

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2127	
GEF Agency project ID		2050	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		FAO	
Project name		Conservation and Adaptive Management of Globally Important agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS)	
Country/Countries		Algeria, Chile, China, Peru, Philippines, Peru, Tunisia	
Region		CEX	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		14: Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes/ Seascapes and Sectors	
Executing agencies involved		Algeria: Ministère de l'aménagement du territoire et de l'environnement ; Chile: Centro de Tecnología y Educación /CET ; China: Ministry of Agriculture/MOA ; Peru: National Environmental Council /CONAMA ; Philippines: Department of Environment and Natural Resources /DENR ; Tunisia: Ministère de l'environnement et du développement durable	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Secondary executing agency; one of the beneficiaries	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		June 10, 2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 2008	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		June 2013	
Actual date of project completion		June 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing	1.0	U/A
GEF Project Grant			
Co-financing	IA own	2.4	U/A
	Government	4.7	U/A
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	2.39	U/A
	Private sector	(Foundations) 1.9	U/A
	NGOs/CSOs	2.9	U/A
Total GEF funding		3.5	3.5
Total Co-financing		14.4	14.4
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		18	18
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		November, 2014	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Warren Olding; Patrizio Warren; Luisa Belli (FAO Office of Evaluation)	
TER completion date		January 2015	
TER prepared by		Michelle Peña Nelz	

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	MS	MS	N/R	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	ML	N/R	ML
M&E Design	N/R	N/R	N/R	MU
M&E Implementation	N/R	U	N/R	U
Quality of Implementation	N/R	N/R*	N/R	MU
Quality of Execution	N/R	N/R*	N/R	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	-	S

* "Implementation approach" rating (moderately satisfactory) shown on page 69 of the TE appears to cover some aspects of both Implementation and Execution in GEF parlance, but it is not clear if all aspects are covered and if the rating is higher in one area or another.

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project document (PD) the global environmental objective is to help conserve the globally significant biodiversity that resides in so-called Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS). GIAHS represents a unique sub-set of agricultural systems, which exemplify customary use of globally significant agricultural biodiversity (Article 10 c and 8j of CBD) and merit to be recognized as a heritage of human kind within the national sovereignty jurisdictions. The project aimed to conserve the GIAHS in five different pilot-countries (Chile, China, Algeria, Peru and Philippines) which were chosen due to their unique agricultural diversity. The GIAHS are threatened not only by degradation, but also by the loss of customary institutions and forms of social organization that underpin management of these systems and their protection. The project was approved under, and is consistent with the framework of the Strategic Program 4 for GEF-4 Biodiversity: "Strengthening the policy and regulatory frameworks for mainstreaming biodiversity" and the GEF Operational Plan Program No.13 "Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity of Importance to Agriculture".

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As stated in the PD, the "global objective of the project is to ensure conservation and adaptive management of Agro biodiversity of global significance that is harbored in Globally Important Agricultural heritage Systems or GIAHS. The project rationale is based on a holistic approach to enable the harmonious interaction between different components of the agro ecosystem to allow the conservation but also smooth adaptation and evolution of biodiversity and genetic resources within the agro-ecosystem."(PD, p.12) According to the project rationale, this approach seems to be the most effective way of in-situ conservation of agro-biodiversity while addressing poverty, food security and sustainable development. The GIAHS approach therefore, centers on human management and knowledge systems, including their socio-organizational, economic and cultural features that underpin the conservation and adaptation processes without compromising their resilience, sustainability and integrity. The development objectives are furthermore connected to the associated knowledge systems of the GIHS, as well as the prevention and rehabilitation of land degradation, and the maintenance of

ecosystem goods and services and the benefits they generate e.g. soil health and soil biodiversity, climate adaptation, water and air as well as human life.

The PD defines the following project outcomes and targets:

1. An internationally accepted system for full recognition of GIAHS. The system is formulated to recognize and promote the conservation and adaptive management of GIAHS within an accepted international policy.
2. The conservation and adaptive management of globally significant agricultural biodiversity harbored in GIAHS in [five]¹ countries is mainstreamed in sectoral and intersectoral plans and policies in pilot countries (National)
3. Globally significant agricultural biodiversity in pilot GIAHS is being managed and sustainably used by empowering local communities and harnessing evolving economic, social, and policy processes and by adaptation of appropriate new technologies that allow interaction between ecological and cultural processes (Local)
4. Lessons learned and best practices from promoting effective management of pilot GIAHS are widely disseminated to support expansion and upscaling of the GIAHS in other areas/countries and creation of the GIAHS network (Global, National, Local)

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

No.

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 highly relevant to the GEF Biodiversity conservation program and partnering countries. PD states that the Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS) were successfully introduced into national priorities of the pilot countries. Furthermore, the project reflects Article 10 (c) of the CBD, which states the protection and encouragement of customary use of biological resources. According to the Evaluations document, none of the six countries had prior to the project a clear political or policy

¹ The original document assumes the implementation of the project in six countries, including Morocco. This country however was taken out before the project was implemented.

framework to support the multi-dimensional aspects of the GIAHS initiative. This is important since the GIAHS are not part of the CBD or another binding international agreement, the whole initiative is based on the Global Partnership Initiative (GPI), which makes the Outcomes 1 and 2 (recognition of the GIAHS on global, national and local level) even more important. However, the mainstreaming of this initiative was rather unsuccessful within the implementing organization FAO. According to the terminal evaluation document the project “took on the role of a pioneering pilot project designed to gain support and momentum over time within the FAO.” (p.22)

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-------------------	--

The terminal evaluation assess project effectiveness as moderately satisfactory. However, this review assess a lower rating because of shortcomings in the achievement of project outcomes, which in some cases were significantly below expectations. Most significant shortcoming is that the project was not able to attain Outcome 1 - to establish an internationally accepted and embedded recognition of the GIAHS Initiative worldwide. As TE states, “... the legal status of GIAHS remains unrecognized at the global level meaning the Project was unable to deliver the establishment of a sustainable financing mechanism and institutional support for consolidating and expanding the GIAHS approach as a long-term open-ended programme (output 1.3).” (TE, pg 9). Furthermore, the project was not able to deliver the fourth objective, which planned to disseminate widely lessons learned and best practices from the pilot GIAHS sites, and preparation of scientific material. (TE, pg 10).

Progress under each of the four development objectives defined in the PD is detailed further below:

1. *An internationally accepted system for full recognition of GIAHS is in place (Global).* No international system was secured during the project implementation time. As the TE states, “the project was unable to secure the Public Endorsement of the GIAHS concept, definition and criteria by key international institutions and pilot country governments.” (TE, p. 9) The TE states that there were discussions on converting the Globally Important Agricultural Heritage System (GIAHS) Initiative into a regular program within the FAO, and that this decision was meant to be taken during the Committee on Agriculture Meeting in October 2014.
2. *The conservation and adaptive management of globally significant agricultural biodiversity harbored in GIAHS in [five] countries is mainstreamed in sectoral and intersectoral plans and policies in pilot countries (National).* According to the TE, the relevance of GIAHS remains high in the pilot countries. However, some differences are visible in the progress of mainstreaming within countries. China for example established the institution of Nationally Important Agricultural Heritage Sites (NIAHGS) and is now part of the regional Association for Agricultural Heritage Systems, together with Korea and Japan. On the other hand countries like Tunisia and Algeria ‘only’ recognized the importance of these Systems and made some efforts to include them into agricultural policies. The TE finds that the role of the Ministries of Agriculture is central in the degree of progress experienced during project implementation. It states that the delivery of outputs was less advanced under weak leadership of a respective governmental authority.

3. *Globally significant agricultural biodiversity in pilot GIAHS is being managed and sustainably used by empowering local communities and harnessing evolving economic, social, and policy processes and by adaptation of appropriate new technologies that allow interaction between ecological and cultural processes (Local).* According to the TE the true champions of the GIAHS are on local level. The establishment of stakeholder platforms to support local farmers through collaborative management together with customary, state and non-government institution was delivered at all sites. One significant achievement was the successful identification and monitoring of local political and socio-economic processes, which benefited highly the local traditional knowledge systems. New methods/practices and environmental friendly technologies were introduced, but with a focus on preserving and strengthening local and/or indigenous livelihoods. Along with the promotion of alternative and/or supplementary incomes, sustainable livelihood were facilitated, including the development of arts and crafts, food processing and agro- tourism.

It is noted that the evaluators only visited the sites of China, Peru and Chile.

4. *Lessons learned and best practices from promoting effective management of pilot GIAHS are widely disseminated to support expansion and upscaling of the GIAHS in other areas/countries and creation of the GIAHS network (Global, National, Local)*

The PD foresees several publications and scientific reports in order to disseminate best practices and lessons learned. The TE however states that no final presentation or preparation of the accumulated scientific material and the project experiences was arranged. Both of these aspects have consequentially an impact on the first outcome because an effective communication of findings, lives from presentable data and experiences. These findings more importantly would have been crucial to lobby in favor of GIHAS on global level.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately satisfactory
-----------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for project efficiency but does state that the project represented good value for money. (p.11) This TER assesses a rating of moderately satisfactory for project efficiency based on evidence in the TE narrative, indicating moderate shortcomings in project efficiency.

The project failed to use supporting resources within the FAO system, as expected in the PD. The TE found only very limited evidence that the project established “linkages with FAO field programs and activities in the six pilot countries” including GEF projects. Project management also failed to establish an effective international steering committee (ISC) mechanism, which was expected to govern the project implementation and help develop and facilitate an effective communication strategy together with the interim GIAHS Secretariat (iGS) and Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC). In the six years of project implementation, only two ISC meeting were held. The other planned project institution -the iGS, supported by the SAC- also faced some weaknesses, due to the lack of alignment with corresponding scientific committee at the pilot country level. This effected mainly the formal selection-process of GIAHS, which is based on the establishment of NIAHS.

4.4 Sustainability

Rating: **Moderately likely**

The TE rates sustainability of project outcomes as moderately likely and this TER concurs. Main reason for this assessment is the moderate shortcoming that GIAHS Initiative was not adopted within FAO's own mainstreaming process. On the other hand, the efforts from different national agencies in the respective pilot countries enhance the likelihood of continuation of project benefits after completion of project implementation.

Risks to project sustainability are further assessed below along the following four dimensions:

- *Environmental threats*– **(U/A)**: The TE does not discuss threats to project sustainability.
- *Financial* – **(ML)**: As the TE states in their conclusion on financial sustainability, sustainability of the GIAHS sites is most likely in Algeria, China and Chile and moderately likely in the other countries. China, Chile and Algeria have shown remarkable interest and efforts in the implementation and recognition of GIAHS or Nationally Important Agricultural Heritage System (NIAHS) and in the mainstreaming of these concepts on national level within their respective governmental agencies. The TE states “this output [outcome 2] has largely been achieved at the national sectoral level in all six pilot countries” but with different intensity. Countries like Peru, The Philippines and Tunisia have made different forms of commitments to the Initiative and it appears that the concept of GIAHS or NIAHS will be adapted into national policies.
- *Socio-political*– **(L)**: As mentioned in the financial section, the visible efforts and engagement with the GIAHS Initiative is reflected at the socio-political level too. The consolidation and/or establishment of the GIAHS initiative has been achieved at all the selected sites and it is assumable that these multi-stakeholder associations on local level will profit from the commitment and mainstreaming on national level.
- *Institutional*– **(ML)**: Based on the TE, the initiative was not successfully adopted into the FAO regular program, which has implications for securing the future of the GIAHS availability to funds and opportunities to upscale the movement on international level. However, on national level the initiative has proved (as showed before) its relevance for the governmental agencies on pilot country level. The TE highlights in this context China and Chile, where “plans are in place to integrate it as an official agricultural policy commitment that will be supported by adequate institutional capacity and finance.” (TE, p.11)

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?

Co-financing of the project varied by country, and it is not clear in the TE if met the initial expectations. The TE however highlights specifically that the confirmation of GEF involvement had a positive effect on the credibility of some project sites and was seen as so called “seed money”. One important example is

the case of China, where co-financing funds were specifically approved due to financial commitment of the GEF and the implementer role of the FAO. The TE reveals furthermore that this fact was crucial to “open doors to a concept that otherwise would not have got off the ground.” Consequently, the regional project in China was also proven to be most effective in terms of outcomes, because the country championed in taking the GIAHS and NIAHS initiative not only to the regional level but also, through co-financing on local level, generated the highest amount of studies (Outcome 2 and 4).

Overall, there is evidence that co-financing was important to the outcomes and sustainability of the overall project. Co-financing enhanced both the level of ownership and the likelihood of sustainability.

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 did not receive any extensions or experienced any delays.

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:

According to the PD the participatory approach chosen by the FAO during the PDF-B Phase can be considered as an effective facilitation and incentive of country ownership. The TE states that the participatory approach utilized in the design stage of the project set the stage for the project’s achievements under outcomes two and three (national and local level), which benefitted from strong stakeholder support and ownership. Based on the evidences provided in the TE it seems that this approach was also beneficiary for the financial support from the governmental agencies who created new institutions in order to carry the GIAHS into national systems and in some cases (like China and Japan) into regional projects.

In other cases the increased sense of country ownership was mostly visible through the success of Outcome 2 which shows the developed commitment of national governments in the pilot countries to the GIAHS initiative. Policy efforts in Peru and Chile (e.g.) were expressed through public commitments of authorities and correspondent governmental agencies (Ministries of Agriculture). As mentioned before, the level of ownership also depends on leadership and political importance of the respective governmental authority. Therefore the achievements have to be assessed according to the development status of the national agency.

On local level the collaboration of multi-stakeholders in respective sites with local governments was considered as successful, which benefits the ownership and the sustainability in general.

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: Moderately Unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	--

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) does not assess a rating for M&E Design at entry, although it does discuss some significant shortcomings in the M&E Design (TE pg 25 and section 4.1). This TER assesses a rating of Moderately Unsatisfactory for M&E Design, based on the design presented in the PD and the assessment presented in the TE. The PD provides an overview of M&E activities that were expected to take place during the project implementation time. Roles and responsibilities are assigned to different organs of the implementing and executing agencies and there is a schedule for M&E activities Furthermore the PD indicates a separate budget for M&E activities.

However, as the TE notes, the M&E plan had major shortcomings. The “(p)roject design was conceived as a rather ambitious test of the theory of change and was not based on a coherent logical framework (LF) in which results indicators were linked to targets and timelines. In addition, the indicators were not established with baseline data. This limited helped limit [sic] internal M&E to mainly operational achievements, rather than support decision makers with results-based information and progress.” (TE, p.8).

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

The TE assesses a rating of Unsatisfactory for M&E Implementation, stating that operations and outputs were not sufficiently monitored by the implementing agency. This review concurs with the TE’s assessment. The TE states that many of the M&E activities called for in the PD did not take place, or were not consistently performed. As TE states, “there was no M&E system in place to measure results and support informed decision making on planning and implementation”.

According to the TE, the M&E implementation suffered from major shortcomings especially in regards to human and financial resources. Roles and responsibilities are described in the TE as a “work in progress”. TE states that experts that were needed to ensure an effective implementation of the M&E plan were not hired, due to a perceived shortage of funding. This had consequently a major impact on the performance of key functions such as results-based monitoring, running an effective communications strategy and the recruitment of technical assistance from an expert’s pool. The TE specifically makes reference to the global level, “where the iGS (interims GIAHS Secretariat) was unable to recruit a qualified consultant to design and manage the Project’s monitoring and evaluation system, or a communications officer, paying particular attention to achieving outcome 4.” (TE, p.29) The PD for example mentions under the section “Monitoring responsibilities and events”, the project management is expected to develop a “detailed schedule of project review meetings.”

TE states that the Project Steering Committees, which were to meet annually (on different levels), only convened some of the time. Particularly the International Steering Committee meeting only convened twice in the six years implementation period, which led to a very limited role in project implementation decisions and follow-up capacities.

At the International Steering Committee level, major shortcoming of the M&E System can be observed. The TE mentions that at the International Steering Committee (ISC) Meeting in April 2014, stakeholders from the 6 pilot countries “were invited to present their GIAHS sites without recourse to results, findings, conclusions, recommendations or lessons learned.” (TE, p.29)

Furthermore the technical and thematic reports as well as the lessons learned reports were limited or not produced. The TE finds that this issue hindered goals, like the objective to establish an internationally recognized system of Globally Important Agricultural Heritage systems (GIAHS).

On financial level, the management of the funds were considered satisfactory, mostly because the budget holder managed to reallocate financial resources in order to satisfy the needs of higher than expected global managements cost.

In summary, the implementation of a robust M&E system at global and country level was largely not delivered.

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 Unsatisfactory
--	--

The TE does not provide a rating for Implementation² but does discuss serious shortcomings in FAO performance. This TER rates Quality of Project Implementation as Moderately Unsatisfactory, based on evidence presented in the TE. TE finds that the project design suffered from significant shortcomings. TE states that the project’s objectives were not downscaled during project development when the GEF funding was reduced by nearly half (from \$6M to \$3.5M at CEO Endorsement), (TE, pg 8). Other design shortcomings include the failure to design a robust M&E system with SMART indicators and a clear logical framework with baseline data. As TE notes, this shortcoming “...helped limit internal M&E to

² “Implementation approach” rating (moderately satisfactory) shown on page 69 of the TE appears to cover some aspects of both Implementation and Execution in GEF parlance, but it is not clear if all aspects are covered and if the rating is higher in one area or another.

mainly operational achievements, rather than support decision makers with results-based information and progress.” (TE, pg 8).

In addition, TE finds FAO support during the project lacking, owing in part to insufficient support for the GIAHS model within FAO itself. As TE states, *“the promotion of GIAHS did not appear to the evaluation team to represent a fully mainstreamed policy commitment within FAO; rather it took on the role of a pioneering pilot project designed to gain support and momentum over time within FAO. The Project did not, therefore, enjoy the inter-departmental support it needed at start-up to promote GIAHS in sites where inter-sectoral activities have long been a fully integral part of the agricultural system. For example, in China the GIAHS site fully integrated forestry, fisheries, agriculture and culture; while in Peru agriculture, livestock, crafts and culture were completely linked. This helps to explain why no synergies were established with other relevant FAO interventions (and other donors) in the pilot countries, or at the global level, despite the in-depth stakeholder analysis conducted in PDF-B and incorporated in the ProDoc.”* (TE, pg 22).

Moreover, TE notes that the management structure established by the project under the interim GIAHS Secretariat was insufficiently staffed and was not sufficiently coordinating the project effectively, both at the global and national levels . However, *“The inability to recruit technical assistance to fill these gaps was mainly due to internal resistance within FAO to resolve the problem and resulted in major constraints on management of the GIAHS initiative. This is a major reason why the Project was unable to achieve its global targets in relation to outcomes 1 and 4 (despite a one-year extension of the Project to 30 June 2014).* (TE, pg 28).

Finally, as TE notes, the overambitious project objectives resulted in a decision to reallocate funds that were intended to go towards the project’s M&E system. The project did not recruit a consultant to design and manage the Project’s M&E system or a communications officer, as intended in the PD, and this limited the effectiveness of the project’s M&E systems during implementation.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: moderately satisfactory
---	--

The TE does not provide a rating for Quality of Execution³. However, this review assess a rating of moderately satisfactory for Quality of Project Execution based on the evidence presented in the TE. The Globally Important Agricultural Heritage System (GIAHS) Movement was executed principally by national environmental/ agricultural governmental agencies (Algeria: Ministère de l’aménagement du territoire et de l’environnement; Chile: Centro de Tecnología y Educación /CET; China: Ministry of Agriculture/MOA; Peru: National Environmental Council /CONAMA; Philippines: Department of Environment and Natural Resources /DENR; Tunisia: Ministère de l’environnement et du développement durable). The assessment is difficult since the influence possibilities of respective agencies were mixed on mostly based on how established they were within the governmental context. While Chile and China had influential Ministries of Agriculture, they were able to use their “considerable

³ Ibid, 2.

power and influence to convoke the steering committee meetings with the Ministry of Environment.” (TE, p.33) On the other hand countries like Algeria, Peru, the Philippines and Tunisia “enjoyed less power and influence over the project implementation because their government departments [were] newly created ministries with small budgets and limited decentralized presence.” This important aspect had a significant influence on the quality of project execution.

The secondary executing agencies were however more successful. CSOs alone or in cooperation with national agencies managed to establish GIAHS Systems on local level which can be drawn back from the FAO’s financial priority shift. In different variation the secondary executing agencies were differently successful in the GIAHS mainstreaming attempt. It seems however that the cooperation with governmental agencies was mutually important.

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.

The Globally Important Agricultural Heritage System (GIAHS) Initiative promotes agricultural systems that have inherent qualities designed to constantly adapt to climate change and variability. Therefore the TE indicates that the GIAHS sites were found to be resilient to climate change. Considering that the amount of the participating countries more than doubled it can be assumed that the sustainable approach of the GIAHS approach will have an impact on the conservation of globally significant (agricultural) biodiversity in these areas.

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.

The inclusive character of the project facilitates the participation of local communities in a broader context. Through the strengthening of alliances with indigenous people, other CSOs and co-operations with (governmental) local and national stakeholders, the value of traditional practices, such as the production of native varieties using organic production methods increased significantly.

Additionally the creation of new income strategies opened new alternative for income on local level. The TE especially highlights the gender perspective (which was not specifically promoted in the PD) and points the high level of woman beneficiaries in the project out. In the majority of interviewed women (including indigenous women) confirmed they had benefited from the training provided by the project in alternative livelihoods, which they confirmed had helped them to increase their monthly income.

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

Based on the information provided by the Terminal Evaluation, the project has enhanced through their engagement of national agencies and ministries in all pilot sites and supported traditional agricultural methods and practices based on environmentally friendly technologies in the several implementations sites of the Global Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS) project. The intensity of these efforts varied based on the capacities and engagement of the national governments. As explained in more detail further down, through the acceptance of the GIAHS in different national policies, the general awareness and knowledge about agricultural biodiversity enhanced sustainable and resilient agricultural systems.

b) Governance

The impact on governance structures is strongly interconnected with national interest in the pilot countries of the GIAHS. The TE gives several examples of changes of national policies especially in the championing pilot country China, where the Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems was enhanced by the Nationally Important Agricultural Heritage System, which opened a different legal realm for the Initiative.

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.

The TE reported briefly some negative impacts of the GIAHS Initiative. Ecologically most significant are the impacts on local level, when specific crops are in high demand leads to loss of rotation systems. On socio-political level it becomes visible how important the role of national institutions are regarding the implementation and strengthening of initiatives like the GIAHS.

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.

The GIAHS Movement was successful in some countries, where the system was adopted into national regulation. This however is, based on the evidences of the Terminal Evaluation, depending on the establishment of governmental agencies on national level. As mentioned before, older and recognized ministries and other agencies have more possibilities to influence the implementation process. Having said that, the TE also refers to the inclusion of the GIAHS into the FAO regular program, which would ensure important funding and further development on global level: Based on the PD and the TE, the integration of the GIAHS into broader programs are crucial for the creation of funds and further lobby and advocacy work. The goal to recognize the GIAHS fully into an internationally accepted system like the CBD is however (on short term base) unlikely, since it cannot be officially endorsed until it is ratified as regular program with budget. Therefore the efforts have to be made on other levels first, in international organizations like the GEF, IFAD, UNESCO, World Heritage Commission (WHC) and UNDP, which all require an initial endorsement within the FAO.

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.

- When indigenous people are involved, the UN Declaration on the Right for indigenous peoples must be the basis for the approach
- Before reaching out to the global level, stable national regimes should be established, also in order to reduce legal vacuums! In this context, the TE is right in saying: No GIAHS without NIAHS.
- Projects with several expected outcomes should adopt a clear and coherent phased approach to aid indicative and annual planning as well as monitoring of results-based indicators (SMART) and the closure phase with a predetermined exit strategy that includes as next steps plan

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE offers the following recommendations from the project experience:

- Due to the lack of an international system of the GIAHS (Globally Important Agricultural Heritage System), the FAO's regular program should reflect the importance of this approach and mainstream it within the organization. It should furthermore also facilitate the involvement of

appropriate Government authorities in all future activities relating to the establishment, implementation and consolidation of GIAHS.

- Following the reviews of the PD, the TE also recommends a more transparent selection process for project implementation sites
- Specially because the first objective of the project (internationally accepted system and recognition of the GIAHS) was not achieved, the promotion of the NIAH (Nationally Important Agricultural Heritage) System in order to strengthen and facilitate the mainstreaming of GIAHS in national policies, strategies and plans and to strengthen the ownership and alignment of GIAHS at the local, national and, ultimately, global levels.
- An effective communication system that provides information and data on key findings and lessons learnt in accordance with the needs of different audience is crucial for the success of the GIAHS Initiative. Additionally the gender perspective as well as the inclusion of other marginalized groups should be reflected in the information package to enhance their access to resources and training.
- Lastly, the TE highlights the necessity to adapt the planning process in correspondence to the funding. It is equally important is the employment of qualified and motivated staff that can eventually bridge lack of funds.

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 TE provides assessments of all relevant outcomes and impacts of the project.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and provides ratings accordingly to the GEF system. However, the chosen presentation structure is rather complicated and shows quite a few repetitive sections who could have been summarized better.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE structure is based on GEF requirements and therefor has a good assessment of project sustainability.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Yes, the lessons learned are comprehensive. Due to the lack of project internal lessons learned the TE does a good job in summarizing and specifying some aspects as lessons learned.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Yes, the report makes reference to the actual project costs, but it is not clear where the initial (and then not fully granted) GEF Funds were drawn from. The figure is roughly estimated as 6 m.	MS

Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E System assessment was not separately done and scattered within the project implementation and execution section. However, the rating was based on logical and comprehensible indicators.	MS
Overall TE Rating		S

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