera, C. Alderman, C and Nordin, N. 2016. Independent Evaluation of the Scale-up Phase (2008-2013) of the UNDP-UNEP Poverty – Environment Initiative

Toufique, K. 2016. Evaluation of the Support to Sustainable and Inclusive Planning (SSIP) Project in Bangladesh

UNDP – UN Environment. PEI Final Joint Project Progress Report – Africa

UNDP – UN Environment. PEI Final Joint Project Progress Report – Europe and CIS

UNDP – UN Environment. PEI Final Joint Project Progress Report – Asia and Pacific

UNDP- UNEP Poverty-Environment Facility, 2016. Summary of the internal mid-term review of the PEI Global program 2014-17

UNDP-UN Environment Joint Management Board Minutes, October 2017

United Republic of Tanzania, 2014. Relevance and Effectiveness of Poverty and Environment Indicators from MKUKUTAI and FYDP Monitoring Systems

1.2 Annex 2: List of People Interviewed

Face to Face Meetings

No	Name	Designation
1	Isabelle Kempf	UN Environment, PEI Co-Director
2	Anne Juepner	Director, Global Policy Centre on Resilient Ecosystems and Desertification (GC-RED). UNDP PEI Co-Director
3	Michael Spilsbury	Evaluation Office - UN Environment
4	David Smith	PEI Africa Program Manager
5	Victoria Luque	Former PEF Prog. Management Officer
6	Jacinta Okwaro	PEI Prog. Mgt. Officer
7	Moa Westman	PEI Regional Advisor
8	Oscar Mwangi	PEF Finance Associate
9	Michael Stanley-Jones	PEI Prog Mgt Officer. PEI M&E Evaluation Group
10	Alex Forbes	Former PEI Programme Office
11	Marie Cristina Zucca	Environmental Governance Coordinator, law Division, UN Environment
12	Julien Wright	Dfid
13	Ambrose Mugisha	International Technical Advisor MoFP-Pro-Poor Economic Growth and Environmentally Sustainable Development Project (MoFP-Poverty Eradication Division [PED]) United Nations Development Programme, Tanzania
14*	Margaret Swai	UNDP Tanzania, Finance
15*	Leticia Kwebwa	UNDP Tanzania, Programme Assistance
16	Amon V.Y. Mbelle	Professor of Economics / International Consultant. Department of Economics. University of Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania
17	Servus Amo Sagday	Assistant Director, Poverty Eradication Division. Ministry of Finance and Planning, Tanzania
18	Dr Lorah Madete	Planning Department, Tanzania
19	Johannes R. Jovein	Principal Economist. Ministry of Finance and Planning. External Finance Department. Tanzania
20	Francis Njau	Lecturer, Institute of Rural Development and Planning (IRDP), Tanzania Project leader – Cholo Eco-Village project
<i>Group meeting to discuss PEI district level initiatives (half day)</i>		
21*	Stephen Ochen	District Fisheries Officer, Bunda LGA, Tanzania
22*	Lt Maulidi	SUMA JKT Bulambati Jeshi la Kujenga Taifa (JKT) – National Service Unit. Tanzania
23*	Mr Mukama	Community Radio, Bunda, Tanzania
24*	Mr Salim	District Natural Resources, Sengerema Local Government Authority, Tanzania
25*	Joseph Mukyome	District Bee Keeping Office, Illeje LGA. Tanzania
26*	Fabian Memosa	District Executive Director, Simiyu Region. Tanzania
27*	Justice L. Kijazi	District Executive Director. The United Republic of Tanzania President's Office. Regional Administration and Local Government. Ikungi District Council [<i>interviewed with Servus Amo Sagday and PEI team</i>]
28*	Philbert Benedict	District Beekeeping Officer. Ikungi District Council, Tanzania
29*	Masungu Mdanya	Acting Planning Officer, Ikungi District Council, Tanzania
30*	Haika Massawe	Community Development Officer, Ikungi District Council, Tanzania

No	Name	Designation
31*	Bee keeper group Mazingera Village	Group discussion with 16 people Ikungi District
32	Amon Manyama	Programme Specialist and Head of Programmes and Projects, UNDP Tanzania
33	Clara Makenya	National Coordination Officer and Focal Point for Tanzania. UN Environment
34*	Margareth Nzuki	Head of Knowledge Management and Innovation Department. Economic and Social Research Foundation. Tanzania
35*	John Kajina	Principal Information Technology Expert. Economic and Social Research Foundation. Tanzania
36*	Danford Sango	Head of Governance and Capacity Development Department. Economic and Social Research Foundation. Tanzania
37*	Gratian R Bamwenda	Environmental Management Specialist. Economic and Social Research Foundation. Tanzania
38	Razacj B. Lokina	Associate Professor. Department of Economics. University of Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania
39	Kenneth Mdadila	Centre for Economic Research and Policy. University of Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania
40	Thomas Beloe	Governance, Climate Finance & Development Effective Advisor, UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub
41	Sutida Manaspiti	Programme Associate, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development, UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub
42	Jonathan Gilman	Regional Development Coordinator, Strategic Policy and Planning, UN Environment, Asia and the Pacific Office
43	Prashanthi Subramaniam	Former Communications Consultant, PEI Asia Pacific team
44	Soen Mi Choi	Former PEI Regional Asia-Pacific Lead
45	Fakrul Ahsan	Chief Technical Advisor, EI, UNDP. Bangladesh
46	Mohammed Shahadut Hossain Mazumder	Finance and Admin Manager. Support to Sustainable and Inclusive Planning Project, Bangladesh
47	A.Z.M. Saleh	Knowledge Management and Research Coordinator. Support to Sustainable and Inclusive Planning Project, Bangladesh
48	Shaila Mahmud	Junior Environment Consultant. Engaging with Institutions (EI) IP project. UNDP. Bangladesh
49	Shamsul Alam	Member (Senior Secretary), General Economics Division, Planning Commission. Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh
50*	Md. Mustafizur Rahman	Joint Chief General Economic Division and Project Director, 7 th Five Year Plan project. Planning Commission, Ministry of Planning. Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh
51*	Md. Mahbubur Rab	Deputy Chief. Poverty Analysis and Monitoring Wing. General Economic Division (GED) Planning Commission. Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh
52*	Nepoleon Dewan	Senior Assistant Chief. Poverty Analysis and Monitoring Wing. General Economic Division (GED) Planning Commission. Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh
53*	Shimul Seu	Senior Assistant Chief. Poverty Analysis and Monitoring Wing. General Economic Division (GED) Planning Commission. Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh
54*	Sadia Afroz	Chief. Poverty Analysis and Monitoring Wing. General Economic Division (GED) Planning Commission. Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh
55*	Md. Mahlubul Alam Siddiqie	Senior Assistant Chief. Poverty Analysis and Monitoring Wing. General Economic Division (GED) Planning Commission. Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh
56*	Murtuza Zulkar Nain Norman	Senior Assistant Chief. International Economics Wing. General Economic Division (GED) Planning Commission. Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh

No	Name	Designation
57*	Krishna Gayen	Additional Secretary, Director General. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics. Ministry of Planning Bangladesh
58*	Md. Rafiqul Islam	Deputy Director and National Focal Point Officer, Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Statistics (ECDS) Cell. National Accounting Wing. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics. Ministry of Planning Bangladesh
59*	Mouful Nahar	Instructor, National Academy for Planning and Development (NAPD), Ministry of Planning. Bangladesh
60*	Md. Nuruzzaman	Director, Training. National Academy for Planning and Development (NAPD), Ministry of Planning. Bangladesh
61	M. Anisul Islam	Director. Centre for Natural Resource Studies
62*	Kyoko Yokosuka	Deputy Country Director, UNDP-Bangladesh
63*	A.K.M. Mamunur Rashid	Climate Change Specialist, UNDP-Bangladesh
64*	Sudipto Mukerjee	Country Director, UNDP-Bangladesh

Notes: * indicates that person was interviewed in a group. The group meetings are color coded.

33 individual meetings

9 group meetings

Skype / Telephone meetings

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Designation</u>
1	Alexandra Regner-Burke	PEI Closure Specialist, Vienna
2	Alexandra Wachtmeister	Environmental Advisor, Sida, Stockholm, Sweden
3	Bernard Crabbe	EC. DEVCO.C2 (European Institutions) Belgium
4	Dechen Tsering	Regional Director, Asia and the Pacific, UN Environment
5	George Bouma	Team Leader, IGSD, Istanbul, UNDP and former PEI Co-Director
6	Jana Hozlarova	PEI Finance Specialist, Bratislava
8	Kayla Keenan	Former PEI Programme Officer
9	Lauren Naville Gisnås	Senior Adviser - Section for Sustainable Development and Environment / Department for Climate, Energy and Environment, NORAD
10	Matilde Mordt	Regional Team Leader for UNDP's Sustainable Development and Resilience Cluster, Latin America and the Caribbean
11	Mette Wilkie	UN Environment, FAO, Rome
12	Monika MacDevette	JMB, UN Environment, Nairobi
13	Nara Luvsan	(Former) Senior Programme Officer for Poverty-Environment Initiative Europe and Commonwealth of Independent States. PEI M&E Evaluation Group / PAGE, UN Environment, Almaty
14	Paul Steele	IIED, PEI TAG
15	Peter Hazlewood	Independent consultant
16	Piedad Martin	Regional Coordination for Development Officer for Latin America and the Caribbean, Un Environment
17	Stephen Chache	Africa Philanthropic Foundation and Co-convenor for Tanzania Sustainable Development Platform
18	Steve Bass*	IIED, PEI TAG
19	Tim Scott	Senior Policy Advisor on Environment, UNDP, New York PAGE Management Board
20	Yogesh Bhatt	Evaluation Specialist, UNDP, Nairobi
21	John Maughan (via email)	Green Growth Knowledge Platform (GGKP)

Note: All meetings were on a one to one basis.

1.3 Annex 3: Evaluation Matrix

Criterion	Questions from TOR ¹ <i>[Additional questions in italics]</i>	Comments
Strategic Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Was the joint project relevant, appropriate and strategic to MDG/SDG indicators, goals and challenges? ● <i>How did the project address country priorities?</i> ● Was the joint project relevant, appropriate and strategic to the mandate, strategy, functions, roles, and responsibility of the UN entities involved? ● What role has the joint project played in the provision of "thought leadership" and in coordinating within the UN system and beyond? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward. ● Was the joint project relevant, appropriate and strategic to the national and relevant donor related policy ● <i>Looking forward how well is PEI placed to help countries deliver on SDGs given its programme of work so far and does this support best relate to a sub-set of SDGs or broader based support?</i> 	<p>In line with the final evaluation of the PEI Scale up Phase this evaluation will examine the relevance of PEI from three main angles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The strategic relevance of P-E mainstreaming within the framework of the global sustainable development agenda (ii) Relevance to programme countries; (iii) The programme's relevance to the corporate strategies and delivery mechanisms of the UN partner agencies, and to other poverty-environment mainstreaming practitioners. <p>Links to criteria Strategic Relevance and Appropriateness in TOR</p>
Achievement of Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>To what extent have outputs been achieved at the global, region and country levels?</i> ● <i>To what extent are the outputs collectively contributing to meeting the overall programme objective and expected results.</i> 	<p>Achievement of outputs based on end of project targets using the Progress to Results Matrix</p> <p>Links to criteria Effectiveness and Efficiency and Impact in TOR</p>
Effectiveness: Attainment of project outcomes and results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To what extent has the project contributed to the expected project outcomes both at the country and global level as identified in the PEI results and resource framework? This will include an assessment of actual and potential, positive and negative, intended or unintended impact of the Initiative, achieved directly or indirectly. ● What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall [outputs and] outcomes of the joint project (including contributing factors and constraints)? 	<p>Links to criteria Effectiveness and Efficiency and Impact in TOR</p> <p>This criterion will cover: (i) Achievement of direct outcomes based on the end of project targets using the progress towards results matrix; (ii) Likelihood of impacts</p>

Criterion	Questions from TOR ¹ [Additional questions in italics]	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>In what way is PEI contributing to achieve the expected intermediate states towards impacts? What are enabling factors/conditions that improve the likelihood of impact and what are key risks?</i> ● Did the joint project contribute to measurable results for sustainable natural resource management and poverty reduction through applying an integrated approach? ● Did the joint project sufficiently address cross cutting issues including gender? 	<p>based on the TOC and evidence documented in reports and through interviews; (iii) Achievement of project goal and planned objective</p>
Sustainability & Replication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Will the outputs/outcomes lead to benefits beyond the life of the existing joint project? ● How effective were the exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the joint project including contributing factors and constraints? ● Was capacity (individuals, institution, and system) built through the actions of the joint project and can it be sustained without further joint project interventions? ● Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to promote national ownership and sustainability of the result achieved? ● Were the actions and results owned by the local partners and stakeholders? ● What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability or broader dissemination of joint project outcomes/outputs/results? ● <i>How successful has South-South knowledge transfer been in widening the application of P-E mainstreaming and what lessons can be applied to the next Phase?</i> 	<p>Links to Sustainability in the TOR</p> <p>Considered the following risks to sustainability – financial, socio-economic, institutional and governance, environmental.</p> <p>The Scale up Phase evaluation examined Sustainability is at two levels: (i) the likelihood that poverty- environment mainstreaming outcomes at country level will be sustained beyond the completion of PEI interventions and will eventually contribute to poverty reduction and environmental sustainability; and, (ii) the likelihood that the PEI host institutions will retain or enhance their capacity to respond to the unmet country demand for PEN mainstreaming support in the event that the Poverty-Environment Initiative ceases to exist.</p>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How has the joint project contributed to achieving stronger and more coherent integration in the implementation of the post rio+20 agenda and how can lessons learnt be used for the 2030 Agenda? Please provide concrete examples and make 	<p>Links to criterion Effectiveness and Efficiency in TOR</p>

Criterion	Questions from TOR ¹ [Additional questions in italics]	Comments
	<p>specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the actions to achieve the outputs and outcomes effective and efficient? • <i>What lessons can be drawn on the relative merits of targeted technical assistance versus a country programme / What are the conditions under which the two are appropriate? At what stage can the PEI withdraw without jeopardizing PEI's impact potential?</i> • <i>Has the project led to more effective integration of P-E mainstreaming in the strategic planning and programme of work of UNDP and UN Environment.</i> • Were there any lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities? What might have been done better or differently? • <i>How did the joint project follow up on / apply lessons learned?</i> 	
Factors Affecting Project Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outcomes? 	The key factors to be analyzed are: project design, project implementation and adaptive management, partnerships and stakeholder participation and public awareness; country ownership, financial planning and management, PEF supervision and backstopping, monitoring, reporting and evaluation
Project design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? • To what extent did the design of the joint project help or hinder achieving its own goals? • Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analyzed while designing the joint project? • Were there clear objectives, theory of change and strategy? How were these used in performance management and progress reporting • <i>How were recommendations from previous evaluations considered in the design?</i> • Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance? How were these used in joint project management, did the joint project apply adaptive management? • Was there coherence and complementarity by the joint project to other actors? • Was there coherence, coordination and complementarity by the joint project with 	Links to criteria Relevance and Appropriateness and Project Design in TOR

Criterion	Questions from TOR ¹ [Additional questions in italics]	Comments
	other UN and Donor funded activities?	
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Are the joint project management arrangements / <i>structure</i> appropriate at the team level and project board level? ● Did the joint project appropriately apply project management principles and regulations? ● Was there appropriate visibility and acknowledgement of the joint project and donors? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance visibility going forward. ● How did the joint project deal with issues and risks? ● Were the outputs achieved in a timely manner? ● <i>Did the project face any delays?</i> ● Were the resources utilized in the best way possible? ● <i>How were recommendations from previous evaluations considered in project implementation?</i> ● What has been the joint project's ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape? Please account for factors both within the UN and external. ● What is the level of contribution of the joint project management arrangements to ownership of the set objectives, result and outputs? 	<p>Links to criterion Project Management in TOR</p> <p>This section will look at the overall management arrangement as set out in the programme documents, changes through the project period (adaptive management) and overall effectiveness of the management and implementation of the project.</p>
Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>How has the PEI harnessed existing and new partnerships and how have these arrangements contributed to the upscaling of PEI objectives?</i> ● <i>Is there scope to further develop and leverage partnerships ?</i> 	
Stakeholder participation and awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>How comprehensive is stakeholder engagement?</i> ● <i>To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?</i> ● <i>To what extent has the private sector been engaged in the project and what opportunities are there for developing this engagement and raising additional private sector finance?</i> ● <i>Has communication with stakeholders contributed to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and influenced uptake of project tools and objectives?</i> ● <i>Are key findings and lessons clearly and effectively documented and disseminated to appropriate parties and to what extent has this led to the replication of PEI's work</i> 	

Criterion	Questions from TOR ¹ [Additional questions in italics]	Comments
Country ownership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What evidence is there of country ownership and applications of PEI tools ?</i> 	
Financial planning and management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the resources (time, funding, human resources) justify the costs incurred and were they sufficient? 	Review of financial management arrangements (disbursements, control and reporting), budget revisions
PEF supervision and backstopping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the joint project's governance mechanisms functioning efficiently? • <i>The Project established joint UNDP-UN Environment regional teams. How successful have they been in supporting countries and leveraging funds through linkages with country programs?</i> 	To consider backstopping activities at the global and regional level
Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent did the joint project's M&E mechanism(s) contribute to meeting joint project results? • <i>Were the indicators and targets used appropriate and SMART?</i> • <i>Do the monitoring tools used provide the necessary information, efficient, cost-effective, participatory?</i> • <i>How are broader development and gender aspects being monitored?</i> 	To include M&E design, budgeting and funding for M&E activities, and M&E implementation.

Notes: 1/ Some of the questions have been re-categorized to match the full set of criteria to be assessed; 2/ There is some overlap between criteria.

1.4 Annex 4: Global Progress Towards Results Matrix – Achievement of Outcomes and Outputs

Based on Global Results and Resources Framework (RRF) for PEI 2013-2018

Project Outcomes / Outputs	Indicator ^a	Baseline Level 2012 / 2015 revisions	Target (Sources: Revision 1 & 2, AR, 2017, PD (Year 5))	Level at end of project ^b	Comments / progress based on AR 2017
<p>Outcome 1: P-E approaches and tools for integrated development policies, plans and coordination mechanisms applied. [Output 1 in PD]</p>	<p>Indicator 1: Level of application ^c of poverty-environment approaches and tools for integrated development policies, plans and coordination mechanisms</p>	<p>[Revised 2015] In 2015: 7 countries at Level 1: Armenia, Burundi, Indonesia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Thailand, Uganda; 10 countries at Level 2: Bangladesh, Botswana, Guatemala, Kenya, Lao PDR, Nepal, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Tajikistan; 9 countries at Level 3: Burkina Faso, Dominican Republic, Kyrgyzstan, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uruguay; 2 countries at Level 4: Bhutan, Rwanda (28 countries)</p>	<p>By 2017, 3 countries move up one level from previous year [Revised 2015]</p> <p>By 2016, at least 2 countries move up one level from baseline (2015)</p>		<p>2017: 7 target countries moved up one level during 2017: Bangladesh, Burkina, Kyrgyzstan, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Philippines, Tajikistan</p> <p>2016: Bangladesh and Lao PDR moved from level 2 to level 3, Malawi moved from level 3 to 4 and Rwanda from level 4 to 5</p>
<p>Outcome 2: Cross sectoral budget and expenditure processes, and environmental economic accounting</p>	<p>Indicator 2: Increased public sector financial expenditure for poverty-environment results in target countries</p>	2	By 2017, at least 4 countries report increased expenditure		<p>6 countries report increased expenditure, 3 in 2017: Indonesia, Rwanda, Tanzania</p> <p>AR, 2016 noted that increased expenditure is unlikely to be achieved in time of economic crisis such as shifts in GDP and revenue collection and in the face of general budget and reductions in official development assistance. However, it would still be possible for PEI to influence an increase in the proportion of the budget being spent</p>

Project Outcomes / Outputs	Indicator ^a	Baseline Level 2012 / 2015 revisions	Target (Sources: Revision 1 & 2, AR, 2017, PD (Year 5))	Level at end of project ^b	Comments / progress based on AR 2017
systems institutionalized [Output 2 in PD]					on inclusive and sustainable environment and natural resource management, although this would not contribute to Outcome Indicator 2
Outcome 3: P-E approaches and experiences documented and shared to inform country, regional and global development programming by the UN and member states [Output 3 in PD]	Outcome Indicator 3: Level of integration of pro-poor environmental mainstreaming approach and tools in UN (UNDP, UNEP) and partner strategies and programmes at country, regional and global levels ^d	Level 2 largely attained	By 2017, level 3 largely attained, with evidence of progress towards level 4 (AR, 2017)		PEI teams have engaged with a number of United Nations Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support (MAPS) missions PEI has contributed to development of new United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs) and Country Programme Documents following agreement of the SDGs, with Dominican Republic, Kyrgyzstan and Mauritania added in 2017 In 2017 PEI contributed to road testing of new training material to strengthen sustainability and resilience in United Nations country programming processes
Output 1:	Indicator: 1.1. Number of policies and development plans that integrate P-E objectives and indicators in target countries [PD: Number of national policies & sub-national/area development plans that integrate P-E objectives and indicators in target countries].	4,439 [Revised 2015] [PD: 21 PEI countries have included P-E objectives and indicators in current 5 year economic development plans]	By 2017, 4,484 policies and plans integrate poverty-environment objectives in target countries [Revised 2015] [PD: 28 PEI countries include P-E objectives and indicators in current economic development plans]		4,542 national and subnational plans include poverty- environment objectives in 23 countries: Armenia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao PDR, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda
	Indicator 1.2 Number of key sectoral policies and plans that integrate P-E objectives and indicators in target countries.	81 [Revised 2015] [PD: 15 PEI countries include P-E objectives and	By 2017, 91 sector policies/plans integrate poverty-environment objectives in target countries (AP, 2017)		112 sector policies/plans integrate poverty- environment objectives in 16 countries: Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Dominican Republic, Kenya, Lao PDR, Malawi, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Tanzania, Thailand

Project Outcomes / Outputs	Indicator ^a	Baseline Level 2012 / 2015 revisions	Target (Sources: Revision 1 & 2, AR, 2017, PD (Year 5))	Level at end of project ^b	Comments / progress based on AR 2017
		indicators in at least one sector policy/plan].	[PD: At least 28 PEI countries integrate P-E objectives & indicators in at least one sector policy/plan]		
	Indicator 1.3 Number of countries that integrate P-E indicators in national and sub-national M&E systems.	30 systems Revised 2015 [PD: 13 PEI countries include P-E indicators in national M&E system].	By 2017, 34 systems integrate poverty-environment indicators in target countries [Revised 2015] [PD: At least 25 PEI countries integrate indicators in national M&E systems]		41 monitoring and evaluation systems integrate poverty-environment indicators in 18 countries: Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Kyrgyzstan, Lao PDR, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nepal, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Tajikistan, Tanzania
	Indicator 1.4: Level of functional Government-led cross-sector coordination mechanisms in target countries (Revised 2015) ^e [PD: Number of countries that report functional cross-sector coordination mechanisms]	Revised 2015 19 countries at Level 2 or above [PD: 15 countries report functional cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms].	By 2017, at least 5 countries move up one level (AP, 2017) By 2016 at least 12 Poverty- Environment Initiative countries largely achieve level 3 or above [PD: 28 countries report functional cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms]		2017 - 4 countries moved up one level: Burkina Faso moved from level 3 to 4; Guatemala, Paraguay and Philippines moved from 2 to 3 (AR, 2017). Therefore, at end of 2017 14 countries at Level 3 or above 2016 - 13 countries at Level 3 or above: Level 3: 10 countries (Bangladesh, Burkina, Lao PDR, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Peru, Philippines, Tanzania); Level 4: 2 countries: Kyrgyzstan, Rwanda); Level 5: 1 (Bhutan) – (AR, 2016)
Output indicators	Output Indicator 2.1: Number of national budgeting and expenditure processes that integrate poverty- environment	58 Revised 2015 [PD: 14 PEI countries	By 2017, 80 budgeting and expenditure frameworks in 14 countries (AR, 2017)		76 budgeting and expenditure processes in 15 countries: Armenia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nepal, Philippines, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda

Project Outcomes / Outputs	Indicator ^a	Baseline Level 2012 / 2015 revisions	Target (Sources: Revision 1 & 2, AR, 2017, PD (Year 5))	Level at end of project ^b	Comments / progress based on AR 2017
	objectives in target countries	incorporate P-E objectives in budgeting & expenditure frameworks]	[PD: 28 PEI countries incorporate P-E objectives in budgeting & expenditure frameworks]		
	Output Indicator 2.2: Number of countries introducing “beyond gross domestic product (GDP)’ measurements	1 [Revised, 2015] [PD: 0 countries integrate wealth values in national accounting]	By 2017, at least 3 PEI countries have introduced ‘beyond GDP’ measurements (AR, 2017) [PD: At least 6 countries integrate wealth values in national accounting]		3 countries with ‘beyond GDP’ measurements in 2017: Bhutan, Dominican Republic, Tajikistan Kyrgyzstan in 2016
	Output Indicator 2.3: Number of (sub) national guidelines and tools to manage private sector investment decisions that integrate poverty-environment objectives [PD: rate of application of distributional impact analysis (e.g. Multidimensional Poverty Index) from P-E mainstreaming.]	12 [Set in 2015]	By 2017, at least 17 guidelines and tools to manage private sector investment decisions in 3 countries [Set in 2015]		21 guidelines and tools in 3 countries: Lao PDR, Myanmar, Philippines [In 2015, the PEI M&E Group suggested revision of Output Indicator 2.3 to introduce an ambitious measurement of government tools that promote transparency and accountability in managing private sector investment]
Output indicators	Output Indicator 3.1: Number of UNDAFs and Country Programme Documents (CPDs) that are poverty-environment mainstreamed	32 – Revision 2 20- Revised 2015 [PD: PEI contributed to the formulation	By 2017, PEI contributes to the formulation of 47 UNDAFs and Country Programme Documents (Revision 2)		48 UNDAFs and Country Programme Documents , with 3 new UNDAFs in Dominican Republic, Kyrgyzstan and Mauritania and 1 Country Programme Document in Mauritania in 2017

Project Outcomes / Outputs	Indicator ^a	Baseline Level 2012 / 2015 revisions	Target (Sources: Revision 1 & 2, AR, 2017, PD (Year 5))	Level at end of project ^b	Comments / progress based on AR 2017
		of 16 UNDAFs and 14 CPDs]	Revision 1: 30 PEI contributes to the formulation of 28 UNDAFs and 26 CPDs (PD)		
	Output Indicator 3.2: Number of UN strategic documents such as United Nations Development Group guidelines and post-2015 debate that reflect Poverty-Environment Initiative inputs	3 Revised 2015 [PD: UNDG guidelines for environmental sustainability]	By 2017, PEI inputs are reflected in 40 United Nations submissions on implementation of post-2015 development decisions Revised 2015 [PD: P-E mainstreaming embedded in UN strategy for supporting implementation of the Post-2015 goals and SDGs]		78 strategic documents, exceeding the target of 40 by 195%
	Output Indicator 3.3: Number of Poverty-Environment Initiative knowledge products shared with regional and global networks	170 Revised 2015 [PD: 14 products shared]	Revision 2: 108 By 2017, 265 products are shared and feedback from users is positive Revised 2015 [PD: 40 products shared]		433 knowledge products, exceeding the target by nearly 150%
	Output Indicator 3.4: Number of references to poverty-environment approaches and tools in UN and other	23 – Revision 2 78 – Revision 1	265 – Revision 2 By 2017, 108 references and citations		375 references and citations, exceeding the target by 347%

Project Outcomes / Outputs	Indicator ^a	Baseline Level 2012 / 2015 revisions	Target (Sources: Revision 1 & 2, AR, 2017, PD (Year 5))	Level at end of project ^b	Comments / progress based on AR 2017
	development agency strategies/plans	[No baseline set in PD]	are documented Revision 1 , 2015) [PD: 50% against baseline]		

Notes: a/ From Programme Document;

b/ color coded –

Achieved	On Track	Not on Track
----------	----------	--------------

c/ Outcome indicator 1 Level Description of Result Level:

1 Evidence of P-E objectives and indicators is technically weak and policy-makers have little capacity to make use of it. Little to no evidence of application of PE tools. Little to no intersectoral coordination. Rare participation in Ministry of P/F planning and budgeting frameworks. Scarce integration of SDGs and SD in NDP, sector plans, subnational plans and monitoring systems.

2 Evidence of P-E objectives and indicators is technically acceptable and policy-makers have developed capacities to make use of them. P-E tools referred to, but not applied. Ad-hoc intersectoral coordination. Ad-hoc participation in Ministry of P/F planning and budgeting frameworks. SDGs and SD referred to in NDP, sector plans, subnational plans and monitoring systems

3 Ample evidence of PE objectives and indicators but policy-makers have limited demand. P-E tools partially applied. Intersectoral coordination institutionalized. Regular participation of Ministry of P/F planning and budgeting frameworks. SDGs and SD integrated into NDP, sector plans, subnational plans and monitoring systems

4 Government-led cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms use evidence to integrate P-E objectives in national/subnational/ sectoral plans and policies and related monitoring systems. P-E tools applied. Intersectoral coordination institutionalized and functional. Integral participation in Ministry of P/F planning and budgeting frameworks. SDGs and SD integrated into NDP, sector plans, subnational plans and monitoring systems and linked to budgeting systems

5. Government-led cross-sector coordination mechanisms actively promote the integration of PE specific targets across key ministries and related plans at national and sub-national level, and sector plans resulting in cross-sectorial policy coherence. PE tools applied and implemented. National and subnational institutions systematically integrate and monitor P-E objectives and targets in their respective policies and planning frameworks (PE reflected throughout long & short term planning documents e.g. vision documents, NDPs, national sub-national plans) and their implementation and monitoring frameworks.

d/ Outcome indicator 3 Description of Result Level (ascending where the highest level reflects intended result):

1 Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI) remains a joint UNDP-UNEP programme, with 2013 level of core and extra budgetary staff maintained. P-E mainstreaming tools (economic, social and ecological assessments, cross-sectoral planning and monitoring and natural wealth accounting) are not acknowledged or reflected in UNDP or UNEP short or long term national/subnational/sectoral policies or plans. UNDG Environmental Sustainability Guideline for UNDAFs has not been updated and UNDAF integration limited to PEI pilot countries. Level of UN and regional institutional collaboration on P-E mainstreaming low.

2 PEI remains a joint UNDP-UNEP programme, with 2013 level of core and extra-budgetary staff maintained. P-E mainstreaming approaches and tools piloted in one or more other country/regional level UNDP and UNEP programmes in PEI and non-PEI countries. UNDP and UNEP pilot P-E mainstreaming in UNDAFs in one or more non-

PEI pilot countries. Piloting of P-E mainstreaming with at least two other UN organisations (e.g. UNCDF, FAO) in one or more PEI countries. South-south exchanges with one or more regional institutions on experiences and lessons learned.

3 PEI remains a joint UNDP-UNEP programme with core staff in regional and HQ offices. P-E mainstreaming approaches and tools are adopted within revised UNDG Environmental Sustainability guidelines. P-E tools are adopted within UNDAFs in PEI and non-PEI countries. UNDP and UNEP programmes incorporate P-E mainstreaming tools in at least two thematic programmes. P-E mainstreaming tools adopted by at least two other UN agencies in PEI and non-PEI countries. Regional institutions pilot P-E mainstreaming in collaboration with PEI in PEI countries.

4 P-E mainstreaming integrated into job descriptions of core staff in regional and HQ offices. UNDAFs in PEI and non-PEI countries apply P-E mainstreaming as part of application of UNDG Environmental Sustainability guidelines. P-E mainstreaming tools adopted and applied by at least two other UN agencies. Regional institutions pilot P-E mainstreaming within their respective programmes.

5 P-E mainstreaming approaches and tools are absorbed in UNDP and UNEP strategies, plans, and programmes. P-E mainstreaming tools are applied as part of UNDAF planning, implementation and monitoring operations at country level and with support from regional offices. P-E mainstreaming objectives and tasks are included in job descriptions of UN RCs, country office directors, regional programme staff, and at respective headquarters. Regional institutions (e.g. NGOs, think-tanks, regional development institutions) adopt P-E mainstreaming approaches and tools as part of their programmes.

e/ Output indicator 1.4 **Description of Result Level**

Level Description of Result Level

1 Government led cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms are non-functioning (i.e. committees exist but not fully functioning). Environment/NRM sector committee has limited representation of other key sectors (e.g. water, lands, etc.). Donor supported programmes are not fully integrated in Government-led sector planning. Environment sector policies/plans do not have strong links with national development planning and budget processes.

2 Government led cross-sectoral coordination mechanism are partially functioning with participation of key sectors. Cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms are partially linked to national development planning, monitoring, budgeting and reporting processes.

3 Government led cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms are largely functioning with participation of key sectors. Cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms are largely linked to national development planning, monitoring, budgeting and reporting processes.

4 Government-led cross-sectoral coordination adopt and implement cross-sector approaches for pro-poor environmental sustainability. PE issues integrated into ENR and other key social sectors (health, gender) and/or objectives of national/subnational/sectoral plans and policies and national monitoring systems. Sectors are supported by the central planning agency to integrate PE in their respective planning and monitoring frameworks. Cross agency mechanisms established and operational for PE mainstreaming.

5 Government-led cross-sector coordination (e.g. implementation of sector plans leads to mainstreaming PE across key ministries at national and sub-national level (e.g. ministries of planning, finance, local government, environment, social/gender), sectoral (e.g. agriculture, forestry, energy, land, water, etc.) and subnational planners are able to systematically integrate and monitor PE issues in their respective policies and planning frameworks (PE reflected throughout long & short term planning documents e.g. vision documents, PRSPs, national sub-national plans and their implementation and monitoring frameworks).

1.5 Annex 5: Summary of Progress against outputs at Regional Level

Output	Asia Pacific	Africa	ECIS	LAC
1. P-E approaches and tools for integrated development policies, plans and coordination mechanisms applied.	<p>Achieved</p> <p>PEI in Asia Pacific has been successful in supporting the integration of pro-poor environmental and climate change issues into core development planning processes, including for example five-year development plans, medium term strategies and annual plans. PEI has also been supporting decentralized planning. This is in line with the growing recognition of the central role local governments and local communities can play in implementing actions for poverty reduction and environment sustainability in the region. PEI's has also focused its efforts on sectorial planning, in particular the mining sector.</p> <p>PEI supported governments with gathering and utilising the right information for monitoring progress made in terms of the particular PEI supported development policy. Functional Government-led cross-sector coordination mechanisms were also established to ensure government ownership and sustainability of results.</p>	<p>Over-Achieved</p> <p>3 regional and global policy decisions include P-E linkages following PEI inputs these include UN Resolution A/HRC/RES/38/4 on Human Rights and Climate Change, an AMCEN Decision (2018) and declaration (2017) (no target)</p> <p>Poverty environment objectives/indicators were in the PEI Africa region integrated into:</p> <p>8 national development plans across all 7 countries – original target 6 81 sub-national plans across 5 countries (Burkina, Malawi, Mali, Rwanda and Tanzania) – original target 33 66 sector policies and plans across 5 countries (Malawi, Mozambique, Mauritania, Tanzania and Rwanda) – original target 14 monitoring and evaluation frameworks across six countries (Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Tanzania and Uganda) – original target 4</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>8 national policies and plans integrate P-E objectives and targets: Armenia (1): Long-term development strategic programme of the RA for 2014-2025 Kyrgyzstan (3): National Programme of sustainable development 2014-2017; National Sustainable Development strategy of the KR 2013-2017; Sustainable Development Methodological Framework on strategic planning Tajikistan (4): Living Standard Improvement Strategy (2013-2015); Manual on Elaboration and Implementation of the Social and Economic Development Programs of Districts and Towns in the Republic of Tajikistan; National Development Strategy 2016-2030; Mid-term Development Programme 2016-2020.</p> <p>70 sub-national policies and plans integrate P-E objectives and targets Kyrgyzstan (6): Naryn Strategy of Regional Development; Suusamyrl local area planning; Issyk-Kul and Talas provinces plans; Batken and Jalal-Abad provinces plans Tajikistan (64): 18 DDPs in Sughd province; 8 DDPs in Gorno-Badakhshan province; 24 DDPs in Khatlon province; 13 DDPs in Districts of Republican Subordination; 1 CPD in Dushanbe city plan¹.</p> <p>2 sectorial policies and plans integrate P-E objectives in environment and water sectors</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>2 PEI projects include P-E objectives and indicators in current / upcoming development plans: Guatemala and Paraguay</p> <p>2 PEI projects integrate P-E objectives and indicators in at least one sector/policy/plan - Paraguay and Peru</p> <p>2 PEI projects integrate P-E indicators in national M&E systems: Guatemala and Peru</p> <p>3 PEI projects report on functional cross-sectorial coordination mechanism: Guatemala, Peru and Paraguay</p>

¹ Socio-Economic Development Programme of Dushanbe City 2018-2025

Output	Asia Pacific	Africa	ECIS	LAC
			<p>Tajikistan (2): The Law on Environmental Impact Assessment ("On amendments to the Constitutional Law of the Republic of Tajikistan") and the Law on Water User Associations.</p> <p>At national level, high-level multi-stakeholder coordination platform is now functional in Kyrgyzstan through SDG Coordination Committee established under the Prime-Minister's office.</p> <p>At sub-national level, multi-stakeholder coordination platform is established in Tajikistan through district working groups composed of local authorities, NGOs, community based organisations and representatives from the private sector.</p>	
<p>2. Cross-sectoral budget, expenditure frameworks, coordination mechanisms, and environment-economic accounting systems institutionalized.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Achieved</p> <p>PEI successfully integrated P-E considerations into (sub)national budgeting and expenditure processes, including providing for example sound policy recommendations for implementing climate change mitigation budget tagging at the (sub)national level, and installing a data management tool on revenues generated from natural resource investments. PEI in Asia Pacific has also supported Governments to develop a wide range of guidelines and tools to better manage private sector investment decisions that take into account P-E objectives, such as investment promotion, screening and monitoring tools as well as supporting national budgeting and expenditure processes</p> <p>The only indicator under Output 2 in which the Asia-Pacific region faced obstacles in making significant progress was: getting PEI countries to use natural</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Over-achieved</p> <p>2 countries (Mozambique and Mali) have increased their budgets (but not expenditure) on environment and climate in the reporting period</p> <p>33 national budgeting and expenditure processes include poverty-environment objectives across 5 PEI Africa countries (Mali, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Rwanda) and Kenya following technical assistance. Original target: 25</p> <p>2 countries pilot multi-dimensional poverty measures with ENR sustainability components</p> <p>4 regional investment guides targeting the private sector in Tanzania highlight the need for investments in poverty-environment actions. Original target: 0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Partial Achievement</p> <p>4 national budgeting and expenditure process integrate P-E objectives and targets</p> <p>Armenia (1): State mid-term expenditures framework of the Republic of Armenia for 2014-2016; Kyrgyzstan (2): Public Private Environmental Expenditure Review (PPEER) focusing on climate change and biodiversity; Ministry of Finance Budget Policy and Practices Guidelines; and Tajikistan (1): Public Environmental Expenditure Review (PEER) focusing on the water sector.</p> <p>Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan introduced "beyond GDP" measurements in water and forestry sectors through System of Environment-Economic Accounts to understand interactions between the economy and environment.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Partial Achievement</p> <p>Not one country integrated P-E objectives in budgeting and expenditure processes (the target was 1)</p> <p>2 countries use natural wealth values and other beyond GDP measurements: Guatemala and the Dominican Republic</p>

Output	Asia Pacific	Africa	ECIS	LAC
	wealth values and other 'beyond GDP' measurements.		<p>Kyrgyzstan: System of Environment-Economic Account - Experimental Ecosystem Accounting (SEEA-EEA) was introduced to the National Statistics Committee to assess the forestry sector and its relation with economic and human activities. Practical application of a new form of statistical reporting for the forestry sector will be functional after PEI's closure. State Agency for Environment Protection and Forestry is capacitated to act as a responsible institution to follow-up on this work.</p> <p>Tajikistan: System of Environment-Economic Account – Central Framework (SEEA-CF) was introduced as a new form of accounting structure to assess water and forestry sectors. SEEA-CF is currently functional within the system of statistics and allowing the integration of water and forestry data with monetary data. TAJSTAT is the responsible agency for accounting natural resources and further replication of SEEA-CF in other sectors.</p> <p>Valuation of Ecosystems Services (VES) has been piloted for the Karakol natural park in Kyrgyzstan</p>	
3. P-E approaches and experiences are documented and shared to inform country, regional and global development programming by the UN and Member States.	<p style="text-align: center;">Achieved</p> <p>PEI Asia Pacific has throughout project duration developed and published knowledge products at the regional level, most notably a compendium of mainstreaming tools and approaches for SDGs documenting in detail all PEI supported tools and approaches throughout.</p> <p>PEI Asia Pacific also consistently supported PEI countries with communications activities and products such as technical briefs, video, flyers and online content.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Achieved</p> <p>5 regional publications and a YouTube video series consisting of 24 country videos produced and disseminated.</p> <p>PEI Africa have influenced the work of actors such as UNCTs, the African Development Bank, the World Bank, UN Environment, UNDP, IUCN, WCMC, UN Women, GIZ and the EU</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Achieved</p> <p>5 UNDAFs and 3 CPDs integrate P-E objectives. Armenia: 1 UNDAF (2016-2020); Kyrgyzstan: 2 UNDAFs (2012-2017 & 2018-2022); 1 CPD (2012-2017); Tajikistan: 2 UNDAFs (2010-2015 & 2016-2020); 2 CPDs (2010-2015 & 2016-2020).</p> <p>The Regional Programme 2014-2017 for ECIS integrates P-E mainstreaming, human rights based approach and gender through poverty and environment nexus.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Achieved</p> <p>UNDAF or CPD P-E mainstreamed: Colombia, Dominican Republic and Panama</p> <p>UN strategic documents produced:</p> <p>4 knowledge products shared with regional and global networks:</p> <p>increased number of references to P-E approaches</p>

Output	Asia Pacific	Africa	ECIS	LAC
	<p>PEI in the region also realised the importance of capacity development and specifically south-south knowledge exchanges and held numerous such events for PEI member countries.</p>		<p>67 PEI knowledge products (Armenia (1); Kyrgyzstan (40); Tajikistan (21); and the Regional component (4)) in total shared with regional and global networks. Links are provided in the PEI ECIS datasheet annexed.</p> <p>15 south-south exchanges involving PEI and also non-PEI countries and Triangular cooperation:</p> <p>Various collaboration with partner agencies, events, trainings, conferences, study tours in Kyrgyzstan (6), Tajikistan (7), and the Regional component (2).</p>	

1.6 Annex 6: Key lessons by region

Asia Pacific	Africa	ECIS	LAC
<p>It is useful to develop a coordinated central framework for mainstreaming that can be applied to national, sectoral and local level plans. A central framework helps define the scope of integration on poverty-environment-climate change and other cross-cutting issues such as gender equality and disaster risk reduction. In Bhutan, Nepal, Mongolia such a framework helped create a conducive policy environment, and government institutions demonstrate better understanding and compliance with mainstreaming goals. It is a challenge to applying this for sectoral budgets and to link integrated plans and budgets. Capacity to undertake the required assessments to establish a central framework and political will to enforce this as a national policy is essential in ensuring its success.</p> <p>It is essential to invest in local governments and local actors to ensure that policies mainstream at the central level bear cascading benefits at the provincial and local level. This is critical, given the evolving decentralization taking place in South and Southeast Asia. To incentivise local governments mainstreaming objectives should be tied to M&E systems or performance assessment systems at the local government level. Annual Performance Agreements, Minimum Conditions Performance Measures Systems and links to performance-based grant allocation systems need to be strengthened to ensure that integrated</p>	<p>Economic evidence of the development benefits remains the most powerful tool in convincing decision-makers to address P-E challenges, when strategically disseminated. The more detailed the evidence required, the more sophisticated the analysis required.</p> <p>Horizontal and Vertical Coherence: The inclusion of P-E objectives in national development plans does not automatically lead to their integration in sector and sub-national plans. If the national poverty-environment objective is not transformed into concrete actions through sector and district plans, change is not realised. Realistically, substantive engagement in many sectors, districts or provinces is beyond PEI staff and financial resources. Engaging in a small number of pilot districts and sectors and seeking to integrate P-E objectives more broadly through the inclusion of P-E elements in central Government guidelines to all districts, provinces and sectors has proved to be the most realistic option.</p> <p>Securing increased expenditure / implementation of poverty-environment actions. If a budget process and corresponding allocations are not influenced, changes in expenditure are very unlikely to occur. However, the integration of P-E objectives in budget processes does not necessarily lead to increases in budget allocations, as budget allocations do not always result in increased expenditure</p>	<p>Guaranteed budgetary or off-budget financing is needed to ensure the implementation of strategic documents. Expenditures are not fully aligned with environmental priorities for different sectors contained in strategic documents committed at national levels.</p> <p>PEI's role in influencing sectorial level strategies was weak and not sufficient. In order to comply with the national level commitments, sectorial strategies should include obligations and sectors should be obliged to include the measures indicated in their programme budgets approved in strategies.</p> <p>Gender. This is a lack of political will and recognition of gender - environment links among policy and decision-makers at all levels. Greater political effort is needed to increase the number of women in senior environmental management, political and decision-making roles in public and private institutions; women are currently have a low level of representation.</p> <p>Mainstreaming is a long-term process. P-E-G integration and application cannot happen quickly, it is a multi-layered and multi-party process requiring a good amount of time from all levels.</p> <p>Data challenges. The lack of reliable local statistics and disaggregated data at the local level makes it difficult to monitor progress and prioritize resources.</p>	<p>Dominican Republic Social protection policies reduce the risk of short term poverty resulting from climate shocks having a long term impact.</p> <p>Without mechanisms focussed on post-disaster investment, there is a risk of accentuating and accentuating inequality. Post-disaster processes must seek both recovery and equity.</p> <p>Inter-institutional strategic alliances are key for the development of a vulnerability index to improve the targeting of public policies.</p> <p>Peru To ensure progress in the empowerment of women within the sector, harmonization and coherence of language focused on inclusion in both national and sub-national policies is needed.</p> <p>To achieve the recognition of recyclers as local development stakeholders at the national level, social indicators need to be incorporated into management, planning and monitoring systems and tools.</p> <p>Public recognition and environmental certifications are good practices in ensuring private sector involvement in municipal recycling programs.</p> <p>Paraguay A technical cooperation framework agreement with defined joint knowledge</p>

Asia Pacific	Africa	ECIS	LAC
<p>plans translate into budgets and activities.</p> <p>Policy coherence is essential to create a conducive context for ensuring that PE mainstreaming is effective. Contradictions between sectoral laws and acts and regulations at the local level pose significant barriers. Lessons from Myanmar, Mongolia, Lao PDR, and Bangladesh demonstrate that analysis of synergies and conflicts between environmental laws and other sectoral laws such as investment laws, mining laws, and infrastructure laws are crucial in raising awareness and shifting policy directions to prioritize poverty-environment linkages. Some tools used by PEI are institutional assessments and review of regulations.</p> <p>Investing in Data: Some of PEI's big wins have been centered on building capacity to gather, analyse and utilize data for economic and environmental decision making. Two stand-out examples are Lao PDR's national concession database and Philippines' Environmental and Natural Resources Data Management Tool.</p> <p>Capacity development at all levels for multi-sectoral bodies: With over 33 cross-sectoral coordination groups established at different levels across the region, PEI's value added in connecting institutions and promoting collaboration and cooperation is evident. To remain effective these multi-sectoral bodies need a continued focus on is mandate and capacity. Mandate can be secured by</p>	<p>and implementation of poverty-environment actions. Many of the factors that influence the final spending decisions are political and lies outside the control of a project like PEI. It is crucial that ministries of finance and environment work together to promote increased budgeting for environmental sustainability within existing government frameworks and systems, rather than creating parallel processes. For example, through strengthening the inclusion of sustainability objectives in annual budget call circulars/budget guidelines and in sector budget checklists. The development of simple and practical tools, e.g. budget checklists and budget codes, along with relevant and timely technical support over a sustained period is key to integrating pro-poor environmental sustainability into budgeting frameworks.</p> <p>More needs to be done to ensure that environment and climate related interventions are prioritized during budget shortfalls and that sufficient resources are directed towards implementation. Periodic public reviews of environment and climate change expenditure are potentially powerful tools – improving the evidence and levels of awareness on what public funds are used for and how effective and efficient (and sometimes how equitable) the results are. However, periodic reviews are time consuming and costly and generally not institutionalised, therefore a high priority should be placed on reforming budget tracking through the introduction of environment and climate</p>	<p>Support of senior Ministries is critical. It is critical to identify an institution at the level of a ministry to lead with environmental coordination and policy development to prevent gaps in implementation. The State Agency for Environment Protection and Forestry in Kyrgyzstan does not have the status of ministry, affecting its ability to influence government decisions relevant to environment, biodiversity and climate change adaptation.</p> <p>Additional support is needed at the sub-national level: In the area of District Development Plan (DDP) related work, inconsistency between indicators and monitoring systems at national and local levels leads to insufficient links between district-level planning and budgeting. To replicate the results of the DDP work in other regions, training is required for relevant M&E specialists at district and regional levels, but there are infrastructure challenges, including limited Internet access and low-grade office equipment as well as adequate human and financial resources.</p> <p>For the successful implementation of the Law, it is necessary to establish an appropriate normative and legal basis through by-laws. Normative and legal documents, such as management orders/resolutions, board resolutions, methodological arrangements and instructions, implementation rules have to be elaborated and applied to enable regulative mechanisms to function.</p> <p>The synergies of the PEI with on-going and planned activities across different</p>	<p>management processes, coordination spaces and concrete actions to be carried out is needed for achieving efficient inter-institutional coordination.</p> <p>Continuous training on P-E approaches addressed at ministerial technical staff has resulted in the development of improved procedures and tools, such as the new Quality of Life Index, in which environmental issues have become more relevant</p> <p>Guatemala Training of municipal stakeholders in P-E approaches, during the elaboration of “municipal development and land use plans” ensures the incorporation of non-traditional elements, such as ethnicity and gender, threats and vulnerabilities to risk management, climate change, economic land development and the valuation of ecosystem services. These processes have strengthened local capacity and raised awareness of the benefits of sustainably managing and conserving natural resources.</p>

Asia Pacific	Africa	ECIS	LAC
<p>political ownership at the highest levels, such as Bhutan’s Mainstreaming Reference Group advocated by the Prime Minister’s Office and the Joint monitoring task force in Lao PDR led by Ministries of Planning and Investment and, Natural Resources and Environment. However, capacity constraints still limit implementation of integrated plans and budgets. The voluntary nature of positions on such cross-sectoral coordinating bodies can be perceived as additional work and burden on time and resources. Therefore, it is recommended that there be some institutional incentive for managing cross sectoral coordination groups, either by way of learning opportunities or within the government.</p> <p>Engaging tertiary education institutions and international institutions of expertise to build capacity through south-south learning exchanges can also be beneficial to meet capacity demands. Promoting a training of trainers approach or a “master trainers” approach can be useful in helping organizations build capacity among themselves. This can also act as a risk mitigation plan in the case of high staff turnover that has been observed in the last two years in PEI Asia Pacific.</p>	<p>change budget codes. Climate and environment budget codes can help improve tracking and justify the need for higher investments. However, greater use of climate change budget codes requires substantial capacity-building of the staff responsible for budget preparation as well as sector environment units/focal points so that they can identify and correctly assign environmental and climate budget codes.</p> <p>Measuring impact of PEI’s work on poverty reduction and environmental outcomes. There are currently no clear methodologies or attempts for establishing the link between increased public environment and climate expenditure and reduced poverty, enhanced climate resilience and improved environmental outcomes. More thinking needs to go to how to analyse the links between increased public environment and climate expenditure and reduced poverty, enhanced climate resilience and improved environmental outcomes. The work that PEI Africa is doing with regards to including environmental aspects into multi-dimensional poverty indices may be one step in the right direction. More time and money needs to be invested in understanding the details of how PEI has catalyzed actions that have an impact on poverty and environment outcomes on the ground to verify and or modify the project theory of change.</p> <p>Fully mainstreaming poverty aspects. While the PEI Africa programme has</p>	<p>sectors at the local, national and regional levels should be highlighted.</p> <p>Continued capacity building and communication outreach work needs to be an integral part of the PEI implementation to address the low awareness of key stakeholders on sustainable development and to strengthen the capacity of the government on poverty reduction and environment protection. Targeted communication and outreach work is necessary to build knowledge P-E issues related to the respective ministries and agencies.</p> <p>More “PEI Champions” are needed at national policy level and regional level. In Kyrgyzstan, PEI has benefitted from the support of Minister of Economy but there is a need to expand such support.</p>	

Asia Pacific	Africa	ECIS	LAC
	<p>been very successful on the 'E' side of P-E mainstream and has demonstrated how improved ENR sustainability can reduce poverty in both income and multi-dimensional terms, more efforts are needed to strengthen the focus on the 'P' side of P-E mainstreaming, not least in the context of support for the implementation of the SDGs. Increased efforts are needed to support the application of ENR linked poverty assessment and poverty reduction targeting in the design of plans, policy, strategies, programmes and projects. A pre-condition for this is support for the systematic application of ENR-poverty related data collection.</p> <p>Engagement with Private Sector. The private sector did not receive sufficient focus by PEI Africa. To influence the private sector in the African context requires an approach that recognizes the political-economy and governance realities. A strategy on how to influence the private sector needs to be part of the implementation strategy from the beginning. From a P-E perspective, influencing private on-farm investment to implement poverty-environment actions should be the priority, with a focus on fisheries and forestry also to be considered. To influence private sector investments, PEI should focus on ENR relevant higher-level policies, regulations and other incentive mechanisms such as environmental fiscal reform to set in place frameworks that encourage the private sector to invest in activities consistent with the implementation of P-E actions.</p>		

Asia Pacific	Africa	ECIS	LAC
	<p>Opportunities to influence investments in specific sectors created by government initiatives to improve investment standards should be seized with a view to include P-E criteria. PEI could also focus on supporting governments to distribute ENR revenues in a manner that helps reduce poverty and improve environmental sustainability.</p> <p>National elections and changes in government can have a considerable impact on the implementation speed of a UN project in the year of and following the elections due to consequent government restructuring. However, more importantly changing political priority and reformed institutions can also have a negative impact on previously achieved poverty-environment mainstreaming achievements. In 2014-2018 PEI Africa experienced such challenges particularly in Mozambique, Burkina Faso, Mauritania and Mali.</p>		

Source: PEI Final Progress Reports for Asia-Pacific, Africa, ECIS and LAC

1.7 Annex 7: Recommendations at regional level, PEI Final Regional Progress Reports

Asia Pacific	Africa	ECIS	LAC
<p>PEI Approach</p> <p>PEI is often too focused on mainstreaming at national and sub-national levels. Therefore, increase emphasis on mainstreaming in sectors (not just the mining sector), and identification of opportunities and approaches to help materialize P-E mainstreaming benefits in sectors.</p> <p>Further clarify the difference between “mainstreaming environmental sustainability” vs “P-E mainstreaming” as countries often used the term interchangeably for the same thing.</p> <p>Do not neglect the environment sector and help improve coordination with other sectors. As an example, the 2017 SMPD study in the Philippines only looked at social reforms and what contributions the extractive sectors made to the local communities e.g. buses donated, whilst losing sight of the equally important rehabilitation of the environment.</p> <p>Quality of outputs: assess extent to which P-E mainstreaming has been achieved in national/sub-national planning policies, instruments. The RRF tries to capture this through Outcome/Output indicator 1, however this is merely a numerical number or level change, and does not provide a clear picture on the extent of the achievement e.g. what were the obstacles that needed to be overcome before proceeding with a</p>	<p>PEI Approach</p> <p>When designing poverty-environment mainstreaming projects consider the broader institutional context, including horizontal and vertical policy coherence gaps and budget and expenditure framework gaps, to better target interventions with the possibility of generating change.</p> <p>Continue to promote the application of practical tools for poverty-environment mainstreaming within existing budget, expenditure and planning frameworks and encourage strengthened collaboration between ministries of environment and finance. Given the critical importance of economic analysis to persuade relevant decision-makers to include and implement P-E objectives, provide increased capacity building support at country level on P-E relevant economic tools.</p> <p>Provide technical support for the introduction and application of environment and climate budget codes to help improve tracking and justify the need for higher investments.</p> <p>Explore methodologies and options to analyze the links between increased public environment and climate expenditure and reduced poverty, enhanced climate resilience and improved environmental outcomes. In</p>	<p>Environmental agencies should develop and include relevant environmental sustainability measures, indicators and results in their programme budgets. Data related to all three dimensions of sustainable development needs to be collected and analysed in a disaggregated manner, including gender disaggregation. Environmental indicators are needed to monitor environmental trends, with the information being used for management, planning and budgeting decisions.</p> <p>Local governments are an important environmental management actor, especially in the areas of waste and water management. However, given the experience from PEERs, funds allocated to local governments for these areas and other needs are generally very low. Therefore, national governments should support decentralization efforts and delegate to local governments developing and implementing environmental protection measures as per existing legislations. The delegation of powers should be accompanied by relevant budgets, including target transfers from national to local budgets. Ministry of Finances should be an integral part of this process to ensure that funds</p>	<p>Projects framed in a period of four years often go through changes in government, whether it's changes at the ministerial level, or at the executive level, and as a result it is necessary to initiate advocacy work with these new counterparts as these changes happen, as well as include more flexibility in the project document for adjustments to be made once priorities shift.</p> <p>Personnel turnover (in agencies and focal points) can lead to possible project implementation delays, as advocacy needs to be done for new personnel and capacities need to be built in order to properly engage in the P-E approach the project has mainstreamed. A way in which the project has dealt with this with positive results has been the elaboration of brochures and guides which contain essential guidelines and information about the most elemental and important elements of activities and approaches within the projects.</p> <p>With regards to financial management of the programme, there are difficulties that are born from the lack of autonomy in budget management on the part of the RT and COs, which has generated problems that range from implementation times to delays in results. The RT has alleviated these issues by communicating the financial situation with the COs in a constant basis, and ensuring activities are prioritized in order to use allocated budget in a more efficient way, foreseeing</p>

Asia Pacific	Africa	ECIS	LAC
<p>local development plan and where these tackled</p> <p>Develop portfolios for analysis, learning & experience exchange. PEI invested large amounts in developing the Mining Decision Making Financial Model used in Lao PDR and Myanmar for the Department of Mines, but often the skills of government officials to operate the tool were lacking. When PEI built capacity through training, often the government official will find another job with the newly acquired skills (such as excel).</p> <p>Given that P-E mainstreaming is complex, non-linear and long-term avoid premature withdrawal from country programs.</p> <p>Do not engage in small pilot experiences, partner with other programs that have systems in place to do this effectively. This will also ensure sustainability of project outcomes.</p> <p>PEI PROGRAM DESIGN, MONITORING & REPORTING Each country should have a robust Theory of Change (ToC) with in depth accompanying narrative. These TOCs should also be standardised and feed in to a more generic regional TOC.</p> <p>Monitoring should assess whether the hypothesis underlying the project design remain valid and outcomes are being achieved.</p> <p>Aggregation of outputs at the global level is useful for accountability purposes but</p>	<p>this context, priorities support for increasing the application of ENR relevant poverty assessment and poverty reduction targeting at country level.</p> <p>Promote the poverty-environment mainstreaming model practiced by PEI within UN Environment and UNDP as a model for SDG implementation support to countries.</p> <p>Any future technical advisory support from PEA should to the extent possible seek to be part of larger UN Environment, UNDP or other partner support to countries to ensure impact and ability to deliver</p> <p>Project Management</p> <p>To improve the effectiveness of PEI/PEA implementation, restore the implementation model from the previous PEI phases but with delegated budget authority to countries</p> <p>Project Staffing. Include sufficient level of budget for staff and technical consultants in donor proposals and project designs at country and regional level. Staff should be embedded in the lead government ministry – which should be the ministry of planning/finance. Understand and act swiftly on issues of staff underperformance. Substantive back-up from regional level is necessary, both moral and technical support on specialist areas (e.g. gender, poverty) plus in terms of results based reporting</p>	<p>allocated for the environment are used for strategic key priorities.</p> <p>The System of Environmental-Economic Accounting is an important tool to support ‘green’ aspects of SDGs monitoring, however, raising awareness outside the statistical community is an important step in building cooperation across government and non-governmental agencies, and between decision-makers and experts.</p> <p>The private sector is an important player both in terms of current impacts and expenditure and in finding positive solutions. To strengthen development outcomes of government needs to facilitate mechanisms to stimulate private investment in environmental sustainability. However, economic instruments and incentives for participating in environmental activities (i.e. environmental protection, biodiversity conservation, climate change adaptation, etc.) are missing.</p> <p>Sustainability requires the support of stakeholders complementary from policy, implementation and resources domains. UNDP through the on-going and further interventions should proactively lobby and look for more P-E champions among political and society leaders by finding and utilizing common interests.</p>	<p>any possible budget complications.</p>

Asia Pacific	Africa	ECIS	LAC
<p>is inadequate to assess P-E mainstreaming progress. Also, PEI lacked clear and attainable baseline targets both at global and regional level, which in turn complicated reporting to donors and oversight.</p> <p>Reporting should communicate P-E mainstreaming progress/challenges in the countries (national, regional, global), and should not lose sight of donor requirements. Some donors focus more on specific PEI elements as opposed to the broader aims and objectives.</p> <p>Regional strategies should include specific outcomes & outputs with respect to inception phase for new countries, technical assistance, knowledge management relevant to the regional program, contribution to creating an enabling environment for P-E mainstreaming among relevant regional institutions and bodies.</p> <p>Outcomes and outputs to be delivered at the global level should also be articulated in a document: (i) Collaboration with other relevant UNDP and UN Environment programs; (ii) Influencing UN agencies; (iii) Knowledge management and communications (internal & external); (iv) Sustainability strategy</p> <p>In the absence of a minimum number of dedicated staff and funding to sustain that infrastructure in the agencies, and without seed funding for country-level work, it will be difficult for the agencies to continue learning and providing the policy and technical support to the countries. As</p>	<p>and quality control.</p> <p>To increase financial allocations to implement poverty-environment actions priorities influencing development partners at both headquarters and country level to support such actions</p> <p>Donor coordination and communication: Engage with donor representatives from the earliest planning stage of PEI country programmes and take their views into account, where consistent with PEI objectives, with a view to catalyzing political and especially financial support to implement p-e objectives. Actively seek out and implement opportunities for co-ordination and synergies. Actively contribute to the most relevant donor and donor-government working groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regularly brief relevant donors on PEI progress. Inviting key donors to join P-E project steering committees or reference groups may be appropriate. <p>Active support from PEI regional team to engage with donors was often necessary.</p> <p>The focus should be on influencing donors to prioritize implementation of P-E objectives through their own programmes, rather than mobilising funds for PEI.</p> <p>Coping with Changes in Governments: Recognize the fact that national elections and changes in</p>	<p>Addressing the capacity gaps for vertical (national, regional, local) and horizontal (sectoral) planning and implementation of sustainable development plans/programmes is a fundamental issue, especially in the light of the SDGs localization and implementation. Targeted capacity building programmes for governmental staff at all levels remain critical. This should be coupled through deep engagement with other ongoing initiatives similar to PEI (i.e. PAGE in Kyrgyzstan). PAGE can serve as a direct continuation of deepening and upscaling PEI's achievements in Kyrgyzstan until 2021.</p> <p>To complement PEI efforts, creation of an appropriate economic mechanism to develop national regulations, policies and strategies to address priority green economy themes are highly recommended, especially for the low-middle income countries, where natural capital acts as an important interface in relation to other SDGs. Therefore, central government capacity in both countries especially in water, forestry, biodiversity and climate change related activities needs to be strengthened and up-scaled by linking strategies and budgeting, expenditure planning and investment analysis, building on PEI ECIS achievements to date.</p> <p>The measurement of natural capital and environmental sustainability, and their links to human development, are complex and multifaceted. To understand these correlations better, the use of better data and new indicators to measure natural</p>	

Asia Pacific	Africa	ECIS	LAC
<p>such the existing UNDP-UNEP collaboration framework will have to be adjusted to reflect this is important shortcoming. One possible solution is to have forward continuous or permanent contracts with the UN.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY OF PEI OUTCOMES UNDP-UN Environment collaboration is essential to deliver the long-term support required to achieve meaningful and durable P-E mainstreaming.</p> <p>A knowledge bank or compendium of tried and tested PEI supported tools and approaches for future duplication or evidence. This should be a living document and be readily available online.</p> <p>To UN Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Country-level support system needs to be improved and enforced. - Clarify role PEI can play to help coordinate delivery at the country level. - Clarify role and added value (substantive and operational) of PEI with respect to “inclusive green economy” - Systematically tap into UN Environment’s global pool of expertise. <p>To UNDP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better management of financial resources, including timely disbursement of fund so as to not delay project implementation. And at country level less Purchase Orders to be carried over to the next year. 	<p>government are likely to have a considerable impact on the implementation speed of a UN project and work with UNDP country offices to establish contingency plans. Following changes in government, take time to understand the political and institutional changes and their impact on poverty-environment mainstreaming results and if need be adjusted subsequent workplans to address these changes.</p> <p>Establish a long-term agreement at the global/regional level with known qualified consultants in the areas of expertise where the project needs support. Technical advisory support from PEI should to the extent possible seek to be part of larger UN Environment, UNDP or other partner support to countries</p> <p>Budget sufficiently for international and national consultants in annual work-plans.</p> <p>Continued and more pro-active follow up on country reported results and activities by global/regional team.</p>	<p>capital and the links between inter- and intra-generational equity is critically important.</p> <p>Based on the national capacity aspects in both countries, PEI regional and country teams recommended to establish a green economy roster for the ECIS region, which would allow countries to carry out Output II activities in a timely manner and access to the qualified international/national consultancies as needed.</p> <p>Training is required for relevant M&E specialists at district and regional levels to replicate the results of successful (sub) national development work, such as district development plans (DDPs) in Tajikistan, but there are infrastructure challenges, including limited Internet access and low-grade office equipment.</p> <p>Support efforts to ensure that equitable proportions of women are elected and/or appointed to government (and corporate) leadership positions to increase the number of women in senior environmental management, political and decision-making roles in public and private institutions throughout the region.</p>	

Asia Pacific	Africa	ECIS	LAC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Involve Regional Bureaus in determining the entry points and priority areas to be addressed in each region in addition to consultation with global and regional centers - Package and make available P-E mainstreaming tools and experiences to improve their uptake and use across the network of UNDP country offices; a strategy to maximize uptake - Consult with Resident Representatives or Country Director how PEI can help achieve crosscutting and multidisciplinary work to address national development priorities consistent with UNDP's new approach to work in a multi-disciplinary manner to address complex development issues - Create mechanisms to help deploy available expertise for PEI's work and increase efforts to engage other UN agencies at country level to contribute to P-E mainstreaming efforts. 			

1.8 Annex 8: PEI Scale up Phase Evaluation Recommendations and Status

Key action	Status
Recommendation 1: <i>Expand PEI geographically and thematically and upgrade the programme as a main but not exclusive UNDP-UNEP delivery mechanism of capacity development support and technical assistance to help meet the SDGs with a focus on inclusive, equitable, pro-poor, climate proofed sustainable development, building on PEI's mainstreaming agenda and modus operandi.</i>	
Evaluate how PEI's current structure and portfolio can be deployed for P-E mainstreaming in support of SDG achievement beyond 2017.	completed
Develop a successor/post-2017 P-E mainstreaming Global Programme in support of SDG implementation and accompanying resource mobilisation strategy.	completed
Recommendation 2: <i>Continue integration of P-E mainstreaming in UNDP and UNEP as an approach for SDG implementation</i>	
Improve integration of P-E mainstreaming within both agencies work programmes.	on-going
Deepen UNDP-UNEP cooperation, using PEI as a model to build integrated frameworks for other joint UNDP and UNEP initiatives at country levels and to inform the design of other joint programmes.	ongoing
Improve coordination between related CO level interventions for P-E mainstreaming objectives (in the context of a Delivering as One (DaO) approach) and improve progress on dissemination of P-E Mainstreaming tools and experiences to the Country Office levels, or through other mechanisms to deploy available UNDP or UNEP expertise upon request.	on-going
Ensure and expand support through UN cooperation mechanisms, for national P-E mainstreaming agendas in the context of SDG implementation	
Recommendation 3: <i>Apply PEI programmatic approach consistently across the global programme</i>	
Review of PEI LAC portfolio and increased support for management of the Regional Team by PEI senior management.	completed
Recommendation 4: <i>Channel improvements for PEI Global, Regional and Country level RBM management and results delivery.</i>	
PEI to improve monitoring on the application of PEI tools (guidelines, templates, databases, indicators, etc.) for impact monitoring.	ongoing
Improve programmatic approach on national capacity for data collection and P-E indicators selection to strengthen the M&E component of the programmatic approach.	ongoing
Apply and use TOC at CO, Regional and Global level as a part of project management.	completed
Increased application of RBM principles in project cycle management (work planning, reporting, M&E, target setting, quality assurance, etc.) and in data collection for results reporting and improved evidence-based project management.	completed
Recommendation 5: <i>Build upon and improve collaboration and partnership for P-E mainstreaming and sustainability of PEI project and programme results.</i>	
Transform PEI Handbook into a living online and modular capacity development offer.	completed
Use of diverse fora to increase the exposure for PEI experiences and tools to other countries, and possibly extend targeted technical assistance in selected cases.	completed