

**Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6)
Draft Terms of Reference for the study on
BIODIVERSITY FOCAL AREA
May 2017**

Background and Scope

1. The GEF provides financial and technical resources for developing countries and countries with economies in transition to implement the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The CBD, which was adopted in 1992, is the global policy framework for action to conserve biodiversity for a sustainable future. The convention includes protocols that target access and benefit sharing of genetic resources (Nagoya), and biosafety (Cartagena).
2. Since 1991, the GEF has provided \$4.8 billion in grants and mobilized an additional \$17.9 billion in co-financing from public, multilateral, and private sources to 1,167 projects supporting countries in biodiversity conservation initiatives. These investments have supported interventions in protected areas (PAs), PA systems, productive landscapes, and seascapes, on biosafety, access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing.
3. The goal of the current Biodiversity Focal Area (GEF-6) strategy is to maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society. To achieve this goal, the strategy encompasses four objectives:
 - improve sustainability of protected area systems;
 - reduce threats to biodiversity;
 - sustainably use biodiversity; and
 - Mainstream conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into production landscapes/seascapes and sectors.
4. Previous studies on the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area have looked at benefit generation, biodiversity loss, and impacts including a comprehensive assessment of the effect of PAs and PA systems¹ (Objective 1 of GEF-6 BD strategy). Recently, the GEF IEO undertook a Value for Money (VFM) analysis to assess the efficiency of GEF investments and technical support to biodiversity projects. Drawing on previous studies and evaluations, this Biodiversity Focal Area study aims to assess the three important and evolving components of the GEF's Biodiversity Strategy, which are yet to be independently evaluated by the IEO. These three areas are:

¹ *Biodiversity Impact Evaluation - Support to Protected Areas and Protected Area Systems* provides an important set of findings on the overall impact of GEF support to protected areas

1. Biodiversity Mainstreaming
2. Combatting Illegal Wildlife Trade
3. Nagoya Protocol and ABS

All the components above will be assessed separately through 3 sub-studies.

5. Biodiversity mainstreaming: The GEF-6 Programming Directions (2014b) states that: ‘Biodiversity mainstreaming is the process of embedding biodiversity considerations into policies, strategies, and practices of key public and private actors that impact or rely on biodiversity. Mainstreaming, therefore, enables biodiversity to persist across entire landscapes and seascapes’. Between 2004 and 2016 the GEF supported a total of 427 biodiversity mainstreaming programs and projects, totaling \$2.7 billion and leveraging an additional \$16.8 billion in co-financing. Of these, only 29% are completed, and the rest is ongoing (57%) and at PPG stage (14%)².
6. Previous studies have been undertaken by the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) to better understand the practice of ‘biodiversity mainstreaming,’ and generate some early lessons. Given its significance and the fact that a large portfolio of GEF projects has this component, there is a need to independently assess it to create an evidence base for informing current and future GEF interventions.
7. Combatting Illegal Wildlife Trade: Hunting, poaching, illegal trade in wildlife and wildlife parts is one of the major threats to species and biodiversity. The value of illegal trade has been estimated at between \$5 and \$20 billion per year, making wildlife crime the fourth most lucrative illegal business after narcotics, human trafficking, and weapons. As per the GEF-6 BD Strategy GEF-supported interventions to reduce poaching and illegal wildlife trade aim to:
 - a) Strengthening national legislation, institutions, and law enforcement to reduce poaching;
 - (b) Strengthening science-based wildlife monitoring, education, and awareness; and;
 - (c) Reducing demand for illegal wildlife products.
8. GEF’s flagship program known as “Global Partnership on Wildlife Conservation and Crime Prevention for Sustainable Development” was launched in 2015 to stop poaching, trafficking and demand for wildlife and wildlife products illegally traded between Africa and Asia. With a \$90 million grant from the GEF and an additional \$513 million in co-financing, the program will work in eight African

² https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/GEF_MainstreamingBiod_11.28.16.pdf

- and two Asian countries.³ Most programs and projects for combatting Illegal Wildlife Trade are in the implementation stage.
9. The Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) provides a legal framework for the effective implementation of the third objective of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD). The main purpose of the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund is to facilitate early entry into force and create enabling conditions at national and regional levels for implementation of the Protocol.
 10. The study objectives and overarching evaluation questions for OPS6 translate into a number of sub-questions grouped by the core evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results, and sustainability). The draft questions are provided in Annex 1-3.

Study Objectives

11. The purpose of this study is to provide insights and lessons for the Biodiversity Focal area going forward into the next replenishment cycle (GEF-7), based on the evaluative evidence generated.
12. The main objective of the Biodiversity Mainstreaming sub-study is to evaluate the conditions under which biodiversity mainstreaming is being implemented in GEF supported interventions and processes. Specifically, the sub-study will:
 - Assess the relevance of biodiversity mainstreaming.
 - Assess effectiveness, results, and impacts of the biodiversity mainstreaming portfolio.
 - Present a synthesis of biodiversity mainstreaming results and progress towards impacts.
13. The objectives of the Combatting Illegal Wildlife Trade sub-study are to:
 - Relevance of the component for combatting illegal wildlife trade and reducing threat to biodiversity
 - Relevance of the component to GEF's BDFA strategy
14. The objectives of the Nagoya Protocol sub-study are to assess:
 - Relevance of the component for addressing issues on access to and sharing benefits of biological resources
 - Relevance of the component to GEF's BDFA strategy

Methods

15. Overall, this Focal Area study will use the following methods and tools:
 - **A Comprehensive Review** of relevant documents consisting of both external and internal documents, reports and publications from GEF and GEF's partner agencies. GEF documents will include project documents, interim reviews,

³ https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/IWT_trifold_reduced_0.pdf

Terminal Evaluations (TEs), and Terminal Evaluation Reviews (TERs). Case studies using both qualitative and quantitative data will be prepared for in-depth consideration of important findings and issues.

- **A Project Portfolio Analysis** will assess the nature and extent of biodiversity mainstreaming, access to and sharing of benefits, and the strategies on combatting illegal wildlife trade within a portfolio of selected GEF projects based on PMIS data. This analysis will include a review of project documents to assess project design, trends in performance and implementation, results as well as alignment with policies and strategies.
- **A quality-at-entry review** of GEF IWT and Nagoya Protocol Projects approved during GEF-5 and GEF-6, will assess the relevance, ex-ante quality of monitoring and evaluation, and the design aspects of these projects.
- **Interviews** with key informants and stakeholders. Since a significant fraction of the projects is still under implementation, key informants and stakeholders will be crucial in providing information on the status of the projects. These include but are not limited to interviews with task team leaders (TTLs), GEF agencies, Executing Agencies, and the GEF Secretariat.

Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix for the Biodiversity Mainstreaming Sub-Study

- 1) Relevance
 - How is GEF support to mainstreaming projects and programs responding to the CBD guidance and decisions?
 - a) What are the gaps in the theory of change? What has been learned from the scientific literature that could contribute to the improvement of the current theory of change?
 - b) How has the biodiversity mainstreaming typologies of projects evolved in the GEF through different strategies?
 - c) To what extent biodiversity mainstreaming has reflected in the priorities of GEF eligible countries?
- 2) Effectiveness and Results
 - a) What are the synergies and trade-offs that mainstreaming brings?
 - b) What are the trends in performance and implementation of the GEF biodiversity mainstreaming portfolio?
 - c) To what extent the sectoral and biodiversity indicators in the results framework effective in measuring project outcomes?
 - d) Has a typology of biodiversity mainstreaming projects been more successful than other typologies of biodiversity mainstreaming in achieving their stated goals?
- 3) Impact
 - a) What are the impacts of biodiversity mainstreaming and what factors influence their achievement?
- 4) Sustainability
 - a) Is the level of stakeholder ownership sufficient to allow for project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?
 - b) Was sufficient time provided within the duration of the project to achieve its objectives as well as ensure its sustainability?
 - c) Was the project designed with the idea of ensuring its sustainability from project inception?
- 5) Progress Towards Impact
 - a) Has mainstreaming been scaled up after GEF projects have ended?
 - b) Looking at the GEF portfolio, have mainstreaming lessons been replicated?
 - c) What were the enabling factors for best practices?

Annex 2: Draft Evaluation Issues/Questions for the IWT Sub-Study

There are six primary lines of inquiry, as well as a number of subsidiary questions. The questions are designed to illuminate specific stages of the IWT supply chain and to specific cross-cutting issues, and in many cases to multiple stages and issues. Additional questions will depend on specific responses.

- 1) Across the IWT supply chain, where is the GEF IWT program addressing needs effectively, and where could it be improved?
- 2) Does the GEF IWT program fill needs not currently met by other funders?
 - a) What are the GEF's comparative advantages in light of its structure, resources, and past practices, and how can the GEF leverage those advantages to more effectively combat IWT? For example, has the GEF fully taken advantage of its niche of working directly through government agencies?
 - b) In what ways, if any, does the GEF framework present challenges to creating an effective IWT program? How can the GEF IWT program work around these obstacles?
 - c) Does the GEF IWT program adequately address linkages between IWT and global criminal trafficking networks?
 - d) To what extent does the GEF IWT program complement activities funded by other entities? To what extent does it duplicate those activities?
- 3) To what extent does the GEF IWT program exhibit key characteristics of effective programs addressing IWT, and where is there room for improvement?
 - a) Do the GEF program and the associated projects adequately build political will and fight corruption?
 - b) Do the GEF's current IWT efforts reflect lessons learned from efforts to combat IWT by other institutions (bilateral donors, NGOs, etc.), as well as previous efforts by the GEF itself?
 - c) Does the GEF IWT program adequately take advantage of new and changing technologies that can be used to combat IWT?
 - d) To what extent does the GEF IWT program advance established international priorities, such as the Aichi Target and SDGs??
- 4) To what extent does the GEF IWT program foster coordination and knowledge sharing?
 - a) Does the GEF IWT program effectively coordinate among individual projects? What are the activities carried out by the Coordination Grant to the WB that aim at assisting countries with coordination?

- b) Does the GEF IWT program effectively foster coordination among government agencies within a country?
 - c) Does the GEF IWT program effectively foster coordination between countries?
 - d) To what extent does the GEF IWT program encourage knowledge sharing among countries and stakeholders?
- 5) To what extent does the broad scope of the GEF IWT program support the goals of the program? Does it create challenges?
- a) Does the range of projects under the GEF IWT program match the scope of the program as framed? To the extent it does not, it is worthwhile and/or possible to address that mismatch?

Annex 3: Draft Evaluation Issues/Questions for the Nagoya Protocol Sub-Study

- 1) Evolution of the GEF ABS/NP strategy/implementation to fit the needs of countries
 - a) How has the GEF strategy on ABS changed over the replenishment phases 3, 4, 5 and 6?
 - b) What are the key issues and challenges facing countries with regard to the implementation of the ABS and, in particular, the Nagoya Protocol?
 - c) Has the GEF strategy dealt with CBD COP recommendations and Guidance related to ABS and the Nagoya Protocol?
 - d) Synthesis: To what extent do the GEF's ABS/NP strategic elements (objectives, etc.) respond to the needs of countries and of the CBD/NP?
- 2) Strategies/Objectives
 - a) To what extent has the GEF support enabled Countries to established measures that promote access and benefit sharing agreements that recognize core ABS principles of PIC, MAT and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits?
 - b) To what extent has GEF support helped to provide technical assistance to ratification and implementation of the NP?
 - c) To what extent has GEF support led to the creation of legally binding agreements between users and providers of genetic resources [and traditional knowledge]?
 - d) To what extent has the program helped to improve capacity to create and implement ABS measures and legally binding agreements?
 - e) Has the GEF support built on the previous GEF ABS work, including for the implementation of the Bonn Guidelines?
 - f) How has GEF support enabled regional ABS development or regional collaboration on national ABS development?
 - g) To what extent does GEF support assist countries in the development of ABS strategies and action plans?
 - h) To what extent has GEF support enabled the development of innovative legal and practical tools for ABS implementation?
 - i) To what extent has GEF support enabled national ABS to provide support/incentives for the conservation and protection of national parks/protected areas?
 - j) To what extent has GEF support enabled national ABS implementation to provide support and incentives for indigenous communities?
- 3) Gaps or Deficiencies in Coverage.
- 4) Suggestions from Good Practices.