1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	3037
IA/EA Project ID	GFL-2328-2715-4983
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Project Name	Conservation and Use of Crop Genetic Diversity to Control Pests and Diseases in Support of Sustainable Agriculture
Country/Countries	China, Ecuador, Morocco, Uganda
Geographic Scope	Global
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	UNEP
Executing Agencies involved	Biodiversity International, Rome, Italy; Yunnan Agricultural University, Kunming, China; Instituto Nacional Autonomo de Investigaciones Agropecuarias (INIAP), Ecuador; Institut Agronomique et Veterinaire (IAV), Morocco; National Agricultural Research Organisation, Entebbe, Uganda
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Among the executing agencies
Involvement of Private Sector	Yes- Beneficiary
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	OP 13, Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture; BD-2, BD-4
TER Prepared by	Joshua Schneck
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Negi
Author of TE	Christine Padoch
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	6/4/2007
Project Implementation Start Date	9/1/2008
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	8/31/2010
Actual Date of Project Completion	2/28/2011
TE Completion Date	4/1/2012
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	0.35	0.35
Co-financing for Project Preparation		
Total Project Prep Financing	0.35	0.35
GEF Financing	3.41	3.41
IA/EA own	0.82	
Government	2.22	5.85
Other*	1.24	
Total Project Financing	7.69	9.26
Total Financing including Prep	8.04	9.61

*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	HS/S*	S	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	L	ML	ML
Monitoring and Evaluation	S	S	S	S
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	S	S	S
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	S	S

4. Project Objectives

4.1. *Global Environmental Objectives of the project:*

According to the Project Proposal submitted for CEO endorsement (ProDoc), the project's overall objective is "to conserve crop genetic diversity in ways that increase food security and improve ecosystem health."

Unlike more well-known Integrated Pest Management strategies, which focus on tools and techniques to modify the environment in which crops are grown, this project's unique contribution is a focus on the management and diversity of local crops themselves as a key resource in maintaining biological diversity, and resistance and resilience to diseases.

No changes to the global environmental objectives of this project were noted in the Terminal Evaluation (TE) or final Project Implementation Report (PIR).

4.2. *Development Objectives of the project:*

According to the ProDoc, the project's near-term objective is "enhanced conservation and use of crop genetic diversity by farmers, farmer communities, and local and national institutions to minimize pest and disease damage on-farm."

The project logframe included in the ProDoc defines the following three expected project outcomes:

(1) "Rural populations in the project sites benefit from reduced crop vulnerability to pest and disease attacks";

(2) "Increased genetic diversity of target crops in respect to pest and disease management";

(3) "Increased capacity and leadership abilities of farmers, local communities, and other stakeholders to make diversity-rich decisions in respect to pest and disease management."

It should be noted that the project was initially designed as a 5-year project with the goal of 100% achievement of project objectives by project completion. As the TE notes, a shortage in funding at the end of GEF-3 led to the project being phased in two parts, with only a percentage of the above outcomes (which were not changed for Phase I or Phase II), expected to be achieved by the end of Phase I (this project).

No changes in the development objectives were noted in the TE 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**

The project's outcomes are precisely those sought under GEF-3 Operational Program 13: Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture, and are consistent with Strategic Priorities 2 and 4 in Biodiversity: "mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and sectors," and "promoting the generation, dissemination, and uptake of good practices for addressing current and emerging biodiversity issues." Because project outcomes are designed to be implemented in two phases, with this project's phase I outcomes corresponding to only a proportion of final outcomes achieved, it is too early to know for sure to what degree project outcomes will be of relevance to GEF goals and priorities. However, according to the TE, the project is clearly on track to achieving the outcomes set out in the ProDoc (TE, pg 22). In particular, the project is successfully generating: (1) criteria and tools for assessing whether genetic diversity can play a role or is playing a role in managing pest and disease pressures for cultivars; and (2) awareness of best practices for using genetic diversity to manage crop diseases and pests among multiple stakeholders. These phase I outcomes provide a strong base from which to achieve the long-term project outcomes of relevance to the GEF.

In addition, it should be noted that the project's work and outcomes are highly relevant to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), for which the GEF serves as the financial mechanism. In particular, the CBD's Programme of Work on Agricultural Biodiversity, which focuses on mainstreaming the conservation of agricultural biodiversity through support for the development of national plans and strategies incorporating these practices in sectoral and cross-sectoral plans and programs. The Conference of the Parties for the CBD has recognized "the special nature of agricultural biodiversity, its distinctive features, and problems needing distinctive solutions (TE, pg 23).

5.2. *Effectiveness* – **Satisfactory**

Because of the phased approach to project implementation, whereby achievement of overall project outcomes is not expected to occur until the completion of Phase II, effectiveness of the project is assessed on the basis of (1) how well the project was able to meet the twenty Objective Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) for project success given in the ProDoc logframe Annex B1-1, and (2) a more subjective assessment by the TE of whether the project appears to be moving towards the achievement of overall outcomes, assuming a Phase II is undertaken.

Regarding point 1, and as reported in the TE (pg 19-20), the project was successful in meeting or exceeding every one of the 20 OVIs for Phase I. Key completed outputs include:

* Publication of an agreed set of guidlines and protocols for assessing the suitability of genetic diversity for managing each crop in the study, and development of tools/methods to estimate the value of using crop genetic diversity as a tool for reducing crop losses;

* Establishment of farmer associations in China and Ecuador, and other indicators of enhanced in-country capacity;

* Establishment and operation of an International Agro Biodiversity Training Center in China.

Despite the high level of success in meeting OVIs there were some delays in project execution due to factors largely outside the control of Executing Agencies. They included additional time needed to complete on-farm experiments in banana/plantain crops in Ecuador due to the inherent nature of this plant (they grow more slowly and are harder to reproduce than other crops in the study), and delays caused by severe weather conditions in Morocco that destroyed one year of experiments. Moreover, it needs to be stated that despite the "promising" work done at project demonstration sites, no new practice or procedure could be documented as being adopted by a significant population of farmers to date (TE, pg 19). Such adoption and subsequent scaling - one of the key indicators of overall project success - will have to wait until Phase II to be evaluated.

The TE reports that the likelihood of impact achievement is high if the project is able to continue into Phase II. This assessment is supported by close mapping of the project to intended impact pathways foreseen in the project's logic model. In particular, the project has succeeded in creating an enabling environment for policy reforms and agricultural development supporting this approach at the national level in participating countries. As reported in the TE, "a crucial project achievement was a review of the legal and policy issues affecting breeding systems and what impacts these have on the decisions made by the national breeding systems in all four countries. These reviews were carried out early in the project and apparently have informed subsequent approaches" (TE, pg 30). Moreover, the project appears to have been successful at achieving a high level of country ownership and buy-in, through the

inclusion of high-level government representatives on project steering committees, though extensive efforts at stakeholder participation, and through the emergence of project champions to drive the intended work and reforms of the project forward (TE, pg 30, 32-34).

5.3. *Efficiency* – **Satisfactory**

As expected, none of the project outcomes have yet been attained, meaning the cost-effectiveness of the project in achieving outcomes and impacts cannot be fully assessed. However, the TE provides some evidence, much of it anecdotal, that the project has been managed in a cost-effective manner (TE, pg 24-25):

* All of the outputs expected for this project (Phase I) have been achieved and are assessed as being of high quality;

* In interviews with country members who sit on the International Steering Committee, no issues were raised about inefficiencies in the management of the financial resources of the project;

* Several national level team members praised the project's administration for "exceptional efficiency and transparency";

* The project appears to have been successful at raising the expected amount of co-financing for this project (see below for issues with financial reporting);

One issue limiting project efficiency: the TE notes that the project could have benefited from the participation of anthropologists experienced in working with smallholder agriculture, or trained ethno-botanists. Such contributions would have helped generate better data, made the results of some analyses more assessable to target populations, and more easily transferred to other regions and contexts (TE, pg 25).

It must be noted that the TE contains only a one-half page summary of finances for the entire project, and it is unreadable due to poor resolution in the scanning of this document. Failure to include a full accounting of project expenditures limits to some degree the ability to fully assess project efficiency.

5.4. *Sustainability* – **Low/Moderate Risks**

The TE and final PIR highlight the fact that this project is incomplete, and that sucessful achievement of outcomes and impacts is very much dependent upon funding and implementation of Phase II of the project. Despite this qualification, the TE reports that the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and benefits after GEF project funding ends is good. Sustainability is further assessed along the following dimensions:

Financial - this poses the greatest risk to sustainability in that funding of Phase II is not assured at the time of the terminal evaluation, and completion of the project's experiments, as well as the bulk of the work in capacity building, mainstreaming, and dissemination are to be undertaken in Phase II. TE reports that the project's management team has been successful at obtaining pledges for some bridge funding to keep the project running before a Phase II is funded. However, such funding is insufficient to complete the work of Phase II.

Socio-political - there are many signs noted in the TE that the project has been successful at achieving a high-degree of country ownership and stakeholder involvement. This was facilitated in-part by careful design of the project's National Steering Committees and Technical Teams to include high-level decision-makers as members (TE, pg 29).

Institutional framework - The project was successful at establishing an International Agrobiodiversity Training Center in China, as well as the establishment of project-linked research programs at universities in Morocco and the US. These institutional developments should help sustain the project's work.

Environmental - As noted in the TE, the project suffered some setbacks due to severe weather in Morocco that destroyed a year's worth of experiments. The project has sought to mitigate the impact of environmental risk through the siting of numerous projects throughout different regions in the participating country, limiting the reliance upon any one site.

Overall risks to sustainability are low-moderate.

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?

Realized co-financing as of June 2011, as reported in the final PIR, is $5.84 million - 37% higher than anticipated in the ProDoc. PIR reports "partners were very keen and committed to project implementation, thus making co-financing very smooth (Final PIR, pg 64).

A clear picture of how co-financing was integrated into the project is not possible without a detailed description of project expenditures and sources of funds, which is not provided in the TE or PIRs.

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?

No information on the reason for higher than expected realized co-financing is provided in the TE or PIRs, other than the note that partners were invested in the project's outcomes, and that certain in-kind contributions were greater than anticipated in the ProDoc.

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?

The project experienced delays with some of the field studies on banana/plantain that could have been anticipated (these crops grow slower than the other crops in the study, and they're harder to reproduce). Also, a year's worth or experiments in Morocco were lost due to inclement weather. However, the delays did not hold up delivery of expected project outputs, and no significant project-wide delays were reported in the final PIR or TE.

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:

TE and PIR report a high level of country ownership in the project's work and outcomes. Each of the four participant countries have developed National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAP) which include crop genetic diversity (TE, pg 34). Actual commitment to using project outputs, outcomes, and thus impacts, could not be assessed as the project work is still far from complete.

7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

7.1. *M&E design at entry* – **Satisfactory**

Project's M&E plan, found in Annex P of the ProDoc, is quite extensive, comprehensive, and according to the TE "appropriate" (TE, pg 37). Project design calls for establishment of various baselines for project monitoring purposes. M&E design also clearly defines timetable for M&E activities, and responsibility. Only shortcoming is the failure to separately budget M&E activities in the ProDoc, and for each project year. Only clearly defined M&E expenditure is that labeled "Evaluation," and this is only budgeted for final project year, so presumably this is for the project's terminal evaluation ($32,000 in GEF funding).

7.2. *M&E implementation*– **Satisfactory**

As reported in the TE, project did a very good job of following M&E plan set forth in the ProDoc. Project reporting was "effective in tracking what actually was going on and what needed special attention" (TE, pg 38), and reporting was generally completed in a timely fashion.

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**

As reported in the TE, the level of supervision and backstopping provided by UNEP, the Implementing Agency, throughout the project was satisfactory. TE reports that members of the International Steering Committee were also satisfied with the "general helpfulness" of the UNEP Senior Program Management Officer assigned to this project. Moreover, the selection of Biodiversity International as the lead Executing Agency appears to have been a strong choice as well. The managment plan set forth in the project's ProDoc, to manage this complex project spanning 4 countries appears to have functioned well. The only reported area for improvement in the project's overall management is outside the control of the project: TE reports that National Executing Agencies that had a clear coordinating institution were overall more effective and efficient in carrying out the work (TE, pg 36).

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

Execution of the project by the Executing Agencies, particularly Bioversity International - the lead Executing Agency - appears to have been strong. This is evidenced by the success in getting almost all of the project's key activities underway, and achieving all of the project's 20 OVIs for Phase I. As reported in the TE, Bioversity International was effective in putting up a "complex but very largely effective management structure" (TE, pg 35). The only areas experiencing delays were in part due to factors outside the control of the EA (severe weather in Morocco, and challenges with Banana/Plantain experiments).

Perhaps the greatest challenge that the project and EA had to adapt to is the decision to structure the project in two phases, instead of a single 5-year project envisioned in the original ProDoc. TE reports that the project's directors have shown considerable adaptive capacity in seeking additional bridge funding for continued work after Phase I resources are exhausted, and in anticipation of a possible (possibly permanent) delay in future GEF funding for Phase II (TE, pg 36).

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?	**Satisfactory**	TE does a good job of assessing relevant outcomes and impacts of the project given the challenge that the project is only partly complete and no outcomes and impacts have yet been achieved.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	**Satisfactory**	Project is internally consistent and convincing. More information on project financials would have provided additional support for the project's high assessment of the project's management competence.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	**Satisfactory**	TE does a good job of assessing project sustainability at this early stage, and is transparent about the degree of subjectivity in its assessment.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	**Moderately Satisfactory**	Lessons learned are logical but not entirely comprehensive. More information on the failure to include enthnobotanists and how this possibly limited some of the data obtained in the project - as mentioned in the body of the TE - would have been informative.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	**Unsatisfactory**	TE contains only a one-half page summary of finances for the entire project, and this is unreadable due to poor resolution in the scanning of this document. Final PIR has more information on co-financing realized but still no accounting of project expenditures.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	**Satisfactory**	Good assessment of the strengths of the project's M&E systems. More information on the baselines called for in the ProDoc, and how and to what degree these were obtained would be helpful. TE should have pointed out the failure of the ProDoc to separately budget for M&E for all project years.

10. Other issues to follow up on

The project's website, which is an important tool for disseminating the work of this project, and potentially contributing to the realization of future project-related outcomes of interest, is not functioned fully. Very few of the project's documents and publications can be assessed here. This should be addressed. The site is at http://agrobiodiversityplatform.org/cropbiodiversity/

11. Sources of information

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

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

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

Two of the project's component work streams contributed to knowledge being generated: (1) a focus on developing criteria and tools to determine when and where genetic diversity can provide an effective management approach for limiting crop damage caused by pests and diseases, and (2) development of best practices for using crop-diversity in the field to reduce pest and disease pressures. Publications and methodologies developed that are listed in the TE include:

* "Crop genetic diversity to reduce pests and diseases on-farm";
* Two different types of tools/methods developed to estimate the value of crop genetic resources to reduce pest and disease damage;
* Protocols for participatory assessment of farming practices with regard to genetic diversity, including lab & field analysis;
* Establishment and operation of an International Agro-biodiversity Training Center in China which includes a training curriculum on agro-biodiversity management for pest and disease pressures.

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

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

TE notes that the criteria and tools to determine when and where intraspecific genetic diversity can provide an effective management approach for limiting crop damage caused by pests and diseases, developed during this project, have been used to guide the management of farming practices for each crop at each of the projects 22 demonstration sites (TE, pg 19).

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

UA

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

TE notes that the project established a website that holds many of the project's outputs and functions well. This site (http://agrobiodiversityplatform.org/cropbiodiversity/), when viewed by the GEF EO (1/25/2013) was not updated and did not have many project documents available for downloading. This is surprising given that Phase I of the project is less than a year old and a Phase II of the project may be forthcoming. Two documents on participatory approaches, one in French and the other in Spanish, were available but the English versions are absent. Links to "Document Archives" did not contain any of the reported project documents.

Is there evidence that these outputs were used? UA

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?
WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

No information is provided in the TE or final PIR on the use of project databases or information sharing arrangements.

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

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

As reported in the final PIR, the following activities contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised:

* 2 national policy workshops in China in FY 11, with the participation of national provincial and local authorities, UNEP, media and farmers; and 1 in Uganda;
* A global meeting in Morocco in February 2011 where 3 scientists from each participating country and international technical experts attended to discuss final results and planning activities for the second phase;
* Farmer trainings in FY 2010 (unspecified number) focused on biodiversity and pathology and entomology with special attention to management to the most common pests and diseases identified in survey work;
* Training on participatory approaches in FY 2009 in all 4 participating countries that were attended by people at all levels;
* In FY 2008 more than 70 people from 22 sites and more than 20 scientists from Agricultural Research Partner Institutes in the 4 countries were trained in participatory approaches necessary for conducting focus group discussions and surveys.

No information is given in the final PIR or TE on the degree to which training programs at the international Training Center in China have been administered.

Was any ***positive*** change in behavior reported as a result of these activities?	No

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

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

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

As reported in the final PIR, the following project activities contributed to building technical/environmental management skills:

* Farmer trainings in FY 2010 (unspecified number) focused on biodiversity and pathology and entomology with special attention to management to the most common pests and diseases identified in survey work;
* Training on participatory approaches in FY 2009 in all 4 participating countries that were attended by people at all levels;
* In FY 2008 more than 70 people from 22 sites and more than 20 scientists from Agricultural Research Partner Institutes in the 4 countries were trained in participatory approaches necessary for conducting focus group discussions and surveys.

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

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

Final PIR reports that survey work assessing smallholder farming practices and knowledge in regard to biodiversity as a management strategy for controlling pests and diseases were completed after project participants received training in participatory approaches (Final PIR, pg 2).

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks?	Yes
Were these adopted?	No

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?	UA

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

Creation of an international Agro Biodiversity Training Center in China. No Further information on this center, its activities, or degree of institutional support is provided in the TE or PIRs.

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?	UA

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

TE reports that more than one farmer association was established in China and Ecuador, and that participation of male and female farmers in committees was reported (TE, pg 20).

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:		Please specify what was contributed:
Technologies & Approaches	Yes	Knowledge and awareness of best practices regarding the use of plant biodiversity as a means for managing pest and diseases.
Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	No	
Financial Mechanisms	No	

Did r**eplication** 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)?

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 r**emoval 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?

Combination *<--dropdown menu*

If "combination", then of which types?

Knowledge & Information & Implementation Strategies *<--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

☐ Local	☐ Intended (local)	☐ Unintended (local)
☐ Systemic	☐ Intended (systemic)	☐ Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained? ☐ Measured ☐ Anecdotal

Was there a change in environmental status? No

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

☐ Local	☐ Intended (local)	☐ Unintended (local)
☐ Systemic	☐ Intended (systemic)	☐ Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained? ☐ Measured ☐ 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? UA

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

	☐	Local	☐	Intended (local)	☐ Unintended (local)
	☐	Systemic	☐	Intended (systemic)	☐ Unintended (systemic)
How was the information obtained?	☐	Measured	☐	Anecdotal	

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts? No

If so, at what scales?	Please mark 'x' for all that apply				
	☐	Local	☐	Intended (local)	☐ Unintended (local)
	☐	Systemic	☐	Intended (systemic)	☐ Unintended (systemic)
How was the information obtained?	☐	Measured	☐	Anecdotal	

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at the **local level**

Too early to tell if project activities will result in a positive contribution to the socioeconomic status of farmers at the local level in participating countries, and elsewhere, but that is the ultimate intent of the full project (Phase I & II).

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at **systemic level**

Too early to tell if project activities will result in a positive contribution to the socioeconomic status of farmers on a systemic level in participating countries, and elsewhere, but that is the ultimate intent of the full project (Phase I & II).

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

Following is a summary of the key lessons from the project, provided in the TE:

* This project benefited from the careful selection of project countries that complemented each other's strengths and are designed to facilitate replication and scaling up in subsequent years. Fore example, countries were chosen to include a variety of important crop genetic diversity, and differing types of resistance to major pests and pathogens, as well as differences in capacity. The design and implementation of this type of global or multi-country projects should be further encouraged and facilitated;
* More flexibility needs to be provided for countries doing field experiments to account for possible difficulties resulting from unexpected environmental factors (in other words, expect the unexpected);
* Bananas, due to their lengthy propagation and difficult reproduction cycles, are challenging to work on. More time should be allotted to project's involving this important staple crop.

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

Following are the recommendations in the TE:

* A second Phase of the project should be swiftly approved by the GEF and fully funded;
* The Project design for the Second Phase should include the use of more trained and experienced social scientists specialized in relevant sub disciplines or ethno-botanists;
* Second Phase of the project should put more emphasis on identifying and building upon local knowledge and practice in agro biodiversity conservation, especially in the area of social networks;
* Second Phase of the project should encourage all national projects to adopt management structures with a single clear coordinating institution;
* Second Phase of the project should clarify how both inter-specific *and* intra-specific crop diversity affect pest and disease problems and how these may be linked.