

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2582	
GEF Agency project ID			
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP	
Project name		Development of National Biosafety Frameworks Project	
Country/Countries		Azerbaijan, Brazil, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Equatorial Guinea, Sao Tome and Principe, Thailand, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uzbekistan	
Region		Global	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Capacity Building for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol	
Executing agencies involved		UNEP	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Through consultation as part of some of the National Coordinating Committees (NCC)	
Private sector involvement		Through consultation as part of some of the National Coordinating Committees (NCC)	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		September 8 <sup>th</sup> , 2005	
Effectiveness date / project start		September 8 <sup>th</sup> , 2005	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		September 8 <sup>th</sup> , 2007	
Actual date of project completion		June 30 <sup>th</sup> , 2007	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	-	-
	Co-financing	-	-
GEF Project Grant		2.609208	2.609208
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		2.609208	2.609208
Total Co-financing		0	0
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.609208	2.609208
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		May 2016	
Author of TE		Camillo Risoli, Julia Niggebrugge	
TER completion date			
TER prepared by		Molly Watts	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)			

\* Expected Co-financing in the project document for project 2582 was 750,000\$ from participating countries. This was an add on project to the original National Biosafety Framework Development,

project 875, and the TE records total materialized co-financing for that project and this one, along with another add on project 2341 together. For this reason, all promised and materialized co-financing is reported in the TER for project 875, and excluded here to avoid double counting.

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation*	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	HS	S	S	U
Sustainability of Outcomes		MU	MU	MU
M&E Design		-	-	MU
M&E Implementation		-	-	MS
Quality of Implementation		HS	HS	S
Quality of Execution		MU	MU	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	S	S

\*The Terminal evaluation for this project is combined with the evaluation of two add-on projects, with the same development objectives, which expanded project activities to additional countries. Ratings provided in the terminal evaluation do not discern between the original project and the add on phases.

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As this full-sized project is an add on to an Enabling activity, the project document does not specify a global environmental objective. This project is the second add on to GEF project 875, “Development of National Biosafety Frameworks”, and “shares the aims and activities of the original project to assist GEF eligible countries to prepare national biosafety frameworks and promote regional and sub-regional cooperation.” (Executive Summary p.3)

The objective of the Cartagena protocol, which this project as well as the original project 875, and an earlier project, GEF ID 2341, prepared countries to enter into force on a national level, is to “contribute to ensuring an adequate level of protection in the field of the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms resulting from modern biotechnology that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking into account risks to human health, and specifically focusing on transboundary movement.” (Prodoc p.9) At a national level, the objective is “to develop and/or strengthen national instruments for environmental management and methods for implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks.” (PRO p. 9)

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

This project shares the same development objective as the original project 875, to “prepare countries for the entry into force of the [Cartagena] protocol.” (prodoc project 875, p.12) Project 875 was designed to assist up to 100 eligible countries to prepare their national biosafety frameworks, while also promoting collaboration and exchange of experiences on relevant issues to national biosafety frameworks. The project document for GEF ID 2582 notes “This final add-on project shares the aims and activities of the original project and will assist GEF eligible countries to prepare national biosafety

frameworks and promote regional and sub-regional cooperation to fulfil their obligations under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.” (Prodoc p.4)

The original project had two components:

- 1) Promoting Regional and Sub-Regional Collaboration and Exchange of Experience
- 2) Preparation of National Biosafety Frameworks (for the 20 additional add on countries)

However, by the time this add-on was approved activities under the first component had been completed. Funds for this add on were thus dedicated solely to the second component, 2) Preparation of National Biosafety Frameworks, in 10 additional requesting countries: Angola, Brazil, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Equatorial Guinea, Sao Tome and Principe, South Africa, Thailand, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan.

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

There were not changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities. The Terminal Evaluation adds what it considers to be a third project component “Global Support” noting that it was not defined as such in the ProDoc. (TE p.3) Additionally, the TE notes that although the project did not experience major changes in its essential design, an evaluation conducted by the GEF Evaluation Office on GEF’s Support to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2005) found that “during the course of the project, the goal was scaled down and aimed only at completing preparation of the draft NBF [National Biosafety Framework], not at having the actual mechanisms in place” (TE p.5)

## 4. GEF IEO 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 <b>Relevance</b>	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	----------------------

The terminal evaluation rates the relevance of this project, along with the original project and an additional add on project also covered in the same terminal evaluation, as highly satisfactory. This terminal evaluation review, which focuses only on project 2582, rates relevance as satisfactory. The project was relevant both to the GEF priorities and priorities in country, as all 20 participating countries had signed the Cartagena Protocol.

The project addressed GEF-3 priorities under “Capacity Building for the Implementation of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.” (Executive Summary p. 1)

The countries which signed the Cartagena Protocol signaled their willingness to assume obligations which would require capacity building and strengthening of human and institutional resources. A Ministerial Round Table held on “Capacity-building in Developing Countries to Facilitate the Implementation of the Protocol” in May 2000 during the Fifth Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity acknowledged the need for capacity-building at the national level, in order to allow “the safe use of modern biotechnology, in particular the safe transfer of living modified organisms (LMOs) resulting from modern biotechnology that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity between countries which may have very different climatic, social and economic conditions.” (ProDoc project 875 p.8) The TE does note shortcomings in the project’s relevance due to its innovative feature and to the strong inherent challenges of the project. (TE p.10)

<b>4.2 Effectiveness</b>	Rating: Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	------------------------

The TE rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory, while this TER rates effectiveness as unsatisfactory, as according to the TE, National Biosafety Frameworks were developed in 3 of the 10 countries for which this add-on project was initiated, namely Azerbaijan, Chad, and Thailand. As noted above, the terminal evaluation assesses achievement of outputs and outcomes of this project along with the original project 875 and an additional add on project. This TER focuses only on effectiveness for project 2582, which had the purpose of expanding project implementation to an additional 10 countries. Project 875 remained open while the two add on projects began, with funding blended among the three projects.

This project functioned under one component: Preparation of National Biosafety Frameworks for 10 additional add on countries: Azerbaijan, Brazil, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Equatorial Guinea, Sao Tome and Principe, Thailand, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uzbekistan. Annex 17 (TE p.144-151) of the terminal evaluation lists all countries who participated in the National Biosafety Framework Development project (meaning both the original, this add-on project, and an additional add on project). This list includes only three of the 10 countries which this add-on project was meant to fund. It is not explained why the seven other countries which were expected to participate did not. (The TE notes that for the National Biosafety Framework Development project as a whole, 123 countries participated. This compares to 130 expected based on the project documents for the three projects.)

In order to assess the quality of all National Biosafety Frameworks delivered among the original project and the two additional add-on projects, the terminal evaluation undertook a study of a sample of 37 of the National Biosafety Framework plans produced, and using a scorecard rated their quality on a six-point scale from Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory. Of the 37, 23 were rated moderately satisfactory or above (4 were highly satisfactory, 7 were satisfactory and 12 were moderately satisfactory), while 14 were moderately unsatisfactory or below (7 moderately unsatisfactory, and 7

unsatisfactory.) Thus the majority of sampled National Biosafety Framework documents produced were “workable documents that in many cases have enabled the countries to move forward their effective implementation.” (TE, p.12) Two of the three countries which developed National Biosafety Frameworks as a result of this add-on project were included in the sample of NBFs reviewed: Chad and Thailand. In 2008, Chad received an overall score of moderately unsatisfactory on its National Biosafety Scorecard, while Thailand received a score of moderately satisfactory.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: Unable to Assess
-----------------------	--------------------------

The TE rates efficiency for projects 875, 2341 and 2582 as a whole as moderately unsatisfactory. As there is no information available specifically on efficiency in this add on project, this TER rates efficiency as unable to assess. As this is a significantly smaller project in terms of GEF funding than project 875, with a more focused goal, it is possible that if it were analyzed separately, efficiency for this add on project would be different from the overall project. Information on efficiency for the three projects taken as a whole is included below.

As the terminal evaluation notes, the issue with the “one size fits all” approach the project adopted is that they “adopt one single approach and allocate resources (time, technical assistance, financial resources) quite evenly along a great variety of countries and baseline situations.” (TE p. 44) The TE notes that in their review of sample projects there was in fact broad range of funding spent “in country”, from 100,000\$ to 200,000\$ with an average of 137,000\$ USD, but there was not a correlation between amount of money spent in country and quality of the National Biosafety framework produced. There was a need for revision of the project budget several times to respond to country needs. The terminal evaluation also notes much higher than estimated project administrative costs, at 33% of total GEF funds for the three tranches of funding combined. Although it is not possible to discern the administrative costs for project 875 alone, as this was by far the biggest project in terms of GEF funding, the ratio shouldn’t have been changed significantly by the additional funding.

In addition to much higher than anticipated administrative costs, and issues in quality arising from the one size fits all approach, the project and the process of developing National Biosafety Frameworks in these 100 countries was much more time consuming than anticipated, and the project which was expected to run for 3 and a half years actually ran for 6 years, with the process of implementing the frameworks in countries still ongoing, and often requiring additional individual GEF projects, described as National Biosafety Framework implementation projects in the terminal evaluation. (TE p.50)

<b>4.4 Sustainability</b>	Rating: Moderately Unlikely
---------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates sustainability of project benefits, for this project along with project 875 and 2341, as moderately unlikely. Based on the evidence provided this TER provides the same rating for project 2582. This TER assesses the four dimensions of project sustainability below:

Financial: The TE rates financial sustainability as Moderately Unlikely. Among the beneficiary countries of this project, those who are in more advanced stages of implementing their National Biosafety framework have noted that financial resources are not sufficient. (TE p.40) Among the resources for

which further funding is needed is sophisticated lab equipment and additional human resources. The TE notes that out of the sample of 37 countries (of the 123 participating countries in both the original and add on projects), 11 reported that they had established a mechanism of budgetary allocations of funds for the operation of their national biosafety framework, 8 reported that they had to some extent, 13 reported no, and another 5 did not respond. For this reason, the TE deems that financial sustainability is still to be proved, although it notes that “for the countries that have a more advanced state of NBF implementation, the insertion of biosafety into the NBSAP is regarded as the first, crucial step for accessing public funds and achieving a minimum of financial sustainability.” (TE p.41)

Sociopolitical: The TE rates sustainability on this dimension as Moderately Unlikely. This is mainly because biosafety involves many key-players, as well as “long and heavy institutional mechanisms of decision-making, contrasting views and conflicting interests, governmental changes, lack of knowledge among Parliaments’ members and other decision-makers, among others.” (TE p.37) The TE cites evidence from reports of the implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks within countries, which point to several hindrances to socio-political sustainability, such as the need for stronger links with Civil Society Organizations, and the capacity of stakeholders to handle negotiations around biosafety. (TE p.37)

Institutional: The TE rates institutional sustainability as moderately unlikely. This is because, although “the progress of the countries towards the institutional sustainability of the biosafety frameworks has been quite remarkable...national biosafety systems are not fully operational in most of the countries and have to be proved in more challenging situations (concrete opportunities to test collegiality and decision-making in presence of GMOs applications.) (TE p.40)

Environmental: The TE rates environmental sustainability as Moderately Likely. Though some issues related to environmental sustainability have been noted, such as the release of GMO (genetically modified organisms) in areas within regions characterized as “genetic resources origin”. In these areas coexistence with traditional agriculture can be a problem, and though it is regulated in some EU countries it has become an issue in other countries. However, the TE notes that this project as well as other biosafety projects have contributed to “underline the relevance of sound procedures for RA and RM for environmental sustainability.” (TE p.42)

## **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?

750,000\$ USD in co-financing was promised for this add on project, coming from the 10 countries in which the project would be implemented. The TE reports total co-financing for this project along with 875 and 2341 together, thus it is not possible to discern how much of the 750,000 materialized. The original National Biosafety Development Project, GEF ID 875, had total expected co-financing, from UNEP and recipient countries blended, of \$12.341 million USD (project GEF ID 2341 did not report any

expected co-financing.) Combined with the \$750,000 USD from this project, that would make a total of \$13.091 million USD of co-financing expected from countries and UNEP. This compares to a total reported materialization of \$13.163 million USD in co-financing, \$12.961 million USD from UNEP and governments blended, and \$202,000 USD in co-financing received from DFID. Thus it would appear that between the projects, just slightly less than expected co-financing materialized from either countries or UNEP (the amounts are blended), but overall co-financing was slightly higher than expected due to the additional co-financing mobilized from DFID. The Terminal evaluation notes that, as the Management Team “made use of the total budget as a “bag” from which national allocations were gradually supplied to the countries according to their specific needs and their capacity of absorption” it is not possible to identify where co-financing was used versus GEF funding. (All expected and mobilized co-financing is recorded in Table 1 of the TER for project 875 and excluded in table 1 of this TER to avoid double counting.)

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?

This add on project was expected to run two years. It appears to have closed on time. It should be noted however that, according to the TE, project closure varied by country widely, and that operations continued in some countries past the official closure date of the National Biosafety Framework project. (TE p.157) The GEF Evaluation Office Biosafety Evaluation of 2005, which considered all three projects, notes that “the initial time allocation of 18 months and their [country] budget frames did not match the complexity and high ambitions of the project document with regard, for example, to regional cooperation, capacity building, public participation, and preparation of the framework itself. It is likely that the countries on average will require 28 to 30 months. (MTE p.3)

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:

As this project was designed to work within multiple different countries it is difficult to provide a description of overall country ownership. The TE reports that some project co-financing came from participating countries, but the amount is blended with UNEP financing, thus it is not possible to discern the amount of co-financing provided by countries. The TE also notes, however, that “the empowerment of national stakeholders is evident and has to be rated, as a whole, Satisfactory.” (TE p.xii)

## **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.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

The terminal evaluation rates M&E as a whole as satisfactory, but does not rate M&E Design at entry separately. The project document for this add on project does not discuss M&E arrangements, but makes it clear that the project will operate under the existing arrangements for the original project. The TE did rate the quality of the original ProDoc as Moderately Satisfactory “due to existing inconsistencies observed in the definition of the outputs and indicators.” The project document contains a logical framework matrix with indicators at the outcome level, but no specific targets. (ProDoc p.28-29) The M&E plan presented in project documents does note both an independent mid-term and final evaluation will be carried out, and that UNEP would submit quarterly and half-yearly reports on substantive and financial matters to GEF. (TE p.21) A dedicated M&E budget is not provided. For the reasons noted above, M&E Design is rated as moderately unsatisfactory.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

As noted in section 6.1, the terminal evaluation rates M&E as a whole as Satisfactory, without providing separate ratings for M&E design and implementation. Despite flaws in the project’s M&E design, the TE notes that the project has implemented an innovative information system (ANUBIS) which has allowed for the evaluation to “easily access substantive and detailed information regarding the progress of the project.” The project’s mid-term evaluation was carried out as planned, though the TE does not discuss any course correction occurring as a result of the MTE. Due to the project’s consistent monitoring of activities through ANUBIS, but also considering the project’s failure to report against targets, this TER rates M&E Implementation as Moderately Satisfactory.

## **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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: Satisfactory
--	----------------------

The implementing agency for this project was UNEP. The TE rates UNEP’s quality of supervision as highly satisfactory, considering the magnitude of the project, as well as the disperse implementation in countries. The TE notes that the introduction of the information system ANUBIS was instrumental in efficient supervision of project implementation, as it allowed for the compilation of progress reports, workshop proceedings, audit reports. The TE also notes the organization of National Project Coordinators periodic meetings at the sub-regional level, the field missions of 1the Fund Management



Officer, and effectiveness in supporting problem-solving at country level. (TE p.50) Noting reports of strong supervision, while keeping in mind issues with an overly ambitious project design, this TE rates UNEP supervision as Satisfactory.

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

UNEP was also the executing agency in this project. In its role of project management, the TE rates UNEP’s performance as moderately unsatisfactory, and this TER agrees with that rating. The project management unit was housed in UNEP’s GEF Coordination office in Geneva. The original management team included a project manager, three program officers and a fund manager, and was expanded in 2003, when this add on project was approved, to cope with expanding workload, so that more than 10 people came to be working on the project. The support reduced eventually back to two staff. The TE notes that the complexity of this project made it difficult to put in place suitable management arrangements, and that “overall, the lack of a clear UNEP management strategy, as far as biosafety is concerned, is progressively leading to a quite unsustainable management situation. (TE p.48)

## 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 in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. 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 TE does not discuss or measure environmental changes as a result of the National Biosafety Frameworks produced by the project.

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 TE does not note any socioeconomic change taking place as a result of this project. The TE notes that “inclusiveness is a major factor of socio-political sustainability, yet it is not an easy process to orient and implement...Though programs of awareness raising and public information have usually been developed through the projects,...established mechanisms and procedures for public hearing and active participation are very rare.”(TE p.37)

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

As part of the add on project specifically, there is no information on changes in capacities.

b) Governance

Through this add-on funding, 19 National Biosafety Frameworks were produced. Additionally, a UNEP Biosafety information system (ANUBIS) was implemented and is still in use by UNEP to track Biosafety related projects. (TE p.11)

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 impacts are noted in the TE or project documents.

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 TE notes that in the most advanced cases of country adoption, biosafety has been inserted in country’s National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans. (TE p.37)

## **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.

1. The design of the Global Project was very ambitious in project size (and underestimated time and efforts required for its implementation

2. The baseline situation was very uneven among the countries and not appropriately taken into account by the “one size fits all” approach

3. The Regional and sub-regional component of the Global Project was largely undervalued in the project budget and in planned activities

4. Criteria for budget allocation among national sub-projects was not clearly defined and transparent

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Recommendation 1:

For an increased effectiveness and efficiency, it is strongly recommended to implement a Biosafety Programming Approach with the following main objectives:

- a) To strengthen and consolidate the Biosafety Portfolio within the Biodiversity Programme and the global context of Sustainable Development goals;
- b) To identify a limited number of Biosafety Programmes encompassing sets of interventions or projects tailored to different countries’ needs and priorities;
- c) To strengthen stocktaking at sub-regional level (e.g. through Rapid Appraisals) in order to match needs and priorities mentioned above and design “multi-country thematic initiatives” with particular attention to countries and sub-regions already exposed (or prone to be) to GMOs development.

Recommendation 2:

Based on the Programming Approach recommended above (Rec 1), it is specifically recommended:

- a) To undertake specific “needs and priorities” Rapid Appraisals in order to identify “homogeneous countries” (see for instance the grouping proposed in chapter 4.3.3), preferably within the same Sub-region, to be matched with multi-country-initiatives addressing specific, yet, common gaps and by exploring forms of South-South Cooperation enhancing the role of “champion-countries” and of a small team of sub-regional consultants to be identified;
- b) Design and implement, based on the above, specific multi-country and result-oriented initiatives in thematic areas (e.g. among others: Risk Assessment and Management, Risk Communication, Detection capacities, Co-existence and Socio-economic considerations);
- c) To support the countries, particularly those already exposed to GMOs, in producing more neutral and scientifically-sound communication tools for crucial decision-makers at different levels (Politicians, Managers, Farmers, Consumers).

### Recommendation 3:

It is strongly recommended to clarify the strategic position of biosafety at Sub-program level (Environmental Governance / EG) and to define more efficient communication channels allowing adequate strategic planning, institutional monitoring and reporting of the Biosafety Programme. More specifically:

- a) to explicitly and meaningfully integrate, as soon as possible, biosafety into the strategic Sub-Programmes, particularly Environmental Governance, as well as within the next possible UNEP PoW (2018);
- b) to clearly define and strengthen the institutional anchorage of biosafety either within DEPI (current situation), considering the insertion of Biosafety within the Biodiversity sector, or, perhaps preferably, within DELC, considering the evident linkage with Sub-programme EG;
- c) to prepare and discuss a biosafety strategy paper for internal use in order to clarify and detail the points outlined above, as well as a concrete proposal for the implementation of the recommended “programming approach” (Rec. 1 and 2), by October 2016.

### Recommendation 4

It is recommended to “reset” the Biosafety Programme by an appropriate design of its internal organizational structure, namely:

- a) To clearly define and implement the functions of the Global Biosafety Programme Coordinator responsible for the overall oversight of Programme Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, including ABS, L&R and BCH Projects<sup>66</sup> and also directly responsible for Eastern, Central and Southern Africa (see following point regarding decentralization);
- b) To enhance Biosafety Programmes decentralization by adding, in a first phase, at least one Biosafety/Biodiversity TM for Asia / Pacific Region posted in Bangkok RO and, if possible, one Sub-regional Biosafety/Biodiversity TM for the francophone West Africa and Maghreb Sub-regions. Appropriate partnerships could be explored with regional institutions, like IICA (Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture) to provide specific support to LAC Biosafety/Biodiversity TM for groups of Latin-America countries (e.g. Central America). Similarly, appropriate partnership could be implemented with IUCN (Int. Union for Conservation of Nature) Regional Offices in Belgrade for the CEE Region and in Fiji for Pacific Islands.

### Recommendation 5

In order to enable the Programming Approach, it is recommended to improve and consolidate the cooperation with partner’s institutions particularly at Regional and Sub-regional levels (e.g. CGIAR

Centres and Institutions, Universities) in order to promote “Biosafety Poles of Excellence” able to support the countries on specific thematic areas. More specifically,

- a) UNEP should prepare by the end of 2016 a strategic paper about cooperation with partners at regional and sub-regional level, with, if possible, input from the GEF;
- b) Enhanced cooperation could include, for instance, consulting partner’s institutions at the time of project design, integrating them in a comprehensive stakeholder analysis by assessing their added value and identifying their roles and responsibilities in the projects and by involving them in technical support and backstopping to the programme.

#### Recommendation 6

In order to firmly insert Biosafety into the mainstream of Sustainable Development Strategies and to improve the coordination with other UN Agencies, particularly those related to Rural Development, Food Security, Food Safety and Genetic Resources Conservation (e.g. FAO, IFAD, WHO), it is recommended to set-up and/or consolidate coordination mechanisms at global, regional and national level, namely through:

- a) Pursuing the initiative of joint webinars (e.g. webinar on “international databases on biosafety” run in 2014 and 2015 by CBD, FAO and OECD) by organizing and launching a joint webinar on “Socio- economic considerations (art. 26 of CPB)” by the end of 2016;
- b) Establishing an active coordination between Biosafety projects and the UNEP/GEF project for the protection in-situ of Crop Wild Relatives (CWR), as well as with FAO / ITPGRFA (International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture) in all the countries where the CWR Project is on-going or planned;
- c) Encouraging the participation of the NCAs in the UNDAF programming exercise and their proactive role in the UNCT (UN Country Team);
- d) Encouraging and/or consolidating the coordination of NCAs with the Codex Alimentarius national commissions in order to promote coordinated actions between Biosafety and Food Safety;
- e) Strengthening and taking an active role in the coordination mechanism under the SCBD, especially in the liaison group on Capacity Building in Biosafety

(TE p.56-61)

## 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 IEO 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 thorough assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project, although it is mixed with achievements of two additional add-on projects, making it difficult to judge achievement these projects separately.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent and extremely detailed. Ratings are well substantiated	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report provides a thorough discussion of project sustainability and exit strategy	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by the evidence.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes total GEF and Co-financing amounts, however co-financing amounts are blended between UNEP and participating countries, thus amounts by contributor are unknown. Additionally the source of funding for different project components is not provided.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report presents a discussion of project M&E focused mainly on M&E implementation. The discussion of M&E Design at entry is brief.	MS
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>S</b>

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

*GEF Evaluation Office Biosafety Evaluation, November 2005 [GEF/ME/C.27/Inf.1/Rev.1]*