

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		145	
GEF Agency project ID		GF/0301-94-06	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP	
Project name		Biodiversity Data Management Capacitation in Developing Countries and Networking Biodiversity Information	
Country/Countries		Bahamas, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Egypt, Ghana, Kenya, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Thailand	
Region		Global	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		EA- Enabling Activities	
Executing agencies involved		National Biodiversity Institutions/Units (NBUs), National Scientific Organizations	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		secondary executing agency	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		6/1/1994	
Effectiveness date / project start		6/24/1994	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		5/1/1997	
Actual date of project completion		3/30/1999	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		4.0	N/A
Co-financing	IA own	0.05	
	Government	1.34	
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		4.0	N/A
Total Co-financing		1.39	N/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		5.39	N/A
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date			
TE submission date		07/1998	
Author of TE		Professor Steven Njuguna	
TER completion date		09/19/2014	
TER prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	N/A	N/A	ML
M&E Design	N/A	N/A	N/A	S
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	S
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/A	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the PD pg. 2, the Global Environment Objectives of the project are to support conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, through the organization, maintenance and use of data generated by the country study process. This project contributes to the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and Agenda 21. Biodiversity data and information management are essential components of virtually all articles of the Convention (TE, pg. 7).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project is to “assist developing countries to meet their obligations under international agreements to organize, manage and use data on biodiversity”. (TE, pg.7)

The project is focused on the needs of developing countries to compile biodiversity data while conducting country studies on biological diversity. Additionally, the project seeks to assist countries in mobilizing this data as a “key instrument in building enhanced national capacity for preparing NBSAPs, in accordance with Article 6 (a) of the Convention on Biological Diversity”. (TE, pg14)

Overall, 10 countries participated in the project; Bahamas, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Egypt, Ghana, Kenya, Papua New Guinea, Poland and Thailand. (TE, pg.7)

The project has the following specific objectives:

- (a) To assess the countries’ requirements for data management and application for the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- (b) To strengthen national mechanisms and institutions for access to and dissemination of national biodiversity information;
- (c) To organize data compiled through, *inter alia*, the country study process and to develop mechanisms for the continued collection and management of information;
- (d) To enhance existing ability and skills to utilize the relevant technologies and know-how in data management;

- (e) To develop linkages with national, regional and global networks relevant to biodiversity information, its exchange and management; and
- (f) To apply a series of information management tools, including guidelines and standards for data management.

Each of the countries participating in the project was to carry out the following activities:

- (a) To conduct a national institutional survey, to determine the national capacity for data management;
- (b) To prepare a national plan for the management and application of biodiversity data in support of the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- (c) To develop a series of basic guidelines to support efficient information management; and
- (d) To compile a resource inventory as a "tool box" of available methods and technologies from which it could draw upon selectively to suit its needs, involving both North-South and South-South cooperation.

The TE states that the principal output of the BDM project is “a national biodiversity data management plan (the BDM plan) to support the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, as required under Article 7 of the Convention”. (TE, pg.17)

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

According to the TE, the duration of the project was too short for several countries, and therefore, the project had to be revised to accommodate delays (TE,pg. 10). However, **no** change in GEO, DO or activities was reported in the TE.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The project is relevant to both the GEF and participating countries.

The project contributes to the implementation of Chapter 15 and 17 of Agenda 21. Those chapters focus on “the need for better information as the basis for sustainable development and conservation of natural resources” (TE, pg. 12).

The project compiles and manages biodiversity data and information; therefore, it contributes to the preparation of the NBSAPs, and the Article 6 of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The BDM plans are important in providing information and data necessary for the success of NBSAPs (TE, pg.12).

The project is also relevant to both the GEF and participating countries, because the Article 7 of the Convention on Biological Diversity is concerned with the identification and monitoring of activities to support Articles 8-10 (*in situ* conservation, *ex situ* conservation and sustainable use of components of biological diversity). (TE, pg.14)

Overall, the BDM project was appropriate for the participating countries. This project came at the time when the countries were starting the process of developing their NBSAPs, as called for by the Convention on Biological Diversity. The availability of reliable and up to date biodiversity data and information is required by the NBSAPs. The BDM project provides an opportunity to compile which the information is available, where it is stored, and how it is managed. This project helps the countries in establishing a nation-wide biodiversity networks, and provides an opportunity for the countries to “develop common procedures for the collection, processing, storage, management and exchange of biodiversity data”. (TE, pg36)

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------	----------------------------------------

Overall, according to the TE, the BDM project was effective in increasing the awareness of the importance of biodiversity data management, and the conservation of biological diversity, in general. However, the full impact of the BDM project remained contingent on the participating countries and donor agencies making available funding to continue the activities outlined in the BDM plans. (TE, pg.69)

The BDM project achieved its main goals. It improved the biodiversity data management at the national level. It also contributed to awareness-raising on biodiversity issues. Finally, the project has influenced national policies on biodiversity.

However, some countries had more successful results than others. The key success factors were: broad political support and commitment, good telecommunication facilities, access to advanced information technology, existing in-country expertise, and good project management capacity. (TE, pg.70)

The following outputs were planned in the project design:

- (1) Consultative workshop: It was held in October 1994 at UNEP headquarters in Nairobi. According to the TE (pg. 55) it was reported as being successful in providing an overview of the project.

- (2) National institutional surveys: The national institutional surveys were completed by all the countries and according to the TE, resulted in useful products.
- (3) Biodiversity information networks and the biodiversity data hub: The biodiversity data hub serves as a catalogue describing the various datasets, and also serves as the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Only Chile, Costa Rica and Poland, were able to establish clearing-house mechanisms (TE.pg.40).
- (4) BDM plans: the BDM plans were prepared by the countries, however, the implementation of those plans was not fully achieved, mostly because of lack of funding (TE, pg.12).
- (5) BDM workshops: They helped improve understanding of biodiversity data management as well as promoting the project objectives.
- (6) BDM Update: Five issues of the newsletter *BDM Update* were published and distributed.
- (7) National linkages: The TE found “little evidence of regional and global linkages established as a result of the project” (TE,pg.4) .

At the end of the project, there were a number of countries that had not completed their project outputs. These include (TE, pg.55) ; Ghana, whose BDM workshops are 50% complete; BDM plan, 60% complete; information management guidelines, 40% complete; national resource inventory, 10% complete; and information technology equipment provision, 80% complete; Thailand, whose national resource inventory is incomplete; and the Bahamas, whose metadatabase and national resource inventory are incomplete. According to the TE, the non-completion of project outputs is mainly due to issues in project design, lack of capacity and inadequate monitoring and supervision.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	----------------------------------------

The efficiency of the project is rated satisfactory, overall the project activities were implemented on a timely basis. (TE, pg.10) However, the TE states that the project duration was too short for many countries which had to rely on limited in-country technical expertise, “The duration of the project seems to have been arbitrarily decided” (TE, pg.10). Therefore the project had to be revised to accommodate delays. Some minor delays were experienced in a few countries (Kenya, Costa Rica, Ghana). These delays were due to some executing partners issues; a high turnover of partners, or some partners had too many responsibilities to properly handle the project.

The newsletters helped keep the BDM participating countries and all the stakeholders informed of the project's achievements. Those newsletters were found to “be very effective in informing the readers on the overall implementation and progress of the BDM umbrella project”. (TE, pg.34)

Finally, in the project design, no budget line was allocated for the active participation of the advisory committee (TE, pg. 41). The TE does not mention any other information on budget efficiency.

There was no disbursement issues, or communication problems reported in the TE and in the PIR.

The sustainability of the project is rated Moderately Likely. The future of the project depends on the implementation of the BDM plans.

According to the TE, additional support to the participating countries should be provided by UNEP and the GEF to implement the BDM plans. Without this support the BDM plans will likely not be implemented (TE, pg. 12). Secure sources of funding for implementation of the BDM plans that would ensure sustainability of the project were not envisioned in the BDM project log frame. According to the TE (pg.12), “a greater exploration of options for continued financing of BDM activities should be undertaken within the participating countries and others intending to implement BDM-type activities”.

On the other hand, in all the participating countries, the BDM project is planned to be continued. Much of the actual data collection, storage and management have been incorporated into the routine work of custodian institutions and the costs absorbed into the budgets of those institutions (TE, pg.43). Some portions of the BDM plan are already started to be implemented, thanks to the funding from other parallel projects, such as the Chinese biodiversity information system and the nature reserve and biodiversity information sources sharing project (TE, pg. 44).

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the 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 so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

This project is a \$5.4 million project, \$4 million was provided by the GEF, \$50,000 by WCMC and the rest by participating countries.

Each of the subprojects in the 10 participating countries was allocated approximately \$250,000 and the government contributions from the participating countries ranged from \$30,000 to \$400,000 (TE, pg.7).

No additional information is given in the TE on co-financing.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. 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 so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project started in June 1994 and was scheduled to run until June 1997. In some countries the project experienced minor delays.

In one of the participating countries, the representative experienced difficulties developing practical guidelines based on the project's findings. This problem was not identified early enough, and therefore,

the first output took 12 months to be completed. The project had fallen behind schedule and the majority of the outputs were not completed (TE, pg. 20).

In two of the participating countries (Kenya and Costa Rica), the project lost momentum because of the resignation of project coordinators.

In Kenya, the implementation of project encountered some delays because of the slow rate of return of completed questionnaires for the national institutional survey. There were other delays that resulted from lengthy government procedures in the procurement of goods and services (TE, pg. 66).

In Ghana, the project coordinator had the responsibility of managing 16 ongoing projects and eight additional projects were in the pipeline. The result was poor project coordination on the part of the project coordinator and delays in the project implementation (TE, pg. 52).

5.3 Country ownership. 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:

During workshops and training that were part of the initial phase of the project, linkages with national networks were developed. Those workshops were a place at which national organizations could meet and exchange information and ideas on biodiversity data management, and strengthen their relationships. (TE, pg.40). However, the TE found “little evidence of linkages with regional agencies that had resulted from the BDM project”(TE, pg.41).

The country ownership was also strengthened by the strategic location of the project focal point at a central government body with a high-level mandate. This allowed the project to form partnerships with key national stakeholders and gave it access to a wide range of resources and audiences (TE, pg. 49). Additionally, the use of local consultants in implementing the project enhanced its acceptability among the stakeholders (TE, pg.50).

However, on the other hand, several important institutions that manage biodiversity information did not participate in the BDM project. The TE states that “this failure was due either to lack of personal or institutional interest or to lack of credibility *vis-à-vis* large projects financed by international organizations, mainly attributable to the many projects which fail because of deficient follow-up after the funding has been used up”(TE, pg. 51).

6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The M&E design at Entry is rated satisfactory.

The TE does not assess M&E Design. The following assessment is based on a reading of the PD. The PD states that the results should be evaluated along 4 major points (PD, pg.15):

- (1) Evaluation and revision of the Guidelines for Biodiversity Data Management following their application in country
- (2) Mid-term evaluation of project in order to assess progress of project implementation and feasibility of expanding scope and benefits of project to other countries
- (3) Evaluation of the project in each country
- (4) Evaluation of the UNEP institutional collaborative programme to support developing countries in biodiversity data management.

The PD also mentions that half yearly progress reports should be submitted, as well as terminal reports within 60 days of project completion, and finally substantive reports produced by UNEP to be distributed to the countries involved in the project.

The PD gives indicators and specific targets to be achieved by each country (PD, pg.8). Those indicators are defined very specifically, and assumptions to reach the output are given. Moreover for each activity, SMART indicators to evaluate the achievements are given. UNEP will be the agency responsible for all M&E activities (PD, pg.15). A budget was planned in the PD for the M&E activities (PD, pg.17).

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------

The M&E implementation is rated as satisfactory. Key M&E activities were as follows:

- (1) A workshop was conducted to formulate and present recommendations and conclusions for the BDM project, and was part of the M&E system. Only 8 of the 10 countries involved in the BDM project attended the workshop (Ghana and Poland could not attend). The workshop was also attended by representatives from UNEP, the GEF Secretariat, WCMC, the BDM advisory committee, Chemonics International, Inc., (coordinators of local consultants) and the Sparvs Agency (international consultant) (TE, pg.62).
- (2) A BDM advisory committee was established to provide advice on technical, organizational and project management matters as part of a collaborative effort. A group of experts from organizations with expertise in the field of biodiversity information management composed this committee (TE, pg.62).

- (3) A subproject agreement was concluded with WCMC for the preparation of a set of BDM support materials intended to raise the profile of biodiversity information in decision-making processes (TE, pg.63).

Finally, a terminal evaluation was conducted. It was a multi-stage process, beginning with a separate evaluation of each country-level subproject coordinated by Chemonics International, Inc., a consulting firm contracted by GEF. Then the findings of the subproject evaluations were synthesized into a draft evaluation report of the overall project. The draft evaluation report was presented at the workshop for review and comments and formed the main part of the workshop resource materials. The results of the workshop discussions and recommendations were to be incorporated into the final evaluation report. (TE, pg.68).

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------

The project was implemented by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The major roles of UNEP were administering funds and monitoring the subprojects. According to the TE (pg.10) “UNEP clearly played an important role in sparking interest in the field of biodiversity data management”. The quality of project implementation is rated Moderately Satisfactory.

During the project, UNEP was supportive in technical aspects and was helpful in providing materials such as the Global Biodiversity Assessment (TE, pg. 11). The technical expertise mobilized and the materials provided were considered very good and helpful by the stakeholders. When the project encountered issues because of government bureaucracy, UNEP was sympathetic and understanding (TE, pg. 46).

However, according to the TE, in some countries, UNEP “did not have adequate capacity and staff to provide the required technical support and field visits” (TE, pg.10). For example, in the Bahamas, the steering committee members wished to have direct contact with UNEP to ask questions as issues arose (TE, pg.46). This was not possible, since no such communication links were established in the design of the project. Most of the communication, outside workshops, was between the subproject coordinator

and the umbrella project task manager. A similar concern was raised by Ghana and Egypt; those 2 countries wished that a BDM expert from UNEP had visited them on a periodic basis to provide technical advice as well as to take part in the in-country workshops and training programmes. UNEP did not have the adequate staff to provide this support, “only one task manager was not sufficient to cope effectively with a project of this nature” (TE, pg.46).

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------------------------	----------------------------------------

The quality of project execution is rated Moderately Satisfactory for the following reasons.

According to the TE ,there was no full-time project coordinator at the country level, and this was a problem in focusing the project and keeping the activities on track. On the other hand, “the use of local consultants in implementing the project enhanced its acceptability among the stakeholders”. (pg. 50),

Moreover, the project execution encountered issues because of the resignation during the project of trained staff (TE, pg.39).

The project advisory committee did not provide global linkages, in view of its members' involvement with global biodiversity information networks. According to the TE, “the committee should have been enabled to play a more active role with funding for its members to participate in national and regional workshops” (TE, pg.41).

Where the project steering committees had broad representation and met regularly, there were few problems in project execution. However, in Ghana for example, the steering committee was established too late and met only twice in the course of the project (TE, pg. 50). Moreover, the TE mentions that several steering committee members commented on the amount of work that this project required, especially knowing that they did not have their responsibilities removed from their jobs. The steering committee members were dedicated and focused, but felt “unfairly compensated for these efforts” (TE, pg.57).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate below that this is indeed the case. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented,

sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

There is no environmental change reported in the TE.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

According to the TE (pg. 44), “in the course of the project implementation, there has been a growing realization that the BDM system could generate a sustainable source of revenue through the commercialization of the BDM products and outputs”. However, this potential source of funding has not been explored further during the course of the project.

No other socioeconomic change is reported in the TE.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

According to the TE (pg.39), “the BDM project has been important for the development of skills not only of the members of the project team, but also for persons involved in the management of biodiversity data at various levels of the government administration”.

The beneficiaries of the BDM development capacities are the national biodiversity units and the national focal institutions. BDM capacities and skills were developed through the workshops and training courses. However, the lack of qualified in-country experts in biodiversity data management hampered capacity-building and the development of skills (TE, pg.36).

Several support materials were prepared to help countries in decision making and establish data and information management programmes (TE, pg.16):

- (1) Guide to National Institutional Survey in the Context of the Convention on Biological Diversity (UNEP/WCMC, 1998), to assist countries in surveying and assessing the state of their capacity for managing biodiversity.

- (2) Guide to Information Management in the Context of the Convention on Biological Diversity (UNEP/WCMC, 1996), proposes a step-by-step information cycle developed from an agreement on priority issues, determination of information needs, design of information products, stakeholder roles and enablement of stakeholders to ensure information is produced in a cost-effective manner.
- (3) Electronic Resource Inventory (UNEP/WCMC, 1995), provides a wide range of information and reference directories on software, hardware, methodologies, standards, common practices, data sources, key organizations and exemplary projects related to biodiversity data management.

b) Governance

Following the PD of the project, a national BDM plan was produced by the participating countries for the efficient management and application of data and information in support of the Convention on Biological Diversity (TE, pg. 25).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impact is reported in the TE.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

A detailed list of replicability process in each of the 10 participating countries is described in page 44 of the TE. Some examples are detailed below:

In Thailand, series of checklists of biodiversity was produced by the country's Office of Environmental Policy and Planning. This is evidence that "activities outside the BDM project have been stimulated through the Office's participation in the project" (TE, pg.39). Moreover, the Government has already agreed to provide funds to implement the BDM plan.

In Poland, the project team is now working on a new project which will be submitted to UNEP/GEF for possible funding (TE, pg. 44).

In Ghana, a donors' conference is planned at the end of the project to present the final project outputs and seek funding for implementation of the BDM strategy and action plan.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The following key lessons were given in the TE (pg. 49):

- (1) It would have been appropriate for UNEP to undertake one or two short-term missions to monitor the progress of the project. Representatives of the UNDP offices identified to act on behalf of UNEP ought to have attended the consultative workshop and the meetings of the advisory committee in order to gain a full understanding of the project's requirements. This would have considerably improved project performance.
- (2) The project was based upon a number of critical assumptions and should have given due consideration to the existing state of biodiversity conservation and technical capacities of developing countries, as well as the in-country work environment. The capacity of each participating country should have been assessed as a pre-project activity and the project design should have accommodated this aspect.
- (3) Implementation of the BDM plans will require large amounts of funding that are not currently available in the participating countries.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following recommendations were given in the TE (pg. 11):

- (1) To ensure the overall success of the project, the implementation of the BDM plans is essential. Such implementation will require further financial support.
- (2) It is essential to implement a second phase of the BDM project to build on what has already been achieved and, at the same time, to extend its impact at the national, regional and global levels. The BDM activities would be complementary to those of NBSAPs.
- (3) The issue of non-completion of project outputs is related to project design, lack of capacity and inadequate monitoring and supervision. These aspects of the BDM project should be reviewed. A mechanism should be put in place to ensure that the project outputs are eventually completed and disseminated to all the stakeholders.
- (4) The BDM project is not fully sustainable without further donor funding. A greater exploration of options for continued financing of BDM activities should be undertaken within the participating countries and others intending to implement BDM-type activities.
- (5) The BDM project could be used as a model for the national development of the clearing-house mechanism. The processes of consultations, national institutional surveys, formulation of best practices and strategic planning could be packaged to help countries develop national clearing-house mechanisms.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report contains a detailed assessment of achievements and impacts of the project; The outputs produced compared to the outputs planned are described, as well as the impacts of the project in each country.	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, and the evidences are complete and convincing. However, there is no rating for any of the category, as this was not a requirement of GEF projects at the time.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Project sustainability is assessed for the project as a whole; however, project sustainability in each country is not described in sufficient detail.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons and recommendations are supported by the evidences presented. Details and linkages to the project assessment are given.	HS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The project costs are not given in the TE. Only the planned budget is given. The actual level of co-financing is not given in the TE.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE does not analyze the M&E system at entry, and the M&E system implementation is only briefly assessed.	MU
Overall TE Rating		S

$$0.3*10 + 0.1*15 = 3+1.6 = 4.5$$

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).