

**GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4**

<b>1. PROJECT DATA</b>				
GEF Project ID:	1307		Review date:	
IA/EA Project ID:	1757	<b>GEF financing:</b>	<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name:	In-situ Conservation of Native Landraces and their Wild Relatives in Vietnam	IA/EA own:	.93	.90 <sup>1</sup>
Country:	Vietnam	Government:	UA	1.43
		Other*:	UA	.51
		<b>Total Co-financing</b>	3.00	1.94
Operational Program:	OP 13: Agro-biodiversity	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	3.92	2.85
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
	Institute of Agriculture Genetics (IAG)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		2002 May
		Closing Date	Proposed: May 2005	Actual: March 2006
Prepared by: Shaista Ahmed	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 36 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 46 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 10 months
Author of TE: Josef Margraf Vu Van Dzung Tran Dinh Nghia		TE completion date: May 2006	TE submission date to GEF EO: May 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 24 months

\* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

**2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS**

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S			S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A			MU
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	-			UA
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	MS
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A		MS

<sup>1</sup> Based on the projections listed in the last PIR.

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why? No. The report did not sufficiently cover project's M&E system and also did not provide any information on actual project costs and co-financing.
2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.? No.

**3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

**3.1 Project Objectives**

**a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

According to the project document the global environmental objective of the project is:

“To conserve globally significant agro-biodiversity of 6 important crop groups (rice, taro litchi-longan, rice bean, citrus, and tea) including native landraces and wild relatives in 3 local eco-geographical areas: the northern mountain, the northern midlands, and the north-west mountains of Vietnam.”

According to the terminal evaluation report there has been no change in the global environmental objectives during the implementation of the project.

**b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

According to the project document the following are the development objectives of the project:

Objective 1: “Establishment of Gene Management Zones (GMZ) through the creation of an appropriate enabling environment.”

Objective 2: “Operationalization of GMZ’s through capacity building, training, and removal of barriers.”

Objective 3: “Targeted research, information management and analysis in support of GMZ establishment and operationalization”

Objective 4: “Public awareness, education and information dissemination in support of the replication of the GMZ approach”

According to the terminal evaluation report there has been no change in the development objectives during the implementation of the project.

**(describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)**

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)

**c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)**

Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

**4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY**

**4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)**

<b>a. Relevance (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities)</b>	
<b>Rating: S</b>	
A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:	
(i) the national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?	
According to the project document, Vietnam is one of Vavilov's "Centers of Origin" and is recognized as one of the 10 centers of "highest biodiversity" in the world. The project document indicates that agro-biodiversity is under threat in Vietnam due to various reasons and its "conservation is urgent" due to the fact that it is the "backbone for food security". The project targets the conservation of six globally important crop species crop groups: rice, taro, tea, litchi-longan, citrus and the rice bean and aims to provide the proper "enabling conditions" to preserve agro biodiversity within Vietnam's critical regions which is consistent with the national sustainable development agenda.	
(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?	
According to the project document conservation of agro-biodiversity, the project's overarching goal is recognized as a national priority within Vietnam's Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP). The project document indicates the project activities are consistent with the BAP and will help the Vietnamese government in protecting the zones where the biodiversity of native landraces and their wild relatives are "abundant and varied". Additionally the project activities mirror activities undertaken by the Institute of Agricultural Genetics (IAG), housed within Vietnam's Ministry for Agriculture and Rural Development, which involve the use of wild plants as genetic resources.	
(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?	
The project's global environmental objective is to conserve globally significant agro-biodiversity of 6 important crop groups which is consistent with GEF's strategies and mandate regarding the conservation of globally significant biodiversity.	
(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)	
Vietnam ratified the CBD – Convention on Biological Diversity in 1994. The project will facilitate Vietnam in meeting its obligations under the CBD.	
A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership <sup>2</sup>	
NA	
<b>b. Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
<p>The TE indicates that initially the design of the project had shortcomings in its "scientific and development approach" to agro-biodiversity conservation especially with respect to the confusion regarding the definition of "in-situ conservation", "landraces", "relatives", and 'cultivars'. However the TE credits project's eventual achievements to implementation of the mid-term evaluation recommendations and the combined support of the mentoring team and the project staff of the IAG. According to the TE, the extended project time frame allowed most of the project activities to be implemented satisfactorily. The project was effective in increasing awareness across relevant stakeholders regarding the importance of conserving Vietnam's unique crop species and their locally adapted varieties. Listed below are the project's various achievements under specific objective headings:</p> <p><b>Objective 1: Establishment of Gene Management Zones (GMZ) through the creation of an appropriate enabling environment.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9 Plant Genetic Resource Importance Zones officially recognized (original target: 8 zones)</li> <li>• Criteria of Importance Zones study zones and management zones refined and presented to Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD)</li> <li>• Guidelines for management of IZ produced and submitted to MARD</li> <li>• Community biodiversity registry for farmers created</li> <li>• Revolving funds established</li> </ul> <p><b>Objective 2: Operationalization of GMZ's through capacity building, training, and removal of</b></p>	

<sup>2</sup> Please consider for regional and global project only

<p><b>barriers.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 40 training courses on traditional varieties knowledge implemented</li> <li>• 18 training courses on techniques implemented</li> <li>• 3 training workshops held</li> <li>• 4 diversity seed fairs held</li> </ul> <p><b>Objective 3: Targeted research, information management and analysis in support of GMZ establishment and operationalization</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly bulletin created with 9 issues</li> </ul> <p><b>Objective 4: Public awareness, education and information dissemination in support of the replication of the GMZ approach</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 manual for pest prevention concerning project crops created</li> <li>• 2 study tours completed</li> <li>• Informational seminar held at University</li> <li>• Produced information materials for dissemination to general public</li> </ul>	
<b>c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: MS</b>
<p>As previously mentioned the majority of the project activities have been implemented satisfactorily. However as mentioned in section 4.1.1b shortcomings due to incomprehensive definitions of “in-situ” conservation and “land races” as well as shortcomings in the “scientific and development approach” to agro-biodiversity conservation in the project design led to delays in project implementation extending the project to March 2006 from the original closure date of April 2005. The first extension was for 7 months to allow for more time to implement project activities, extending the project to December 2005. The second extension was for 3 months to finalize all project activities before the project closure which finally extended the project to March 2006. Both extensions did not lead to increases in the project budget. By December 2004 only 33 out of 159 activities had been completed. Through the implementation of recommendations made by the mid-term review and through support of the mentoring team and IAG’s project staff, the project had completed most of its activities by the revised closing date.</p>	
<p>d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated) – this could happen both during the designing of the project where some choices are made that lead to preference for one priority over the other, and during implementation of the project when resources are transferred from addressing environmental priorities to development priorities and vice versa. If possible explain the reasons for such tradeoffs.</p>	
<p>No trade-offs were specified in the TE.</p>	

**4.1.2 Results / Impacts<sup>3</sup> (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible))**

**4.2 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of risks to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

<b>a. Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<p>According to the TE due to lack of an overarching strategy regarding the continuation of the transfer of knowledge, substantial inputs may be required through a follow-up phase/project. The TE informs that Vietnam’s five-year budget includes a budget of \$1.2 billion for genetic resource protection which will allow various institutions to continue with agro-biodiversity conservation and provide matching funds for future international projects. Additionally, the project will most likely not be able to continue to the next phase based on GEF’s current funding and will require combined funding through national and international efforts.</p>	
<p>Although some of the local varieties chosen for the project have an “excellent” marketing value and provide</p>	

<sup>3</sup> Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

<p>decent incomes for farmers, the TE indicates that others did not “substantially” contribute to the livelihood of farmers. The TE claims the project has “responded well” by adapting different incentives for the conservation of low-income versus high-income generating varieties and specifies that “novel processing technologies” could be utilized in successfully marketing low-income generating varieties. Another option is the trade-marking and registration of hybrids which has the potential for future income generation, especially for national institutions. However the TE cautions the technical and the administrative processes behind it are “cumbersome and expensive, and the follow-through on international claims is beyond farmer’s ability”.</p> <p>The TE also discusses the on-going conflict regarding the financial compensation provided to protect individual trees which had been previously conserved by local communities as a component of cultural heritage. The TE warns community support of preserving cultural heritage may be abandoned once funding stops.</p>	
<b>b. Socio-economic / political</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<p>According to the TE the project has progressively become a “socially accepted support structure” for local communities. The TE attributes this to the fact that the project switched from sub-contracting to directly contracting to communities. This support structure was also strengthened due to the fact that farmers became active partners in the project’s implementation. The TE indicates that farmers have received extended support beyond species conservation. As a result farmers have “unanimously” expressed their interest in continuing the project activities and including more crops than the original six that were selected.</p> <p>However the TE emphasizes the project’s success is contingent upon the “social integration” of the project’s field staff and the charisma of its leadership. Additionally the TE emphasizes the sustainability of the project’s interventions is dependent upon the “strong management input” from farmers. The TE also emphasizes that farmer-independent in-situ conservation mechanisms such as agricultural gardens for tourism and gene conservation should also be taken into consideration at the same time as farmer’s management and traditional knowledge needs. Also the TE indicates that farmer’s cannot be responsible for in-situ conservation unless they get “sufficiently compensated” for their services.</p>	
<b>c. Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<p>As previously mentioned the Vietnamese government has allocated \$1.2 billion toward genetic resource protection in its 5-yr plan. According to the TE, this allocation will allow various institutions, of which many which are located within Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, to continue with agro-biodiversity conservation. The TE attributes the project’s success to the scientific institutions under the Vietnamese Academy. In turn, the TE claims, these institutions have “increased their knowledge-base, enriched their collections and acquisitions and guarantee sustained efforts towards selected species conservation.” However, the TE indicates that the project still lacks an overarching strategy regarding the “continued knowledge transfer” which may require “substantial input” through a follow-up phase or project.</p>	
<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: UA</b>
<p>The TE indicates that pesticide use in and around agro-biodiversity zones should be replaced by “ecological and organic farming practices” to help increase the flora and fauna naturally associated with the selected 6 crops and their farming systems. However the TE does not specify to what extent this risk can undermined the future flow of project’s environmental benefits.</p>	
<b>e. Technological</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
<p>The TE notes that surveys feeding into the GMZ plans were not conducted in cooperation with local communities. As a result basic data on the local names of the species and varieties were not collected which, according to the TE, is “necessary as a first indicator for a genetic difference”. According to the TE only “morphological criteria” was used for differentiating varieties which is insufficient for the project’s purpose of protecting existing local varieties which have a “long history of migration and adaptation”. Without revisions to the survey, the project is left with collection of names of ‘landraces’ that is significantly different from earlier Vietnamese documents. The TE cautions these inconsistencies may contribute to future problems in nomenclature and subsequently in trade marking and registration of local species and varieties. If these issues are left unaddressed, the gains made in the project will be undermined.</p>	

#### 4.3 Catalytic role<sup>4</sup>

<p><b>a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders</b></p>
<p>As previously mentioned the project has progressively become a “socially accepted support structure” for local communities. The TE attributes this to the fact that the project switched from sub-contracting to directly contracting to communities. As a result farmers became active partners in the project’s implementation. There are an increasing number of farmer families that want to be included in the project activities as well as those that have attended trainings, with many farmers receiving extended support beyond species conservation. Farmers have “unanimously” expressed their interest in continuing the project activities and including more crops than the original six that were selected. Additionally, there is an increasing importance of agricultural biodiversity conservation across national institutions which have provided substantial support through their staff involvement, fund allotment, policy development, and extension activities.</p> <p>The TE recognized a “deep impact at all levels of involvement” in terms of the awareness regarding the importance of agro-biodiversity conservation. The involvement and commitment to agro-biodiversity conservation across stakeholders has helped to develop a “good social base” as well as a “sense of urgency” which will help in the project’s continuation either through a new project or a second phase.</p>
<p><b>b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors</b></p>
<p>The TE notes that agro-biodiversity and its national importance has become an “integral part of institutions and authorities involved in the project”. This is evidenced by the level of support national institutions have provided towards agro-biodiversity conservation through their “staff involvement, fund allotment, policy development, and extension activities”.</p>
<p><b>c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?</b></p>
<p>According to the TE the project’s greatest achievement has been the awareness that has been raised across all levels—from government all the way to famers—regarding the importance of crop varieties. As previously mentioned, the increasing importance of agricultural biodiversity conservation is evidenced by the support national institutions have provided through their staff involvement, fund allotment, policy development, and extension activities. This, in turn, has created a “solid base” for continuation of conservation efforts.</p> <p>The TE indicates with Vietnam’s signing of the WTO agreement, farmers will be under increased economic pressure to compete in the world market. While this may on one hand lead to an increased “monoculture of conventional hybrid crops”, on the other hand this may encourage the pursuit of new opportunities with indigenous crops which are locally adaptable.</p>
<p><b>d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contributed to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)</b></p>
<p>The TE indicates that Vietnam’s five-year budget allocates \$1.2 billion for genetic resource protection which will allow various institutions to continue with agro-biodiversity conservation and provide matching funds for future international projects.</p>
<p><b>e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?</b></p>
<p>The TE credits the project’s eventual achievements to the implementation of the recommendations of the mid-term review and the combined support of the mentoring team and the project staff of the IAG. While established during the later stages of project implementation, the mentoring team spearheaded most of the scientific and technical improvements and introduced crucial changes that were implemented by the project management team. Additionally the mentoring team played a significant role in recommending and monitoring the project’s improvements.</p>

#### 4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

<p><b>a. Co-financing.</b> To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to</p>
---

<sup>4</sup> Please review the ‘Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework’ prior to addressing this section.

achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The TE does not provide any information regarding the actual co-financing nor describes if or to what extent materialization of co-financing affected the project's outcomes and/or sustainability. Thus based on the limited information provided in the TE it is difficult to assess if the co-financing was essential to achievement of GEF objectives.
<b>b. Delays.</b> If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
As previously mentioned the project experienced delays due to shortcomings in design of the project. As a result the project objectives could not be achieved by April 2005 and were extended to March 2006. The first extension was for 7 months which extended the project to December 2005 and the second extension was for 3 months extending the project to March 2006. Both extensions did not lead to increases in the project budget. By December 2004 only 33 out of 159 activities had been completed, but by the project's end the project had achieved most of its objectives due to implementation of recommendations that were made in the mid-term evaluation and through the support of the Mentoring Team and IAG's project staff.
<b>c. Country Ownership.</b> Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability highlighting the causal links.
The Steering Committee comprised of 7 Province Directors, the Vice Minister of MAR, the Ministry of Planning, Ministry of Finance and the National Government and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs met yearly to approve the critical changes necessary in the project's design. According to the TE, the involvement of scientific institutions under the Vietnamese Academy of Science contributed "substantially" to the project's success.

#### 4.5 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

<b>a. M&amp;E design at Entry</b>	<b>Rating (six point scale): S</b>
The M&E plan at entry appeared to be sufficient and practical. The project document specified M&E procedures such as Tripartite Review and Project Implementation Review (PIR), and included detailed and measurable indicators. In an effort to develop "a more active and supportive approach" to monitoring GEF projects, the IPGRI (International Plant Genetic Resources Institute) was designated to establish a project mentoring team comprised of IPGRI scientists, representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Developments and representatives from agencies involved in similar projects across other countries. The main role of the monitoring team was to provide support and offer advice to the project team during the implementation of project activities.	
<b>b. M&amp;E plan Implementation</b>	<b>Rating (six point scale): UA</b>
As previously mentioned, the TE credits project's achievements to implementation of the mid-term evaluation recommendations and the support of the mentoring team. While established late, the mentoring team played a significant role in recommending project improvements, especially scientific and strategic improvements. The mentoring team introduced "crucial changes" that were implemented by the management team shortly after Steering Committee's approval. The TE asserts that in general recommendations were adapted in a timely manner. However, aside from the mentoring team's role in the M&E activities, the TE fails to provide sufficient information regarding specific M&E procedures or the role of other stakeholders played in the implementation of M&E activities.	
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? Unable to assess.	
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Unable to assess.	
b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system? See 4.5b.	

b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.  
Unable to assess.

#### **4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution**

##### **a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale):**

##### **b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MS**

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.

The TE indicates that initially the design of the project had shortcomings in its “scientific and development approach” to agro-biodiversity conservation especially with respect to the taxonomy of the local varieties of landraces. However the TE credits project’s eventual achievements to implementation of the mid-term review’s recommendations and the combined support of the Mentoring Team and the project staff of the IAG. According to the TE, with the project extension the majority of the project activities had been implemented satisfactorily. The high level of increased awareness across is considered one of the project’s major achievements which has provided a strong impetus for its continuation across relevant stakeholders.

UNDP was the implementing agency for the project. According to the TE, although the UNDP Programme officer changed frequently (4 officers in 3 years) which, according to the TE, required adjustment time. The UNDP is reported to have provided “timely and professional support”. The TE describes UNDP’s role as implementing agency as “excellent”.

##### **c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies<sup>5</sup> (rating on a 6 point scale): MS**

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

The executing agency for this project was the Institute for Agriculture Genetics (IAG). The Hanoi Agricultural University, the Institute of Ecology and Biological Resources, and the Asian Pacific Research Institute also provided support, under IAG’s coordination, in the execution of the project activities. The TE indicates that coordination was not always to the “expectations of all partners, resulting in untimely inputs and even diverse nomenclature between different institutions for the same species flock” with not all of the partner institutions performing their responsibilities “satisfactorily”.

According to the TE there were shortcomings in the design of the project which did not allow for the objectives to be achieved within the initial project time frame. Initially sub-contracting was used for project implementation which the TE reports posed a “serious obstacle” to efficient management of the project. The TE reports that the project progressively became a “socially accepted support structure” for local communities when the project switched from sub-contracting to directly contracting communities. As a result, farmers “unanimously” expressed their interest in continuing the project activities and including more crops beyond the original six crops that were selected.

The TE claims by the project’s end it had achieved most of its objectives and overall it provided a “good scientific basis” for the design and management of special conservation zones. The TE attributes the project’s success to the implementation of recommendations that were made in the mid-term review and to the support of the mentoring team and IAG’s “excellent project staff” who were able to establish effective working relationships with the people in the implementation sites.

## **5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

<sup>5</sup> Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.



**a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects**

These were the lessons learned that were specified in the TE document:

- i. Agro-biodiversity conservation must include a rural development component that respects controversial forms of farming such as shifting cultivation and sees the farming communities as the owners and managers of the entire traditional knowledge system.
- ii. Involving farmers at an early stage and combining conservation with assistance in processing and marketing motivates farmers to participate.
- iii. A combined national and international mentoring team, which guides the project towards scientific and technical improvements during implementation, should be composed of national and international experts. Mentoring teams are a key element for adaptive management and should become an integral part of innovative projects.
- iv. Diversification of conservation strategies and a widening of the definition for in-situ protection are essential for the survival of endangered species and varieties.
- v. All activities leading to successful knowledge transfer have to be completed before other implementation activities which rely on them can start. Too early implementation without a sound knowledge base requires changes, which at a later stage in the project cycle are difficult to manage.
- vi. The early inclusion of private companies with a good reputation for marketing agro-forestry products is essential for the farmers' confidence in a new project and for ensuring its economic sustainability.
- vii. Private companies should be encouraged through special partnership programs to domesticate otherwise endangered species and develop novel products for new markets.
- viii. Eco-Tourism can enhance and support efforts for agro-biodiversity protection if designed to fit the needs and interests of tourists.

**b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation**

These were the recommendations made in the TE document:

- i. A nation-wide agro-biodiversity survey needs to be conducted and a common data bank needs to be established which can be utilized by all institutions.
- ii. Future efforts should not only focus on conventional crops but must include also other economically important plant groups such as medicinal and ornamental species.
- iii. One conservation option to explore is the establishment of Agricultural Gardens which can be set up through collaborative multi-donor support which can fulfill various functions from conservation to education, and which can be income-generating by attracting tourists and traders.
- iv. Possible in-situ conservation options to consider: the creation of biodiversity home gardens, the foundation of private species societies, genetic exchange programs with other countries, buffer zone management for crop diversification, foster parenthood for selected species, and the Government's designation of large areas of public land for the sole purpose of conserving genetic diversity.
- v. Pesticide use in and around agro-biodiversity zones should be discouraged and actively be replaced by ecological and organic farming practices to increase the flora and fauna naturally associated with the selected crops and their farming system.
- vi. Indigenous knowledge about local varieties from growth, daily management, processing, utilization to replacement or crop cycling needs to be collected, validated and included into educational material in order to serve as a tool for efficient maintenance of the landraces.
- vii. Farmers should be assisted in accessing loans for new product development and processing, and in

taking advantage of certification and registration opportunities with UPOV.

- viii. Media such as TV broadcasts and illustrated guide books should be produced to stimulate public interest and create new markets.

## 6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

### 6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p><b>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> The report provides an extensive assessment of the project outcomes and includes an annex which breaks down project outcomes by objective.</p>	S (5)
<p><b>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?</b> While the report provides some evidence regarding the project implementation and outcomes, the report does not provide any clear ratings to which evidence can be compared.</p>	MU (3)
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> The report provides an extensive assessment of the project's sustainability breaking down the analysis of sustainability along ecological, social, economic, institutional dimensions.</p>	S (5)
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> The lessons learned are comprehensive, and for the most part, supported by the evidence presented in the report.</p>	S (5)
<p><b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> The report does not provide any information regarding the project costs.</p>	U (2)
<p><b>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b> The report did not provide sufficient assessment of the project's M&amp;E system.</p>	MU (3)

## 7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

### 8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)

### 9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)