## **Evaluation of NEASPEC**



#### **Evaluation Overview**

#### **PURPOSE / SCOPE**

- To inspire and inform strategy development process for next 5-year period (2021-2025)
- Evaluate the implementation of the current Strategic Plan (2016-2020)

#### **METHOD**

Conducted in accordance with the norms, standards and procedures set out in the "ESCAP monitoring and evaluation: policy and guidelines"

#### **EVALUATOR**

Dr. Joyce Miller, a Swiss-based consultant

#### **APPROACH**

- Qualitative and quantitative: desk research + interviews (41) + survey (161)+ 4 NEASPEC meetings
- Supervision provided by ESCAP valuation Reference Group

#### [ESCAP Evaluation reference group]

- Executive Secretary (Chair)
- Director, Strategy and Programme Management Division (SPMD)
- Head, ESCAP East and North-East Asia Office
- Deputy Head, East and North-East Asia Office
- Officer, Evaluation Unit, SPMD (secretariat)

### **Evaluation: conclusion (1)**

#### **RELEVANCE**

- Stands out in the quality of dialogue, linking to usefulness to its member States
- NEASPEC's ability to support and accelerate progress towards these commitments has not been fully recognized

#### **EFFECTIVENESS**

- Judged as very high by providing a useful infrastructure for multi-state discussion and cooperation
- Opportunities to strengthen the alignment of NEASPEC's programmatic agenda and its implementation with the framework and strategic plan to deepen environmental cooperation and the 2030 Agenda

#### **EFFICIENCY**

 NEASPEC's processes to facilitate intergovernmental cooperation: not judged by the notion of efficiency

### **Evaluation: conclusion (2)**

### SUSTAINABILITY, RESOURCE MOBILIZATION, PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENTS

- Sustainability is not in question.
- Better served through unearmarked funds and a reliable, forecastable, and adequate flow of resources
- A more strategic approach to partnership to unleash further financial and inkind support from project partners

### MAINSTREAMING OF GENDER EQUALITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

 Potentially non-controversial entry points within NEASPEC's work on land degradation, marine protected areas and low carbon cities

### STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESS OF THE INSITUTIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL SET-UP

- Mid-level SOM participation, frequent National Focal Points (NFPs) changes, maintaining a voluntary approach, and providing minimal resourcing
- A golden opportunity to link NEASPEC more strongly to achieving member States' obligations related to international treaties and the 2030 Agenda

### Recommendations

Recommendation	ESCAP Management responses
1. Decide whether or not to move forward in operationalizing NEASPEC in a way that would <b>enable the full realization of its founding vision to be a comprehensive environmental cooperation mechanism.</b>	Encourages member States to revisit the Framework of NEASPEC adopted in 1996 and Vision Statement adopted in 2000 with a view of reflecting the latest development and long-term perspectives of NEASPEC, and thus the SOM-24 to discuss the need and modality of revisiting the Framework.
2. Review the 1996 founding framework and update NEASPEC's charter so that it is aligned with the ambition and intention of the involved member States, as informed by the 27 years of cooperation and coordination and in light of the accelerative effect of using a Strategic Plan.	

### Recommendations

Recommendation	ESCAP Management responses
3. Honor the notion of high-level participation in SOM, as per the founding vision, and more stability of designated NFPs	Higher level of representations as well as the inclusion of more stakeholders into the national delegation could further strengthen SOM into a key decision-making body and a main subregional platform for project coordination and management to the Programme.
4. Strengthen existing links and identify and broaden new communication and reporting channels between NEASPEC and ESCAP for synergy	Enhance its linkages with ESCAP's regional programmes: two recent ESCAP resolutions on air pollution and oceans and new initiatives on geospatial air pollution information, climate change, and nature-based solutions.
5. Revise the funding modalities to <b>enhance the reliability and level of funding flows</b> , and review options for progressively moving towards <b>more equitable contributions from all member States</b> , with a roadmap towards this achievement.	Consider institutionalizing the modality of national contributions, for example, through a trust fund agreement, towards more stable and predictable, which could be discussed in connection with the recommendation 1 and 2

#### Recommendations

Recommendation	ESCAP Management Response
6. Enhance the resourcing of the NEASPEC Secretariat	The option of expert secondment could be still useful, which could offer mutual benefits for the Secretariat and member States. Furthermore, the Secretariat will make an internal arrangement for allocating more staff time to enhance the efficiency of work on NEASPEC, and proposes allocating the Core Fund for co-financing the professional staff dedicated to the NEASPEC operation, as proposed in Core Fund plan for 2021-2025
7. Use virtual meetings to enhance the frequency and quality of the intergovernmental connectedness being pursued under NEASPEC	Utilize virtual meetings even after returning to the normal condition from COVID-19 in order to enhance the frequency and quality of the intergovernmental connectedness

#### **ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### The Meeting may wish to:

invite member States to share views on the recommendations, and secretariat responses, and suggest follow-up actions.

decide on holding an ad hoc meeting to develop and agree on a concrete implementation plan for addressing the evaluation recommendations, including follow-up actions with clear responsibilities and timelines.

# THANK YOU 谢谢 та бүхэнд баярлалаа ありがとうございます 감사합니다 спасибо

