

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		413	
GEF Agency project ID		N/A	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-1	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP	
Project name		Global Biodiversity Forum Phase II	
Country/Countries		N/A	
Region		Global	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		STRM-Short-Term Response Measures	
Executing agencies involved		IUCN	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not involved	
Private sector involvement		through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) / Approval date (MSP)		2/26/1998	
Effectiveness date / project start		4/1/1998 (TE, pg 7)	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		UA	
Actual date of project completion		2/1/2000 (TE, pg 7)	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.745	
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.899	
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		0.745	0.705 (from Trustee dataset)
Total Co-financing		0.899	U/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.644	U/A
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		07/2000	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		David R. Given	
TER completion date		10/25/2014	
TER prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Daniel Nogueira-Budny and Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	N/A	N/A	U
M&E Design	N/A	N/A	N/A	MU
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	S
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	UA
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/A	N/A	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/A	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

This project's Global Environmental Objective (GEO) is to realize the global benefits of biodiversity by assisting stakeholders from developing countries and economies in transition in establishing an ongoing dialogue on biodiversity. The project's overall goal is the creation of the Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF), which will help relevant parties and major stakeholders to effectively implement the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), according to the Project Document (PD, pg. 2). The Forum will provide an opportunity to increase capacity and understanding, especially in developing regions, as well as facilitate increased cooperation and partnership through the sharing, debating and development of networks, (TE, pg. 6).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The GBF has several phases. The pilot phase, which began in March 1998 and ended in February 2000, involved 1,550 individuals from more than 105 countries, meeting for eight sessions (PD, pg.3). This TER covers Phase II of the project. Based on the outcomes of the pilot phase of the GBF, the strategy for Phase II of the GBF is to more effectively focus meetings and outcomes on the provisions of the CBD, especially on areas that have been identified as important in supporting national priorities, action plans and programs. These include ecosystem topics and approaches, biodiversity indicators, M&E, access to genetic resources, benefit-sharing, ago-biodiversity, indigenous and local communities; national biodiversity strategies and action plans, incorporating biodiversity into sectoral planning; financial resources; and incentive measures. In addition, some GBF sessions are designed to contribute directly to work programs under the CBD intergovernmental process and to help build understanding of nationally-supported global processes (PD, pg. 1).

The Development Objectives (DOs) of the GBF phase II are as follows:

- (1) Establish an informal mechanism whereby parties to the CBD and major stakeholder groups can explore and debate the key issues concerning CBD implementation;
- (2) Expand the CBD constituency and foster broader involvement of, and commitment by, independent, public and business sector partners in the CBD's implementation;
- (3) Catalyze new cooperative partnerships and initiatives involving parties and stakeholder groups among different sectors;

- (4) Strengthen regional output into the process and implementation of the CBD through regional initiatives and sessions that consider issues in a more in-depth and open process;
- (5) Foster feedback between science and policy, from global to local levels, through multi-disciplinary workshops and the sharing of technical experience.

The expected outcomes from Phase II include (PD, pg.3):

- (1) A fully operational and coordinated institutional basis for GBF;
- (2) Approximately seven GBF meetings prepared and held;
- (3) Broader and more active stakeholder engagement in CBD implementation at the global, regional, national and local level;
- (4) Extensive dissemination and documentation of implementation measures for the CBD;
- (5) A sustainability study undertaken;
- (6) Monitoring and evaluation plan developed and implemented.

Project activities are implemented in close collaboration with the Secretariat of the CBD to ensure that priorities identified by the Conference of the Parties receive adequate attention from developing country parties (TE, pg.7).

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

No changes in GEO, DO, or project activities were reported in the TE.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The relevance of the project is rated Satisfactory.

A consortium of organizations instituted the concept of the Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF) in response to calls by Agenda 21, CBD and its Conference of the Parties (COP) for mechanisms by which people involved or engaged in biodiversity issues, in industry, government sectors, nongovernmental

organizations, or at the community level can contribute to the fullest possible understanding of the values and uses of biodiversity, as well as to actions for conserving and sustainably using biological resources in an equitable manner (PD,pg. 8). Therefore, the pilot phase of GBF, from 1992 to 1997, was in-part a response to calls by Agenda 21 and the meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD to contribute effectively to the understanding of values and uses of biodiversity, and to actions for conserving and using biological resources sustainably and equitably (TE, pg. 6). As such, the overall objectives of this project, to support the effective implementation of the CBD, are in-line with those of the GEF. GEF support for this project identified as a Short-Term Response Measure, which afforded flexible use of GEF funds for areas identified as of pressing immediate concern.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately satisfactory
-------------------	--

The effectiveness of the project is rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

According to the TE, the process of continuing the Global Biodiversity Forum has shown considerable value and is developing as a major component of the CBD. The GBF has achieved many of its expected outcomes (TE, pg. 19). The GBF has also been recognized by the Conference of the Parties intergovernmental process as a very useful mechanism for discussing issues related to the CBD. (TE, pg. 9)

Progress is detailed further below under each expected outcome:

Regarding Outcome 1 (A fully operational and coordinated institutional basis for GBF); the achievements are satisfactory. Issues for discussion are selected by the GBF Steering Committee through a process of consultation. Once issues have been decided, co-sponsoring is sought, abstracts are asked for and issue statements are organized. Forum organizers seek comment from those with a GBF track record, while also encouraging new participants. According to the TE, forums and their outputs contribute constructively to formal decisions and recommendations taken at the Convention on Biological Diversity intergovernmental level, and to effective national and regional implementation efforts. An essential feature, but also a weakness of the GBF process, is its very broad constituency and consensus process.

Regarding outcome 2 (About seven GBF meetings prepared and held) the achievements are satisfactory. A total of 15 GBFs have been held, six during the course of GBF Phase II (TE, pg.11). In addition, there have been regionalized forums in Moscow, Sri Lanka and in Mombasa. These have been locally coordinated to look more specifically at regional issues in a global context.

Regarding outcome 3 (Broader and more active stakeholder engagement in the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity globally, regionally, nationally and locally) the achievements are moderately satisfactory. According to the TE, some initial phases of GBF were viewed as closed sessions of northern participants, however later GBFs have increasingly utilized indigenous participants from developing regions. Moreover, only a few regional meetings were held during Phase II, preventing the project from allowing a wider regional participation (TE, pg. 11).

Regarding outcome 4 (Extensive dissemination of, and documentation on, implementation measures for the Convention on Biological Diversity) the achievements are satisfactory. Reports from forums are made available as promptly as possible in English, French and Spanish. The Global Biodiversity Forum website has been developed and is readily accessible and well indexed. Products are widely distributed and many are available for free down-loading from the GBF website. Hard copy reports of forums are available and a growing number of secondary products such as case studies and workshop follow-up documents are available.

Regarding outcome 5 (a sustainability study undertaken) the TE does not mention any achievement for this outcome. Therefore it seems that the study was not undertaken, and the outcome is highly unsatisfactory.

Finally, regarding outcome 6 (Monitoring and evaluation plan developed and implemented) the achievements are satisfactory. According to the TE, consultants to the Biodiversity Policy Coordination Division of IUCN developed a monitoring and evaluation plan in 1999. An internal monitoring trial of GBF participants was tested at the fourteenth GBF and the system was approved by the Steering Committee in June 1999. Monitoring is therefore in place and at the fifteenth GBF all participants were asked to return a survey sheet to the organizers for professional evaluation by a consultant hired for the purpose.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Unable to Assess
-----------------------	---------------------------------

There is no information in the TE that allows to assess the efficiency. There is no information on the budget and cost-efficiency, and no information on the schedule, and timeline, and information on disbursement, or on communication issues with agencies. Also, there is no PIR available therefore no possibility to assess efficiency.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Unlikely
---------------------------	-------------------------

The sustainability of this project is rated as Unlikely, due principally to uncertainty regarding financing for continuation of project outcomes.

Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes are assessed along the following four dimensions:

- a) Environmental sustainability – (U/A): ICR does not provide enough information on potential threats to environmental sustainability to rate this factor
- b) Financial sustainability – (Unlikely): According to the TE (pg.5) “Can the process continue and evolve further in the absence of GEF funding? Probably not, at least in the short-term”. The

project was funded mainly by the GEF, and there has been no effort towards finding further funding to ensure sustainability of the project. Moreover, the project did not achieve overall financial stability yet, therefore to ensure sustainability, long-term funding has to be found (TE, pg.18).

- c) Institutional sustainability – (Moderately Unlikely): According to the TE, reassessment of coordination roles and consideration of whether a very small, focused and dedicated secretariat would enhance the operation of GBF, especially in the areas of funding, ongoing development of issues, use of outputs and monitoring is necessary to ensure project sustainability (TE, pg.19). Another related priority to ensure project sustainability is active monitoring, resourcing of focal point issue coordinators, facilitating within-country and within-region dissemination of the results of forum debates and follow-up protocols for GBF issues (TE, pg. 18).
- d) Socio-Political sustainability – (Moderately Likely): There were not enough stakeholders involved in the process. Therefore to ensure sustainability, there is the need for GBF to engage more with industry, trade, private sector, and producer interests by coordinating a session of GBF to coincide with international trade or economics meetings. According to the TE, several interviewees considered that “a significant number of players in the production sector are seeking to understand biodiversity in a sustainability context” (TE, pg.13).

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

While the project was partially funded through co-financing, there is no information reported on co-financing in the TE.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

There is no information available on project delays, extension, schedule, or timeline in the TE.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Country ownership of the project was not very strong. According to the TE, initial phases of GBF were sometimes considered closed sessions of participants from the Global North. However, the later GBFs improved on that point, and have increasingly utilized indigenous participants from developing regions. Nevertheless, at the fifteenth GBF there were occasions when debate on issues was blocked by groups from the Global North, in addition to lapses in cultural sensitivity (TE, pg. 8).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	--

The M&E design at entry is rated as Moderately Unsatisfactory.

While the PD did not include a detailed M&E plan, the PD does include a logframe, a budget for all the M&E activities, and provides detailed instructions on the development of the M&E system during implementation. The PD states that the “development of a monitoring and evaluation plan will be one of the first activities undertaken by the Coordination Secretariat for this project” (PD, pg. 18). The plan will be implemented by the Steering Committee, which will review and approve it. This plan is based on indicators that measure effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the project activities. The PD also mentions that at each session of the GBF, participants and organizers will be surveyed to measure the impact of forum discussion. Results will be compiled to adjust the subsequent activities (PD, pg. 18). However, because the M&E design at entry lacks indicators and targets and a developed M&E plan, M&E design at entry is assessed as Moderately Unsatisfactory.

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

The M&E implementation is rated Satisfactory.

One of the project indicators is the extent to which the monitoring and evaluation plan was used in providing feedback into the design and implementation of subsequent sessions of GBF. A monitoring trial was tested at the fourteenth GBF and the system was approved by the Steering Committee in June 1999 (TE, pg. 12). The monitoring system was therefore put in place, and at the fifteenth GBF all participants were asked to return a survey sheet to the organizers for professional evaluation by a consultant hired for the purpose. Fifty percent of the participants answered that survey. The questions covered general organization, general outcomes, detailed comments on workshops attended, and follow-up to GBF including how individuals expect to follow up issues themselves. According to the TE, “this is the first forum where there has been a full monitoring system in action” (TE, pg. 12).

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout

project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Unable to Assess
--	---------------------------------

TE provides insufficient information to provide a rating on the quality of project implementation.

The GBF project involved a consortium of institutions of which the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) was among the partners. UNEP was also a member of the Steering committee. Moreover, UNEP is an agency for the Global Support Program for Biodiversity Enabling Activities and therefore was the most appropriate agency to ensure that the discussions of the GBF fits into the global support program (PD, pg. 5).

There is no other information in the TE and or the PIR about the quality of implementation from UNEP.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Satisfactory
---	-----------------------------

The quality of project execution is rated Satisfactory.

The execution agency of the GBF project is the World Conservation Union (IUCN), a membership organization that comprises 74 states, 107 government agencies, 623 national NGOs, and 56 international NGOs (PD, Annex 1). It satisfactorily organized effective workshops and produced focused outputs. However, it had difficulty envisioning the make-up of the workshop audiences (TE, pg. 17). IUCN has also regularly maintained the website statistics developed a monitoring and evaluation plan in 1999.

It should be noted that the GBF project was designed in such a way so as to rely upon partnerships, having a small number of high-profile global institutions within the forum structure to drive it in this sense, although the IUCN is the lead organization for GBF Phase II, “it must not be perceived to be leading GBF but should be seen only as one of a number of facilitators” (TE, pg. 10).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate below that this is indeed the case. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

There is no information available in the TE about environmental changes.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

There is no information available in the TE about socioeconomic changes.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

GBF is being increasingly recognized as a very useful mechanism for discussing issues related to the CBD. This is due to the direct participation of NGOs, the production and distribution of issue-based reports and statements, input into other conventions, and by within-country and intra-regional action and networks (TE, pg. 9).

The forum engages in a form of transfer technology, where people who otherwise would not touch with world issues can be introduced to them and can be tutored into responsible roles in the meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD and related forums (TE, pg.10).

A total of 15 GBFs have been held of which six have been held during the course of GBF Phase II. In addition, there have been regionalized forums during this period in Moscow in May to June 1999, Sri Lanka in October 1999 and Eastern and Southern Africa in Mombasa in February 2000. There were over 1450 participants in total (TE, pg.11).

Detailed access statistics have been maintained by IUCN on a website (Te, pg.11).

The major outputs of GBF in terms of the Conference of the Parties process are its reports and associated documents from each GBF, and the summary statement of conclusions and recommendations. (TE, pg.12)

b) Governance

Climate change issues, brought up in the eleventh GBF and twelfth GBFs, led to the development of a greater focus on institutional program, such as the IUCN climate change program. They also fed into the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD and other meetings (TE, pg. 15).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

There were no unintended impacts reported in the TE.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The GBF is moving towards engaging with other biodiversity interest groups apart from the direct relationship with the Conference of the Parties to the CBD, such as the Convention on Wetlands and CITES (TE, pg. 15).

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE does not give any key lessons or good practices about this project.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE gives the following policy recommendations (TE, pg. 5):

- (1) Development of a communications strategy;
- (2) Consideration of a very small, focused and dedicated secretariat;
- (3) Engagement with private, business and research stakeholders;

- (4) Consideration of the timing of GBF and related convention meetings

And the following program recommendations (TE, pg. 5):

- (1) Greater use of commissioned review papers on focal issues in conjunction with expansion of the range of case studies;
- (2) Professional facilitators for workshops;
- (3) Highly targeted analyses;
- (4) Increasing levels of interaction with other conventions;
- (5) A more open and structured approach to topic selection;
- (6) Ongoing use of the internal monitoring and evaluation plan; and
- (7) Greater use of language translation, especially for regional forums, as funding allows.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report contains an assessment of project outcomes. However, it is a list of each outcome and there is no general analysis. Each outcome is described, but there is no link between all the outcomes and no global analysis of the project as a whole. Impacts are not very clearly given.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, and the evidences are complete. However, there is no rating given for any of the categories.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report does not clearly assess project sustainability. The TE says that sustainability is probably unlikely; however, it does not clearly explain what the reasons for this statement are.	U
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	There are no lessons learned given in the TE. The only recommendations given are very specific to the project, and no recommendation that could be generalized to other project.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The projects costs are not given. And, there is no information on co-financing, on the actual vs expected amount, or even on how co-financing influenced the project achievements.	HU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E system is briefly assessed and described. The implementation and the improvements possible are given. More details are needed to be able to adequately assess the M&E system.	MS
Overall TE Rating	This report lacks a global analysis of the project. It is a list of each activities one after the other. But there is no general assessment of the project as a whole.	MU

$$0.3*8 + 0.1*10 = 2.4+1= 3.4$$

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