

UNDP-GEF MTR Management Response

Management response to the Midterm Review of the *Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF SGP in Peru*¹

Project Title: Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF SGP in Peru

UNDP Project ID (PIMS) #: 5497

GEF Project ID (PMIS) #: 9044

Midterm Review Mission Completion Date: June 7, 2019

Date of Issue of Management Response: July 9, 2019

Prepared by: *Peru SGP National Coordinator*

Contributors:

Cleared by: *UNDP-GEF RTA /UNDP GEF UCP Global Coordinator*

Context, background and findings

The Mid-Term Review of the GEF Small Grant Programme Operational Phase 06 in Peru was carried out in March-April 2019 with the field visit taking place from March 23rd to April 3rd, 2019. The Draft Final Report was delivered on April, 2019 and finalized in June 2019. The Evaluation was carried out by the Consultant Elena Laura Ferretti, who include ten recommendations in the final report.

The management response to each of the recommendations is outlined in the present document.

¹ This template is in alignment with the [Management Response Template](#) for UNDP project-level evaluations in the Evaluation Resource Centre.

Recommendations and management response

Midterm Review recommendation 1. Outcome N.2 Reporting on targets should always clarify the interpretation taken. A few indicators are subject to interpretation (see chapter 4.2.1.1): as this may change what is within reach, given resources, time and geographical characteristics of the area, it is necessary to explain which is the interpretation taken when reporting on achievements.				
Management response: Agreed. A monitoring matrix will detail the definition, variables and main attributes of each indicator of the SGP results framework, considering the SMART approach. This methodology has already been implemented at the grant project level. This will certainly clarify the interpretation of progress and gaps for achieving key targets. Reporting on PIR will follow the interpretation taken.				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking ²	
			Comments	Status ³
1.1 Develop monitoring matrix	August 2019	CPM		
1.2 Reporting	September 2019 and subsequent reporting	CPM		

Midterm Review recommendation 2. Outcome N.3 Ensure more drive and stricter monitoring of Strategic Projects. Three of them only recently started. The ecotourism strategic activity is split between two NGOs which have quite different approaches and require careful alignment of objectives and methodologies; this represents a unique opportunity but also a risk. To recuperate delays, ensure drive, monitoring and consider an additional strategic project in water management, depending on funds availability.				
Management response: Partially agreed. Based on the progress results that each of the strategic have shared in the recent exchange of experiences and in their formal progress reports, SGP team will conduct meetings and visits to strategic projects. There are not enough resources for an additional strategic project in water management at the same scale of the others, but a smaller project that promotes scaling up of water management initiatives can be funded.				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
2.1 Review of progress reports until June 2019	July 2019	CPMU		
2.2 Feedback meetings with coordinators	July 2019	CPM		

² If the MTR is uploaded to the ERC, the status of implementation is tracked electronically in the Evaluation Resource Centre database (ERC).

³ Status of Implementation: Completed, Partially Completed, Pending.

2.3 Monitoring visits to projects	September-December 2019	CPMU		
2.4 Call for proposal for small scale projects related to upscaling SGP initiatives, including water management	August-September 2019	CPMU		

Midterm Review recommendation 3.

Outcome N.3 Ensure a focus on the marketing side of the production chain. All community agrobiodiversity projects should include a component to strategically link production to the market, within a landscape approach and ensuring an equitable price (added value for recuperated ancestral products/services). The agrobiodiversity project is instrumental in this way but only for native products, which are the SGP focus; beneficiaries seek marketing linkages also for other non-native products. SGP will not support non-native products but could consider them at policy level: this could influence district, province and regional strategic policies changes.

Management response: Partially agreed. Most of the projects related to agrobiodiversity already include a component to strategically link production to the market and are also being part of the technical assistance covered by the strategic project on added value and marketing. As part of the final months of the monitoring of these community projects, more attention will be paid on ensuring the marketing side of the production chain. Also, in the case of new projects on this topic, the team will include a component to strategically link production to the market, if relevant. It is important to consider that there are some community agrobiodiversity initiatives are implemented with very poor and vulnerable families that are more focused in food security and in recuperating biodiversity in crops, or in adapting to climate change, or including agroecological practices, and their goals at an initial moment are not related to the market.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
3.1 Ensuring marketing focus on current projects related to agrobiodiversity.	August-October 2019	CPM		
3.2 Ensuring marketing focus on new projects related to agrobiodiversity.	As new CfP are launched	CPM		

Midterm Review recommendation 4.

All outcomes. Ensure the sound gender approach taken by the project is extended to involve the youth. This is a key activity to impact on the lessening of migration from the area and extend benefits across generations; a policy to systematically involve the youth is recommended.

Management response:

Agreed. Capacity building, exchange experience events and communication products will consider this recommendation to be also oriented to the youngsters. In future call for proposals, more attention will be given to involve young people, for example from school students, universities, research thesis.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking
---------------	------------	---------------------	----------

			Comments	Status
4.1 Include disaggregation of beneficiaries including youth criteria	September 2019 and subsequent reporting	CPMU		
4.2 Involve more youth in capacity building events and scaling up / replication processes promoted by SGP.	September 2019 – to the end of the project	CPMU		

Midterm Review recommendation 5.

Consider a no-cost extension of the Project. Aside from delays, the Project effectively has only three and not four years of implementation, from February 2017 to end of January 2020. Considering the nature of the small-grants and the fact that this is the first SGP FSP of the country, an extension is advisable up to 17 months, according to funds availability.

Management response:

Agreed. An extension to allow operative work of 4 years will certainly ensure that the objective and targets are met, since part of the targets depend on replication and scaling up processes based on the evidence of projects. Appropriation of the results by local and regional decision makers is also key, and 2019 has marked the beginning of advocacy activities for this, coinciding with the incoming of new subnational authorities. Therefore, an extension request is being formulated and will be discussed with the SGP National Steering Committee.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
5.1 Planning and draft request	August 2019	CPMU and UNDP RTA		
5.2 NSC meeting for discussion on extension workplan	September 2019	CPMU and SGP NSC		
5.3 Formal request	September 2019	CPMU and UNDP RTA		

Midterm Review recommendation 6.

Reform the Peru NSC to ensure: i) respect for the rotation rule, ii) replacement of members that have been sitting on the Committee for a long-time, especially when sick, old or are leaving (i.e. probably the gender focal point); iii) willingness and capacity to participate in pre-selection and M&E project site visits; iv) reporting on meetings is standardized and more informative of the decision-making process.

Management response:

Agreed. A proposal of Peru NSC reform will be prepared, considering the criteria outlined in this recommendation, based on exchange of ideas with MINAM, UNDP Peru, and other current NSC members. The proposal will also consider the gaps in knowledge necessary for the present and next phase, as well as the institutional memory that some of the current members have. This proposal will be shared and discussed with NSC input and decision will be made. Based on this, UNDP Peru will issue official letters to the new NSC members. From now on, the SGP team will include in the minutes of the NSC meetings more detailed information about discussions and decision-making

process. In the previous minutes, the focus was more on the decisions and the detailed supporting material was compiled separately.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
6.1 NSC reform proposal prepared and shared	September 2019	CPM		
6.2 NSC meeting for discussion and decision	September 2019	NSC		
6.3 More detailed NSC minutes	Starting May 2019	CPM		
6.4 Reformed NSC starts officially, with official letters to members from UNDP	October 2019	UNDP		

Midterm Review recommendation 7.

Document lessons learnt from previous and current OPs and prepare decision-making tools. Lessons learnt from previous SGP OPs are available but they are neither structured nor systematized. SGP Peru is only now being evaluated as a stand-alone Country Program, though in the past it was part of the UNDP/GEF Joint Evaluation of the SGP.. The preparation of decision-making tools/documents/reports are recommended, in addition to nicely prepared knowledge management material, which are tailored for other, although important, processes and actors. The CPMT, SGP Global may be involved to provide inputs while documenting lessons learnt from previous OPs.

Management response:

Agreed. Lessons learned that include current and previous phases in the Southern Andes are planned through the following publications: three study cases, one for each thematic strategic project: value addition and marketing of Andean crops and products; sustainable production and value addition from camelids; community-based ecotourism. One SGP publication about traditional knowledge of native crop/livestock genetic resources. SGP thematic policy briefs based on evidence from projects, with recommendations to policy makers. One SGP study case summarizing impact, lessons learned and recommendations for policy makers in the six main topics the SGP is working on.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
7.1 Publications detailed planning	July- December 2019	CPMU		
7.2 Systematization, writing and edition	September 2019 – June 2020	CPMU (and strategic projects)		
7.3 Publications printed /produced and shared	March-December 2020	CPMU		

Midterm Review recommendation 8.

Ensure MINAM visibility in communication material and during meetings with stakeholders. MINAM's requests for visibility have not been answered in the modalities required by the claimant.				
Management response: Agreed. All communication material that is being produced by SGP Peru since December 2018 involves MINAM's logo and acknowledges MINAM support. Following this guideline, a new visual identity manual for SGP Peru has been produced in 2019 and distributed to grantees in order to comply with this requirement.				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
8.1 New communication material from SGP and from grantees involve MINAM-SGP guidelines	SGP from December 2018. Grantees progressively since April 2019.	CPMU		

Midterm Review recommendation 9. Replace the Tracking Tools with the new GEF "Updated Results Architecture for GEF-7". This new policy, approved in June 2018 by the GEF Council meeting, includes a set of 11 "core indicators" and 29 sub-indicators and requires projects to replace the TT with these core indicators. It is suggested to proceed to this adjustment as soon as feasible, possibly during the preparation of the next PIR or ultimately before the Terminal Evaluation.				
Management response: Agreed. Migration will be done from Tracking Tools, to the new set of core indicators.				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
9.1 Migration to core indicators tracking	August – September 2019 and subsequent reporting	CPM		

Midterm Review recommendation 10. Assess results achieved at small-grant project level and design an exit-strategy. Identify promising, yet not mature, initiatives to ensure they are not abandoned, even if the decision is taken to move the geographical focus of SGP for OP-7. It takes time and practice to ensure projects are not "islands" but instead fully coordinated and integrated activities which may translate into possible local development policies. In addition, working in the sierra is a key activity to decrease migration towards the selva.				
Management response: Partially agreed. We will design an exit strategy at the project level but will also consider the "innovation level" as sometimes is not the "project" what is needed to be supported but the "innovative idea", the "model" or the diversity of best practices led by an organization within a topic. And sometimes is the combination of innovations among several projects.				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status

10.1 Assess results achieved at small-grant project level (as projects go through their final stage)	August 2019-January 2020	CPMU		
10.2 Design an exit-strategy, related to the project extension.	November 2019	CPMU and NSC		