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**Methodology**

# Approach and Methodology

In this section we have described our approach and methodology for the Evaluation.

## General approach

The Evaluation has been carried out against the expectations set out in the Results Framework and the assumptions of how desired change happened set out in the Theory of Change of individual sub-programmes (Annex 2 to ToR). We have noted that an updated Theory of Change for sub-programme 1 will be provided.

The essence of a theory of change approach is the belief that the potential for impact is enhanced through an explicit understanding of:

* the long-term change sought – a goal, typically a higher order development outcome;
* what needs to change and why;
* the context for change and others active in it, dynamics in the context; and,
* how and why a set of activities and outputs will help to stimulate outcomes that contribute to long-term change.

We believe that the theory of change approach will add significant value to the Evaluation because it will help more clearly define and set out the contribution and ‘sphere of influence’. A theory of change approach recognizes that change is emergent, complicated, messy and that causes are not always obvious, linear and direct. Such an approach provides a detailed, diagrammatic means to understanding and testing how multiple intermediate steps along an impact pathway contribute to the ultimate long-term change sought. In this regard, theories of change complement and add analytical depth to an understanding of a programme and help stakeholders to identify and make transparent the intuitive or unspoken assumptions linking an intervention to its anticipated impact.

At the same time, evaluations must take seriously the issue of context specificity. Thus, in addressing the question of relevance, the study will consider what steps are taken to ensure that assumptions about interventions and anticipated impact are calibrated to fit context-specific opportunities, constraints and needs. The possibility of using Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD) framework to guide the evaluation and the political economy analysis will be looked into.

Moreover, our approach in this Evaluation will ensure that the voice of intended beneficiaries is taken into account in considering the relevance of underlying assumptions about change and whether/how ownership over these is facilitated (or not) through how support is delivered.

As part of our rigorous evaluation design we use evaluation frameworks as a standard tool. We find them useful for two reasons. (a) They provide an effective way of structuring issues, questions, indicators and methods in a comprehensive way. (b) They are also useful as a tool to present the issues and questions to be covered by this Evaluation to stakeholders, thus enabling informed discussion around focus and potential gaps.

Based on the evaluation framework we have developed the validation matrix. The use of validation matrix has helped to ensure consistent reporting of findings and assist in drawing together the final synthesis of findings.

Quality assurance is embedded into our practices and is systematically built into our approach to this assignment. Please find a summary of our Quality assurance system in Annex 8 to the Tender.

##  Design of the Evaluation

The Evaluation is conducted as per international standards. Our approach has been designed in accordance with standards for ensuring quality evaluation processes and products as detailed in OECD/DAC’s Evaluation Quality Standards for development evaluations, Sida´s evaluation principles, UNDP evaluation policy and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) standards and ethical guidelines for evaluation in the UN system. We also adhere to the International Framework Good Statistical Practice.

We have used a suitable mix of formative vs summative assessment techniques for this Evaluation. Since the main purpose of the Evaluation is to provide recommendations and lessons learned that can be used in designing a possible new global programme, a formative approach has been used. The other purpose is to assess the performance and achievements of the global programme and individual sub-programmes and to document project results. For this purpose a summative approach was required.

In order to execute the Evaluation we have adopted a participatory approach and therefore anticipate that our staff has, as has been the case with similar evaluations that we have carried out at the request of Sida and the Swedish EPA among others, had a close dialogue with the Client and the stakeholders from the design to the conduct of this Evaluation. We have implemented a design based on a process that ensures regular consultation and an extensive two-way feedback. Personnel at the Swedish EPA have been invited to participate in the work of the Evaluation Team, when appropriate and when they choose to.

Furthermore, the Team have had a transparent discussion on each of the main conclusions, on the sources we have used, the extent to which the source can or could be considered to have a stake in the issues, the extent to which we have been able to corroborate or triangulate the conclusion by other sources with a different perspective or stake, or if there might be an alternative explanation vis-à-vis the observations.

After approval of the Inception report we have conducted the Evaluation as detailed in the work- and time plan, mindful of the specified timetable for deliverables. During the Evaluation process, we have given feedback and discussed the initial observations/findings with the Swedish EPA.

Planning of the assignment is a transparent process with structured meetings carefully planned within a set timeframe. We have consulted with stakeholders at an early stage of the assignment to identify their availability thus ensuring that the methodology and schedule can be flexibly implemented by accounting for realities on the ground in order to minimize delays and misconceptions around the assignment.

The Evaluation Manager met with us on the 2018-06-01 to provide information on the more specific question to be answered by the Evaluation. In addition all the documents for the final evaluation of Swedish EPA's Global Programme have been shared through a google drive folder. All sub programme managers were asked to upload the relevant documents into the sub programme folders. After the meeting and the documentation was uploaded the Evaluation Team developed checklists, with semi-structured open-ended questions based on the questions per ToR. The questionnaires have been modified slightly to take account of different positions and responsibilities and different perspectives of major stakeholders. The draft questionnaires were sent to the Evaluation Manager for comments before we started interviewing the informants.

# Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions

The Evaluation has been carried out against the expectations set out in the Results Framework and the assumptions of how desired change happened set out in the Theory of Change of individual sub-programmes.

Each sub-program have been processed and reported separately in the inquiry. The Evaluation has answered the evaluation questions outlined in table 2 below. The evaluation efforts across the four sub-programmes have been appropriated according to the budget and implementation rate of each sub-programme.

***Table 2: Evaluation criteria and key questions***

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation criteria: Relevance** |
| a. To what extent is the intervention relevant to the needs and priorities as defined by stakeholders and beneficiaries, policies of partner countries and donor agencies? b. What is the added value of the partnership configurations in addressing the global environmental challenges and in meeting the needs of the sub-programme countries and organisations? c. To what extent do the sub-programmes’ logical model and theory of change remain appropriate to the context or require revision for the next phase? |
| **Evaluation criteria: Effectiveness** |
| a. To what extent has the intervention made progress towards planned outcomes and outputs? Which areas or outcomes have made the most progress and which have the least and why?b. How effective were the implementation strategies (including outreach & dissemination efforts) in achieving expected results?c. To what extent did the interventions develop and strengthen capacities of partners?d. How effective have the interventions been in establishing ownership?e. How effective have activities been implemented by partner institutions and to what extent have they contributed to the programme and sub-programme outcomes?f. What are the key lessons from these partnerships and the possibilities to replicate them in the next phase and elsewhere?g. How have the partnership configurations and the sub/programme logical model enabled/constrained the delivery of the sub/programme Theory of Change? |
| **Evaluation criteria: Efficiency** |
| a. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve results? Have resources been used efficiently and timely?b. Were sub/programme management capacities adequate and efficient?c. Has relevant international, regional and local expertise been sought?d. How effectively did the management team monitor performance and results?e. Can the costs of the intervention be justified by the results? |
| **Evaluation criteria: Degree of change** |
| a. What are positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended, changes observed on the target groups or beneficiaries?b. To what extent have environmental governance capacities been strengthened at global, regional, national or community level as a result of the sub/programme?c. To what extent has the sub/programme created institutional changes in environmental governance (i.e. changes on the rules (formal and informal), processes, norms, beliefs and values that govern behaviour and relationships between agents, between agents and organisations, and between organisations and the public)? |
| **Evaluation criteria: Sustainability** |
| a. What steps have been taken to ensure sub/programme sustainability (including, e.g. disseminating sub/programme results, lessons and experiences)? Are the sub/programme results, achievements and benefits likely to be durable?b. Are results anchored in national institutions and can they be maintained at the end of the sub/programme?c. Can the sub/programme approach or results be replicated or scaled up by national partners? What would support their replication and scaling up? |

# Methods

## Overall methodological approach

Our approach is designed to ensure that data collection takes account of the purpose and scope outlined in the ToR during data collection and the range of methods used. A clear Evaluation cycle has been used to ensure thorough data collection process from primary sources of information supplemented with proper documentation (secondary sources). The data has been collected corresponding to the areas specified in ToR. The focused areas have systematically been subjected to the Evaluation questions based on the Terms of Reference.

The successful implementation of any evaluation of this nature is contingent on the information provided by the organisation that is focus of the evaluation and the partner organisations. Thus, it was important that the documentation is uploaded before we draft the questionnaires in order to make sure that we will get the complementary information that is necessary in the interviews. We have also –when possible - strived to obtain “second opinions” from other sources slightly more removed from the present partnership, or in such other ways that can add an independent view or corroborate outside perspectives.

Furthermore, the Evaluation Team have had a transparent discussion on each of the main conclusions, findings and recommendation as verified per the sources of information and data used.

The members of the Team have extensive experience of leading complex evaluations. The managerial experience also comprises evaluation expertise to fully understand how to make the Evaluation utilization-focused and participatory for all stakeholders, and thereby put the intended users at the centre of the Evaluation process. Our Team members have wide experience covering all thematic areas of work.

As mentioned above, we have used a suitable mix of formative vs summative assessment techniques for this Evaluation. Within the Evaluation team, considerable experience of using different formative and summative assessment techniques is assembled. The Team has worked with and has in-depth knowledge of a wide variety of evaluation methodologies and approaches as apparent from CVs appended to the Tender. Our approach is always to seek participatory, results-oriented and utilization-focused evaluation methodologies as a point of departure. Within this overall priority, a wide variety of methods can be applied as required by the Client and the evaluation objectives as specified in our Tender.

Our general approach is centred on how the Client (including partners and other stakeholders) can use the information provided by the Evaluation. Depending on purpose, scope and objectives, an evaluation can provide a variety of information categories; what they all have in common is the objective of contributing to the *organisational learning process* and to the *operational* (programme, project, strategic etc.) *planning process*. Whereas the learning process is often more long term, and has its own particular logic, the planning process mostly has immediate needs for decisions and priority setting. The planning process also has its own needs for systemization and mechanisms for how performance assessments feed into the information base available to decision makers, and is highly operational. As discussed at the meeting 2018-05-21 we have made sure that the Evaluation report will provide both lessons learned and recommendations for the next Programme period.

Based on the evaluation framework we normally develop a validation matrix to be presented in the Inception report. As necessary documentation was still not available at that time we were not in a position to provide the validation matrix in the Inception report. However, this has been done as part of the Evaluation Team´s work along with selecting interviewees and drafting questionnaires. The use of validation matrix has helped us to ensure consistent reporting of findings and assist in drawing together the final synthesis of findings.

Setting up appropriate mechanisms for how the flow of information (from various sources and mechanisms) reaches the decision maker, and back again to the operational level, is a management art form. What the Evaluator can and should do is to make sure he or she understands the systems in place and their need of information so as to provide specifics on how the Evaluation information can be channelled, processed, aggregated (or disaggregated), or systematised to optimise utility for the existing planning process or its evolution/development.

This objective guides our QA system on evaluation content: Conclusions and recommendations should have the particular needs of long term learning and operational planning in mind by default. In designing and implementing learning processes we are guided by UNDESA/IASIAs “*Standards of Excellence*”.

To be evidence-based, objective, and independent, the Evaluation has used a *triangulatio*n process drawing on a variety of data sources and approaches to confirm results. The final stage in the analysis of data consists in combining results from different types of sources. As is detailed in the validation matrix the data-collecting techniques – studies of written documents, interviews etc - that are used vary from one area to be analysed to another. Thus, the evidence is a combination of documentary, physical, testimonial and analytical. In this way the Evaluation Team has provided reasonable assurance that evidence is competent (valid and reliable) and actually represents what it purports to represent. The criteria representing the normative standards against which the evidence is judged vary also; however, in many cases there is an established international best practice or good practice to compare with.

M&E in capacity building or capacity development programmes is difficult. Challenges occur in concretely identifying changes or improvements in organizational capacity. Difficulties arise in determining whether changes in capacity are causally connected to the programme. There is also the challenge of determining whether any changes in organizational capacity have, in fact, led to any broader, societal change.The best opportunity for minimizing these challenges occurs at the programme design and planning stages by carefully considering the scope of capacity development activities, the specific targeted results to be achieved and the level at which results will be measured. We have been provided with links to theories[[1]](#footnote-1) that the SEPA has used for the Global Programme. This will be used in our assessments of the key questions per ToR.

As discussed at the meeting 2018-05-21 evaluation rating scales will not be used in this Evaluation. The rationale for this decision is specified in the notes from the meeting.

## Desk studies

The Evaluation Team has reviewed all relevant sources of information, such as the sub/program documents, contacts list, progress/annual reports, activity reports, knowledge products, budget and financial data, tracking tools of implementing agencies, quality assurance reviews, global/national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that may be useful for this evidence-based Evaluation. EGP, sub-programme one, has an ongoing evaluation and knowledge management resource at Lund University that has established additional evidence base for this final evaluation.

When the Evaluation team assessed the documents made available by the Evaluation manager, the sub-programmes and Lunds University we made a gap analysis to find out if there are additional information that should be provided before the interviews were carried out.

## Interviews

Interviews have been held with a sample of personnel and organizations and individuals. The selection of interviewees was discussed with the Evaluation Manager at the meeting 208-05-21 and was finalised over the email. The interviewees include:

* Programme and Sub-programme Managers
* Representatives of global partnership organisations (UNDP, UN Environment and Sustainable UN, Gothenburg University)
* UNDP country offices and local government and non-government partners (Sub programme 1)
* Lund University knowledge management and ongoing evaluation experts (Sub programme 1)
* Representatives of the piloting UN agencies (Sub-programme 2)
* Representatives from the Environment for Development Centres, the World Bank Waves, UN Stat. (Sub-programme 3)
* Staff of Swedish EPA and other Swedish public agencies/ministries including in the Network for Learning (Sub-programme 4)

The Evaluation Team has met with project partners and stakeholders during two planned sub-programme events in Sweden to collect further data and/or validate findings as necessary and possible. Sub-programme 1 had an event in Stockholm in June and Sub-programme 3 in Gothenburg in the 3rd week of June.

Thus, interviews have been carried out with key informants in Sub-programme 1 at the meeting in Stockholm in June with additional interviews over the phone.

Interviews with key informants in Sub- programme 3 have been carried out during the meeting in Gothenburg in June.

When it comes to interviews on country level Mongolia and Colombia have been prioritised. Interviews have been carried out by Mongolian and Spanish speaking consultants in accordance with the Tender (for details please also refer to section 7 below). Contact details to the interviewees have been provided by the Evaluation Manager and her Team. The Team has drafted semi-structured interview guides in the Mongolian and Spanish languages. The draft interview guides was shared with the Evaluation Manager for comments. When it comes to Kenya and Mozambique we have used secondary data and assessments from the ongoing evaluation. If any gaps have been identified in relation to the Evaluation questions we have contacted key informants for additional information.

When it comes to Sub-programme 4 it was noted that most of the participants mentioned in the annual report has limited knowledge about the Programme. Thus, the Evaluation manager has selected a number of staff members at SEPA that has been interviewed. In addition, one key informant at the Ministry has been interviewed as well as one member of the Network for Learning.

# Work- and Time Plan

The scope of work of the Evaluation has included the following activities:

***Inception (Phase 1):***

* Desk review
* A first visit to the Swedish EPA for the kick-off meeting and to gather materials and conduct interviews with key stakeholders;
* Develop a methodology for data collection and analysis to be submitted to the Swedish EPA for comments and approval (as part of the Draft Inception report);
* The individuals to be interviewed using distance-spanning techniques will be identified;
* Develop a more detailed draft work plan including time-frames, to be vetted and approved by the Swedish EPA;
* Draft the Inception report and submit the Draft Inception Report to the Swedish EPA for comments; and
* Submit the Inception Report to the Swedish EPA for approval no later than 31 May 2018.

***Data Collection and Analysis (Phase 2):***

* Detailed planning;
* Booking interviews;
* Desk studies;
* Visit to the Swedish EPA to conduct interviews with key stakeholders;
* Take part in the event in Stockholm on Sub-programme 1;
* Take part in the event in Göteborg on Sub-programme 3; and
* Telephonic and/or Skype interviews with stakeholders at other locations

***Reporting (Phase 3):***

* Produce a Draft Evaluation Report;
* Submit the Draft Evaluation Report to the Swedish EPA no later than 30 September 2018;
* Finalize the Evaluation Report based on feedback from the Swedish EPA;
* Validation workshop in Geneva;
* Final Evaluation Report submitted to the Swedish EPA for approval ; and
* Final Evaluation Report approved

Throughout the Evaluation, the Team leader has had regular contact with the Swedish EPA, as needed.
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**Interview Guides**

#### *Sub programme 1: Environmental Governance for Sustainable Natural Resource Management, in collaboration with UNDP*

**Interview Guide: Swedish EPA-UNDP Environmental Governance Programme**

The Swedish EPA has assigned Professional Management to the carry out the Final Evaluation of the Swedish EPA-UNDP Environmental Governance Programme on Mining (EGP). The Evaluation is intended to assess the performance and achievements of the global programme and individual sub-programmes, to document project results and lessons, and to provide recommendation for future efforts. Each sub-program will be reported separately. The Evaluation covers the period from September 2014 to June 2018.

Please note that this is a generic interview guide that will be adjusted to each respondent during the interview. Some of the questions may not be as relevant as others.

1. Please describe briefly your role in the EGP. Has the division of responsibility’s been adequate and clear within the programme?
2. From your perspective: What has been working well and what has been working not so well in the EGP?
3. To what extent is the EGP relevant to the needs and priorities of stakeholders and beneficiaries, and the policies of partner countries and donor agencies?
4. What is the added value of the SEPA-UNDP collaboration in addressing the global environmental challenges and in meeting the needs of the EGP countries and partner organisations?
5. We have noted that the EGP Theory of Change and the Results Framework has been changed several times during the programme; how has this been reflected in the programme activities?
6. How has the SEPA-UNDP collaboration and the EGP logical model enabled/constrained the delivery of the EGP Theory of Change?
7. To what extent do the EGP logical model and Theory of Change remain appropriate to the context, and to what extent could they be used for Phase 2?
8. Are the objectives and expected results realistic and clear? Has it been possible to measure the results and adjust activities when needed?
9. Please comment on the progress towards fulfilment of the objectives and expected results and the efficiency of EGP implementation. What are the reasons for low or high achievement of objectives?
10. Looking back: Have activities/tasks/input been adequate in relation to the expected results?
11. How effective were the implementation strategies (including outreach & dissemination efforts) in achieving expected results?
12. To what extent did the interventions develop and strengthen capacities of partners?
13. How effective have the interventions been in establishing country ownership?
14. How effective have activities been implemented by national partner organizations and to what extent have they contributed to the EGP outcomes?
15. What are the key lessons from these partnerships and the possibilities to replicate them in the next phase and elsewhere?
16. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve results? Have resources been used efficiently and timely?
17. To what degree were EGP management capacities adequate and efficient?
18. Has relevant international, regional and local expertise been sought and used?
19. How effectively did the management team monitor performance and results?
20. Can the costs of the intervention be justified by the results?
21. What are positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended, changes observed on the target groups or beneficiaries?
22. To what extent have environmental governance capacities and/or awareness been strengthened at global, regional, national or community level as a result of the programme?
23. To what extent has the EGP created institutional changes in environmental governance (i.e. changes on the rules (formal and informal), processes, norms, beliefs and values that govern behaviour and relationships between agents, between agents and organisations, and between organisations and the public)?
24. What steps have been taken to ensure EGP sustainability (including, e.g. disseminating EGP results, lessons and experiences)? Are the EGP results, achievements and benefits likely to be durable?
25. Can the EGP approach or results be replicated or scaled up by national partners? What would support their replication and scaling up?
26. Do you have any other comments or observations you wish to share?

**Interview Guide Colombia: Swedish EPA-UNDP Environmental Governance Programme[[2]](#footnote-2)**

The Swedish EPA has assigned Professional Management to the carry out the Final Evaluation of the Swedish EPA-UNDP Environmental Governance Programme on Mining (EGP). The Evaluation is intended to assess the performance and achievements of the programme and to provide recommendation for future efforts. The Evaluation covers the period from September 2014 to June 2018.

Please note that this is a generic interview guide that will be adjusted to each respondent during the interview. Some of the questions may not be as relevant as others for you.

Please describe briefly your role in the EGP. Has the division of responsibility’s been adequate and clear within the EGP; a) between UNDP HQ and Country Office and b) within the national coordination groups?

1. Has your view on human rights and rule of law principles changed as a result of your participation in the EGP? Have you gained knowledge or skills from the EGP? How has your knowledge changed on human rights principles such as access to information and participation, rule of law principles, mine closure, environmental monitoring and effects on ecosystem services from mining? Are you able to apply the new knowledges/skills? How or why not?
2. From your perspective: What has been working well and what has been working not so well in the EGP?
3. To what extent is the EGP relevant to the needs and priorities of stakeholders and beneficiaries in Colombia?
4. What is the added value of the EGP in addressing the needs in Colombia?
5. What is the added value of the EGP for your organisation? To what extent did the interventions develop and strengthen the capacity of your organisation?
6. How effective have the interventions been in establishing country ownership in Colombia?
7. Are the objectives and expected results realistic and clear? Has it been possible to measure the results and adjust activities when needed?
8. Please comment on the progress towards fulfilment of the objectives and expected results and the efficiency of EGP implementation in Colombia. What are the reasons for low or high achievement of objectives?
9. Looking back: Have activities/tasks/input been adequate in relation to the expected results?
10. How effective were the implementation strategies (including outreach & dissemination efforts) in achieving expected results?
11. How effective have activities been implemented by your organisation (if relevant) and/or other national partner organizations in Colombia and to what extent have they contributed to the EGP outcomes?
12. To what extent has the EGP leveraged partnerships and synergies with complementary initiatives in Colombia?
13. How effective has the programme been in supporting multi-stakeholder processes in Colombia?
14. What are the key lessons from the partnerships and the possibilities to replicate them in the next phase and elsewhere?
15. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve results? Have resources been used efficiently and timely?
16. To what degree were EGP management capacities adequate and efficient?
17. Has relevant international, regional and local expertise been sought and used?
18. How effectively did the management team monitor performance and results?
19. Can the costs of the intervention be justified by the results?
20. What are positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended, changes observed on the target groups or beneficiaries?
21. To what extent have environmental governance capacities and/or awareness been strengthened at national or community level as a result of the sub-programme?
22. To what extent has the EGP created institutional changes in environmental governance in Colombia (i.e. changes on the rules (formal and informal), processes, norms, beliefs and values that govern behaviour and relationships between agents, between agents and organisations, and between organisations and the public)? Has the programme resulted in changes in legislation which is being implemented and enforced? Has right holders' access to decision making increased? Are decisions making processes more participatory? Have right holders better possibilities to participate and influence in decision making? To what degree have right holders been empowered to participate and influence decision making? Who has access to relevant information (relevant for e.g. a consultation meeting, prior informed consent, court case)? Has right holders' access to information increased? Are there any changes in relationships between organisations? Who else are now working together as a result of EGP (fully or partly)?
23. What steps have been taken to ensure EGP sustainability in Colombia (including, e.g. disseminating EGP results, lessons and experiences)? Are the EGP results, achievements and benefits likely to be durable?
24. Can the EGP approach or results be replicated or scaled up by national partners in Colombia? What would support their replication and scaling up?
25. Do you have any other comments or observations you wish to share?

**Interview Guide Mongolia: Swedish EPA-UNDP Environmental Governance Programme[[3]](#footnote-3)**

The Swedish EPA has assigned Professional Management to the carry out the Final Evaluation of the Swedish EPA-UNDP Environmental Governance Programme on Mining (EGP). The Evaluation is intended to assess the performance and achievements of the programme and to provide recommendation for future efforts. The Evaluation covers the period from September 2014 to June 2018.

Please note that this is a generic interview guide that will be adjusted to each respondent during the interview. Some of the questions may not be as relevant as others for you.

Please describe briefly your role in the EGP. Has the division of responsibility’s been adequate and clear within the EGP; a) between UNDP HQ and Country Office and b) within the national coordination groups?

1. Has your view on human rights and rule of law principles changed as a result of your participation in the EGP? Have you gained knowledge or skills from the EGP? How has your knowledge changed on human rights principles such as access to information and participation, rule of law principles, mine closure, environmental monitoring and effects on ecosystem services from mining? Are you able to apply the new knowledges/skills? How or why not?
2. From your perspective: What has been working well and what has been working not so well in the EGP?
3. To what extent is the EGP relevant to the needs and priorities of stakeholders and beneficiaries in Mongolia?
4. What is the added value of the EGP in addressing the needs in Mongolia?
5. What is the added value of the EGP for your organisation? To what extent did the interventions develop and strengthen the capacity of your organisation?
6. How effective have the interventions been in establishing country ownership in Mongolia?
7. Are the objectives and expected results realistic and clear? Has it been possible to measure the results and adjust activities when needed?
8. Please comment on the progress towards fulfilment of the objectives and expected results and the efficiency of EGP implementation in Mongolia. What are the reasons for low or high achievement of objectives?
9. Looking back: Have activities/tasks/input been adequate in relation to the expected results?
10. How effective were the implementation strategies (including outreach & dissemination efforts) in achieving expected results?
11. How effective have activities been implemented by your organisation (if relevant) and/or other national partner organizations in Mongolia and to what extent have they contributed to the EGP outcomes?
12. To what extent has the EGP leveraged partnerships and synergies with complementary initiatives in Mongolia?
13. How effective has the programme been in supporting multi-stakeholder processes in Mongolia?
14. What are the key lessons from the partnerships and the possibilities to replicate them in the next phase and elsewhere?
15. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve results? Have resources been used efficiently and timely?
16. To what degree were EGP management capacities adequate and efficient?
17. Has relevant international, regional and local expertise been sought and used?
18. How effectively did the management team monitor performance and results?
19. Can the costs of the intervention be justified by the results?
20. What are positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended, changes observed on the target groups or beneficiaries?
21. To what extent have environmental governance capacities and/or awareness been strengthened at national or community level as a result of the sub-programme?
22. To what extent has the EGP created institutional changes in environmental governance in Mongolia (i.e. changes on the rules (formal and informal), processes, norms, beliefs and values that govern behaviour and relationships between agents, between agents and organisations, and between organisations and the public)? Has the programme resulted in changes in legislation which is being implemented and enforced? Has right holders' access to decision making increased? Are decisions making processes more participatory? Have right holders better possibilities to participate and influence in decision making? To what degree have right holders been empowered to participate and influence decision making? Who has access to relevant information (relevant for e.g. a consultation meeting, prior informed consent, court case)? Has right holders' access to information increased? Are there any changes in relationships between organisations? Who else are now working together as a result of EGP (fully or partly)?
23. What steps have been taken to ensure EGP sustainability in Mongolia (including, e.g. disseminating EGP results, lessons and experiences)? Are the EGP results, achievements and benefits likely to be durable?
24. Can the EGP approach or results be replicated or scaled up by national partners in Mongolia? What would support their replication and scaling up?
25. Do you have any other comments or observations you wish to share?

### Sub programme 2: Partnership for an environmentally sustainable One UN, in collaboration Sustainable UN (SUN) within UN Environment (UNEP)

**Interview Guide: Partnership for an environmentally sustainable One UN; Environmental managements systems in the UN (Sub-programme 2 in Swedish EPA Global Programme)**

The Swedish EPA has assigned Professional Management to the carry out the Final Evaluation of the Swedish EPA Global Programme. The Evaluation is intended to assess the performance and achievements of the four sub-programmes in the global programme, to document results and lessons, and to provide recommendation for future efforts. Each sub-programme will be reported separately. The Evaluation covers the period from September 2014 to June 2018.

Please note that this is a generic interview guide that will be adjusted to each respondent during the interview. Some of the questions may not be as relevant as others for you.

1. Please describe briefly your role. Has the division of roles and responsibilities been adequate and clear within the sub-programme?
2. From your perspective: What has been working well and what has been working not so well in the sub-programme?
3. To what extent is the partnership (sub-programme) relevant to the needs and priorities of the four pilots based in DR Congo, Kenya, Thailand and USA?
4. What is your assessment of the Swedish EPA experts’ EMS coaching to the four EMS pilot organisations?
5. What is the added value of the partnership (sub-programme) in addressing the global environmental challenges and in meeting the needs of partner organisations? What has been the results of the activities for example support to the EMS pilots, development of UN-adapted guidelines for EMS, development of monitoring of EMS, and support to capacity development on environmental management systems?
6. Are the objectives and expected results realistic and clear? Has it been possible to measure the results and adjust activities when needed?
7. Please comment on the progress towards fulfilment of the objectives and expected results and the efficiency of the implementation. What are the reasons for low or high achievement of objectives?
8. Looking back: Have activities/tasks/input been adequate in relation to the expected results?
9. Has an effective collaboration mechanisms between Swedish EPA, SUN and UN system been established?
10. To what extent are there functional coordination, guidance and follow-up of EMS in the UN system in line with the principles of One UN?
11. To what extent have the EMS pilots capacity and mandate to implement EMS?
12. To what extent applies the EMS pilots EMS in the fulfilment of their mandates?
13. How effective were the implementation strategies (including outreach & dissemination efforts) in achieving expected results?
14. To what extent did the interventions develop and strengthen capacities of partners?
15. How effective have the interventions been in establishing ownership in the organisations?
16. What are the key lessons from the partnership and the possibilities to replicate them in the next phase and elsewhere?
17. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve results? Have resources been used efficiently and timely?
18. To what degree were the project management capacities adequate and efficient?
19. Has relevant international, regional and local expertise been sought and used?
20. How effectively did the management team monitor performance and results?
21. Can the costs of the intervention be justified by the results?
22. What are positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended, changes observed on the target groups or beneficiaries?
23. What steps have been taken to ensure lasting results (including, e.g. disseminating results, lessons and experiences)? Which additional steps are planned or needed? Are the results, achievements and benefits likely to be durable?
24. Can the approach or results be replicated or scaled up by national partners? What would support their replication and scaling up?
25. Do you have any other comments or observations you wish to share?

### Sub programme 3: Ecosystem Services Accounting for Development (ESAfD) in collaboration with Environment for Development (EfD) and the World Bank´s Global initiative for Wealth Accounting Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES)

**Interview Guide: *Ecosystem Services Accounting for Development (ESAfD)* (Sub-programme 3 in Swedish EPA Global Programme)**

The Swedish EPA has assigned Professional Management to the carry out the Final Evaluation of the Swedish EPA Global Programme. The Evaluation is intended to assess the performance and achievements of the four sub-programmes in the global programme, to document results and lessons, and to provide recommendation for future efforts. Each sub-programme will be reported separately. The Evaluation covers the period from September 2014 to June 2018.

Please note that this is a generic interview guide that will be adjusted to each respondent during the interview. Some of the questions may not be as relevant as others for you.

1. Please describe briefly your role. Has the division of roles and responsibilities been adequate and clear within the sub-programme?
2. From your perspective: What has been working well and what has been working not so well in the sub-programme?
3. To what extent has Output 1 been achieved (Advancement in methodology for ecosystem accounting for decision making)? Please elaborate on the progress.
4. To what extent has Output 2 been achieved (Increased knowledge generated about identified gaps in knowledge in ecosystem accounting recognized by the accounting community)? Please elaborate on the progress.
5. Please comment on how cross-cutting issues (gender, poverty reduction) have been taken into consideration in the sub-programme.
6. To what extent have you been able to share results both in academic and practitioner arenas? How will the results be used in coming years? Please elaborate on your concrete plans.
7. Has an effective collaboration mechanisms between Swedish EPA, Environment for Development (EfD) and the World Bank´s Global initiative for Wealth Accounting Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES) been established? Will the collaboration sustain? What more can be done?
8. Please comment on the progress towards fulfilment of the objectives and expected results and the efficiency of the implementation. What are the reasons for low or high achievement of objectives?
9. What are the key lessons from the studies and the possibilities to replicate them elsewhere?
10. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve results? Have resources been used efficiently and timely?
11. Looking back: Have activities/tasks/input been adequate in relation to the expected results?
12. How effective were the implementation strategies (including outreach & dissemination efforts)?
13. How effective have the interventions been in establishing country ownership in the countries where the studies have been carried out?
14. To what degree were the management capacities adequate and efficient?
15. Has relevant international, regional and local expertise been sought and used?
16. How effectively did the management team monitor performance and results?
17. Can the costs of the intervention be justified by the results? How can costs for face-to-face workshops be justified? How can the climate footprint of face-to-face workshops be justified?
18. What are positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended, changes observed so far on the target groups or beneficiaries?
19. To what extent have environmental governance capacities and/or awareness been strengthened at global, regional, national or community level as a result of the sub-programme directly or indirectly?
20. To what extent has the partnership created institutional changes in environmental governance (i.e. changes on the rules (formal and informal), processes, norms, beliefs and values that govern behaviour and relationships between agents, between agents and organisations, and between organisations and the public)?
21. What steps have been taken to ensure sustainability (including, e.g. disseminating results, lessons and experiences)? Are the results, achievements and benefits likely to be durable?
22. Can the approach or results be replicated (or scaled up) by national partners? What would support their efforts?
23. Do you have any other comments or observations you wish to share?

### Sub programme 4: Capacity development of staff at Swedish EPA

**Intervjuguide: Utvärdering av Globala programmet,** **Delprogram 4: Capacity development of staff at Swedish EPA**

*Naturvårdsverket har gett Professional Management i uppdrag att genomföra slututvärderingen av Globala programmet. Globala programmet består av fyra delprogram, varav delprogram 4 fokuserar på kapacitetsutveckling av Naturvårdsverkets medarbetare, i flera fall tillsammans med Nätverket för lärande. Utvärderingen täcker perioden september 2014 till juni 2018.*

***Frågor till medlemmar i Nätverket för lärande (N4L)***

1. Berätta kort om din roll i myndigheten
2. Hur länge har du varit engagerad i N4L och vilka aktiviteter har du deltagit i?
3. Vilka är dina erfarenheter av N4L? Vad har fungerat bra respektive mindre bra? Vad har uppnåtts? Vilka lärdomar är viktiga att ta med i den fortsatta processen? Vilket mervärde ger nätverket?
4. Hur ser du på Naturvårdsverkets roll i N4L? Vad har du lärt från hur Naturvårdsverket och andra myndigheter arbetar?
5. Hur ser du på begreppet kapacitetsutveckling? Har synen förändrats något under tiden som du deltagit i nätverket?
6. Har synen på kapacitetsutveckling inom internationellt utvecklingssamarbete och konventionsarbete förändrats inom din myndighet under tiden som ni deltagit i nätverket, i så fall på vilket sätt och vad skapade den förändringen tror du?
7. Upplever du en ökad kunskap och/eller ökat intresse kring samband mellan miljöfrågor och mänskliga rättigheter – inom departement/andra myndigheter/andra aktörer?
8. Upplever du en ökad kunskap och/eller ökat intresse kring samband mellan offentlig förvaltning och mänskliga rättigheter?
9. Har synen på mänskliga rättigheter och jämställdhet i relation till er verksamhet och offentlig förvaltning förändrats genom nätverket? Om ja på vilket sätt?
10. Har era arbetssätt kopplat till mänskliga rättigheter, jämställdhet och kapacitetsutveckling förändrats under tiden som ni deltagit i nätverket? Om ja på vilket sätt? Om nej, varför tror du att det är så?
11. Behöver synen på kapacitetsutveckling förändrats inom myndigheters arbete med internationellt utvecklingssamarbete, om ja på vilket sätt?
12. Hur tycker du att svenska myndigheter generellt och specifikt bör arbeta med kapacitetsutveckling för internationellt utvecklingssamarbete framöver?
13. Har nätverket för lärande bidragit till något mervärde för dig? Om ja på vilket sätt? Om inte, varför tror du att det är så och vad behövs?
14. Är du med i några andra etablerade nätverk/system för gemensamt lärande och utbyte av erfarenheter mellan svenska myndigheter när det gäller hur myndigheterna arbetar med internationellt utvecklingssamarbete? Vilka? Hur fungerar dessa?
15. Hur bör arbetet i N4L bedrivas framöver? Hur bör det organiseras? Hur skulle N4L kunna ge värde/nytta för dig och din myndighet (innehåll i och former för nätverkandet etc)? Hur kan den gemensamma lärprocessen utformas? Vilka aktiviteter är av intresse?
16. Vilken roll skulle Naturvårdsverket kunna ha i N4L framöver?
17. Har du några övriga synpunkter?

***Frågor till representant från departementet***

1. Berätta kort om din roll kopplat till Globala programmet, d v s kopplat till att stärka ’’environmental governance’’ på global och nationell nivå i länder som omfattas av det svenska biståndet och genomförande av miljökonventioner.
2. Finns det idag etablerade nätverk och/eller samarbeten mellan myndigheter för gemensamt lärande och erfarenhetsutbyte kopplat till internationellt utvecklingssamarbete? Hur fungerar dessa nätverk/samarbeten idag? Vilken roll har Naturvårdsverket i dessa nätverk/samarbeten?
3. Har du några förslag på hur samarbetet mellan myndigheter och andra aktörer kan utvecklas kopplat till kapacitetsutveckling kring frågor gällande internationellt utvecklingssamarbete och mänskliga rättigheter?
4. Har du några kommentarer kring hur Naturvårdsverket arbetar med kapacitetsutveckling av medarbetare i frågor som rör internationellt utvecklingssamarbete och mänskliga rättigheter?
5. Har synen på miljö och mänskliga rättigheter på något sätt förändrats på departementet? Om ja, på vilket sätt och hur har det tagit sig i uttryck konkret (t.ex. skrivelser, regeringsuppdrag, konventionsarbete och förhandlingar)?
6. Hur ser du på kompetensen hos Naturvårdsverket och andra myndigheter inom konventionsarbete och internationellt utvecklingssamarbetet när det kommer till mänskliga rättigheter och miljö? Saknas något för att ni på departementet ska kunna driva de här frågorna?
7. Hur ser du på Naturvårdsverkets roll och ansvar när det gäller nätverkande, gemensamt lärande och utbyte av erfarenheter mellan svenska myndigheter kopplat till internationellt utvecklingssamarbete?
8. Hur skulle du vilja se att departementet arbetade med miljö och mänskliga rättigheter? Vad ser du för hinder och möjligheter för detta? Vad skulle behövas för att ni ska kunna utnyttja den här potentialen (om du tycker att den finns)? Hur skulle Naturvårdsverket kunna bidra till detta?
9. Hur tycker du att myndigheter som Naturvårdsverket borde arbeta med miljö och mänskliga rättigheter i konventionsarbete och inom internationellt utvecklingssamarbete?
10. Upplever du en ökad kunskap och/eller ökat intresse kring samband mellan miljöfrågor och mänskliga rättigheter – inom departementet/Naturvårdsverket/andra myndigheter/andra aktörer?
11. Vad ser du för potential och fördelar med att göra kopplingen mellan miljö och mänskliga rättigheter? Vad ser du för hinder och möjligheter med detta?
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## Persons Met, Interviewed and Consulted

#### Sub programme 1: Environmental Governance for Sustainable Natural Resource Management, in collaboration with UNDP (EGP)

**Management team, Members of BoA, focal points and SEPA staff**

Ms Maria Bang, Global Programme Manager

Ms Ann-Cathrin Pedersen, Project Manager EGP, UNDP

Ms Sanna Due, policy advisor, SEPA/UNDP HQ

Mr Tim Scott, Team leader EGP, UNDP HQ

Mr Carl Bruch, Member of EGP BoA, Director Environmental Law Institute

Mr Flaviano Bianchini, Member of EGP BoA, Source International Founder and director

Mr Casper Sonesson, Global Policy Advisor for Extractive Industries and sustainable development, UNDP

Mr Janeiro Avelino, EGP focal point in Mozambique, UNDP

Ms. Barkhas Losolsuren, EGP focal point Mongolia, UNDP

Mr. Felipe Lesmes, EGP focal point Colombia, UNDP

Mr Geoffrey Omedo, EGP Programme officer, UNDP Kenya

Ms Claudia Ituarte, Member of EGP BoA, International, Environmental Law Advisor at SwedBio at SRC

Ms. Jenny Iao-Jörgensen, Lunds University

**Colombia**

Ms. Maria Paula Franco, Contracts and Agreements Specialist, National Environmental Licensing Agency (ANLA)

Ms. Johanna Vanessa Garcia, Specialized Professional, Infrastructure Group, National Environmental Licensing Agency (ANLA)

Ms. Carolina Pulido, Project Manager, Cifras y Conceptos S. A.

Ms. Viviana Arango, Centro Regional de Empresas y Emprendimientos Responsables, Institute for Human Rights and Business

Ms. Alexandra Gil Taboas, Project Support Officer for Extractive Industries, UNDP Panama

Ms. Jimena Puyana, Head of environmental department, UNDP Colombia

**Mongolia**

Mr. Batbayar Nyamtseren, Member of the WG/ Project Board, Director, Department of Environment, Geology and Mining Inspection, General Agency for Specialized Inspection (GASI)

Mr. Enkhbat Altangerel, Member of the WG/ Project Board, Head, Division for Environmental Assessment and Auditing, MET

Mr. Altangerel Ch, Member of the WG/ Project Board, Head of Secretariat, National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia (NHRCM)

Ms. Bayarsaihan N, Chairman of the Steps without border NGO

Dr. Banzragch Ts, Consultant/Expert in environmental science, Board member of Association on forest sector NGO

Mr. Ganchimeg S, Head of division for environment, geology and mining, Uvurkhangai

### Sub programme 2: Partnership for an environmentally sustainable One UN, in collaboration Sustainable UN (SUN) within UN Environment (UNEP)

Ms Maria Bang, Global Programme Manager

Ms Emma Håkansson , Project leader, Swedish EPA/SUN

Ms Kristina von Oelreich, KTH/SUN, former Swedish EPA

Mr Tom Sengalama, EMS pilot, MONUSCO

Mr Andy Cole, EMS pilot, WFP

Ms Violaine Haeringer, Secretariat headquarters, EMS pilot

Ms. Flavia Reale, ESCAP, EMS pilot

Ms Anne Jona, UNFCCC, part of the UN EMS working group

Ms Jannica Pitkanen, Secretariat of the United Nations Environment Management Group

Mr Mitch Hall, Director and Co-Founder Impacti

### Sub programme 3: Ecosystem Services Accounting for Development (ESAfD) in collaboration with Environment for Development (EfD) and the World Bank´s Global initiative for Wealth Accounting Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES)

Ms. Maria Bang, Global Programme Manager

Dr. Matías Piaggio, Executive coordinator and Researcher, CATIE

Dr. Byela Tibesigwa, Researcher, University of Dar es Salaam

Dr. Zhaoyang Liu, Researcher, Peking University / University of Cambridge

Dr. Dawit Woubishet Mulatu, Researcher, ECRC, Ethiopian Development Research Institute

Dr. Richard Mulwa, Researcher, University of Nairobi

Dr. Michael Ndwiga, Researcher, University of Nairobi

Dr. Jane Turpie, Researcher, University of Cape Town

Dr. Per Strömberg, Researcher, Swedish EPA (Naturvårdsverket)

Dr. Juha Siikamäki, Principal Investigator, IUCN, Chief Economist

### Sub programme 4: Capacity development of staff at Swedish EPA

Ms. Maria Bang, Global Programme Manager

Ms. Emma Håkansson, Project Manager, Swedish EPA/SUN

Ms. Ann-Cathrin Pedersen, Project Manager EGP, UNDP

Dr. Per Strömberg, Researcher, Swedish EPA

Ms. Lena Skiöld, N4L, the Swedish Public Employment Services

Ms. Stina Andersson, the Ministry of the Environment and Energy
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## Documentation of Materials Reviewed and Cited

**Overall documentation**

Global Programme Annual Report 2017, 2016, 2015 and 2014

Financial Report 2017, 2016, 2015 and 2015

Proposal for Global Programme March 2014 – March 2018, 2014-01-27

Tjänsteköpsöverenskommelse Naturvårdsverkets globala program 2014-2018, Sida 13/000230

2018 (signed 20140901)

Revised Budget SEPA Global Programme Version 2018 01 15

**Sub programme 1: Environmental Governance for Sustainable Natural Resource Management, in collaboration with UNDP**

Results framework sub programme 1 , phase 2 September 2015, June2018, , 31 aug 2017

Annual Work Plans for the sub programme

Annual Work Plans for each of the programme countries

EGP M&E data synthesis report, Version 1 20180125

Monitoring & Evaluation Framework EGP, Version 1.1 February 2017

EGP ToC evolving versions

EGP Internal Stocktaking Workshop, 30 January 2018

Summary Report: In-depth Study of EGP’s effectiveness and impact in Kenya and Mozambique, Jenny Iao-Jörgensen, draft 2018-07-01

Notes from the Outcome Harvesting/Mapping session, Kwale 15-17 May 2018

Background on the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework, Elinor Ostrom, The Policy Studies Journal, Vol. 39, No. 1, 2011

Country Study Report on Kenya and Mozambique, Jenny Iao-Jörgensen , draft 2018-09-01

Dialogue report: The Stockholm Dialogue on the Nexus Between Human Rights, Environmental Sustainability and Conflict Prevention, 20180612

List: EGP global level contribution, UNDP NY, 13 July 2018

Report on the Joint Workshop on Environmental Governance of the Mining Sector- Putting Policies into Practice, Kwale, 15-17 May 2018

Evaluation: Workshop on Improving Governance in the Colombian Extractive Sector, 30 Nov - 1 Dec 2017

Annual Meeting report: Strengthening Human Rights and Rule of Law in the Governance of Mining - From Policy to Practice, New York, 6-8 November 2017

Annual Workshop Feedback, November 9th 2017

Summary of Advisory Board Meeting, Stockholm, Sweden – 30 November 2016

Advisory Board Terms of Reference

Feedback Form for the NBSAP Forum Webinar Series & GOXI Learning Series

GOXI Survey Fall 2017

Results Framework Sub programme 1, phase 2, September 2015-June1 2018, 31 August 2017

Terms of Reference for Expert on Mission assigned to UNDP

United Nations Development Programme Job Description

UNDP QA

UNDP Global Project Document: Environmental Governance for Sustainable Natural Resource Management

Back to office reports (8st)

ToR Knowledge Management and Lessons Learnt

Third-party cost-sharing agreement between SEPA and UNDP. November 2014

Draft Concept Note: Biodiversity Law and Governance: Contributions of International Law and Governance to Mainstreaming Biodiversity, 2018-08-12

Concept Note: Regional Workshop. Participatory Environmental Governance for Sustainable Natural Resources Management in the Latin American and Caribbean Region, 2018-10-03--05

Pilot Community Based Environmental Monitoring, Concept Note for Environmental Monitoring Activity, not dated

Transcription of cards used during Session 4 (External Evaluation of EGP) of the 2018 EGP Annual Global Workshop (October 17, 2018)

**Sub programme 2: Partnership for an environmentally sustainable One UN, in collaboration Sustainable UN (SUN) within UN Environment (UNEP)**

Action plan for integrating sustainable development practices into Secretariat-wide operations and facilities management, UN General Assembly, 27 April 2017

ToR, EMG Consultative Process - Moving Towards a Common Approach: Environmental and Social Standards and Accountability for UN Programmes/Projects, 14 March 2017

Greening the blue report, UN annual reports 2016, 2017 and 2018

Note: Moving towards 2030 - Environmental and social sustainability in the UN system in the next decennium

SEPA Global Programme Extension Proposal 2018-2019, 2018 01 15

Briefing Note: Moving Towards a Common Approach: Environmental and Social Standards for UN Programming

Results of a stocktaking exercise undertaken year 2015, describing the development and implementation of environmental management systems (EMS) across the UN system, May 2016

Draft final report for sub programme 2, 2018-07-13

**Sub programme 3: Ecosystem Services Accounting for Development (ESAfD) in collaboration with Environment for Development (EfD) and the World Bank´s Global initiative for Wealth Accounting Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES)**

Papers and products ESAfD

List of contacts ESAfD

List of papers and progress ESAf

Discussion Paper: In Search of Urban Recreational Ecosystem Services in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, Byela Tibesigwa, Razack Lokina, Fred Kasalirwe, Richard Jacob, Julieth Tibanywana, and Gabriel Makuka, March 2018

Discussion Paper: Naturally Available Pollinator Decline Will Decrease Household Food Security and Increase the Gender Gap in Nutrition between Men and Women Who Head Smallholder Farm Households in Sub-Saharan Africa, Byela Tibesigwa, march 2018)

**Sub programme 4: Capacity development of staff at Swedish EPA**

Baseline study : Capacity development of staff at the Swedish EPA, 2015-03-25

Results framework : Capacity development of staff at the Swedish EPA, 2014-06-09

Utvärderingar av seminarier och kurser (seminar evaluations)

Workshop programs

List of participants at programme activities
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**Acronyms and Abbreviations**

**ANLA** National Environmental Licensing Agency (Colombia)

**ASG** Assistant Secretary General

**BCM** Business Continuity Management

**BPPS** Bureau for Policy and Programme Support, UNDP

**CEB** Chief Executives Board

**CITES** Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered

 Species of Wild Fauna and Flora

**CO2** Carbon dioxide

**CPR** Committee of Permanent Representatives

**DPKO** Department of Peacekeeping Operations

**EfD** Environment for Development

**EGP** Environmental Governance for Sustainable Natural Resource Management *or* Environmental Governance Programme

**EMAS** Eco-Management and Audit Scheme

**EMG** Environment Management Group

**EMS** Environmental Management System

**EMS WG** Environmental Management System Working Group

**ESAforD** Ecosystem Services Accounting for Development

**ESCAP** Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

**ESES Framework** Environmental, Social and Economic Sustainability Framework

**ESS** Environmental and Social Sustainability

**ESS Framework** Framework for Advancing Environmental and Social Sustainability in the UN System

**FAO** Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

**GASI** General Agency for Specialized Inspection (Mongolia)

**GCF** Green Climate Fund

**GEF** Global Environment Facility

**GHG** Greenhouse gas

**GGN** Global Guidance Notes on mining and human rights

**GRI** Global Reporting Initiative

**HLCM** High Level Committee on Management

**HLCM PN** High Level Committee on Management’s Procurement Network

**IFAD** International Fund for Agricultural Development

**IAMLADP** International Annual Meeting on Language Arrangements,

 Documentation and Publications

**IMG** Issue Management Group

**INFM** Inter-Agency Network of Facilities Managers

**ISO** International Organization for Standardization

**IUCN** International Union for Conservation of Nature

**JIU** Joint Inspection Unit

M&E Monitoring & Evaluation

**MET** Ministry of Environment and Tourism in Mongolia

**MDGs** Millennium Development Goals

**MINUSTAH** United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti

**MMHI**  Ministry of Mining and Heavy Industry in Mongolia

**MoA** Memorandum of Agreement

**MONUSCO** United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo

**MoU** Memorandum of Understanding

**NHRCM** National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia

**OIOS** Office of Internal Oversight Services

**OLA** Office of Legal Affairs

**ORMS** Organizational Resilience Management System

**PDCA cycle** Plan, do, check, act cycle

**PoW** Programme of Work

**RoLPA** Rule of Law in Public Administration assessment

**RoLPAM** Rule of Law in Public Administration assessment of Mining

**SEPA** Swedish Environmental Protection Agency

**SESA** Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment

**SDGs** Sustainable Development Goals

**SMS** Sustainability Management System

**SOM** Senior Officials Meeting

**SRD** Sectorial Reference Documents

**SUN** Sustainable United Nations

**Swedish EPA** Swedish Environmental Protection Agency

**ToR** Terms of Reference

**UN** United Nations

**UNCEEA** UN Committee of Experts on Environmental-Economic Accounting

**UNDG** United Nations Development Group

**UNEA** United Nations Environment Assembly

**UNEP** United Nations Environment programme

**UNIFIL** United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon

**UNITAR** United Nations Institute for Training and Research

**UN-NGLS** United Nations Non-governmental Liaison Service

**UN/NY** United Nations Headquarter in New York

**UNOG** United Nations Office at Geneva

**UNON** United Nations Office at Nairobi

**UNU** UN University

**UNSD**  United Nations Statistical Division

**WAVES** World Bank´s Global initiative for Wealth Accounting Valuation of Ecosystem Services

**WFP** World Food Program

**WTO** World Trade Organization

1. http://fpf.forestry.oregonstate.edu/system/files/Ostrom-Background-Institutional%20Analysis-2011.pdf.

 Understanding Institutional Diversity: http://wtf.tw/ref/ostrom\_2005.pdf. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The interview guide will be translated into Spanish and sent to the interviewees in advance [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The interview guide will be translated into Mongolian and sent to the interviewees in advance [↑](#footnote-ref-3)