7t1

fl_Ioo

**MIDTERM EVALUATION
(YEM/97/100/A/01/99)**

**UNDP SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT
PROGRAMME IN YEMEN**

January 2001

**Evaluation Team:
Kamal Siblini (Team Leader - UNDP Consultant)
Ibrahim Sharaffedine (Government Representative)**

A('KNOWW'LEDGEt\IENTS

 Yemen - ITNTP Suctainahle Fnvirnnmental A'/ nttnvement Prn• arome - Alidtetm Review

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The objectives of the UNDP Sustainable Environmental Management Programme (SEMP) are to: i) build capacity of several government institutions, research institutions, NGO's and local communities in environmental management, and more specifically in the field of land degradation, habitat, and biodiversity to endure the sustainable use of Yemen's national resources, and ii) support the National Environment Action Plan (NEAP). The UNDP environment programme encompasses three main areas of intervention i) capacity building in environmental management, ii) land resources management and use, and ii) eco-tourism.

The objective of this evaluation is to assess the performance of the programme within the framework of national execution and the programme approach. Accordingly, the evaluation will determine, as objectively and independently as possible, the reality of the programme goals, its relevance, cost-effectiveness, management efficiency, the achievements in capacity building process and indicators of sustainability. Within this context, the evaluation team shall identify problems and constraints that are encountered during implementation, the nature and extent of government and related international agencies support in address, implementation of NEX Modality and Programme approach. Ultimately the evaluation team ought to compile the findings and formulate welldefined recommendations for action and remedy as well as the lessons learned, if any. This evaluation encompasses to all sub-programmes except those relating to biodiversity.

This evaluation is based on the Project Support Document and other documents that further detailed project design. Moreover, the evaluation will adhere to the information required in the "Guideline of Evaluators" of the UNDP.

Both the progamme approach and national execution modality are being implemented for the first time in Yemen. The pressure on both UNDP and government to successfully implement these modalities is quite significant. The evaluation focused on the results and achievements of the environment programme with additional focus on the modalities of implementation.

The programme achieved some important results but in some cases fell short of achieving some of its required objectives. This was partially the result of a weak design to bridge the gap between the outputs and the objectives and clearly define an implementation mechanism, and an inadequate *effort* to take corrective actions and refocus the programme when it was needed.

The programme spent approximately 75% of its budget, or USD 4.8 Million, out of the original USD 6.5 Million. Government contribution is approximately 11% of the budgeted amount of USD 450,000. Project Management Unit expenditures amounted to approximately 13% of total project costs.

The areas of intervention of the programme are hereby divided into five themes for which the results are summarized below:

> *Capacity Building:* improved capacity of government staff in environmental management.
> *Technical Assistance:* significant outputs were produced in terms of studies, legal framework and training. Weakness was apparent in delays, lack of coordination, incomplete work, and delivery of inputs, and transfer of capacity to nationals.
> *Awareness:* increased awareness in government and some communities.
> *Legal Framework, Studies and Research:* Significant progress but requiring further action to insure that the outputs are used to their full extent and are sustainable.
> *Community Participation:* Successful pilots in participation, readiness to sustain, and strong ownership. *National Execution:* Good government support (non-financial), but overall not successful.

> *Programme Approach:* Inadequate implementation of both executing agency and some LIN supporting agencies and weak monitoring and evaluation. Lack of CT. NDP guidance affected executing agency performance.

The findings are divided into nine different areas that form the cornerstone of the recommendations to follow. These areas are:

> *a) Continued Relevance of the Programme:* Although the programme was relevant at design time, the project document did not define the mechanism of

implementation clearly enough for the programme *to* be implemented successfully. There was a lack of capacity building in order to implement the approach sought, weak agreements with UN agencies, unclear roles and responsibilities, and lack of an exit strategy.

b) *Programme Results and Achievements:* the programme achieved some significant results but was hampered by: i) weak delivery of agency outputs, ii) a focus on outputs rather than objectives, iii) an unclear link between the Programme and Sub-Programmes, *iv)* a lack of baseline, target and actual indicators to evaluate results, v) inadequate follow up of training, studies, awareness, and legal framework activities, vi) and a lack of cumulative reporting

e) *Effectiveness of the Approach Used to Produce the Project Results:* the multiplicity of implementers and beneficiaries was one of the reasons that the implementation was not effective. Other issues faced are: the delays in input/resources delivery, weak monitoring, reporting and evaluation system, unclear ro --s and responsibilities of stakeholders, lack of training to assist in management and operations, high staff rollover, and a lack of formal staff evaluation.

d) *The Efficiency of Programme Management:* Coordination and communication between sub-pro ᵗ rammes, within sub-programmes, between government and UN agencies and government (to include PM) and UNDP was inadequate to successfully support the multitude of tasks and stakeholder in this proj et. The vague procedures left the door open for misinterpretation of delivery of some inputs and delays i processing input requests to include budget advances largely hampered work progress. The we ess of the programme support document, sub-programme four document and agreements with UN age ies created an information gap that was hard to fill in midstream. While there were some positive im acts of implementing the National Execution (NEX) approach, its performance together with the progr., e approach leaves a lot to be desired. The weak capacity to implement NEX, the unclear roles and responsibilities, the inadequate procedures, and the lack of an exit strategy greatly contributed to its partially unsatisfactory results. Government support on the other hand was inadequate when it c e to⸴ cost sharing and although progress was made in coordinating between government agencies, mu h improvement is still required. The Programme did not take advantage of common grounds in co munity participation and income generating activities in the UNDP poverty programme and capacity bui ding and local administration initiatives in the UNDP governance programme.

I

e) *Transfer of Capacity to Nationals:* While no evaluation took place to evaluate the contribution of technical assistance and most training activities it was evident that transfer of capacity was weak Relevant training sessions for planning, monitoring, reporting and evaluation were not conducted, there was a lack of documentation to report on lessons learned, there was a confusion between capaci building and awareness and in some cases government counterpart were not receptive to the cap ty building effort.

Views of Beneficiaries: Beneficiaries complained from delays in implementing their projects, the funding, and the inadequate budget. They developed unrealistic high expectations for funding an

delays in lacked

understanding of programme objectives both of which could have been avoided with proper introduction of the programme.

g)

Impact and Sustainability: although the outputs from the programme were relatively satisfactory, the design gap between outputs and objectives made it hard to assess the potential impact that the programme might have had. The inadequate capacity building effort to manage and monitor projects, the lack of documentation and the absence of baseline, target and actual indicators point to weak ability to sustain some of the efforts undertaken.

h) Resource Mobilization: while resource mobilization consultants were hired to assist in the effort to identify needs, collect information about donors and submit proposal for future funding, the process was slow and not as effective as it could have been and the government capacity was not adequate. The delay in actively addressing the government cost sharing issues by UNDP hampered the resources mobilization for the programme.

The evaluation team recommends immediate action on a number of items to salvage some of the results, collect some of lessons learned expected from this programme, and prepare for the next modality to implement sustainable environmental management activities. Considering that much of the issues in the programme directly or indirectly relate to the execution mechanism, the modality experience of the programme approach and National
Execution takes forefront in the corrective activities to be implemented.

It is apparent that the implementation of the co-existing two approaches, programme and national execution, while possibly a good one, needs better preparation. Therefore a phased implementation of the approaches in recommended. This should start with reviewing the validity of the programme approach in terms of what it means to UNDP and to the government. If a programme approach is to be pursued, it will need to adhere to some major changes in the planning process and should include an exit strategy and criteria of programme success. The programme approach will be implemented in parallel with training in project management, planning, monitoring and evaluation for both UNDP environment programme staff and

government agency staff to include the EPC, the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, Ministry of Cultural and Tourism, Agricultural Research and Extension and Authority and any other relevant government agencies. Once the programme approach has been validated a decision should be made regarding the adoption of the NEX modality and how it would fit with the programme approach, given the capacity building effort, the lessons learned from the current NEX implementation, and some predefined criteria. The NEX implementation will also be subject to the planning changes for the programme approach in addition to special attention to an exit strategy, sustainability, budgeting rules and regulations, clear responsibilities and cost sharing.

Furthermore, the evaluation team is recommending a number of actions regarding the ongoing programme to insure that the results of the programme activities are salvaged and put to the best use possible. The programme should be extended to a maximum of 12 months with sub-programme specific end dates. Exit strategies will need to be identified for each of the sub-programme and non-performing UN Agencies would be dropped from the subprogrammes. An evaluation will be planned in a timely fashion to assess the results of the programme possibly together with the capacity building efforts and the implementation of the programme approach. The current PMU setup and its function should remain the same to insure continuity of implementation.

It is recommended that the following activities be extended for the sub-programmes:

- SP 1: Introduce training on management, monitoring, reporting and evaluation and complete resource mobilization effort
- SP2: finalize ongoing consultancies, and software & hardware
- SP3: Deliver completed outputs

- SP4: continue with clear objectives, finish ongoing projects, start documentation (budget for the activity), and define IUCN role
- SP5: deliver remaining outputs - monitor legal framework activities
- Special Programme - Support to Women in Coastal Areas: Proceed with supporting existing centers, focusing on additional needs, sustainability and documenting lessons learned

The evaluation is also recommending that UNDP considers the creation of the position of a Monitoring and Evaluation Officer for all UNDP programmes. The officer would be responsible for monitoring and evaluation to include training and reporting, assist in the coordination between UNDP programmes, and be involved in designing new programmes.

The evaluation brought about a number of important lessons. Although is it important to focus on capacity building in subjects within the environment sector it is even more critical, in order to sustain this effort, that capacity building efforts would target the ability of the government to plan, monitor, report and evaluate projects. Clear and detailed designs with

well-defined roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders are also essential for successful implementation and sustainability of the programme. Other lessons learned include: i) Baseline data and targets are essential for programme evaluation, ii) Importance of a monitoring, reporting and evaluation mechanism, iii) Better planning of evaluations, iv) Timely and coordinated delivery of inputs and outputs, v) Clear and detailed designs are essential for successful implementation and sustainability of the programme, vi) Assessing the relevance and required capacity of any UNDP approach or modality vis a vis the government work portfolio is essential to the success of that approach, and vii) Objectives need to be at the forefront of implementation

1. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

 1.1
   Objectives of Evaluation
As per the terms of reference, the mid term evaluation of the Sustainable Environmental Management Programme is intended to assess the performance of the programme within the framework of national execution and UNDP programme approach. The evaluation team was to "determine, as objectively and independently as possible, the reality of the programme goals, its relevance, cost-effectiveness, management efficiency, the achievements in capacity building process and indicators of sustainability. Within this context, the evaluation team shall identify problems and constraints that are encountered during implementation, the nature and extent of government and related international agencies support in addressing the implementation of NEX Modality and Programme approach. Ultimately the evaluation team ought to compile the findings and formulate well-defined recommendations for action and remedy as well the lessons learned, if any."

The evaluation will build upon the different experiences of the executing and implementing agencies, government counterparts, UNDP and beneficiaries to develop a comprehensive assessment of the programme results, potential impact and sustainability, and performance of the stakeholders in implementing the NEX modality and programme approach.

In this document, the word "programme" will refer to the UNDP Sustainable Environmental Management Programme, while the word "sub-programme" will be used for projects under the SEMP.

The word "evaluation", and unless otherwise specified refers to the current midterm evaluation.

The current evaluation, with terms of reference attached in Annex 3, attempts to

complement the existing reviews and assessments in progress such as that for the development of the NEX for Yemen.

The evaluation covers all the stakeholders involved in the programme, namely:

- Environmental Protection Council (EPC): as the national executing agent of the programme.
- The Programme Management Unit (PMU)
- Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation: Coordination/Supervision Unit (including the Technical Executive Secretary & Accountant), sub-programme 4 units in Sana'a, Taiz, Shabwa and Hadramout, and related NGO's
- General Directorate for Forestry and Desertification Control (GDFDC) for sub-programme 3
- Agriculture Research and Extension Authority AREA for sub-programme 2
- General Tourism Authority (GTA) for sub-programme 5
- The participating communities within the area of sub-programmes 3 and 4
- Two women's centers in Hodeidah Governorates for the Special Sub Programme
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) for sub-programmes 2, 3, and 4
- United Nations Operation Support (UNOPS) for sub-programme 1
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) for sub-programme 2
- World Tourism Organization for sub-programme
- International Center for Agricultural Research in Dry Areas (ICARDA) for sub-programme 2
- The World Conservation Union (IUCN) for sub-programme 4

Covering the following geographical areas:

1.2
   Evaluation Methodology, Scope & Structure of the Report

Sana'a:	UNDP
	EPC, PMU, GDFDC (sub-programme 3), Coordination/Supervision Unit, sub
	programme 4 S na'a unit and
sub-programme 5 Dhamar:	AREA (sub-pi⁻ag
vnune 2).	
Taiz:	sub-programn ' Taiz unit and NGO's
Hodeidah:	NGOs women's center - Sub-programme 7
Shabwa:	sub-programma: 4 Shabwa unit and NGO's
Sayoun:	sub-progranuw.m 4 Sayoun unit and NGO's

The time frame of the programme is Arwiá 1ʲ997 until June 2000.

The midterm evaluation took place from November 5 to

November 26, 2000. A number of activities took place in

preparing the evaluation report, namely:

- Review of programme documents, specifically, the PSD. progress reports, terminal and ex-post reports, Country Programme Review, the Strategy Paper prepared for EPC by the Dutch Team, UNDP guidelines, **PSDs** of other UNDP programmes, and a number of other documents that were relevant to the programme.
- Meetings with all concerned parties mentioned above (a list of people met is attached in annex 2)
- Field visits to all the areas above except for Shabwa due to time constraints
- Questionnaires to sub-programmes regarding their views on the achievements and problems in
  implementing sub-programme activities.
- Participatory group meeting,•._ to discuss particular issues
- Contact with the resource mobilization consultant via email
- Meeting with consultants preparing the Yemen NEX modality manual

The evaluation process - subject of this ToR - was applied to the first five sub-programmes including the activities related to the special programme on Support for Women in the Coastal Areas.

It was understood by the evaluation team that due to the unavailability of qualified personnel, an Environmental Specialist from UNDP headquarters, that was supposed to join the evaluation team, did not participate in the evaluation mission.

1.3   Condition for Success of Evaluation

To insure the success of the evaluation r•~u~ts, the following conditions need to be met:

a)   Support and commitmr,*w -,f UNDP and executing agencies and they representatives
b)   Receptive and responsive decision-making process
e)   Active role of stakehoWars in development and carrying out recommendations
d) Appropriate capacity*'(,!- i !NDP staff to ensure effective implementation of
        evaluation recommendations

The objective of this review will be to H#dight some of the implementation issues, accumulate lessons learned, and if necessary make changes to the activities or the tools used to implement them. Some of the criteria to measure the success of recommendation implementation are:

a)   Extent of UNDP implei˙ientation of the evaluation recommendations

b)   Ability to better monitor and report on programme and sub-programme

c)   Extent of the support of management in the application of
newly acquired skills d)   Increased cases of lessons learned

e)   Ability of I_1NDP to sustain the ideas that resulted from the evaluation

f)   Extent to which some of the relevant recommendations have been
institutionalized

g)   Ability t transfer knowledge to executing agencies

2. **PROGRAMME RESULTS**

The Sustain,: i L L ivironmental Management Programme YEM/97/100, according to the terms
of reference and
2.1

Programnme Descri tion

the Project   ,   Document (PS D), is funded by UNDP and formulated within the concept of National
S.·   and UNDP Programme Approach. The programme began in 1997 and is expected to finish at
Execution t i'   '+íF1'0. The programme engages the following agencies:
the end c''

Four gon-.;~ ᵣ>₃ₜₜ₊._;:f **agencies:**

Executing		Environmental Protection Council (EPC)
Governm~·?	rpart	Ministry of Agriculture & Irrigation (MAI);
Agencies		General Tourism Authority (GTA), Agricultural Research and Extension Authority (AREA), NGO's and local communities.

Six Internai.   niplementing Agents:

United N *s*	-aies:	FAO, UNOPS, UNEP and WTO
Internatior	Us:	IUCN
Internationa *V* rfessional Center		ICARDA

The over,•;.   ,'the programme are to build the capacity of several government institutions, research
instituticw;s, . ~C ,)'r. and local communities in the environmental management in the field
of land degradation, Habitat and Bi{xdiversity to ensure the sustainable use of Yemen's
national resources. The programme also, supports national priority actions identified in the
National Environment Action Plan (NEAP) and other government dl·:;   .;ntation. The

NEAP has been incorporated into the five-year Development Plan 1996-2000, which describ. : ;. ctoral priorities within the context of national development objectives.

The total bud, ..the programme is US$ 6,504,300, shared between UNDP and Government as follows:

UNDP   ;1SD 6,054,300 (TRAC 1&2)
Governme~   t - J 450,000

The Govermr., ! -ost sharing is borne by the local institutions involved in the programme.

The progr: m':'e structured, according to the PSD, into seven sub-programmes with the objectives of 1) Strengthening the coordination capability of the EPC, 2) Supporting units with the Land Resource Utilization Center in AREA. 3) Planning for desertification control, 4) Promoting community participation in land resource management. ', S. stainable develop Eco-Tourism by establishing an Eco-Tourism department in the GTA, 6) Formulation of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, 7) Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity of Socotra Archipelago.

The follow in   :. brief description of the objectives of the first five sub-programmes subjective to this evaluation in addition to that of the special programme to support women in coastal areas:

Sup-Programme 1: Coordination and Support to Environment Management

- Strengthening capacity building of EPC and its Technical Secretariat (EPC-TS) in coordination of external [supped] to environmental interventions; where overlap of interventions is avoided as much as possible and interventions are planned and secured addressing national priority needs

Sub-Programme 2: **Information and Advise on Land Resources Utilization**

- Establishment of Land Resource Management Center through the formation of three Units for Land
 Resource Utilization Planning, Land Degradation Monitoring and Genetic Resources.
- Preparation of maps for national desertification and land Degradation and land assessment of critical
 areas experiencing or threatened by land degradation.
- Establishment of national inventory and data base development of fauna and flora.

Sub-Programme 3: Planning for Desertification Control

- •Strengthening the forest sector, at central and regional levels, to acquire the capacity and necessary skills to provide general guidance and services for sound land resources management with special emphasis on desertification control planning and management. (Provision of training, redrafting of forest policy and forest law to reflect national priorities. Establishment of national network for desertification control).
- Mobilization and awareness raising among government officials, local communities, NGO's and other related institutions, programmes and projects for their direct involvement, participation and support in desertification control, planning and management.
- Collection of data and information as well as provision of sectoral studies in related field of land resources.
- Elaboration and production, through beneficiary participatory approaches, of a National Conceptual and Strategic Framework to Combat Desertification as well as Regional Action Plan focusing on areas experiencing or being threatened by desertification.

Sub-Programme 4: Community Participation in Land Resources Management

- Models for Community Participation in Land Resources Management tested in four governorates (Hadramout, Shabwa, Sana'a and Taiz) to investigate, document, revitalize, and strengthen indigenous natural resources management systems (INRMS).
- Support the identified local action via the provision of relevant external inputs on the basis of specific

  agreement and with the emphasis on sustainability and capacity building of regional key actors.
- Monitor and the above process and result using participatory approaches, and draw lessons for all

  components for the sustainable practices of the country as a whole.

Sub-Programme 5: Promotion of Eco-Tourism

- Production of necessary legislation, laws and monitoring standards to be adopted by the cabinet.
- Raising public awareness locally and outside on importance of Eco-tourism as a potential sustainable source for development.

Special Programme: Support to Women in Costal Areas

- Creating incoming generating activities using material from the surrounding environment through the establishment of Women Centers

The Programme forms an integral part of the four other Government Programmes (water, poverty alleviation through job creation and sustainable livelihoods, decentralization/governance and disaster management), all of which would work together in an integrated and coordinated manner towards realization of national development objectives, including sustainable environmental management.

2.2   Programme Progress
For the purpose of this evaluation the areas of intervention of the programme are divided into five themes for which the results are summarized below:

Environment Programme

Capacity Building: improved capacity of government staff in environmental management.
Technical Assistance: significant outputs were produced in terms of studies, legal framework and training. Weakness was apparent in delays, lack of coordination, incomplete work, and delivery of inputs, and transfer of capacity to nationals.
Awareness: increased awareness in government and some communities.
Legal Framework, Studies and Research: Significant progress but requiring further action to insure that the outputs are used to their full extent and are sustainable.
Community Participation: Successful pilots in participation, readiness to sustain, and strong ownership.

At the programme management level the progress of the two approaches associated with the programme implementation are summarized below:

National Execution: Good government support (non-financial), but overall not successful. *Programme Approach:* Inadequate implementation of both executing agency and some UN supporting agencies and weak monitoring and evaluation. Lack of UNDP guidance affected executing agency performance.

The following is the description of the achievements per sub-programme. An information sheet describing the achievements and issues as perceived by individual sub-programmes is attached in Annex 1.

Sup-Programme 1: Coordination and Support to Environment Management

Activity	Progress
Two staff selected, trained and working according to adequate job descriptions	Completed
Joint steering committee established with MPD	Completed
Overview over existing and pipeline environmental management activities by national and international agencies gained	Completed
Reporting system for environmental management activities established	Completed
EPC and line ministries advised on rights and obligations related to international	Completed

conventions

Knowledge of potential sources of external support and how to seek and report	Partially completed
External support which reflects national priorities applied for	Started and in progress
National agencies priorities shared and discussed between them	Partially completed
Reporting system on environmental management activities operational	Partially completed
NEAP updated	Not Completed

Sub-Programme 2: Information and Advise on Land Resources Utilization

Activity	Progress
Functional Land Resource Utilization Planning Unit	
Two staff selected, trained and working according to adequate job descriptions	Completed
Watershed methodology	First UNEP consultancy failed to produce results. Another consultant was requested 1 " v2 years ago.
Land resource utilization plans made for watersheds	Not completed by consultant
Land resource utilization plans made for ten sites of sub-programme 4 (UNEP)	None completed
Land resource utilization plans made upon request from other national agencies	None completed
One MSc degree in water resource planning obtained	Completed
Functional Land Degradation Monitoring Unit	
Two staff selected, trained and working according to adequate job descriptions	Completed
Manual based on International Soil Reference and Information Center	Not completed
National land degradation map	Not completed. Lack of hardware, software and training required for the work.
Land degradation assessment with maps of critical areas prepared	Not completed
Information collected entered in database	Incomplete
Database linked to GIS	Incomplete
One MSc degree in land conservation / management obtained	In progress
Functional genetic Resources Unit	
Four staff selected, trained and working according to adequate job descriptions	Completed
Existing herbarium re-organized	Completed
Seed material screened, stored and characterized	Completed
Databank and genetic resources established and linked to existing natural resources GIS of the Environmental Resource Assessment for Rural Land Use Planning Project	Completed
Additional genetic material collected	Completed
Herbarium setup	Completed
Databank linked to GIS	Completed
Publication completed on plant genetic resources in Yemen	No available funds in budget
One MSc degree in plant genetics obtained	In Progress

Sub-Programme 3: Planning for Desertification Control

Activity	Progress
One staff selected, trained and working according to adequate job desc tion	Completed
Consolidated view developed on definition of desertification, physical processes	Completed
Underlying causes of desertification, including socio-economic factors studied and presented in a technical report.	Report to be submitted to GDFDC
Traditions of Community involvement & participation in programs supporting land resource management studied and presented in a technical report	Transferred to SP4. Not completed by IUCN
Forest Policy Principles and draft Forest Law reviewed and findings presented in a technical report	To be presented to parliament for approval
Sustainability of externally supported interventions to combat desertification studied and presented in a technical report	Not started

Ksiblini UNDPY ËAfENI >Evaiuation.doc

Strategic plan to combat desertification and action plan
Eleven diplomas in desertification control planning
Completed Completed

Sub-Programme 4: Community Participation in Land Resources Management

Activity	**Progress**
Traditional water management practices studied and results presented in technical reports, pictorial leaflets and posters and on video	Not completed
Traditional management of grazing reserves studied	Not completed
Economic viability of treatment of waster water for fertilizer and irrigation assessed	Not completed
One staff selected and trained and working according to job description	Completed
Local MAWR and MLA staff participating in planning and implementation of pilot projects (10 sites)	Partially completed
Action plans made for community participation in flood control and water harvesting (5 sites), pest management and treatment of slurry and waster water for irrigation (1 site) and grazing management (4 sites)	Not completed
Capacity building of local communities in 4 governorates	Partially completed
Revitalization and documentation of local knowledge and practice in land resource utilizations	Not started

Sub-Programe 5: Promotion of Eco-Tourism

Activity	**Progress**
Four staff selected, trained and working according to adequate job description	Completed
Potential for Eco-tourism studied and presented in a technical report	Awaiting action by the Minister

Systems of information sharing with relevant national and international agencies	Partially completed because of lack of funding
Private sector alerted for eco-tourism Established	Not completed
Need legislation, rules and regulations drafted	Awaiting action by the Minister
Monitoring systems established	No funding available
Three-year action plan for promotion of eco-tourism prepared and in operation	Under preparation
Public awareness campaigns launched	No funding available

Special Programme: Support to Women in Costal Areas

Activity	Progress
Establishment of two women s centers	Completed (4 centers established)
Train Coastal Women in Environmental preservation and handicrafts	Completed (2 centers) - 290 women graduated
Training of trainers	Completed (2 centers)

The table below summarizes the expenditures of the programme up to November 2000 and compares it with the revised and original budgets. *(Source: PMU Finance)*

	Original Budget PSD (USD)	Last Budget Revision (USD)	'Actual Expense to-date (USD)	'% **Actual Expenses to Original Budget**
PMU	873,500	661,737	620,293	71%
SPi	357,600	507,603	454,965	127%
SP2	1,330,900	1,328,840	986,681	74%
SP3	1,013,700	965,643	863,681	85%
SP4	2,667,000	2,583,791	1,616,200	61%
SP4.1	560,070	533,550	391,291	70%
SP4.2	453,390	436,300	323,240	71%
SP4.3	746,760	714,915	408,303	55%
SP4.4	426,720	414,552	206,618	48%
SP4.5	480,060	484,474	286,748	60%
SP5	211,500	270,068	246,618	117%
SP7 & Others & Coastal Women		254,606	59,794	
Total	**6,454,200**	6,572,288	4,848,232	75%

The budget amount remaining on hand is USD 1.8M.

..3. FINDINGS

As per the terms of reference, the findings *h.:w~.* been divided into nine

different themes as follows: ***Continued Relevance of the Programme:***

- Examine whether the programme digs, objectives and expectations are still relevant in the context of the country's changing circumstances.
- Review the extent to which the *objec,: υ* :s, outputs and expected results of the programme as designed initially were realistic bearing in nund the policy decision made by the Government of Yemen and UNDP to opt for a programme approach and national execution for this (and other) programmes, the existing national capacities (particularly tho,;,. EPC) and the resources made available.
- Examine the extent to which the adc·,; . *-T A* of the modalities of national execution and programme approach remain valid.

Programme Results and Achievements:

- Based on PSD objectives and outpol_ .:-·J the various programme workplans, list the main achievement of the programme (and quantify this n ,:,ssible). If quantification is not possible, provide as an accurate description as possible.

Effectiveness of the *Approach Used to Pro· :. ~ :e* ***the Project Results:***

- Review the organization strucLi=e of t'.ie programme (PMU and sub-programme units) and determine
  whether the organization and stnsc! f the programme, the resource, the distribution of responsibilities
  and coordination mechanisms werc opriate for the achievement of the programme objectives.
- Asses whether these organizational ,, s rgements were cost effective.

The Efficiency of Programme Management:

- Asses the efficiency of the approa~. i⁻ ,: *ƒ*c'd in planning, organizing and controlling the delivery of the inputs. This includes the backstopps:,,.; by central PMU and other means (e.g. backstopping secured from implementing agents).
- Asses the coordination and communication process (incl. the information flows) between the various components of the programme.
- Determine whether the programm sayi,ort document was explicit enough on the above and whether sufficient funding was earmarked.
- Asses whether the execution :n~+·ivrv (NEX) was clearly understood by the concerned units and staff (roles and responsibilities) and whether sufficient attention was devoted to this modality as an implicit capacity enhancement objective.
- Asses the nature and extent of the Government's support (policy, financial, human and material) to the programme.
- Review the programme deliver against initial plans and budgets (overall and by

component).

- Review the potential linkages ,461b other UNDP-supported programmes (poverty, and governance in particular).

*** Transfer *of Capacity* to National: ***

Significant focus was put in the programme document on the need to enhance national capacities as a mean of promoting self-reliance and ultimately the sustainability of programme activities and results.

- Examine whether sufficient attention has been given to capacity building and whether the various approaches adopted in this respect were relevant and successful (combination of internal/external training, coaching, guidelines, manuals, etc.)

The Views of the Direct Beneficiaries:

- Examine whether the participation of communities and primary beneficiaries has been adequate in providing the support needed to for the preparation and implementation of the projects and is likely to have an impact on their living conditions.

- What was the level and effectiveness of NGO involvement in planning, programming, decision-making and implementation and evaluation of their own activities?

- To the extent possible, collect the views and

impressions of beneficiaries. *Impact and Sustainability:*

- Although some outcomes may not materialize until many years after completion of programme activities,
  evaluate whether (1) tangible outputs have been achieved and thus, (2) provide a judgment on whether
  any impacts are likely to emerge and remain sustainable. If not, provide the key reasons.
- Asses the impact of the programme on the main beneficiaries, policies and the physical environment, etc.
- To the extent possible highlight linkages (direct or indirect with other UNDP supported programmes
  (poverty, governance and water).

Government Support of the Programme:

- Review the programme resource and assess the extent and nature of the Government's support to the programme (overall direction, advocacy, integration of results into the Government's plans, etc.)

Resource Mobilization:

- Based on discussions with all stakeholders, specify the reasons for the securing the cost sharing contributions initially foreseen in the programme document.
- Assess whether any efforts have been devoted to advocacy and resource mobilization, the concrete steps were taken and the results achieved.
- Review the relevance of the material prepared for this activity (brochures, leaflets, videos, programme proposals, etc.)

Accordingly, the findings of the evaluation are as follows:

3.1 Continued Relevance of the Programme

<div align="center">a)</div>

Unrealistic design vis a vis implementation arrangements: although the programme design was realistic in setting out its outputs and objectives, it fell short in providing the tools and procedures to realize the programme goals. The programme plans did not include any capacity building activities directly related to assisting in programme implementation such as project management, monitoring, reporting and evaluation. This is equally true for the programme approach as far as UNDP is

<div align="center">*Ksibli,,, (VDP}EE1>ENI"Evaótahon,doc*</div>

concerned and the NEX modality as far as EPC, PMU, and other players are concerned. The PMU, UNDP and EPC were expected to implement a new programme without any strengthening of skills required to do the work. This led to an extended learning curve, too much learning by trial and error and no general direction or leading group in attempting to realize programme objectives. The programme objectives, design and expectation remain valid but would require significant changes in the implementation modality to achieve the intended results. More details regarding the efficiency and effectiveness of the NEX modality and Programme approach are in section 3.3 and 3.4.

b) *Inadequate level of coordination details:* in addition to the lacking capacity building, the modality of execution left a lot to be desired for in terms of the level of coordination. It was, and remains unclear, who is or should be in charge of steering the programme in the right direction, who requests and approves any changes to programme activities, and the role and mandates of the international implementing agencies and NGOs. This is mostly apparent in dealing with financial issues in terms of budgeting, spending, approvals, and source of funds. Different rules apply to different players.

3.2 Programme Results and Achievements

Programme results were discussed in section 2. Below are some of the

reasons why it was hard to assess the results and achievements of the programme.

      a) *Weak delivery of agency outputs:* while the international agencies had a leverage in terms of the flexibility they were given to implement their assigned activities, they failed to deliver their outputs in a timely and coordinated manner. In particular, the use of consultants through these agencies was a major source of delays. While some of these delays could be associated with the late recruitment of the consultants, the weak coordination with government agencies and in some cases the lack of participation of the government agencies, the lack of mechanism in place to review assignment results and control budgets greatly affected deliveries.

      b) *Focus on outputs rather than objectives:* both at the programme and sub-programme level there is a noticeable focus on outputs rather than objectives. In most cases it was hard for staff to describe the objectives of the work they are involved in. The spotlight of their work was on producing the expected outputs regardless of the intended sub-programme objective. This is most apparent in sub-programme 4 where on the outset it might seem that the sub-programme was very successful until we look back at its main objective; in addition to being an income generating exercise and assisting communities in managing their natural resources, it was intended to investigate, document, revitalize, and strengthen indigenous natural resources management systems. While to some extent this has taken place a couple of important areas have fallen short of intended objectives. It seems that in most cases the community did not make the link between the activities of the project and the environment. It was simply looked at as an income generating activity and water management for agriculture. In addition, the documentation of the indigenous natural resources management systems was lacking. This greatly affects the sustainability of the programme concept. The sub-programme staff was focusing on assisting as many communities as possible and focusing on the quantitative aspect instead of concentrating on the qualitative aspect of collecting information that can be further used in future projects and natural resource management strategies.

      c) *Unclear link between the Programme and Sub-Programmes:* Similarly, the link between subprogramme objectives and Programme objectives was unclear to staff. Considering that the objectives of the Programme are the sub-programmes names themselves it was hard for staff to decipher the objectives of the Programme without referring to separate sub-programmes. The nomenclature ultimately contributed to the separation of the sub-programme from the programme. Without any common themes it was difficult to implement and view the UNDP Programme as a programme. This was evident in discussions with Government and UNDP staff that kept referring to specific sub-programmes to describe the achievements of the Programme. There was no attempt to organize and

view the sub-programmes as objectives with common themes that can be united under programme objectives.

d) *No baseline, target and actual indicators to evaluate results:* Indicators required to manage and evaluate the programme and sub-programmes were absent. The progeamme design had no baseline data to describe the pre-programme status. No target indicators were developed to compare the intended outcome and impact to the actual indicators. In general, the mechanism to assist in the monitoring and evaluation of the programme and sub-programmes, aside from reports, was absent. In addition, other relevant socio-economic indicators that could be highly valuable in assessing some programme results were not collected.

e) *Inadequate follow up of training, studies, awareness, and legal activities: A* number of such activities were in each of the sub-programmes. In order to achieve its intended impacts most of these activities require additional activities as next steps beyond the completion of the outputs. For example, i) very few trainings involved pre and post-training evaluations, therefore it was hard to assess the success, failure or general impact of such activities; and ii) as for studies and legal framework activities, no additional ex-post activities were included to guide the implementation of the recommendation in these studies and drafted laws. Therefore some of the studies and laws were just produced as outputs with no direction as what will happen to their content.

j) *Lack of cumulative reporting:* the current reporting requirements necessitate the generation of periodic progress reports. However, there is no cumulative reporting that would allow subprogramme coordinators or managers at UNDP and the government agencies to get a cumulative overview of the sub-programme or programme progress. This was apparent in the course of this evaluation were it was necessary to go through all the periodic progress reports to develop an idea of the overall progress to date. This becomes more pronounced when there is a change of staff that requires the new staff to get acquainted with the programme or sub-programme progress.

3.3 Effectiveness of the Approach Used to Produce the Project Results

a) *Weak monitoring, reporting and evaluation system:* the overall planning or lack thereof for the monitoring, reporting, and evaluation, the mechanisms involved, procedures and formats of reports greatly reduced the efficiency and effectiveness of operations and the production of project results. In general, the capacity of monitoring and evaluation in both UNDP and the government is inadequate to effectively implement programme activities.

b) *Unclear roles and responsibilities of stakeholders:* Both the programme support document and the NEX modality document were very unclear about the coordination procedures between the different stakeholder. While the

programme support document provided some of the required terms of references for different staff members it fell short from clearly defining the relationship between different staff and entities. On the other hand, the NEX modality is a generic document that was developed for a number of different countries. The current efforts to recreate the NEX modality document with a Yemen focus will hopefully better detail the coordination process.

e) *Lack of training to assist in management and operations:* Although there has been significant amount of training in the areas of environmental management, no training has taken place in the areas of management, monitoring, reporting and evaluation. This should have been one of the core activities to support the implementation of the NEX modality.

d) *High staff rollover:* it has been noted that there has been a high staff rollover in both UNDP and PMU staff This contributed to a number of implementation delays. The fact that some responsibilities and relationship were not well defined added to the problem as staff had different management styles. It is interesting to note here that some of the PMU staff left to go to other UNDP Programmes where they could have longer contract periods.

e) *Lack of formal staff evaluation: No* staff evaluations are conducted to assess the performance of PMU members. This lack of standard performance evaluation methods has led to weakness in staff

performance and in some cases the inability to make performance improvements or simply no clear grounds to act on bad performance.

f) *Multiplicity of* **stakeholders:** Although this is a relatively small programme, the number of stakeholders is relatively high. In addition, the cross cutting nature of the environment sector requires even more close attention to the number of stakeholders that should be involved if the programme is to run in a more effective manner.

g) *Lack of use of external experiences:* on a number of occasions during the evaluation it was evident that there was very little effort to seek knowledge from experiences beyond the Yemeni borders. Although some of the environmental problems being faced have had a track record elsewhere, very little has been done to capitalize on such experiences.

h) ***Improvement required in choosing programme staff.•*** in addition to the issues regarding staff evaluation it is important to note that

choosing the appropriate staff and developing the criteria for such a task should be revisited. For example, although the gentleman who is the National Director for the Special Programme for Coastal Woman has done a good job, the choice of a woman National Coordinator would have been more sensible. Even though such a choice might have required additional logistical support it might have been a more effective one.

3.4 The Efficiency of Programme Management
a) Coordination and Communications

- **Inadequate communication within** SP4: The communication within the same subprogramme in some cases is less than adequate. In SP4 for example no report, lessons learned or experiences are shared between the different regional offices. The learning curve can be significantly reduced if a better rapport is established between different groups within the same sub-programme especially those that are geographically dispersed.
- Weak coordination plan between SP2-SP3-SP4: Although these three sub-components are related and are under the same implementing and executing agency and ministry, the coordination between them could have been improved. Starting with the design, the SP3 and SP4, which require some outputs from SP2, were scheduled to start before SP2. During the implementation, the coordination between the sub-programmes was still weak and staff were not really aware of what was taking place in other sub-programmes. Again, reports were not being shared between the sub-programmes.
- Lack of **feedback on** reports: Staff complained about the inadequate feedback on reports. This applied to all levels starting with the UNDP down to the regional representations of subprogrammes. Although sometimes the feedback takes place it is rarely documented which does not extend the benefits of such an interaction.
- UN agencies too **independent in their** work: UN agencies are very independent in the decision-making regarding budgeting and implementation of programme activities. Budgets are agreed to between UN headquarters and UN agencies while two of the main players in the programme, UNDP and the government, are not involved in the process. While UNDP agencies are responsible for implementation, and as per the NEX, the government is accountable for the implementation of the results. In order to hold the government accountable for programme results, it should be made more involved in budgeting and implementation.

b) Planning, Organizing, and Controlling Delivery of Inputs

- Delays in input/resources delivery: there were a number of occasions were delays in delivery of inputs greatly effected the production of outputs leading to a cancellation of some

Ksihlini/UNDPED1E.A' ~'E'afuation.doc

of the activities. Government cost sharing, which will be discussed in section 3.4 e), was delayed for a significant period of time and led to the lack of funding for some activities. In addition, the unclear procedures of recruiting consultants through international agencies, and in some cases the internal procedures of some of these agencies, resulted in delays in starting some of the activities.

• **Weak backstopping (PMU, UNDP, EPC):** In general, the backstopping activities were very weak. They did very little to support in resolving some of the issues and were few and far in between when they took place. This is evident by the lack of evaluations for the programme and NEX modality.

•   **Government cost sharing not adhered to:** Refer to 3.4 e)

•   **Delays in reporting by agencies:** it was also noted that there had been reporting delays by executing agency. Again, the highly independent arrangement of the agencies leaves the agencies unaccountable for the reporting requirements.

•   **Unclear budget revision procedures:** the budget revision process is unclear in terms of i) how UNDP headquarters sets the quarterly budgets, ii) if UNDP Yemen informs PMU of the budget limitations instead of sending back the budget for revisions if it comes over budget, iii) how does PMU decide on what sub-programme gets what budget and is that based on specific activities, and iv) how is that divided within the same sub-programme and are subprogrammes aware of what their budget limitations are. These procedures seem to change with individuals and time. It is evident that clearer instructions and more efficient procedures need to be developed for the budget revision. In general, most sub-programmes have complained that the budget assignments have fallen much shorter than their expectations and below the amounts required to complete their scheduled activities.

•   Unclear **procurement** procedures (UN agencies): Especially when it comes to recruiting consultants there seem to have been some disagreement about some consultants between the government and the some UN agencies. It is important that a mechanism is created to settle such issues, perhaps clearer procurement procedures.

•   **Inadequate** procedures for requesting and receiving advances: While this is slightly related to the problems with budgeting revisions, there is a fundamental problem with the sub-programmes being required to ask for advances when they run out of funds. Experiences has shown that the revisions are submitted on a quarterly basis and that the advances can take up to a month to be processed. Given that, it would seem that if the quarterly budgets were spent, the sub-programmes will go for six months out of the year with no budgets. In some cases there has been a transfer of funds between different units within SP4. It is not clear in those cases how the accounts were managed.

•   **Weak accounting and** financial management **procedures and tools at PMU:** Aside from the high rollover that affected the performance of the accounting and financial management tasks at PMU, it seemed that tools and methods of operations were insufficient to efficiently manage programme finances. Reporting on financial information does not produce

adequate reports to analyze such things as administrative costs, which assists in the analysis of programme effectiveness. In addition, the software currently used to manage finances is a spreadsheet, which although can undertake some required accounting tasks, is highly inadequate for such a function. Completing tasks such as the production of reports, presentation of results, and making changes to different settings is highly inefficient compared to the minimal cost at which locally available accounting software can be purchased.

c) Project Support Document

Although the support document was compr'hensive in terms of the most of the issues relating to the environment sector it was very weak in tern s of being able to support and provide the appropriate tools for the proper implementation of the programme.

- **Weak communication** and cor rdi ation **procedures:** both the NEX modality document and the Programme Support Dcic e- ,c ! _t were not specific enough in terms of the different coordination mechanisms and resroi abilities of different players as repeatedly mentioned in this evaluation.
- No **description of information it,--,** with so many stakeholders and different reporting requirements and budgeting procedt<n:. the lack of information flows in the PSD make it difficult for managers and evahr:+t~vs ;o clearly understand the process to best manage and assess the efficiency and effecti~ mess of information and processes flow.
- Weak **reporting mechanism** and content: reporting mechanism, formats, and content are unclear in the PSD. Reports are ,;,. ;,t¡~ with a lot of narration which allows the reporter to stray away from some of the reCJl i?-:_r=,ants, there are no follow ups on previous issues from past reports, no room to report eit <rr.o'ress indicators, and no fields to note feedback from people receiving the reports.
- No contingency planning and *w , ti* **budgeting:** this is a general issue that applies to all budgets plans from the model proiee of SP4 on to the budget revisions to the original budget in the PSD. Contingence   are not included and therefore any unforeseen expenses are not planned for. This is apear- aʲi SP4 were some model projects were not completed and were having problems recei\ irr_i additional small amount to fully produce the intended impact. In addition, it was noted ti tome of the activities listed in the PSD did not have budgets lines associated with tho .
- Lack of management capacity !v i:.:ing arrangements: there were no plans to improve management skills of releva-.~ stagy?' to lthough the PSD highlights the programme approach and NEX modality it sidesteps w; , portant tools required to successfully implement both of them.
- **Inadequate monitoring and** ev.rla ration **section:** the section on monitoring and evaluation in the PSD was lacking in qualitx art,: .,>'bstance. As per previous comments about indicators, training and mechanisms it is al'L'arent that this area

was given very little attention.

- Lack **of operations manuals** for .c'st sub-programmes: Aside from sub-programme 4 and an inception report for sub-prosy'..,n 3, there were no documents to guide the implementation of sub-programs   lie information describing the activities and some of the budget details in the PSD was i i ranugh for an efficient and effective implementation of the sub-programmes.
- Weak **operations manual for SP4:** it is important to note that most of the same comments that were made for the PSD apt'.:: the operations manual of the SP4.

d) Understanding of NEX

- Unclear **roles and responsibilities:** as mentioned earlier the NEX modality was presented in a generic document that wt.s m ant to highlight a new execution approach but was not detailed and customized ew)uz1?", tr meet the needs and requirements of the current programme. The definition of su ,:..:older roles and responsibilities was weakly defined in programme documents and left a fct of room for interpretation. This is especially an issue for the relationship between international implementing agencies and the government on one hand and the PMU and UNDP at the ctL-.:.
- Weak **agreements** with t1N' an.- i ci .,: the agreements between the government and the UN agencies recommended by the NEX were also used from a generic format, which left out a lot

of details that should be required. Issues relating to procurement, budgeting, and approval of outputs in addition to accountability were less than adequately presented.

- **Unrealistic combination of programme approach and national execution and lack of capacity to implement:** the combined implementation of the programme approach and national execution put a strain on the programme implementation. The capacity to implement either approach was inadequate which led, in addition to previously mentioned issues, to an unrealistic approach. While UNDP was trying to run a programme approach for the first and trying to come to grips with how that would work they also needed to play a role in the implementation of the NEX modality. With limited capacity both in numbers and skills UNDP was not prepared to take on the challenge. While the programme approach is explicitly a UNDP programme, it is important to note how that fits within the activities of the EPC. EPC views it is own programme as a sector programme guided by the NEAP document and funded by different sources under different programmes. Given these interrelationships and the dependence of some activities in one programme on another the capacity available to coordinate these activities and at the same time treat them as independent programmes under each funding source with specific

procedural requirements, is not adequate neither at UNDP nor in the government.

- No timely **evaluation or exit strategy:** there was no exit strategy planned for the NEX modality. What if the strategy was failing? What were the measures of a success or failure? Was it possible that the strategy might not work and that an exit and other options are to be considered? A timely evaluation would have corrected many of the issues relating to implementation.

e) Government Support

- Delay in cost-sharing delivery: government sharing has been an issue but should be resolved starting in 2001 now that the government has included a line item for it in the budget. When the programme agreement was signed with the government, the government signing party represented by the Ministry of Planning did not consult with the Ministry of Finance, the disbursing party, regarding the cost sharing arrangement. The delay in meeting cost sharing requirements led to a reduction in yearly programme budgets by UNDP.
- **Coordination between government agencies require** improvement: although there was a
  multitude of government agencies involved in this programme, EPC managed to establish workable relations with all of them. This was mostly done through personal efforts and relationships. Therefore it will be essential that the coordination between the agencies be established and improved in order to sustain the current efforts and pull together better impacts.

f) Programme Plan and Budget

Most of the issues regarding planning and budgeting were mentioned in section 3. 4 c). A couple of them are reemphasized here.

- No conformity between plans and **budget:** the activities planned were sometimes not budgeted for. Although the budget in the PSD went into a good level of details it did not do so to the extent where every activity was budgeted for. This meant that the implementing staff did not meet some of its scheduled objectives because of lack of funds.
- No contingency plans: This occurred at all level from programme, to sub-programme, and on to projects in sub-programme 4. Although other funding issues were present, these shortages were mostly significant in sub-programme 4 where some model projects fell short

of completion and in some cases did not meet its intended objectives because of a small shortage in funding.

g) Potential Linkages with other UNDP Programmes

- **Lack of linkages with the Poverty Programme:** although the poverty and environment programmes have the community participation and income generation objectives in common, there was no coordination between the two programmes. The experiences of the poverty programme in these areas could have been highly beneficial in these areas. Beyond UNDP programmes, projects such as the Social Development Fund could have also been a learning experience for the EMP. Future programmes should specifically highlight some of the areas of potential linkages and coordination and possibly make some of them a prerequisite when deemed appropriate.
- **Lack of linkages with the Governance Programme:** Much of the same applies to the Governance Programme and that would involve capacity building at the government level and local administration involvement in implementation. The latter would focus on the SP4 type of sub-programme while the former would coordinate with SP 1 activities.

.5 **Transfer of Capacity to National**

a) Training **is not adequate for future planning,** monitoring, reporting **and evaluation of projects:** one of the most important capacities to be transferred was that of the ability to manage future projects. This was a problem at a number of levels from UNDP nationals to communities going through government agencies and local administrations.

b) Lack of documentation of experiences: this was an issue across the whole programme. It is important to keep in mind that documentation goes beyond storing reports and other documents. The importance of documenting lies in retrieving the important experiences and lessons so that they can be put to use in the future and so that they become a part of the institutional memory of an organization. At the sub-programme level it was apparent especially in those sub-programmes that required documentation as part of their outputs. At the PMU level, it was also lacking in terms of lessons learned and experiences to be documented for future use and in case there are changes in staff. UNDP has also failed to document information regarding the programme. The changes of staff in the programme and the increased learning curve for new comers accentuated the importance of documentation.

c) Very little NGO involvement: the NGO involvement was limited to SP5 with tourism and one or two established community based organizations in SP4. It is the opinion of the evaluation team that the programme designers perceived much more NGO presence and involvement than what took place. Transfer of capacity was therefore limited.

d) Lack of technical assistance evaluation: The work of FAO, IUCN, ICARDA, UNEP and WTO was intended to build capacity amongst nationals. Although it could be said that some of that effort was successful, very little is known about the actual results and how that impacts the capacity building and transfer to nationals. Such an

effort is also important to evaluate the future contribution of such agencies in implementing similar activities.

e) **Inadequate** evaluation of capacity building efforts: except for a couple of cases, more specifically in SP5 very little was done in terms of assessment of training. As mentioned earlier these activities need to be built into the training process and would allow for a fair measurement of capacity building and transfer.

f) Government counterpart not receptive to capacity building effort: in some cases, the partnership that was supposed to be established between the international agencies and the government lost much of its value. Government counterparts only wanted to see the outputs produced and did not care much about gaining experience and their own capacity being built. The transfer of capacity in this case was

·it ./   AD'   iII'   i   I i it ' i I 1,/ IIr It ' I',' I il it '   t/ r,u a a a.
l i e r   1 1

not due to a lack of effort by the agencies but by a lack of appropriate reception by the receiving agency.

3.6 The Views of the **Direct Beneficiaries**

a) **Lack of training to plan, monitor and evaluate** own work: a number of beneficiaries, be it at the community level, local administration or PMU mentioned the lack of training that might allow them to sustain the current effort and perhaps undertake similar programmes without assistance. This goes against the concept intended by the NEX modality.

b) **Delays in funding and incomplete** works: The delay in funding was one of the main complaints by communities, sub-programme and PMU. This greatly affected the initiative taken upon by different players. Especially in the case of SP4, communities and sub-programme were disappointed in the inability to secure funding to complete some work. This might have led to a reduced belief and trust in the workings of the programme and system in general while the programme was supposed to do the exact opposite in encouraging such initiatives.

c) No **attention to seasonal constraints:** In some cases the lack of attention to seasonal constraints especially in regards to SP4 and the rainy season cycle, has left many opportunities lost for communities that could have taken advantage of seasonal rains if the inputs had been delivered in a timely manner.

d) Very **high** expectations: this seems to be a natural phenomenon especially in community type projects, and one of the important issues to be documented for future reference.

e) Lack of **understanding of programme** objectives: in a number of occasions and through detailed discussion regarding programme objectives, beneficiaries realized their lack of focus, and sometime understanding of programme objectives. This is largely due to a loss of focus on objectives by programme management at different levels.

3.7 **Impact** and Sustainability

a) Design gap between **outputs and** objectives: Point 3.2 b) above focuses on this aspect which highly effects the ability to measure and even reach the intended impact in some cases. From the outset, the design did not provide the guidelines to create a link between the outputs and objectives.

b) Inadequate **documentation** of **lessons learned and** feeding of institutional memory at higher levels: one of the main outcomes of this programme was to document many of the experiences relating to the NEX modality and the programme approach. In addition, sub-programme four was specifically based on documentation of traditional methods of resource management. Both of these were almost completely side stepped. In general, the capacity building effort, which is the focus of the programme, requires that the stakeholders in the programme learn about their needs, requirements, achievements and the sustainability of their activities and outputs. Documenting lessons learned and building an institutional memory are two great necessary elements of such an approach. The lack of documentation was spread at all levels, from the communities and regional implementation levels to the UNDP.

c) **Inadequate** capacity building to manage projects: as mentioned previously, the sustainability of the programme and its outcomes requires the government and UNDP to fully benefit from the NEX modality and the programme approach but unfortunately neither party was fully ready to undertake the challenge. The future sustainability of the programme was further hampered by the lack of training to build the required management capacity for the UNDP and government to better implement such a modality.

d) Lack of linkages with other UNDP programmes: The linkages with other UNDP programmes such as governance and poverty could have been good grounds for more sustainable efforts for all

programmes. As mentioned earlier, these programmes have many elements in common and could greatly benefit from coordinating some activities and learning from each other.

e) **Absence of baseline, target, and actual indicators:** The absence of these indicators made the measurement of programme impact almost unattainable. The baseline indicators regarding the preprogramme conditions was not documented in the PSD, no targets were highlighted in terms of the expected achievements of the programme and no data was collected to assess the potential impact. One could argue that there was baseline information and objectives were laid out in the design. Looking closely at the design, this type of information was not detailed enough and did not require specific information and indicators to be collected throughout the project to fully assess whether the objectives intended were attained or not.

f) **Inadequate planning for future programming:** one month before the official date for the ending of the programme, it seemed that there was very little effort or concern regarding the next steps to be taken. A lot of talk was taking place regarding the possibility of extending some of the subprogrammes but no substantial effort was being made to draw up the next steps. This is one of the reasons that the programme as a whole had been loosing staff all along and being less efficient than it could be. While the results of this evaluation were to assist in

making that decision, very little was done to set the stage for the evaluation itself in terms of preparing cumulative data to show the progress of the programme and maybe preparing a number of options for future plans. The evaluation team hopes that this approach would be much more forward looking, active, and would be more driven.

3.8 <u>Government Support to the ProgramWe</u>

a) **Delayed deliver** of cost **sharing:** the cost sharing issue was mentioned earlier and was one of the factors of the subsequent slowdown of programme funding and implementation. This issue seems to have been resolved at this stage but would requir-; close attention as the cost sharing is being delivered.
b) No solid plans for future coordination efforts with other ministries: one of the main benefits of a NEX modality should be the ability to use the lessons learned from this approach and that of the programme approach and implement it to better coordinate between government agencies. As mentioned earlier much of the coordination success has been attributed to personal contacts and relationship between personnel in different agencies. In general, there has been little effort to formalize such arrangements, regardless of the NEX approach, so that the future coordination and implementation of common activities could benefit from the current experience, build on it to more efficiently and effectively implement programmes, and reach increased impact and sustainable results

3.9 **Resource Mobilization**

a) Weak coordination between government agencies in planning **cost-sharing:** one of the main issues surrounding cost-sharing is that he initial planning for it was not coordinated between the different government agencies namely, the ministry of planning and the Ministry of Finance. The skilled resources available to coordinate this effort are not adequate.
b) **Delay in** addressing cost-sharing **issue** by UNDP: one if the issues in mobilizing financial resources has to do with the delay by UNDP in addressing the cost sharing problems. This was not taken seriously until late into programme implementation. At that point in time UNDP was forced to adjust budgets to take into consideration the shortfall in resources.
e) **Weak** training for communities **to seek** additional funding: no training took place to assist communities under sub-programme four to seek additional funding for their required work. In general, they were told about other funding agencies but not trained in any fashion on how to pursue that.

d) **Slow progress and weak outcome in resource mobilization:** sub-programme one which focuses mostly on resource mobilization got to a slow start and caught up slowly as time went by. A faster start could have provided much needed assistance to other sub-programmes and to future programming. The view of the consultants

that worked on resource mobilization is that the capacity still does not exist to fully benefit from the resource mobilization efforts. They noted three areas of concern namely, the lack of skills and experience to conduct the tasks, a limited knowledge of the English language required to communicate with most donor agencies, and a weak information exchange between departments and units.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS LEARNED

14.1 Recommendations

For each of the immediate objectives recommended the following characteristics will be presented:

      a)   *Activity:* this is the recommendation activity to be undertaken.

      b)   **Findings:** these are the findings corresponding to the recommendation and presented in section

        3.0. In some cases more than one activity will cover one finding.

      c)   **Expected Results:** these are the expected improvements a result of implementing the

        recommended activity.

      d)   **Responsibility:** Main responsible party for implementing recommendations

      e)   **Measure** of **Success:** indicators to assess the activity results

      f)   **Time Frame:** deadline for implementing recommendation activities

The evaluation team recommends immediate action on a number of items to salvage some of the results, collect some of lessons learned expected from this programme, and prepare for the next modality to implement sustainable environmental management activities. Considering that much of the issues in the programme directly or indirectly relate to the execution mechanism, the modality experience of the programme approach and National Execution takes forefront in the corrective actions to be implemented.

It is apparent that the implementation of the two approaches, programme and national execution, while possibly a good one, needs better preparation. Therefore a phased implementation of the approaches is recommended. This should start with reviewing the validity of the programme approach in terms of what it means to UNDP and to the government. If a programme approach is to be pursued, it will need to adhere to some major changes in the planning process

and should include an exit strategy and criteria of programme success. The programme approach will be implemented in parallel with training in project management, planning, monitoring and evaluation for both UNDP environment programme staff and government agency staff to include the EPC, the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, Ministry of Cultural and Tourism, Agricultural Research and Extension and Authority and any other relevant government agencies. Once the programme approach has been validated, a decision should be made regarding the adoption of the NEX modality and how it would fit with the programme approach, given the capacity building effort, the lessons learned from the current NEX implementation, and some predefined criteria. The NEX implementation will also be subject to the planning changes for the programme approach in addition to special attention to an exit strategy, sustainability, budgeting rules and regulations, clear responsibilities and cost sharing.

Furthermore, the evaluation team is recommending a number of actions regarding the ongoing programme to insure that the results of the programme activities are salvaged and put to the best use possible. The programme should be extended to a maximum of 12 months with sub-programme specific end dates. Exit strategies will need to be identified for each of the sub-programme and non-performing UN Agency activities would be dropped from the sub-programmes. An evaluation will be planned in a timely fashion to assess the results of the programme possibly together with the capacity building efforts and the implementation of the programme approach. The current PMU setup and its function should remain the same to insure continuity of implementation.

The evaluation is also recommending that UNDP considers the creation of the position of a Monitoring and Evaluation Officer for all UNDP programmes. The officer would be responsible for monitoring and evaluation to include training and reporting, assist in the coordination between UNDP programmes, and be involved in designing new programmes.

The following activities forming the recommendations provide the guidelines

for its implementation. **Recommendation 1: Extensions and Changes to**

Current Programme

Immediate Objective 1: Complete most

programme outputs Activity and Expected

Results

Pro ramme Level

Activity	Findings	Expected Results
1. Extend the duration of the programme up to 12 months		Insure that most of the expected outputs are produced and that cost-sharing is active
2. Drop non-performing activities especially those relating to specific UN Agencies (example: IUCM consultancies)	*Weak delivery of agency outputs (3.2.a)*	Remove unnecessary pressure to complete some activities and possibly reallocate funding to other activities.
3. Set programme exit strategy in order to insure that the programme as a whole is halted and/or completed based on certain criteria and the exit strategy for each of the sub-programmes.	*No timely evaluation or exit strategy (3.4 d)*	Will insure that the extended programme period is used efficiently and effectively.
4. Plan the final programme evaluation so that evaluation results can be used for future programme planning	*No timel_v evaluation or exit strategy (3.4 d)*	Insure that enough time and lessons learned are available to plan the next operation
5. Assess if the current programme activities/ results can be a part of or can be used for a future programme	*Inadequate planning for future programming (3.7j)*	To sustain some of the current efforts and build on them to further plan new programmes
6. Insure that the PMU focuses on preparing lessons learned and final reports of project achievements.	*Inadequate documentation of lessons learned and feeding of institutional memory at higher levels (3. 7 b)*	An effective closing of the programme and a transition of the PMU into the EPC

hsiblini'UNDPFF_.1IEN1 "'E»aluatton.doc

Yemen - UNDP Sustainable Environmental Management Programme - Midterm Review
January 2001

Sub Programme Level

Activity	Findings	Expected Results
1. Sub Programme 1: Complete the work on resource mobilization	*Delays in funding and incomplete works(3.6 b)*	Completion of sub-programme activities and documentation of

		lessons learned
Sub Programme 2: Finalize ongoing activities and consultancies 3. Sub Programme 3: Deliver completed outputs 4. Sub-Programme 4: Finish ongoing projects, start documentation at the regional level of traditional methods and lessons learned and define IUCN role 5. Sub-Programme 5: Deliver remaining outputs within budget and provide funding for relevant activities within the PSD 6. Special Programme: Proceed with supporting existing centers while focusing on activities to sustain the effort to include membership fees and searching for additional funding sources. Document lessons learned about the methodology of implementation.		

Responsibility. Measure of Success. and Time Frame

Responsibility	*Measure of Success*	**Time Frame**
UNDP and PMU	Completion of programme outputs and good documentation of lessons learned	Programme and Sub-Programme outputs: by end of 2001 (12 months)

Recommendation 2: **Phasing Implementation of the Programme Approach and the NEX Modality**

The NEX modality is meant to focus on institutional capacity building and the incorporation of programme activities into the overall activities of the EPC. The programme approach on the other hand is UNDP specific, i.e. it is a "UNDP programme". If not implemented correctly these two approaches cannot coexist. Please note that the assessment below are based on the results of this report which recommends the following:

- Improve capacity of UNDP and EPC to plan, monitor and evaluate projects/ programmes (first six months of 200 1)
- Assist EPC to develop its own sector approach modality to plan, monitor and evaluate its activities (first six months of 2001)
- Preparation of a detailed and clear future UNDP Programme (By September 2001)
- Reformulation of the NEX modality to fit the current conditions (By September 2001)

Immediate Objective 1: Assess the relevancy of the programme approach

Activity and Expected Results

Pro ramme Level

Activity	Findings	Expected Results
1. Define the role of the programme approach at UNDP - is the current programme made out of cohesive and completely interdependent sub-programmes that are meeting one specific goal? Is the programme approach the appropriate approach given the capacity of UNDP, the setup of the EPC and the needs of the sector? Identify common themes such as technical assistance, legal framework and studies, capacity building, ... Develop future programme based on the comments in Recommendation 3 below	*Unrealistic design vis a vis implementation arrangements (3.1 a) Unclear roles and responsibilities of* *stakeholders (3.3. b) Unrealistic combination of* *programme approach and national execution and lack of capacity to implement (3.4 d) Lack of linkages with the Poverty Programme (3.4 g) Lack of linkages with the Governance Programme (3.4 R)*	A clear understanding of the programme approach at UNDP. What does it mean? How are its results assessed? How do you accordingly develop future programmes?
2. Develop capacity at UNDP to plan, monitor, report and evaluate the programme. This includes devising the tools for programme staff to collect the necessary indicators, and create the mechanism for collection and developing a time series of indicators for the UNDP environment programme to assess sector progress over an extended period of time. These indicators should include other peripheral indicators that can affect or be affected by the environment such as social and economic measures. Develop guidelines for the selection of indicators. Annex 4 provides a template for the collection and mechanism to collect impact indicators. Management indicators for both the programme and sub-programme levels need to be developed.	*Weak monitoring, reporting and evaluation system (3.3 a) Lack of training to assist in management and operations (3.3 c)* *Lack of management capacity building arrangements (3.4 c)* *Training is not adequate for future planning, monitoring, reporting and evaluation (3.5 a)* *Lack of training to plan, monitor and evaluate own work (3.6 a)* *Inadequate capacity building to manage projects (3.7 c)*	Better handle on objectives, smoother monitoring of project progress, the ability to respond to needs and changes and evaluate project progress and take appropriate corrective action.

Responsibility, Measure of Success, and Time Frame

Responsibility	Measure of Success	Time Frame
UNDP	• A good understanding of the UNDP	Formulation of UNDP

	programme approach and the ability to put together clear and well-defined future approaches, be it programme or otherwise. • Improved ability of UNDP to manage, monitor and evaluate their activities.	Programme modality and capacity building within the first six months of the year. Preparation of the next programme approach in the three months following the formulation and capacity building.

Immediate Objective 2: Assess the relevancy of the NEX modality Activity and Expected

Results

Pro ramme Level

January 2001

Activity	**Findings**	**Expected Results**
1. Adjust the current NEX approach document based on evaluation of the modality. Insure that the current consultancy reviewing the NEX modality comes out with a clear document on NEX implementation. Focus on weaknesses of current modality such as: exit strategy, roles and responsibilities, cost sharing, sustainability, and procedures. Identify the role of a PMU vis a vis such a modality and clear up its functions and sustainability.	*Unclear roles and responsibilities of stakeholders (3.3 b) Government cost sharing not adhered (3.4 b) Inadequate procedures for requesting and receiving advances(3.4 b) Unclear budget revision procedures (3.4 b) Weak communication and coordination procedures(3.4 c)*	Develop a NEX modality that fits the needs and current setup in Yemen based on lessons learned from the latest NEX implementation.
2. Provide capacity building for select and relevant government staff in the areas of planning, monitoring, reporting and evaluation, (EPC, PMU, MAI, GTA, AREA) with priority given to PMU. Annex 9 provides an outline to assess the implementation capacity and guide the capacity building effort.	*Unclear roles and responsibilities (3.4 d) evaluation system (3.3 a) Lack of agreements with UN agencies Management-sharing delivery (3.4 e) Weak coordination (3.3 b) Lack of management capacity building in planning (3.4 e) Training is not adequate for future planning, monitoring, reporting and evaluation (3.5 a) Lack of training to plan, monitor and evaluate own work (3.6 a) Inadequate capacity building to manage projects (3.7 c)*	Better handle on objectives, smoother monitoring of project progress, the ability to respond to needs and changes and evaluate project progress and take appropriate corrective action.

3. Together with EPC review how the UNDP-funded programme fits in the overall activities of the EPC. Just as UNDP has a programme approach should EPC have a sector approach run like a programme and having the UNDP programme as an integral part of it? It is recommended that the ministry of planning be involved in such an exercise. Sub-Programme 1 should equally be involved.	*Unrealistic combination of programme approach and national execution and lack of capacity to implement(3.4 d) Unrealistic design vis a vis implementation arrangements (3.1 a.)*	Develop an understanding of the fit of the UNDP programme within the overall activity scope of the EPC. Assist EPC in developing a comprehensive understanding of its activities, how they interact and how they should be planned, monitored and evaluated in a way so as to continuously have a good and consistent overview of EPC activities and objectives.

Yemen - IINDP Sustainable F,nvironmental Management Programme - Midterm Review
January 2001

Responsibility, Measure of Success, and Time Frame

Responsibility	Measure of *Success*	Time Frame
UNDP and EPC	• A good reformulation of the NEX modality if deemed appropriate. *e* Improved ability of EPC to manage, monitor and evaluate their activities.	Formulation of NEX modality and capacity building within the first six months of the year. Preparation of the next NEX or other form of approach in the three months following the formulation and capacity building.

Recommendation 3: Improve the Planning Process

Immediate Objective 1: Develop clear and

executable programmes *A* ctivity and Expected

Results

Activity	Findings	Expected Results
1. Improve the following items in future	*Unrealistic design vis a vis*	A good base upon

programme support documents: • Coordination and communication • Clear roles, responsibilities and accountability • Contingency planning and budgeting • Monitoring and evaluation sections (mechanisms, indicators and methodology for measurement, ...) • Reporting (information flows, formats) • Exit strategy for programme and sub-programmes • Documentation methods and responsibilities • Transparency of procedures • Activities planned to sustain results such as evaluation and follow up on studies, legal framework activities and capacity building • Sub-programme operations manuals for each of the sub-programmes or inception reports • Use of logical framework analysis • A sub-programme modification sheet to document how and why the changes took place. • Risk mitigation measures. 2. Consider external assistance to review the PSD once it is developed	*implementation arrangements(3.1 a) Focus on outputs rather than objectives (3.2 b) Unclear link between the Programme and Sub-Programme (3.2 c) No baseline, target and actual indicators to evaluate results (3.2 d) Inadequate follow up of training, studies, awareness, and legal activities (3.2 e) Weak monitoring, reporting and evaluation system (3.3 a) Unclear roles and responsibilities of stakeholders(3.3. b) Unclear budget revision procedures (3.4 b) No description of information flows(3.4 c) Lack of operations manuals for most sub-programmes(3.4 ç) No contingency planning and weak budgeting (3.4 c) Inadequate monitoring and evaluation section (3.4 c) No conformity between plans and budget (3.4 f) No contingency plans (3.4 f Lack of linkages with other UNDP Programme (3.4 g) Design gap between outputs and objectives (3.7 a) Lack of linkages with other UNDP programmes (374 d) Absence of baseline, target, and actual indicators(3.7 e)*	which to plan and implement the project.

Yemen - UNI)P Sustainnhle Environmental Management Programme - Midterm Review
January 2001

Responsibility, Measure of Success, and Time Frame

Responsibility	*Measure of Success*	Time Frame
UNDP with contribution from government counterparts	Clear and useful PSD to implement the next programme/project	By September 2001 assuming that the next programme/project starts in January 2002

Recommendation 4: Improve Programme Implementation

Immediate Objective 1: Improve efficiency and effectiveness of

implementation Activity and Expected Results

Activity	Findings	Expected Results

A number of activities need to take place: 1. Improve reporting (cumulative reporting, reporting on issue resolution progress from previous reports, place fields for feedback, ...). Sample bi-yearly and inception reports are attached in Annex 7. 2. Perform programme staff evaluations 3. Improve staff recruitment for the programme based on set criteria 4. Try to reduce staff rollovers by pinpointing reasons for staff departures 5. Provide programme staff with sources of information to assist in improving programme effectiveness 6. Introduce computerized accounting tools to the PMU 7. Setup experience documentation and lessons learned standards and mechanisms within or outside the reporting process 8. Plan for evaluation activities to follow technical assistance and capacity building activities 9. Develop a training or staff orientation module to introduce new programme staff to essential tools in programme management and operations. An outline of such a module is attached in Annex 8.	*Lack of cumulative reporting (3. High staff rollover (3.3 d) Lack of formal staff evaluation (3.3 e) Lack of external experiences (3.3 Improvement required in choosing programme staff (3.3 h) Lack of feedback on reports (3.4 a) Weak accounting and financial management procedures and tools at PMU (3.4 b) Weak reporting mechanism and content (3.4 c) Lack of documentation of experiences (3.5 a) No evaluation of technical assistance (3.5 c) Inadequate evaluation of capacity building efforts (3.5 d) Inadequate documentation of lessons learned and feeding of institutional memory at higher levels (3.7 b)*	A general improvement of operations and procedures.

Responsibility. Measure of Success, and Time Frame

Res , onsibilit	*Measure o Success*	Time Frame
UNDP and any Programme desi • n team	Improved reporting. documentation and staff t ualit	Within six months of the report and in re aration of future ro rmme desi ns

lísib1iuií UNDPY1--k1F..V ('Evaluation.doc

34 of

Immediate Objective 2: *Performance improvement of Executing Agencies* *A*ctivity and

Expected Results

Activity	Findings	**Expected Results**
1. Improve the definition of and review the relationship between the executing UN	*UN agencies too independent their work (3.4 a) Delays in*	Improved delivery of inputs and outputs by

	input/resources delivery (3.4 b)	the UN agencies
agencies, UNDP (local and headquarters), and government counterparts 2. Define procedures to be followed by the UN agencies in terms of procurement, financial management and budgeting, and reporting g 3. Review the processes that involve the UN agencies and UNDP headquarters vis a vis the NEX modality concept 4. In general, improve the contracts between the UN agencies and the government 5. Develop, criteria for the evaluation of UN agency knowledge transfer and develop incentives for government staff to contribute to UN agency outputs	*Delays in reporting by agencies* *(3.4 b) Unclear procurement procedures (UN agencies) (3.4 b) Weak agreements with UN agencies (3.4 d) Government counterpart not receptive to capacity building effort (3.5 e)*	

Responsibility, Measure of Success, and Time Frame

Responsibility	*Measure of Success*	Time Frame
UNDP, Programme planning team, government, UN agencies	More efficient delivery of outputs by the UN agencies,	In the process of preparing the next UNDP environment programme

Immediate Objective 3: Improve

delivery to beneficiaries *Activity and*

Expected Results

Activity	Findings	**Expected Results**
Focus on awareness and training issues related to direct involvement of communities in task implementation. Keep expectations in check through appropriate, focused and objective-oriented awareness campaigns; insure sustainability of efforts through training on issues such as seeking funding and self-monitoring and evaluating of community activities. Can be tested with the remaining model projects in SP4.	*Very high expectations (3.6 d) Lack of understanding of programme objectives (3. 6 e) Weak training for communities to seek additiona l fiu~ding (3.9 c)*	More focused involvement of communities and better impact of produced outputs.

Responsibility, Measure of Success, and Time Frame

Responsibility	Measure of Success	Time Frame
UNDP and programme planning team as well as implementing side.	Clearer results and better sustainability of community efforts and involvement	During the preparation of the next programme

Immediate Objective 4: **Improve monitoring and**

evaluation at UNDP Activity and Expected Results

Activity	Findings	Expected Results
Create a monitoring and evaluation position at UNDP - This position will cover all UNDP Programmes. Suggested terms of reference are attached in Annex 5. As a complementing tool a programme knowledge management information system (PKMIS) can be developed eventually to keep track of all programmes at UNDP and serve as a depository of lessons learned. A brief description of the perceived PKMIS is attached in Annex 6.	No baseline, target and actual indicators to evaluate results (3.2 d) Weak monitoring, reporting and evaluation system (3.3 a) Inadequate monitoring and evaluation section (3.4 c) Lack of linkages with other UNDP Programme (3.4 g) Lack of linkages with other UNDP programmes (3.7 d) Absence of baseline, target, and actual indicators (3.7 e)	Assist in the coordination between the different UNDP programmes. Compile lessons learned about modalities and modes of operation. Improve the monitoring, reporting and evaluation of UNDP portfolio in Yemen.

Responsibility, Measure of Success, and Time Frame

Responsibility	Measure of Success	Time Frame
UNDP	Creation of position and noticeable improvement in programmes monitoring, evaluation and coordination	Within a year from this report.

- *Capacity building of government institutions forms the base of any programme:* although is it important to focus on capacity building in subjects within the environment sector it is even more critical, in order to sustain this effort, that capacity building efforts would target the ability of the government to plan, monitor, report and evaluate projects. A national execution modality such as the one being implemented for this programme highlights further the need for the government to be equipped with all the tools and skills to execute the required functions efficiently and effectively. Moreover, this capacity building will further sustain its ability to plan and implement future programmes within the context of UNDP and beyond which is the ultimate goal of the NEX modality.
- *Baseline data and targets are essential for programme evaluation:* it was evident during programme evaluation that the basis upon which the evaluation was taking place was going to be weak considering that the baseline and target indicators, where there were some, that were established during the planning process was inadequate. This meant that the perceived impacts were not clearly identified in order to provide clear programme intentions.

4.2 **Lessons Learned**

- *Importance of a monitoring, reporting and evaluation mechanism:* the absence of a mechanism and clear guidelines for monitoring, reporting, and evaluating programme results can be detrimental to the effective and efficient progress and assessment of the programme.
- *Better planning of evaluations:* it is necessary to better plan evaluation exercises to further benefit from their results. This would include that not only a complete evaluation team be present but that the information and documentation required for the smooth and efficient evaluation are ready ahead of the exercise. Cumulative reporting on progress, design and other evaluation documents as well as the meetings that don't only concern the programme directly but indirectly should be planned for.
- *Timely and coordinated delivery of inputs and outputs:* especially in a programme approach where some of the sub-programmes are dependent on each other it is very important that this coordinated effort is supported by timely delivery of inputs and outputs especially those affecting other sub-programmes.
- *Clear and detailed designs are essential for successful implementation and sustainability of the programme:* it is ._,vident that the lack of details and planning or at least guidance to that level of details can greatly affect the performance. The efficiency and effectiveness of programme implementation could be hampered if the base upon which the programme is established is weak.
- *Assessing the relevance and required capacity of any UNDP approach or modality vis a vis the government work portfolio is essential to the success of that approach:* the UNDP environment programme was based on the NEAP which guides the objectives and activities of EPC activities. However, issues such as dependence of the programme on other EPC activities, capacity building of EPC to manage future programmes, and their ability to coordinate with other funded programmes were not closely analyzed.
- *Objectives need to be at the forefront of implementation:* the essence of the programme should be kept in mind at all stages of implementation. It should be the guiding force behind the execution of tasks. The awareness of objectives to people involved in the implementation of the programme should be planned as part of programme activities. In addition, the use of such tools as indicators and creating the mechanism for executing agencies and staff would refocus the attention.