

United Nations Environment Programme

Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP GEF Project

In situ Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives through Enhanced Information Management and Field Application

Giorgio V. Brandolini Consultant

Evaluation Office

October 2013

Project Number: GFL-2328-2715-4757

Geographical Scope: Global

Start Date: April 2004

Completion Date: April 2010

Executing Agency: Bioversity International, Maccarese (Rome), Italy

- National Executing Agencies:
- Ministry of Nature Protection, Yerevan, Armenia
- General Directorate on Biodiversity, Vice Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources and Biodiversity, La Paz, Bolivia
- Ministry of Scientific Research, Antananarivo, Madagascar
- Ministry of Agriculture, Colombo, Sri Lanka
- State Committee on Science and Technology, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Table of contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations	4
Project Identification Table	5
Executive Summary	
I. Evaluation Background	
A. Context	
B. The Project	
Presentation of the project	
Financing	
C. Evaluation objectives, scope and methodology	
Evaluation methodology	
Evaluation questions	
Data collection and analysis instruments	
Methods for additional data collection, data check and	l analysis18
Data limitations	
II. Project Performance and Impact	
A. Attainment of objectives and planned results	
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Review of Outcomes to Impacts	
Theory of change	
B. Sustainability and catalytic role	
Sustainability	
Catalytic role	
Replication	
C. Processes affecting attainment of project results	
Preparation and Readiness	
Stakeholder involvement	
Country ownership/ driven-ness	
UNEP supervision and backstopping	
Monitoring and Evaluation	
D. Complementarity with UNEP programmes and strategies	
Linkage to UNEP's Expected Accomplishments and	POW 2010-2011
Alignment with the Bali Strategic Plan (BSP)	

Gender	
South-South cooperation	
III. Conclusions and lessons learnt	
A. Conclusions	
B. Lessons Learnt	43
Annexes	46
1. Evaluation TORs	46
2. Evaluation program, containing the names of locations visited and the names (or functions) of people in	net53
2.1. Sri Lanka	53
2.2 Uzbekistan	54
2.3 Bolivia	54
3. Bibliography	55
4. Summary co-finance information and a statement of project expenditure by activity	56
4.1 Project costs by component (US\$)	56
4.2 Total planned project co-finance and actual co-finance received	57
4.3 Project budget by Component (GEF expenditure + Co-financing)	59
5. Technical working papers	59
5.1 Quality of Project Design	59
5.2 Theory of change diagram	66
5.3 ROtI results score sheet	69
5.4 Project portals features on February 20th, 2013	71
5.5 Project indicators	71
6. Brief CVs of the consultant	74
7. Formal response / comments from the project management team and / or the country focal point	76

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ARS	Agricultural Research Service
BGCI	Botanic Gardens Conservation International
BSP	Bali Strategic Plan
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agriculture Research
CWR	Crop Wild Relatives
DGEF	Division of GEF Coordination
DIVA-GIS	Geographic Information System software
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GBIF	Global Biodiversity Information Facility
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System Software
GRIS	Genetic Resources Information System
IMC	Information Management Committee
IMIS	Integrated Information Management System
IPGRI	International Plant Genetic Resources Institute
ISC	International Steering Committee
IT	Information technology
ITPGRFA	International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD/DAC	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development / Development Assistance Committee
PA	Protected Area
PGR	Plant Genetic Resources
PPP	Public Private Partnerships
PROINPA	Fundación Promoción e Investigación de Productos Andinos, Bolivia
ROtI	Review of outcome to Impact
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
UMSA	Universidad Mayor Saint Andrews, Bolivia
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
USA	United States of America
WB	World Bank

Project Identification Table

GEF project ID:	PMS: GF/1020-04-01	IMIS number:	GFL-2328-2715-4757	
Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity	GEF OP #:	13,4	
GEF Strategic Priority/Objective:	2	GEF approval date:	2 March 2004	
UNEP approval date:	24 March 2004	Date of first disbursement:	14 April 2004	
Actual start date:	March 2004	Planned duration:	61 months	
Intended completion date*:	February 2009	Actual or Expected completion date:	October 2010	
Project Type:	FSP	GEF Allocation:	US\$5,827,025	
PPG GEF cost:	US\$335,000	PPG co-financing:	US\$85,000 cash US\$255,000 in kind	
Expected MSP/FSP Co- financing:	US\$6,176,969	Total Cost:	US\$12,678,994	
Mid-term review. (planned date):	June-Oct 2007	Terminal Evaluation (actual date):	January 2013	
Mid-term review. (actual date):	June-Oct 2007	No. of revisions:	4	
Date of last Steering Committee meeting:	October 2009	Date of last Revision:	27 August 2009	
Disbursement as of 30 June 2011:	US\$ 5,743,739	Date of financial closure:	N/A	
Date of Completion:	March 2011	Actual expenditures reported as of 30 June 2011:	US\$ 5,827,025	
Total co-financing realized as of 30 June 2011:	US\$ 7,184,843	Actual expenditures entered in IMIS as of 30 June 2011:	US\$ 5,827,025	
Leveraged financing:	US\$ 2,362,731			

Source: Project Document, Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

Executive Summary

A. Introduction

The <u>In situ</u> Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives through Enhanced Information Management and Field Application project is inscribed in GEF Operational Programme #13 on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity important to Agriculture. The main objective of the project is the enhanced conservation of crop wild relatives in Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan and enhanced capacity to use information to support their conservation and sustainable utilization.

The Implementing Agency was the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) through its Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF). Bioversity International (Bioversity) was in charge of the execution, in collaboration with a government-designated national Executing agency, the competent ministry, and coordinating local partners in each country. Activities extended from March 2004 to April 2010. Local partners in each country signed working agreements with their respective country Executing agency. An International Steering Committee (ISC), meeting annually, was in charge of the project strategic guidance. It was assisted by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the Information Management Committee (IMC) and a national Steering committee in each participating country. The following National Executing Agencies were in charge of the project in each country:

- Ministry of Nature Protection, Yerevan, Armenia,

- General Directorate on Biodiversity, Vice Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources and Biodiversity, La Paz, Bolivia,

- Ministry of Scientific Research, Antananarivo, Madagascar,

- Ministry of Agriculture, Colombo, Sri Lanka,

- State Committee on Science and Technology, Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

Bioversity International, as global Executing Agency, hosted the global Project management unit (PMU) coordinating the 5 national PMUs established to coordinate and manage project implementation in each country.

GEF financing for the project was US\$ 5,827,025, co-financing US\$ 7,184,843 for a total US\$ 13,011,868. Co-financing exceeded that anticipated in the project document by 16%. Project partners, through leveraged funds (US\$ 2,362,731) fulfilled the originally planned contributions by compensating the reduction in the originally committed ones: International organizations (US\$ 2,492,349, -30%) and Governments (US\$ 1,420,684, --16%). Contribution by Non-government organizations (\$909,079, -4%).

B. Findings and Conclusions

1. Integration of Crops Wild Relatives (CWR) conservation, study and use. CWR conservation, monitoring and use activities were undertaken at a pilot scale in the project countries with positive results. The project was very active in CWR exploration and research. In situ conservation and use received comparatively attention. These activities led to the enhancement of the local professional skills for CWR *in situ* conservation and study and the establishment of a significant global body of knowledge on CWR conservation which did not exist at project outset. Furthermore, the project did develop multidisciplinary approaches promoting the integration of CWR in development strategies, environmental tourism and agricultural research. Partner countries realized the potential and enhanced their capacities of *in situ* conservation of CWR in protected areas although their capacity to scale up depend on the buildup of economic management / PPP development skills outside the scope of the project.

2. *CWR geographical dimension*. The project partner countries are inscribed in regions of intensive plant species differentiation and domestication. Their rich agro-biodiversity and CWR endowment can greatly contribute to renewing and enlarging the genetic basis for crops improvement not only locally but also at the global level. Some local partners use the information generated by the project in pre-breeding and breeding programmes. The project adopted a global multi-country approach, in alternative to a regional one consistent with the geographical dimension of crops domestication centers. Knowledge generated by the project is expected to catalyze regional approaches.

3. *CWR knowledge and use*. The Project developed a hard copy CWR Manual and e-learning modules, through the collaboration of its partners, available in English, French and Spanish as well as in the Russian (PDF format) by the end of the year. This information constitutes a valuable asset for linking conservation, study and use of CWR.

4. Project strategy. The project adopted a two-fold strategy, by (a) building local skills and awareness and networking them to address CWR challenges, and (b) fostering the concentration of information at the national and global level. These two different perspectives complemented each other, the only setback being the limited concentration of resources on the more potentially fruitful approach strengthening national networks to catalyze resources and foster change in a bottom up perspective

5. Project coordination. Project identification and implementation was conducted by involving local partners in need assessments and by establishing a multilevel participatory coordination mechanism, thus tackling in a structured and coordinated way managerial exigencies and technical issues. The late appointment of the TAG members did postpone decisions on some strategic and implementation choices. Changes in international organizations (IO) staff in charge of the project did limit the mutual understanding. According to the TAG members, most international partners' contribution to the project was short of expectations. With the new international coordinator the project did improve communication with local partners and adopted a more effective bottom up approach to technical choices in field activities implementation, with positive results.

6. Skills development and networking. The project positively enhanced, networked and tested local collaborations in conservation and study of CWR. It filled knowledge and skills gaps in professional and local organizations and assisted them in addressing such shortages in a multidisciplinary way. The benefits of project outputs are ongoing. Lessons learnt triggered new studies on CWR and agro-biodiversity that have become a part of the national conservation and research strategy for food security in the partner countries.

7. *Consciousness*. Awareness raising activities were effective in catalyzing consciousness on the role and value of CWR among the scientific community and selected opinion and decision makers. Success stories concern conservation and research initiatives with little appeal on the public and top level decision makers looking at environment as a booster of production and livelihoods.

8. *Information management*. The project established national CWR information management systems by integrating data on CWR generated by local partners. Common features include the harmonization of descriptors and data transfer protocols, the use of websites to communicate basic information extracted from the national databases and disseminated through the national and Global portal on CWR managed by Bioversity.

9. Overall assessment. The project stimulated consciousness on CWR value among scientists and selected decision makers in the participating countries. It generated knowledge, skills and new patterns of collaboration. Thanks to the project-induced development of local skills, the project local partners started to play a more active role in international scientific initiatives linking research, conservation and development The Project supported CWR mainstreaming into National action plans. Although this new emphasis on policy and regulatory frameworks was not matched by actions stimulating the mobilization of resources.

C. Lessons learnt

1. Integration of Crops wild relatives (CWR) conservation, study and use. The multi-disciplinary approach is effective in dealing with CWR as a border theme between agro-biodiversity and biodiversity, basic research, conservation and development, public and private initiative. This approach has to be extended from the botanic – agricultural alliance brokered by the project to include the exploration of traditional knowledge of resident population. Three major areas of CWR use are foreseeable:

- multiplication and education actions in the conservation sites gathering resources and linking conservation to development;

- exploitation of CWR with an economic value by resident population to diversify their food security and sources of income in a perspective of environmental friendly local development,

- inclusion of CWR in pre-breeding and breeding programmes framed in the perspective of climate change and natural risk threats to agricultural crops production and food security.

2. *CWR geographical dimension*. CWR *in situ* conservation and study has to leverage a regional approach targeting the common challenges and sharing resources and lessons learnt, in order to maximize the regional dimension of species diversification / crops domestication. National networks with different scopes and targets multiply the value

of individual resources and expertise on CWR. They create critical masses that can become the counterpart of regional and global players.

3. *CWR knowledge and use*. The consciousness on the economic value of CWR in the participating countries has raised expectations and stimulated the mobilization of local resources, partnerships or competition. The level of decision making needed to achieve sustainability is higher than that envisaged by the project strategy. It requires a greater commitment in key areas such as:

- development skills in conducting sector economic studies and cost / benefit analysis in conservation and use planning in the CWR sector;

- development of skills in negotiating, accessing and managing funding mechanisms (international research tenders, public private partnerships);

- definition of the prevalence or coexistence of conservation and development priorities, i.e. the ascription of CWR to conservation or development approaches and regulations (e.g., by reference to the CBD or ITPGRFA);

- legal regulation of interventions and investments in biodiversity conservation, access to information and use (policy level actions).

4. *Project strategy*. Creation of local knowledge and skills and consciousness promotes a bottom up approach to development, as the beneficiaries are eager to use the acquired knowledge and skills to pursue their own priorities. With the growth of awareness on the value of CWR and biodiversity, bottom up ownership and diffusion of decision making through networking has to become the gateway in streamlining conservation toward development through mobilization of local ownership. Strategies linking natural resources conservation and community development have to be explored in the identification phase of these initiatives.

5. Project coordination. Planning and decision making at different levels, partnership agreements and field actions across a wide set of sectors and five countries resulted in a cumbersome coordination work. The coordination mechanism has to be strengthened in planning and M&E by developing local partners' skills in such areas when the Executing agency doesn't directly participate in field activities – not to lose the control of the quality and timing of the execution -. The TAG has to be active since the project start up in order to provide strategic inputs to the project planing. Otherwise its contribution risks to be restricted to the operationalization of technical decisions taken by other people at the beginning of the project.

6. *Skills development and networking*. To maximize the usefulness of the project output, CWR exploration has to be completed with studies on traditional knowledge and uses, agronomic testing and characterization, reproductive biology and techniques for overcoming cross-species fertilization and genetic incompatibility. Network management skills have to be developed in order to make these viable and open to further expansion and intensification of action as well as in gathering local resources. Intervention mechanisms promoting different approaches to networking (by goal, theme, technology, etc.) can provide the opportunity for identifying new needs and customize skills development.

7. *Consciousness*. Success stories in the use of CWR are essential to achieve public consensus and top level decision makers' commitment to this sector. In practice, actions targeted to the use of CWR in local development and breeding are the key to the sustainable handover and continuation of the project results. Linkages with other initiatives (such as environmental education, ecotourism, etc.) can be fostered by channeling communication campaigns through networks. Stimulus of the network approach can be substantive in promoting consciousness at the local and regional level.

8. Information management. The Global portal effectiveness as a communication tool and data sharing mechanism depends on the willingness of partner countries to contribute and update information. National database and portals usefulness and viability also depend on the willingness of local partners to invest in communication. As conservation and economically sensitive information is submitted only on the base of bilateral agreements, a winwin approach is needed to establish viable information sharing agreements. International organizations have to develop a broker approach in facilitating this architecture and build opportunities for cross-breeding specialist skills and success stories as well as for enhancing communication and standardization of information sharing on CWR and biodiversity.

I. Evaluation Background

A. Context

1. The <u>In situ</u> Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives through Enhanced Information Management and Field <u>Application</u> project is inscribed in GEF Operational Programme #13 on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity important to Agriculture (para. 19.iii). Improved conservation and use of Crops wild relatives (CWR) are a source of global benefits for agricultural production in the long term. The promotion of *in situ* conservation of CWR and other wild plants for food production constitutes one of the 20 agreed activities of the FAO Global Plan of Action for the Conservation and Sustainable Utilisation of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.

2. The conservation and use of CWR has been recognized as a key element in the implementation of the *Convention on Biological Diversity* (CBD). The centers of diversification and domestication of crops, mostly concentrated in the sub-tropics and tropics, attract the interest of local and foreign researchers. Conservation, study and use of CWR is at the interface between biodiversity exploration and agro-biodiversity. They require the alliance of knowledge and skills developed in both sectors.

3. Since the Convention on Biological Diversity in 1992 and International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) in 2004, it is widely recognized that in situ conservation of PGRFA is necessary to preserve the broadest genetic diversity inherent in and between plant populations. In order to secure this vital resource for future crop improvement, there is now a need for up-scaling the *in situ* conservation of CWR, nationally and regionally, as well as ensuring that there is adequate *ex situ* backup conservation. The Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture has called for the development of a network of *in situ* conservation areas for CWR, along Article 5 of the ITPGRFA.

4. Until recently, the study of *agro-biodiversity* has been decidedly preferred to that on CWR as the former is of more immediate fruition in breeding programmes. Climate change and natural risk point to the recourse to a broader gene-pool to ensure long term crops improvement. The debate on Climate change is linking the preservation of renewable resources (biodiversity, habitat, soil and water, etc.) to local development, i.e. sustainability. With the predicted rise in global temperature over the next 50 years (IPCC, 4th Assessment Report) that is expected to cause drought and changes in rainfall patterns and the shift in the distribution of pests and diseases, the genetic diversity and resistance carried by CWR will be vital for adapting crops to changing environments.

5. By the late 1980s following the unsatisfactory progress in conserving CWRs primarily through *ex situ* programs the agricultural community began considering integrated conservation as a more effective method of preservation, with emphasis on the *in situ* component. The drafting and signing of the *Convention on Biological Diversity* and the FAO *Global Plan of Action for Plant Genetic Resources* (1996) were turning points that brought *in situ* CWR conservation into the mainstream of international and national priorities. This reorientation had generated international agreements and position statements, scientific publications, and on-the-ground projects dealing specifically with the rationale, theory and method of *in situ* CWR conservation.

6. Local participation in identifying priorities and undertaking field actions is badly needed, especially in the perspective of ensuring *in situ* conservation of CWR. Recent national and regional approaches to CWR mobilize local population and scientific community interest in CWR study and exploitation. The CWR project preliminary study has assessed the state of biodiversity in the participating countries. It recorded scattered resources and initiatives in this field with a limited scope and size. Local partner wage a subordinate role in international research programmes. In such situation, locally generated information on CWR has few chances to be fully exploited in breeding and local development. At the time of the project identification, an integrated approach tackling CWR from policy making to conservation, characterization and use was a novelty in developing and in transition countries.

B. The Project

Presentation of the project

a. Rationale

7. CWR constitute an increasingly recognized resource for improving agricultural production and for maintaining sustainable agro-ecosystems. They have contributed many useful traits to crop plants. Modern improved varieties contain genes from their wild relatives. CWR are also a vital component of wild areas populations' livelihood. The conservation and use of CWR are essential elements for ensuring long term plant breeding. Political, administrative, and infrastructural obstacles within countries may limit their effective *in situ* conservation. Infrastructure and decision-making capacity are lagging in developing and in transition countries so that top level decision-makers and the public ignore CWR value for crops improvement for food security.

8. Access to information on CWR is fragmentary as it is usually dealt with (a) separately for each crop or (b) in the frame of habitat and biodiversity conservation. Specialists in developing and in transition countries know the potential of CWR. Insofar they have been unable to raise resources and mobilize skills across the broad range of sectors needed to tackle the multiple steps linking geo-botanical exploration to conservation and pre-breeding. Lack of awareness and public support in exploiting the potentials of CWR is a major hurdle to raising funds for their study and conservation. Opportunities are lost and threats to CWR populations, also in protected areas, go unperceived due to the low priority assigned to this topic, usually associated with environmental protection and basic research than to food security and development.

9. Each of the five project partner countries possesses many important genera and species of CWR of crops vital for global food security; the survival of some of these *taxa* is under threat. These countries are interested in improving the conservation and economic utilization of these resources in a sustainable and cost effective way. The Governments of these countries have recognized that their national agro-biodiversity conservation programme planning, decision-making and implementation frameworks need substantial improvement for undertaking effective *in situ* CWR protection and use.

10. National CWR conservation action plans didn't exist at the time of the project identification in any of these countries either autonomously or as part of existing biodiversity strategies. Environment / Conservation and Development / Agriculture actions were designed and implemented independently. One notable exception is Madagascar where the *National Centre of Agricultural Research for Rural Development* works with the *National Office of Environment* on conservation related issues. Limitations also existed in identifying priority actions and developing the necessary management plans for the conservation of priority *taxa*. Adherence to different standards hampered systematization along international standards and hence dissemination of information on CWR in these countries: Bolivia and Madagascar had developed *Red lists* using IUCN categories that are different from those adopted by Armenia, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan.

b. Goals

11. The Project's *overall development goal / development objective* is the improved global food security through effective conservation and increased use of priority crop wild relatives.

Its *immediate objective* is the Enhanced conservation status of selected CWR in Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan.

c. Components

12. The project *components* are:

1. An internationally accessible information system available through the internet that allows access to, processing and utilization of CWR information for conservation planning amongst the institutions within and outside of the target countries of the project.

2. National information systems are operational and allow the efficient collection, management, analysis, and presentation of CWR information in Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan.

3. Enhanced capacity to apply information management technologies in planning for in situ conservation of CWR.

4. Knowledge and public awareness of value of crop wild relatives are increased.

d. Intervention areas and target groups

13. The intervention area of this project is the enhanced conservation of CWR. The project target groups are the general public, policy makers, natural resource managers, community workers, plant breeders, scientific/conservation communities and associations (Bolivia, Uzbekistan). All of them are stakeholders in the conservation of CWR, some are users. They play a critical role in establishing a consensus on the national priorities in this field. In fact the project target groups are quite differentiated, although numerically led by the academic community, and their level of involvement in project activities also varies. Depending on the country, public and private partners were more or less active players.

e. Milestones in the project design

14. The raising of concern among scientists on the narrow genetic basis used in many staple crops breeding programmes has triggered the interest in traditional varieties first and CWR more as a source of germplasm. Since the 1990' major actions have been undertaken and the *International treaty on plant genetic resources for food and agriculture* (ITPGRFA) has been enacted in 2004. In fact, at the time of the project identification the 5 countries agricultural development programs didn't contemplate the recourse to CWR. The debate arising from the *Rio summit* (1992) and *Convention on biological diversity* (CBD) highlighted the importance of wild species in development but it did not result in targeted provisions on CWR conservation and use. A further event was needed to raise the debate on these species to a level of consciousness that triggered action: Climate change threatening the yield of agricultural crops world-wide. Modeling of environmental scenarios showed that the shift in meteorological parameters can overcome in intensity and swiftness, the capacity of adaptation of crops and that recourse to new and more diversified sources of improved genetic traits is needed to achieve results in the long term.

15. The five project countries (Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan) are located within centres of crop or plant diversity. They encompass mountain ecosystems of major importance as identified by GEF (Andes, Caucasus, foothills of Hindu-Kush and Pamir, mountain chains on tropical islands). Economically important and endangered CWR exist in these ecosystems. As noted in the national *Biodiversity Strategic Action Plans*, they are all concerned to link *in situ* conservation of important CWR with the sustainable use of their mountain ecosystems. At the end of the 1990s, during the project identification phase, the 5 partner countries recognized that skills and information on CWR often existed but scattered between herbaria and *ex situ* gene banks.

16. The different perspective of the key players in the environmental conservation and agricultural development sectors was a major hurdle to target CRW in a comprehensive way. There was no inter-sector coordination in implementing sustainable conservation actions in a local development perspective. This divide is replicated elsewhere in the world, as natural resources conservation and human development are seen as conflicting strategies. The project proposal, integrating the contribution and expectations of the partner countries, was elaborated in 2002 and approved for funding in 2004.

f. Implementation and completion

17. The project started in March 2004 following delays in appointment and establishment of some elements of the Global and of the 5 National Project management units. Funds were received in Madagascar and Sri Lanka in early November, in December in Bolivia and Uzbekistan. Armenia did receive funds in May 2005 due to problems in establishing the disbursement arrangements into and within the country. Field activities in Bolivia commenced in early April after the appointment of a national funds management agency (FundEco). Activities were completed in

2010, after the approval of a no cost extension that was granted in order to publish the CWR *in situ* conservation manual systematising the Project experience.

18. The Implementing Agency of the project was the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) through its Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF). Memorandums of understanding between Bioversity international (Biovertisy), the Executing Agency, and the National executing agency designated by each beneficiary country government were signed at the inception of the project to ensure consistency and continuity of support by national authorities to the project implementation. Bioversity signed Letters of agreement with the 5 national executing agencies, to be executed on an annual basis. Work plans and budgets were reviewed and formally revised on annual basis. The 5 national PMUs monitored the in country project implementation. UNEP approved ongoing revisions based on justifications provided by the Executing agency. Local partners signed working agreements with their own country executing agency. The International Steering Committee (ISC) met every year to ensure the project's strategic guidance. It was assisted by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the Information Management Committee (IMC) and a National steering committee in each country. Daily activities were entrusted to the international and national project management units led by the respective coordinators, assistant and IT expert, plus a global information management system manager. Agreement for sharing of information between national partners and international system were signed. National partners also agreed to exchange information originating from the project activities. UNEP backstopped these operations by providing advise on compliance of GEF procedures and by facilitating decision making through participation to coordination meetings and support to the global PMU in tackling the problems arising during the implementation of the financial agreements with the partner countries.

19. Each country established its own criteria for selecting the priority crops and associated CWRs. They included staple crops such as cereals, pulses and tubers as well as cash and horticultural crops such as vegetables, fruit, berries, nuts and spices. Baseline awareness surveys were conducted in each country. They revealed a little understanding by interviewees of the importance of crop wild relatives to plant diversity conservation and sustainable livelihoods promotion.

20. The *Darwin core* standard for plant taxonomic description was adopted and resources descriptors for the CWR databases were developed. The Information management committee in August 2007 decided that development of the *Genetic Resources Information System* (GRIS) – a centralized information storage system approach used originally for managing *ex situ* gene bank collections - cease and each country develop its own data storage system. The *Global portal* adopted a strict referral modality (lists of web links) to network CWR resources and to disseminate information. In this way, the taxon-level metadata section of the portal establishes direct links with external datasets on CWR, including information put online by the 5 partner countries. Each country developed databases in MySQL and MS Access using the agreed CWR descriptors and gathered data generated by local partners' project activities. Information about CWR from *ex situ* collections (e.g., herbaria) in partner countries was also gathered and analyzed, CWR population location maps were generated and databases were populated, revised and updated. The data stored in the national information systems are accessible through the Global portal via distributed searches using *Global Biodiversity Information Facility* (GBIF) tools and protocols (Darwin Core) for the taxonomic indexing of national data. TAPIRLink standard is used for transferring to the Global portal the update of the links.

21. Monitoring was performed through collection, systematization and transfer of project information from local partners implementing the activities to the respective national implementing agency and the international executing agency. The Project workplan was reviewed and updated on an annual basis. An updated table of the project activities and outputs was systematized and annexed to the project periodic reports. Two independent experts conducted the mid-term review from July to October 2007. This exercise confirmed the major change in the project strategy concerning the design of the Global CWR information system centered on the CWR Global Portal, This adopted International standards and protocols for accessing the data made available by the national information systems instead of centralizing the management of their information on CWR. It also highlighted that the key outcomes of the Project are mutually reinforcing and that their achievement requires effective coordination among partners and activities. It stressed that the capacity for facilitating teamwork and participatory decision-making is a primary requirement and urged the preparation of a post-Project sustainability plan, including a strategy for mobilizing resources beyond those available in-Project.

g. Implementation arrangements and main partners

22. National and international actions were intensively implemented by customizing and delivering project inputs upon local partners' requests. The high frequency of coordination meetings - twice per year - resulted in an effective debugging of non-conformities and harnessing of the project to the local opportunities and constraints. The TAC and IMC provided specialist advice in the two sectors of major concentration of activities: CWR conservation and study, and information management. Each country independently dealt with the global Executing agency. The different national contexts and priorities didn't allow establishing bilateral / multilateral coordination between countries. In Bolivia and Madagascar both public and private partners were actively involved in the project, while in the other countries research and development institutions and park authorities from the public sector were the only intervening entities. International partners provided expertise although their delivery was smaller than committed at the identification stage. IUCN contribution was substantial although it didn't source the extra funds originally planned to conducting several field activities. In Bolivia, FundEco, a service foundation established by a public university, was associated to the project in order to release the grants to private partners, a task public bodies can't perform under the local law.

Financing

a. Actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances)

23. The budget of the programme activities is made of the GEF cash grant and partners contributions in cash and kind (co-financing). GEF expenditures amounted to US\$ 5,827,025 (45%), co-financing US\$ 7,185,843 (55%) for a total Project budget of US\$ 13,011,868 (see Annex 4.4).

b. Co-financing

24. *Co-financing. International organizations* (IO), *Government* and *Non-government* (NG) partners co-financing covered about 51% of the budget plan, according to the Project document. The initial commitment to co-financing (US\$ 6,205,803) in project document was surpassed by 16% (US\$ 7,185,843), including 2,362,731 leveraged money compensating the lower than expected contribution by IO. In fact co-financing totalled 78% of the initial commitment¹.

c. Financial management

25. The initial GEF contribution budget² is structured in budget lines along GEF-UNEP rules. Detailed breakdown by component and Sub-component was not mandatory at the time of the programme start. As expenditures consist mostly of work and services procurement – capital investments are quite limited – this budget structure is a minor inconvenience. In fact, the repartition of project staff's work time between different lines of activity is very approximate also in the best conditions. On the other side, the co-financing budget is broken down by Component as contributions are earmarked by specific activity³.

26. The *Finance and Administration* (F&A) group based at Bioversity HQs oversaw the financial management of the project and assisted the international Coordinator in the management of resources. The project design doesn't

¹ Leveraged co-financing comes from government, NGOs and International organizations but in different amounts and from different budget sources than initially committed. This is a current practice for GEF projects as commitments are made 2-3 years before actual project start and conditions change.

² Annex 1A of the Project document

³ Table 2 of the project document

mention specific management arrangements or disbursement procedures⁴ as they follow GEF-UNEP's rules. Section 5 of the Project document is the more detailed text on financial rules. It specifies that cost overruns incurred by partners have to be agreed with UNEP. Funds were disbursed to national Executing agencies based on the annual letters of agreements.

d. Application of proper standards (clarity, transparency, audit etc.) and timeliness of financial planning, management and reporting

27. General accounting rules were specified in the Letters of agreement between Bioversity and the national implementing agencies. National Executing agencies reported to Bioversity along the project budget format. Local partners adopted their own financial procedures in co-financing. Reporting local partners' contribution to the national Executing agencies was a challenging task. It underwent a trials and errors process before achieving consistency In fact, the project developed case by case solutions to deal with the fact that local partners have different organization histories and respond to national financial and administrative rules. For instance, in Bolivia the performance of financial tasks was assigned to FundEco in order to overcome prohibition to release government grants to private partners. The complexity of this alignment of approaches was compounded by the frequent late disbursement of funds to countries. In fact, private partners did overcome such hurdles by mobilizing their own resources with greater ease than the public ones that comply stricter administrative rules.

e. Administrative processes such as recruitment of staff, procurement of goods and services (including consultants), preparation and negotiation of cooperation agreements

28. The annual cooperation agreements were the key tools used to plan and implement the partnerships in each country. The negotiation and formulation of such work tools gave flexibility to the project implementation. In fact, they enabled adjustments in the work timeline and fine tuning of activities since the initial agreements to the adoption of no cost extensions. Local staff continuation in the project, on the other side, was discouraged by the limited duration of commitments taken under the annual agreements.

f. Co-financing materialization as expected at project approval

29. The amount of the countries' financial contributions fulfilled their commitment stated in the project document. Additional co-financing was provided by all project partners including the global and national Executive agencies In fact International organizations leveraged funds to fulfil their initial commitments, short of the initial budget, for the reason mentioned in note 1, paragraph 24. Some activities were rescheduled to match such situation.

g. Breakdown of final actual costs and co-financing for the different project components

30. Leveraged resources represented a consistent portion of Co-financing especially for Component 3 (skills development). They correspond to the difference noted in paragraph 23, with reference to IO financial contributions.

h. Modifications to design before or during implementation

31. The project tackled the CWR priorities of 5 countries. Bioversity and other IO provided their experience in CWR conservation and study in several fields. The extensive Logical framework and indicators synthesize the complexity of this approach but the technical content of each activity was greatly in the hands of each local partner, with the scientific advise of Bioversity and the other IO. This approach allowed adaptation to the local context and fine tuning of field delivery, in modality, time and content.

⁴ Cfr. Annex 10E1 of the Project document

32. A part the benefits of the adoption of the adaptive management approach, the Project strategy recorded only a major change concerning the *International information management system* (IIMS). Discussion on strategies alternative to the initial GRIS highlighted the concerns by implementing partners (national authorities) to retain the control on the sensitive information on CWR and supervision on its access. Thus, the Global portal role was confined to the interconnection among the national and Bioversity information management systems without physical transfer of the national datasets.

C. Evaluation objectives, scope and methodology

33. The mandate for evaluations in UNEP covers all programmes and projects of the *Environment fund*, related trust funds, earmarked contributions and projects implemented by UNEP under the *Global environment facility* (GEF) and under partnership agreements. UNEP *Evaluation policy* (2009) defines the scope and purpose of Impact evaluations (bullet 26):

- The focus is on evaluating progress towards high-level goals and providing estimates of development impact.

- Post-project impact evaluations will be conducted on a selective basis with the aim of identifying UNEP's success in sustaining benefits several years after a project — or portfolio of projects — has been completed

The goal of this evaluation is to assess project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the project, including their sustainability.

Evaluation methodology

34. The terminal evaluation of the CWR project concerns the output and the mechanism of the intervention in view of the assessment of the contribution of this tool to improve CWR conservation, study and access to the useful information by researchers and other stakeholders. Specifically, this study identifies the relations between goal, impact and results by analyzing:

a. project plans and reports, identification studies and surveys and other recorded information,

b. project monitoring analytical data (progress, achievements and indicators), and by

c. interviewing stakeholders at Bioversity headquarters and in three of the project countries, including field visits to CWR conservation sites and meetings with stakeholders from institutions, economic and civil society organizations, and interview of the members of the project Technical advisory committee.

Evaluation questions

35. The ToR section *Objective and Scope of the Evaluation* (cfr. Annex 1) presents the Evaluation questions, here below classified along the 5 OECD/DAC criteria⁵:

Question	Criteria	Indicator		Sources	Assessment
		Target	Achievement		
1. How successful was the project in creating effective national information systems in each of the five implementing countries that bring together dispersed information held by relevant national institutions and agencies?	Effectiveness	NIS fully operational	 National information system operational in 4 out of 5 countries (in Bolivia it is being incorporated in a national biodiversity IS) as follows⁶: in Armenia, data available on the national website include 104 species, 7,438 records and about 6,000 coordinates, in Bolivia, national partner institutions have introduced 3,010 records from 162 species into their institutional databases and made them available online through the National and Global Portals; at the time of the evaluation the National 	Websites, interviews	Satisfactory

Table 1. Evaluation questions

⁵ Evaluation question 5 is added to cover the Efficiency criterion. Detailed answers to the questions is provided in this report *Section II: Project performance an impact*, specifically paragraphs 50-95

⁶ Annex 5.4 presents the appraisal of the Portal features at the time of the Evaluation field survey.

			portal was not active - in Madagascar, data on 282 CWR species from 1,952 records were transferred from the original database and are linked to the Global Portal, - in Sri Lanka, information on 30 priority species has been transferred to temporary electronic databases - in Uzbekistan data on 843 described samples of 6 project priory crops from 400 surveyed during 2005- 2008 plots and 903 accessions of 8 wild species conserved in ex situ conditions in 7 research institutions are available through the national portal		
2. How successful was the project in creating an international information system and management capability that integrated the extensive but fragmented and dispersed data on crop wild relatives held by the international partners, other international sources and key institutions in other countries?	Effectiveness	IIS fully operational, number of access	Global portal fully operational, 13,000 accesses from 2008 to 2010	BI website, Crop Wild Relative Global Portal survey, interviews	Fully satisfactory
3. How successful was the project in developing capacity in the five participating countries, to apply information management technologies in planning for in situ conservation of crop wild relatives?	Effectiveness	On going in situ conservation of crop wild relatives actions implemented along programme generated plans	On going in situ conservation of crop wild relatives actions developed, approved and implemented in one protected area in each of the 5 project countries along programme generated plans	Programme reports, interviews	Fully satisfactory
4. To what extent did the project increase awareness among decision makers and the general public of the value of crop wild relatives and of the need for their conservation in the partner countries?	Effectiveness	Number of policy, strategy and planning documents produced by national authorities	National CWR Conservation Action Plan for CWR have been developed in all countries (in Madagascar for PGR including CWR and in Sri Lanka for biodiversity including CWR) Project activities related publications include hundreds of studies, scientific papers, work plans and communication materials, each of them contributing to raise interest and understanding of CWR role in science, environment conservation and	Generated documents (policies, etc.), press reviews, interviews	Fully satisfactory

			development		
5. How did the CWR project harmonize different exigencies and changing needs of local partners and stakeholders?	Efficiency	Timeliness in project execution	Delay in the start of field activities and funds disbursement to local partners, partly due to respect of local partners needs and conditions in each partner country; satisfactory completion of field activities by a one year no cost extension.	Project reports, interviews of project staff and partners	Satisfactory
6. To what extent did the project enhance conservation of crop wild relatives in Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan?	Impact	CWR under enhanced conservation along programme generated plans	All countries have developed management plans for priority taxa: Armenia for Triticum and Aegylops in Erebuni nature reserve, Bolivia for Theobroma in TIPNIS, Madagascar for Dioscorea in Ankaratantsika national park, Sri Lanka for Cinnamonum in Kanneliya forest reserve, Uzbekistan for Amygdalus in Chatkal Biospheric State Reserve, and Juglans, Malus, Pistacia in Ugam-Chatkal State Natural National Park	State of the plant genetic resources for food and agriculture rep orts, intervie ws, field visits	Fully satisfactory
7. Overall, how likely is it that the project will contribute to increasing global food security through effective conservation and increased use of priority crop wild relatives? ⁷	Sustainability	Cooperation agreements on CWR applied research and development	CWR applied research and development by local partners without declared Cooperation agreements with development / economic bodies. The conservation of CWR provides options for use of valuable traits in breeding activities in the partner countries, some of which are ongoing.	Agreements for the use of CWR and related information, interviews, field visits	Likely

Annex 2 presents the evaluation timeframe, places visited and knowledgeable people interviewed.

Data collection and analysis instruments

36. Field visits were performed in 3 project countries (Bolivia, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan) out of 5, between January and March 2013, to check on a sample basis the context, impact and cross-checking issues at stake for the sustainability of the project. Bioversity experts, national coordinators, local partners and other stakeholders in the conservation, study and use of CWR were interviewed to cross check the consistency of the documentation and field visits performed to put in perspective the field actions. Quantitative data were deduced from the documentation provided by Bioversity at the beginning of the mission. Knowledgeable people met in the 3 countries provided further technical publications on the output of their field work. The bibliography in Annex 3 lists the documents consulted.

Methods for additional data collection, data check and analysis

⁷ Cfr. the Theory of change analysis of the project, starting at paragraph 69.

37. This report is the result of the analysis of a mix of project and other CWR related documents, field visits and interviews, and cross-checks of these data. This exercise was made of 3 phases:

a. The desk phase

38. The *Desk phase* includes starting with the briefing at FAO Rome with UNEP programme task manager, Bioversity representatives and the collection of project documents. They coordinated the plan of field visits in the 3 selected countries. The evaluator elaborated the initial version of the *Theory of change* (ToC) model (outputs to goal) to be used in assessing the project achievements long term impact and sustainability, completing it after the field visits by adding a table covering the loop existing between outputs to outcomes. At the end of the Desk review he submitted to UNEP Evaluation office the Inception report including the assessment of the project relevance and design, the analysis of the ToC and the evaluation methodology and work tools.

b. The field phase

39. The *Field phase* consisted in the field visits in Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan and Bolivia (approximately one week trip per country) where the evaluator met representatives from the implementing agencies, local partners, environmentalists and other project stakeholders. He visited three conservation sites in Sri Lanka and one in Uzbekistan. Documentation collected during the field visits concerns mostly the output of the project, such as red list catalogues and other scientific and conservation planning publications. The plan of field visits provided information validating that recorded in the project documents and provided further elements conducive to a better perception of the condition, stakeholders' interests and activities results and continuation. It also contributed to enhancing the project accountability and learning both upstream and downstream by allowing partners to provide their insights in the assessment of the project.

c. The synthesis phase

41. The evaluation field visits consisted of brainstorming sessions, interviews, documents analysis, *powerpoint* presentations by partners, cross-check examination of the critical issues of the project implementation including field visits in CWR conservation sites. The field visits to the conservation sites included interviews of reserve officers and field staff while resident population was not addressed due to time constraints. This phase was completed by a brainstorming meeting with Bioversity staff at Rome headquarters (including teleconferencing with the Global project coordinator) undertaken between the Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan visit, to update on the visits schedule, complete and cross check information and discuss key issues concerning the desk study and field visits.

c. The synthesis phase

41. The *Synthesis phase* systematized and analyzed the information collected along the OECD / DAC criteria and synthesizes the conclusions into the answers to the evaluation questions. Financial analysis concerns the assessment of the consistency of actual vs. planned contributions and their repartition among categories of partners' and components. The elaboration of the evaluation report was performed at the evaluator's home and shared with stakeholders through UNEP Evaluation Office.

Data limitations

42. Limited gaps in documentation exist – such as the final expenditures and the country annual reports - but are of little value for the evaluation as budget analysis is performed at the overall level⁸ and specific activities have to be put in the frame of the project as a whole.

⁸ See note 1 in paragraph 23 for the definition of the level of budget analysis,

II. Project Performance and Impact

A. Attainment of objectives and planned results

Annex 5.5 presents the project indicators. They are summarized in Table 1 consisting of selected synthesis indicators answering to the Evaluation questions stated in the ToR.

Relevance

43. The consistency of project objectives and implementation strategies are hereafter analyzed with reference to: *Relevant GEF focal areas, strategic priorities and operational programme*. The project is relevant to GEF-3 Biodiversity strategy, ongoing at the time of the programme identification that earmarked conservation of *Agrobiodiversity* as a *specific outcome*.

44. The new GEF Biodiversity strategy (GEF-5) sets the goal of the conservation and sustainable use of *biodiversity* and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services. The specific objectives to (1) Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems, and to (2) Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors fully encompass the CWR conservation approach of the project. GEF-3 and GEF-5 strategies make no specific provision for CWR, although Outcome 1.2: *Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management* and Outcome 2.1: *Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation* imply the participation of local communities in conservation and the sustainable use of CWR as an input for local *income generation* and source of germplasm for plant breeding.

a. Sub-regional environmental issues and needs

45. Tackling the sub-regional environmental dimension of CWR conservation, study and use was out of the scope of the project objectives and implementation strategies. The choice to work in 5 countries in different continents resulted in the preference for the global and multi-country approach, instead of a regional or sub-regional one.

b. UNEP mandate and policies at the time of design and implementation

46. The project is aligned to UNEP *Medium-term Strategy 2010–2013* whose cross-cutting thematic priorities include (a) climate change, and (b) ecosystem management. The strategy recognized that CWRs conservation is a condition for sustainable agricultural production and a component of the preservation of the whole ecosystem. Bullet 33 of UNEP Strategy states that: *strengthen[ing] the ability of countries to integrate climate change responses into national development processes. As CWRs are a key source of genetic materials for long term adaptive breeding of domesticated species (crops), their continuous adaptation plays a central role in long term climate change response.* Furthermore Bullet 39 states that the UNEP objective is that *countries utilize the ecosystem approach to enhance human well-being, that each country has to actively participate to the conservation of eco-systems on which depend the preservation and use of CWRs.*

c. Sub-regional environmental issues and needs

47. The project tackled key issues for the conservation and exploitation of CWR in countries that are primary (Armenia, Bolivia, Uzbekistan) and secondary (Madagascar, Sri Lanka) centres of crops domestication. In fact, other initiatives for the identification, description, conservation and use of CWR are performed there through a mix of *in situ* and *ex situ* approaches. Usually, the project countries scientific institutions were in charge of small-scale actions or played a subordinate role in the frame of wider initiatives or under the aegis of foreign institutions (cfr. the *Latin America maize programme* [LAMP] brokered by a seed transnational company benefitting from a first-hand access to public research data). The project strengthened the local approach by building local strategies and

resources and by establishing successful multidisciplinary partnerships to address the conservation and study of CWR in partner countries but at a small scale.

Effectiveness

48. The extent to which activities were performed and outputs were achieved are presented by Component and analyzed under the respective Evaluation questions.

Components 1 and 2: Internationally accessible system and National information systems. The project established data processing standards based on species descriptors (e.g., Darwin core species standard and the descriptors of the database fields) and internet connectivity and data transfer protocols (TAPIRLink). Since its launch in 2008 and up to 2010, there were over 13,000 visits to the Portal from users across 164 countries. In Armenia, data available on the national website includes 104 species, 7,438 records and about 6,000 coordinates. In Bolivia, national partner institutions have introduced 3,010 records from 162 species into their institutional databases and made them available online through the National and Global Portals; at the time of the evaluation however, the National portal was not active. In Madagascar, data on 282 CWR species from 1,952 records were transferred from the original database and are linked to the Global Portal. In Sri Lanka, information on 30 priority species has been transferred to temporary electronic databases. 843 described samples of 6 project priory crops from 400 surveyed during 2005-2008 plots and 903 accessions of 8 wild species conserved in ex situ conditions in 7 research institutions are available through the national portal.

49. The common protocols [database fields] adopted in storing CWR data have achieved consistency of information on CWR and facilitated their exchange without jeopardizing national authorities' and local partners' information ownership and control. Commitment to transfer to Bioversity the CWR information generated by local partners was agreed for the duration of the project. The Global portal links are updated but former local partners are not obliged to provide information generated by new studies. Conservation and economically sensitive data such as punctual locations of natural populations of CWR are not released through the Global and national portals to avoid uncontrolled access and exploitation of the growth sites. For such reasons, both national and international CWR websites release a limited set of data on each species / accession. Both the international and national portals are communication gateways linking parties interested in CWR with the organizations that have studied them and know their location. Access to sensitive data has to be negotiated and possible partnerships agreed with local partners in charge of the databases before access to and use of the data is granted.

50. Evaluation question 1. How successful was the project in creating effective national information systems in each of the five implementing countries that bring together dispersed information held by relevant national institutions and agencies? All the project countries established national information systems on CWR. Information sharing was agreed and performed by local partners during the project, and data transferred and stored in the national databases. Access to these databases is limited due to connection problems (e.g., they are discontinuously online in Uzbekistan, Sri Lanka and Madagascar) or discontinuity in use in Bolivia; the Armenian website is the best accessible of them all, although requiring authorization before access to the more sensible sets of information. They are now available through the national websites and referred to through the Global portal. Sensitive data (such as exact location of CWR populations) indeed is not openly accessible; differentiated access limits the threat of uncontrolled removal of the endangered species; it also protects the knowledge developed by each local partner. Systematic survey of traditional uses of the CWR accessions was conducted in Armenia and Bolivia. The resulting information was used in elaborating the Red lists and in developing the CWR management and monitoring plans formulated under the project.

51. The sustainability of the national information management systems depends on national budget allocations. Some countries have already faced budget constraints and their portals are incomplete / intermittent, not updated or down (as in the case of Bolivia, see Annex 5.4). Neither was the project able to enlarge the network of local partners to enhance the number of sources of information and participation of new instances. National policies and contexts influence local partners' willingness and capacity to feed data in the national information system. Controversial issues, such as the ownership of the project generated information have contributed to project implementation delays and are not yet solved. The key reason is the greater consciousness on the CWR value and role in development induced by the project results. Therefore, access to databases is restricted and pooling of field information mostly ended with the project.

52. CWR are at the interface between agro-biodiversity and natural biodiversity. Depending on the context the same species is ascribed to one field or the other; typically as part of biodiversity for conservation and agro-biodiversity for development. CWR are a conceptual hybrid between agro-biodiversity (crops) and biodiversity (natural habitats), tilting on one side or the other depending on the observer's perspective. Funding depends on the prevalence of, the interest in agricultural / local development or environmental conservation. Thus different policies and regimes apply to the same species or accession, and opportunities and restrictions on *information access* follow the same patterns. All project country partners understand the key issue of CWR information management: the access to the data with a practical / economic value has to be agreed with the organization partner in charge of its study or conservation.

53. Interest in CWR information heavily depends on the opportunities and modalities of agro-biodiversity and biodiversity exploitation and study. In some countries, partnerships for expanding and sharing information are ongoing (e.g., Bolivia National herbarium collaboration with *Missouri botanical garden*). Nevertheless, there is a gap in the framing of the networks that act as closed rings instead of expanding to a wider constituency of people interested in CWR. This limited investment in network management to foster a decentralized approach to knowledge generation and sharing has negatively impacted on the accrual of information after the project end.

54. Evaluation question 2. How successful was the project in creating an international information system and management capability that integrated the extensive but fragmented and dispersed data on crop wild relatives held by the international partners, other international sources and key institutions in other countries? The CWR Global portal disseminates the data systematized and supplied by the partner countries and other sources. This open approach is consistent with the different paces and orientation of each country in the management of CWR unexploited potential and newly built local skills to generate and manage information along its context and priorities and keeping. The reliance on open, easily accessible and up-scalable software instead of the dedicated package (GRIS) as originally envisioned in the project design makes easier new contributions to the *Global portal*.

55. The functionality of the global approach to share CWR information was determined by the two mutually reinforcing strategies embedded in the project design:

- Components I and II were *initially* aimed at centralizing information management, and

- Components III and IV were aimed at strengthening local skills in a networking equal partnership perspective.

The project strengthened capacities in the participating countries and created greater consciousness on CWR value there. At the same time it aimed at channel and disseminate CWR information through the Global portal. The establishment of the CWR *Global portal* was delayed and information transfer mechanism reshaped due to the request by national implementing agencies that the national CWR databases be not integrally incorporated in the global system. Standardization was achieved in taxonomy and database *field* categories but not in the adoption of an unique programme software. The international information system didn't supersede the plurality of national approaches to information management. Annex 5.4 presents a synthesis of the Portals features at the time of the *Terminal evaluation* field survey January – March, 2013).

56. Component 3: Capacity building. Skills development has greatly increased the capacity of the national authorities and local partners to study CWR in situ conservation and to generate and use information on these species. The development of the network of CWR partners generated and brought together multidisciplinary knowledge on CWR and their environmental, botanical and geographical characterization. These data have been systematized through the descriptors established by the project and entered in the national management information system. This approach and the capacity building conducted by Bioversity experts and other project professionals has established innovative skills in each participating country by bridging gaps in eco-geographical and botanic studies and conservation methodologies. Over 495 species have been assessed according to IUCN Red Listing criteria: Armenia 100 taxa, Bolivia 152, Madagascar 153, Sri Lanka 27, Uzbekistan 63 species. All five countries have developed management plans for priority taxa: Armenia for Triticum and Aegylops in Erebuni nature reserve, Bolivia for Theobroma in TIPNIS, Madagascar for Dioscorea in Ankaratantsika national park, Sri Lanka for Cinnamonum in Kanneliya forest reserve, Uzbekistan for Amygdalus in Chatkal Biospheric State Reserve, and Juglans, Malus, Pistacia in Ugam-Chatkal State Natural National Park Training has been especially intensive in the field of eco-geographical surveys and geo-referencing (i.e., GIS mapping of CWR distribution), in red listing and in developing in situ conservation and monitoring plans. In fact, participating countries developed internal coordination mechanisms by networking botanists, agronomists, park managers and national planners whose skills were used to perform ad hoc studies, establish priorities and provide information for the elaboration and startup of the CWR national conservation strategies and plans as well as targeted species management and monitoring plans inside

protected areas. The CWR manual and the *e-learning* modules of the Global CWR portal were developed to disseminate such knowledge internationally. The CWR manual is being disseminated as hard copy and PDF files through the CWR Global portal at once.

57. CWR priority *taxa* were selected based on criteria established by each country partner along local partners' consensus and with Bioversity technical assistance. This exercise contributed to establishing mutual understanding among conservation and development partners. The information generated by field exploration has been linked to the analysis of the threats on the survival of these species and resulted in the red listing of the endangered CWR. Furthermore, the project provided expertise to local partners in conducting studies on conservation legislation, benefit sharing and CWR conservation planning with the participation of the resident population. As a whole, these interventions strengthened the project countries' capacities to conduct CWR *in situ* conservation and study.

58. Partner countries participated in a systematization event of the project experience resulting in the publication of the book: *Crop Wild Relatives: A Manual for* in Situ *Conservation*, not forecast in the project design, and further developed in a set of online e-learning modules are now available through the CWR Global portal. Targeted agronomic characterization was performed for a selected set of CWR and collected germplasm used in pre-breeding programs, also using molecular biology and plant tissue culture techniques. Local partners did include some of the CWR species in their current pre-breeding and varieties development programmes (e.g., *Oryza* in Sri Lanka, *Amygdalus* in Uzbekistan, quinoa, potato and *Phaseolus* in Bolivia).

59. Evaluation question 3. How successful was the project in developing capacity in the five participating countries, to apply information management technologies in planning for in situ conservation of crop wild relatives? The project strengthened the professional skills of the participating countries in the *in situ* conservation, study and management of CWR information. National authorities and beneficiaries recognize the positive advantages of multi-disciplinary integration achieved during the project. Presently they are designing and implementing new initiatives, such as the wild rice protected site, the Red listing of Bolivian endangered species, the completion of the conservation programme in Chatkal Biosphere State Reserve, Uzbekistan, as well as the characterization or accessions of *Arachis, Phaseolus*, the classification of new specimens and didactic tours of conservation sites and herbaria.

60. Capacity building was performed vertically to provide a basic set of CWR related knowledge and skills to all participating countries, with theoretical and practical modules delivered to the trainees in each country. The creation of multi-sector teams inside each country has been an effective way of cross-sharing experiences and information. Nevertheless, the project strategy didn't include exchanges of technical experiences across countries (success stories), an excellent way to cross-breed ideas and stimulate change, a gap bridged by the elaboration of the CWR Manual and establishment of IUCN CWR group *In situ* CWR conservation and monitoring plans have promoted the concept of species-specific conservation and repopulation. Park authorities advocate more comprehensive strategies to manage biodiversity on a biocenosis / habitat basis. E.g., in Chatkal and Kanneliya they plan to include CWR targeted actions in reserve-wide conservation plans including didactic and touristic actions.

61. The project supported the design of the national action plans and strategies addressing systematically the hurdles to CWR conservation. These documents highlight the needs and desirable activities without specifying the source of resources. An alternative approach would have included sector studies and cost / benefit analyses to stimulate governments' commitment to invest in CWR related actions. This was precluded by the fact that the project scope didn't contemplate the buildup of local capacities in the field of CWR economic prospecting and project financing.

62. Component 4: Awareness Raising: actions were customized for each country. Each one had a unique starting point in CWR consciousness and the importance of CWR was perceived in different degree, depending on the interaction of conservation and development priorities. Communications campaigns were tailored on such context, involving the scientific community, natural reserves, media, educators, civil society organizations and the general public. Project activity related publications include hundreds of studies, scientific papers, work plans and communication materials, each of them contributing to raising interest and understanding of CWR's role in science, environment conservation and development. Print media and television also ran stories on CWR in Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan and Bolivia. Improvement in the awareness levels of stakeholders with regard to CWR and their importance in ensuring continuous improvement of crops and food security is recorded, as witnessed by the surveys. These actions resulted in a greater consciousness of the role of CWR in sustainable development and their linkage

with conservation of biodiversity, as recorded in the awareness surveys realized during the project. Bolivia, Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan, Armenia and Madagascar have revised legislation and management and action plans that make positive statements about the importance of CWR and their conservation.

63. Evaluation question 4. To what extent did the project increase awareness among decision makers and the general public of the value of crop wild relatives and of the need for their conservation in the partner countries? CWR awareness in the project countries has grown especially in the scientific community, as the project had limited resources to appeal to a broader public. The analysis of the web traffic shows that in 5 months (1 July 2008 - 30 November 2010) the Global portal recorded 17,298 visits, of which 13,369 were unique visitors (respectively, 114 and 88 per day), from 166 countries / territories.

64. The feedback from the CWR Global portal survey among knowledgeable people (80 responses) performed under the project shows above average appraisals for all features, with particularly good reviews on the Resources section. Public-awareness surveys conducted in project countries show satisfactory level of information and knowledge about CWR among the interviewed groups. As a whole this information confirms that CWR is a specialist's topic but provides little evidence about the general public perception.

65. The project targeted an intermediate political level by assisting the 5 beneficiary countries in designing strategies / actions plans and not formulating national policies. Top level national decision makers don't specifically tackle CWR as a priority *per se* but enshrine it in wider policies aiming at environmental conservation, scientific research and agricultural / local development. The limited project commitment to actions tackling the use of CWR did limit the potential appeal of this topic for the general public through success stories showing, for instance, economic benefits for the common citizens.

Efficiency

66. Evaluation question 5. How did the CWR programme harmonize different exigencies and changing needs of local partners and stakeholders? The consultation with local partners held at the time of the identification study ensured the commitment of these to the achievement of the project goals. The project coordination mechanism did address both management and planning issues through the signing of annual agreements and the project countries. This mechanism ensured the alignment of the project strategy with the changes in national policies. The bilateral agreements ensured flexibility to the implementation although project staff left due to contractual discontinuity.

67. International and national coordinators, under the supervision of EAS and International Steering Committee (ISC) strategic guidance and with the advice of the *Technical advisory committee* (TAC) and *Information management committee* (IMC), were in charge of field actions implementation. This multi-level structure was effective in ensuring the identification and resolution of technical issues. The TAC started working one year and a half after the project inception. Thus it couldn't provide any advise on the initial strategic and technical choices of the project. Its contribution was more effective in the second phase of the implementation. The interviewed TAC members recognize that harmonization of the partners' technical and political agendas was an extremely time consuming exercise that was greatly enhanced by the appointment of the second international coordinator. He was very effective in facilitating communication with the project stakeholders. The frequent change of the IO staff in charge of the project created some hurdles in the delivery of their contribution. Confrontation about the access to information was especially critical in view of the growing concern of Governments – but also of some research centers - about ownership of sensitive knowledge on CWR for breeding programmes. The project advocated a decentralized networking approach to collaborations but didn't support national partners in developing their managerial, fund raising and planning capacities that could have facilitated the expansion and strengthened the network and enhanced sustainability.

68. Local partners experienced some difficulties in fulfilling the administrative and financial procedures of the project, due to their different organization history and lack of acquaintance with the project global and multi-country implementation framework. The large scope of the project – tackling different policy frameworks, work tools and techniques, organization needs, crops / species, organizations with different skills and constraints, etc. - and absence of an independent monitoring function resulted in great independence of action at the field level: the project acted as a network of loosely connected initiatives. Independence in field implementation is a positive feature of the project, consistent with its scientific dimension, stimulating the freedom of thought of each local partner. This approach is to

be counterbalanced by a strong and independent monitoring function in order to allow timely coordination and convergence of actions. In fact, National coordinators faced difficulties in enforcing a common strategy (cfr. bullet 59) and track field activities in detail in a reliable way. National coordinators had to limit their control on field activities mostly to the budgetary field. As a result of this approach and other contingencies, several activities were delayed and the project ended about one year later than scheduled.

Cost effectiveness has to be assessed in this frame: the project coordination mechanism absorbed a relevant amount of resources while field activities were quite slim in their financial execution. Notwithstanding, the assessment of cost effectiveness by an arithmetic calculation of money spent can be misleading as the partners had to commit substantial organization and backstopping resources to implement field activities. Establishing a coordinated approach in the field of CWR is an innovative measure that can need the establishment of a burdensome multi-level planning mechanism and continuous trials and errors in the field. This can be perceived in the following facts : (a) redesign of the information system conception, due to different perception on data ownership by National coordinating agencies (b) cumbersome coordination to streamline project activities in very different contexts, and (c) delays in execution due to the need to undertake the annual activities planning to take into account the diversity noted in (b). The project discounted its being innovative in several sectors and at the same time. This was particularly evident in the implementation at once of a centralizing and a decentralizing strategy (cfr. the analysis on this topic in paragraph 55 of the Effectiveness section). These two different perspectives complemented each other, the only setback being the limited concentration of resources on the more potentially fruitful approach strengthening national networks to catalyze resources and foster change in a bottom up perspective.

Review of Outcomes to Impacts

69. The *Theory of Change* (ToC) identifies the sequence of <u>conditions and factors deemed necessary for project</u> <u>outcomes to yield impact</u> and assesses the <u>current status of and future prospects for results</u>. Thus, the analysis of the Project *Impact pathways* is made of two components:

- the revision of the connections between the Outputs and Outcomes (the Project direct impact on the conditions / needs assessed), and

- the study of the project accomplishments (Project Outcomes) relevant to its overall Development objective (the Project expected contribution to Global development).

Although the project did face the immediate challenge of creating capacities in CWR conservation and study in the participating countries, the ToC postulates its assessment vs. *Global food security*, its long term, goal and theoretical justification. Thus, the following analysis is made of two components: Outputs to Outcomes and Outcomes to overall Development goal. Of course, the *Project assessment* (see scoring table) is based on the level of achievement of its *Immediate objective*. The ToC analysis is functional to answer Evaluation question 7, concerning the likeliness of the Project contribution to increasing Food security.

Theory of change

70. The Theory of change is a framework designed to discuss the *programme effectiveness* from output all the way through immediate outcomes and intermediate states to impact and sustainability, in order to make clear its contribution to the *overall development strategy*. The present ToC was elaborated on using the basis of the project Logical framework and presents several topics that have to be clarified (see Annex

5.2) in order to put the progress in the CWR field in a broader development context. In fact the Development objective: *Improved global food security through effective conservation of crop wild relatives (CWR)* is clearly very atop of the project realizations and implies the convergence of many external factors with the Project *Immediate Objective: Enhanced conservation status of selected CWR in Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka, and Uzbekistan.* The linkage with *global food security* is mediated by many development issues, including Human resources, economic trends and political stability. A more realistic formulation of the project objectives should have considered the improvement of agricultural / forestry production sustainability (overall Development goal) as a consequence of the enhancement of CWR conservation and access to basic data thereof (Outcome) in the 5 participating countries.

71. The bridge among these elements is quite wide also in such perspective. In fact, the 4 components Outputs concern some key issues to promote identification, conservation and study of CWR. They are not exhaustive. By themselves they can't achieve the change ensuring sustainability of the whole process from basic research to production of improved crops at the national level either. Activities undertaken to achieve such a goal are relevant,

indeed, but have to be linked to the elements ensuring the sustainability of their results. In such perspective, building managerial skills and targeting CWR at the regional level are outputs that should complement those originally included in the project logical framework.

72. The project design considers a broad set of assumptions and internal drivers and develops converging strategies in order to be an effective input of agricultural production enhancement. Enabling conditions have to consider the multiple fallout of a topic strictly connected to the basic research on environment and agriculture. CWR have an actual value for people living in their areas of origin, a future value for them as well as for farmers all around the globe, and an ecological value for environmental tourists. They are a privileged gate to the exploitation of the genetic resources of nature. They are considered a symbol of local development. And, last but not least, they are not easily circumscribed to a limited set of taxa and locations, i.e. they are pervasive in developing and developed countries.

73. The ToC diagram (see Annex 5.2) considers the *Intermediate states* conductive to the overall Development objective. It avoids diagramming the result-cause feedbacks that would complicate the graphic presentation. They can be inferred from the fact that in a knowledge system, each progress involves a feedback. In the short term, the project output has to strengthen the national networks expanding their area of interest into the traditional knowledge and uses, develop targeted work-lines and achieve a regional dimension. Participatory conservation mechanism have to be enhanced at the local level and linked to local governance and consensus among resident population and other local stakeholders. At the same time, the CWR challenges have to reach a higher level of consensus by analyzing and discussing technical, economic and social bottlenecks to their use and integration of conservation, scientific research and economic activities to enhance policies and develop sustainable value chains through *Public private partnerships* (PPP)⁹

74. In the long term, the direct consequence of an increased interest in CWR and availability of knowledge and tools for their conservation, study and availability for utilization, is that several work lines can be built on their potential to fulfill the needs of different beneficiaries.

- There is a first and immediate approach to manage CWR as source of income for the local population (typical the case of alternative crops and sources of livelihood in rural and forest areas). This use is a source of activities that can result in over-exploitation or sustainable use. CWR traditional uses appeal to parties fostering local development. Resources generation – sustainability – is achievable in a relatively short time span.

- A second set of Intermediate states is the fruit of networking and making available information - that is the capacity to influence policies and strategies favorable to the conservation and use of CWR -. It is conductive to catalyze collaborations and mobilize resources that benefit the whole CWR sector.

- The third path to change is made of the set of activities devoted to the economic exploitation of CWR to enhance the genetic traits of agricultural crops. In the long term it is expected to generate resources as the progress from conservation and basic characterization studies to applied research and development of improved breeds to be tested and put on the market is complex and unpredictable.

75. The external factors conditioning this change depend on local, regional and global trends at once, decisions taken inside the private and public sector, as well as the expansion of the human resources committed to CWR related activities. In fact these three long term strategies are strictly linked to the project outputs and should be complemented by assumptions on the general and specific development drivers. Such exercise exceeds the foreseeable scope of the project field actions and could result in abstract considerations difficult to predict in their interactions with the project achievements.

76. It has to be stressed that the Project has invested on the soft capital in geo-botanic exploration and study, data sharing, planning, capacity building, awareness raising, etc. A different, broader approach has to be considered in order to transfer the results of basic research and conservation to the economic field, as in developing countries lack of infrastructure is a widespread hurdle to development. Infrastructural investment in CWR has to be framed in larger conservation, scientific research and development actions to become sustainable.

⁹ See paragraph 69 for the clarification on the *scope* of the *Theory of change*. The present analysis is aimed at putting the project *Immediate objective* in the perspective of its *Development objective*.

77. The identified *Impact pathways* are not strictly time-bound, as the project by un-tapping information on the CWR has created the conditions for continuous processes and interactions of research, traditional and modern production, institutional and civil society. Feedbacks strengthen this process and create conditions for further interactions and speeding the processes. The potentials of CWR reside equally in this immense genetic pool and the realization of such environmental capital. In the project design the outputs focus on creating the availability and access of the CWR basic research results. The interaction with developers such NGOs assisting local communities in sustainable exploiting natural resources, as well as research centers and seed companies investing in long term breeding, integration of networks and databases with other collaborative approaches have a great potential. Alternative approaches should be considered in order to achieve sustainability. In fact the national networks and databases are linked to regional and global initiatives. The *Global portal* approach is effective in sharing basic information and referring users to their sources. Greater regional and thematic initiatives have the potential for establishing links on a broader set of information by sharing methodological, basic and applied research results and speed up the buildup of value chains narrowing the chasm with improved breeds development and use.

78. Evaluation question 6. To what extent did the project enhance conservation of crop wild relatives in Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan? The Project has created capacities now available in the field of the conservation and study of CWR in the 5 participating countries. Actions enhancing conservation of CWR have been performed at a pilot level, the main output of such actions being the creation and testing of capacities. The successes achieved by the CWR project in the field have been substantial as new approaches and coordination of different competencies have enhanced local awareness on the benefits and potential of the replication of these actions. Indeed, the project didn't build managerial skills and capacities to access funding mechanisms and mobilize resources for scaling up the deployment of conservation and study actions targeted to CWR.

79. Developing capacities to prioritize and earmark resources for replication and scaling up of the conservation initiatives to match national challenges in this field was not the scope of the project. Neither was regional integration in CWR conservation, study and use. In particular the small care assigned to developing CWR utilization capacities has limited the attractiveness for decision makers to expand their commitment in this sector. Thus, CWR remain a component of biodiversity or development strategies without an autonomous appeal to a fully fledged access to funds on the grand scale possible in the participating countries. Resident population was consulted at the time of the identification to the CWR management plans but they were not involved in economic activities enhancing the attractiveness of conservation and multiplication of results by private resources involvement.

80. The prevailing approach in the reserves where CWR actions have been implemented is to ensure conservation of biodiversity and the habitat as a whole and not CWR as a standalone target. Thus capacities built to tackle the conservation needs of specific species of CWR are being used to develop reserve-wide plans. Red listing has highlighted the extensive threats challenging the existence of these species but doesn't ensure their matching by protection corresponding actions. Typically, the local development approach provides extensive opportunities for interesting the local population in their conservation. Their presence on the spot is an asset with long term impact on the integration of conservation and use practices. National policies concern development and biodiversity are needed to exploit such potential.

81. As a whole, challenges in the field exceed the project pilot dimension. It limited its commitment to pilot initiatives on CWR utilization. They imply localized targeting (involvement of the resident population) in a regional perspective (the species differentiation and crops domestication geographical regional dimension) to make the best use of scarce resources. The project limited commitment at this level resulted in the creation of knowledge and appropriation of best practices but lack of strategies to reply results at the regional level.

82. The project has contributed, and is likely in the future to further foster *changes in stakeholders' behavior* with reference to:

i) accessing and using information and data on crop wild relatives held by international partners, other international sources and key institutions in other countries, by systematizing, storing and making available information on CWR and best practices (cfr. the publishing of the CWR in situ conservation manual),

ii) pooling, accessing and using information from national institutions and national agencies given the presence of new national information systems, by integrating CWR information regarding identification, threats, localization and other information useful for further studies and action,

iii) making improved use of the information and applying information management technologies in planning available for supporting the conservation and use of crop wild relatives, although with some loops especially in the capacities to access resources and manage actions at a larger scale and involving private partners,

iv) stimulating the involvement of decision makers and the general public in the conservation of CWR, although with positive results at a relatively low political level with little impact on the mobilization of resources to achieve results matching the dimension of the challenge. Decision makers and the general public expect success stories in the field of CWR use in order to tackle these issues in a greater scale.

83. These results are essential for undertaking further actions leading to (a) the achievement of the improved conservation and use of CWR in the participating countries as well as to (b) local CWR resources use in a larger perspective leading to improved global food security. In fact the knowledge basis of further actions has been established and research and development players have now to be stimulated to make good use of the technology created / transferred up to date to the participating countries. The limited project focus on creating conditions and skills for accessing to new funds such as *Public private partnerships* (PPP) contains the potential and sustainability of the project outputs also in the research field. The establishment of managerial skills and a favorable legal framework are the prerequisite for the involvement of private partners and the effective access to such resources.

B. Sustainability and catalytic role

84. The project strategy has at its core the adaptation and test of innovative approaches in CWR conservation, study and, in a lesser extent, use. Each of its four Components contributes to creating the knowledge basis or to foster the awareness and access to CWR information. The *dissemination of CWR information* is the key tool devised in the project strategy to catalyse the benefits of its results. But the gateway to the sustainability of the project results is strictly linked to the *economic use* of such information that is outside of the project scope.

Sustainability

85. A plurality of conditions and patterns are needed to achieve sustainability, replication and up-scaling of the programme results. CWR exploration and research enables the improvement of agricultural production both in the modern (commercial) as in the traditional (subsistence) agricultural sector as (a) CWR identification and conservation are preliminary steps of long term breeding programmes and (b) CWR conservation is conductive to exploit several wild fruits and other species as sources of income for and by the rural households. This is typically the case of the wild fruits and other *Non timber forestry products* (NTFP) or of the minor cereals and herbaceous species that play a key role in the poor people diet differentiation. The following sections present sustainability under its socio-political, financial, institutional and environmental dimensions.

a. Socio-political sustainability

86. Component 3 (capacity building) and 4 (awareness raising) created skills, strategies and plans enhancing national knowledge and commitment to CWR conservation and use. Component 4 contributed to increasing knowledge on the connection between conservation and development although at a pilot scale. Opinion surveys conducted during the project show a growing awareness on conservation among specialists. Nonetheless the project conservation effort concerned CWR in natural reserves: a higher political commitment is needed to expand such approach outside protected areas as conservation and development interest are competing there more freely. The interface of basic research and conservation with development programmes in exploiting CWR has not been directly tackled by the project. In fact, but for a farmers' association in Uzbekistan and an indigenous people organization in Bolivia, users did not participate in the design or delivery of project activities. The national networks didn't expand to encompass civil society and environmental protection organizations, an ideal vehicle for enhancing the project reach. This approach limited the opportunity to use tangible results to build a wide socio-political consensus on the conservation and research strategies promoted by the project.

b. Financial resources

87. The project concentrated on creating knowledge and skills. Its scope didn't include direct assistance to participating countries in tackling their great hurdles in accessing resources for long term investments in nature conservation and basic research. Its output is not able to produce results generating resources adequate to sustain studies and innovation in the CWR sector. Sub-component 3.5: *Improve Use of CWR in Breeding Programmes* linked CWR exploration to crops improvement, although this commitment to financial sustainability is quite limited in the project economy. Technical skills development and creation of a knowledge basis on CWR is not enough to shorten the gap between donors, leading research centers, seed companies and the project local partners. Many CWR species – typically fruit bearing plants – carry a great potential for local development. Development interests are challenging also the protected areas, as observed during the field visit to Chatkal Biosphere State Reserve (Uzbekistan) where conservation and grazing interests collide, or in the TIPNIS area (Bolivia) where conservation and grazing interests collide, or in the TIPNIS area (Bolivia) where conservation exigencies with the increasing economic needs of the resident population.

c. Institutional framework

88. The project was active in developing technical and planning skills. It also tackled the enhancement of institutional capacities in information management. It assisted local partners in creating and networking their knowledge but didn't directly strengthen the networking mechanisms. Strengthening local partners as organizations and their capacities to compete for research funding was out of the project scope. Commitment of resources to strengthen the local network as such was also sidelined by the project. Typically, research capacities built by the project depend on national policies assigning resources to science, environmental conservation and sustainable development. In short the project didn't tackle the link between socio-economic and institutional sustainability in a way appealing to top decision makers (i.e. people designing national policies assigning resources to development, science, conservation): how to create economic value to sustain CWR conservation and study programmes.

d. Environmental sustainability

89. The project emphasis on the establishment of skills in conservation planning and study of CWR distribution together with the awareness raising actions is expected to stimulate new, pro-active initiatives facilitating the environmental sustainability of the CWR habitats. CWR national actions plans, conservation management and monitoring plans undertaken in all the project countries have environmental sustainability at the core of their strategies, although mobilization of the economic resources needed to achieve such a goal was out of the Project scope. Strategic decisions linking conservation and development are needed to avoid that success stories in the use of CWR ignite overexploitation and environmental degradation of the habitat.

90. Evaluation question 7. Overall, how likely is it that the project will contribute to increasing global food security through effective conservation and increased use of priority crop wild relatives? The project has created knowledge on CWR potential for use in food security actions in 5 countries with high plant species diversity, through project activity related publications and awareness raising actions, as well as at the global level, through the *Global portal*. The outputs of this initiative are mostly useful in view of new and wider conservation and study actions. At the same time there is little evidence of the immediate progress toward the overall development goal fostered by *the project* at this stage. The chain of actions connecting it to the project field actions is quite extensive and the project immediate contribution to the global scenario consists in the dissemination of the project outputs in the field of CWR ecogeographic explorations, red listing and conservation practice (cfr the ToC section above). The project tested the agronomic characterization of the CWR accessions and reproductive biology / techniques for exchanging genes between CWR and the domesticated species. Practical actions benefiting producers of food had a minor role in the project economy were out of the Project scope. The *Global portal* communication actions were the only ones aimed at reaching a wider audience of CWR enable the conservation and use of such genetic materials for improving food security.

91. The exploitation of CWR genetic potential is ahead, although pre-breeding programmes fostered by the project are creating the knowledge and methodologies for progress in this direction. The access to CWR is hampered by lack of information on their agronomic value of CWR and uncontrolled exploitation of their habitats (genetic erosion).

92. Potential uses of CWR concentrate in:

- (i) plant breeding for improved production, quality and resistance to pathogens,
- (ii) better use of minor crops in a local development perspective and wild species, and
- (iii) enhancement of cultural and didactic value of biodiversity hosted in natural reserves and the environment.

The Project introduced some initiatives in the (i) and (iii) fields, whose temporal limits exceeded those of the project itself and are still ongoing. The patterns for the use of CWR have still to be developed or adapted from other experiences in a systematic way. More than best practices the project can present evidence of the enabling conditions / minimum requirements for future action in such field.

93. National decision makers backed the project as biodiversity erosion has become a key topic in the debate on sustainable development. The project results did not achieve political commitment at the highest level (cfr. the priorities of Sri Lanka Ministry of agriculture sidelining CWR and difficulties to achieve funds for implementing the wild rice reserve in Puttalem District, Sri Lanka; the controversies on the Cochabamaba - Trinidad road crossing TIPNIS in Bolivia; the compatibility between conservation and use of CWR conservation sites, typified by the access to Chaktal biosphere reserve by herdsmen as observed by the evaluator in Uzbekistan) In fact success stories from the project are mostly of interest for the scientific community and conservation professionals. They have little appeal for the public and politicians looking for development and economic achievements. A major problem in the utilization of CWR is the long chain of intermediate states linking basic research and conservation to the exploitation of their genetic potential for crops improvement (development). The Project didn't explore the economics of their use. In fact, in the field (ii) [cfr. bullet 92] this path is decidedly shorter and could result in fast impact actions at the local level and contribute to raise public awareness and political commitment. Nevertheless, private partners' participation was extensively tested in Bolivia and with good results: private plant breeding partners are using the output of CWR exploration in pre-breeding and breeding programmes. This result was not replicated in the other project countries as private entities are marginal players of basic agronomic research there while public institutions concentrate their limited resources on other priority topics.

94. Conditions fostering investments and capacities to access funds are critical to build value chains for the sustainable use of CWR. No action was included in the project for tackling such problems, thus missing a critical step in achieving sustainability. Indeed the establishment of national networks provided the opportunities for the development of basic managerial skills in running cooperative projects by partners endowed with different organization histories and capacities. Building *Public private partnerships* oriented to CWR use is a more complex task. It involves not only disbursements but also funds sourcing and assumption of enterprise risks. Furthermore, the use of CWR requires policies ensuring continuity of commitment by governments and the establishment / enforcement of regulatory conditions protecting intellectual rights on discoveries. In this field, each project country is positioned in a different way, with or without restrictions and guaranties appealing to investors. The limited Project experience in this field, that is outside its scope, is not enough to systematize a comprehensive approach to such issues.

95. Technological gaps in the exploitation of CWR for breeding programmes include the development of interspecies breeding techniques to overcome hybridization barriers (e.g., gametophytic incompatibility). The project didn't explore the existence of enabling conditions existing in the participating countries and cost / benefit ratio for new investments. It created the initial knowledge, awareness and best practices in conservation and study of CWR but in didn't extensively tackle the link between research and development in the participating countries. The *Global portal* by expanding such punctual achievements to the wider global community is expected to play a catalytic role in the field.

Catalytic role

96. The catalytic role of GEF-funded interventions is embodied in their approach supporting the creation of an enabling environment and of investing in pilot activities which are innovative and showing how new approaches can

work. UNEP and the GEF also aim to support activities that upscale new approaches to a national, regional or global level, with a view to achieve sustainable global environmental benefits. The Project commitment to the economic exploitation of CWR and sourcing of economic resources to achieve sustainability is quite limited. The exploration of mechanisms to bridge the project CWR potentials with the economic stakeholders' interests has not been included in its design. Champions providing incentives for policy changes were confined to the scientific field (e.g., the identification of new species of CWR and their localization). As such they are not enough to capture public imagination and mobilize the socio-economic resources needed to achieve policy changes of first magnitude. Interest in the CWR potential has triggered the interest of the project countries Ministries of environment in controlling the flow of information on these species, thus limiting their access through the *Global portal*.

a. Catalytic financing

97. New actions concerning CWR are going on in the participating countries as a fall out of the project. A regional project involving Uzbekistan and the other 4 Central Asia countries (in situ conservation of agro-biodiversity with GEF/UNEP funding) and another one involving 4 Andean countries including Bolivia (Amazon biodiversity information management with CAN funding) are making use of the results of the CWR project. An extensive *Red list* of the Andean region of Bolivia has been published in 2013, using the project methodology; an analogous work is underway for the Bolivian Amazon lowlands. The wild *Oryza* reserve establishment in Sri Lanka is also built on the positive outcome of the CWR project.

b. Catalyzed behavioral changes

98. Scientific methodologies transferred to the 5 participating countries have been used by the local partners with effective results, also after the project end, as shown by recent publications on the identification and characterization of new CWR species and red lists publishing. New explorations and breeding programmes are ongoing. The national CWR action plans, although designed without a proper financial support, exist as lists of potential actions. Conservation management and monitoring plans are still ongoing although with limited funding. In Northwest Sri Lanka a Wild rice conservation area has been established. The *Global portal* is active thanks to the commitment of Bioversity own resources. Most national information systems are still active, although often with a limited functionality and, of course perform a communication role more than being the gateways to the national CWR datasets. Annex 5.4 presents their functionality at the time of the evaluation field visits.

c. Institutional changes

99. National networks are still active. The original information-sharing agreements are still effective. Since they are not cogent, data are exchanged on a voluntary basis. Indeed inter-institutional collaborations are managed on a bilateral basis more as the network promoted by the project. In fact the project approach didn't directly tackle *policy decisions* and local partners have to rely on their ordinary resources to collaborate. It included no action intended to strengthen the local partners and the national networks as such. In fact these have performed as rings of independent initiatives and facilitated information sharing but they have not built common approaches to bid for funds and catalyze larger partnerships.

Replication

100. Project's contribution to catalyze behavioural changes in terms of use and application by the relevant stakeholders of:

a. Show-casing of technologies and approaches by the demonstration projects

The 4 Project components are made of a set of design, adaptation and use of innovative approaches to CWR study, conservation and, in a lesser degree, use. The project included capacity building (3.2 *Plan and undertake training of*

target groups) as well as targeted planning and execution activities (Components 3 capacity building and 4 awareness raising), thus addressing in a comprehensive way the different phases of the behavioural change process. Field studies are expected to become the source of knowledge and expertise to show the potentials for CWR research and development. Cross-sharing information events such as the February 2008 Conservation workshop and the dissemination of project generated data through the *Global portal* and national websites created the basis for a larger access to CWR information. In fact, by assembling a network of local partners, a differentiated set of capacities has been created that supports the incremental build up of skills and new approaches to these topics. The number of people and organizations committed to CWR is anyway limited. In fact the programme design considered mostly the conservation component, with emphasis on raising the interest and participation of conservation sites residents through pilot actions plans.

b. Development of strategic programmes and plans

101. Component 3 (capacity building) and 4 (awareness raising) built planning capacities and tested them in exemplary situations (case studies). In fact this approach was promoted from the institutional (3.3 *Develop policy framework*, 3.3.3 *Develop or revise National Action Plans for CWR conservation*) to the field level (3.4.1.3 *Develop management plans of CWR conservation actions*), 4.2 *As indicated in 3.4.1, prepare and initiate implementation of management plans for CWR populations in at least 5 protected areas* along with the creation of some basic tools to achieve an even approach (3.3.1.2 *Develop and publish CWR conservation guidelines in national languages*) and cross cutting actions to get maximum impact (4.2 *Implement national and international public awareness strategies*). As a result, national actions plans were designed. The lack of sector studies and cost / benefit analysis limit the usefulness and replication / scaling up of such initiatives.

c. Establishment of assessment, monitoring and management systems at the national and sub-regional level

102. The programme commitment to building monitoring systems was limited to the field level, where monitoring of target protected areas hosting CWR were executed: 3.4.4 *Develop and test monitoring procedures in protected areas (for 3-5 taxa per country)*. It enhanced the monitoring and managerial skills of the national coordinating agencies through the managerial experience acquired in running the networks of project partners. The above mentioned achievements (i.e., at the national scale) are a pre-requisite for the integration of activities and build-up of assessment, monitoring, and management systems at the regional and sub-regional level.

C. Processes affecting attainment of project results

Preparation and Readiness

103. Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? CWR objectives and components are clearly stated in the project document and logical framework. They converge into pushing CWR topics in the foreground of conservation and research strategies of the participating countries. CWR *in situ* conservation and monitoring activities were performed as a pilot. A much larger deployment of resources would have been needed to achieve the project output *nation-wide* in the 5 participating countries. Of course, the knowledge oriented Project strategy and scope didn't include the build up of skills to tackle the economic constraints to the use of CWR, typically through PPP. Impact of the tsunami in Sri Lanka in 2005 and cyclones in Madagascar in 2007 and change of Governments, political unrest at the beginning of 2009 and 2010 in Madagascar and late disbursement of funds also contributed to delay in implementation. Delays related to political instability (e.g., in Madagascar) had a cross-components impact in that country only. In the long term perspective of the CRW basic research and conservation this was not a major hurdle.

104. Were the capacities of executing agencies properly considered when the project was designed? The project effectively mobilised the capacities of over 40 organizations: the executing agency – *Bioversity international* -, international organizations, the executing agencies – sector ministries - and local partners in 5 countries. Strategic

decisions taken at the central level were based on an extensive consultation process conducted through the already mentioned project coordination bodies. The managerial role of local partners (organizations coordinated by the national Executing agency and funded by the project in each country) was limited to the specific tasks entrusted to them. This shared approach streamlined activities in the field quite effectively, avoiding conflict of competencies among partners. It gave flexibility to the implementation and didn't hamper scientific freedom in conducting CRW research.

105. Was the project document clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation? The project document is realistic, although incomplete, especially in the area of sustainability. Its strategy and scope oriented to create knowledge didn't tackle the conditions enabling the use of such capacities and information and ensuring economic feedback inside each country that give sustainability to the build up of knowledge and skills. Mobilized resources were up to the expected outcomes, but in the areas in which international partners were lagging behind their initial commitments. The initial plan to establish information management systems adopting a shared and fully compatible software didn't reflect the internal drivers of each country and partner needs. Each organization has to fulfil specific requirements in establishing and managing its knowledge base / datasets, with its own pace in customizing and updating software. In such context, no solution matching all needs was realistic.

106. Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation? The project's wide scope and complex coordination did result in identifying only part of the implementation hurdles. In fact, it used an adaptive management strategy in order to match such challenge. On-going negotiations and arrangements were needed to solve unexpected issues, as those arising from the approaches opposing Components 1-2 to Components 3-4 orientation and results. The Project identification combined Bioversity experience in the participating countries and output of the sector technical reviews conducted in the 5 partner countries. The project implementation required case by case and year by year negotiation with national authorities and local partners. The International / National *Steering, Information management*, and *Technical advisory committees* harmonized the implementation of field actions across countries and the independent management of technical and administrative issues. Delay incurred in framing the data sharing agreement did reflect the challenge of aligning project actions to national policies: for example, the agreement of Bolivia on the proposed exchange of data was delayed by compliance to national policies on biodiversity. At last, each partner retained control on the evolution of its own information system architecture by adopting the same descriptors and data transfer protocols to share information only.

107. Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities) and enabling legislation assured? Project countries provided their best resources in the field of conservation and study of biodiversity. A stronger involvement of economic partners interested in the exploitation of CWR was out of the project scope, although it is a pre-requisite to enhance the sustainability of the results. In fact the Project Logical framework assumptions that *Governments' commitment to CWR conservation [be] maintained* and that *Continued participation and motivation of stakeholders [be assured]* didn't consider the fact that a reason for this intervention is the lack of local resources and that stakeholders have to be stimulated, typically through PPP achieving economic results. The legal framework in the partner countries is uneven. In fact, Bolivia having a greater experience in agro-biodiversity also had a more restrictive legal approach on the access to conservation and economically sensitive information on CWR. As the project didn't tackle directly policies, it had little leverage to stimulate the harmonization of the legal framework across countries.

108. Were adequate project management arrangements in place? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? The project adopted a multilevel decision making approach from activity to country to international coordination. This funnel structure created many opportunities for fine tuning, aligning activities and enhancing their integration. It was also intended to stimulate lessons learnt sharing and to maximize the usefulness of champions. In fact its major setback is that its scope was not extensive enough to link the productive sector to the conservation and research activities in a systematic, sustainable business oriented way.

109. *Implementation approach*. The project implementation approach was based on a multipliers coordination structure supervising the delivery of technical advice at the national and field actions level. Planning was discussed and agreed with the participating countries through annual agreements. Although burdensome, this approach enabled tackling organization problems at their root.

The Project constituted a single specific task within Bioversity's project *Conservation Strategies and Technologies*. A full time *Project coordinator* and *Programme assistant* oversaw the day-to-day management of the Project under the direct supervision of Bioversity *Principal scientist*. For instance, the International *Steering committee* oversaw the implementation. The Project coordination mechanism didn't contemplate a Monitoring systems independent from activities execution. This arrangement resulted in a common approach to implementation and assessment of activities with negative effects on capitalising lessons learnt and decision making, e.g., by delaying the reshaping of the information management systems architecture to match partner countries exigencies. The late appointment of TAC members resulted in a substantial delay before its members be able to influence technical and operational decisions. The new international coordinator also improved the communication with stakeholders through a more sensitive, bottom up approach in considering their exigencies and proposals. These changes positively impacted on the project implementation as advise to local partners become more customized to their needs and capacities.

110. Were lessons learned and recommendations from Steering Committee meetings adequately integrated in the project approach? The Steering committee meetings did effectively tackle constraints such as those mentioned above. Activities were repeatedly adjusted with local partners enjoying substantial managerial and technical independence of judgment in field implementation.

111. What factors influenced the quality-at-entry of the project design, choice of partners, allocation of financial resources etc.? An extensive process of consultation and inputs gathering was at the basis of the project design. This exploited Bioversity past experience in the participating countries and local institutions knowledge and inputs. The Logical framework design has several shortages such as the very broad definition of the Assumptions (it is difficult to establish direct links between assumptions such as *The different relevant actors are willing to cooperate* and *Communities are interested in benefit sharing procedures* and the specific project activities) and the not always identified numeric targets of the indicators (see next section). Budget planning and execution followed UNEP rules. Resources were allocated by Component, while their destination to fund specific activities depended on later decisions taken during the implementation phase – typically the annual agreements between Bioversity and the partner countries governments.

Stakeholder involvement

112. The project framed new collaborations between scientific and natural conservation bodies with different background, with a decided prevalence of public institutions, under the leadership and in collaboration with their respective environmental authorities. Participation by civil society and private parties was limited to a small number of the project partners. In fact, the Components 1, 2 and 3 were substantially enhancing the skills of the project partners and supporting their activities while Component 4 adopted a broader reach in raising awareness among opinion makers and the general public. The project structured approach to decision making and reliance on the co-financing mechanism made possible the involvement of all partners in creating a consensus on planned activities. A key step in this achievement was the consensual identification of the project activities. On the other hand the prevalence of studies and protected areas based field activities restricted the participation of local population and civil society representative in the project consensus process. Thus, the project output is strongly aligned on the priorities of the scientific community and environmental institutions with smaller contributions by the representatives of the civil society and private sector at large.

Country ownership/ driven-ness

113. Local partners' interest in the project output increased with the buildup of new knowledge and skills on CWR. A strong feeling of ownership of the achievements is evident in the interest to control CWR information at the individual partner and national level. Notwithstanding the involvement of other stakeholders was limited (see the previous paragraph) and consensus on CWR didn't reach the higher political level. The project streamlined its field actions mostly in the more favorable environment – learned people responsive to environmental messages. The information management approach of the project was effective as far as resources allowed. Continuation of activities in the CWR sector and their expansion is still weak and dependent on a limited capacity of lobbying for funding. Framing of the CWR issues in the national strategies is suffering the same problems of access to financing sources.
Build up of organizational and marketing skills contributing to sustainability and enhancement of driven-ness was not tackled systematically by the project. Local partners fulfilled their financial obligations thus confirming that they were a driving force of the project and commitment to ownership of the results.

UNEP supervision and backstopping

114. UNEP played a supervisory role in the project overall management and implementation. It ensured that project partners implemented activities along their own priorities and take corrective actions along the Midterm review recommendations. It assisted to coordination meetings through the Task manager, ensured advise to comply with GEF procedures and facilitated the adoption of the Midterm review recommendations. Thus, UNEP was indispensable to the establishment of an implementation framework allowing that the project experiment new ways of CWR conservation and research: local institutions exercised their freedom of scientific and technical judgment in studying and innovating. In fact the internal M&E system approach highlighted in the following section did ensure amplitude of choice in technical decisions by local partners. This approach was in line with the scientific and innovative approach of the project stimulating creativity and customization in the use of the technology transferred by local partners. Specifically UNEP played a critical role in streamlining the project through the mid-term evaluation mission, whose recommendations were effective in reshaping the project information management system approach.

Annex 5.1 presents the Assessment of the overall quality of the project design.

Monitoring and Evaluation

a. M&E design

115 According to the Project document, monitoring of the progress in executing the components and activities is undertaken in accordance with UNEP's internal guidelines for project *Monitoring and evaluation* (M&E). The M&E strategy includes a midterm assessment and end of project assessment undertaken by external review teams. Ongoing evaluation determines the quality of the work undertaken and ensures that it meets the project objectives. The project document is quite extensive on reporting but is sketchy in defining the M&E strategy, procedures, planning and assignment of tasks. UNEP Division of GEF Coordination was in charge of the evaluations. Changes in UNEP M&E policies happened during the Project execution¹⁰ increased the Evaluation Office role in managing the evaluations with greater emphasis on their autonomous execution.

i) Quality of the project logframe

116. The Project Logical framework is consistent with the strategy, building capacities in the countries and channelling information to the centre for dissemination at the global level. Its overall Development goal is very ambitious: increase global food security as the project is aimed at making available data generated on CWR to those interested in global food security. Assumptions concerning the commitment of participating countries are a bit optimistic, as maintenance of the information systems, management plans implementation, benefit sharing and policy development are among the challenges the programme itself is trying to overcome. They have little relevance in connecting the *Immediate objective* with the *Development* one. Furthermore, the expectation of mainstreaming project experience and support implementation of best practices to the benefit of other countries should be based on global awareness campaigns outside the scope of the project. In short, dissemination of information depends on the Bioversity long term commitment more than on the locally enhanced capacities.

¹⁰ Cfr. UNEP Evaluation manual released in 2008 and the policy of 2009

ii) SMART-ness of indicators

117. Output indicators are often complexly worded. They were developed as per acceptable standards in 2000 - 2002 at the time of the Project design. Some lack precise numerical targets. As milestones of the programme progress they are likely to present a concise snapshot of the results (benefits) achieved by the project. In fact, many indicators correspond to the delivery of project activities instead of their effects (outputs): e.g., those describing the conservation and monitoring plans (activities) instead of quantifying their output (e.g., intensity and geographical scale of the enhanced CWR conservation in terms of specific *taxa*). Emphasis on activities delivery results in little interest in indicators based on external sources of data (i.e., independent from the project activities reporting system).

iii) Adequacy of baseline information

118. The identification studies are adequate as far as the project goal is limited to create and share knowledge on CWR. A survey of national and local NGOs and institutions skills has been performed during the project identification (Annex 10E Project *Co-ordination and Implementation Arrangements at National Levels*). The *Status and Trends in CWR Conservation and Country Priorities for CWR Conservation* survey provides a comprehensive picture of strengths and weaknesses in each country. Bioversity as other IO experience in these countries highlighted the gaps in national approaches to CWR - lack of public support and resources as well as of expertise at the conservation-development interface -. Notwithstanding, the lack of a preliminary analysis on CWR conservation economics is a typical shortage in the deployment of a result oriented M&E strategy.

iv) Arrangements for monitoring

119. The information collected at the time of the identification is summarized in the reports listed in Project document Annex 9 *Monitoring* (operations) and 10E1 (finance), in line with UNEP requirements at that time. The M&E approach was axed on reporting by executing agencies on their own actions without collecting external evidence on the impact of project results. These monitoring arrangements didn't ensure objective evidence of the project progress and independent analysis of its impact, as they mostly provided the reports formats and timing. Data collection and analysis on external topics relevant to the project implementation – e.g., a baseline of project indicators – was not performed, except for the identification studies on national biodiversity research systems – clearly outdated at the time of the project implementation –. Thus, internal reporting on the project execution - but in the notable case of the external Midterm review - provided decision makers information not consistently different from that they had in their hands at the time of the implementation of their own decisions.

v) Arrangements for evaluation

120. During project implementation, UNEP Task manager was also in charge of the organization of the Midterm review. Procedures for M&E have not been elaborated further than the description of data collection (indicators) in the Logframe and annexing indicators in the annexes of the project reports. More recently, UNEP *Evaluation office* started to perform evaluations independently from the project supervision, thus increasing the reliability of evaluation findings¹¹.

b. Budgeting and funding for M&E activities

121. Coherently with the above considerations, the project budget doesn't have a specific allocation for M&E. They are included in the correspondent management and coordination budget lines and involve the same human resources. This also limits the independence and reliability of the collected information.

¹¹ Cfr. UNEP Evaluation manual released in 2008 and the policy of 2009.

c. M&E plan implementation

122. Implementation of M&E was performed along the above mentioned tenets. The *Midterm review* was performed at the end of 2007 together with an *Evaluation of Technical Aspects of the Project*; this exercise confirmed the opportunity to reshape the International information management system by shifting from the GRIS to the simpler and more flexible *Global portal* approach. Such recommendations were successfully implemented.

D. Complementarity with UNEP programmes and strategies

123. The project is embedded in the strategy and actions of the *Biodiversity Conservation and Availability* programme, fully in line with UNEP objective *that natural resources are produced, processed and consumed in a more environmentally sustainable way* of UNEP *Medium term strategy* $2010 - 2013^{12}$. It's the continuation of previous CWR experiences in the participating countries and corresponds to the priorities of UNEP biodiversity strategy. It fosters the sustainable evolution of crops along the Cross-cutting priority of *Ecosystem management*, also as a tool to mitigate *Climate change* impact on agricultural production.

Linkage to UNEP's Expected Accomplishments and POW 2010-2011

124. UNEP *Medium Term Strategy* (MTS) specifies desired results (Expected Accomplishments) in 6 thematic focal areas. The project contributes to UNEP's expected *Ecosystem management accomplishment* (a) *That countries and regions increasingly integrate an ecosystem management approach into development and planning processes*, by building knowledge and skills on conservation of CWR, a component of the ecosystem often under threat. The conservation actions implemented by the project anyway lack components essential to achieve sustainability such as preliminary economic studies. Systematization of lessons learnt through the CWR conservation manual is expected to stimulate comprehensive approaches and scaling up of activities at the global level.

Alignment with the Bali Strategic Plan (BSP)

125. The project strengthens technology support and capacity-building (BSP bullet 5a) in developing countries and countries with economies in transition along UNEP BSP strategy. It also matches BSP priorities by promoting national ownership (5b), bottom up needs assessment (5a) and integration with other initiatives (5d). In fact the plan advocates for *institutional capacity-building, including through the exchange of expertise, experiences* (BSP bullet 21). The most important achievement of the project in this field has been the joint elaboration of the *CWR* in situ *conservation manual*. The project includes several BSP cross-cutting issues (iii) civil society and private sector cooperation, (v) development plans, (vii) development of capacity, (viii) data collection, (ix) access to information, (x) access to technology, (xi) awareness raising; and thematic areas (i) biodiversity, (ii) climate change, (xvi) forests, (xix) food security.

Gender

126. The project didn't adopt a specific gender equality perspective, although some activities in the field have been leveraging the contribution of women to conservation, study and use of CWR (cfr. the CWR national action plans and CWR conservation plans). Women were a consistent share of the technical staff mobilized by the executing agencies. Local partners and beneficiaries' capacity building actions have involved both men and women. No specific action has been considered to tackle possible gender inequalities, specific vulnerabilities of women and children, or the role of women in mitigating environmental changes. These goals could have been more prominent in the project strategy if it had been more CWR use oriented (e.g., women's role in the non timber forestry products

¹² Paragraph 48: Resource efficiency – sustainable consumption and production: *The UNEP objective is that natural resources are produced, processed and consumed in a more environmentally sustainable way.*

economy). Conservation in natural reserves and study don't require substantial participation of communities and provide little room for building on the role of women living there.

127. Likeliness of lasting differential impacts on gender equality and the relationship between women and the environment. The project design didn't include specific provision to achieve this goal. For instance actions directed to this goal such as awareness raising activities dealt with the general public without distinction of sex.

128. To what extent do unresolved gender inequalities affect sustainability of project benefits? As already mentioned, the project design didn't include specific provision to achieve this goal.

South-South cooperation

129. This project was showcase in the Global South-South Cooperation portal. The implementation of project activities created important synergies and facilitated sharing and learning through South-South and North-South exchanges. The project was able to engage more than 60 national and international agencies essential to the complex and multidisciplinary nature of CWR in situ conservation. Planning, implementation, and monitoring were carried out through a series of local and national committees, coordinated and guided by Bioversity through the ISC made up of representatives from all participant countries and international organizations. A 3-person TAC provided overall technical direction. The agencies and organisations essential to this process traditionally had little history of working together; the project enabled them to do so, with great effectiveness, enabling partners to overcome many of the national political, administrative, and infrastructural obstacles that had so far limited efforts. Moreover, it provided an interdisciplinary and apolitical platform for information gathering and sharing and for the development of national and international information resources which are now available for other countries to employ. Furthermore, by including relevant international partners in the fields of legal and policy review and analysis, information management, and conservation actions, national partners were linked to the best and most up-to-date science in these fields. Bioversity conception of development and global mandate on biodiversity ensures that the lessons learnt in the project be accessible to users all across the world and that the requirements of the CWR origin country to get credit for its inputs be fulfilled. The 5 participating countries mobilized their resources in designing activities identified along national priorities, with no cross-border links among them at the level of project coordination. The participation of partners in joint training and knowledge sharing events and communication actions, disseminated project benefits among countries. The executing agency and the other international organizations provided common services, exchanged information. For instance conservation plans and building of local skills were strictly targeted to local needs identified inside each country also when applying the shared knowledge and skills, due to the fact that what work in a given country may not work in another country with different cultural backgrounds and policies.

III. Conclusions and lessons learnt

A. Conclusions

1. Integration of Crops wild relatives (CWR) conservation, study and use. CWR conservation, monitoring and use activities were undertaken at a pilot scale in the project countries with positive results. These activities led to the enhancement of the local professional skills in the identification, description and botanical categorization of CWRs as well as on identification of threats, red listing and in situ conservation; and the establishment of a significant global body of knowledge on CWR conservation which did not exist at project outset. Partner countries realized the potential and enhanced their capacities of *in situ* conservation of CWR in protected areas although their capacity to scale up depend on the buildup of economic management / PPP development skills outside the scope of the project. The project was very active in CWR exploration and research. In situ conservation and use received comparatively attention. Notwithstanding the project did develop multidisciplinary approaches promoting the integration of CWR in development strategies, environmental tourism and agricultural research. Enhancement of local capacities to access resources and involve private partners in the conservation and use of CWR in a development perspective were undertaken on a minor scale. This approach limits the sustainability of the results achieved in the field, the

adoption of the network approach to address CWR issues in an integrated way (conservation - study - use) and the achievement of a critical mass matching the dimension of this challenge at the national, regional and global level.

2. *CWR geographical dimension*. The project countries are located in regions of intensive species differentiation and crops domestication. Their rich agro-biodiversity and CWR endowment can greatly contribute to renewing and enlarging of the genetic basis for crops improvement not only locally but also at the global level. Information generated is already being used in pre-breeding and breeding programmes by some local partners. *Centers of diversification and domestication of plants* have an environmental regional dimension overcoming country borders. Shared ecological factors and habitats create the conditions for pooling resources and avoiding overlapping in strategies and activities tackling the access to natural resources. The project adopted a Global multi-country approach, in alternative to a regional one consistent with the geographical dimension of the centers of crops domestication. Local networks aggregation by shared habitats realizes scale economy in the use of resources, exploitation of outputs and lessons learnt. In fact the same approach is preferred by donors and cooperation mechanisms in adopting systematic approaches to development through regional integration.

3. *CWR knowledge and use*. The project developed an hard copy CWR Manual and e-learning modules, through the collaboration of its partners, available in English, French and Spanish as well as in the Russian (PDF format) by the end of the year. This information constitutes a valuable asset for linking conservation, study and use of CWR.

4. Project strategy. The project adopted a two-fold strategy, by (a) building local skills and awareness and networking them to address CWR challenges, and (b) fostering the concentration of information at the national and global level. Ownership of CWR information was debated during the project implementation and at the time of the midterm review aligned to the different national biodiversity policies. Thus, the devolution of the control of information at the global level was restrained by the prevalence of an approach privileging the harmonized but independent management of information in each country. The national and international portals have assumed the shape of communication tools. Access to the sensible information is achieved by direct agreements with local partners and national coordinators. These two different perspectives reinforced each other, the only setback being the limited concentration of resources on the more potentially fruitful approach: strengthening local networks to catalyze resources and foster change in a bottom up perspective. This conflict was most evident in Bolivia, a country with a strong tradition of enforcing sovereignty on natural resources and eager to manifest its independence in releasing and using data on CWRs.

5. Project coordination. The project identification and implementation was conducted by involving local partners in need assessments and by establishing a multilevel participatory coordination mechanism, integrating in a structured and coordinated way managerial exigencies and technical issues. At the same time project planning through annual agreements with national authorities built the consensus at the political level on project planning. Nevertheless, this advantage was associated to discontinuity of action, delays in strategic decision making and funds transfer and dispersion of human resources. Flexibility was especially useful in view of the growing consciousness on CWR value and adaptive management of the Project to take into consideration the local context and political consensus on biodiversity related issues. The late appointment of the TAG members did postpone decisions on some strategic and implementation choices. Changes in international organizations (IO) staff in charge of the project did limit the mutual understanding. In fact most international partners' contribution was short of expectations. With the new international coordinator the project did improve communication with local partners and adopted a more effective bottom up approach to technical choices in field activities implementation. Partners were able to express their viewpoint and the project aligned its evolution to fulfill expectations coming from the field. The Executing agency was especially effective in its role of broker and coordinator of technology transfer and as a communication channel. It was less effective when it tried to coordinate information management and promote specific solutions overcoming the peculiarities of each country approach to conservation and development. In fact, it has to adopt a minimum commitment position as overcoming the hurdles faced at the interface of conservation and development (bridging opposing interests on biodiversity) requires high level political decisions.

6. Skills development and networking. The project positively enhanced, networked and tested local collaborations in conservation and study of CWR. It filled knowledge and skills loops in professional and local organizations and assisted them in addressing such shortages in a multidisciplinary way. Key achievements include the collaboration between partners from different technical sectors (government, botany, agriculture, civil society) and in a minor extent between public and private research organizations. Successful initiatives include the creation of local

capacities for geo-botanical exploration, establishing threats and dissemination of endangered species, plant phylogeny and, inter-species crossing trials and reproductive biology, etc.). The benefits of project outputs are ongoing. Lessons learnt triggered new studies on CWR and agro-biodiversity that have become part of the national conservation and research strategy for food security in partner countries.

7. Consciousness. Awareness raising activities were effective in catalyzing consciousness on the role and value of CWR among knowledgeable people and selected opinion and decision makers. The degree of awareness depends on the initial ecological consciousness of the concerned sector of the population, i.e. is quite variable between countries. Customized awareness raising toolkits were applied to match such diversity of conditions. Understanding of the links between CWR conservation and food security sustainability has grown in the public, for example through the emphasis put on communication on CWR in natural reserves visited by the public in Sri Lanka. The Project disseminated innovative messages but lacked Success stories appealing to the general population and generating behavioural change. Success stories concern conservation and research actions with little appeal on the public and top level decision makers looking at environment as a booster of production and livelihoods.

8. Information management. The project established national CWR information management systems by integrating data on CWR generated by the local partners. Common features include the harmonization of descriptors and data transfer protocols, the use of websites to communicate basic information extracted from the national databases and disseminated through the *National* and *Global portal* on CWR managed by Bioversity. The Project promoted an innovative geo-botanic information systematization through *Darwin core* standards and CWR descriptors that is now used for larger studies biodiversity in the participating countries. Critical data on the localization of CWR populations were protected by adopting sector distribution instead of punctual identification in the released maps.

9. Overall assessment. The project stimulated consciousness on CWR value among scientists and selected decision makers in the participating countries. It created knowledge and skills and pattern of collaboration. It didn't address the policy, managerial and resources mobilization eliminating bottlenecks to CWR conservation, study and use. The Project supported CWR mainstreaming into National action plans. Although, this new emphasis on policy and regulatory frameworks was not matched by actions stimulating the mobilization of resources to become effective. This should be built on economic considerations too and the clarification of a high level political consensus on conservation and development. Thanks to the development of local skills, the project local partners started to play a more active role in international scientific initiatives linking research, conservation and development.

Criterion	Summary Assessment	Rating
A. Attainment of project objectives and results	The project did achieve the expected results and contributed to enhancing knowledge and skills on CWR in the participating countries, effectively disseminating the project generated information at the global level	HS
1. Effectiveness	The project performed the planned tasks achieving the expected Outputs, although with some delays in the execution the resulted in a no cost extension. The databases and websites established under the project have different consistency and their potential is partly exploited	HS
2. Relevance	The project was in line with GEF and UNEP priorities at the time of the identification. Activities were based on assessments of countries and local partners' needs. This comprehensive approach ensured upstream and downstream accountability in project design at once.	HS
3. Efficiency	The multi-level coordination mechanism and independent targeting of technical issues ensured that decisions were taken at the proper level. Delays were due to the complexity of the logframe and administrative hurdles in funds disbursements	S
B. Sustainability of project outcomes	The project has created conditions for further actions in the field of CWR, although not adequately addressing the economic dimension of sustainability of Outcomes. E.g., while the Peradeniya and Kaneliya forest CWR sites are attracting students and the general public. Development initiatives have a greater standing than CWR conservation in areas such as the TIPNIS in Bolivia; the enforcement of CWR protected areas from herdsmen is still weak in Uzbekistan, lacking ad hoc need assessments.	L

Table. Overall ratings of the project

Criterion	Summary Assessment	Rating
1. Financial	The project did address in a limited way the economic and managerial	MU
	dimension of the commitment of stakeholders to CWR, thus endangering	
	their sustainability. National information systems established by the	
	project are active but in Bolivia. Access to the CWR information is	
	partial, often unsatisfactory (see Annex 5.4), e.g. due to connection	
	problems (Uzbekistan) or restricted access to the database (Sri Lanka).	
	External resources are needed to improve the situation.	
2. Socio-political	Participating countries have enhanced their awareness on the role of	L
	CWR as an input of development. The project's limited commitment to	
	policies (e.g., at an higher decision level than that framing Action plans	
	and by linking conservation to development policies that have an higher	
	standing in decision making) and regional approaches (due to its Global	
	multi-country approach) resulted in some inconsistencies in ensuring that	
	such consciousness becomes the engine of change in national policies	
3. Institutional framework	The buildup of skills and elaboration of plans did contribute to the	ML
	enhancement of local partners in the scientific and technical field.	
	Agreements have been signed to share information on CWR. In absence	
	of a comprehensive institutional strengthening approach developing	
	capacities to fund raise and manage the economic fall-out of CWR	
	consertation and reserach the local networks didn't develop all their	
	potential for partnership	-
4. Environmental	The project had a positive role in establishing and completing basic	L
	knowledge and skills needed to improve environmental conservation,	
	although not adequately linking them to use of natural resources, the	
	gateway to sustainability in the local development context. In the pilot	
	areas, major nurdies are faced, due to the limited links with economic	
	approaches ensuring the sustainability of conservation.	110
C. Catalytic role and replication	As an output of the project, several new initiatives in biodiversity	нз
	Skills developed in the conservation and study of CWP have continued	
	to produce results on a larger scale (new research project e.g. at the	
	Central Asia and Amazon basin level some pre-breeding and breeding	
	programs) while information management systems and local networks	
	are not fully exploited (national networks established by the project are	
	still active but they didn't increase their members)	
D. Stakeholders involvement	Local institutions were active in the activities identification and retained	S
	control of field activities. Limited participation of local partners and	
	population were recorded as a consequence of the project orientation to	
	create basic resources of limited significance for development	
E. Country ownership / driven-	The project contributed to enhance local awareness on CWR. It exploited	HS
ness	the commitment of local partners to appropriate the full potential of	
	biodiversity. Skills developed are being used in a larger scale and depth	
	in conservation and research.	
F. Achievement of outputs and	The project fulfilled its commitment in terms of outputs and activities,	HS
activities	with some changes and delays, due to the adjustments done to align	
	information management to the overall decentralizing approach of the	
	project.	
G. Preparation and readiness	The commitment of the partners to biodiversity ensured their proactive	HS
	participation to the project. Project strategy took a greater	
	decentralization turn as a result of the increase of partners awareness on	
	the value of CWR for local development and breeding programmes	-
H. Implementation approach	The project did structure coordination and technical advice at several	S
	ievers to tackie implementation issue properly. Annual agreements with	
	the participating countries did enhance flexibility. This approach was	
	effective in problem resolution, although did not solve the funds	
	disbursement delays arising from specific and often changing	
	national requirements and procedures., that arose from the extension	
	of the initiative and difficulty in dealing with partners with different	
	organization histories and administrative / financial requirements.	
	The project management was successfully responded to these	

Criterion	Summary Assessment	Rating
	changes	
I. Financial planning and management	The project financial planning and management had to face the project complexity. The wide scope of the project would have required a stricter follow up of financial planning and execution by local partners, as their background in this area is quite diversified. National coordinators positively solved such inconsistencies in reporting.	S
J. Monitoring and Evaluation	M&E at the time of the project identification was not clearly considered as a function independent from supervision. Reporting was adequate but not based on a reliable data collection approach.	MS
1. M&E Design	The M&E design is sketchy in the project document. Indicators definition is sometimes very complex and doesn't facilitate the quantitative targeting of beneficiaries and results. Logframe assumptions are often very broad with little reference to the constraints in project implementation.	MS
2. M&E Plan Implementation	Monitoring data collection was not independent from project execution supervision, a standard practice, with negative impact on its reliability. The feedback from the midterm review was properly implemented.	MS
3. Budgeting and funding for M&E activities	Project budget didn't separately earmark M&E. This approach created uncertainty on the independence of M&E from the supervision function.	MS
K. UNEP and UNDP Supervision and backstopping	Supervision and backstopping did contribute to the framing and tackling of implementation problems, although they were not able to avoid delays in the purely administrative and financial field.	HS
1. UNEP	UNEP supervision facilitated the streamlining of activities in coordination with the executing agency. It had a proactive role in the internal project coordination	HS
2. UNDP	UNDP was not involved in CWR project. GEF-UNDP SGP funds were used as associated financing supporting demonstration plots training in Bolivia	HS

B. Lessons Learnt

1. Integration of Crops wild relatives (CWR) conservation, study and use. The multi-disciplinary approach is effective in dealing with CWR as a border theme between agro-biodiversity and biodiversity, basic research, conservation and development, public and private initiative. This approach has to be extended from the botanic – agricultural alliance brokered by the project to include the exploration of traditional knowledge of resident population. In perspective it has to be enhanced to include uses of CWR with the mobilization of expertise in the corresponding fields of interest (ethno-botany, community development, agro-forestry, etc.). The development of sustainable utilization of CWRs is the gateway to their survival in the endangered zones. Three major areas of use are foreseeable:

- multiplication and education actions in the conservation sites gathering resources and linking conservation to development;

- exploitation of CWR with an economic value by resident population to diversify their food security and sources of income in a perspective of environmental friendly local development,

- inclusion of CWR in pre-breeding and breeding programmes framed in the perspective of climate change and natural risk threats to agricultural crops production and food security.

2. *CWR geographical dimension*. CWR in situ conservation and study has to leverage a regional approach targeting the common challenges and sharing resources and lessons learnt, in order to maximize the regional dimension of species diversification / crops domestication. National networks with different scopes and targets multiply the value of individual resources and expertise on CWR. They create critical masses that can become the counterpart of regional and global players. Initiatives for regional integration are looking for opportunities to pool resources of national partners and create success stories igniting economic and political convergence. Regional and international excellence centers can play a critical role in brokering and participating to these exercises, in a bottom up perspective developing and mobilizing as much as possible local partners' ownership and contribution.

3. *CWR knowledge and use*. The consciousness on the economic value of CWR in the participating countries has raised expectations and stimulated the mobilization of local resources, partnerships or competition. The level of decision making needed to achieve sustainability is higher than that envisaged by the project strategy. It requires a greater commitment in key areas such as:

- development skills in conducting sector economic studies and cost / benefit analysis in conservation and use planning in the CWR sector;

- development of skills in negotiating, accessing and managing funding mechanisms (international research tenders, public private partnerships);

- definition of the prevalence or coexistence of conservation and development priorities, i.e. the ascription of CWR to conservation or development approaches and regulations (e.g., by reference to the CBD or ITPGRFA);

- legal regulations of interventions and investments in biodiversity conservation, access to information and use (policy level actions).

4. *Project strategy*. Creation of local knowledge and skills and consciousness promotes a bottom up approach to development, as the beneficiaries are eager to use the acquired knowledge and skills to pursue their own priorities. With the growth of awareness on the value of CWR and biodiversity, bottom up ownership and diffusion of decision

making has to become the gateway in streamlining conservation toward development through mobilization of local ownership. Strategies linking natural resources conservation and community development have to be explored in the identification phase of these activities.

5. Project coordination. The project integration of the contribution of local partners in the participating countries resulted in a complex coordination mechanism. Planning and decision making at different levels, partnership agreements and field actions across a wide set of sectors and five countries, resulted in a cumbersome coordination work. In such conditions, institutions with different organization history and legal framework collaboration need to improve their planning, management and reporting skills. Investment in institutions building is also consistent with the network approach mobilizing partnerships bottom up, i.e. through shared decisions. In such context the coordination mechanism has to rely on a strong monitoring and evaluation system too. The coordination mechanism has to be strengthened in planning and M&E by developing local partners' skills in such areas when the Executing agency doesn't directly participate in field activities – not to lose the control of the quality and timing of the execution -.. The TAG has to be active since the project start up in order to provide strategic inputs to the project planning. Otherwise its contribution risks to be restricted to the operationalization of technical decisions taken by other people at the beginning of the project.

6. Skills development and networking. To maximize the usefulness of the project output, CWR exploration has to be completed with studies on traditional knowledge and uses, agronomic testing and characterization, reproductive biology and techniques for overcoming cross-species fertilization and genetic incompatibility. The network approach viability depends on its flexibility and capacity to appeal to a wide set of partners, in different sectors and including public and private entities, profit and no profit organizations. Network management skills have to be developed in order to make them viable and open to further expansion and intensification of action as well as in gathering local resources. Exchanges of experiences by thematic sector across countries also facilitate the sharing of lessons learnt through adaptation of best practices and speeds up the pace of change. Intervention mechanisms promoting different approaching to networking (by goal, theme, technology, etc.) can provide the opportunity for identifying new needs and customize skills development.

7. *Consciousness*. The project decidedly raised consciousness of CWR value among specialists. Success stories in the use of CWR (see 1) are essential to achieve public consensus and top level decision makers' commitment to this sector. In practice, actions targeted to the use CWR in local development and breeding are the key to the sustainable handover of the project results. Linkages with other initiatives (such as environmental education, ecotourism, etc.) can be fostered by channeling communication campaigns through networks (see the *Ciudadanos CAN* page in www.facebook.com promoting the Amazon region biodiversity knowledge project). Stimulus of the network approach can be substantive in promoting consciousness at the local and regional level.

8. *Information management*. The *Global portal* effectiveness as a communication tool and data sharing mechanism depends on the willingness of partner countries to contribute and update information. National database and portals usefulness and viability also depend on the willingness of local partners to invest in communication. As conservation and economically sensitive information (e.g., maps allowing access to endangered CWR sites) is

submitted only on the base of bilateral agreements (i.e., along the pattern agreed in case of financing research and other activities) a win-win approach is needed to establish information sharing agreements. Local partners are interested in reciprocal access to information, provided it is used for no profit activities; thus incentives have to be developed in fostering building information sharing mechanisms. Typically, information on the characterization of accessions and location of CWR populations can be expected to be retained by partners as far as possible (i.e., they will not be fully disclosed) as proprietary knowledge with a potentially high competitive value. Its access by the knowledgeable public is expected to go through the establishment of partnerships finalized to common goals. While information with a communication value only (e.g., indexing of databases, success stories, partnership mechanisms) can be more easily systematized and released through the global and national portals. Local and regional network have to conform to this bottom up model and act as bridges between the local and global level. A global perspective is expected to foster the interaction of different thematic network and their indexing more than the gathering and managing of the information of local datasets in a unique database. International organizations have to develop a broker approach in facilitating this architecture and build opportunities for cross-breeding specialist skills and success stories as well as for enhancing communication and standardization of information sharing on CWR and biodiversity.

Annexes

1. Evaluation TORs

Objective and Scope of the Evaluation

In line with the UNEP Evaluation Policy¹³, the UNEP Evaluation Manual¹⁴ and the Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations¹⁵, the terminal evaluation of the Project "In situ Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives Through Enhanced Information Management and Field Application" is undertaken at the end of the project to assess project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the project, including their sustainability. The evaluation has two primary purposes: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and (ii) to promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP, international and national executing agencies, the GEF and their partners. Therefore, the evaluation will identify lessons of operational relevance for future project formulation and implementation. It will focus on the following sets of key questions, based on the project's intended outcomes, which may be expanded by the consultants as deemed appropriate:

- How successful was the project in creating effective national information systems in each of the five implementing countries that bring together dispersed information held by relevant national institutions and agencies?

- How successful was the project in creating an international information system and management capability that integrated the extensive but fragmented and dispersed data on crop wild relatives held by the international partners, other international sources and key institutions in other countries?

- How successful was the project in developing capacity in the five participating countries, to apply information management technologies in planning for *in situ* conservation of crop wild relatives?

- To what extent did the project enhance conservation of crop wild relatives in Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan?

- To what extent did the project increase awareness among decision makers and the general public of the value of crop wild relatives and of the need for their conservation in the partner countries?

- Overall, how likely is it that the project will contribute to increasing global food security through effective conservation and increased use of priority crop wild relatives?

Overall Approach and Methods

The terminal evaluation of the Project "In situ Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives through Enhanced Information Management and Field Application" will be conducted by an independent consultant under the overall responsibility and management of the UNEP Evaluation Office (Nairobi), in consultation with the UNEP GEF Coordination Office (Nairobi).

It will be an in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby key stakeholders are kept informed and consulted throughout the evaluation process. Both quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods will be used to determine project achievements against the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts.

The findings of the evaluation will be based on the following:

A desk review of project documents¹⁶ including, but not limited to:

Relevant background documentation, inter alia UNEP and GEF policies, strategies and programmes pertaining to Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives.

Project design documents; Annual Work Plans and Budgets or equivalent, revisions to the logical framework and project financing;

Project reports such as progress and financial reports from countries to the EA and from the EA to UNEP; Steering Committee meeting minutes; annual Project Implementation Reviews and relevant correspondence;

The Mid-term Review report;

The Project Completion Report

Documentation related to project outputs.

Interviews¹⁷ with:

Project management and execution support;

UNEP Task Manager (Rome) and Fund Management Officer (Nairobi);

Country lead execution partners and other relevant partners;

¹³ http://www.unep.org/eou/StandardsPolicyandPractices/UNEPEvaluationPolicy/tabid/3050/language/en-US/Default.aspx

¹⁴ http://www.unep.org/eou/StandardsPolicyandPractices/UNEPEvaluationManual/tabid/2314/language/en-US/Default.aspx

¹⁵ http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/TE_guidelines7-31.pdf

¹⁶ Documents to be provided by the UNEP are listed in Annex 7.

¹⁷ Face-to-face or through any other appropriate means of communication

Relevant staff of GEF Secretariat;

Representatives of other multilateral agencies (e.g. BGCI, IUCN,, FAO) and other relevant organisations.

Country visits. The evaluation consultant will visit each of the 3 implementing countries i.e. Bolivia, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan. C. Key Evaluation principles

Evaluation findings and judgements should be based on sound evidence and analysis, clearly documented in the evaluation report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) to the extent possible, and when verification was not possible, the single source will be mentioned¹⁸. Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out.

The evaluation will assess the project with respect to a minimum set of evaluation criteria grouped in four categories: (1) Attainment of objectives and planned results, which comprises the assessment of outputs achieved, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency and the review of outcomes towards impacts; (2) Sustainability and catalytic role, which focuses on financial, socio-political, institutional and ecological factors conditioning sustainability of project outcomes, and also assesses efforts and achievements in terms of replication and up-scaling of project lessons and good practices; (3) Processes affecting attainment of project results, which covers project preparation and readiness, implementation approach and management, stakeholder participation and public awareness, country ownership/driven-ness, project finance, UNEP supervision and backstopping, and project monitoring and evaluation systems; and (4) Complementarity with the UNEP strategies and programmes. The lead consultant can propose other evaluation criteria as deemed appropriate.

Ratings. All evaluation criteria will be rated on a six-point scale. However, complementarity of the project with the UNEP strategies and programmes is not rated. Annex 3 provides detailed guidance on how the different criteria should be rated and how ratings should be aggregated for the different evaluation criterion categories.

In attempting to attribute any outcomes and impacts to the project, the evaluators should consider the difference between what has happened with and what would have happened without the project. This implies that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. This also means that there should be plausible evidence to attribute such outcomes and impacts to the actions of the project. Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluators, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.

As this is a terminal evaluation, particular attention should be given to learning from the experience. Therefore, the "why?" question should be at front of the consultants' minds all through the evaluation exercise. This means that the consultants needs to go beyond the assessment of "what" the project performance was, and make a serious effort to provide a deeper understanding of "why" the performance was as it was, i.e. of processes affecting attainment of project results (criteria under category 3). This should provide the basis for the lessons that can be drawn from the project. In fact, the usefulness of the evaluation will be determined to a large extent by the capacity of the consultants to explain "why things happened" as they happened and are likely to evolve in this or that direction, which goes well beyond the mere assessment of "where things stand" today.

D. Evaluation criteria

Attainment of Objectives and Planned Results

The evaluation should assess the relevance of the project's objectives and the extent to which these were effectively and efficiently achieved or are expected to be achieved.

Achievement of Outputs and Activities: Assess, for each component, the project's success in producing the programmed outputs as presented in Table A1.1 (Annex 1), both in quantity and quality, as well as their usefulness and timeliness. Briefly explain the degree of success of the project in achieving its different outputs, cross-referencing as needed to more detailed explanations provided under Section 3 (which covers the processes affecting attainment of project objectives). The achievements under the regional and national demonstration projects will receive particular attention.

Relevance: Assess, in retrospect, whether the project's objectives and implementation strategies were consistent with: i) Subregional environmental issues and needs; ii) the UNEP mandate and policies at the time of design and implementation; and iii) the relevant GEF focal areas, strategic priorities and operational programme(s).

Effectiveness: Appreciate to what extent the project has achieved its main objective of enhancing capacity in the 5 participating countries to use information to support conservation of crop wild relatives and their sustainable utilization, and its component objectives as presented in Table 2 above. To measure achievement, use as much as appropriate the indicators for achievement proposed in the Logical Framework Matrix (Logframe) of the project, adding other relevant indicators as appropriate. Briefly explain what factors affected the project's success in achieving its objectives, cross-referencing as needed to more detailed explanations provided under Section 3.

Efficiency: Assess the cost-effectiveness and timeliness of project execution. Describe any cost- or time-saving measures put in place in attempting to bring the project to a successful conclusion within its programmed budget and (extended) time. Analyse how delays, if any, have affected project execution, costs and effectiveness. Wherever possible, compare the cost and time over results ratios of the project with that of other similar projects. Give special attention to efforts by the project teams to make use of / build upon pre-existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities with other initiatives, programmes and projects etc. to increase project efficiency.

Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI): Reconstruct the logical pathways from project outputs over achieved objectives towards impacts, taking into account performance and impact drivers, assumptions and the roles and capacities of key actors and

¹⁸ Individuals should not be mentioned by name if anonymity needs to be preserved.

stakeholders, using the methodology presented in the GEF Evaluation Office's ROtI Practitioner's Handbook¹⁹ (summarized in Annex 8 of the TORs). Appreciate to what extent the project has to date contributed, and is likely in the future to further contribute to changes in stakeholder behaviour as regards to: i) accessing and using information and data on crop wild relatives held by international partners, other international sources and key institutions in other countries ii) accessing and using information from relevant national institutions and national agencies given the presence of new national information systems iii) the improved use of the information and in applying information management technologies in planning available for supporting the conservation and use of crop wild relatives, iv) support and involvement from decision makers and the general public regarding the conservation and value of crop wild relatives, and the likelihood of those leading to improved conservation and use of crop wild relatives, and the likelihood security.

Sustainability and catalytic role

Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived results and impacts after the external project funding and assistance ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to undermine or contribute to the persistence of benefits. Some of these factors might be direct results of the project while others will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not under control of the project but that may condition sustainability of benefits. The evaluation should ascertain to what extent follow-up work has been initiated and how project results will be sustained and enhanced over time. Application of the ROII method will assist in the evaluation of sustainability.

Four aspects of sustainability will be addressed:

Socio-political sustainability. Are there any social or political factors that may influence positively or negatively the sustenance of project results and progress towards impacts? Is the level of ownership by the main national and regional stakeholders sufficient to allow for the project results to be sustained? Are there sufficient government and stakeholder awareness, interests, commitment and incentives to execute, enforce and pursue the programmes, plans, agreements, monitoring systems etc. prepared and agreed upon under the project?

Financial resources. To what extent are the continuation of project results and the eventual impact of the project dependent on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that adequate financial resources²⁰ will be or will become available to implement the programmes, plans, agreements, monitoring systems etc. prepared and agreed upon under the project? Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project results and onward progress towards impact?

Institutional framework. To what extent is the sustenance of the results and onward progress towards impact dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? How robust are the institutional achievements such as governance structures and processes, policies, sub-regional agreements, legal and accountability frameworks etc. required to sustaining project results and to lead those to impact on human behaviour and environmental resources?

Environmental sustainability. Are there any environmental factors, positive or negative, that can influence the future flow of project benefits? Are there any project outputs or higher level results that are likely to affect the environment, which, in turn, might affect sustainability of project benefits?

Catalytic Role and Replication. The *catalytic role* of GEF-funded interventions is embodied in their approach of supporting the creation of an enabling environment and of investing in pilot activities which are innovative and showing how new approaches can work. UNEP and the GEF also aim to support activities that upscale new approaches to a national, regional or global level, with a view to achieve sustainable global environmental benefits. The evaluation will assess the catalytic role played by this project, namely to what extent the project has:

catalyzed behavioural changes in terms of use and application by the relevant stakeholders of: i) technologies and approaches show-cased by the demonstration projects; ii) strategic programmes and plans developed; and iii) assessment, monitoring and management systems established at a national and sub-regional level;

provided *incentives* (social, economic, market based, competencies etc.) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholder behaviour; contributed to *institutional changes*. An important aspect of the catalytic role of the project is its contribution to institutional uptake or mainstreaming of project-piloted approaches in the regional and national demonstration projects; contributed to *policy changes* (on paper and in implementation of policy);

contributed to sustained follow-on financing (catalytic financing) from Governments, the GEF or other donors;

created opportunities for particular individuals or institutions ("champions") to catalyze change (without which the project would not have achieved all of its results).

Replication, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated (experiences are repeated and lessons applied in different geographic areas) or scaled up (experiences are repeated and lessons applied in the same geographic area but on a much larger scale and funded by other sources). The evaluation will assess the approach adopted by the project to promote replication effects and appreciate to what extent actual replication has already

¹⁹ http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/Impact_Eval-Review_of_Outcomes_to_Impacts-RotI handbook.pdf

²⁰ Those resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, other development projects etc.

occurred or is likely to occur in the near future. What are the factors that may influence replication and scaling up of project experiences and lessons?

Processes affecting attainment of project results

Preparation and Readiness. Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of executing agencies properly considered when the project was designed? Was the project document clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities) and enabling legislation assured? Were adequate project management arrangements in place? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were lessons learned and recommendations from Steering Committee meetings adequately integrated in the project approach? What factors influenced the quality-at-entry of the project design, choice of partners, allocation of financial resources etc.?

Implementation Approach and Adaptive Management. This includes an analysis of approaches used by the project, its management framework, the project's adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), the performance of the implementation arrangements and partnerships, relevance of changes in project design, and overall performance of project management.

The evaluation will:

Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been followed and were effective in delivering project outputs and outcomes. Were pertinent adaptations made to the approaches originally proposed?

Assess the role and performance of the units and committees established and the project execution arrangements at all levels;

Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of project management by the EA and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project;

Assess the extent to which project management responded to direction and guidance provided by the Steering Committee and IA supervision recommendations;

Identify administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project, and how the project partners tried to overcome these problems;

Assess the extent to which MTE recommendations were followed in a timely manner.

Stakeholder ²¹ Participation and Public Awareness. The term stakeholder should be considered in the broadest sense, encompassing project partners, government institutions, private interest groups, local communities etc. The assessment will look at three related and often overlapping processes: (1) information dissemination between stakeholders, (2) consultation between stakeholders, and (3) active engagement of stakeholders in project decision making and activities. The evaluation will specifically assess:

the approach(es) used to identify and engage stakeholders in project design and implementation. What were the strengths and weaknesses of these approaches with respect to the project's objectives and the stakeholders' motivations and capacities? What was the achieved degree and effectiveness of collaboration and interactions between the various project partners and stakeholders during the course of implementation of the project?

the degree and effectiveness of any public awareness activities that were undertaken during the course of implementation of the project; or that are built into the assessment methods so that public awareness can be raised at the time the assessments will be conducted;

how the results of the project (information sharing over the internet using the internationally accessible information system and the new methods of in-country information collection, management and analysis using national information systems) engaged key stakeholders in conservation of crop wild relatives.

The ROtI analysis should assist the consultants in identifying the key stakeholders and their respective roles, capabilities and motivations in each step of the causal pathway from activities to achievement of outputs and objectives to impact.

Country Ownership and Driven-ness. The evaluation will assess the performance of the Governments of the countries involved in the project, namely:

in how the Governments have assumed responsibility for the project and provided adequate support to project execution, including the degree of cooperation received from the various contact institutions in the countries involved in the project and the timeliness of provision of counter-part funding to project activities;

to what extent the political and institutional framework of the participating countries has been conducive to project performance. Look, in particular, at the extent of the political commitment to enforce (sub-) regional agreements promoted under the project;

to what extent the Governments have promoted the participation of communities and their non-governmental organisations in the project; and

how responsive the Governments were to Bioversity's coordination and guidance as well as UNEP supervision and Mid-Term Review recommendations.

²¹ Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by the project.

Financial Planning and Management. Evaluation of financial planning requires assessment of the quality and effectiveness of financial planning and control of financial resources throughout the project's lifetime. The assessment will look at actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. The evaluation will:

Verify the application of proper standards (clarity, transparency, audit etc.) and timeliness of financial planning, management and reporting to ensure that sufficient and timely financial resources were available to the project and its partners;

Appreciate other administrative processes such as recruitment of staff, procurement of goods and services (including consultants), preparation and negotiation of cooperation agreements etc. to the extent that these might have influenced project performance;

Present to what extent co-financing has materialized as expected at project approval (see Table 1). Report country co-financing to the project overall, and to support project activities at the national level in particular. The evaluation will provide a breakdown of final actual costs and co-financing for the different project components (see tables in Annex 4).

Describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective. Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector.

Analyse the effects on project performance of any irregularities in procurement, use of financial resources and human resource management, and assess the adequacy of measures taken by the EA or IA to prevent and/or respond to such irregularities.

UNEP Supervision and Backstopping. The purpose of supervision is to verify the quality and timeliness of project execution in terms of finances, administration and achievement of outputs and outcomes, in order to identify and recommend ways to deal with problems which arise during project execution. Such problems may be related to project management but may also involve technical/institutional substantive issues in which UNEP has a major contribution to make. The evaluators should assess the effectiveness of supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP including:

The adequacy of project supervision plans, inputs and processes;

The emphasis given to outcome monitoring (results-based project management);

The realism and candour of project reporting and ratings (i.e. are PIR ratings an accurate reflection of the project realities and risks);

The quality of documentation of project supervision activities; and

Financial, administrative and other fiduciary aspects of project implementation supervision.

Monitoring and Evaluation. The evaluation will include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The evaluation will appreciate how information generated by the M&E system during project implementation was used to adapt and improve project execution, achievement of outcomes and ensuring sustainability. M&E is assessed on three levels:

M&E Design. Projects should have sound M&E plans to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified. The evaluators should use the following questions to help assess the M&E design aspects:

Quality of the project logframe as a planning and monitoring instrument; analyse/compare logframe in Project Document, revised logframe (2008) and logframe used in Project Implementation Review reports to report progress towards achieving project objectives;

SMART-ness of indicators: Are there specific indicators in the logframe for each of the project objectives? Are the indicators measurable, attainable (realistic) and relevant to the objectives? Are the indicators time-bound?

Adequacy of baseline information: To what extent has baseline information on performance indicators been collected and presented in a clear manner? Was the methodology for the baseline data collection explicit and reliable?

Arrangements for monitoring: Have the responsibilities for M&E activities been clearly defined? Were the data sources and data collection instruments appropriate? Was the frequency of various monitoring activities specified and adequate? In how far were project users involved in monitoring?

Arrangements for evaluation: Have specific targets been specified for project outputs? Has the desired level of achievement been specified for all indicators of objectives and outcomes? Were there adequate provisions in the legal instruments binding project partners to fully collaborate in evaluations?

Budgeting and funding for M&E activities: Determine whether support for M&E was budgeted adequately and was funded in a timely fashion during implementation.

M&E Plan Implementation. The evaluation will verify that:

the M&E system was operational and facilitated timely tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period;

annual project reports and Progress Implementation Review (PIR) reports were complete, accurate and with well justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs;

projects had an M&E system in place with proper training, instruments and resources for parties responsible for M&E. Complementarities with UNEP strategies and programmes

UNEP aims to undertake GEF funded projects that are aligned with its own strategies. The evaluation should present a brief narrative on the following issues:

Linkage to UNEP's Expected Accomplishments and POW 2010-2011. The UNEP MTS specifies desired results in six thematic focal areas. The desired results are termed Expected Accomplishments. Using the completed ROtI analysis, the evaluation should comment on whether the project makes a tangible contribution to any of the Expected Accomplishments specified in the UNEP MTS. The magnitude and extent of any contributions and the causal linkages should be fully described. Whilst it is recognised that UNEP GEF projects designed prior to the production of the UNEP Medium Term Strategy (MTS)²²/ Programme of Work (POW) 2010/11 would not necessarily be aligned with the Expected Accomplishments articulated in those documents, complementarities may still exist.

Alignment with the Bali Strategic Plan (BSP)²³. The outcomes and achievements of the project should be briefly discussed in relation to the objectives of the UNEP BSP.

Gender. Ascertain to what extent project design, implementation and monitoring have taken into consideration: (i) possible gender inequalities in access to and the control over natural resources; (ii) specific vulnerabilities of women and children to environmental degradation or disasters; and (iii) the role of women in mitigating or adapting to environmental changes and engaging in environmental protection and rehabilitation. Appreciate whether the intervention is likely to have any lasting differential impacts on gender equality and the relationship between women and the environment. To what extent do unresolved gender inequalities affect sustainability of project benefits?

South-South Cooperation. This is regarded as the exchange of resources, technology, and knowledge between developing countries. Briefly describe any aspects of the project that could be considered as examples of South-South Cooperation. The Consultant

For this evaluation, one independent consultant will be hired. The evaluator will have the following expertise and experience: Evaluation of environmental projects

Extensive knowledge and expertise in plant genetic resources conservation

Expertise in biodiversity conservation and plant ecology

Expertise in global/regional planning, cooperation, institutions, treaties and politics in the field of agricultural biodiversity

Good knowledge of GEF strategies and policies and UNEP/GEF work

Management of large scale global multi-country conservation projects: planning, multi-stakeholder coordination, finances and administration, monitoring etc.

Knowledge of information management

The consultant will be responsible for collecting and analysing project data, and preparing the main evaluation report.

The consultant will work under the overall responsibility of the UNEP Evaluation Office and (s)he will consult with the Evaluation Office on any procedural and methodological matters related to the evaluation. It is, however, the consultant's individual responsibility to arrange for any other logistical matters related to the assignment.

By undersigning the service contract with UNEP/UNON, the consultant certifies that he/she has not been associated with the design and implementation of the project in any way which may jeopardize their independence and impartiality towards project achievements and project partner performance. In addition, they will not have any future interests (within six months after completion of their contract) with the project's executing or implementing units.

F. Evaluation Deliverables and Review Procedures

The Consultant will prepare an inception report containing a thorough review of the project design quality and the evaluation framework. The review of design quality will cover the following aspects:

Project relevance (see paragraph 34 (b));

A desk-based Theory of Change of the project (see Annex 8 - ROtI analysis);

Sustainability consideration (see paragraphs 35-36) and measures planned to promote replication and upscaling (see paragraph 37);

Preparation and readiness (see paragraph 39);

Financial planning (see paragraph 44);

M&E design (see paragraph 47(a));

Complementarities with UNEP strategies and programmes (see paragraph 48);

Using the above, complete and assessment of the overall quality of the project design (see Annex 9);

The evaluation framework should summarize the information available from project documentation against each of the main evaluation parameters. Any gaps in information should be identified and methods for additional data collection, verification and analysis should be specified. A draft schedule for the evaluation process should be presented.

The evaluation framework will present in further detail the evaluation questions under each criterion with their respective indicators and data sources. The inception report will be submitted for review by the Evaluation Office before the evaluation team conducts any field visits.

The main evaluation report should be brief (no longer than 35 pages – excluding the executive summary and annexes), to the point and written in plain English. The report will follow the annotated Table of Contents outlined in Annex 2. It must explain the

²² <u>http://www.unep.org/PDF/FinalMTSGCSS-X-8.pdf</u>

²³ http://www.unep.org/GC/GC23/documents/GC23-6-add-1.pdf

purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used (with their limitations). The report will present evidence-based and balanced findings, consequent conclusions, lessons and recommendations, which will be cross-referenced to each other. The report should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. Any dissident views in response to evaluation findings will be appended in footnote or annex as appropriate.

Report summary. The Consultant will prepare a 15-slide presentation summarizing the key findings, lessons learned and recommendations of the evaluation. This presentation will be shared with the Task Manager and selected project partners by 15 April 2013. The purpose of this presentation is to engage the main project partners in a discussion on the evaluation results.

Review of the draft evaluation report. The Consultant will submit the zero draft report latest by 4 March 2013 to the UNEP EO and revise the draft following the comments and suggestions made by the EO. The EO will then share the first draft report with the UNEP GEF Coordination Office (Nairobi) and the UNEP Division for Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI). The UNEP Task Manager will forward the first draft report to the other project stakeholders, in particular Bioversity, the ISC and IMG for review and comments. Stakeholders may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. Comments would be expected within two weeks after the draft report has been shared. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to the UNEP EO for collation. The EO will provide the comments to the Team Leader for consideration in preparing the final draft report. The consultant will submit the final draft report no later than 2 weeks after reception of stakeholder comments. The consultant will prepare a response to comments that are in contradiction to his findings and could therefore not be accommodated in the final report, with a clear explanation why. This response will be shared by the EO with the interested stakeholders to ensure full transparency.

Consultations will be held between the consultants, EO staff, the UNEP/GEF, UNEP/DEPI, and key members of the project execution team. These consultations will seek feedback on the proposed recommendations and lessons.

Submission of the final Terminal Evaluation report. The final report shall be submitted by Email to:

Segbedzi Norgbey, Head UNEP Evaluation Office Email: <u>segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org</u>

The Head of Evaluation will share the report with the following persons:

Maryam Niamir-Fuller, Director UNEP/GEF Coordination Office Email: maryam.niamir-fuller@unep.org

Ibrahim Thiaw, Director UNEP/DEPI Email: Ibrahim.Thiaw@unep.org

Marieta Sakalian UNEP/DEPI-GEF Senior Programme Management /Liaison Officer (CGIAR/FAO), Biodiversity Marieta.Sakalian@unep.org

The final evaluation report will be published on the UNEP Evaluation Office web-site <u>www.unep.org/eou</u> and may be printed in hard copy. Subsequently, the report will be sent to the GEF Office of Evaluation for their review, appraisal and inclusion on the GEF website.

As per usual practice, the UNEP EO will prepare a quality assessment of the zero draft and final draft report, which is a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluation consultants. The quality of the report will be assessed and rated against both GEF and UNEP criteria as presented in Annex 5.

The UNEP Evaluation Office will also prepare a commentary on the final evaluation report, which presents the EO ratings of the project based on a careful review of the evidence collated by the evaluation team and the internal consistency of the report. These ratings are the final ratings that the UNEP Evaluation Office will submit to the GEF Office of Evaluation. Resources and Schedule of the Evaluation

This Terminal Evaluation will be undertaken by an independent evaluation consultant contracted by the UNEP Evaluation Office. The consultant will work under the overall responsibility of the UNEP Evaluation Office and (s)he will consult with the EO on any procedural and methodological matters related to the evaluation. It is, however, the consultant's individual responsibility to arrange for their travel, obtain documentary evidence, meetings with stakeholders, field visits, and any other logistical matters related to their assignment. The UNEP Task Manager, UNDP Regional Technical Advisor, UNDP Country Offices and regional and national project staff will provide logistical support (introductions, meetings, transport, lodging etc.) for the country visits where necessary, allowing the consultant to conduct the evaluation as efficiently and independently as possible.

The consultant will be hired for 9.5 weeks. He will travel to Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan, Bolivia and Rome, Italy.

The consultant will be hired under an individual Special Service Agreement (SSA) covering the consultant's fees but which is NOT inclusive of all expenses such as airfares, in-country travel, accommodation, incidental and terminal expenses. Air tickets will be paid separately by UNEP and 75% of the DSA for each authorised travel mission will be paid up front. Local in-country

travel and communication costs will be reimbursed on the production of acceptable receipts. Terminal expenses and residual DSA entitlements (25%) will be paid after mission completion.

The Consultant will receive 20% of the honorarium portion of his fee upon submission of a satisfactory inception report, 40% upon acceptance of the first draft report deemed complete and of acceptable quality by the EO. The remainder will be paid upon satisfactory completion of the work.

In case the consultant is not able to provide the deliverables in accordance with these TORs, in line with the expected quality standards by the UNEP Evaluation Office, payment may be withheld at the discretion of the Head of the Evaluation Office until the consultant has improved the deliverables to meet UNEP's quality standards.

If the consultant fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP in a timely manner, i.e. within one month after the end date of their contract, the Evaluation Office reserves the right to employ additional human resources to finalize the report, and to reduce the consultant's fees by an amount equal to the additional costs borne by the Evaluation Office to bring the report up to standard.

2. Evaluation program, containing the names of locations visited and the names (or functions) of people met

Date	Place	Activity	People interviewed
1/13/2013	Bergamo – Milan – Rome (Italy)	Mobilization	
1/15	Rome – FAO	Briefing with UNEP / Bioversity Int.	Marieta Sakalian (UNEP), M. Eshan Dulloo, Teresa Borelli (Bioversity)
1/16-18	Rome	Desk study	
1/20-21	Rome – Dubai – Colombo (Sri Lanka)	Flight to Sri Lanka Link with M. of Environment through National coordinator Submission of inception report	Pm phone coordination with Mr Anura Wikesekara, national coordinator
1/22	Colombo	Briefing at M. of Environment	Gamini Gamage (Additional secretary policy & planning), N.K.G.W. Nummawatta (Additional secretary Natural Resources), Sujith S. Rathnayake (Biodiversity secretariat)
1/23	Colombo Travel to Kandy	Colombo university Bandaranayake ayurvedic research institute	CU: Pradeepika Sapitiamthi. Plant biochemistry lecturer. Natural resources conservation lecturer. Tara Silva, plant genetics BARI: Suddipa Sugathadasa, pharmacology
1/24	Peradeniya Kandy	Peradeniya, Plant genetic resources center National herbarium Peradeniya university, Department of Crop Science Faculty of Agriculture	PGRC A.S.U Liyange, head of exploration unit NH: Dr Subani, botanist Prof. Pushakumara, PU/DCS Head of department P.W. Rathansiri, director
1/25	Waripane CWR site Matara		Waripane forest
1/26	Kaneliya forest Ruhunu university Matara		Forest part director Disna Ratnasekera, University of Ruhuna, biology lecturer
1/27	Matara – Colombo		
1/28	Colombo	IUCN,environmentalassociationsMinistryofenvironment,Ministry of agriculture	Mr Shamen P. Vidanage, IUCN acting country representative Sanjith Rathanayake, Biodiversity secretariat Lalith K. Hathurusinghe, director, projects
1/29	Colombo – Kurunegala (NWP) – Colombo	Provincial environmental authority, Maligawa, Kurunegala, North West Province	Saman Senanayake, director NWP Secretary of education, health and environment Dharshana Kumara, Biodiversity secretariat
1/30	Colombo – Dubai	Ministry of environment	N.K.G.K. Nemmawatta, Additional secretary for natural resources

2.1. Sri Lanka

		R.H.M.P. Abaykoon, Director of Biodiversity
		secretariat
		R.P.L.C. Randeni, Officer of biodiversity secretariat
		Interview of Anura Wijesekara, program coordinator
1/31	Dubai – Rome	
1-2/2	Rome – Verona - Bergamo	

2.2 Uzbekistan

Date	Place	Activity	People interviewed
2/5/2013	Bergamo – Bologna –	Uzbek visa	
	Rome (Italy)		
2/9/2013	Rome – Verona - Bergamo		
2/11	Bergamo – Verona - Rome		
2/15	Maccarese (Rome)	Bioversity International briefing	Marieta Sakalian (UNEP), M. Eshan Dulloo, Teresa Borelli (Bioversity). Danny Hunter (CWR Global project coordinator) by teleconferencing
2/18	Rome – Moscow (Russia)	Mobilization	
2/19	Moscow – Tashkent (Uzbekistan)	Institute of genetics and plants experimental biology: presentation of the project activities	Usmanov Rustam (IGPEB), Muhabbat Tudrieva (UNEP/GEF-BI), Sativaldi Djataev, Mustafina Feruza (CWR), Yevgeniy Butkov, Republican Scientific Production Center of Decorative Husbandry and Forestry, Uktam Pratov, Scientific Plant Production Center "Botanica", onion and apple, Karim Baymetov, Uzbek Research Institute of Plant Industry, barley, Mirakbar Yakubov, IGEPB, Public awareness, Fayzulla Abdullaev, Uzbek Research Institute of Plant Industry, Capacity building, Sergei Myagkov, GEF Focal Point, Aleksandr Grigoriantc, State Bio Control of the State Committee of the Nature Protection of the Republic of Uzbekistan.
2/20	Tashkent – Parkent –	Chatkal Biospheric State	Alexander Esipov- Deputy Director of the Chatkal
2/21	Tashkant – Bostanlik	Ilgam-Chatkal State Natural	Freesh Sarymeakov General Director of the
<i>L</i> / <i>L</i> 1	UChSNNP-Tashkent -	National Park	UChSNNP
2/22	Tashkent	Institute of genetics and plants experimental biology	Yuvinaliy Karpenko, Database development, Sativaldi Djataev, National Project Coordinator, Abduvokhid Abdulrasulev, Institute of Horticulture, Viticulture and Wine Making, Muhabbat Tudrieva, Bioversity
2/23	Tashkent – Moscow – Rome (Italy)	Demobilization	

2.3 Bolivia

Date	Place	Activity	People interviewed
2/24	Rome – Amsterdam – Lima	Mobilization	
2/25	Lima - La Paz	Briefing with project	Beatriz Zapata F., Project coordinator
	La Paz	coordinator	Juan Pablo Cardozo, viceminister
		Ministry of environment,	Dedy Gonzalez, director DGBAP
		Viceministry of environment,	Johnny Guzman, head of Genetic resources unit,
		biodiversity & natural resources	DGBAP
			Rafael Murillo, technician Genetic resources
		FundEco	DGBAP

			Victor Ramos, director FundEco
			Jorge Mariaca, FundEco board
			Mario Baudoin, Proinpa board
2/26	La Paz	Herbario nacional de Bolivia	Rosaisela Meneses, director Herbarium
	La Paz - Cochabamba		Monic Moraes, director Instituto de ecología
			Stephen Beck Botanist
		Proinpa Altiplano	Wilfredo Rojas, Proinpa región La Paz
			Milton Pinto, technician
2/27	Cochabamba	CIPEG Pairumani	Gonzalo Avila, CIPEG, Pairumani
	Cochabamba – Santa Cruz	Proinpa	Antonio Gandarillas, gerente general Proinpa
		Centro de biodiversidad y	Ximena Cadima
		genética, UMSS	Fernando Patiño
		Carrera de biología, UMSS	Susana Arrazola, ecología vegetal, CBG UMSS
			Magaly Mercado
			Amalia Antesana, nutrition Biology UMSS
			Amparo Bruckner B., biology carreer
2/28	Santa Cruz	Fundación amigos de la	Laniel Larrea Alcazar, FAN
	Santa Cruz – La Paz	naturaleza	Saul Cuellar
		Museo national de historia	Patricia Herrera, director MNHNNKM
		natural Noel Kempff Mercado	Alejandro Murakami, botanist-taxonomist
		(MNHNNKM)	Carlos Rivadeneira, director IIA el Vallecito
		IIA el Vallecito(UAGRM)	
3/1	La Paz	Ministry of environment,	Beatriz Zapata F., Project coordinator
	La Paz – Santa Cruz	Viceministry of environment,	Juan Pablo Cardozo, viceminister
		biodiversity & natural resources	Dedy Gonzalez, director DGBAP
			Claudia Cortez, Responsable Sistema de Información
			de Biodiversidad
			Rafael Murillo, technician Genetic resources
			DGBAP
3/2	Santa Cruz – São Paulo	Demobilization	
3/3	São Paulo – Rome		
11-12/3	Rome - Bergamo		
28/8	Home based	teleconference	Arthur Chapman, TAC
28/8	Home based	teleconference	Vernon Heywood, TAC
6/9	Home based	teleconference	Susan Bragdon, TAC

3. Bibliography

ADB 2012. Nepal: Strengthening Capacity for Managing Climate Change and the Environment: Training Manual for Mainstreaming Climate Change and Environmental Management in Government Training Programmes at National and Subnational Levels. TA 7173-NEP

FAO 2010. The Second Report on the state of the world's plant genetic resources for food and agriculture FAO 2012. The state of food and agriculture

Hunter D., Heywood V. (ed.) 2011. Crop Wild Relatives: A Manual of in situ Conservation. Bioversity International. Earthscan. 414 p.

GED 1998. Guidelines for Monitoring and Evaluation for Biodiversity Projects

GEF. Conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity important to agriculture

GEF Evaluation office 2008. Guidelines for GEF agencies in conducting terminal evaluations

GEF Evaluation office 2009. Review of Outcomes to Impacts Practitioner's Handbook

GEF 2008. Focal area strategies and proposed strategic programs for GEF-5: process proposal

GEF 2008. Biodiversity Strategy for GEF-5

IDLO 2009. Imagining a traditional knowledge commons: a community approach to sharing traditional knowledge for non-commercial research

IUCN, SSC, CWRSG. Operational strategy

MMAyA 2009. Libro rojo de parientes silvestres de cultivos de Bolivia

MoA Armenia / FAO 2008. Country report on the state of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture MoA Bolivia / FAO 2009. Informe nacional sobre el estado de los recursos fitogenéticos para la agricultura y la alimentación. GCP/BOL/037/ITA MoA Madagascar 2009. Deuxième rapport national sur l'état des ressources phyto-génétiques pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture

MoA Sri Lanka 2007. Country report on the state of plant genetic resources for food and agric ulture. AG: GCP/RAS/186/JPN

Maxted N., Kell S. 2009. Establishment of a global network for the *in situ* conservation of crop wild relatives: status and needs. FAO

UNEP 2004. Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building. UNEP/GC.23/6/Add.1

UNEP 2009. Medium-term Strategy 2010–2013: environment for development

UNEP Evaluation office 2009. Evaluation policy

UNEP Evaluation and oversight unit 2008. Evaluation manual

In situ Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives Through Enhanced Information Management and Field Application (*Project Number GFL-2328-2715-4757; PMS: GF/1020-04-1*):

- Cover Note Work Program Inclusion - UNEP/GEF Biodiversity, 2002

- Project brief, 2002
- Full project proposal, 2002
- Project document, 2004
- Final report to UNEP-GEF, 31/03/2011
- Co-financing reports, 2007-2010
- Inventory of non-expendable equipment

4. Summary co-finance information and a statement of project expenditure by activity

Note. UNEP format of financial reports does not require reports per project component. Thus, the data in the following tables are the result from the reclassification and merging the project consolidated budget and the

Component / Subcomponent	Partner	Estimated cost at design	Actual Cost	Expenditure % ratio (actual / planned)
Output 1	International Organizations	1,470,000	1,192,913	81
	Leveraged	0	289,546	
Total		1,470,000	1,482,459	101
Output 2	Government	468,521	255,560	55
	Non Government	391,765	351,841	90
	International Organizations	204,485	102,880	50
	Leveraged	0	301,129	
	GEF	1,523,271		
Total		2,588,042	1,011,410	
Output 3	Government	733,372	697,661	95
	Non Government	443,157	443,158	100

4.1 Project costs by component (US\$)

	International Organizations	531,159	277,014	52
	Leveraged	13,955	1,137,169	8149
	GEF	2,008,806		
Total		3,730,449	2,555,002	
Output 4	Government	111,856	98,053	88
	Non Government	57,720	57,584	100
	International Organizations	39,348	38,050	97
	Leveraged	7,309	228,031	3120
	GEF	325,483		
Total		541,716	421,718	
Project	Government	373,410	369,410	99
Management	Non government	59,218	56,496	95
	International Organizations	1,299,310	881,492	68
	Leveraged	1,218	406,856	33404
	GEF	1,969,465		
Total		3,702,621	1,714,254	
	Government	1,687,159	1,420,684	84
	Non Government	951,860	909,079	96
	International Organizations	3,544,302	2,492,349	70
	Leveraged	22,482	2,362,731	10509
	GEF	5,827,025		
All components	GEF		5,827,025	
GRAND TOTAL		12,032,828	13,011,868	

4.2 Total planned project co-finance and actual co-finance received

Project duration: from March 2004 to October 2010. Reporting period from March 2004 to March 2011

Source	Budget	Actual	Cash	Actual	Total
	original	received to	contribution	received /	received
		date	/ actual	budget	by
			received	original	contributor
					or
					component

	US\$	US\$	%	%	%
GOVERNMENT	\$1.687.159	\$1,420,684	24.74	84.21	19.77
	\$1,007,109	¢1,120,001	21.71	01.21	17.17
Outcome 1: International Information System	\$0	\$0			
Outcome 2: National Information System	\$468,521	\$255,560	6.78	54.55	
Outcome 3: Capacity Development and Conservation	\$733 372	\$697 661	25 84	95 13	
Outcome 4: Public Awareness	\$111.856	\$98.053	36 51	87.66	
Outcome 5: Project Management	\$373.410	\$369.410	31.95	98.93	
				,	
NON-GOVERNMENT	\$951,860	\$909,079		95.51	12.65
Outcome 1: International Information System	\$0	\$0			
Outcome 2: National Information System	\$391,765	\$351,841		89.81	
Outcome 3: Capacity Development and Conservation				100.00	
Outcome 4: Public Awareness	\$443,157	\$443,158		100.00	
Outcome 5: Project Management	\$57,720	\$57,584		99.76	
	\$59,218	\$56,496		95.40	
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS	\$3 544 302	\$2 102 310	38.00	70.32	34.60
	\$5,544,502	\$2,492,349	50.99	70.32	34.09
Outcome 1: International Information System	\$1.470.000	\$1 192 913	65.29	81.15	
Outcome 2: National Information System	\$204 485	\$102,915	6.64	50.31	
Outcome 3: Capacity Development and	¢201,105	\$102,000	0.01	00.01	
Conservation	\$531,159	\$277,014	2.10	52.15	
Outcome 4: Public Awareness	\$39,348	\$38,050	0.39	96.70	
Outcome 5: Project Management	\$1,299,310	\$881,492	20.42	67.84	
TOTAL PROJECT					
TOTALTROJECT	\$6,183,321	\$4,822,112	27.44	77.99	67.12
Outcome 1: International Information System		M1 1 0 0 1 1 1		<u></u>	
Outcome 2: National Information System	\$1,470,000	\$1,192,913	65.29	81.15	
Outcome 3: Capacity Development and	\$1,064,771	\$710,281	3.40	66.71	
Conservation	\$1,707,688	\$1,417,833	13.13	83.03	
Outcome 4: Public Awareness	\$208,924	\$193,687	18.56	92.71	
Outcome 5: Project Management	\$1,731,938	\$1,307,398	22.79	75.49	
Leveraged - TOTAL	\$22,482	\$2,362,731	25.00	10509.43	32.88
Outcome 1: International Information System	\$0	\$289,546	3.37		
Outcome 2: National Information System	\$0	\$301,129	34.98		

Outcome 3: Capacity Development and Conservation Outcome 4: Public Awareness Outcome 5: Project Management	\$13,955 \$7,309 \$1,218	\$1,137,169 \$228,031 \$406,856	26.54 43.43 18.37	8148.83 3119.87 33403.61	
GRAND TOTAL PROJECT	\$6,205,803	\$7,184,843	26.64	115.78	100.00
Outcome 1: International Information System Outcome 2: National Information System Outcome 3: Capacity Development and	\$1,470,000 \$1,064,771	\$1,482,459 \$1,011,410	53.20 12.80	100.85 94.99	20.63 14.08
Conservation	\$1,721,643	\$2,555,002	19.10	148.40	35.56
Outcome 4: Public Awareness	\$216,233	\$421,718	32.01	195.03	5.87
Outcome 5: Project Management	\$1,733,156	\$1,714,254	21.74	98.91	23.86

4.3 Project budget by Component (GEF expenditure + Co-financing)

Component	US\$	%
International Information System	1908501.00	14.67
National Information System	1011410.00	7.77
Capacity Development and Conservation	3894144.23	29.93
Public Awareness	1011443.63	7.77
Project Management	5186369.14	39.86
Grand total	13011868.00	100.00

5. Technical working papers

5.1 Quality of Project Design

Relevance	Evaluation Comments	Prodoc reference
Are the intended results likely to contribute to UNEPs Expected Accomplishments and programmatic objectives?	Yes, the programme results enhance the ecosystem management EA a) with reference to CWR component of the natural environment	UNEP 2009. Medium- term Strategy 2010–2013: environment for development
Does the project form a coherent part of a UNEP-approved programme framework?	Yes, it is coherent with the Ecosystem management programmatic framework	UNEP 2009. Medium- term Strategy 2010–2013: environment for development
Is there complementarity with other UNEP projects, planned and ongoing, including those implemented under	The programme is framed in the sector Conservation and Availability Programme and in line with the UNEP	UNEP 2009. Medium- term Strategy

the GEF?		biodiversity approach and priorities	2010–2013:
			environment
			for development
			uevelopment
Are the project's objectives	i) Sub-regional	Yes, CWR are a component of biodiversity conservation	FAO 2010.
and implementation	environmental issues and	strategies in the participating countries / sub-regions	The Second
strategies consistent with:	needs?		Report on the
			world's plant
			genetic
			resources for
			food and
			agriculture
			Country
			state of
			PGRFA
	ii) the UNEP mandate and	Yes, strengthening local contribution to CWR is coherent	UNEP 2004
	policies at the time of	with Bali plan objectives and strategy, and specifically with	Bali Strategic
	design and	Biological diversity as well as food security and	Plan for
	implementation?	environment thematic areas	Technology
			Support and
			building
			building
	iii) the relevant GEF focal	Yes, GEF-3 considers Conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity important to agriculture	GEF 2008.
	and operational	biological diversity important to agriculture	Strategy for
	programme(s)? (if		GEF-5
	appropriate)		
	iv) Stakeholder priorities	Yes, the country reports included in the project document	Project
	and needs?	present the concerns of CWR institutional stakeholders for	document,
		the conservation and study needs identified by the	2004
		programme	
C	overall rating for Relevance		HS
Intended Results and Causality			
Are the objectives realistic?		The Development goal is overstated as the basic research	Programme
		fostered by the project is a limited component of the food	document /
		security achievement	logframe
Are the causal pathways from project outputs [goods and		The gap between the Outcomes and the Development goal	Programme
services] through outcomes [changes in stakeholder		is not convincingly described. A broad set of assumptions	document /
behaviour] towards impacts cle	early and convincingly	have to be fulfilled	logtrame
intervention logic for the project	esented Theory of Change of ct?		
Is the timefrom listic WI	t is the likelihe - 1 that the	Decrements is long anough to allow the arbitrary of the	Duo ano
anticipated project outcomes ca	an be achieved within the	outcomes provided the planned activities were matched by	document /

stated duration of the project?	other ensuring sustainability.	logframe
Are the activities designed within the project likely to produce their intended results	The activities have the potential to produce their immediate results	Programme document / logframe
Are activities appropriate to produce outputs?	The programme activities from component 1 and 2 have the potential to achieve their outputs. A wider approach is needed to achieve a critical mass ensuring appropriate management (3) and consensus (4) on CWR protection, study and use.	Programme document / logframe
Are activities appropriate to drive change along the intended causal pathway(s)	The gap between outcomes and Development goal is quite wide. A vast set of assumption and activities have to be implemented to bridge this gap	Programme document / logframe
Are impact drivers, assumptions and the roles and capacities of key actors and stakeholders clearly described for each key causal pathway?	The programme design is not aligned to the ToC model, it deals with activities and results and has limited concerns for demonstrating the change along casual pathways.	Programme document / logframe
Overall rating for Intended Results and causality		MS
Efficiency		
Are any cost- or time-saving measures proposed to bring the project to a successful conclusion within its programmed budget and timeframe?	Field activities are undertaken on a case by case basis to tackle and opportunities of CWR existing in the field. On the other side, the lack of standards on management and expenditures could result in inefficiencies during the implementation.	Programme document
Does the project intend to make use of / build upon pre- existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities with other initiatives, programmes and projects etc. to increase project efficiency?	Networking of leading institutions in each country is at the core of the programme strategy. thus field activities are integrated in already existing strategies and build on local expertise.	Programme document
Overall rating for Efficiency		MS
Sustainability / Replication and Catalytic effects		
Does the project design present a strategy / approach to sustaining outcomes / benefits?	The programme has a strictly basic research approach. Little concerns for sustainability – linking activities to income generation – is sought at the design level	Programme document
Does the design identify the social or political factors that may influence positively or negatively the sustenance of project results and progress towards impacts? Does the design foresee sufficient activities to promote government and stakeholder awareness, interests, commitment and incentives to execute, enforce and pursue the programmes, plans, agreements, monitoring systems etc. prepared and agreed upon under the project?	Although considerations are made on socio-political factors and awareness raising is directed to create consensus on the CWR value, little is build a broad participation of stakeholders from the economic sector and, in a lesser measure, the academic one. networks are mostly limited to organization dealing with CWR in the basic research stage, plus agricultural and environmental institutions.	Programme document Programme
benefits, does the design propose adequate measures /	The programme design is note concerned with access to	riogramme

mechanisms to secure this funding?		funding after the programme expiry	document
Are there any financial risks that may jeopar sustenance of project results and onward pro- impact?	rdize ogress towards	Incomplete design doesn't consider the requirements of people and organizations that could make an economic use of the programme outputs.	Programme document
Does the project design adequately describe institutional frameworks, governance structu processes, policies, sub-regional agreements accountability frameworks etc. required to s results?	the ires and s, legal and ustain project	Identification studies included the analysis of the institutional framework related to CWR. Less emphasis was put on its governance and sub-regional initiatives or accountability.	Programme document
Does the project design identify environmer positive or negative, that can influence the f project benefits? Are there any project outpu level results that are likely to affect the envi which, in turn, might affect sustainability of benefits?	ntal factors, uture flow of its or higher ronment, project	The project design has a partial analysis of environmental factors. In fact the programme itself is expected to define such elements and to propose remediation in order to conserve CWR	Programme document
Does the project design foresee adequate measures to catalyze behavioural changes in terms of use and application by the relevant stakeholders of (e.g.):	 i) technologies and approaches show-cased by the demonstration projects; 	Programme document	Programme document
	ii) strategic programmes and plans developed	Programme document	Programme document
iii) assessment, monitoring and management systems established at a national and sub-regional level		Programme document	Programme document
Does the project design foresee adequate measures to contribute to institutional changes? [An important aspect of the catalytic role of the project is its contribution to institutional uptake or mainstreaming of project-piloted approaches in any regional or national demonstration projects]		The support to national institutions and networks is a progress in the creation of a new institutional approach to CWR conservation.	Programme document
Does the project design foresee adequate me contribute to policy changes (on paper and i implementation of policy)?	easures to n	The programme tackles specific needs of the CWR conservation. Its impact is targeted and localized. National policies are marginally touched as the programme	Programme document

	component in such area is mostly concerned with the coordination of the sector than in framing new policies.	
Does the project design foresee adequate measures to contribute to sustain follow-on financing (catalytic financing) from Governments, the GEF or other donors?	Measures to sustain follow-up financing are of a limited size. The sustainability strategy is sketchy at the programme documents.	Programme document
Does the project design foresee adequate measures to create opportunities for particular individuals or institutions ("champions") to catalyze change (without which the project would not achieve all of its results)?	The project strategy is concentrate resources on a limited number of champion taxa and initiatives.	Programme document
Are the planned activities likely to generate the level of ownership by the main national and regional stakeholders necessary to allow for the project results to be sustained?	The convergence of the programme components is directed to generate ownership. This approach is countenanced by the exclusion from most activities of the economically active stakeholders.	Programme document
Overall rating for Sustainability / Replication and Catalytic effects		MU
Risk identification and Social Safeguards		
Are critical risks appropriately addressed?	The programme addresses the risks directly related to its activities. Social and political challenges are tackled while economic challenges are little considered	Programme document
Are assumptions properly specified as factors affecting achievement of project results that are beyond the control of the project?	Assumptions on progress results are well designed. The knowledge basis of the programme context and actions is quite well defined.	Programme document
Are potentially negative environmental, economic and social impacts of projects identified	Negative impacts are identified, although the programme strategy is not adequate to meet all of them. Demonstrative actions have a role in further improving the knowledge on conditioning factors.	Programme document
Overall rating for Risk identification and Social Safeguards		MS
Governance and Supervision Arrangements		
Is the project governance model comprehensive, clear and appropriate?	The different levels of decision making are clearly described in the programme document	Programme document
Are roles and responsibilities clearly defined?	Tasks are assigned at each level in a logical and clear way.	Programme document
Are supervision / oversight arrangements clear and appropriate?	Supervisory committees and reporting procedures allow decision makers tackle the problems arising from implementation in an appropriate way. Anyway the top down approach makes little room for feedback from beneficiaries in the field.	Programme document
Overall rating for Governance and Supervision Arrangements		MS

Management, Execution and Partnership Arrangements	The programme strategy privileged flexibility through shared coordination of activities at the different implementation levels. Partners co-financing enhanced their commitment to programme execution. Partnership arrangements were central to achieve this shared decision approach.	Programme document
Have the capacities of partner been adequately assessed?	Countries CWR strategies and partners skills and coordination were assessed in the identification phase.	Programme document
Are the execution arrangements clear?	The project execution was performed through Partnership agreements / LoA. Their negotiation resulted in the clarification of challenges and constraints to the programme implementation.	Programme document
Are the roles and responsibilities of internal and external partners properly specified?	The tasks of the local partners have been negotiated and clarified case by case. International organizations expectations have not been properly assessed as their international perspective doesn't match the decentralized approach of the programme.	Programme document
Overall rating for Management, Execution and Partnership Arrangements		MS
Financial Planning / budgeting		
Are there any obvious deficiencies in the budgets / financial planning	Budgeting and financial planning are aligned to Bioversity procedures. Co-financing creates the conditions for sharing decisions in funds allocations. In absence of a project procedures manual, analysis of financial issues is limited. Flexibility in financial rules reduces the chances of a square and reliable assessment of goodness of expenditures. The programme fulfilled the expectation of leveraging local resources in order to achieve local ownership.	Programme document
Cost effectiveness of proposed resource utilization as described in project budgets and viability in respect of resource mobilization potential	The local partners based implementation approach has the potential for contained expenses and effective targeting. Due to the quite extensive set of activities implementing innovative / scientific methodologies and high logistic constraints in accessing conservation sites, it is difficult to assess cost effectiveness.	Programme document
Financial and administrative arrangements including flows of funds are clearly described	The budget breakdown in budget lines without reference to expenditure center / activities makes difficult to assess the goodness of the flows of funds.	Programme document
Overall rating for Financial Planning / budgeting		S
Monitoring		
 Does the logical framework: capture the key elements in the Theory of Change for the project? have 'SMART' indicators for outcomes and 	The logframe is not aligned to the ToC as UNEP adopted this approach after the progreamme inception. Indicators are wordy and often without targets. Means of verification are not always available due to the programme reporting	Programme document / logframe

 objectives? have appropriate 'means of verification' adequately identify assumptions 	standards. Assumptions are realistic	
Are the milestones and performance indicators appropriate and sufficient to foster management towards outcomes and higher level objectives?	Higher level objectives requires a more complete strategy. milestones and indicators for the high level objectives are inadequate.	Programme document / logframe
Is there baseline information in relation to key performance indicators?	The initial surveys of the CWR country systems and partners are adequate to assess progress in this sector. Programme activities include surveys to assess specific themes baselines.	Programme document / logframe
Has the method for the baseline data collection been explained?	Not adequately	Programme document
Has the desired level of achievement (targets) been specified for indicators of Outcomes and are targets based on a reasoned estimate of baseline??	Targets are often qualitative or not specified. They are often not referable to the baseline studies	Programme document / logframe
Has the time frame for monitoring activities been specified?	The programme document presents the time frame for monitoring in a discursive way	Programme document
Are the organisational arrangements for project level progress monitoring clearly specified	The presentation of the monitoring arrangement is sketchy and not consistent with current standards	Programme document
Has a budget been allocated for monitoring project progress in implementation against outputs and outcomes?	No specific budget line for monitoring can be found in the budget attached to the programme document	Programme document / programme budget
Overall, is the approach to monitoring progress and performance within the project adequate?	The lack of a reliable monitoring strategy defining procedures independent from project coordination is inadequate to current M&E standards	Programme document
Overall rating for Monitoring		MU
Evaluation		
Is there an adequate plan for evaluation?	The evaluation plan is sketchy although in view of the limited consistency of this activity a more detailed description is not required	Programme document
Has the time frame for Evaluation activities been specified?	The evaluation time is sketchy although in view of the limited consistency of this activity a more detailed description is not essential	Programme document
Is there an explicit budget provision for mid term review and terminal evaluation?	No specific budget line for evaluation can be found in the budget attached to the programme document. Lack of evaluation budgeting could result in misperception its role in the programme economy	Programme document
Is the budget sufficient?	No specific budget line for evaluation can be found in the budget attached to the programme document	Programme document
Overall rating for Evaluation		U

5.2 Theory of change diagram







5.3 ROtI results score sheet

Results rating of project entitled:	<i>In situ</i> conservati application	on of cro	p wild relatives through er	hanced in	nformation management	and field	
Outputs	Outcomes	Rating (D – A)	Intermediary	Rating (D – A)	Impact (GEBs)	Rating (+)	Overall
1. An internationally accessible information system available through the internet that allows access to, processing and utilization of CWR information for conservation planning amongst the institutions within and outside of the target countries of the project	1. enhanced conservation of CWR in Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan	A	 enhanced local capacity to use information to support CWR conservation and sustainable utilization Establishment of networks (thematic, by crop) of parties interested in CWR information sharing web based data sharing 	A	1. improved global food security through increased use of priority CWR	С	BD
2. information systems are operational and allow the efficient collection, management, analysis, and presentation of CWR information in Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan		С	 4. Enhancement of agricultural knowledge information systems 5. Technology transfer / capacity building on CWR role in sustainable development 6. Establishment / enhancement of partnerships to conserve, study / exploit CWR 7. Exchange of CWR germplasm locally, regionally, globally 	D			

3. Enhanced		В	8. Local communities	D		
capacity to apply			interest / commitment			
information			in CWR conservation			
management						
technologies in			9. Recreational use of			
planning for in			natural reserves /			
situ conservation			habitats			
of CWR			10 A server to CWD			
			10. Access to CWR			
			for economic use by			
			traditional			
			communities			
			communities			
			11, Local development	D		
			programmes			
			exploiting CWR &			
			traditional knowledge			
			12. Local development			
4 Vac-1-1	4	D	12 Internetion 1 1	C		
4. Knowledge and		В	15. International and	C		
of value of crop			regional agricultural			
wild relatives are			coordination			
increased			coordination			
mereuseu			14. Characterization of			
			CWR germplasm and			
			systematization of			
			information			
			15. Identification of			
			valuable genetic traits			
			in CWR			
			16. Investments of	D		
			seed industry in R&D	2		
			in developing			
			countries			
			17. Exchange of CWR			
			germplasm locally,			
			regionally, globally			
			18 Access to CWD			
			for basic breeding			
			research			
			1050uron			
			19. Advances breeding			
			programs			
	Define					
	Kating justification:		kating justification:		kating justification:	
	justification:					
	Outcomes delivered		Sustainability		The complexity of	
	establishing the		depending on		achieving the	

knowledge basis for	conditions and actions	Intermediary stages
planning and	not impacted by the	doesn't allow to link
conservation of	prgramme activities,	outcomes to feasible
selected CWR and	whose focus has	achievements in
local collaborations	remained confined to	terms of food
in sharing	the initial stages of	security but in a
information on their	protection and study of	limited way.
status.	CWR	Forecast are
		conditioned by
		assumptions related
		to a general
		improvement of
		development
		conditions presently
		unpredictable

5.4 Project portals features on February 20th, 2013

Country	CWR species	Limitations		
Armenia	List, publications	Project information, Limited functionality, restricted access		
Bolivia	-	Not working		
Madagascar	-	Under construction, limited functionality		
Sri Lanka	List, publications	Project information		
Uzbekistan	List, characterization in Russian,	Project information		
	publications			
Global portal	List, link to databases,	No reference of records to the CWR programme countries		
	publications	datasets		
Reference portals				
Guatemala	List, records, atlas	Identification data only		
(USAD/ARS)				
Germany	List, characterization data, link to	Identification data only		
	databases, publications			

5.5 Project indicators

	Project Intervention strategy	Key performance indicator	Achievements
Develop ment objective :	Improved global food security through effective conservation of crop wild relatives (CWR).	FAO indicators used for the 2 nd and 3 rd reports of the State of the World's Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture show improvement in conservation and use status of crop wild relatives. These indicators include:	The second State of the World's Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (SoW-2)1 concludes that interest in and awareness of the importance of conserving CWR, both ex situ and in situ, and its use in crop improvement have increased substantially. The UNEP/GEF CWR Project and the five participating countries are cited on a number of occasions.
		• use of crop relatives in breeding from pedigree analysis;	
		 numbers of CWR in ex situ collections; numbers of identified in situ CWR actions. 	
Immedia te Objectiv e	Enhanced conservation status of selected CWR in Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka, and Uzbekistan	National-level CWR Conservation and Sustainable Use Action Plans developed, adopted and under initial stages of implementation in the 5 partner countries by year 4 of the project	National-level CWR Conservation and Sustainable Use Action Plans developed, adopted and under initial stages of implementation in the 5 partner countries (in Sri Lanka as a priority of the national biodiversity plan)
--------------------------------	--	---	--
		Management plans for CWR populations in at least 5 protected areas (one per country) developed and under initial implementation by year 4	Management Plans are now available in all 5 countries for species of the following genera: Triticum and Aegylops in Armenia, Theobroma in Bolivia, Dioscorea in Madagascar, Cinnamomum in Sri Lanka, Amygdalus in Uzbekistan.
		Conservation interventions identified and initiated on two priority taxa in each partner country by year 4	Conservation intervention prioritized for 36 taxa: Armenia 4 genera, Bolivia 16, Madagascar 5, Sri Lanka 5, Uzbekistan 6.
Output 1:	An internationally accessible information system available through the internet that allows access to, processing and utilization of CWR information for conservation planning amongst the institutions within and outside of the target countries of the project.	Conservation agencies in the 5 partner countries have accessed and used information on the international information system to:	Data from the five partner countries is available through the Global Portal, as well as from the international partners' databases and several other international resources.
	1 5	a) develop/revise the CWR Conservation and Sustainable Use Action Plans;	
		 b) develop the CWR management plans for target populations within one protected area per country; and c) design conservation interventions for two priority taxa in each partner country 	
		A single internet address connects users to national and international CWR information sources and is accessed by a increased number of users from different countries. Baseline established at year 4 and goal will be an increase of 25% by year 5 and increasing at 10% over the next 5 years on a total number basis. Data will also be collected to measure geographic diffusion of use. The goal will be to reach users in 10 countries by year 5 and in 40 countries within 5 years of project end with 50% of countries from centers of crop diversity or of plant species diversity.	The Global portal was launched in 2008
		A 10% increase in users per year, the year after the international information system availability, by non-target countries for application in conservation planning for CWR, the study of CWR and information gathering.	Since its launch in 2008 and up to 2010, there were over 13,000 visits to the Portal from users across 164 countries

Output 2:	National information systems are operational and allow the efficient collection, management, analysis, and presentation of CWR information in Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan.	At year 3, 100 % of the available CWR information in the 5 countries is fully integrated in the information systems. This will include species name, taxonomy, spatial information, conservation status and threats, information on uses and users institutional information.	In Armenia, data available on the national website include 104 species, 7,438 records and about 6,000 coordinates. In Bolivia, national partner institutions have introduced 3,010 records from 162 species into their institutional databases and made them available online through the National and Global Portals. At the time of the evaluation the National portal was not active. In Madagascar, data on 282 CWR species from 1,952 records were transferred from the original database and are linked to the Global Portal. In Sri Lanka, information on 30 priority species has been transferred to temporary electronic databases. In Uzbekistan data on 843 described samples of 6 project priory crops from 400 surveyed during 2005-2008 plots and 903 accessions of 8 wild species conserved in ex situ conditions in 7 research institutions are available through the national portal
		International information system is linked to and accessible by all partner institutions in the 5 countries by year 4 of the project.	Data from the five partner countries have been transferred to the Global Portal
		Analytical tools for CWR data analysis are developed and used for the assessment of the CWR status in each country.	All countries are using analytical tools to map distribution of CWR species and to identify important new areas for conservation. Red Listing has been used in all countries to assess threats
		Assessments of CWR conservation status are used in the production of management plans for CWR populations in one protected area per country.	The conservation status of over 310 species of CWR has been evaluated using IUCN Red List Criteria.
Output 3:	Enhanced capacity to apply information management technologies in planning for in situ conservation of CWR.	Developed guidelines and protocols for determining national CWR conservation priorities by year 3 of the project.	All countries applied criteria and procedures early on in the project to help identify key species and areas (36 taxa).
		Analysis of national conservation legislation conducted in each country for the appropriateness to CWR by year three of project and under consideration by legislative bodies by the end of the project.	National legislation has been reviewed in all countries and workshops held to discuss results.
		National-level CWR Conservation and Sustainable Use Action Plans developed/revised and under initial stages of implementation in 5 countries by year 4 of project.	The National CWR Conservation Action Plan for CWR have been developed in all countries (in Madagascr for PGR including CWR and in Sri Lanka for biodiversity including CWR)
		Monitoring procedures for target CWR taxa developed and tested in year 2 and 4 of the project.	Armenia has developed a monitoring protocol for wild cereals in the Erebuni State Reserve, Bolivia for Theobroma in TIPNIS protected area, Madagascar for Dioscorea in Ankarafantsika National Park, Sri Lanka for Cinnamomum capparu-coronde, populations in the Kanneliya Forest Reserve, Uzbekistan for almond, walnut and pistachio in Ugam-Chatkal Nature Reserve
		Developed or revised national CWR red lists by year 3 of project.	Over 495 species have been assessed according to IUCN Red Listing criteria: Armenia 100 taxe, Bolivia 152, Madagascar 153, Sri Lanka 27:, Uzbekistan 63 species.
		Management plans for CWR populations in at least 5 protected areas (one per country) developed and under initial implementation by year 4.	All five countries have developed management plans for priority taxa: Armenia for Triticum and Aegylops in Erebuni nature reserve, Bolivia for Theobroma in TIPNIS, Madagascar for Dioscorea in Ankaratantsika national park, Sri Lanka for Cinnamonum in Kanneliya forest reserve, Uzbekistan for Amygdalus in Chatkal biosphere state reserve, and Juglans, Malus, Pistacia in Ugam Chatkal State National Park
		Conservation interventions on two priority taxa in each partner country initiated in year 4.	Conservation interventions in Armenia on Triticum and Aegylops in Erebuni, in Bolivia on Arachis, Phaseolus, Solanum, Annona, Manhiot, in Madagascar on Dioscorea, Ensete, in Sri Lanka on Oryza, Vigna, Musa, Cinnamomum, Piper, in Uzbekistan on Amygdalus, Juglans, Malus, Pistacia

		A participatory research program on CWR conservation in each country by year 5. Assessment of benefit sharing for CWR conservation and sustainable use by year 4 in partner countries.	Participatory research was contucted in all 5 countires Studies on benefits sharing were conducted in Armenia, Bolivia, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan
		Selected (1-3 per country) national breeding programmes have initiated activities involving CWR evaluation and use in crossing programmes.	In Armenia pre-breeding studies were conducted on Triticum and Pyrus, in Bolivia on Solanum, Arachis and Chenopodium, in Madagascar on Oryza, in Sri Lanka on Oryza and Vigna, in Uzbekistan on Hordeum and Pistacia
Output 4:	Knowledge and public awareness of value of crop wild relatives are increased.	Institutional and governmental statements and documents indicating increased support for and recognition of CWR.	Most countries have revised legislation and management and action plans that make positive statements about the importance of CWR and their conservation.
		Increased budget allocation for CWR conservation in budgets for conservation programmes by year 5 of project.	In Bolivia increased budget allocations for CWR conservation have been recorded,
		Increase in understanding and awareness from different segments of segment (baseline established at project start-up)	Project activities related publications include hundreds of studies, scientific papers, work plans and communication materials, each of them contributing to raise interest and understanding of CWR role in science, environment conservation and development. Print media and television continue to run stories on CWR in most countries. Improvement in the awareness levels of stakeholders with regard to CWR and their importance is recorded.

6. Brief CVs of the consultant

Mr *Giorgio V. Brandolini* has received an *MSc in agriculture* at *Milan university*, Italy, in 1986, and specialized in the evaluation of natural resources with *Istituto agronomico per l'oltremare* in Florence in 1991. At the beginning of his career he tackled the development challenges from a rural community, environmental sustainability and technology transfer perspective. He managed field projects fostering rural development and food security in a participatory way. With the time his areas of interest became broader encompassing community development, inclusiveness and local governance in line with the evolution of the development cooperation priorities.

His full time commitment to M&E started with the assessment of the micro-realization programme in the Comoros islands in 2006. His field assignments as an evaluator involved the recruitment of monitors and organization of team work (induction, training and coaching of evaluators and counterparts M&E staff) as well as coordination of field deployment, surveying, data management, statistical processing and presentation of findings and recommendations to stakeholders. In performing these tasks he adopted and innovated M&E strategies and practices developed by UN agencies and other organizations, e.g., by adapting the highly structured WFP approach in structuring the evaluation questions, indicators and survey tools to logistic and cultural constraints (Côte d'Ivoire 2008-09) and by cross-checking sources of information and field data in situations dominated by difficult access to the beneficiaries (Afghanistan 2010-11).

He is active in the formulation of policies and strategies aimed at streamlining environmental issues into development policies and agricultural strategies, in the identification and formulation of strategies and programmes addressing natural resources conservation, non wood forestry product use, food security and community development, and in and in the project cycle management of International biodiversity conservation and forest governance programmes. His field work tackles agro-forestry, natural resources conservation & use, community ownership. He is acquainted with EU Biodiversity Policy as well as with international environmental policies such as REDD+, FLEGT, CBD, Kyoto protocol, CITES, Bern Convention, Ramsar Convention.

Team leader of missions assessing needs and performing participatory M&E of environmental and development programs as well as elaborating environmental profiles of tropical countries rich in biodiversity. He is active in conducting the evaluation of environmental programmes (ex-ante, mid-term, ex-post), as well as the assessment of community dynamics and women participation in the conservation of agricultural biodiversity and traditional knowledge and contribution to household income generation and community governance.

He provides his advice on strategies and design of work plans tackling institutional aspects of agricultural biodiversity conservation and use for the Ministries of Agriculture and Forestry of Afghanistan, Iraq, Eritrea,

Kosovo, Peru, etc. his field experience in integrating environmental issues into development policies, strategies and programmes covers Africa, the Middle East, South Asia, Eastern Europe and Latin America.

As a team leader he developed integrated packages of M&E participatory survey and analysis tools intended to expand, diversify and speed up the access to information, by interrogating beneficiaries and other stakeholders, cross-checking their feedback and statistically processing huge amount of data. He developed integrated systems of data collection and verification of data reliability through the cross-checking of project output with the beneficiaries / implementing partners' perception in order to assess the linkages among delivery mechanisms and outcome. He has expanded his M&E approach to include learning and accountability (upstream and downstream) in shaping evaluation strategies. While performing these tasks in challenging contexts he developed a deep understanding of the fundamentals of socio-economic development that he addressed by assembling and managing the diversified expertise of expat / national experts and local field monitors / facilitators working in multidisciplinary teams.

He published on a wide range of topics: project & evaluation methodology agriculture & biodiversity, local economic development & social cohesion, traditional health care & cultural heritage. He has excellent negotiation and communication skills and is accustomed to deal with international donors, Government officials, civil society representatives and community leaders. He is creative and acquainted to swiftly address emerging and hidden issues while working under pressure and across cultural barriers. He is fluent in English, French and Spanish.

7. Formal response / comments from the project management team and / or the country focal point

Stakeholders' comments on the revised draft	Evaluator's response to Stakeholders' comments	EO feedback on the revised draft	Evaluator's response to EO
We acknowledge that the project has led to an enhancement of "local professional skills", but it also generated a significant body of knowledge on <i>in</i> situ conservation of crop wild relatives, which should be highlighted. In this context, it would be useful to also include reference to the CWR Manual and the e-learning modules which are the project's major outputs .The Manual is the result of the hard work and commitment of project partners and has been recognised as an important tool for furthering the conservation of Crop Wild Relatives. It is available in English, French and Spanish and it is expected to have the Russian version in PDF format by the end of the year.	The evaluation report acknowledges the knowledge and skills developed by the project in the proper sections and tables. The revised report emphasizes such topics as observed in the track and change comments, for instance in the Conclusions and other sections.	The report has responded to this comment adequately however some rephrasing of text has been made in ¶3 of the main report for better clarity and to reiterate that the CWR Manual and e-modules are the major outputs of this project. Although it is mentioned in the Conclusions section (III ¶3), its mention there has no particular value- add as a conclusive remark. Consider providing a more evaluative statement about the CWR Manual and e-modules instead, e.g. their effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, replicability, etc.	During the field survey, the evaluator asked about the manual and e-learning tools. Interviewees in the national coordinating institutions and local partners had not yet seen the manual has it had been recently printed. On such basis, little can be added to the evaluation report text.
With regard to the geographical dimension, it is important to clarify that the project was a global project designed to be implemented at national level and developing synergies between the project assisted countries while delivering global environmental benefits. It was not designed to be implemented at the regional level. To have done this in addition to a global scope would have been outside of the scope of the approved by GEF Council project. However the outputs of the project can be used to scale out the lessons learnt by the project at the regional level.	The evaluation report makes reference to the regional dimension in relations to the species diversification and crops domestication areas – i.e., to the conservation and study challenge underlying the project strategy – and potential for scaling up the project results. The revised report makes reference to the fact that this would have been out of the Project Global multi-country approach.	This comment has been addressed adequately in the Executive Summary. In the main report however, the evaluator's discussion on the 'CWR geographical dimension' remains inconsistent – discussions come across as lessons or recommendations on the benefits of adopting a regional approach even though the Stakeholders' comments clearly state that the project was designed, approved and implemented as a Global multi-country intervention - implying that regional approach is out of scope. It is recommended that where regional	The dimension of species diversification and crops domestication centers is sub-regional / regional, although the exact coverage is debated, the importance of a definition of an area based on climate/morphology instead than only national boundary is acknowledged. This is the basis for tackling such issues at a over- national level. The evaluation report notes that such shift from national to regional approach is underway in Uzbekistan (Central Asia) and Bolivia (South America).

		dimension is discussed within this report, the scope of the approved project should be kept in mind.	
On the economic value of CWR, it should be recognised that there is as yet no accepted procedures for developing economic sector studies or cost benefit analysis for CWR. The economic value of individual genes inserted into new cultivars remains a difficult area for which there are as yet very limited numbers of studies and no general procedures. Estimates of the economic value of crop wild relatives in dollar terms have been very few and are subject to substantial criticism with respect to the assumptions made and the methods used. While further research in this area would be very welcome it was clearly well beyond the projects capacity to enter into this arena (and it wisely chose not to do so). It would have involved a substantial research commitment outside the agreed and approved project framework. We have therefore some doubts about the inclusion of this observation in the conclusions as it might raise false perceptions of what the project was about and false expectations as to what is possible given the current state of knowledge. However it would be entirely appropriate for the reviewer to point to the need for this perspective to be taken into account in future research by relevant organizations on crop wild relatives at some point in the text of the report. It is a valid and important opinion and should be flagged as a recommendation for future work/projects, but certainly this is not a gap of the reviewed project.	The evaluation report highlights the importance of the economic dimension of CWR use in relation to ensuring the sustainability of the project results and potential for their scaling up through PPP. The sustainability issue is put in its context by the evaluation question n. 7 (likeliness of the project contribution to global food security) along the findings of the Theory of change analysis. The revised report recognizes that it was beyond the projects scope to enter into this arena	Addressed satisfactorily.	The result of pursuing
strategies mentioned under "Project Strategy" complement each other and are not in opposition. It is necessary to build capacity at the national levels to be able to develop CWR information system at national	highlighted that the 2 mentioned strategies, although complementing each other (i.e., provided opportunities for cross- breeding of local and	amended the report to acknowledge that the two strategies were indeed complimentary approaches. His response to this comment however	two complementary strategies is duplex: mutual support and dispersion of resources at once. Both issues are presented in relation to the project design and

and global level. It was a conscious decision in the design process of the project. The development of the system was actually done using a bottom up approach, as is acknowledged in the paragraph 5, 6 and 9 of the findings and conclusion of the executive summary, but also acknowledge the bottom up approach in several places in the report (e.g. para 125, overall assessment on p. 40) . The delay in funds disbursement is not connected to the strategy, but might have been of an administrative nature.	expat experiences) required that the project information management be reshaped when national consciousness on the value of CWR information arose. It also noted that the network approach could have been envisaged as an alternative since the identification of the Project thus enlarging its appeal to other local parties, such as Civil society organizations and privates that could have leveraged extra local resources. The revised report links more strictly the delay in funds disbursement to the reasons highlighted in the track and change comments.	seems to lean towards how the approach/strategy ought to have been envisaged as opposed to an assessment of the performance of the actual approach used as per project design; Perhaps the arguments here are best presented as lessons to be adopted by other similar projects. The issue on delayed funds has been adequately addressed in the revised draft.	efficiency, i.e., is analyzing if other approaches making better value for money were feasible, due to the project flexibility (cfr. paragraph 32 on the adaptive management approach)
It is unclear on what basis the author concludes that awareness activities were ineffective to trigger change in environment policies, while in most countries there have changes in the management plans of the protected to strengthen the conservation of CWR. This conclusion somewhat contradicts the evaluation made under para 35 Question 4 (p.19) which was considered as fully satisfactory.	The evaluation report stresses that change was achieved at the level of project activities (concerned parties) but, also due to the project strategy, it didn't reach the higher levels of decisions making / public consciousness. The project was pilot in this field, so changes were circumscribed. The revised report clarifies such ideas in the sections referred to by the track and change comments.	Addressed satisfactorily.	
Most of the arguments made under para 1-4 of the lesson learnt in the executive summary were beyond the scope of the project and would have better been articulated as recommendations for future work. Further the project coordination did not pose any problem and it actually functioned very well. National project coordinators were appointed to coordinate project activities at national level and a global project coordinator based at Bioversity ensured overall	The evaluation report doesn't include recommendations as the project is over and there is no way to use them in its implementation. It comprises lessons learnt that are referred to potential actions dealing with CWR, in the perspective of food security envisaged by the Project Development objective. The revised report	There should be a clear distinction between the evaluation of the project as designed, and the lessons derived, in order to ensure that project performance is not unduly criticized. There is a continuous trend in the stakeholders' comments with regards to scope, implying that there is a need to clearly differentiate lessons from evaluation	The influence of the design options on the project implementation is clarified by adding reference to the scope of the project.

coordination of the project. The studies being proposed under para 6 was not envisaged in the project.	clarifies the coordination issues in the points highlighted in the track and change comments along the evidence provided by such observations.	findings. This is a valid concern. Suggestion: greater care should be taken to confine assessments to those aspects that are within the scope of the project , and then explicitly highlighting the pertinent lessons that have been identified from such findings (e.g. by use of numbering, bold font, text boxes, etc.) to make a clear distinction. The chapter on lessons learnt may then provide a synopsis of all these lessons, including even those aspects outside the scope of this project but which must be considered as critical to the success of future projects.	
In the evaluation questions table on page 18-20, we agree with most of the rating. However for question 5 on efficiency, we consider this should be at least rated as "satisfactory"; The project had gone through a lot of efforts in meeting the exigencies and needs of the national partners. This is insufficiently acknowledged here.	The revised report improves this rating along this suggestion	Adequately addressed	
In overall evaluation of the project (p. 40-42), we do not	The Evaluation report on the basis of the	There continues to be a general difference in	Sustainability is analyzed in the context
agree with the rating and	Theory of change	perception on the	of the factors
arguments provided with regard	approach and of the	Sustainability criteria as	influencing the
to sustainability. Further we	considerations	discussed in the report,	continuation of
security may be perceived as	previous answers	appearing to be of the	are highlighted in the
being weak, but we would like to	(especially n. 3, 4 and	opinion that they have	Theory of change (ToC)
argue that the project has	5) noted that	been unfairly assessed.	section of the report.
achieved its intended immediate	sustainability is	To be of the same mind,	The scope and meaning
objective on this aspect through	challenged at the	Sustainability here	of the ToC in analyzing
an effective in situ conservation	political and economic	should be understood	the project – i.e.,
of CWR, enough awareness at	critical issues have not	continued long-term	amerent options
beyond the participating	be tackled, typically	outcomes (changes in	are clarified in
countries. It was reported in the	those ensuring an	baseline conditions) and	paragraphs 69 and 70.
State of the World report on	economic support to	impacts (use of these	
Biodiversity for Food and	CWR conservation and	outcomes) after project	
Agriculture and also included in the 2011-2020 Strategic Plan	Sludy. The revised report	he prudent to ensure	
for biodiversity which is the	stresses that the	that the assessments	
overarching framework on	sustainability frame is	and language on	

biodiversity related conventions, but for the entire United Nations system. This GEF project played in an important role in providing the basis for these recommendation to be made at the global levels on the importance of CWR. Further the options provided by CWR to contribute adapted traits for breeding activities is a clear link for their contribution to food security. We consider this should receive a higher rating and that the respective sections of the report should be revised accordingly.	not only related to the Immediate objective but also to the Development one. The revised report partly improved the sustainability rating and provided further reasoning to these topics	Sustainability are kept within this context. Although the linkage of the project's immediate outcomes to the overall (and longer-term) development goal appears to be weak, the consultant is quite in order in pointing this out in his assessment of the project; it should be emphasized however, that the project has indeed been successful in achieving its immediate objectives and that the ROtl and Theory of Change have been used to help identify the most critical impact drivers and assumptions needed to convert project outcomes into the desired higher level impacts. Such information is very useful, even when it appears to include aspects outside the scope and time frame of the project being evaluated	
We do not agree with view expressed on page 129 in regard to South - South cooperation. The project had consistently encourage cross fertilisation between the 5 countries. It has provided a common platform throughout the project for the 5 countries to share their respective experiences, while allowing each country to adopt country specific strategies for the implementation of their activities. One key lesson we has learnt from this project and others , is that what work in a given country may not work in another country with different cultural backgrounds. Approaches needs to be modified and adapted to the needs of the country.	The revised report includes the suggestions provided in the track and change observation.	Adequately addressed	

Finally, a couple of remarks- The Evaluation programme annex contains names of the people and list of the places planed to be met an visited not actual people met and sites visited; Danny Hunter, the Global Project Coordinator is not mentioned in the consultation that took place in Bioversity; the short name of Bioversity International should be Bioversity' and not "BI".	The evaluation report includes as an annex 2 the field visits chronogram with the names of the people and list of the places effectively visited by the Evaluator. The revised report annex 2 includes Mr Danny Hunter, that was interviewed by teleconferencing. It also refers to <i>Bioversity international</i> as Bioversity	Adequately addressed	
Finally, some of the language used at times seems ambiguous and there were a few times I wasn't sure if a negative or positive statement was being made.	The revised report improves the text style	The evaluator has attempted to address most of the review comments in the track changes and to varying extents depending on the nature of the issue being addressed. It is accepted that the consultant may have a differing opinion and evaluate accordingly, choosing not to alter the original text. In such instances sound evidence-based arguments must be provided to support the evaluative statements being made. The consultant should however ensure that wherever factual errors are pointed out by the stakeholders (and in this case, mostly to do with scope of the project), care should be taken to ensure that such comments are indeed considered in the drafting of the final report.	Corrections have been done in response to comments pointing out controversial or not adequately proved facts. Further elements have been added in the text to corroborate statements and corrections to them.