1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	3811
IA/EA Project ID	GFL-2328-2715-4A21
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Project Name	International Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystems
Country/Countries	Global
Geographic Scope	Global
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	UNEP
Executing Agencies involved	Globe International
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Involved as main executing agency
Involvement of Private Sector	Yes- Beneficiary
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	GEF-4 BD2: SP4, Strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity; SP5, Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services
TER Prepared by	Joshua Schneck
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Kumar Negi
Author of TE	Camille Ban, Patricia Kameri-Mbote
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	9/29/2008
Project Implementation Start Date	11/1/2008
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	12/31/2010
Actual Date of Project Completion	12/1/2010
TE Completion Date	
IA Review Date	
TE Submission Date	3/1/2011

2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant	N/A	
Co-financing for Project Preparation	N/A	
Total Project Prep Financing	0.00	0.00
GEF Financing	1.00	1.00
IA/EA own	1.00	1.10
Government		
Other*		
Total Project Financing	2.00	2.10
Total Financing including Prep	2.00	2.10

*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	HS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	ML	ML	ML
Monitoring and Evaluation		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 long-term goal of the project is that "key drivers of degradation of ecosystems and unsustainable land use change that are contributing to climate change and biodiversity loss will be addressed through regulatory and legislative measures."

No changes in the Global Environmental Objectives of the project were noted in the terminal evaluation or final PIR.

4.2. *Development Objectives of the project:*

According to the ProDoc, the project's near-term objective is to "assist legislators and parliamentarians in a global discourse on developing regulatory tools and applied public policy to address land use change and ecosystem degradation."

The project framework contained in the ProDoc lists the following expected outcomes:

* "Public policy and legislative responses to key drivers of land use change and biodiversity loss are developed";

* "Issues of land use change and biodiversity loss placed on the political agenda of senior legislators, finance ministers, and heads of government";

* "Capacities built...and outreach made to political actors not traditionally engaged in this policy area."

* "Improved knowledge on ecosystem services approaches amongst key decision makers in governments and parliaments";

* Awareness of "best practices on land use, biodiversity protection, ecosystem management and ecosystem services as they relate to the introduction of sound regulations and legislation"; and

* "Improved legislation and a better informed legislature in developing countries."

No changes in Development Objectives of the project were noted in the terminal evaluation 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 projects outcomes are consistent with and highly relevant to GEF-4's strategic long-term objectives and strategic programs, particularly BD2, SP4: Strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity; and BD2, SP5: Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services. The project advances these strategic programs by directly engaging with parliamentarians and legislators to build knowledge, capacity, and consensus among this group to address the core drivers of biodiversity loss through development and implementation of national, regional, and international policy. Such drivers were identified in the 2005 GEF-supported Millennium Ecosystem Assessment.

In particular, the project created the first ever international body composed entirely of parliamentarians pushing an agenda of sustainable land use.

The project's three focal areas of forests, marine ecosystems, and natural capital directly engaged with and provided policy inputs for two conventions for which the GEF serves as the financial mechanism: the Convention on biological Diversity (CBD), and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) (TE pg 18).

In addition, project outcomes were highly relevant to many of the countries represented in the GLOBE Commission, as evidenced by the linkages between the Commission's work and national legislation enacted to address biodiversity degradation (TE, pg 13, 16-17, 27).

5.2. *Effectiveness* – **Highly Satisfactory**

According to the terminal evaluation, the project has been successful in meeting the expected outcomes set out in the ProDoc. The project-supported Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystem (the Commission), which is the first and only parliamentary body focused on sustainable land use, was successful in: placing issues of ecosystem degradation and land use change on the agendas of key political actors within parliaments across the G20 and other key nations; increased awareness among key decision-makers and stakeholders of the drivers of ecosystem degradation in forest and marine systems and of ecosystem services (natural

capital); developing politically-tested policy responses to ecosystem degradation; and playing a significant role in advancing legislation at the national, regional, and global level (TE, pg17).

In particular, the following outcomes, described in the TE, are considered the greatest achievements of the Commission:

* GLOBE Network established - network of parliamentarians from 40 countries focused on sustainable land use and ecosystem health, that has received a significant level of trust and buy in among legislators (TE, pg 3).

* Recognition of parliamentarians, including those involved with Globe International, by the Convention on Biological Diversity. Stakeholders interviewed for the TE consider this a strong platform on which to build.

* Development of forestry proposals that fed into advancements made on reducing tropical deforestation and degradation at the UNFCCC COP15, setting the stage for further progress on REDD+ at Cancun.

* Consensus on a Marine Ecosystem Recovery Strategy was reached between major fishing nations in part due to the work of the Commission (TE, pg 3).

In addition, the TE reports that the Commission made a clear contribution to influencing legislation and policy development, including:

* Legislation on illegal logging, passed by the European Parliament, that was aided by the considerable efforts of a number of the Commission's leading legislators.

* Establishment of the largest Marine Protected Area (MPA) in the world - the Chagos Archipelago - through the lobbying of GLOBE co-chairman Barry Gardner MP (member of parliament).

* In Brazil, enactment of climate legislation and waste management as well as establishment of a national commission on the oceans.

* Development of a new World Bank initiative on the incorporation and valuation of natural capital within national accounts - something that was specifically advocated by the Commission. The Commission is working in partnership with the World Bank on this initiative.

In light of the considerable achievements towards impacts made by this two-year project, the project is considered Highly Satisfactory in terms of effectiveness.

5.3. *Efficiency* – **Highly Satisfactory**

The project was notable for its ability to achieve a great deal with limited financial resources. The project was able to operate using a small core team of 3.5 people, which kept costs low. Experts who donated their services to GLOBE at below costs and/or on a pro bono basis were

motivated by the opportunity afforded by the Commission to engage directly with legislators on key environmental issues. Experts were drawn from industry, financial management and consultancy firms, former World Bank staff, academia and legislators. This includes Ian Johnson, Commission Chair, former VP for Sustainable Development at the World Bank, who contributed some 40 days of work to the Commission, and leveraged his network in support of the Commission's work. Other notable contributions came from the Zoological Society of London and the Global Canopy Program.

It took longer than expected to establish the Secretariat to support the Commission and the Commission was not functioning effectively until a Director for the Commission was recruited (Ian Johnson). This caused some small delays in project implementation. However, all of the project outputs were achieved on-time, and the project is considered highly successful in achieving desired outcomes.

The project is rated as Highly Satisfactory in terms of efficiency.

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

As assessed in the terminal evaluation, the continued long term project derived outcomes and impacts face moderate risks. That is, sustainability is dependent on the following factors:

Financial resources - While the project has been successful in creating a powerful platform for continuing to advance policy addressing ecosystem degradation, greater financial resources and commitments of funding over time are required to build on the projects achievements. Currently, the project's core staff of 3.5 is overstretched and there is risk that future project outputs will not be of the quality required to sustain the reputation developed by the Commission's work to date. Moreover, the ability to engage with additional countries, including developing countries that are experiencing high-levels of ecosystem degradation but which lack the capacity to act on Commission outputs without further assistance, is limited without additional secured funding commitments. As the TE notes, the GLOBE forest initiative, started under this project, has already received some financial commitments from the German Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development. There are also a number of other potential sources of funds (TE pg 20-21).

Socio-political - Although the current membership of the Commission is highly supportive of the Commission's work and outcomes, the risk of losing key champions and failure to recruit new ones is present. GLOBE seeks to mitigate this risk by working with a broad group of legislators.

Institutional framework and governance - the new institutional framework (the Commission) set up through this project needs to be maintained and developed, along with similar efforts at the domestic level. This includes enactment and enforcement of relevant environmental policies. This is perhaps the most significant risk to project sustainability.

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 project is reported to have exceeded expected co-financing by around 16% ($162,473) (TE, pg 53). Co-financing was critical to the achievement of GEF objectives and well integrated throughout the project. This included in-kind contributions of pro bono work from leading experts and senior advisors on all aspects of the project's work - forests, marine ecosystems, and natural capital. Moreover, TE notes the recorded in kind contributions of around $581,000 is "considered to be an underestimate of the actual unpaid time provided by a range of experts to the commission" (TE, pg 19).

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?

As noted above, realized co-financing exceeded expected co-financing by around 16%. The TE notes that many project participants were motivated to devote their time by the opportunity afforded by the project's Commission, to interact directly with parliamentarians and legislators on issues of personal and global concern.

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?

As reported in the TE, it took longer to establish the Secretariat to support the Commission than originally intended, and the Commission did not function effectively until a Director for the Commission was recruited. This caused a small delay in project implementation. However, no effect was noted on project outcomes or sustainability and the project was completed on time. The TE notes that delays may have been avoided if key project personnel were recruited at an earlier stage (TE, pg 46). As reported in the first PIR for the project, the first Commission meeting was delayed and some of the planned communications were delayed. The possibility exists that more could have been accomplished without these delays, but the project has already exceeded expectations.

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:

Although the project is global focused, being an international Commission made up of active parliamentarians and legislators from 40 countries, the TE reports that country ownership of project outputs and outcomes is considered to be high (TE, pg 27). Work streams selected were highly relevant to developing and developed countries alike, and the GLOBE International network now includes national chapters in 18 countries. 16 of those national chapters are from G20 countries, including 3 which were established during the project's timeframe (Mexico, Indonesia and South Africa). National chapters provide a forum where legislators from all parties can meet to discuss national environmental legislation and international environmental concerns. The high degree of country ownership is reflected in the passage of national environmental legislation in Brazil, following inputs from the Commission, the establishment of the MPA by the UK, and the illegal logging legislation passed by the European Parliament, again with inputs from the Commission.

7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Project M&E design is consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. The ProDoc includes a Project Results Framework which includes appropriate indicators for each expected output. M&E expenses for a Terminal Evaluation are budgeted, however other M&E activities are not. The ProDoc calls for the establishment of a baseline for evaluating project results. Indicators are provided in the ProDoc Results Framework for each of the desired project outcomes and appear practical and sufficient. However, as the TE notes, the indicators in the Results Framework do not match the indicators used in the PIR (TE, pg 38).

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

Based on the terminal evaluation and PIR, M&E was satisfactory. PIR reports were completed for the project in 2009, 2010, and 2011. No mid-term evaluation was conducted as this was not required. Legislators were asked for their feedback on the project's products and processes following Commission meetings. The project worked to establish baselines for each of the policy areas targeted, which consisted of mapping the existing legislation and policy in relevant countries. The TE notes that the GLOBE Secretariat also understood internal reviews of each Commission engagement to see how they could be improved upon in subsequent meetings (TE, pg 39).

While indicators used in the PIRs appear equally relevant and sufficient at evaluating project performance, project evaluation would have been aided by some explanation of why these indicators are different from those provided in the ProDoc Results Framework. Also, while there was no dedicated budget for M&E activities aside from production of the Terminal Evaluation, it is assumed that these activities were covered under administrative support.

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**

According to the Terminal Evaluation, the level of supervision and backstopping support provided by UNEP was sufficient and well suited to the project's design. In particular, the project was purposely designed to afford Commission members, comprised of legislators and parliamentarians, a significant amount of control over the project's direction. As the TE notes, this approach was "necessary to ensure the legislators had ownership of the Commission, without which participation would not have been forthcoming." (TE, pg 35).

The principle changes to the project's work and scope that occured over the course of the project were: (1) the project's scope, originally focused on G8+5 countries. This was expanded to include 40 countries relevant to project outputs, for example, fishing nations that would be impacted by the introduction of new marine legislation proposed by the Commission; (2) the Commission's work was more clearly defined as focusing on 3 separate work streams - forests, marine, and natural capital - that in effect meant there were 3 Commissions operating over the project period, increasing the work load and management requirements.

While the scale and scope of the Commission's work increased over the course of the project, the project was successful in achieving all of the desired short-term outcomes, and a portion of this is attributable to the supervision and support provided by UNEP.

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

According to the Terminal Evaluation, the project put in place a clear management structure with "strong leadership from the Chairman," (TE, pg 36) as called for in the ProDoc. The project did experience some delays at the start of the project as a result of a longer than anticipated process establishing a Secretariat to support the Commission, and the Commission did not function effectively until the onboarding of the Commission's Chairman.

As the TE notes, the project's implementation strategy, which focused on putting legislators in direct contact with scientists and economists throughout the policy process, was very effective in building trust among Commission members that their recommendations were not based on third party interpretations of the latest science and economics. The project was also successful in providing Commission members with a mapping of relevant legislation already in place, allowing for comparison, analysis, and identification of policy gaps.

Communication among the project's different workgroups and management is reported in the PIRs as having been good, especially after a senior technical advisor was brought on to support the project. This is assessment is supported by interviews conducted for the TE (TE, pg 36).

Administration challenges were principally related to the project's small operating team of 3.5. In particular, the project lacked a dedicated financial manager and administrator. As reported in the TE, payment has been an issue with some project partners, who faced "significant delays in receiving payments" (TE, pg 37).

TE notes that funds were correctly managed and transparently accounted for.

Lastly, the project exhibited good adaptive management in allowing for much of the project's direction and focus to be guided by Commission members, allowing for strong buy-in among Commission members, and work that was highly relevant to countries expected to be impacted by Commission's policy recommendations.

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's assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project was clear, and was aided by numerous examples of linkages between Commission outputs and policy development. A bit more discussion of the results of the Commission's work on forests and linkages to COP15 outcomes would have been helpful.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	**Satisfactory**	The report is internally consistent and convincing overall. The report does a good job at first describing the limitations of drawing direct linkages between project output's - which essentially feed into a political process - and desired outcomes. Despite this, the TE makes a strong case that the project was successful in achieving all of its desired short-term outcomes.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	**Satisfactory**	The report makes clear that additional funding is needed to support sustainability of the project's outcomes and ability to see a scale up in project results. A bit more information on financial and institutional sustainability would have been helpful.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	**Satisfactory**	Lessons are clear, succinct, and supported by evidence provided in the TE.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	**Satisfactory**	Yes.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	**Moderately Satisfactory**	The biggest short coming of the TE is a failure to discuss why indicators used in the PIRs are different from those set out in the ProDoc's Results Framework.

10. Other issues to follow up on

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?

A large number of briefing papers, reports, and proposals were generated as part of the Commission's three work streams on Forests, Marine Ecosystems, and Natural Capital, and are available on the Globe International website (www.globeinternational.org). Work includes:

* Marine: "Marine Ecosystem Recovery Strategy"
* Forests: "The Role of Terrestrial Carbon in climate Change; The Economics of Avoided Deforestation; The State of Play of Forests in Climate Change Policy; Monitoring and Measuring Changes in Above Ground Biomass in Tropical Forest; Rewarding Local land Stewards for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation."
* Natural Capital: "Natural Capital: The new Political Imperative - interim report prepared for the Parliamentarians and Biodiversity Forum at the tenth conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Nagoya, Japan. October 2012; Natural Capital Action Plan."

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

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

Evidence that knowledge was used for management or governance, provided in the TE includes:
* Commission's work on marine systems, including research outputs, was instrumental in the establishment of the largest Marine Protected Area in the world - the Chagos Archipelago in the British territorial waters of the Indian Ocean (TE, pg 3).
* Forest policy proposals addressing illegal logging played a *"central role"* in improving and directing legislation dealing with illegal logging passed by the European Parliament in June 2010 (TE, pg 15).
* Globe proposals on forest policy and deforestation are believed to have played an impact in educating Brazilian legislators, including those involved with the Commission's work stream, who went on to pass national climate legislation in Brazil in 2009. The legislation calls for a voluntary reduction of emissions on the order of 37% by 2020. Deforestation comprises 75% of Brazil's emissions, and the Commission's work on reducing deforestation is considered highly relevant to subsequent strategies adopted by the Brazilian legislator to slow the rate of deforestation (TE, pg 16).
* Globe work on Natural Capital is believed to have informed the ongoing partnership between GLOBE and the World Bank on the promotion of natural capital in national accounting (TE, pg 14).

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

	Yes

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

All reports produced by this project are available on Globe's website at http://www.globeinternational.org/ . In addition, papers are available through partnering institution's websites, including the Global Canopy Project at http://www.globalcanopy.org/

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?	Yes

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

While no direct evidence is provided in the TE on the downloading of information from websites, project outputs were clearly used in a number of forums and for undertaking various project activities.

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

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

Activities contributing to awareness and knowledge being raised include:
* Creation of an International Commission on Land Use Change & Ecosystems, comprised of active parliamentarians and legislators. The Commission helped educate members and members carried this knowledge back to national policymaking forums.
* Creation of high level Advisory Board on Science and Economics to educate Commission members and help oversee production of relevant reports, briefs, and proposals.
* Quarterly meetings of the Commission
* Development and execution of nationally focused parliamentary engagement for Commissioners. This includes national GLOBE International chapters in 18 countries that are key constituents for the Commission's ongoing work. Also included GLOBE Convention on Biological Diversity Parliamentarians and Biodiversity Forum at the CBD COP10 in Nagoya, Japan, where GLOBE convened legislators and provided an opportunity for all countries that are Party to the Convention to send a legislator to the event and take part in developing the GLOBE Natural Capital Action Plan (TE, pg 33).
* Development of Climate Change Policy, including recommendations on how to integrate forest carbon into a post-2012 international climate agreement, endorsed at COP15; and Action plan for Coral Reefs.

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

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

Commission itself is reported in the TE as having played an instrumental role in facilitating many of the environmental policy achievements to date described in this terminal evaluation review. This includes links to the establishment of the MPA in the Chagos Archipelago, enactment of 2010 legislation in the European Parliament combating illegal logging, and domestic legislation in Brazil addressing climate change and solid waste management.

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

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

Research reports on incorporating natural capital into markets and national accounts, and reports on management of marine of forest ecosystems. This was facilitated and directed by the activity that creating a high level Advisory Board on Science and Economics.

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

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

No evidence is provided in the TE or PIR.

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

Were these adopted? Yes

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

While the TE notes the difficulty of directly attributing the work of the Commission, which is a body for engaging and educating parliamentarians, legislators, and stakeholders on the responsible stewardship of ecosystems, with the passage of policy (TE, pg 6-7), the TE does make the strong case that project outputs played a significant role in the passage of the following laws:

* Legislation on illegal logging, passed by the European Parliament, that was aided by the considerable efforts of a number of the Commission's leading legislators.
* Establishment of the largest Marine Protected Area (MPA) in the world - the Chagos Archipelago - through the lobbying of GLOBE co-chairman Barry Gardner MP (member of parliament).
* Enactment of climate legislation and waste management in Brazil, as well as establishment of a national commission on the oceans.

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?

Establishment of the GLOBE International Commission on Land Use Change & Ecosystems, comprised of active parliamentarians and legislators. The commission is the first and only parliamentary body focused on sustainable land use and ecosystem health. The project also played a role in Brazil's decision to establish a national commission on the oceans (TE, pg 16). The permanence of the Globe Commission is dependent upon continued interest and funding support from stakeholders. No further information is given on the Brazilian Ocean Commission in the TE.

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?

The project succeeded in bringing about recognition of parliamentarians as a new group of stakeholders in the Convention on Biological Diversity (TE, pg 3). The project was also successful in engaging legislators from developing countries with the policy development activities of GLOBE, through the Commission's engagement with national GLOBE chapters.

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

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

As the TE notes, the Commission established by the project has successfully established a network of parliamentarians from 40 countries, achieving a "significant level of buy in and trust among legislators" (TE, pg 3).

Did the project contribute to any of the following:		Please specify what was contributed:
Technologies & Approaches	Yes	Project provided inputs to an ongoing partnership with the World Bank on incorporating Natural Capital into national accounts. Also contributed to the establishment of an MPA in British territorial waters, and legislation for the environmentally sound handling of solid waste in Brazil.
Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	No	
Financial Mechanisms	No	

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)?

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?

Combination <--*dropdown menu*

If "combination", then of which types?

Institutional Capacity (governance) & Knowledge & Information <--*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? UA

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

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

How was the information obtained? | | Measured | x | 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**

No direct evidence given on impacts, however it can be assumed that stress reduction at the local level will occur as a result of: the MPA established in the Chagos Archipelago; domestic climate legislation in Brazil that anticipates a large reduction in Brazil's deforestation rate; solid waste management legislation passed in Brazil; and 2010 legislation passed in the European Parliament addressing illegal logging. All of these outcomes are, according to the TE, linked to the work of this project.

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

No direct evidence given on impacts, however it can be assumed that systemic stress reduction will occur as a result of: the MPA established in the Chagos Archipelago; domestic climate legislation in Brazil that anticipates a large reduction in Brazil's deforestation rate; solid waste management legislation passed in Brazil; and 2010 legislation passed in the European Parliament addressing illegal logging. All of these outcomes are, according to the TE, linked to the work of this project.

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? 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

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

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

Following is the summary of lessons learned, provided in the Terminal Evaluation:

* The project experienced some delays in the project implementation and the Commission did not function effectively until a Director for the Commission was recruited. The TE recommends recruiting key project personnel as early as possible in the preparatory stages of future projects, to allow for efficient project implementation.
* This project has demonstrated that long lead times are required to effect changes in legislation, highlighting the need for long term planning and support to achieve carefully designed and widely supported policy changes and legislation in future projects.
* The project's approach/model of facilitating close collaboration and contact between legislators, scientists and economists proved to be effective in facilitating the advancement of environmental policy. In particular, the TE notes that this approach was effective in building trust among participating legislators that their recommendations were not based on third party interpretations of the latest science and economics.

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The following recommendations are listed in the Terminal Evaluation:
* Continued funding of the project, into "Phase 2." Additionally, given the long time frame typically required to develop and enact legislation, the project has relatively short-term funding despite having long term objectives. The TE recommends that a subsequent phase of the project either have a longer time frame with additional funding, or scaled back objectives more feasibly achieved within the project's timeframe. Finally, funding should be secured so that all outputs can be translated as needed.
* To make the work of the Commission more effective, a second phase of the project should focus on national-level implementation. This will require working more closely with national stakeholders, many of whom lack the capacity to act on the Commission's more high-level recommendations. This in turn is a more time and resource intensive undertaking. Drafting of model legislation should be a central part of the next phase. Additional funding will need to be secured to see this through.
* The project's core team of 3.5 should be expanded in the next phase to around 15-20.
* Long term strategic planning should be undertaken for a subsequent phase, consistent with a ROtI evaluation framework and terminology. This will aid in future evaluations, and help all parties to be clear on what is realistic to achieve within the project timeframe.
* Additional support must be given to making outputs more relevant to developing countries. This includes providing additional support to enable developing country partners to attend forums, providing technical assistance in the development and introduction of domestic legislation, and training.
* Phase 2 should include efforts to include a balanced representation among the Commission's members from developed and developing countries.