

Synthesized Summary

of the

Mid Term Review of the UNDP-UNEP Poverty- Environment Initiative (PEI) Scale-Up

Kris B. Prasada Rao

PEMCONSULT
PEOPLE • ENVIRONMENT • MANAGEMENT

16 December 2011

1 Introduction

The purpose of this Synthesis Summary is to provide a brief overview of key findings of the midterm review (MTR) of the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative's (PEI) Scale-up Programme in relation to the key themes of relevance to Senior Management of UNDP and UNEP:

- Poverty and environment practice
- Monitoring and evaluation
- UNDP and UNEP agency issues – and integration of PEI in the agencies
- Business practice of PEI at global and regional Level

1.1 PEI Scale-up Programme

PEI is a global programme that supports country-led efforts to mainstream poverty-environment (PE) linkages into national development policies and planning. PEI provides financial and technical assistance to government partners to set up institutional- and capacity strengthening programmes and carry out activities addressing the national PE context. PEI's Scale-up Programme's (2007-2012) intended outcome is "*Improved capacity of programme country government and other stakeholders to integrate environment concerns of poor and vulnerable groups into policy, planning and implementation processes for poverty reduction, pro-poor growth and achievement of the MDGs.*"

The outputs leading to the achievement of this are:

Output 1: Country led PE mainstreaming programmes where PEI programmatic approach to PE mainstreaming is implemented in target countries.

Output 2: Joint UNDP-UNEP regional support programmes and regional communities of practice on PE mainstreaming established and functioning to enhance regional capacity to support PE mainstreaming.

Output 3: Global advisory services and support provided by PEI and the Poverty-Environment Facility

PEI operates through a joint UNDP-UNEP Board, a jointly staffed UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Facility (PEF) located in Nairobi, and jointly staffed Regional Teams and Government-UNDP country teams. PEI currently works in 17 country programmes located in Africa, Asia-Pacific (A-P), Europe and CIS (ECIS) and Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC). The PEI approach operates with three country programme phases:

Design phase: Finding entry points and making the case

Phase 1: Mainstreaming PE linkages into policy processes

Phase 2: Meeting the implementation challenge

1.2 Midterm Review

In August-October 2011, an independent external MTR of the PEI Scale-Up Programme was carried out by PEMConsult. The MTR assessed the progress and performance of the programme vis-à-vis relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact¹, and sustainability at all three levels of PEI operations (global, regional, country). The MTR team visited PEF, Africa Regional Team, and six country programmes². Interviews were carried out with PEI staff (global, regional and country) and UNDP and UNEP staff, representatives of PEI partner and donor institutions, and national Government and partners; these were done in person, over telephone/Skype and through email. Furthermore, an extensive review of PEI documentation was carried out.

¹ Due to the relatively young age of the programme, impact is not expected at this stage and the MTR focused on the likelihood of achieving the intended outcomes and impact. Furthermore, acknowledging the PEI is a policy initiative, impact is defined in the MTR ToR as "*the extent to which PEI is influencing/likely to influence policy, planning, and budgeting processes so they become pro-poor and environment friendly/sustainable*".

² Africa – Botswana, Malawi; A-P – Bhutan, Laos; ECIS – Tajikistan; LAC – Uruguay

2 Implementation Progress

Output 1: PEI is on target for phase 1 countries (target already met), a bit below the target for phase 2 countries (two countries below target), and far below the target for preparation of new country programmes (five countries below target plus three on hold). The regional distribution of phase 1 and phase 2 countries is very different from the targets, with significantly fewer countries outside Africa. Due to a significantly lower budget available (USD 21,074,514) than anticipated (USD 33,043,478), PEI has put three country programmes, where preparatory phases had been completed, on hold. The unmet targets are unlikely to be fulfilled.

Output 2: PEI has exceeded both regional level targets (establishment of Regional Teams and communities of practice in Africa, Asia, and LAC) as PEI has also established a fully functional Regional Team in ECIS.

Output 3: At the global level, the Results Framework contains no targets, but has three indicators: i) Enhanced capacity to provide global advisory services to Regional Teams and UN Country Teams/UNDP Country Offices, ii) resources mobilized to support PEI scale-up, and iii) increased access by countries to good practice guidance and tools on poverty-environment mainstreaming. A prolonged period of understaffing of PEF since April 2010 has affected the ability of PEF to provide support to Regional Teams and caused delays in other core functions. Nonetheless, in some areas support capacity has been enhanced and guidance documents and tools have been produced.

Annual expenditures of the young PEI Scale-up country programmes has generally been low up till now³, with 47% of the budget unspent 14 months before completion, it is unlikely that PEI will be able to spend the remaining resources by December 2012, although all funds are committed. Nonetheless, spending has increased significantly as country programmes have matured and more country programmes have been initiated, and based on the current expenditure pattern, PEI expects that 84% of the budget will have been spent by end 2012.

With no targets set for the outcome indicators and no data on the progress against these, it is impossible to assess the likelihood of the PEI Scale-up programme achieving the intended outcome. The first outcome indicator is: *Number of countries in which pro-poor environmental concerns are incorporated into: (1) the national development/poverty reduction and growth strategy, (2) budget processes/Medium-Term Expenditure Framework, (3) key sectoral policies and plans, (4) the poverty monitoring system.* Findings in the countries visited by the MTR team suggest that the different PEI country programmes are very likely to achieve (1) and (4) and likely to achieve (3), but unlikely to achieve (2) within the current Scale-up programme phase. Most Scale-up country programmes are quite young, so it is too early to expect impact and sustainability.

Due to the unavailability of data and the difficulty of measuring the second outcome indicator, “*Widespread access to knowledge, tools and good practices on integrating environment into poverty reduction and growth policy and planning processes*”, it is impossible for the MTR team to assess the programme’s delivery against it. PEI has developed several knowledge resources and made them available on its website and elsewhere; and the MTR team is aware of PEI methods and tools being used by some other UN and non-UN programmes as presented in the report. But the extent of the awareness of them and their use beyond the PEI programme is unclear.

³ Most country programmes display low levels of spending, albeit sometimes still with a high level of activity; this may in part be due to the fact that most country programmes are still young. Furthermore, many country programmes have significant cofunding from UNDP Country Offices (TRAC funds) and some have have cofunding from bilateral donors; these funds are reportedly often spend before PEI funding, as they are subject to annual reporting/allocation.

3 Poverty and Environment Practice

3.1 Value added

Mainstreaming is often perceived as abstract and an abstract concept, and a significant achievement of PEI is that it has demonstrated it is possible to translate the mainstreaming principle into tangible action. Policies and planning in PEI countries inadequately address in a pro-poor manner the underlying environmental problems causing poor and vulnerable groups depending on natural resources to spiral down into deeper poverty. Thus, PEI adds value by providing a practical approach and tangible tools to build government capacity to mainstream and include PE concerns in an integrated manner in policy and planning processes, and thereby PEI indirectly contributes to poverty reduction and sustainable development.

3.2 Country programmes and PEI approach

Most of the PEI Scale-up country programmes⁴ are young and only one is in Phase 2 (Bhutan). It is thus too early to expect impact at the country level. Experiences suggest that PEI programmes can relatively quickly build up government understanding of PE linkages, government ownership in planning/finance and environment ministries, influence development plans and planning processes, promote inclusion of PE indicators on government monitoring systems, and also promote cross-sectoral collaboration at the sub-national level. It is also possible for PEI to influence targeted sector policies, strengthen government planning and implementation capacity and promote inclusion of PE mainstreaming in civil servant training curricula. However, findings from the six country programmes visited and discussions with PEI staff suggest the more difficult aspects are to influence budgeting processes and enhance cross-sectoral collaboration at central level. Mainstreaming and an integrated approach to PEI issues will often require collaboration across ministries, but this also requires overcoming hurdles related to institutional mandates and the absence of a culture of collaboration (and even turf battles); these are difficult aspects to influence on the short term and there may be an insufficient focus on this in PEI country programme design. Most PEI Scale-up countries are in Phase 1; according to the current PEI programmatic approach, budgeting and implementation are to be addressed during Phase 2. Therefore, most programmes have not yet influenced budgeting processes and only to a limited extent the actual implementation/roll-out of new/revised policies and plans with PE concerns integrated. Nonetheless, experience from both the Pilot and Scale-up phases of PEI suggests it takes time to influence budgeting and thus should be addressed already from an early stage of implementation. It is difficult to talk of sustainability yet, as country programmes have not yet had time to consolidate the results achieved and to ensure that Government has the full capacity to roll out PE mainstreaming.

Important elements of the PEI approach include a consultative design process, institutional analysis and work to understand the political economy, and the use of existing processes and structures as entry points and mechanisms to bring about change. Depending on the national context, three different models for PE mainstreaming have been used in country programmes visited by the MTR: a) Engaging broadly in Government processes across sectors, b) engaging in specific issues of strategic importance to the country, and c) using an area based approach starting from the sub-national level.

For PEI country programmes sustainability entails “sustained changes in national and local government practices and approaches, which integrate environmental concerns into pro-poor policies, development planning and budgeting”. Indeed, the sustainability of PEI country programmes is based on the premise of a long-term engagement of up to 5-10 years to ingrain changed approaches in government practice. Thus, considering the young age of most country programmes, it is not realistic to expect they will fully become sustainable by the end of 2012. In some of the countries visited, the MTR has recommended no-cost extensions to up till the end of 2012, but all country programmes would need support beyond 2012 to achieve sustainability and full impact.

⁴ The MTR does not cover the Africa pilot programme countries

The technical quality of the tools and support provided by PEI is seen as high, and there is a high country demand for PEI support. However, poverty considerations could be strengthened as the multiple dimensions of poverty (beyond overall economic aspects), gender and vulnerability issues are often only reflected to a limited extent in country programme design and implementation. The rationale behind the UNDP-UNEP partnership is to take advantage of UNEP's expertise on environment and UNDP's expertise on development and strong country presence, but both UNEP and UNDP have at the global and regional levels mainly provided environmental expertise. One improvement at the strategic level is the inclusion of the Poverty Practice Director of UNDP's Bureau of Development Policy in the Joint Management Board as an adviser.

3.3 Main findings:

- PEI adds value by providing a practical approach and tangible tools to build government capacity to mainstream and include PE concerns in an integrated manner in policy and planning processes
- PEI can build up government ownership, influence planning, influence targeted sector policies, promote cross-sectoral collaboration at the sub-national level, and strengthen government planning and implementation capacity. The more difficult aspects are to influence budgeting processes and to enhance cross-sectoral collaboration at central level
- The consultative design process, work to understand the political economy, and the use of existing processes and structures as entry points are important elements of the PEI approach
- The timeframe of the Scale-up programme is too short to ensure sustainability of most country programmes. All Scale-up country programmes would need support beyond 2012 to achieve sustainability and full impact
- The multiple dimensions of poverty, gender and vulnerability issues are often only reflected to a limited extent in country programme design and implementation. Both UNEP and UNDP have at the global and regional levels mainly provided environmental expertise

3.4 Main recommendations

Recommendation	Timeline	Target Group				
		UNEP Management	UNDP Management	PEF	Regional Teams	Country Teams
1. Improve the balance between poverty and environment expertise available to PEI, allocate poverty expertise to all Regional Teams and Country Teams	March 2012		X			
2. Conduct/commission studies and analyses of lessons learned and practices on the following from selected PEI country programmes to analyse key factors (external and internal) that promote or inhibit successful PE mainstreaming and the contribution/attribution of PEI. This should include: - Mature country programmes (good, medium and poor performers) - Countries where PEI has influenced budgeting processes or established cross-sectoral collaboration at national level - An analysis of the three different models for country programmes, and factors determining the best model for a country, i.e. whether to: i) Engage broadly across sectors at national and sub-national level, ii) engage in an area of strategic importance to the country and later expand to other sectors, or iii) take an area based approach starting from the sub-national level	June 2012			X	X	
3. Commission studies on gender and vulnerability issues in relation to environmental issues and how they relate to selected country programmes, to elucidate whether they are adequately considered in programme design and policy work. A guidance note on addressing gender and vulnerability in country programmes could be elaborated	March 2012			X		
4. Adjust PEI programmatic approach: - Include an inception phase for team mobilisation and refinement of the results framework - Ensure clearly defined, focused and strategic economic studies are completed at an early stage. More sophisticated studies can be done later	Sept 2012			X		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include social studies on the multiple dimensions of poverty and vulnerability at an early stage as a tool to inform country programme design - Focus on engaging in budget processes already in phase 1 - Include the three delivery models (broad engagement, narrow focus, area based) as possible options to consider - Reliance on local capacity whenever feasible - Include specific activities to ensure cross-sectoral collaboration - Include specific activities focusing on sustainability from an early stage - Outcome oriented M&E, baselines, indicators, targets as management tools - Delineation of purpose of pilots and when they are appropriate 						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

4 Monitoring and Evaluation

The monitoring and reporting system of PEI has some significant weaknesses, although it complies with UNDP procedures. Reporting focuses on progress on activities, and does not sufficiently capture outcomes and impact. Furthermore, the result frameworks in both the global Scale-up PRODOC and country PRODOCs are inconsistent in the application of targets, indicators and baselines, especially at the outcome level, the global results framework does not have any targets set for the indicators at Outcome level and the second indicator appears difficult to measure. When outcome indicators are available, they are generally not reported against. The monitoring system is currently not used as a management tool at the country and regional levels, but is merely used to report to the higher levels. Despite a correct emphasis on a need for M&E indicators that reflect gender and vulnerability (e.g. capturing how different groups such as smallholders, pastoralists, landless, female headed households, ethnic minorities, handicapped are impacted differently, so unintended negative impacts of policy changes etc. can be avoided/mitigated), these indicators are not fully developed in the global PRODOC and many of the individual country PRODOCs. Furthermore, a full analysis of assumptions and risks is also found lacking. Implications of the weak monitoring and reporting system are: i) Difficulties in demonstrating the value added and outcomes of PEI to donors, ii) national partners often push for pilot projects to demonstrate tangible results, and iii) lessons learned and best practices are not systematically captured. PEF is currently working on a comprehensive revision of the monitoring and reporting system to address these weaknesses. Ongoing agency level work in UNDP on improving impact monitoring and results-based management is also expected to contribute to strengthening PEI's monitoring and reporting system.

4.1 Main findings:

- Result frameworks in both the global Scale-up PRODOC and country PRODOCs are inconsistent in the application of targets, indicators, and baselines, especially at the outcome level, and indicators do not fully capture gender and vulnerability aspects. When outcome indicators are available, they are generally not reported against
- It is difficult to demonstrate the value added and outcomes of PEI to donors
- PEF is currently working on a comprehensive revision of the monitoring and reporting system to address these weaknesses

4.2 Main recommendations

Recommendation	Timeline	Target Group				
		UNEP Management	UNDP Management	PEF	Regional Teams	Country Teams
5. Continue ongoing work on improving the monitoring and reporting system and roll out into practice by January 2012 for global level and new countries/phases	January 2012			X	X	X
6. Develop 4-5 SMART global indicators for the country level to capture the intended results and likelihood of changes being sustained. Assess whether a single indicator set would be applicable, or whether broadly defined targets should be agreed upon against which each country identify appropriate	January 2012			X	X	

indicators. Include in annual progress reports an at-a-glance table, where the progress of each country against these indicators is categorised/scored						
7. Provide specialist M&E inputs to the development of all future results frameworks, to ensure that monitoring is integrated as a management and learning tool, and that resources and mechanisms are included for effective M&E	January 2012				X	
8. Ensure that baselines are established for all new programmes/phases	January 2012				X	X
9. Support ongoing programme phases to strengthen the capture of outcome evidence. Promote simple measures to enhance outcome monitoring	March 2012			X	X	
10. Improve poverty, vulnerability and gender indicators	June 2012			X	X	X
11. Set measurable targets for the second Outcome indicator and Output 3 indicators of the current Results Framework, and report against these targets and indicators	January 2012			X		
12. Assess monitoring system in Tajikistan to see if there are relevant lessons, e.g. regarding measuring outcomes and integration with UN country indicators	March 2012			X		

5 UNDP and UNEP Agency Issues– and integration of PEI in the agencies

A unique feature of PEI is the joint collaboration between UNDP and UNEP, with joint teams, programming, management, budgeting, reporting mechanisms, and pooled funding. The joint collaboration is widely seen as a model for interagency cooperation and how to practically implement the Delivering as One concept, both globally and at country level. The UNEP-UNDP collaborative teams, PEF and Regional Teams, are generally well functioning. Furthermore, both agencies have provided a significant amount of their own core resources and staff time to PEI.

However, while UNDP-UNEP collaboration generally works very well at the PEI programme level, the partnership appears more problematic at the agency level. Donors see interagency collaboration between UNEP/UNDP as a vital reason for supporting PEI, so hiccups in interagency collaboration could threaten the future fundraising ability of PEI. Of particular concern is the prolonged period where neither organisation has filled its senior manager position within PEI⁵, which has had a negative impact on PEI's effectiveness at the strategic level. The different administrative and financial management systems (e.g. agency recruitment and procurement procedures) of UNDP and UNEP are also causing some practical difficulties and inefficiencies (such as delays, low spending at country level); for example, UNEP staff do not have access to the UNDP Atlas system, which is used by PEI for financial management and progress reporting.

While the intended outcome is improved capacity and processes at the national level, there is arguably also a global aspect to sustainability of PEI, although it is not included in the Scale-up results framework, namely the extent to which the experiences and approaches of PEI are ingrained in UNEP and UNDP and an integrated PE approach is mainstreamed into their general practice. So far, this integration appears to take place in certain areas, but not systematically/broadly.

UNEP has other mainstreaming initiatives in relation to the green economy and climate change, which share similarities to PEI's agenda, but collaboration between PEI and these appears somewhat limited, although they reportedly have integrated/adapted some PEI tools in their work. Some UNEP staff report it to be a challenge for UNEP to engage at the country level, where PEI has its focus. On the other hand, there are examples of UNEP using PEI as a platform for engaging at the country level.

In late 2010, an evaluation of UNDP's contribution to environmental management for poverty reduction found that UNDP did not address PE issues in a coordinated institutional approach. One recommendation made by the evaluation was *"the Poverty Environment Initiative represents good practice and should be scaled up to provide a model of how UNDP does business at the country level."*

⁵ UNEP has after the Midterm Review filled the senior manager position, effective from January 2012

It should also be used as a model for working together with UNEP and other agencies”⁶. At the country level, PEI has influenced UNDAFs and UNDP country programme documents to include PE mainstreaming; and UNDP country offices often have a strong sense of ownership of PEI country programmes as evidenced by significant financial contributions (27% of total PEI country programme funding). Furthermore, in some cases PEI country programmes benefit from integrating implementation with other UNDP programmes, but in other cases this does not work well, reportedly due to the implementation modalities applied.

5.1 Main findings:

- The joint collaboration between UNDP and UNEP generally works well at the programme level, and is widely seen as a model for interagency cooperation and how to practically implement the One UN concept, both globally and at country level
- The partnership appears more problematic at the agency level. Donors see interagency collaboration as an important aspect of PEI, so this could threaten the future fundraising ability of PEI
- Different administrative and financial management systems of UNDP and UNEP are causing some practical difficulties and inefficiencies
- Mainstreaming of PEI approaches into agency practice takes place in some areas, but not systematically/broadly

5.2 Main recommendations

Recommendation	Timeline	Target Group				
		UNEP Management	UNDP Management	PEF	Regional Teams	Country Teams
13. Immediately recruit UNEP and UNDP senior managers for PEI ⁷	January 2012	X	X			
14. Maintain and further enhance current joint programme management and pooled funding modalities to ensure continued full collaboration and utilisation of the comparative advantages of both UNEP and UNDP		X	X	X		
15. Include in the next PEI phase mainstreaming of PEI conceptual thinking, methodologies and tools into UNEP and UNDP as a specific output with clearly defined targets		X	X	X		
16. Establish modalities for PEI collaboration and coordination with relevant UNDP and UNEP’s initiatives (e.g. climate change and green economy), e.g. by allocating PEI staff time to these initiatives and vice versa. Build this into the design of the next PEI phase	June 2012	X	X	X		
17. Develop strategy for enhancing awareness and capacity on PE mainstreaming and PEI tools among UNEP and UNDP staff. Identify key staff at HQ, Regional Offices and Country Offices. Provide training courses and mentoring on PE mainstreaming in their core work. Build this into the design of the next PEI phase	December 2012 (strategy)	X	X	X		
18. Provide UNEP employed PEF and Regional Team staff access to Atlas	January 2012		X			
19. Review experiences with country programme delivery through other UNDP programmes to identify lessons on implementation modalities and best practices	December 2012			X	X	

6 Business Practice of PEI at Global and Regional Level

The technical advisory, support and guidance provided by PEF and Regional Teams are widely appreciated and seen as being of high quality, although there is generally less expertise on poverty

⁶ UNDP, 2010, Evaluation of UNDP Contribution to Environmental Management for Poverty Reduction: The Poverty-Environment Nexus. Evaluation Office, December 2010

⁷ Done for UNEP

than environment. There is a high country demand for PEI support; 37 countries have requested support.

6.1 PEF

At the global/PEF level, prolonged understaffing and absence of senior managers is negatively affecting the support and guidance provided to Regional Teams (especially the Africa Team) and is causing delays, although UNDP has allocated senior staff time to PEI as interim mitigation steps and UNEP has recruited a manager effective from January 2012. An interviewed donor representative expressed that the delays caused in relation to preparing and planning for PEI beyond 2012, including donor consultation in this regards, was an area of particular concern⁸. Negative impressions among donors on PEI management at the strategic level may negatively influence the ability of PEI to raise funds for a new phase.

Nonetheless, in some areas support capacity has been enhanced, and PEF has developed several knowledge resources and made them available on their website. The technical tools, guidance notes, and knowledge management services provided by PEF are also widely appreciated by Country Teams, and external outreach also appears to be quite effective. However, the extent to which there is widespread awareness about these resources and their use beyond the PEI programme is unclear/impossible to assess. Their use elsewhere in UNDP and UNEP appears limited, although they have been built upon in relation to green economy and climate change mainstreaming initiatives. The EC funded climate change alliance initiative uses PEI capacity building approaches; but the extent to which the PEI methodology is influencing other agencies and initiatives is unknown to the MTR team.

Overall, PEF appears quite cost-efficient, e.g. in 2010 its annual budget was below USD 300,000⁹, although this figure does not include staff salaries, which are covered by UNDP and UNEP core funds.

6.2 Regional Teams

The Regional Teams play a crucial role in designing effective country programmes, and play an important support role for country programmes, which is appreciated by Country Teams. The structure of Regional Teams and their approaches differ. With frequent travels and very frequent communication between Regional Teams and Country Teams, the support provided may be overly detailed, and in some countries Regional Teams also engage in the day-to-day programme management and national meetings, reportedly due to major capacity challenges and vacancies at the country level. While it is difficult to make firm conclusions about the cost-effectiveness of the Regional Teams from the financial information available, the MTR notes that the proportion of the budget allocated for the Regional Teams in ECIS and in particular LAC is high compared to the budget allocation for country programmes in their respective regions (although the actual support costs per country are similar to those of A-P and Africa), and travel costs in Africa are high compared to other regions.

6.3 Main findings:

- There is a high country demand for PEI support
- The technical advisory, support and guidance provided by PEF and Regional Teams are widely appreciated and of high quality
- PEF has developed several knowledge resources, i.e. tools, guidelines and best practices and made them available on their website. This is widely appreciated by Country Teams but the extent to which there is awareness about these resources and their use beyond PEI is unclear
- Prolonged understaffing and absence of senior managers at PEF has negatively affected the support provided to Regional Teams and caused delays

⁸ A scenario paper on the future of PEI was circulated and discussed with the donors in November 2011, after the completion of the MTR.

⁹ Source: PEI 2010 Financial Report.

- The Regional Teams play a crucial role in designing effective country programmes and providing support for country programmes
- The support provided by Regional Teams may be overly detailed, and the budget for some Regional Teams is high compared to country allocations

6.4 Main recommendations

Recommendation	Timeline	Target Group				
		UNEP Management	UNDP Management	PEF	Regional Teams	Country Teams
20. Review cost efficiency and reduce costs as appropriate for each Regional Team, e.g. by reducing travel costs, consultant costs, and other costs	June 2012	X	X	X	X	
21. Carry out an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the setup of the various Regional Teams to capture lessons learned and best practices. Themes: Quality of support, capacity to provide poverty-related technical advice, actual support needs of Country Teams, role of Regional Teams vis-à-vis day-to-day country programme management and national agendas, comparison of team structures, withdrawal/phase-out strategies	June 2012			X		

7 Conclusion

PEI has met most of the intended output targets 15 months before completion, but is unlikely to meet the remaining targets. PEI is unlikely to spend all the funds available before completion of the current Scale-up phase. Without outcome targets and progress data it is impossible to assess the likelihood of the PEI Scale-up programme achieving the intended outcome, but at the country level it appears likely to achieve most expected results, with the exception of influencing budgets. Progress has been affected a combination of less than anticipated funding, slow recruitment/understaffing, and slow procurement processes. The timeframe of the Scale-up programme is too short to ensure sustainability of most country programmes, which would need further support beyond 2012.

PEI adds value by providing a practical approach and tangible tools for PE mainstreaming, and has demonstrated an ability to influence government planning and policy processes, although influencing government budgets has proven a challenge.

The technical advisory and support provided by PEF and Regional Teams are widely appreciated and of high quality. However, the multiple dimensions of poverty, gender and vulnerability issues are often only reflected to a limited extent in country programmes, and PEI generally has more environmental than poverty expertise available.

Impact/outcome oriented monitoring is weak, and result frameworks are inconsistent in the application of targets, indicators, and baselines, and do not fully capture gender and vulnerability aspects. When outcome indicators are available, they are generally not reported against. It is thus difficult to demonstrate the value added and outcomes of PEI to donors. PEF is currently working on improving the monitoring and reporting system.

The joint collaboration between UNDP and UNEP generally works well at the programme level, but the partnership appears more problematic at the agency level; this could threaten the future fundraising ability of PEI. Integration/mainstreaming of PEI approaches into agency practice should be more systematic, to fully unleash the potential benefits and impact of PEI at a global scale.