

1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	2796
IA/EA Project ID	GF/1010-07-01 (4977)
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Project Name	Building the Partnership to Track Progress at the Global Level in Achieving the 2010 Biodiversity Target (Phase I)
Country/Countries	
Geographic Scope	Global
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	UNEP
Executing Agencies involved	UNEP-WCMC (with 39 partners)
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Not involved
Involvement of Private Sector	No- Not Involved
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	OP1: Arid and Semi-Arid Zone Ecosystems OP12: Integrated Ecosystem Management OP 13: Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture OP2: Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems OP3: Forest Ecosystems OP4: Mountain Ecosystems
TER Prepared by	Nelly Bourlion
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Kumar Negi
Author of TE	Dave Pritchard
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	14/05/2007
Project Implementation Start Date	01/07/2007
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	01/03/2011
Actual Date of Project Completion	01/12/2010
TE Completion Date	31/12/2010
IA Review Date	N/A
TE Submission Date	8/30/2012

2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant		
Co-financing for Project Preparation		
Total Project Prep Financing	-	-
GEF Financing	3.64	3.64
IA/EA own	1.38	1.68
Government		
Other*	3.79	9.76
Total Project Financing	8.81	15.08
Total Financing including Prep	8.81	15.08

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

3. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF Evaluation Office TE Review
Project Outcomes	HS	S	S	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	L	L	L
Monitoring and Evaluation	HS	S	S	S
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	S	S	S
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	S	HS

4. Project Objectives

4.1. *Global Environmental Objectives of the project:*

According to the project appraisal document, the overall objective of this project is to "provide benefits globally, nationally, and locally through better informing decisions made by governments and other stakeholders to improve the conservation status of species, habitats, and ecosystems."

The assumption is that better information leads to better decisions. The expected principal impact is better information for decision-makers, and as a consequence decisions themselves to be better informed (more fully or logically reflecting knowledge, being implementable in more effective and verifiable ways, etc.). This project's goal is to build a "2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnerships" (2010 BIP) and to "enable significant improvements to individual indicators and their interpretation".

No changes to Global Environmental Objective are noted in the Terminal Evaluation report.

4.2. *Development Objectives of the project:*

In the appraisal document, the project log frame lists the following development objective: "reduction in the rate of biodiversity loss at the global level, through improved decisions for the conservation of global biodiversity".

The immediate objective was that "decisions made by governments and other stakeholders are better informed to improve the conservation status of biodiversity at the global level".

The 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (2010 BIP) project aims to achieve these objectives through the delivery of three outcomes:

- (1) "A 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership generating information useful to decision-makers";
- (2) "Improved global indicators implemented and available";

(3) "National governments and regional organizations using and contributing to the improved delivery of global indicators".

Only a minor change occurred in the formulation of outcome 3. At first, outcome 3 was a response to enthusiasm for national capacity-building, but there were conceptual challenges in integrating this into a project on an indicator system designed to function at the global level. The Terminal Evaluation team reported that the element of “national contributing to global” was difficult to achieve (few of the indicators rely on data reported at the national scale) and instead the emphasis went on global support for national/regional use.

No other major changes were noted in the Terminal Evaluation report or final PIR.

4.3. *Changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities:*

Criteria	Change?	Reason for Change
Global Environmental Objectives	No	
Development Objectives	No	
Project Components	No	
Other activities	No	

5. **GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability**

5.1. *Relevance – Satisfactory*

Relevance of the outcomes is rated as satisfactory because they conform with GEF strategic priorities, especially the generation and dissemination of best practices for addressing current and emerging biodiversity issues.

This priority was achieved by (a) improving the understanding of the extent to which biodiversity targets are being met; (b) providing information to support prioritization and other aspects of decision making; (c) cross-relating indicators relevant to different focal areas and other sectors; and (d) promoting and facilitating development of complementary indicators at other levels.

The project outcomes were also relevant and consistent with the GEF OP 1 (Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems), OP2 (Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems), OP3 (Forest Ecosystems), OP4 (Mountain Ecosystems), OP12 (Integrated Ecosystem Management) and OP13 (Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture).

According to the Terminal Evaluation report, the project has supported the GEF’s own need to be able to evaluate the achievement of biodiversity outcomes from its activities, strengthening the logic of the Facility’s support for the work.

5.2. *Effectiveness – Satisfactory*

The project had three planned outcomes, and was highly satisfactory in effectively achieving these.

Expected outcome 1 was to create a Biodiversity Indicators Partnership to generate information useful to decision-makers.

The project brought together a set of knowledge indicators and analysis by forming the BIP, which created alliances and generated products that were viewed as "highly credible and authoritative" by decision makers. According to the Terminal Evaluation report, "a sense of shared values, equitability, brand identity and internal technical cross-fertilization were not always optimal" and the level of participation varied widely and were mainly determined by funding. However, this project was well-managed and coherent, and it delivered.

The primary challenge in attaining this outcome was a poor communication strategy. However, according to the Terminal Evaluation report, this had little effect on the quality of information outputs. Reaching beyond the "biodiversity community" remains a challenge, but according to the Terminal Evaluation report, the project's "integrated indicator storylines" work was an important steps in this direction.

The expected outcome 2 was to improve the implemented and available global indicators.

The CBD indicator framework left a lot of work to be done before it could function as a full measure of the 2010 target. In this sense, the project gave important help to some indicators and provided the means to knit together an overall picture.

The main issue with this outcome was that priorities were not clear enough, and sometimes the project's own mechanisms for scientific quality assurance failed. However, according to the Terminal Evaluation report of the 34 indicators, 19 (56%) are reported as having been strengthened during the project.

The expected outcome 3 was to make sure National governments and regional organizations were using and contributing to the improved delivery of global indicators.

This outcome was the most difficult to achieve since not all of the global 2010 indicators were applicable at national scales. However, the project chose to focus on national priorities without reference to the 2010 target.

The main change was that the Steering Committee re-worded the planned outputs to reflect the reality. However they did it once the work was finished. The Terminal Evaluation report states that it would have been better to formalize a change earlier on.

Overall, the project generated excellent information and worked hard to promote its uptake. Tailoring and targeting of the right audience was successful. However, the Terminal Evaluation report suggests that some redundancy could have been reduced by "each set of indicator findings being directed towards a specific named policy response mechanism or decision-opportunity". This would have made the response of biodiversity status improvement to indicators more effective.

The project's development objective was only achievable after the project's close. The project was not seeking to directly achieve global environmental benefits itself, but was designed to provide tools for others to achieve those benefits. Therefore, according to the Terminal Evaluation report, "it could be argued that reduction in the rate of global biodiversity loss was an over-ambitious yardstick against which to be judged".

5.3. *Efficiency – Satisfactory*

A project such as the 2010 BIP partnership requires a strong management effort. The partnership involves numerous partners, and therefore cost effectiveness is judged very differently depending on perspectives and standards from each of them. Some expenses were perceived as useless since they did not generate data products and only the approach taken was justified. However, according to the Terminal Evaluation report, outcome 3 (global-national linkages) was cost-efficient. Overall the project was run with a fairly streamlined management model, and overhead costs were proportionate to its size. Apart from some aspects of partner sub-contracts, financial controls were robust, co-funding significantly exceeded targets, and the project came in on budget.

There was a delay of almost a year until GEF CEO Endorsement was secured in June 2007 and the project could be launched the following month. This was explained as a consequence of a new GEF CEO arriving in post and the subsequent alteration of GEF procedures. However, these major externally-imposed time reductions did not significantly impact the project.

5.4. *Sustainability – Low/Moderate Risks*

The risks to sustainability are rated as low to moderate, supported by the following reasoning:

Originally the project had two phases, and the sustainability of the program was supposed to be ensured at the end of phase II. Therefore, in some of the partner's minds, sustainability was less of a priority in this Phase I project.

One of the project's goals was to ensure that the suite of 2010 biodiversity indicators was incorporated into relevant policy planning and programs of work. Sustainability was therefore an integral goal of the project. At the level of individual countries and institutions, sustainability is partly dependent on technical and partnerships factors. Technically, the project has produced a strong methodological guidance and documented experiences to learn from. On the other hand, the creation of a partnership is a strong basis for sustainability. Partners can interact independently among themselves on the indicators agenda in new ways that were facilitated by the project but are not dependent on it.

Financial risks: UNEP-WCMC and the BIP Steering Committee have committed to continuing the Partnership after the GEF project ends, and there is a widespread willingness among the partners to do so. Many of the organizations involved are likely to continue working on the

indicators for which they have specific individual roles, but the scale of what may be possible on a joint basis is highly dependent on what further funding investment can be secured.

Socio-Political risks: The project's outcomes and impacts are directly linked to inter-governmental processes, and socio-political risks to sustainability are therefore small. The socio-political engagement at the national government level could be harder to sustain. But in 2010, the media coverage of BIP products was very high and showed a public interest in biodiversity.

Institutional risks: According to the Terminal Evaluation report, the 2010 indicators were built on knowledge systems embedded in communities of interest in existing institutional structures. This increased the expectation that relevant frameworks would be continued in the future. In the Mid-Term Evaluation, institutional systems for quality assurance for the indicators were cited as a source of risks to sustainability, but since then, the issues have been solved. Governance and policies surrounding data ownership are not considered a specific risk to sustainability.

Environmental risk: There is no risk from environmental factors that could impact the future of the project.

6. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

6.1. Co-financing

6.1.1. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project?

The co-financing was critical to achieve the GEF objectives. The co-financing activities were well integrated in the project. According to the Project Document, co-financing was mostly focused on the second outcome to improve global indicators implemented and available, especially on the parts about the coverage of protected area and the trends in extent of selected biomes, ecosystems, and habitats. Outcome 3 was not supported at all by co-financing.

6.1.2. If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The main observation concerning co-financing is the excellent performance of the project in securing over 350% additional cash co-financing than the budgeted amount. This can be interpreted as confidence built by the project and the partnership in the quality and credentials of its work. At the same time, realized in-kind co-financing support was significantly less than the planned amount (down by 34%). The Terminal Evaluation report states that the reasons for this are not clear, but a final annual

Partners co-financing report, due after the submission date of the Terminal Evaluation, could allow some more information to be gathered.

The additional co-financing above the levels budgeted came both from higher contributions being made by partners and others who had been identified in the planned budget, and from contributions being made by other organizations or initiatives which had not initially been listed as co-funders but which became involved through the course of the project.

6.2. Delays

- 6.2.1. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

There was a delay of almost a year in the GEF CEO endorsement. This necessitated significant revision of the original project in terms of time and budget. The original concept was for a two-phase, six-year project with \$12 - \$15 million in GEF funding, starting in 2006 and contributing to reporting on the 2010 target in 2012. The project approved and implemented was a single-phase project with \$3.64 million of GEF funding.

There were no other reported delays related to implementation.

6.3. Country ownership

- 6.3.1. 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:

Country ownership is difficult to analyze in a project such as 2010 BIP since it is a global-level project. The country ownership was not as strong as expected. The project was focused more on technical cooperation than engagement of governments. The Terminal Evaluation notes that the engagement of national representatives and government agencies in these activities demonstrates country ownership of the project. But this system of country ownership affected the outcomes of the project since the original vision of a coherent and balanced interaction between global indicators and national priorities did not turn out to be the reality. Instead, this part of the project served national priorities at the expense of reducing emphasis on coherence with the global framework. National governments did not value the global dimensions of the project.

7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

7.1. M&E design at entry- **Moderately Satisfactory**

Overall the project's M&E Plan was adequately designed and it satisfies the GEF design standards. According to the Terminal Evaluation report, the only exception was that some of

the indicators in the logical framework were not appropriate. There was a lack of clarity surrounding the extent or magnitude of achievement sought. However, indicators at output level were generally better, and timeframes generally well specified.

7.2. *M&E implementation – Satisfactory*

In the M&E plan, the implementation of the project was verified by reports to the SC and UNEP TM, including quarterly financial statements and other financial reports, biannual Secretariat reports and technical progress reports, annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) and minutes of key meetings.

The M&E system was implemented as planned, and was improved in later parts of the project when data on indicator development was gathered to compare progress against baselines. Moreover, a standard UNEP progressive risk assessment tool was also employed as part of the PIR process.

According to the Terminal Evaluation report, the Steering Committee's role in M&E during project implementation was a little vague to some of its members.

8. **Assessment of project's Quality of Implementation and Execution**

8.1. *Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution – Satisfactory*

8.2. *Overall Quality of Implementation - Satisfactory*

The overall quality of implementation is satisfactory. According to the Terminal Evaluation, the level of supervision and backstopping support provided by UNEP was good. Personal rapport between the project team and UNEP supervisors has been good. In the second half of the project especially, TM supervision and support was accessible, hands-on, proactive and supportive. The BIP Secretariat was given good feedback on performance, the information on which M&E progress reporting was based was diligently tested.

The only shortcomings were the following:

(1) There was some initial confusion about the affiliate and associate partner categories, the involvement of some partners changed during the project, and differential resource-allocation caused some structural tensions. Ultimately all these issues were overcome.

(2) The project's ultimate goal to report on a wide range of global biodiversity trends was too ambitious because of the contraction of the time frame reduced at 2 years.

(3) Representational balance across the different interests and regions of the project was a challenge and this was a preoccupation for a time at the beginning. Similar unsurprising challenges affected participation, with tradeoffs between cost-effectiveness and equitability meaning that a preponderance of meetings in Europe required more travel from those elsewhere, and teleconferencing did not work well for those with technological constraints.

(4) No project-specific external audit of the 2010BIP was undertaken; but this was not a requirement and only an implied intention in the Project Document.

(5) The Mid Term Evaluation took place later than planned, three-quarters of the way through the project instead of half-way through, and reported in April 2010. The resulting report was comprehensive and raised several recommendations.

8.3. Overall Quality of Execution - **Satisfactory**

The overall execution quality can be rated as satisfactory.

The Executing Agency UNEP-WCMC came to the project with good institutional management infrastructure in place, and a technical and political familiarity with the field of work. Internal finance and human resources processes provided high standards of formal safeguards. However, UNEP-WCMC was also a funded indicator implementing partner itself as well as being the Secretariat; as recommended by the Terminal Evaluation report safeguards against conflict of interest could have been more transparent.

Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) were submitted annually, and comments, action points and ratings were all added by the UNEP-DGEF Task Manager. Secretariat reports, technical reports, financial reports, and minutes of meetings were also submitted.

According to the Terminal Evaluation report, some aspects of the start-up phase might have benefited from better guidance from UNEP, such as interpretation of GEF procedures and a review of the scale of the project's aspirations in light of its reduced budget and timeframe.

The Project Document referred to an "Information Management Working Group" as another entity in the structure: this was never progressed and its absence seems not to have been felt.

According to the Terminal Evaluation report, one unsuccessful component of the structure was the Scientific Advisory Body (SAB). The SAB was conceived for setting data and methodological standards and providing quality assurance for delivery of the indicators. Its members were appointed but it never became fully operational in the way envisaged, mainly because many of the individual indicator systems and organizations had their own specialized peer-review processes. The SAB was an overdesigned element of the project and not a cost-effective approach to quality assurance.

9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

Criteria	Rating	GEF EO Comments
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Highly Satisfactory	The Terminal Evaluation report presents a clear assessment of the project outcomes, outputs, and impacts. It presents the rating of project impact achievement likelihood, as well as a detailed state and assumption for each output. Each assessment is justified and based on strong evidences.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Highly Satisfactory	The Terminal Evaluation report is consistent and the ratings are well documented. The ratings are presented with justifications, and evidences are gathered in a table summarizing the achievements of the project. The findings are easy to understand, and the evidences are strong.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Highly Satisfactory	Sustainability of the project is well documented and argued. The author of the Terminal Evaluation report justifies his assessment by taking into account the new CBD Strategic Plan and targets defined for the period to 2020.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Satisfactory	The lessons to be learned are supported by the evidence presented. However, the recommendations are very brief. The Terminal Evaluation report only suggests two new ideas and refers for the other recommendations to the Mid-Term Evaluation report. A brief follow-up is presented in the Terminal Evaluation report, but a more detailed analysis would have been useful.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Satisfactory	The report includes a very detailed budget and costs analysis in annex. Co-financing sources are detailed with the planned and actual resources involved, and the expenditures are broken down by output and activity for each year of the project. However, the costs are not reported per source of financing.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Highly Satisfactory	The report clearly describes the quality and limitations of the M&E plan at entry and at implementation as well as how it was used for project management.

Annex I – Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office

Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated or improved?

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

The 2010 BIP brought together an unprecedented wealth of technical experience and used this well to share and advance methodologies and scientific standards on indicators. Details were documented authoritatively in the downloadable BIP manuals, factsheets and CBD Technical Series Document, and represented a key added value of the global partnership approach.

The project's regional workshops covered the process of using national indicator data in compiling national reports to the CBD and helped to enhance awareness on this. A guidance document on national indicator development was produced, as well as four guides on specific indicators, on-line factsheets in multiple languages, an index tool, and a national indicators web-portal (also in multiple languages) alongside the BIP website. Ten capacity-building workshops were also held involving 45 countries in Asia, the Americas and Africa. Technical assistance at other times was also provided.

Is there evidence that the knowledge was used for management/ governance?

HOW WAS THIS KNOWLEDGE USED AND WHAT RESULTED FROM THAT USE?

The knowledge was used by the "partnership" in some sections of the 3rd edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO3) described as "the key CBD publication in 2010"; and in a compilation of an in-depth treatment of indicators (including lessons learned) used in a CBD Technical Series report.

Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO INFORMATION BEING COMPILED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE TO MANY?

Newsletters, two websites, factsheets, brochures, press releases, and guidance documents. Some were specifically targeted at national users. Moreover, two publications of two group-authored papers were published in the refereed journal Science and were accessible to the public.

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?

WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

According to the Terminal Evaluation report, reporting in the scientific literature was important in the project's overall impact, however, there is no firm evidence that reports improved as a result of the information made accessible.

Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being

raised?

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

User needs surveys and presentations in relevant fora.

Was any **positive** change in behavior reported as a result of these activities?

Yes

WHAT BEHAVIOR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT?

According to the Terminal Evaluation report, changes occurred in the project team rather than in the public. Participants reported taking new understanding and motivation into their daily work and wider interactions. Appropriate indicator methods appear to have been applied in new ways. Data availability remains a key limitation in many developing countries, but the project helped to build confidence in ways of using the few data available to good effect.

Did the project activities contribute to building technical/ environmental management skills?

No

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO **TECHNICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS** BEING BUILT OR IMPROVED?

The nature of the project is about working relationships between people. That is why no activities contributed to technical and environmental management skills being built.

Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained?

No

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks?

No

Were these adopted?

WHAT LAWS/ POLICIES/ RULES WERE ADOPTED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures?

Yes

Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures?

Yes

WHAT OFFICES/ GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WERE CREATED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

The project's outcome 1 built the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership and therefore created an institutional infrastructure. This partnership reviewed relationships among different indicator initiatives, and clarified the actions necessary to fill gaps and ensure delivery of the 2010 indicators in a coordinated manner. This partnership is expected to ensure replicable efforts beyond the project itself.

Did the project contribute to structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance?

Yes

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

Yes

WHAT STRUCTURES/ MECHANISMS/ PROCESSES WERE SUPPORTED BY THE PROJECT THAT ALLOWED MORE STAKEHOLDERS/ SECTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES?

According to the Terminal Evaluation report, the project was appealing since additional partners sought affiliation as time went on as affiliates or associates (two in 2007, two in 2008, three in 2009 and ten in 2010, with three others having partly completed the process at the time of the terminal evaluation writing).

Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution?

No

WHAT PROCESSES OR MECHANISMS FACILITATED TRUST-BUILDING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION?
WHAT RESULTED FROM THESE?

Did the project contribute to any of the following:

Technologies & Approaches	No
Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	No
Financial Mechanisms	Yes

Please specify what was contributed:

The Partnership created by BIP has a continuing life beyond the project. Some mandates and firm intentions are already being apparent as a basis for resourcing of further work

Did **replication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place?

No

SPECIFY WHICH PLACES IMPLEMENTED WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH.

WHAT WAS THE RESULT IN THOSE PLACES (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

According to the terminal Evaluation, the project approach and the methods developed are replicable, and it has proven to be catalytic in institutional and technical terms. The project has also contributed to strengthen the “enabling environment” that helps these benefits to be broadened and sustained in the longer term.

Did **scaling-up** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

No

SPECIFY AT WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE & ECOLOGICAL SCALE AND WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS ADOPTED.

HOW WAS IT MODIFIED TO FIT THE NEW SCALE? WHAT WAS THE RESULT AT THE NEW SCALE/S (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **mainstreaming** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

No

SPECIFY HOW (MEANS/ INSTRUMENT) AND WHICH ASPECTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING SYSTEM. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OR STATUS (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **removal of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place?

No

SPECIFY HOW DEMAND HAS BEEN CREATED FOR WHICH PRODUCTS/ SERVICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO GEBs.

Based on most of the project's components and/or what it generally intended to do, what type of project would you say this is?

Institutional
Capacity
(governance)

<--dropdown
menu

If "combination", then of which types?

&

<--dropdown menu

QUANTITATIVE OR ANECDOTAL DETAILS ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **PRESSURE HAS BEEN REDUCED/PREVENTED** OR ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **STATUS HAS CHANGED** AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES AS A CONTRIBUTION/RESULT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES. FOR SYSTEM LEVEL CHANGES, SPECIFY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR ECOLOGICAL SCALES.

Was stress reduction achieved?

No

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

<input type="checkbox"/>	Local	<input type="checkbox"/>	Intended (local)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unintended (local)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Systemic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Intended (systemic)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Measured	<input type="checkbox"/>	Anecdotal
--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	-----------

Was there a change in environmental status?

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

<input type="checkbox"/>	Local	<input type="checkbox"/>	Intended (local)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unintended (local)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Systemic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Intended (systemic)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Measured	<input type="checkbox"/>	Anecdotal
--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	-----------

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the **local level**

Evidence of intended stress reduction at a **systemic level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at a **systemic level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **systemic level**

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place during the project?

Environmental No

Socioeconomic No

To what extent were arrangements in place and being implemented during the project? Briefly describe arrangements.

To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/ indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?

To what extent were arrangements put into place to function after GEF support had ended? Briefly describe arrangements.

Was there a government body/ other permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and/or socioeconomic status?

Has the monitoring data been used for management?

How has the data been used for management? Describe mechanisms and actual instances.

Has the data been made accessible to the public?

How has the data been made accessible to the public? Describe reporting systems or methods.

“SOCIOECONOMIC” REFERS TO ACCESS TO & USE OF RESOURCES (DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS), LIVELIHOOD, INCOME, FOOD SECURITY, HOME, HEALTH, SAFETY, RELATIONSHIPS, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF HUMAN WELL-BEING .AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, INCLUDE “BEFORE” AND “AFTER” NUMBERS, YEARS WHEN DATA WAS COLLECTED, AND DATA SOURCES.

Did the project contribute to **positive** socioeconomic impacts?

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

<input type="checkbox"/> Local	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (local)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (local)
<input type="checkbox"/> Systemic	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (systemic)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

<input type="checkbox"/> Measured	<input type="checkbox"/> Anecdotal
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts?

Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report

The key lessons that should be learned from the project are:

- (1) A partnership of differing motivations and varied degrees of investment requires a central coordinating body that is sufficiently resourced. A sensitive and flexible leadership is needed, as well as special quality assurance, risk and contingency provisions. Moreover, expectations on all sides should be made very explicit and should be actively managed.
- (2) Resource allocation in a partnership is fraught with risk and needs disproportionate care, since it can exacerbate tensions rather than build bonds. Levels of engagement could be expected to mirror levels of funding.
- (3) Short feedback loops to specified response options make the indicators more effective in meeting recipients' needs and improving biodiversity status. Findings have the best chance of being used when they are directed towards a specific named policy response mechanism or decision-opportunity.
- (4) It is proved conceptually difficult to integrate a national capacity-building strand into a project about an indicator system designed to function at global level. Few of the global indicators rely on data reported at the national scale, and not all are operable at other scales. Countries participating in the project consequently focused on national priorities largely without reference to the global biodiversity target. If anything, this part of the project served national priorities well at the expense of coherence with the global framework. That may satisfy the "country-drivenness" criterion but is not ideal for the bigger picture, and there may be an issue here for the GEF to consider in relation to global projects.

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The Terminal Evaluation report completes the Mid Term Evaluation report's recommendations with these two suggestions:

- (1) The BIP Secretariat in conjunction with relevant partners should actively pursue opportunities for publication of further papers in the scientific literature derived from the project's indicator analyses. Final project budget reconciliations should be completed as well as the third user survey, whose results should be compared with earlier ones to assess differences. A follow-up review of the project's impact on MEA and other processes would be desirable in late 2011.
- (2) The agenda for continuation of the BIP and the Partnership should be pursued by UNEP-WCMC, including concerted efforts to seek funding. The new role of the Partnership should be formalized among all concerned as soon as possible in relation to the listed priorities.