





Combined Terminal Evaluation Report

UNDP Projects / GEF Funding Approvals Covered by this Terminal Evaluation Report:

Project	Title	GEF PIMS	UNDP PIMS	GEF Agency	GEF Funding
A	National Reporting to the CBD: Supporting countries to prepare the Third National Report on Biodiversity Phase I	2714	3456	UNDP	\$1,000,000
B	National Reporting to the CBD: Supporting countries to prepare the Third National Report on Biodiversity Phase II	2880	3456	UNDP	\$1,000,000
C	Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments – Phase I	3414	3918	UNDP / UNEP	\$1,000,000 (\$885,000 to UNDP; \$115,000 to UNEP)
D	Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments – Phase II	3746	3918	UNDP / UNEP	\$1,000,000 (\$980,000 to UNDP; \$20,000 to UNEP)



December 10, 2018

Josh Brann, International Consultant, Brann.Evaluation@gmail.com

Contents

I. Executive Summary.....	4
II. 3-4 NR Project Terminal Evaluation Approach.....	10
A. Terminal Evaluation Purpose, Objectives and Scope	10
B. Principles for Design and Execution of the Evaluation	12
C. Evaluation Approach and Data Collection Methods.....	12
D. Limitations to the Evaluation.....	13
III. Project Overview.....	13
A. 3-4 NR Project Development Context	13
B. 3-4 NR Project Description and Strategy	14
C. Implementation Approach	15
D. Key Stakeholders	18
E. Key Milestone Dates.....	18
IV. Relevance.....	22
A. Relevance of the 3-4 NR Project to Implementation of the CBD.....	22
B. Relevance of the 3-4 NR Project Objective to GEF Strategic Objectives	22
C. Relevance of the Project Approach: Project Strategy and Design	23
V. Project Management and Cost-effectiveness (Efficiency)	23
A. Implementation, Including UNDP Oversight	23
B. Execution (Project Management).....	23
C. Risk Assessment and Monitoring.....	24
D. Flexibility and Adaptive Management.....	24
E. Financial Planning by Component and Delivery	25
F. Planned and Actual Co-financing.....	31
G. Monitoring and Evaluation	33
VI. Effectiveness and Results	34
A. Conclusion on Effectiveness: Progress Toward and Achievement of the Objectives	34
B. Conclusion on Results: Achievement of Planned Results	35
C. Findings Supporting Conclusions on Results and Effectiveness	35
D. Impacts and Global Environmental Benefits	42
VII. Key GEF Performance Parameters.....	42
A. Sustainability	42
B. Gender Equality and Mainstreaming.....	43
VIII. Main Lessons Learned and Recommendations	43
A. Lessons from the Experience of the 3-4 NR Projects.....	43
B. Recommendations for Consolidating Results and Supporting Sustainability of the 3-4 NR Projects.....	44
IX. Annexes	45
A. Annex 1: Terms of Reference	46
B. Annex 2: GEF Operational Principles	50
C. Annex 3: 3-4 NR Project Terminal Evaluation Matrix	51
D. Annex 4: Rating Scales	56
E. Annex 5: Key Informants Consulted	57
F. Annex 6: Documents Reviewed.....	58
G. Annex 7: 156 Potentially GEF-eligible Countries for Possible Support Under 3 NR Umbrella Projects, and Status of Support Received	60
H. Annex 8: 3-4 NR Project Results Framework Assessed Level of Indicator Target Achievement	65
I. Annex 9: 3-4 NR Project Mainstreaming of UNDP Programme Principles	73

Acronyms

3 NR	Third National Report to the CBD umbrella project(s)
4 NR	Fourth National Report to the CBD umbrella project(s)
APR	Annual Project Report
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
COP	Conference of Parties
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CPD	Country Programme Document
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DIM	Direct Implementation
GEF	Global Environment Facility
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MSP	Medium-sized Project
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
PIMS	Project Information Management System
PIR	Project Implementation Report
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
USD	United States dollars

I. Executive Summary

Table 1 Projects Summary Data

Project Title:	National Reporting to the CBD: Supporting countries to prepare the Third National Report on Biodiversity Phase I			
GEF Project ID:	GEF PIMS ID: 2714		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Agency Project ID:	UNDP PIMS ID: 3456 Phase I: Award ID: 00039377 Project #: 00044131	GEF financing:	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Country:	Global	IA/EA own:	\$0	\$0
Region:	Global	Government:	\$0	\$0
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	\$0	\$0
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	\$0	\$0
Executing Entity:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):	April 19, 2005	
		Operational Closing Date:	Planned: December 31, 2007 Revised: June 29, 2009 Actual: April 2018	

Project Title:	National Reporting to the CBD: Supporting countries to prepare the Third National Report on Biodiversity Phase II			
GEF Project ID:	GEF PIMS ID: 2880		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Agency Project ID:	UNDP PIMS ID: 3456 Phase II: Award ID: 00041959 Project #: 00048010	GEF financing:	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Country:	Global	IA/EA own:	\$0	\$0
Region:	Global	Government:	\$0	\$0
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	\$0	\$0
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	\$0	\$0
Executing Entity:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):	December 16, 2005	
		Operational Closing Date:	Planned: December 31, 2007 Revised: June 29, 2009 Actual: April 2018	

Project Title:	Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments – Phase I			
GEF Project ID:	GEF PIMS ID: 3414		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Agency Project ID:	UNDP PIMS ID: UNDP Atlas Award ID: UNDP Atlas Project ID:	GEF financing:	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Country:	Global	IA/EA own:	\$532,500	\$515,000
Region:	Global	Government:	\$0	\$440,271
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	\$220,450	\$300,000

FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	\$752,950	\$1,255,271
Executing Entity:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	\$1,752,950	\$2,255,271
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):	March 18, 2008	
		Operational Closing Date:	April 2018	

Project Title:	Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments – Phase II & III			
GEF Project ID:	GEF PIMS ID: 3746		<i>at endorsement</i> (Million US\$)	<i>at completion</i> (Million US\$)
Agency Project ID:	UNDP PIMS ID: UNDP Atlas Award ID: UNDP Atlas Project ID:	GEF financing:	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Country:	Global	IA/EA own:	\$532,500	\$550,000
Region:	Global	Government:	\$0	\$446,091
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	\$179,550	\$100,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	\$712,050	\$1,096,091
Executing Entity:	UNDP / UNEP	Total Project Cost:	\$1,712,050	\$2,096,091
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):	December 15, 2008	
		Operational Closing Date:	April 2018	

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND OVERVIEW

1. This terminal evaluation covers four separate individual Global Environment Facility (GEF) Medium-sized Project (MSP) funding approvals: two approvals (“Phase I” and “Phase II”) for support to countries for their 3rd National Reports to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and two approvals (“Phase I” and “Phase II”) for support to countries for their 4th National Reports to the CBD, including national assessments of progress toward the 2010 biodiversity targets. Each funding approval was for \$1,000,000, for a total of \$4,000,000 in GEF funding. The first of these MSPs was approved by the GEF March 17, 2005. The last of these MSPs was approved by the GEF October 7, 2008, and was expected to be completed March 16, 2011. In 2016, UNDP determined that there remained a positive balance of funds in the budgets of these projects, and in July 2016 these funds were re-programmed in-line with the original project objectives. These funds were fully disbursed in 2018, facilitating closure of these projects, and completion of the terminal evaluation.

2. The 3rd NR Phase I project was designed to assist at least 49 countries in the preparation of their Third National Reports on Biodiversity in order to meet their national reporting requirements under the CBD; the project document does not state a specific “objective”. This project, through its umbrella structure, was intended to provide expedited assistance to countries and reduce transaction costs of individual Enabling Activity requests. The 3rd NR Phase II project followed a similar model, and was designed to support 50 additional countries.

3. The objective of the 4th NR Phase I and Phase II projects was: *“to enable GEF eligible CBD parties, through their respective biodiversity sectors, to assess progress towards the achievement of the 2010 Biodiversity Targets at national level through a country-wide, stakeholder consultation process and to appropriately report and communicate on it through the fourth national report of the CBD and associated products.”* The 4th NR Phase I project aimed to support 42 countries, while the Phase II project aimed to support 48, for a total of 90.

4. According to GEF and UNDP evaluation policies, terminal evaluations are required for all GEF funded MSPs. However, the extent to which the projects covered by this terminal evaluation were subject to this requirement is unclear, since, although they were classified as MSPs, they were an aggregation (umbrella projects) of Enabling Activities. A terminal evaluation was not a planned activity of the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan of the 3-4 NR projects, although independent evaluation was mentioned in at least one of the projects' Prodocs. As per the evaluation Terms of Reference (TORs) the terminal evaluation reviews the actual performance and progress toward results of the project against the planned project activities and outputs, based on the standard evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, results and sustainability. The evaluation assesses progress toward project results based on the expected objective and planned results, as well as any unanticipated results. The evaluation identifies relevant lessons for other similar projects in the future, and provides recommendations as necessary and appropriate. The evaluation methodology was based on a participatory mixed-methods approach, which included two main elements: a) a desk review of project documentation and other relevant documents; and b) input and data collected by email from Key Informants. The evaluation is based on evaluative evidence from the project development phase through June 30, 2018, when the terminal evaluation data collection phase was completed. The desk review was begun in April 2018, and the evaluation process was completed in June 2018.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS ON THE MAIN EVALUATION CRITERIA

5. With respect to **relevance**, the project is considered **relevant / satisfactory**, as the project clearly supports the implementation of the CBD. The project also conforms with GEF biodiversity focal area strategies and priorities for GEF-3 and GEF-4. The projects' design as an umbrella approach for the disbursement of enabling activity funds was a relevant strategy, although it did not fully generate the efficiencies anticipated, at least for the 3 NR projects, under which only 75% of the expected countries accessed the enabling activity funding; in other words, only 47.4% of the 156 potentially GEF-eligible countries were funded by UNDP under the umbrella projects, instead of the 63.5% of GEF-eligible countries that were expected to access funding through the project.

6. The projects' **efficiency** is rated **moderately satisfactory**. Project implementation is considered moderately satisfactory, due to UNDP not closing the project in a timely manner, and the necessity of re-programming funds from the 3rd NR Phase I and Phase II projects. Project execution (management) is considered satisfactory. Financial planning and management was moderately satisfactory (again due to the issue of the positive balance of funds at the initial completion of the 3rd NR project activities). Due to the choice to re-program the surplus funds, the project management costs for the 3 NR projects rose from a planned 0% of GEF funding to 7.7% of GEF funding; this is still within GEF thresholds for the share of project management funds, but much higher than originally planned. Adaptive management was positive, as the decision to re-program the surplus 3NR projects' funds is considered an adequate resolution to this situation. Co-financing was higher than planned, at \$2,351,362 USD, or 161% of planned co-financing. Monitoring and evaluation is satisfactory, although the extent

to which these projects are subject to the full standards and requirements of MSPs, per the GEF M&E Policy, is not fully clear, considering that they are an aggregation of Enabling Activities.

7. The 3-4 NR projects have achieved the projects' objectives and the majority of expected results. The projects' **effectiveness** is rated **satisfactory**. The projects' activities contributed to achievement of the planned objectives. Under the 3NR project, it was only able to support 75% of the countries planned, but all but 15 of 156 GEF-eligible countries were ultimately supported in one form or another.

8. Project **results / achievement of overall outcomes** is rated **satisfactory**. The projects met the objectives and achieved the majority of planned overall results. Key results achieved with project support include:

- 74 countries completed 3NRs;
- Only 15 (less than 10%) of 156 GEF-eligible countries were not supported by UNDP, UNEP, or through their own/other means for the completion of their 3NR;
- 90 countries completed 4NRs
- 19% of countries submitted their 4NR prior to CBD deadline (against a target of 60%)
- 90% of countries submitted a 4NR prior to the CBD COP 8.
- Collaboration established between UNDP and UNEP

9. The GEF Evaluation Office and UNDP require a rating on project impact, which in the context of the GEF biodiversity focal area relates to actual change in environmental status (e.g. improvements in the status of genes, species, ecosystems, etc.). The impact rating is not highly relevant in the context of the 3-4 NR projects, since the projects were an aggregation of GEF Enabling Activities, designed to support countries in meeting their reporting requirements under the CBD. Therefore, according to the intentional design and strategy of the project, the project may contribute to long-term impacts, but these would only be expected long after project completion, and would be too diffuse to identify the contribution of the 3-4 NR projects. However, an impact rating is provided as required for the terminal evaluation, and consequently, impact ratings for the project must be assessed as **negligible**.

10. The rating for the **sustainability** criteria is **Not applicable / Likely**. The projects covered by this terminal evaluation were umbrella projects for GEF Enabling Activities, supporting countries that are party to the CBD to complete their 3NR and 4NR to the CBD. Therefore, there was no particular expectation with respect to sustainability of results, and the sustainability evaluation criteria is considered not applicable. This applies to the underlying components of sustainability required to be assessed for evaluations: financial sustainability, socio-economic sustainability, institutional and governance sustainability, and environmental sustainability. However, in any subsequent GEF or UNDP portfolio-level analysis where a rating is required, the sustainability criteria may be considered "likely". 3NR and 4NR produced by the participating countries are expected to remain available (at a minimum, on the CBD website) for reference.

RECOMMENDATIONS

11. The recommendations of the terminal evaluation are listed below, with the primary target audience for each recommendation following in brackets.

12. **Key Recommendation 1:** It is recommended that for any future umbrella enabling activity projects, if a terminal evaluation is required, it should be conducted within the final three months of project execution, as per GEF and UNDP evaluation requirements. [UNDP]

13. **Key Recommendation 2:** It is recommended that all UNDP-GEF projects undergo an audit at least once, at least one year prior to project completion. If audit costs are not prohibitive in the respective jurisdiction where project management is located, it is recommended that audits be a standard part of annual project financial management. [UNDP]

LESSONS

14. The below lessons have been documented through the terminal evaluation process:

15. **Key Lesson:** Support projects of this nature need to be started long before the actual deadlines for the planned outputs. In the case of the 4NR project, only 19% of countries (all funded under Phase I of the project) managed to submit their 4NR by the CBD deadline.

16. **Key Lesson:** Countries often require intensive support to absorb small funding amounts of this nature. Experience from the 3NR umbrella projects (both UNDP's and UNEP's¹) showed that many countries have been rather slow in preparing and remitting country requests. Often requests were incomplete or contained inconsistent text.

17. **Key Lesson:** Countries need to be supported to include civil society in national dialogues related to biodiversity conservation policy. The review of several country funding requests from the 3NR projects showed that many countries missed the opportunity to truly involve civil society in consultations.

18. **Key Lesson:** Guidance documents related to multilateral environmental agreements should be produced in as many languages as feasible, but at a minimum in the six UN languages.

19. **Key Lesson:** In aggregated "umbrella" support projects such as these it is useful to err on the side of caution in initial funding, in terms of allocating the maximum amount to potentially be disbursed to countries. However, given the high likelihood that the maximum amount will not ultimately be used, there should be a clear and specific plan and agreement about how any surplus funds will be used.

¹ The UNEP 3 NR umbrella project(s) are not covered by this terminal evaluation.

3-4 NR PROJECT TERMINAL EVALUATION SUMMARY RATINGS TABLE

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	Rating	2. Implementation & Execution	Rating
M&E Design at Entry	S	Quality of UNDP Implementation	MS
M&E Plan Implementation	MS	Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	S
Overall Quality of M&E	S	Overall Quality of Implementation / Execution	S
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating	4. Sustainability	Rating
Relevance	S	Financial Resources	NA / L
Effectiveness	S	Socio-political	NA / L
Efficiency	MS	Institutional Framework and Governance	NA / L
Overall Project Outcome Rating	S	Environmental	NA / L
5. Impact	Rating	Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	NA / L
Environmental Status Improvement	N		
Environmental Stress Reduction	N		
Progress Toward Stress/Status Change	N	Overall Project Results	S

Standard UNDP-GEF Ratings Scale

Rating Criteria	Rating Scale
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant (R) Not-relevant (NR)
Effectiveness, Efficiency, Results, GEF principles, other lower-level ratings criteria, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the achievement of objectives in terms of effectiveness or efficiency Satisfactory (S): There were minor shortcomings in the achievement of objectives in terms of effectiveness or efficiency Moderately satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the achievement of objectives in terms of effectiveness or efficiency Moderately unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the achievement of objectives in terms of effectiveness or efficiency Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the achievement of objectives in terms of effectiveness or efficiency Highly unsatisfactory (HU): There were severe shortcomings in the achievement of objectives in terms of effectiveness or efficiency
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely (L): Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future Moderately Likely (ML): Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained Moderately Unlikely (MU): Substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on Unlikely (U): Severe risk that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant (S): The project contributed to impact level results (changes in ecosystem status, etc.) at the scale of global benefits (e.g. ecosystem wide, significant species populations, etc.) Minimal (M): The project contributed to impact level results at the site-level or other sub-global benefit scale Negligible (N): Impact level results have not (yet) been catalyzed as a result of project efforts
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable (N/A) Unable to assess (U/A) Not specified (N/S)

II. 3-4 NR Project Terminal Evaluation Approach

20. The terminal evaluation was initiated by UNDP, in line with the monitoring and evaluation plan of the project. The evaluation was carried out as a collaborative and participatory exercise, and identifies key lessons and any relevant recommendations necessary to ensure the achievement and sustainability of project results.

21. This terminal evaluation covers multiple “umbrella” projects for the disbursement of Enabling Activity funds. Typically, GEF-funded Enabling Activities are not required to have terminal evaluations. However, since these projects were technically classified as GEF-funded MSPs, a terminal evaluation is required. Therefore, this terminal evaluation has applied a “standard” GEF-project terminal evaluation approach, even though the projects covered do not conform to the standard GEF evaluation parameters.

A. Terminal Evaluation Purpose, Objectives and Scope

22. The **purpose** of the evaluation is to provide an independent external view of the progress of the project at its approximate completion, and to provide feedback and recommendations to the GEF, UNDP, and project stakeholders that can help strengthen the project and ensure its success following completion.

23. The **objective** of the terminal evaluation is to:

- Assess progress toward achievement of expected project results;
- Identify and document lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP and GEF programming globally; and
- Make recommendations regarding specific actions that should be taken to enhance the results of the project.

24. The **scope** of the evaluation is as outlined in the TORs (Annex 1). The evaluation compares planned outcomes of the project to actual outcomes and assesses the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project’s overall objective. It also evaluates the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outcomes and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency as well as features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs and the impacts of the project. The evaluation also addresses the underlying causes and issues that contributed to targets not adequately achieved.

25. The evaluation covers the following aspects of the project, integrating the GEF’s Operational Principles, as appropriate:

- Project design, development (including decision-making and gender mainstreaming), risk assessment / management, and preparation
- Stakeholder ownership and drivenness
- Project timing and milestones
- Implementation and execution arrangements, including GEF Agency oversight
- Stakeholder participation and public awareness
- Communications

- Partnership approach
- Work planning, financial management/planning, co-financing
- Flexibility and adaptive management
- Progress toward results outcomes and impacts
- Gender integration and mainstreaming in implementation
- Sustainability
- Catalytic role: Replication and up-scaling
- Monitoring and evaluation (project and results levels) compliance with UNDP and GEF minimum standards, including SMART criteria for indicators
- Lessons learned
- Impact and Global Environmental Benefits

26. In addition, the UNDP requires that all evaluations assess the **mainstreaming of UNDP programming principles**, which include:

- UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)/Country Program Action Plan (CPAP) / Country Programme Document (CPD) Linkages
- Poverty-Environment Nexus / Sustainable Livelihoods
- Disaster Risk Reduction / Climate Change Mitigation / Climate Change Adaptation
- Crisis Prevention and Recovery
- Gender Equality / Mainstreaming
- Capacity Development
- Rights-based Approach

27. Evaluative evidence will be assessed against the main UNDP and GEF evaluation criteria, as identified and defined in Table 2 below:

Table 2. GEF and UNDP Main Evaluation Criteria for GEF Projects

Relevance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time. • The extent to which the project is in line with the GEF Operational Programs or strategic priorities under which the project was funded. • Note: Retrospectively, the question of relevance often becomes a question as to whether the objectives of an intervention or its design are still appropriate given changed circumstances.
Effectiveness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it will be achieved.
Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost-effectiveness or efficacy.
Results
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. • In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short to medium-term outcomes, and longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other local effects.

Sustainability

- The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion: financial risks, socio-political risks, institutional framework and governance risks, environmental risks
- Projects need to be environmentally, as well as financially and socially sustainable.

B. Principles for Design and Execution of the Evaluation

28. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the GEF M&E Policy,² which includes the following principles for evaluation: Credibility, Utility, Impartiality, Transparency, Disclosure, and Participation. The evaluation was also conducted in line with United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards.³ The evaluation provides evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluation followed a participatory and consultative approach, ensuring close engagement with the UNDP project team. The evaluation was carried out in accordance with the guidance outlined in the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results,⁴ and in accordance with the evaluation guidance as outlined in the GEF M&E Policy.

C. Evaluation Approach and Data Collection Methods

29. The evaluation methodology was based on a participatory mixed-methods approach, which included two main elements: a) a desk review of project documentation and other relevant documents; and b) data collected from Key Informants by email. The evaluation is based on evaluative evidence from the project development phase through June 30, 2018, when the terminal evaluation data collection phase was completed. The desk review was begun in May 2018, and the data collection and analysis were completed in June 2018.

30. The TE evaluation matrix, describing the indicators and standards applied with respect to the evaluation criteria, is attached as Annex 3 to this report. An interview guide was not used for data collection for this evaluation report, due to the small number of Key Informants, and the nature of the project. The standard UNDP-GEF rating tables and rating scale applied is included as Annex 4 to this report. The list of individuals consulted is included as Annex 5 to this report.

31. The collection of evaluative evidence was based on two primary data collection methodologies:

1. Desk review of relevant documentation (list of documents reviewed included as Annex 6 to this report).
2. Consultation with Key Informants

32. As such, the terminal evaluation process involved four main steps, some of which overlapped temporally:

1. Desk review of project documentation
2. Consultations with Key Informants

² See <http://www.thegef.org/gef/Evaluation%20Policy%202010>.

³ See http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp?doc_cat_source_id=4.

⁴ See <http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook>.

3. Analysis of data, follow-up to address any data gaps, and drafting of the evaluation report, then circulation to evaluation participants for additional feedback and input
 4. Finalization of the evaluation report and follow-up with the project team and stakeholders
33. Key Informants consulted were those current or former UNDP staff most knowledgeable about the project.

D. Limitations to the Evaluation

34. All evaluations face limitations in terms of the time and resources available to adequately collect and analyze evaluative evidence. For the 3-4 NR project terminal evaluation, the main limitation was that the majority of the project's activities and results were completed many years previously. Therefore, it was not feasible to collect data from project beneficiaries (countries receiving support for their national reports). This was not considered a critical limitation, considering the nature of the project and the expected results. To compensate for this limitation, wherever possible the evaluation has tried to draw on multiple data sources for triangulation of evaluation findings. Altogether the evaluation challenges were manageable, and the evaluation is believed to represent a fair and accurate assessment of the project.

III. Project Overview

A. 3-4 NR Project Development Context

35. Prodocs for "standard" GEF-funded MSPs include a section on the development context in which the project will be implemented. This was not completed for the 3NR Phase I or Phase II projects, most likely because it was not required either by the GEF or by UNDP at the time these projects were funded.

36. The 4NR projects provide a summary of the development context at the time these projects were carried out:

Biodiversity is currently being lost at unprecedented rates due to human activities around the globe. To address this problem, the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) adopted a Strategic Plan in 2002 (decision VI/26) aiming at a more effective and coherent implementation of the three objectives of the CBD through the achievement, by the year 2010, of a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss at the global, regional and national level as a contribution to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on earth. In 2006, the CBD COP8 adopted a framework for monitoring implementation of the achievement of the 2010 Targets and integration of targets into the CBD's thematic programmes of work (decision VIII/15). More specifically, decision VIII/15 promoted the further development of the global outcome-oriented indicators, with particular emphasis on those that are closely linked to the Millennium Development Goals. The same decision also urged Parties and invited other Governments to: (1) develop national and/or regional goals and targets and related national indicators, considering submissions from indigenous and local communities and other stakeholders, and (2) incorporate them into inter alia relevant plans, programmes and initiatives, including national biodiversity strategies and action plans. The CBD indicates that decision VII/301 is to be viewed as a flexible framework within which national and/or regional targets may be developed,

according to national priorities and capacities, and taking into account differences in diversity between countries. It is within this framework that the current project proposes to benefit participating countries. In May 2007, the UN Secretary General announced, in a statement that the 2010 Biodiversity Targets are “fully integrated into the framework of the Millennium Development Goals and, as a sign of further support, the international community decided to declare 2010 the International Year for Biological Diversity”.

B. 3-4 NR Project Description and Strategy

37. This terminal evaluation covers four separate UNDP individual GEF MSP funding approvals: two approvals (Phase I and Phase II) for support to countries for their 3rd national reports to the CBD,⁵ and two approvals (Phase I and Phase II) for support to countries for their 4th national reports to the CBD⁶, including national assessments of progress toward the 2010 biodiversity targets. Each funding approval was for \$1,000,000, for a total of \$4,000,000 in GEF funding. The first of these MSPs was approved by the GEF March 17, 2005. The last of these MSPs was approved by the GEF October 7, 2008, and was expected to be completed March 16, 2011. In 2016, UNDP determined that there remained a surplus balance of funds in the budgets of the 3NR Phase I and Phase II projects, and in July 2016 these funds were re-programmed, in-line with the original project objectives. These funds were fully disbursed in 2018, facilitating closure of these projects, and completion of the terminal evaluation.

38. 3NR Projects (Phase I and II): The 3NR Phase I project was the first of the projects covered by this terminal evaluation. The Phase I project was designed to assist at least 49 countries in the preparation of their 3NR in order to meet their national reporting requirements under the CBD. This project, through its umbrella approach, was intended to provide expedited assistance to countries and reduce transaction costs of individual requests. Its benefits were intended to include enabling country parties to the CBD to improve the quality and timeliness of their reporting as called for under Decision VII/25 of the CBD at its Seventh COP.

39. The 3NR Phase I project had the following expected results: i.) At least 49 countries produce a 3NR; ii.) Guidance material is available to assist countries in the preparation process.

40. The 3NR Phase II project was expected to ensure that at least 50 additional countries produce a 3NR.

41. 4NR Projects (Phase I and II): The project's development *goal* is to contribute to improved planning and decision-making within the biodiversity sector for the conservation of global biodiversity. The *objective* of the 4NR Phase I and Phase II projects was: *“to enable GEF eligible CBD parties, through their respective biodiversity sectors, to assess progress towards the achievement of the 2010 Biodiversity Targets at national level through a country-wide,*

⁵ These UNDP MSPs should not be confused with a similar UNEP project, which is not covered by this evaluation. There was also a 3rd NR UNEP GEF MSP titled “UNEP Support to CBD Parties for Preparation of 3rd National Reports to the CoP of CBD”, which was approved at almost the same time (February 2005) as the UNDP 3NR Phase I MSP; this UNEP 3NR MSP was also for \$1,000,000 and was GEF PIMS ID #2713.

⁶ There was also an additional 4th NR UNEP GEF MSP titled “Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments - Phases III”, which was approved July 22, 2009. This UNEP MSP was also for \$1,000,000, and had GEF PIMS ID #3920.

stakeholder consultation process and to appropriately report and communicate on it through the 4NR of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and associated products.”

42. The 4NR Phase I project aimed to support 42 countries, while the Phase II project aimed to support 48 (for a total of 90). With focus on the 2010 Biodiversity Commitments at the country level, the 4NR global project had two implementation phases. Country-level activities were implemented through sub-projects applying an umbrella approach, under which a minor global component provided cohesion among these sub-projects. The project was implemented through a partnership between UNDP and UNEP, where the two agencies complemented each other through their comparative advantage in their assistance to eligible countries within the GEF's Biodiversity Focal Area (BD) 2. The funding from the GEF was obtained in the form of two MSPs, each corresponding to a phase, and both MSPs approved within the GEF's Enabling Activities window. The Phase I MSP was approved on November 07, 2007 and Phase II MSP on October 08, 2008. The project provided an expedited mechanism for the development, submission and approval of countries' proposals for measuring progress towards the 2010 target (through the 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments) and the preparation of the fourth national report to the CBD COP by beneficiary countries. This was done through interagency collaboration.

43. The 4NR projects were designed as umbrella projects for Enabling Activities, repeating the approach implemented in the 3NR projects. The 4NR projects were also specifically designed to assist all countries that were likely to have an interest in the lump-sum funding for carrying out their initial 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessment. This was expected to contribute to the preparation of countries' fourth national reports to the CBD, which would help countries meet their reporting requirements under the Convention.

44. The project was structured in two outcomes, implemented through three outputs:

- **Outcome 1:** Countries supported financially and substantively with their 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments and the production of the 4NR and other associated reports in a timely and expedited manner.
 - Output 1.0. Financial and substantive support provided to up to 48 new countries (a total of 90 countries in Phases I and II) their 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessment.
- **Outcome 2:** Knowledge Management, Monitoring, Learning, Adaptive Feedback & Evaluation
 - Output 2.1: Guidance material is available to assist countries and website for information exchange and network on 2010 Targets at national level is developed and constantly updated.
 - Output 2.2. Project is duly monitored and evaluated through collaboration between UNDP and UNEP

C. Implementation Approach

45. 3NR Projects: No detailed information was provided in the 3NR Phase I or Phase II funding requests indicating the specific implementation arrangements. The 3NR Prodoc

provides the below relevant information, which describes the overall project implementation approach, although it does not include specific details on actual implementation arrangements:

The project proposes an umbrella approach, a new modality for providing assistance to countries in undertaking additional enabling activities in the biodiversity focal area of the GEF. The project is specifically designed to assist at least 49 countries in the preparation of their Third National Reports for meeting their national reporting requirements under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). This approach provides opportunities to the GEF and UNDP for managing the biodiversity enabling activities more strategically. Other important benefits include: improved support services to countries, reduced administration burden on countries and Implementing Agencies, reduced transaction costs for the GEF, and improved quality of programming. Finally, this global project will aim to ensure synergy between the GEF enabling activities, the GEF's strategic approach for capacity building as implemented through a number of ongoing National Capacity Self-Assessments (NCSA) in countries, and national reporting requirements and guidelines of the CBD.

46. 4NR Projects: The following implementation arrangements were applied for the 4NR Phase I and Phase II projects, which included UNEP as an implementation partner:

The project will be managed by UNDP/GEF (lead) and UNEP (partner agency) through the designated focal points for the project, who are expected to work together towards to fulfillment of the project's objectives. The specific arrangement for each agency and the budgets that each will manage are outlined through their respective project documents (PRODOC). Else, the internal division of responsibilities between UNDP and UNEP are represented in the table and is based on the agencies 'respective comparative advantage' and on the sequence of steps, which start with the preparation of the country request and end by the completion and submission of the fourth national report to the CBD.

47. Table 3 below from the Prodoc indicates the implementation responsibilities. The implementation arrangements for the 4NR project were further detailed in the Prodoc, in relation to the respective roles of UNDP and UNEP:

Joint work between UNDP and UNEP is also expected to be highly beneficial to countries, each agency drawing on their comparative advantages in the project's internal division of tasks. UNDP will retain the role of approving and delivering the lump-sum funding to countries, of monitoring the use of these funds at country level and also lead the preparation of the "Guide to Countries Assessing Progress Towards 2010 Biodiversity Targets" to countries. This is in line with UNDP's comparative advantage in GEF projects, which is the development and management of capacity building programs and technical assistance projects, as spelled out in the GEF Instrument. UNEP will in turn be in charge of producing and managing the contents of the additional webpages within the CBD CHM devoted to the 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessment and in revising countries' fourth national reports as per demand. This is in line with UNEP's primary role in GEF projects, which is of catalyzing the development of scientific and technical analysis, as also spelled out in the GEF Instrument. The UNDP country representation will allow for appropriate coverage of GEF eligible countries in this global project.

48. The 2012 PIR more concretely describes the implementation situation between UNDP and UNEP, once the project was nearly completed: "UNDP and UNEP had different roles within the project, based on each agency's comparative advantage. UNDP's role has been the


disbursement at the national level and the production of a guidebook. UNEP was responsible for operationalising the 4NR Webportal and for assisting, on a demand basis, in the review of countries' 4NR. As demand for national report review was much lower than expected, funds entrusted to UNEP were channeled in 2008/9 to other activities, in particular the organization of regional training workshops for CBD focal points."

Table 3. 4 NR Project GEF Agency Implementation Responsibilities

		Country	UNDP Country Offices	UNDP HQ	UNEP
1.	Guidelines and FAQs			X	(x)
2.	Developing and updating of the additional webpages within the CBD CHM dedicated to the 2010 Targets National Assessment Website, including the intranet for data sharing, networking, sharing of experiences between countries and reporting on progress			(x)	X
3.	Country request and RAF compliant Endorsement prepared	X			
4.	Review and interaction with country partners to make proposals eligible		X	X	
5.	Approval of country requests			X	
6.	Issuance of Delegation of Authority (DOA) and release of funds			X	
7.	Disbursement of Funds (entry into Atlas)		X		
8.	Implementation at country level (consultations, preparation of report)	X			
9.	Monitoring of implementation at country level until the report is ready		X		
10.	Review and analysis of draft countries' fourth national report as per demand (with a special focus on countries' understanding of scientific and technical issues).				X
11.	Submission of fourth national report to CBD Secretariat and dissemination of other products from the projects.	X			
12.	Financial Reporting to GEF Secretariat			X	X
13.	Project Evaluation (to be carried out in phase II)			X	X

49. Figure 1 below represents the management arrangements structure for the 4NR projects.

Figure 1 Management Arrangements for 4NR Projects (Phase I and II) (Source: Prodoc)



D. Key Stakeholders

50. The stakeholders for the project are primarily the client countries who were expected to access the enabling activity funds to complete their 3NR and 4NR. The CBD Secretariat is also considered a key stakeholder, since it is responsible for collecting and tracking national reports.

E. Key Milestone Dates

51.

52. For the 4NR Phase I and Phase II projects, the “approval phase” went from September 2006 to UNDP Prodoc signature of the Phase I project in March 2008. The “implementation phase” then went until December 2013 when the project funds were fully expended, although the 4NR project was originally planned for completion in December 2010. The “post implementation” phase lasted until March 2018, when the terminal evaluation was initiated.

53. Table 4 below indicates the key project milestone dates. The below table should be read keeping in mind that the 3NR Phase I and Phase II projects were considered “one project” in the UNDP project management system once the Phase II project was approved. The same formal project management tracking approach was taken for the 4NR Phase I and Phase II projects. Therefore, when the 3NR project positive balance funds were approved for re-programming, this was considered as a single project milestone within the UNDP PIMS, although these were two separate project approvals in the GEF PIMS.

54. The overall picture from the 3NR project milestones is that the 3NR Phase I project was approved for funding the 2nd quarter of 2005. The 3NR phase II project was approved in July of

2005, with UNDP Prodoc signature in December 2005, and first disbursement on March 1, 2006. Implementation of project activities went on until sometime in 2010 (exact date of initial completion of project activities was not available), although the project was initially expected to be completed in the 2nd quarter of 2006. The actual activities of the 3NR Phase I and Phase II projects were wrapped up in late 2009 / early 2010 (exact date not available). However, sometime before July 2016 it was noted that there were still positive funds balance for the 3NR Phase I and Phase II projects, and in July 2016 these funds were re-programmed in line with the original project objective, with a planned final disbursement date of December 2017. The terminal evaluation for these projects was then contracted in the 1st quarter of 2018, and completed in the 2nd quarter of 2018.

55. For the 4NR Phase I and Phase II projects, the “approval phase” went from September 2006 to UNDP Prodoc signature of the Phase I project in March 2008. The “implementation phase” then went until December 2013 when the project funds were fully expended, although the 4NR project was originally planned for completion in December 2010. The “post implementation” phase lasted until March 2018, when the terminal evaluation was initiated.

Table 4 3-4 NR Project Key Milestone Dates

Milestone	Expected Date [A]	Actual Date [B]	Months (Total)
3 NR Phase I (GEF ID #2714)⁷			
1. Date of first country endorsement letter attached to UNDP MSP project proposal	N/A	January 7, 2005	
2. 3NR Phase I project proposal received by GEF Secretariat	N/A	February 2, 2005	1 (1)
3. Comments received from CBD Secretariat on 3NR Phase I Proposal	N/S	February 11, 2005	0 (1)
4. Submission of 3NR Phase I Prodoc	N/S	February 16, 2005	0.5 (1.5)
5. GEF Approval for Implementation of 3NR Phase I	March 17, 2005	March 17, 2005	1 (2.5)
6. 3 NR Phase I UNDP Prodoc signature – implementation start	N/S	April 19, 2005	1 (3.5)
7. 3 NR Phase I first disbursement	May 2005	March 31, 2006	11 (14.5)
7.1 UNDP management approved re-activation and re-programming of positive funds balance	N/A	July 14, 2016	123.5 (138)
8. 3 NR Phase I Operational Completion	April 2006	December 31, 2017	17.5 (155.5)
9. 3 NR Phase I Terminal Evaluation	January 2007	March 2018	3 (158.5)

⁷ Sources: 1.A. Not applicable; 1.B. UNDP Prodoc list of Annexes; 2.A. Not applicable; 2.B. GEF online PIMS; 3.A. Not specified; 3.B. UNDP MSP project proposal; 4.A. Not specified; 4.B. UNDP MSP project proposal; 5.A. As per GEF Secretariat business standards; 5.B. GEF Online PIMS; 6.A. Not specified; 6.B. 2008 PIR; 7.A. Following Prodoc signature; 7.B. 2008 PIR; 8.A. 12 months after implementation start (Prodoc signature), as per MSP project proposal; 8.B. Operational completion after expenditure of re-programmed positive balance; 9.A. Within 3 months of planned project completion, as per UNDP standard practices; 9.B. Formal initiation of terminal evaluation process.

Milestone	Expected Date [A]	Actual Date [B]	Months (Total)
3 NR Phase II (GEF ID #2880)⁸			
10. Date of first country endorsement letter attached to UNDP MSP project proposal	N/A	January 19, 2005	0 (0)
11. 3NR Phase II project proposal received by GEF Secretariat	N/A	July 18, 2005	6 (6)
12. Submission of 3NR Phase II Prodoc	N/S	July 18, 2005	0 (6)
13. 3NR Phase II expected starting date - UNDP Prodoc signature – implementation start	November 15, 2005	December 16, 2005	5 (11)
14. 3 NR Phase II first disbursement	January 2006	March 1, 2006	2.5 (13.5)
15. Cessation of initial project activities	December 2006	2010	48 (61.5)
16. UNDP management approved re-activation and re-programming of positive funds balance	N/A	July 14, 2016	66 (127.5)
17. 3 NR Phase II Operational Completion	December 2006	December 31, 2017	17.5 (145)
18. 3 NR Phase II Terminal Evaluation	October 2006	March 2018	3 (148)
4 NR Phase I (GEF ID #3414)⁹			
19. Date of first country endorsement letter attached to UNDP MSP project proposal	N/A	September 6, 2006	0 (0)
20. Initial PIF submission	N/A	July 2, 2007	10 (10)
21. PIF approval	July 2007	August 1, 2007	1 (11)
22. CEO Approval Request / Prodoc submission	July 2008	September 30, 2007	2 (13)
23. Revised CEO Approval Request / Prodoc submission	Not specified	October 24, 2007	1 (14)

⁸ 10.A. Not applicable; 10.B. UNDP 3 NR Phase II MSP project proposal; 11.A. Not applicable; 11.B. GEF online PIMS; 12.A. Not specified; 12.B. UNDP 3 NR Phase II MSP project proposal; 13.A. UNDP 3 NR Phase II MSP project proposal; 13.B. 2008 PIR; 14.A. Following Prodoc signature, as per UNDP procedures; 14.B. 2008 PIR; 15.A. Within 12 months of Prodoc signature, as per UNDP MSP project proposal; 15.B. Note to File re: re-programming of 3 NR Phase I and Phase II positive balance funds; 16.A. Not applicable; 16.B. Note to File re: re-programming of 3 NR Phase I and Phase II positive balance funds; 17.A. 12 months after Prodoc signature, as per UNDP MSP project proposal; 17.B. Operational completion after expenditure of re-programmed positive balance; 18.A. Within 3 months of planned completion, as per UNDP standard practices; 18.B. Formal initiation of terminal evaluation process.

⁹ 19.A. Not applicable; 19.B. GEF CEO Request for MSP Approval Annex E.1; 20.A. Not applicable; 20.B. Stated in GEF CEO Request for MSP Approval Part IV, para. 76; 21.A. Not applicable; 21.B. Stated in GEF CEO Request for MSP Approval Part IV, para. 77; 22.A. Within 12 months of PIF approval; 22.B. Submission date indicated on GEF CEO Request for MSP Approval and UNDP signature date on this document; 23.A. Not specified; 23.B. Date of file name of GEF CEO Request for MSP Approval; 24.A. Within 30 days of receipt of GEF CEO Request for MSP Approval, per GEF business standards; 24.B. 2012 PIR; 25.A. Within 1 month of GEF approval; 25.B. Prodoc signature date; 26.A. GEF CEO Request for MSP Approval milestones; 26.B. 2012 PIR; 27.A. Expected based on operational completion milestone in GEF CEO Request for MSP Approval; 27.B. Assumed based on fact that initial work on NBSAP Forum was completed around this time when NBSAP Forum first became operational online; 28.A. Within three months prior to operational completion, as per UNDP standards; 28.B. Formal initiation of terminal evaluation process.

Milestone	Expected Date [A]	Actual Date [B]	Months (Total)
24. GEF Approval	November 2007	November 7, 2007	0.5 (14.5)
25. UNDP Prodoc signature – implementation start	December 2007	March 18, 2008	4 (18.5)
26. First disbursement	January 2008	March 2008	0 (18.5)
27. 4 NR Phase I Operational Completion	December 2010	December 2013	69 (87.5)
28. 4 NR Phase I Terminal Evaluation	October 2010	March 2018	51 (138.5)
4 NR Phase II (GEF ID #3746)¹⁰			
29. CEO Approval Request / Prodoc submission	N/A	August 25, 2008	0 (0)
30. GEF Approval	September 2008	October 7, 2008	1.5 (1.5)
31. UNDP Prodoc signature – implementation start	November 2008	December 15, 2008	2 (3.5)
32. First disbursement	December 2008	December 17, 2008	0 (3.5)
33. 4 NR Phase II Operational Completion	December 2010	December 2013	60 (63.5)
34. 4 NR Phase II Terminal Evaluation	October 2010	March 2018	51 (129.5)

¹⁰ 29.A. Not applicable; 29.B. GEF online PIMS; 30.A. Within 30 days of receipt of GEF CEO Request for MSP Approval, per GEF business standards; 30.B. GEF online PIMS; 31.A. Within one month of GEF approval; 31.B. 2012 PIR; 32.A. Within one month of Prodoc signature; 32.B. Date of first disbursement to countries with Phase II funding; 33.A. Expected based on operational completion milestone in GEF CEO Request for MSP Approval; 33.B. Assumed based on fact that initial work on NBSAP Forum was completed around this time when NBSAP Forum first became operational online; 34.A. Within three months prior to operational completion, as per UNDP standards; 34.B. Formal initiation of terminal evaluation process.

EVALUATION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

IV. Relevance

56. With respect to **relevance**, the projects are considered **relevant / satisfactory**, as the projects clearly supports the implementation of the CBD. The projects also conform with GEF biodiversity focal area strategies and priorities for GEF-3 and GEF-4. The projects' design as an umbrella approach for the disbursement of Enabling Activity funds was a relevant strategy, although it did not fully generate the efficiencies anticipated, at least for the 3NR projects, under which only 47.4% of GEF-eligible countries (74 of 156) accessed the Enabling Activity funding through the umbrella projects, instead of the anticipated 63.5% (99 of 156).

A. Relevance of the 3-4 NR Project to Implementation of the CBD

57. The 3NR and 4NR projects supported parties to the CBD to meet their national reporting obligations. The projects were clearly and directly relevant for supporting implementation of the CBD. The 4NR projects also included an element focusing on national assessment of the 2010 biodiversity targets, with the expectation that insights would be included in countries' 4NR. This was further and directly related to support for implementation of the CBD, and in particular for assessing global progress toward the 2010 biodiversity targets.

B. Relevance of the 3-4 NR Project Objective to GEF Strategic Objectives

58. The GEF has limited financial resources so it has identified a set of strategic priorities and objectives designed to support the GEF's catalytic role and leverage resources for maximum impact. Thus, GEF supported projects should be, amongst all, relevant to the GEF's strategic priorities and objectives. The 3NR Phase I project was approved and implemented under the strategic priorities for GEF-3 (July 2002 – June 2006).¹¹ Under the GEF-3 strategic priorities, this project was line with GEF's Strategic Priority 1 for Capacity Building (CB1), which supports Enabling Activities. The project was also broadly relevant to all Biodiversity Strategic Priorities and Operational Programmes, since countries' national reports to the CBD provide information about various aspects of biodiversity and its conservation for the CBD parties. The 3 NR Phase II project was also under the GEF-3 strategic priorities, as the project was approved by the GEF in September 2005.

59. The 4NR project was in-line with the GEF-4 GEF's Strategic Priority for Capacity Building (CB1), which supports Enabling Activities. The project was also highly relevant to the GEF-4 GEF Focal Area Strategy for Biodiversity, in its efforts to make a substantial contribution to implementing most of the Millennium Development Goals, particularly environmental sustainability and poverty reduction, while meeting priorities identified by the COP of the CBD.

¹¹ For the focal area strategic priorities for GEF-5, see GEF Council document GEF/R.5/31, "GEF-5 Programming Document," May 3, 2010.

C. Relevance of the Project Approach: Project Strategy and Design

60. The 3NR Phase I project was the first to propose an umbrella approach, a new modality for aiding countries in undertaking Enabling Activities in the biodiversity focal area of the GEF. The project was specifically designed to assist at least 49 countries in the preparation of their 3NR for meeting their national reporting requirements under the CBD. This approach was expected to provide the GEF and UNDP opportunities for managing biodiversity Enabling Activities more strategically. Other important benefits were expected to include: improved support services to countries, reduced administration burden on countries and Implementing Agencies, reduced transaction costs for the GEF, and improved quality of programming. Finally, this global project aimed to ensure synergy between the GEF Enabling Activities, the GEF's strategic approach for capacity building as implemented through ongoing National Capacity Self-Assessments in countries, and national reporting requirements and guidelines of the CBD.

61. The project strategy and design are considered relevant, although experience from the 3NR Phase I and Phase II projects showed that the umbrella approach did not fully generate the efficiencies expected. Only 75% (74 of 99) of the expected countries ultimately accessed the Enabling Activity funding to complete their 3NR. Other GEF-eligible countries completed their 3NR without GEF support (18 countries, two did not submit to CBD), or with a stand-alone Enabling Activity (eight countries, but four did not submit 3NRs to the CBD). A total of 15 GEF-eligible countries did not take advantage of the umbrella Enabling Activity modality, and did not otherwise complete their 3NR through other means. Although the umbrella approach did not facilitate the uptake of Enabling Activities by as many countries as anticipated, it may still have been more efficient than the alternative approach of all countries accessing Enabling Activity funding individually.

V. Project Management and Cost-effectiveness (Efficiency)

62. The projects' **efficiency** is rated *moderately satisfactory*. The efficiency rating is an aggregate of the implementation and execution ratings, plus a qualitative assessment of the other factors analyzed below under each of the headings in this section of the report: Risk assessment and monitoring, flexibility and adaptive management, financial planning, co-financing, and monitoring and evaluation.

A. Implementation, Including UNDP Oversight

63. UNDP is the GEF Agency responsible for the project, and carries general backstopping and oversight responsibilities. On the whole there were no notable oversight issues, apart from the fact that UNDP did not financially close the project in a timely manner (further discussed in Section V.E below on financial management). Implementation by UNDP is considered *moderately satisfactory*.

B. Execution (Project Management)

64. This was a direct execution project (DEX), meaning that UNDP was also responsible for project execution (project execution can also be considered "project management"). Project

execution is considered **satisfactory**. Given the timing of the project activities relative to the timing of the terminal evaluation, there was not substantive information available on project management procedures, but none of the available evidence indicates any shortcomings in project management. Shortcomings in financial management related to the timeliness of project closure are discussed in Section V.E.

C. Risk Assessment and Monitoring

65. The 3NR Phase I and Phase II Prodocs did not include risk assessments, as they were not subjected to the same Prodoc requirements as standard GEF MSPs. The risk assessment requirement was included for the 4NR Prodoc, which identified the following risk:

Experience from the 3NR Umbrella Projects (both UNDP's and UNEP's) showed that many countries have been rather slow in preparing and remitting country requests. Often requests were incomplete or contained inconsistent text. The review of several requests also showed that many countries missed the opportunity to truly involve civil society in consultations. The following measures will be taken to mitigate these risks:

- *Country requests will be accepted in English, French and Spanish;*
- *Country requests contain more guidance on their preparation; and*
- *Information on operational procedures and substantive guidance will be prepared as a priority activity under this phase and made available in English, French and Spanish.*

66. The 4NR Phase II Prodoc followed up with additional risk information:

Delays in the approval of Phase II proposal resulted in delays of 2-4 months in the approval of at least 18 country proposals. While the proposal for this project's Phase II could theoretically have been submitted earlier in order to ensure a seamless transition between both phases, this strategy to avoid delays may not have produced the desired results. The condition normally imposed by the GEF for the approval of phased projects is that at least 90% of the funds from the first phase must be committed (if not spent) before a request for the subsequent phase can be submitted. In light of this rule, submission of Phase II was therefore not possible before mid-July 2008, when actually \$885,000 (or 89% of funds) were effectively committed. The Phase II MSP was submitted on 04 Aug 2008 showing those figures.

The strategy to avoid further delays (given that obtaining DEX clearance under Phase I was a rather lengthy process), is therefore not to treat the second approved MSP (i.e. Phase II) as a separate and discrete project requiring a stand-alone PRODOC. Rather, the internal UNDP approval of Phase II will be done through a substantive revision of the existing PRODOC (i.e. this document). It is important to note that the GEF Trustee has provided its green light for treating Phase II as a substantive revision.

D. Flexibility and Adaptive Management

67. Flexibility is one of the GEF's ten operational principles, and all projects must be implemented in a flexible manner to maximize efficiency and effectiveness, and to ensure

results-based, rather than output-based approach. Thus, during project implementation adaptive management must be employed to adjust to changing circumstances.

68. The major adaptive management element within the scope of the projects being evaluated was the re-purposing of the positive balance of the 3 NR projects' funding after the initial completion of the projects, as further described in Section V.E below.

E. Financial Planning by Component and Delivery

69. The summary of project GEF financing is indicated in Table 5 below. The GEF-allocation was \$1,000,000 for each of the four umbrella projects, for a total of \$4,000,000. There was no project management budget planned for the 3NR projects, but operational expenses totaled \$26,663, plus project management expenses of \$126,765 associated with the reprogramming of surplus funds; therefore "actual" project management expenditures totaled \$153,428, or 7.7% of the total. For the 4NR projects, project management was budgeted at \$5,500, or only 0.3% of the total; actual project management expenditure was \$4,443, which was 0.2% of the total.

Table 5 Project Planned vs. Actual Financing, Through May 15, 2018* (\$ USD)


	GEF amount planned	GEF amount actual	% of original planned
3 NR Project – Phase I	\$1,000,000	\$998,118	99.8%
3 NR Project – Phase II	\$1,000,000	\$874,337	87.4%
3 NR Project – Project Coordination and Management	\$0	\$126,765	(infinity)
3 NR Project – M&E	\$0	\$0	N/A
4th NR Project – Phase I and Phase II	\$2,000,000	\$1,866,468*	93.3%
Outcome 1	\$1,870,000	\$1,640,770	87.7%
Outcome 2 (including NBSAP Forum work)	\$104,500	\$221,421	211.9%
Monitoring and Evaluation	\$20,000	Not specified – included in Outcome 2	N/S
Project Coordination and Management	\$5,500	\$4,443	80.8%
Total[†]	\$4,000,000	\$3,865,688	96.6%

Sources: Project Document for planned amount; project financial documents provided by UNDP for actual amounts.

*Includes (-\$166) in "unrealized loss/gain".

70. 3NR Project Phases I and II: The 3NR Phase I project was expected to disburse all of its funding within 12 months of operation, but the project was only able to disburse 54.4% of the total in 2005. Considering that the project did not start disbursement until the start of the 2nd quarter of 2005, the 12-month implementation period was also expected to go through the 1st quarter of 2006. In 2006 all together the project spent another 27.8% of the funds, for a total disbursement of 82.2% of funding. Figure 2 below indicates the planned, actual, and cumulative expenditure for the 3NR Phase I project.

Figure 2. 3NR Phase I Project Planned, Actual, and Cumulative Expenditure (source: UNDP CDRs)




71. Although the project was not expected to extend beyond 2006, over the next four years (2007-2010) a further 4.1% of funding dribbled out. The project was operationally closed for five years after 2010, and no expenditures occurred from 2011-2015. In 2016 UNDP determined that there were surplus funds of \$137,406 in the project account, indicating that the project had never been financially closed.

72. A similar situation occurred with the 3NR Phase II project. The full \$1,000,000 was expected to be disbursed in a 12-month implementation period, which approximately coincided with the 2006 calendar year, since the UNDP Prodoc signature occurred in mid-December 2005. In 2006 the project spent only 21.4% of the total funds. The project spent an additional 24.9% over the next three years (2007-2009), at which point less than half (46.3%) of the project funds had been spent. However, the 3 NR Phase II project was linked with the Phase I project in UNDP's administrative system as a single UNDP project, with one UNDP PIMS number, and the Phase II project stopped activities (operationally closed) at the same time as the Phase I project, in 2010.

73. Figure 3 shows the planned, actual, and cumulative disbursement of the 3NR Phase II project. Like the Phase I project, after the completion of the main project activities there remained surplus funds in the 3NR Phase II project account – in this case, a balance of \$537,334.45 (combined with the surplus Phase I funds, this was a total of approximately \$675,000); the surplus funds were identified by UNDP in 2016. These funds were re-programmed, as further described below.

74. As of May 2018, 87.4% of the 3NR Phase II project funds had been spent, with a still-remaining balance of \$125,663. This balance consists mainly of funds due to UNEP (\$99,000) under the project joint activities agreement, and operational and administrative expenses to be disbursed as part of the project closing, including \$20,908 due to UNOPS.

Figure 3. 3NR Phase II Project Planned, Actual, and Cumulative Expenditure (Source: UNDP CDRs)



75. The significant under-expenditure for the 3NR Phase I and Phase II projects was due to multiple factors. For one, only 74 countries drew funds, as compared to the budgeted 99. At a planned \$20,000 per countries, these “missing” 25 countries would alone account for \$500,000 of the approximately \$675,000 surplus. The remaining \$175,000 surplus was due to the fact that the countries that received funding actually used less on average than the budgeted \$20,000 per country. Figures for per country expenditure for the 3NR project were not readily available for this terminal evaluation, but for example, actual expenditures under the 4NR project averaged \$17,827 per country, or \$2,173 less than planned. If the 3NR per country average expenditure was just a bit less, around \$17,635 per country, then the \$2,365 difference, when multiplied for the 74 countries that received funding, would account for the remaining \$175,000 surplus.

76. In July 2016, UNDP management approved a re-activation of the remaining balance from the 3NR Phase I and II projects. As per the UNDP management note:

“Reactivation of PIMS 3456 National Reporting to the CBD: Supporting countries to prepare the Third National Report on Biodiversity. The project started in 2005 with the GEF grant of US\$ 1 million to ‘enable country parties to undertake their national reporting obligations towards the CBD’. The project stopped operating in 2010, with its goals all met, but with funds remaining - \$137,406.33 from Phase I and \$537,334.45 from Phase II. Reactivation of this funding is requested to continue to provide support countries on implementation of NBSAPs, through a new package of activities whose purpose is in line with the original project objective. A detailed procurement plan has been developed (see annex) with activities and duration. The proposed activities fall under are designed to equip country Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to implement their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and report on how this implementation helps fulfil their obligations to the CBD Strategic Plan 2020.

This alignment of the new activities with the original objective will be clearly recorded. The planned activities will enable us to provide much needed support for countries to enhance their capacity for improved reporting to the convention. We envisage that the project can be operationally closed by the end of 2017."

77. The re-activation of the 3NR projects funding balance was designed to align with and support the objective and outcomes of the active project providing global support to NBSAPs (GEF ID #5601): "The activities outlined in the plan will dovetail with the current GEF-funded MSP on "Global Support to NBSAPs" ([GEF ID #5601], operational closure planned for end June 2017), with the established project management team to be responsible for initial procurement of consultants to undertake the new activities."

78. The re-programming of the funds was a reasonable approach, and generated positive results in-line with the project's original objective, but was not in line with standard or expected procedures. The Request for GEF Funding for the 3NR Phase I project specifically states in Section F "Budget" that "Note: Unallocated funds will be returned to the GEF Secretariat upon completion of the project." The request for GEF funding for the 3NR Phase II project includes the same note in the same budget section.

79. Details on the results generated with the re-purposing of the 3NR surplus funds are elaborated in later Section **Error! Reference source not found.** on results of this evaluation report.

80. There was no project management budget line in the originally budgeted 3NR Phase I or Phase II projects. Although the re-programming of the 3NR surplus was reasonable, the funds were spent through activities that required project coordination and management support. The re-programming of funds budgeted \$114,500 for this, plus \$12,265 in UNDP Direct Project Costs (UNDP overhead for DEX projects) (total of \$126,765).¹² This means that the "project management" costs for the 3NR Phase I and Phase II projects went from 0% of the planned project budget to 6.3% of the project budget. Additional project administrative expenditures totaled \$26,663 (including \$20,908 to UNOPS), raising the total actual project management expenditure to 7.7% of the \$2.0 million budget. This is still within the GEF threshold of project management budget tolerances for MSPs, but it is significantly less efficient than if the full 3NR Phase I and Phase II project budgets had been spent as originally planned.

81. 4th National Reports Project Phases I and II: The 4NR projects were structured such that the Prodoc for Phase I could also serve as the Prodoc for Phase II, although a second GEF approval for the Phase II funding was required. Each phase was for \$1.0 million USD in funding. Although the 4NR project funding was allocated with UNDP as the sole GEF agency, it was actually a joint project between UNDP and UNEP. Under Phase I, UNDP was to implement \$885,000 and UNEP was to implement \$115,000. Under Phase II, UNEP was to implement \$20,000 of the \$1.0 million in funding.

82. Under the 4NR Phase I project 42 countries were to receive funding, and under the 4 NR Phase II project an additional 48 countries were to receive funding support, for a total of 90

¹² Actual expenditures for these budget lines under the re-programmed funds was not available, but is anticipated to closely correspond to this figure; the remaining "unspent" balance for the 3 NR projects not accounted in the CDRs was \$127,545.

countries receiving support; by the end of the project 90 countries had received funding. Of these, 85 received funding of \$20,000 USD, while the remaining five countries received only slightly less; the average funding amount was \$19,970 USD. The lowest amount (\$18,000) was allocated to the Solomon Islands. However, the average actual expenditure of the per-country allocated funding was only \$17,827 USD.

83. The Direct Execution (DEX) aspect of the project, as well as the fact that it was a joint project with UNEP, meant that procedures to operationalize the project were more complex than a “normal” UNDP-GEF project. In addition, although the 4NR Phase I Prodoc also served as the Prodoc for Phase II, the two phases could not be operationalized in a financially seamless way: Funding for the 42nd country under Phase I (Ghana) was disbursed August 4th, 2008; this was followed by a five-month gap until funding was disbursed for the first set of countries under Phase II, on December 17, 2008 (the day after UNDP Prodoc signature for Phase II), when funding for 23 countries was approved.

84. Table 6 and Table 7 below show the detailed annual planned and actual expenditure for the 4 NR Phase I and Phase II projects.

Table 6. 4 NR Phase I and Phase II Planned Annual Expenditures (Source: Prodoc)

4 NR Phase I and II - Planned	2008	2009	2010	Total
Outcome 1: Support to countries for 2010 Targets Assessment	\$ 910,000	\$ 960,000	\$ -	\$ 1,870,000
Outcome 2: Knowledge Management, Learning	\$ 84,500	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 104,500
M&E	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
Project Management	\$ 5,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,500
Total	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 960,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 2,000,000

Table 7. 4 NR Phase I and Phase II Actual Annual Expenditure (Source: UNDP financial documents (“CDRs”))


4 NR Phase I and II - Actual	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Outcome 1 Support to countries for 2010 Targets Assessment	\$344,067	\$963,886	\$239,181	\$69,628	\$(103)	\$-	\$24,110	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1,640,770
Outcome 2 Knowledge Management, Learning	\$6,580	\$3,382	\$7,200	\$1,360	\$11,694	\$-	\$1,088	\$-	\$27,281	\$38,853	\$-	\$97,438
Outcome 2 NBSAP Forum	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$93,101	\$-	\$30,882	\$-	\$0	\$-	\$123,983
Unrealized loss / gain	\$3,405	\$(3,582)	\$13	\$(2)	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$(166)
Project Management	\$-	\$-	\$3,265	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$4,443
Total	\$354,052	\$964,865	\$249,660	\$70,986	\$11,591	\$93,101	\$25,198	\$30,882	\$27,281	\$38,853	\$-	\$1,866,468

85. The 4NR Phase I and Phase II projects were planned for three years in total, 2008-2010; like the 3NR projects, the 4NR project will not be closed until the completion of this terminal evaluation (in 2018). The 4NR projects were structured in two outcomes, with Outcome 1 (93.5% of the funding) targeted for support to countries for their 4NR (including reporting on

2010 CBD targets), and Outcome 2 (6.2% of funding) focused on knowledge management, learning and monitoring and evaluation. Figure 4 below shows the planned vs. actual expenditure by outcome.

86. In total, slightly less funds were spent on Outcome 1 than planned, and slightly more were spent on Outcome 2 than planned. Slightly less was spent on project management as well, although this made up only a tiny portion of the overall project budget (planned for 0.3% of total; actual 0.2% of total).


Figure 4. 4NR Phase I and Phase II Projects Planned vs. Actual Expenditure by Outcome



87. The support to countries under Outcome 1 was substantially completed between 2008 and 2011, as can be seen in Table 7 (although one country, Senegal, did receive support in 2014). According to the 2013 PIR: “To date, all participating countries received funds authorization and the total accumulated financial delivery is 88% (by end Dec 2012). A budget balance exists and it will be channeled to a new related activity, the NBSAP Forum, which will count on a new portal.” The NBSAP Forum activity also fed into the GEF-funded MSP on “Global Support to NBSAPs” (GEF ID #5601). The NBSAP Forum became operational in the 4th quarter of 2013, though there was additional expenditure on this activity in 2015. In total the project spent \$123,983, or 6.6% of the budget, on the NBSAP Forum activity. For the purposes of this evaluation the NBSAP Forum activity is being considered as part of Outcome 2 on knowledge management and learning.

88. Although Outcome 1 activities (the majority of the project budget) were substantially complete in 2011, activities under Outcome 2 (including the NBSAP Forum) continued on with small annual expenditures from 2012-2017. Figure 5 below shows the 4NR Phase I and Phase II projects’ planned and annual expenditure, and planned vs actual cumulative financial delivery.

Figure 5. 4NR Phase I and Phase II Planned vs. Actual Annual and Cumulative Expenditure



89. Neither the 3NR project or the 4NR project had an audit. No audit procedures were specified for the 3 NR Phase I project. The project documents for the 3NR Phase II project stated, “Standard DEX audit procedures will be applied”. In some cases, the general cost-benefit for conducting audits may not suggest that an audit should be conducted (even if one is indicated in a Prodoc M&E Plan). However, it is considered good practice for GEF-funded MSPs to undergo audits at least once, preferably at least a year prior to project completion (so measures to resolve any financial accounting issues may be implemented). Had audits been conducted for the 3NR and 4NR projects, it is likely that the audit process would have identified the existence of a positive balance in the projects’ accounts earlier than 2016. It is recommended that all UNDP-GEF projects undergo an audit at least once, at least one year prior to project completion. If audit costs are not prohibitive in the respective jurisdiction where project management is located, it is recommended that audits be a standard part of annual project financial management.

F. Planned and Actual Co-financing

90. The specified planned co-financing for the 3NR and 4NR projects was \$1,465,000 USD from two partners: UNDP, and the NGO Countdown 2010. This is an expected co-financing ratio of 0.37: 1. Table 8 below shows planned and actual co-financing. Actual total co-financing amounted to \$2,351,362 USD, or 161% of planned co-financing.

91. In terms of the individual GEF funding approvals, the two approvals for the 3NR projects did not include any planned co-financing. The funding request for the 3NR Phase I project stated, with respect to co-financing: “While in-kind or in-cash co-funding may be allocated by individual countries in addition to the support sought from the GEF, this cannot be estimated at present. **All co-funding indicated by countries will however be tracked as individual country requests are received and will be reported to the GEF.**” (emphasis added) It is unclear if this co-

financing information was actually tracked. The UNDP team responsible for the terminal evaluation was not the team in place during the actual 3NR project implementation, and was not able to provide co-financing data.

92. The two 4NR projects had \$752,950 (Phase I) and \$712,050 (Phase II) in co-financing. Although GEF projects are generally expected to have a higher level of co-financing, the CBD national reporting projects covered by this evaluation were Enabling Activities grouped together in an umbrella project, so as Enabling Activities, they would not be expected to be held to the same co-financing standard that “normal” GEF projects are.

93. Under the 4NR project the following co-financing amounts were received:

- UNDP co-financing of \$1,065,000 USD from two supporting relevant UNDP global initiatives.
- IUCN co-financing from the Countdown 2010 global initiative, totaling \$400,000.
- Co-financing from countries’ governments were accounted for through submitted proposals, and amounted to \$886,362 from 90 countries; i.e. an average of \$9,848 per country (relative to average GEF funding of \$19,970 USD per country).

Table 8. Planned and Actual Co-financing Received, as of December 31, 2012 (USD)

Sources of Co-finance	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Planned	Actual	Explanation
National Governments	National Governments	Not specified	3NR Phase I and II: Not specified	No data available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “While in-kind or in-cash co-funding may be allocated by individual countries in addition to the support sought from the GEF, this cannot be estimated at present. All co-funding indicated by countries will however be tracked as individual country requests are received and will be reported to the GEF.”
GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash	\$532,500 (4NR-Phase I) \$532,500 (4NR-Phase II) Total: \$1,065,000	4 NR Phase I: \$515,000 4 NR Phase II: \$550,000. Total: \$1,065,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP Mainstreaming BD into national planning • UNDP Global BD programme (MDG rollout)
Other	IUCN (civil society)	Cash	\$220,450 (4NR-Phase I) \$179,550 (4NR-Phase II) Total: \$400,000	4 NR Phase I: \$300,000 4 NR Phase II: \$100,000. Total: \$400,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Countdown 2010 program
National Governments	National Governments	Not specified	Not specified	4 NR Phase I: \$440,271 (17.1% cash, 78.8% in-kind) 4 NR Phase II: From 48 countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 NR Phase I: From 42 countries (average of \$10,649 per country) • 4 NR Phase II: From 48 countries

				4 NR Phase II: \$446,091 (21.2% cash, 78.8% in-kind)	(average of \$9,294 USD per country)
Total				Total 3 NR Phase I and II: No data available. Total 4 NR- Phase I and Phase II: \$2,351,362	

Sources: Planned from Project Document. Actual total co-financing received as per data from UNDP/Project Team, with the data mainly from the 2012 PIR, which had data ending December 31, 2012. No data was received for the terminal evaluation reflecting additional co-financing received after this date.

G. Monitoring and Evaluation

94. The 3-4 NR projects should not (from a substantive point of view, rather than an administrative point of view) be required to meet all requirements of the GEF M&E Policy that are regular MSPs. These projects were, in terms of substance, solely a collection of Enabling Activities, which individually are not required, for example, to have terminal evaluations. Based on the M&E measures outlined in the respective project documents, **M&E design** is considered **satisfactory**. **M&E implementation** is considered **moderately satisfactory**, and **overall M&E** is considered **satisfactory**.

95. M&E Design: Although they are classified as MSPs, it is unclear the extent to which the 3-4 NR projects were subject to the GEF M&E policy, considering that they were an aggregation of Enabling Activities, which have different M&E requirements than “normal” GEF-funded MSPs. The 4 NR project included a few activities (i.e. knowledge management activities) that were not solely Enabling Activities, but these accounted for only \$130,000 of budget – around the range of FSP PPGs, which are also not required to have evaluations. Some M&E activities were indicated in the M&E plans in the Prodocs for the respective projects. The 3NR Phase I and Phase II projects had essentially no M&E plan; the MSP Request for GEF funding states only that, “Funds will be awarded to countries through UNDP Country Offices who will be responsible for monitoring project progress as per individual country proposals. Standard UNDP M&E procedures will be applied.” The 4NR project proposals did include a more detailed section on M&E, including a minimal budgeted M&E plan (Table 3 of Part IV of the 4 NR Phase II Prodoc). Generally speaking the projects do not meet the requirements outlined in the GEF M&E Policy; however, it is considered that they are not required to.

96. With respect to independent evaluation, the CEO Endorsement Request for the 4NR Phase I project stated, “In accordance with standard UNDP’s and UNEP’s M&E procedures for GEF projects, the project will be evaluated during the implementation of Phase II, where lessons, experiences and the impact of the project will be independently assessed. Due to the umbrella nature of the project, where 90% of the budget is composed of grants and its phased implementation, no Mid-Term Evaluation will be carried out.” However, in the budgeted M&E Plan table immediately following this statement there was no budget indicated for independent

evaluation. In terms of budget, \$20,000 was indicated for “Project Intranet”, but all other M&E costs were to be covered through GEF Agency fees, or with partner managed funds.

97. The 3NR projects did not include a results framework with indicators and targets; the only “indicator” was provided on the cover page of the project proposals, stating (in the case of the 3NR Phase I project) in a box on “Contribution to Key Indicators of the [GEF] Business Plan”: *“At least 49 countries will be assisted in preparation of Third National Reports on Biodiversity in order to meet their national reporting requirements to the Convention on Biological Diversity.”*

98. The 4NR projects did include a results framework with indicators and targets, in line with the GEF M&E Policy.

99. M&E Implementation: The project M&E activities were implemented as foreseen. The project team provided reports at required reporting intervals (i.e. quarterly progress reports, annual PIR), and UNDP oversight has been appropriate. The project did not have a financial audit (as discussed at the end of Section V.E above on financial management), although audits were at least indicated in some of the projects’ M&E plans.

100. The one notable (and obvious) shortcoming of the implementation of M&E activities is that the terminal evaluation was not conducted until long after the completion of the 3-4 NR projects. This was likely due to a combination of factors: a) the fact that the projects were only an aggregation of Enabling Activities (which do not require terminal evaluations); b) some shortcoming on oversight on the part of the responsible GEF Agency (UNDP); and c) the fact that the 4NR project was a joint project with UNEP. In the 2012 PIR for the 4NR projects, the following “problem” was identified: *“Evaluations of joint agency projects are complicated because of the need to harmonise procedures”*, with the solution being *“Wait until 2014 and consult with Evaluation Offices of both UNDP and UNEP.”* It was also stated, *“there will be consultations with UNDP’s and UNEP’s Evaluation Office on the preferred approach to evaluation.”*

101. While the delayed terminal evaluation is not an ideal situation, it is not considered a critical shortcoming in this instance, since most Enabling Activities do not have terminal evaluations. Therefore, the fact that any terminal evaluation is being conducted for these Enabling Activity umbrella projects is incrementally beneficial relative to the majority of GEF-funded Enabling Activities. At the same time, it is recommended that for any future umbrella Enabling Activity projects, if a terminal evaluation is required, it should be conducted within the final three months of project execution, as per GEF and UNDP evaluation requirements.

VI. Effectiveness and Results

A. Conclusion on Effectiveness: Progress Toward and Achievement of the Objectives

102. The 3-4 NR Projects have achieved the projects’ objectives and the majority of expected results. The projects’ **effectiveness** is rated **satisfactory**. Under the 3NR project, the project was able to support 74 of the planned 99 countries, but all but 15 of the 156 GEF-eligible countries completed their 3NR through one mode of support another (from UNDP, UNEP, or on their

own). Of these 15, 8 actively refused support, meaning that only 7 countries were not supported.

103. Under the 4NR projects, 90 of the planned 90 countries were supported, although only 17% of countries met the CBD reporting deadline prior to COP 10, and 10% of countries did not submit 4th national reports by the time of the COP.

B. Conclusion on Results: Achievement of Planned Results

104. Project **results / achievement of overall outcomes** is rated **satisfactory**. The 3NR Phase I and Phase II projects met the objective of assisting countries with their 3NRs to the CBD, although only 74 of the anticipated 99 countries requested funding under the 3NR umbrella project; however, all but seven GEF-eligible countries ultimately received support in one form or another (i.e. via UNDP, UNEP, through stand-alone Enabling Activities, or actively refused support). The 3NR projects did not have a results framework with indicators and targets by which to assess results. The 4NR projects did have a results framework with targets and indicators.

105. Detailed and specific information related to project results not otherwise covered in this section is available in the “Self-assessment” column of Annex 8 of this report, which includes the 3NR project’s reporting on “Progress in addressing project priorities and in delivering expected products” 4NR projects’ results framework and the on indicators and targets from the 2008 PIR (the final PIR produced) for the 3NR projects.

C. Findings Supporting Conclusions on Results and Effectiveness

106. Results from the 3rd National Reporting Projects - Phase I and Phase II

107. At completion of the project activities, 74 countries had received funding under this project and 64 submitted their 3NR to the CBD COP. This is 75% of the 99 countries that were expected to be supported. The full list of GEF-eligible countries and their 3NR funding status and results are included in Annex 6.

108. There are a variety of valid reasons that only 74 countries received funding. The GEF-funding context and GEF Agency context are important for understanding the project situation, and the number of countries that received assistance. The 3NR project that is the subject of this evaluation was implemented by UNDP, but there was also a similar UNEP umbrella project approved at the same time. When the UNDP and UNEP projects were being developed prior to GEF funding approval, the idea was that all GEF-eligible countries would receive their Enabling Activity assistance for their 3NR through one of the two umbrella projects. The UNDP 3NR Phase I and Phase II projects were to cover 99 countries, and the UNEP project was to cover “up to” 50 countries. According to UNDP project staff, the two agencies aimed to continue assisting countries they had previously assisted with Enabling Activities.

109. Prior to project approval there were approximately 156 countries identified as potentially eligible for GEF funding. The UNDP and UNEP umbrella project Prodocs contain in the “Annex 1” of each Prodoc indicative lists of countries expected to seek 3 NR Enabling Activity funding – these include 97 in the UNDP 3NR Prodocs (the project was funded for 99

countries), and 44 in the UNEP Prodoc (the project was funded or 48 countries). There was a 13-country overlap between the two lists, resulting in a total of 128 countries listed in the two Prodocs; 28 GEF-eligible countries were not included on the Prodoc lists of either agency. However, there were a variety of factors that affected the actual number of countries that accessed the funding. Figure 6 below provides a summary overview of the status of all of the potential GEF-eligible countries.

110. At the time the projects were approved, in 2005, there were some countries that had been previously eligible for GEF funding that were going to be ineligible for the GEF phase planned to start July 2006. These included 12 countries that were set to join the EU; ultimately eight of these countries did receive 3NR Enabling Activity funding (four from UNDP). Four other countries were going to be “graduating” from World Bank assistance (the criteria for GEF eligibility): Bahrain, Oman, Saudi Arabia, and South Korea. Eleven countries from UNDP’s Prodoc list informed UNDP that they would do their 3NR report without GEF Enabling Activity funding.

111. The countries on UNDP’s original list of 97 that were not funded are indicated in Table 9 below, with the accompanying explanation.


Table 9. Unsupported countries on UNDP's original list of 97, with explanations

Reason	Number of Countries	Countries
Did 3rd national report on own without GEF support.	11	Albania, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Dominican Republic, India, Mexico, Oman, Trinidad & Tobago, Zambia
Did 3rd national report through an individual GEF Enabling Activity.	5	Fiji, Guyana, Jamaica, Nauru, Thailand
Indicated they had no interest following UNDP inquiries.	8	Azerbaijan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Cook Islands, Equatorial Guinea, Federated States of Micronesia, Papua New Guinea**, Venezuela
Did not receive UNDP funding, without specific explanation.	8	Congo, Democratic Peoples’ Republic of Korea*, Haiti, Madagascar*, Malaysia*, Nigeria, Saint Kitts & Nevis, Serbia & Montenegro
Total	32	

*On UNEP Prodoc list, received funding from UNEP; ** on UNEP Prodoc list, but not funded

112. UNDP had 97 countries on its original target list, and 32 of these did not receive funding for the various reasons above, leaving 65. However, UNDP funded an additional 9 countries that were not on the Prodoc list (one of which was on UNEP’s Prodoc list), to reach the total of 74 funded.

Figure 6. Summary Breakdown of GEF-eligible Countries 3NR Funding and Submission Status



KEY: *EU Accession country (12); ** Graduated from GEF support (4); underline = no 3rd national report submitted to CBD (28); *italics* = on UNDP Prod list (97)

113. The Enabling Activity application process was intended to be a demand-driven process, and therefore it was up to the countries to determine whether they wanted to receive funding or not. Therefore, UNDP should not be criticized for only funding 74 countries out of an intended 99. Ultimately, out of approximately 156 potentially GEF-eligible countries, seven countries did not receive GEF support in one form or another, and did not clearly refuse support: the five countries indicated in Table 9 above (8 did that not receive UNDP funding, less the 3 that received UNEP funding), plus Lao PDR, and Libya, which were not on either UNDP or UNEP's original Prodoc lists.

114. Therefore, ultimately the main shortcoming is not with respect to results or effectiveness, but is the inadequate financial tracking of the excess funding allocated for 25 countries (allocation for 99 less the 74 funded) that were not funded under the umbrella project. The tracking and use of the excess funding under the 3NR Phase I and Phase II projects has been discussed in previous Section V.E of this report, on Financial Management. Per the final project PIR, at project completion, there was no more active demand for 3NR funding and an amount of \$285,189 remained undisbursed (corresponding to 19% of the total budget). UNDP planned to approach the GEF Secretariat and propose that remaining GEF funds in the 3 NR project be transferred to the 4NR project; however, it does not appear that this occurred. As of July 2016, a balance remained of \$137,406.33 from Phase I and \$537,334.45 from Phase II.

115. Other Planned 3NR Project Results: The guidebook "*Third National Reports to the Convention on Biological Diversity*" was prepared and disseminated among national CBD focal points. This publication – a primer on national reporting consultation processes – remains available in both the UNDP/GEF and the CBD websites. The guidebook received positive feedback from the CBD Secretariat and was, according to them, widely used in the consultation process that preceded the preparation of the 3NR in several countries. The collaboration on the guidebook and on disseminating information on funds availability and procedures for application brought the UNDP closer to the CBD Secretariat and UNEP.

116. Additional Results 2016-2018 with Re-Programmed Surplus 3 NR Phase I and Phase II Funds: As previously described in Section V.E on financial management, in 2016 it was determined that there was a positive balance of \$137,406.33 from Phase I and \$537,334.45 from Phase II. UNDP approved an approach whereby these funds would be used to achieve additional results that were in-line with the project's original objective (as discussed in previous Section V.E on financial management), and in coordination with the active Global NBSAP revision support project.

117. The following activities were planned to use the surplus 3NR projects' funds:

- Activity 1: Develop framework for learning on NBSAP monitoring and implementation
- Activity 2: Scale-up demand-driven learning facility
- Activity 3: Engagement of indigenous populations, women and local community engagement in the implementation of revised NBSAPs
- Activity 4: Global protected area road map
- Activity 5: Project Coordination and Overall Support

118. The results for these new activities are summarized below:

119. Activity 1: Develop framework for learning on NBSAP monitoring and implementation: *Concept: Develop and implement, through the existing NBSAP Forum Partnership (UNDP, UNEP-WCMC, CBD) and in partnership with Parties, a framework for voluntary monitoring and increased learning on the implementation of national biodiversity targets, strategies and actions, and their linkages with national SDG planning processes.*

120. Under this activity the project contributed two initiatives. First, with additional support from the United National Aeronautics and Space Agency (NASA), a multi-partner collaboration developed the UN Biodiversity Lab. This is an online biodiversity spatial mapping and planning tool. The website was launched July 5, 2018: <https://www.mapx.org/unbiodiversitylab/>. Press release: <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/news-centre/news/2018/un-biodiversity-lab-launched-to-revolutionize-biodiversity-plann.html>.

121. Second, the project supported the Forest Integrity Project, within the framework of the GEF-funded, UNDP implemented, 6th National Reporting (6NR) project. The Forest Integrity Project is working with eight pilot countries to integrate several forest-related datasets into their national conservation planning and reporting. These include: Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ecuador, Indonesia, Peru and Viet Nam. Through NASA-funded research data on forest cover, human footprint, forest integrity, and forest connectivity and fragmentation is being provided to the eight pilot countries.

122. Activity 2: Scale-up demand-driven learning facility: *Concept: Scale up existing e-learning work to respond to the emerging needs of countries; e.g. self-paced tutorials, web-hosted and facilitated courses, webinars and in-person workshops.*

123. The project developed learning material on key themes: (a) sustainable production and consumption, including sustainable commodity platforms, sustainable commodity supply chains and targeted scenario analyses; (b) integrated land/water/marine planning, including land use planning; (c) restoration for ecosystem services and climate resilience; (d) resource mobilization, using the BIOFIN approach and expanding learning, training and outreach efforts; (e) effective biodiversity communications; and f) effective control of illegal wildlife trade.

124. The project addressed these through (a) a MOOC and online course; (b) a webinar series; (c) a MOOC and online course on resilience; (d) an upcoming online course and MOOC on resource mobilization.

125. Activity 3: Engagement of indigenous populations, women and local community engagement in the implementation of revised NBSAPs: *Concept: Create mechanisms and pathways for increasing the engagement of indigenous populations, women and local communities in key policies that affect them, with an emphasis on the intersection between biodiversity and development.*

126. The project supported support for side events at key international forums, and provided targeted support for the participation of indigenous and women representatives at key forums. These included COP 13 of the CBD in December 2016 in Cancun, Mexico, and the UN Oceans Conference in New York, USA in June 2017.

127. At COP 13 the project contributed support for participation of the 19 Equator Initiative prize winners. A capacity building training workshop was conducted for the 19 prize winners on communications and negotiations. The workshop was facilitated by UNDP Global Biodiversity

Programme and involved presentations from GEF SGP, UNDP Mexico, and the ICCA Consortium. The workshop prepared Equator Prize winners to engage at COP by enhancing their understanding of the international development context, briefing them on issues to be discussed at COP13, and better equipping them to deliver presentations at multiple COP13 venues for a diverse set of audiences. The workshop also generated trained spokespersons for the Equator Initiative who can deliver clear messages on the importance of the power of local action to conserve biodiversity and reduce poverty through innovative solutions.

128. The project also contributed support to the 2017 Equator Initiative Prize ceremony in New York, USA, during the UN General Assembly.

129. Also, at COP13, the project contributed to Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Day. This included a UNDP-organized session in which panelists from two Equator Prize winner initiatives, the UNDP Global Biodiversity Programme, UN, CBD, CONANP, and GEF SGP discussed how facilitating the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in biodiversity conservation contributes to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the SDGs. Increased calls for IPLC engagement at the COP meant that this session was very timely.

130. *Activity 4: Global protected area road map: Concept: Work with CBD, UNEP-WCMC, countries and NGO partners to develop a global road map for fully achieving Target 11.*

131. UNDP supported the CBD to build the global protected areas road map. CBD gathered information received during the six regional workshops, organized by the CBD Secretariat during 2015-2016, on the status, gaps and opportunities for the elements of Target 11, along with the roadmaps for national priority actions to achieve Target 11, has been further synthesized and analyzed to showcase the global status of each element of Target 11. In 2015-16, the CBD Secretariat organized six regional workshops in Africa, Asia and Pacific, Central and Eastern Europe, and Latin America and the Caribbean. The workshops involved the collection of information on the status, gaps and opportunities for the elements of Target 11 from 108 Parties, and of roadmaps from 101 Parties. These roadmaps contained more than 1400 national priority actions addressing all elements of Target 11. These workshops constitute the first phase of the CBD Secretariat's two-phased strategy, to facilitate the achievement of Target 11 by 2020. Details of the CBD Secretariat's two-phased strategy for protected areas were presented to the twentieth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) and to the first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI) as information documents [UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/43](#) and [UNEP/CBD/SBI/INF/41](#).

132. The results of an analysis of the roadmaps from the six regional workshops was presented as an information document at the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention in Cancun, Mexico, in December 2016 ([UNEP/CBD/COP/13/INF/17](#)). This document provided an update of the status of the elements of Target 11, and also included estimates of progress that could be made for each element if identified national priority actions were implemented as proposed.

133. CBD Secretariat's second phase of the protected areas strategy: These roadmaps have also been instrumental in the CBD Secretariat's second phase of the protected areas strategy (2017-2020), which aims to, *inter alia*; facilitate decentralized implementation of the roadmaps developed/collected in the first phase, in a concerted manner with comprehensive coordination

among all relevant partners. The Conference of the Parties to the Convention, in [decision XIII/2 paragraph 9\(d\)](#), called for this approach when it invited Parties, other governments, relevant partners, regional agencies, bilateral and multilateral funding agencies, in conjunction with the Secretariat, to *inter alia*, facilitate support networks at the regional and sub-regional level.

134. Activity 5: Project Coordination and Overall Support:

135. The above activities required coordination and support from the UNDP Biodiversity Support Program team. The budget allocation for this activity is discussed in previous Section V.E on financial management.

136. Results from the 4NR Project – Phase I and Phase II

137. The following results were achieved under the 4NR projects:

- A total of 90 countries were supported (out of a planned 90) for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments and producing the fourth national report to the CBD COP.
- The following publication was presented for discussion at the CBD COP9, and then distributed: “Towards 2010 - A guide for setting 2010 national biodiversity targets and for preparation of the fourth national report to the Convention on Biodiversity” (2008); published with the UN University Institute of Advanced Studies and the CBD Secretariat.
- The 4NR Web Portal was functional and constantly updated.

138. The average amount of time for countries to complete their 4NR enabling activities was 14.1 months, while the maximum was 32 months (Bahamas), and the minimum was two months (Mongolia). In the cases of the shorter completion times, it might be assumed that the countries had actually already done a significant amount of the work prior to receiving their funding: 33 countries went from funding approval to CBD submission in less than 12 months.

139. The initial timing of the 4NR Phase I project and the five-month gap between the 4NR Phase I and Phase II projects may have significantly reduced the effectiveness of the project. The 4NR project funding distribution started in March 2008 (31 months prior to the CBD COP 10 in October 2010), and only 17 (19%) of the 90 countries managed to submit their 4NR reports to the CBD prior to the March 30, 2009 deadline (18 months before COP) for submitting data for the global reporting to be presented at the COP. As stated in the Prodoc, *“The submission of the 4NR to the CBD by the 30 March 2009 deadline is crucial for the production of the Third Global Biodiversity Outlook and the preparation of reviews and assessments of progress towards the 2010 Biodiversity Targets for consideration by the COP in its 10th meeting in 2010.”*

140. The project results framework first indicator target was for 60% of countries to submit their 4NR by the CBD deadline. Given the 4NR Phase II implementation start of December 2008, there would only have been three months for countries to submit by the March 30, 2009 deadline. Even without the five-month delay, there would have only been eight months for countries to complete and submit their 4NR – still less than the average required time of 14.1 months. With this average time of completion, all 4NR funding would have had to been initiated by January 2008 – approximately one year before the Phase II countries were funded.

141. Although most countries missed the initial CBD deadline (18 months before the COP), it still would have been possible for countries to submit their reports within a “reasonable” time

before the COP. However, 26% of countries did not submit at least six months prior to the COP, which would have been important for the countries' official reporting on progress toward the 2010 Biodiversity Targets to be included in further global reporting at the COP. Ultimately only 9 (10% of the total) countries did not manage to submit their 4NR prior to the COP, but these countries all took over two years to complete their 4NR (25.7 months), much longer than the average time of 14.1 months.

D. Impacts and Global Environmental Benefits

142. The GEF Evaluation Office and UNDP require a rating on project impact, which in the context of the GEF biodiversity focal area, relates to actual change in environmental status (e.g. improvements in the status of genes, species, ecosystems, etc.). The impact rating is not highly relevant in the context of the 3-4 NR Projects, since the projects were an aggregation of GEF Enabling Activities, designed to support countries in meeting their reporting requirements under the CBD. Therefore, according to the intentional design and strategy of the project, the project may contribute to long-term impacts, but these would only be expected long after project completion, and would be too diffuse to identify the contribution of the 3-4 NR projects. However, an impact rating is provided as required for the terminal evaluation, and consequently, impact ratings for the project must be assessed as follows:

- *Environmental status improvement* is assessed as **negligible**;
- *Environmental stress reduction* is assessed as **negligible**; and
- *Progress toward stress/status change* is assessed as **negligible**.

VII. Key GEF Performance Parameters

143. Sustainability is one of the five main evaluation criteria, as well as being considered one of the GEF operational principles. UNDP-GEF project evaluations are also required to discuss the mainstreaming of UNDP program principles; this analysis is not considered relevant for these projects, as further detailed in Annex 9 of this evaluation report.

A. Sustainability

144. The rating for the **sustainability** criteria is **Not Applicable / Likely**. The projects covered by this terminal evaluation were umbrella projects for GEF Enabling Activities, supporting countries that are party to the CBD to complete their 3-4NR to the CBD. Therefore, there were no expectations with respect to sustainability of results, and the sustainability evaluation criteria is considered **not applicable**. However, in any subsequent GEF or UNDP portfolio-level analysis where a rating is required, the sustainability criteria may be considered **likely**. This applies to the underlying components of sustainability required to be assessed for evaluations: financial sustainability, socio-economic sustainability, institutional and governance sustainability, and environmental sustainability.

145. The 3NR – Phase I funding request stated, with respect to sustainability,

The project foresees that sustainability of the project results will be improved by building upon existing knowledge and capacities within countries. It is expected that the preparation of Third National Reports in individual countries will build upon the achievements, capacity and knowledge generated in earlier enabling activity projects. In particular the synthesis of biodiversity information foreseen in the preparation of the Third National Reports is expected to utilize an earlier body of knowledge as well as be informed by lessons learnt and good practices identified in planning, preparation, analysis, and participatory processes undertaken in earlier enabling activities.

146. The 4NR – Phase I funding request also commented on sustainability: “The participatory assessment of 2010 Biodiversity Targets at national level will help to increase global knowledge about biodiversity and enable countries to learn from each other and, through the fourth national report for the CBD and other products from the 2010 Assessments, to draw upon this knowledge for further analysis, planning and priority setting.”

147. The 3-4NRs produced by the participating countries are expected to remain available (at a minimum, on the CBD website) for reference, supporting sustainability.

B. Gender Equality and Mainstreaming

148. The projects covered by this terminal evaluation were designed and implemented prior to the adoption of UNDP’s Gender Equality Strategy 2014-2017, and the project design did not include a gender analysis. The projects did not include gender disaggregated indicators. Under UNDP’s project “Gender Marker” assessment system implemented organizationally as part of the Gender Equality Strategy, the 4NR project was rated in 2015 as “*Gender Equality*”.

VIII. Main Lessons Learned and Recommendations

A. Lessons from the Experience of the 3-4 NR Projects

149. The terminal evaluation has identified the below notable lessons from the experience of the 3-4 NR Project. This lesson should be aggregated by UNDP for application to other similar future initiatives.

150. **Key Lesson:** Support projects of this nature need to be started long before the actual deadlines for the planned outputs. In the case of the 4NR project, only 19% of countries (all funded under Phase I of the project) managed to submit their 4NR by the CBD deadline.

151. **Key Lesson:** Countries often require intensive support to absorb small funding amounts of this nature. Experience from the 3NR umbrella projects (both UNDP’s and UNEP’s¹³) showed that many countries have been rather slow in preparing and remitting country requests. Often requests were incomplete or contained inconsistent text.

152. **Key Lesson:** Countries need to be supported to include civil society in national dialogues related to biodiversity conservation policy. The review of several country funding requests from the 3rd NR projects showed that many countries missed the opportunity to truly involve civil society in consultations.

¹³ The UNEP 3 NR umbrella project(s) are not covered by this terminal evaluation.

153. **Key Lesson:** Guidance documents related to multilateral environmental agreements should be produced in as many languages as feasible, but at a minimum in the six UN languages.

154. **Key Lesson:** In aggregated “umbrella” support projects such as these, when funding is allocated, there should be a clear and specific plan and agreement about how any surplus funds will be used, if countries do not use the maximum amount budgeted for them.

B. Recommendations for Consolidating Results and Supporting Sustainability of the 3-4 NR Projects

155. The recommendations of the terminal evaluation are listed below, with the primary target audience for each recommendation following in brackets.

156. **Key Recommendation 1:** It is recommended that for any future umbrella enabling activity projects, if a terminal evaluation is required, it should be conducted within the final three months of project execution, as per GEF and UNDP evaluation requirements. [UNDP]

157. **Key Recommendation 2:** It is recommended that all UNDP-GEF projects undergo an audit at least once, at least one year prior to project completion. If audit costs are not prohibitive in the respective jurisdiction where project management is located, it is recommended that audits be a standard part of annual project financial management. [UNDP]

IX. Annexes

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Annex 2: GEF Operational Principles

Annex 3: 3-4 NR Project Terminal Evaluation Matrix

Error! Reference source not found.

Annex 4: Rating Scales

Annex 5: Key Informants

Annex 6: Documents Reviewed

Annex 7: 156 Potentially GEF-eligible Countries for Possible Support Under 3 NR Umbrella Projects, and Status of Support Received

Annex 8: 3-4 NR Project Results Framework Assessed Level of Indicator Target Achievement

Annex 9: 3-4 NR Project Mainstreaming of UNDP Programme Principles

A. Annex 1: Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terminal Evaluator for UNDP-GEF Global Support to NBSAPs and 3, 4 National Reporting to the CBD Projects

Type of Contract:	Individual contract
Location:	Home based
Category	Sustainable Development
Languages Required:	English
Starting Date	8 November 2017
Duration of Contract:	Up to 40 working days through 29 June 2018
Supervisor:	EBD Senior Technical Advisor

Background:

I) The project was designed to: By end-2013, some 140+ countries have accessed the GEF's Biodiversity Enabling Activities (BD EA) with the aim of updating their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and fulfilling other related obligations under the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD). The new generation of NBSAPs being now produced will be aligned with the [Aichi Targets](#) that were agreed upon by CBD Parties during the COP10 in Nagoya, as part of the CBD's Strategic Plan.

This project relates to Aichi Target 17, which predicates the development, adoption and initial implementation of NBSAPs as effective policy instruments for biodiversity mainstreaming. Target 17 relates to all other Aichi Targets with respect to biodiversity policy development.

UNDP and UNEP are the two main GEF agencies for BD EA. They noted that countries that accessed GEF funds for preparing their Post-Nagoya NBSAPs count on uneven levels of technical support for the task, in spite of current and growing demand for support services within the framework of their BD EA. Most countries receive only basic technical and operational support, while others, in particular those that accessed GEF funding directly, receive no support at all. Yet, experience shows that support is vital for a successful outcome of policy-oriented projects.

Through close collaboration, UNDP and UNEP obtained GEF funding for a new and joint global initiative that will address the technical support issue and make thereby a key contribution to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 at the global level. Refer to the approved UNDP-UNEP Medium Size Project (in the [GEF's page](#) and to the complete MSP file).

The project, will cement the 'NBSAP global partnership', together with the CBD Secretariat, a key partner in the equation. It will also provide quality and focused technical support to all countries that have accessed—or will access—GEF resources for BD EA. An important mechanism for support provision in the context of this partnership is the [NBSAP Forum](#).

In addition, UNDP obtained funding from the Government of Flanders, Belgium, for availing guidance on climate resilience within the process of NBSAP preparation and development. Both the GEF and the Flanders financed initiatives are managed under a consolidated operational project within UNDP, titled "*UNDP Global Support to NBSAPs*".

II) The Third National Report fund balance was reallocated in 2016 and 2017 to support four work streams: 1. Develop framework for learning on NBSAP monitoring and implementation; 2. Scale-up demand-driven learning facility; 3. Engagement of indigenous populations, women and local community engagement in the implementation of revised NBSAPs; and 4. Global protected area road map.

With focus on the 2010 Biodiversity Commitments at country level, UNDP and UNEP are jointly implementing a two phased global umbrella Medium Size Project (MSP), within the Enabling Activities window, with the aim of providing finance for the preparation of countries' fourth national report to the CBD, which central theme is the 2010 Biodiversity Targets.

The project is designed to assist interested and BD eligible countries, financially and substantively, in assessing progress towards the 2010 Target through a national participatory assessment process, using the provisional framework for goals and targets adopted by the CBD COP decision VIII/15 and the guidelines for the fourth national report of the CBD will be used in connection with the national assessment. The joint partnership and umbrella approach are aimed at reducing transaction costs of individual country requests, providing the GEF, UNDP and UNEP an opportunity for managing the biodiversity Enabling Activities more strategically in close partnership with the CBD and other key global actors. Activities at country level will include data gathering – building, wherever possible, on existing data and processes – stakeholder consultations, as well as reporting and communicating on 2010 Targets.

In connection with this process and in light of previous experience, particularly with the funding of the third national report, which also applied the umbrella approach, UNDP is planning to conduct Terminal Evaluation for 3NR and 4 NR Projects together with the NBSAP TE. Combined one TE report is required for 3NR and 4NR Projects.

Given its global nature, the projects are implemented directly by UNDP, more specifically by the functional cluster 'Ecosystem & Biodiversity' (EBD) within UNDP-GEF. Project implementation will be carried out in close collaboration with [UNEP](#), in particular with UNEP's centre of excellence, World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC), plus UNEP-GEF other relevant UNEP divisions and other Projects' partners.

The TEs will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. The objectives of the evaluations are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Scope of work:

The scope of the evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the projects. The evaluator will compare planned outcomes of the project to actual outcomes and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the projects' overall objective of the Global Support to NBSAPs and 3, 4 National Reporting to the CBD projects. It will also attempt to evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outcomes and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency as well as features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs and the impacts of the projects. The evaluations will also address the underlying causes and issues that contributed to targets not adequately achieved.

The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported Projects](#). An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported projects can be found in [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#). The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular with the GEF focal point, UNDP and UNEP Project team. The evaluator should also interview the UNDP GEF Technical Advisor based in the region and key stakeholders, the donor, contact persons from UNEP (as a responsible party for the NBSAP project). Interviews will be held with a number of organizations at the global level as indicated above, as well as, local, regional and national stakeholders which details will be provided by UNDP and UNEP.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the projects document, projects reports – including annual reports, projects budget revisions, progress reports, projects files, national strategic and legal

documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment (all provided by UNDP).

The Evaluations will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the adequacy and sustainability of project budgeting to deliver on the key objective and outcomes of the projects. The evaluator will receive assistance from the United Nations Environment Programme and UNDP Project Team to obtain financial data.

The evaluation reports must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations, and lessons.

Expected outputs and deliverables:

The key product expected from the terminal evaluations are two comprehensive analytical reports written in English and according to the provided outline.

The two terminal evaluation reports will be stand-alone documents that substantiates its conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned; one for the Global support to NBSAPs and a joint one for the 3, 4 NR to the CBD Projects. The reports will provide convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings.

The reports, together with its annexes, will be submitted in electronic format in both, MS Word and pdf format.

The consultant is expected to deliver the following:

- Presentation on initial findings for the Global support to NBSAP project once all interviews and research have been completed - to be submitted by 23 March 2018;
- Presentation on initial findings for the 3 and 4 NR to the CBD projects once all interviews and research have been completed - to be submitted by 23 April 2018;
- Draft final full Report for the Global support to NBSAP project as per required template and including annexes delivered - to be submitted by 9 April 2018;
- Draft final full Report for the 3 and 4 NR to the CBD projects as per required template and including annexes delivered - to be submitted by 18 May 2018;
- Final Report (revised reports) for the Global support to NBSAP project, detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report - to be submitted by 25 May 2018;
- Final Report (revised reports) for the 3 and 4 NR to the CBD projects, detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report - to be submitted by 29 June 2018.

All outputs will be reviewed and approved by the EBD Senior Technical Advisor.

Payment schedule on NBSAP TE report:

- Presentation on initial findings - 10%
- First Draft Terminal Evaluation Reports - 40%
- Final Terminal Evaluation Reports within one week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft- 50%

Payment schedule on 3 and 4 NRs to the CBD TE report:

- Presentation on initial findings - 10%
- First Draft Terminal Evaluation Reports - 40%
- Final Terminal Evaluation Reports within one week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft- 50%

Information on Working Arrangements:

- The consultant will work from home;
- The Consultant will be given access to relevant information necessary for execution of the tasks under this assignment;
- All templates and log frame will be provided by UNDP;

- The Consultant will be responsible for providing her/his own working station (i.e. laptop, internet, phone, scanner/printer, etc.) and must have access to a reliable internet connection;
- Given the global consultations to be undertaken during this assignment, the consultants are expected to be reasonably flexible with his/her availability for such consultations taking into consideration different time zones;
- Payments will be made upon satisfactory delivery of outputs and submission of a certification of payment form, and acceptance and confirmation by the EBD Senior Technical Advisor on outputs delivered.

Competencies:

Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards;
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Treats all people fairly without favoritism.

Technical Competencies:

- Demonstrated ability to coordinate processes to collate information and facilitate discussion and analysis of material;
- Technical competencies in undertaking complex evaluations which involve multiple countries and variety of stakeholders
- Demonstrated strong research and analytical skills

Communications:

- Excellent writing skills in English;
- Demonstrated knowledge of UN terms, language and style;
- Excellent communication skills and experience in conducting structured interviews with a variety of stakeholders;

Professionalism:

- Demonstrated ability to meet deadlines and work under pressure;
- Demonstrated excellent organizational skills.

Required skills and experience:

Education:

- Advanced (Master or PhD) degree in environmental governance, public policy, development studies or any other related field.

Experience:

- Minimum six years of relevant professional experience;
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal areas; (biodiversity) will be an advantage;
- Experience with GEF financed initiatives as well as evaluation of GEF financed or UNDP supported projects will be an advantage.

Language skills:

- Excellent English writing and communication skills;

B. Annex 2: GEF Operational Principles

<http://www.gefweb.org/public/opstrat/ch1.htm>

TEN OPERATIONAL PRINCIPLES FOR DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GEF'S WORK PROGRAM

1. For purposes of the financial mechanisms for the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the GEF will **function under the guidance of, and be accountable to, the Conference of the Parties (COPs)**. For purposes of financing activities in the focal area of ozone layer depletion, GEF operational policies will be consistent with those of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer and its amendments.
2. The GEF will provide new, and additional, grant and concessional funding to meet the agreed **incremental costs** of measures to achieve agreed global environmental benefits.
3. The GEF will ensure the **cost-effectiveness** of its activities to maximize global environmental benefits.
4. The GEF will fund projects that are **country-driven** and based on national priorities designed to support sustainable development, as identified within the context of national programs.
5. The GEF will maintain sufficient **flexibility** to respond to changing circumstances, including evolving guidance of the Conference of the Parties and experience gained from monitoring and evaluation activities.
6. GEF projects will provide for **full disclosure** of all non-confidential information.
7. GEF projects will provide for consultation with, and **participation** as appropriate of, the beneficiaries and affected groups of people.
8. GEF projects will conform to the **eligibility** requirements set forth in paragraph 9 of the GEF Instrument.
9. In seeking to maximize global environmental benefits, the GEF will emphasize its **catalytic role** and leverage additional financing from other sources.
10. The GEF will ensure that its programs and projects are **monitored and evaluated** on a regular basis.

C. Annex 3: 3-4 NR Project Terminal Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
Evaluation Criteria: Relevance			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project's objective support implementation of the CBD? Did the project support other relevant MEAs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linkages between project objective and elements of the CBD, key convention articles and programs of work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CBD website Project documents UNDP staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Stakeholder interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project objective fit GEF strategic priorities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of coherence between project objective and GEF strategic priorities (including alignment of relevant focal area indicators) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GEF strategic priority documents for period when project was approved Current GEF strategic priority documents UNDP staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Stakeholder interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project's objective fit within and supportive of national biodiversity conservation needs and priorities for participating countries? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of coherence between project objective and national needs, priorities and strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National policy documents Country stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review National level interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the project linked with and in-line with UNDP priorities and strategies? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of coherence between project objective and design with UNDP strategic documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP strategic priority documents Agency staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Agency staff interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were relevant stakeholders sufficiently involved in project development? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of involvement of local and national stakeholders in project origination and development (number of meetings held, project development processes incorporating stakeholder input, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project staff Local and national stakeholders Project documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder interviews Desk review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project's design correspond to the needs and priorities of countries that are eligible for GEF support? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of coherence between project objective and stated priorities of local stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National stakeholders Document review of local development strategies, environmental policies, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder interviews Desk review

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
Evaluation Criteria: Efficiency			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project cost-effective? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality and adequacy of financial management procedures (in line with UNDP, and national policies, legislation, and procedures) Financial delivery rate vs. expected rate Management costs as a percentage of total costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Interviews with project staff
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are expenditures in line with international standards and norms? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of project inputs and outputs relative to norms and standards for donor projects at the global level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Interviews with project staff
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project implementation approach efficient for delivering the planned project results? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequacy of implementation structure and mechanisms for coordination and communication Planned and actual level of human resources available Extent and quality of engagement with relevant partners / partnerships Quality and adequacy of project monitoring mechanisms (oversight bodies' input, quality and timeliness of reporting, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project stakeholders Project staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Interviews with project staff Interviews with stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project implementation delayed? If so, has that affected cost-effectiveness? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project milestones in time Planned results affected by delays Required project adaptive management measures related to delays 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Interviews with project staff
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of cash and in-kind co-financing relative to expected level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Interviews with project staff
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is the project leveraging additional resources? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount of resources leveraged relative to project budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Interviews with project

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
			staff
Evaluation Criteria: Effectiveness			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the project objectives likely to be met? To what extent are they likely to be met? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of progress toward project indicator targets relative to expected level at current point of implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with stakeholders Desk review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the key factors contributing to project success or underachievement? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of documentation of and preparation for project risks, assumptions and impact drivers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with stakeholders Desk review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the key risks and barriers that remain to achieve the project objective and generate Global Environmental Benefits? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presence, assessment of, and preparation for expected risks, assumptions and impact drivers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with stakeholders Desk review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the key assumptions and impact drivers relevant to the achievement of Global Environmental Benefits likely to be met? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actions undertaken to address key assumptions and target impact drivers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with stakeholders Desk review
Evaluation Criteria: Results			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the planned outputs been produced? Have they contributed to the project outcomes and objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of project implementation progress relative to expected level at current stage of implementation Existence of logical linkages between project outputs and outcomes/impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with stakeholders Desk review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the anticipated outcomes likely to be achieved? Are the outcomes likely to contribute to the achievement of the project objective? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of logical linkages between project outcomes and impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with stakeholders Desk review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are impact level results likely to be achieved? Are the likely to be at the scale sufficient to be considered Global Environmental 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental indicators Level of progress through the project's Theory of Change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with stakeholders

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
Benefits?			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review
Evaluation Criteria: Sustainability			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are project results likely to be dependent on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project results once the GEF assistance ends? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial requirements for maintenance of project benefits, as necessary Level of expected financial resources available to support maintenance of project benefits, as necessary Potential for additional financial resources to support maintenance of project benefits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with stakeholders Desk review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do relevant stakeholders have or are likely to achieve an adequate level of “ownership” of results, to have the interest in ensuring that project benefits are maintained? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of initiative and engagement of relevant stakeholders in project activities and results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with stakeholders Desk review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do relevant stakeholders have the necessary technical capacity to ensure that project benefits are maintained? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of technical capacity of relevant stakeholders relative to level required to sustain project benefits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with stakeholders Desk review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are the project results dependent on socio-political factors? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of socio-political risks to project benefits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with stakeholders Desk review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are the project results dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of institutional and governance risks to project benefits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with stakeholders Desk review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project impacts and Global Environmental Benefits? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of environmental risks to project benefits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with stakeholders Desk review

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
<i>Cross-cutting and UNDP Mainstreaming Issues</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the project take incorporate gender mainstreaming or equality, as relevant? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of appropriate engagement and attention to gender-relevant aspects of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with stakeholders Desk review

D. Annex 4: Rating Scales

Progress towards results: use the following rating scale	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.
Adaptive management AND Management Arrangements: use the following rating scale	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The project has no shortcomings and can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	The project has minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (S)	The project has moderate shortcomings.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The project has significant shortcomings.
Unsatisfactory (U)	The project has major shortcomings.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has severe shortcomings.
Sustainability: use the following rating scale	
Likely (L)	There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability/linkages
Moderately Likely (ML)	There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability/linkages
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability/linkages
Unlikely (U)	There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
Impact	
Significant (S)	By project completion project directly contributed to scientifically documented large scale impacts.
Minimal (M)	By project completion project directly contributed to anecdotal and/or relatively small site-specific impacts.
Negligible (N)	By project completion project no direct contribution of project to impacts.

E. Annex 5: Key Informants Consulted

The following people were consulted as key stakeholders for the evaluation.

Name	Position
Ms. Jamie Ervin	Global Programme on Nature Development, UNDP HQ
Ms. Fabiana Issler	Former Senior Technical Advisor for EBD, UNDP HQ
Ms. Cathy Maize	Global Programme Associate, EBD Unit, UNDP HQ
Ms. Madina Momunkulova	Administrative and Travel Assistant, Global NBSAP Support, UNDP – GEF
Ms. Midori Paxton	Head of Global EBD Unit, UNDP HQ
Ms. Christina Supples	6 th National Report to the CBD Project Advisor, former 3NR-4NR Project Manager, former Global Support to NBSAP Project Manager

F. Annex 6: Documents Reviewed

Project-related Documents

Prodoc: “National Reporting to the CBD: Supporting Countries to Prepare the Third National Report on Biodiversity, Phase I” (GEF PIMS #2714)

GEF Medium-Sized Project Proposal Request for GEF Funding: “National Reporting to the CBD: Supporting Countries to Prepare the Third National Report on Biodiversity, Phase I” (GEF PIMS #2714)

Prodoc: “National Reporting to the CBD: Supporting Countries to Prepare the Third National Report on Biodiversity (Phase II)” (GEF PIMS #2880)

GEF Medium-Sized Project Proposal Request for GEF Funding: “National Reporting to the CBD: Supporting Countries to Prepare the Third National Report on Biodiversity (Phase II)” (GEF PIMS #2880)

Prodoc: “Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for Carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments- Phase I” (GEF PIMS #3414)

GEF Request For CEO Endorsement/Approval, Project Type: Medium-sized Project: “Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for Carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments- Phase I” (GEF PIMS #3414)

Prodoc: “Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments (BD 4NR Phase II)” (GEF PIMS #3918)

Financial Documents:

3 NR Phase I Project CDRs: 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2016, 2017, 2018

3 NR Phase II Project CDRs: 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2016, 2017, 2018

4 NR Phase I and Phase II Project CDRs: 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018

Annual Project Implementation Reports:

3 NR Phase II Project PIR 2008

4 NR Phase I and Phase II Projects PIR 2012

Additional miscellaneous internal project management documents, including documents showing country funding and related data by project

3 NR Phase I and Phase II Management Memo: UNDP “Note to File”, Subject: “Reactivation of PIMS 3456 National Reporting to the CBD: Supporting countries to prepare the Third National Report on Biodiversity”, signed July 14, 2016 / July 19, 2016.

3 NR Phase I and Phase II Management Memo: Procurement Plan / activity planning for re-programmed 3 NR Phase I and Phase II funds

Non-Project Documents

- Website: <http://www.cbd.int>; numerous webpages accessed multiple times from January 2018 – August 2018.
- Website: <http://www.thegef.org>; numerous webpages accessed multiple times from January 2018-August 2018.
- Medium-Sized Project Proposal, Request For GEF Funding: “UNEP Support to CBD Parties for Preparation of 3rd National Reports to the CoP of CBD”, February 4, 2005.

- Project Information Form (revised): “Support to GEF Eligible CBD Parties for carrying out 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments - Phases III”, April 14, 2009.

G. Annex 7: 156 Potentially GEF-eligible Countries for Possible Support Under 3 NR Umbrella Projects, and Status of Support Received

Countries in **BOLD** did not submit a 3rd national report to the CBD. There were 28 countries in total out of the 156 that did not submit 3rd national reports to the CBD; 7 of these were funded by UNDP under the 3 NR umbrella projects.

Country	Prodoc List	3 NR funded under an umbrella project	Umbrella Funding Agency	Funding status under umbrella project
Afghanistan	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Albania	UNDP	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
Algeria	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Angola	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Antigua & Barbuda	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Argentina	UNDP	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
Armenia	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Azerbaijan	UNDP	No	None	Indicated no interest after UNDP inquiries
Bahamas	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Bahrain	None	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
Bangladesh	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Barbados	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Belarus	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Belize	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Benin	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Bhutan	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Bolivia	UNDP	No	None	Indicated no interest after UNDP inquiries
Bosnia & Herzegovina	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Botswana	UNDP	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
Brazil	UNDP	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
Bulgaria	UNDP	No	None	Indicated no interest after UNDP inquiries
Burkina Faso	Both	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Burundi	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Cambodia	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Cameroon	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Cape Verde	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Central African Republic	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP

Country	Prodoc List	3 NR funded under an umbrella project	Umbrella Funding Agency	Funding status under umbrella project
Chad	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Chile	UNDP	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
China	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Colombia	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Comoros	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Congo	UNDP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Cook Islands	UNDP	No	None	Indicated no interest after UNDP inquiries
Costa Rica	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Cote d'Ivoire	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Croatia	None	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Cuba	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Czech Republic	None	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea	Both	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Democratic Republic of Congo	Both	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Djibouti	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Dominica	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Dominican Republic	UNDP	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
East Timor	None	No	None	Did 3 NR through individual UNDP-GEF EA
Ecuador	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Egypt	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
El Salvador	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Equatorial Guinea	UNDP	No	None	Indicated no interest after UNDP inquiries
Eritrea	None	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Estonia	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Eswatini (Swaziland)	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Ethiopia	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Fiji	UNDP	No	None	Did 3 NR through individual UNDP-GEF EA
Gabon	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Gambia	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Georgia	None	No	None	Did 3 NR through individual UNDP-GEF EA
Ghana	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Grenada	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP

Country	Prodoc List	3 NR funded under an umbrella project	Umbrella Funding Agency	Funding status under umbrella project
Guatemala	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Guinea	Both	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Guinea-Bissau	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Guyana	UNDP	No	None	Did 3 NR through individual UNDP-GEF EA
Haiti	UNDP	No	None	No explanation
Honduras	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Hungary	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
India	UNDP	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
Indonesia	None	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Islamic Republic of Iran	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Jamaica	UNDP	No	None	Did 3 NR through individual UNDP-GEF EA
Jordan	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Kazakhstan	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Kenya	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Kiribati	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Kyrgyzstan	None	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Lao PDR	None	No	None	No explanation
Latvia	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Lebanon	Both	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Lesotho	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Liberia	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Libya	None	No	None	No explanation
Lithuania	None	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Macedonia	None	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Madagascar	Both	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Malawi	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Malaysia	Both	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Maldives	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Mali	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Malta	None	No	None	No explanation
Marshall Islands	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Mauritania	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Mauritius	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Mexico	UNDP	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
Micronesia, Federated	UNDP	No	None	Indicated no interest after

Country	Prodoc List	3 NR funded under an umbrella project	Umbrella Funding Agency	Funding status under umbrella project
States of				UNDP inquiries
Moldova	None	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Mongolia	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Morocco	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Mozambique	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Namibia	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Nauru	UNDP	Yes	None	Did 3 NR through individual UNDP-GEF EA
Nepal	None	No	None	Indicated no interest after UNDP inquiries
Nicaragua	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Niger	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Nigeria	UNDP	No	None	No explanation
Niue	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Oman	UNDP	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
Pakistan	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Palau	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Panama	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Papua New Guinea	Both	No	None	Indicated no interest after UNDP inquiries
Paraguay	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Peru	Both	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Philippines	Both	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Poland	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Republic of Korea	None	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
Romania	None	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Russian Federation	UNEP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Rwanda	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Saint Kitts & Nevis	UNDP	No	None	No explanation
Samoa	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Sao Tome and Principe	None	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Saudi Arabia	None	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
Senegal	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Serbia & Montenegro	UNDP	No	None	No explanation
Seychelles	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Sierra Leone	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Slovak Republic	None	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP

Country	Prodoc List	3 NR funded under an umbrella project	Umbrella Funding Agency	Funding status under umbrella project
Slovenia	None	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
Solomon Islands	UNEP	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
South Africa	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Sri Lanka	None	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
St. Lucia	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
St. Vincent and Grenadines	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Sudan	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Suriname	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Syrian Arab Republic	Both	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Tajikistan	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Tanzania	Both	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Thailand	Both	No	None	Did 3 NR through individual UNDP-GEF EA
Togo	None	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Tonga	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Trinidad & Tobago	UNDP	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
Tunisia	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Turkey	None	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Turkmenistan	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Tuvalu	None	No	None	Did 3 NR through individual UNDP-GEF EA
Uganda	None	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Ukraine	None	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
Uruguay	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Uzbekistan	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Vanuatu	UNEP	Yes	UNEP	Funded by UNEP
Venezuela	UNDP	No	None	Indicated no interest after UNDP inquiries
Vietnam	None	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Yemen	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP
Zambia	UNDP	No	None	Did 3 NR on own without GEF support
Zimbabwe	UNDP	Yes	UNDP	Funded by UNDP

H. Annex 8: 3-4 NR Project Results Framework Assessed Level of Indicator Target Achievement

Results Framework Assessment Key

<i>Green = Achievement Likely / Achieved / Exceeded</i>	<i>Yellow = Partially Achieved / Achievement Uncertain</i>	<i>Red = Achievement Unlikely / Not Achieved</i>	<i>Gray = Not applicable</i>
---	--	--	------------------------------

3rd National Reporting Project Phase I and Phase II (source: 2008 PIR)

Note: The 3 NR Projects did not include strategic results frameworks with indicators and targets, but did include the below results assessment table in the PIR.

<i>Project Priorities</i>	<i>Product expected</i>	<i>Progress made</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Terminal Evaluation Assessment</i>
Project Objective: To enable country parties to undertake their national reporting obligations towards the CBD	To create the enabling conditions for countries to access funding and substantive guidance for the preparation of their Third National Report to the CBD COP	<p>The project has successfully created a fast, transparent and cost-effective funds disbursement mechanism, flowing from HQ through COs and from there to national counterparts, for consultation in connection with the preparation of the 3NR by GEF eligible CBD parties.</p> <p>Substantive guidance in the form of a publication has been available since November 2006. The guidebook, titled "Third National Reports to the Convention on Biological Diversity" was considered very useful by CBD Secretariat. Positive feedback was also received from beneficiary countries through the Secretariat.</p> <p>This umbrella modality served as strong inspiration to UNEP, which submitted a similar MSP to the GEF for financing 3NR in 40 countries, based on the UNDP MSP.</p>	<p>While the expected outcome of the project is that countries submit their 3NR to the CBD COP, it is in fact the countries' governments responsibility to deposit their report at the CBD Secretariat, and not that of UNDP.</p> <p>UNDP has strongly encouraged CBD parties that benefitted from the project to fulfill their obligations to the Convention.</p> <p>However, it is important to note that UNDP is not an intermediary in the relationship between the CBD and its Parties.</p>	Ninety-one percent, or 67 of the 74 countries assisted submitted their 3NR to the CBD Secretariat.

Project Priorities	Product expected	Progress made	Comments	Terminal Evaluation Assessment
		The project also paved the way to another umbrella project, namely PIMS 3918 Towards 2010 Targets (Phase I and Phase II), which currently finances 4NR through a partnership between UNDP and UNEP.		
Priority 1: Countries supported in preparation of 3NRs	At least 49 countries produce Third National Reports (3NRs) in Phase I and 50 countries in Phase II	<p>50 countries were assisted in Phase I, of which 47 submitted their 3NR to the CBD COP; while 25 countries benefitted in Phase II, of which 17 submitted their 3NR to the CBD COP.</p> <p>In average requests for funding were treated in 31 days from receipt of an eligible request to the issuance of Framework for service Agreement (FSA) at the CO level.</p> <p>Of the funds allotted to assist countries (\$1,214,811), 81 % (based on total approved allocations) has been disbursed.</p> <p>The latest approval was from Ecuador which requested funding for their 3NR in Jul 2008, after a fairly long period without requests being received and as the 4NR global project was already in full implementation.</p>	<p>Although 85% of countries that benefitted from the funding under this project have effectively submitted their 3NR to the CBD COP, a small minority has not.</p> <p>While UNDP regularly monitors 3NR submissions through the CBD Secretariat website and updates its database, the preferred line of communication with respect to reminders for national report submission is from the CBD Secretariat to CBD Parties.</p> <p>The latest exchange between UNDP and the CBD Secretariat on this subject was on January 2009, when it was noted that, of the 75 countries that received the funding, 10 have not submitted their 3NR to the CBD (one is in the process of doing it).</p> <p>The CBD Secretariat will send a reminder soonest. It is likely that all countries (or possibly 98% of them) that received funding through the project will have submitted their</p>	74 countries were supported through the 3 NR Phase I and Phase II umbrella project. Out of the total of 156 GEF-eligible countries, 16 countries did not receive funding via UNDP, funding via UNEP, and did not fund their 3NR report themselves. Of these, all but one (Nepal) did not submit a 3NR to the CBD.

Project Priorities	Product expected	Progress made	Comments	Terminal Evaluation Assessment
			reports to the CBD COP by June 2009.	
Priority 2: Guidance material is available to assist countries	Guidance material is available to assist countries in the preparation process	<p>The guidebook “Third National Reports to the Convention on Biological Diversity” was published in paper and electronic form in November 2005 is the result of a partnership between UNDP with the UN University’s Institute for Advanced Studies. The guide is available at the UNDP/GEF Website under publications (www.undp.org/gef) in the CBD website (www.cbd.int/reports).</p> <p>The guidebook was prepared in consultation with the CBD Secretariat and counted on inputs from UNEP.</p>	According to feedback from the CBD Secretariat, the “3NR Guidebook” (in short) was actively used and generally seen as a positive input in the 3NR preparation process. However, it was only made available in English. In the future, such publications should also be made available in French and Spanish.	Completed.

4th National Reporting Project Phase I and Phase II (source: 2012 PIR)

Project Priorities	Product expected	Progress made	Comments	Terminal Evaluation Assessment
Project Objective: Enable GEF eligible CBD parties to assess progress towards the achievement of the 2010 Biodiversity Targets at	1. At least 60% of participating countries complete their fourth national report to the CBD on time (i.e. before the deadline of March 30, 2009) and 100% of participating countries submit their fourth national report of the CBD before project end.	<p>100% of countries (n=90) that benefitted from the funding under this project have effectively submitted to this date (Jan 2013) their 4NR to the CBD COP.</p> <p>For all countries that received funding</p>	<p>Target not achieved in terms of the CBD deadline, but 100% achieved and surpassed in terms of the number of countries completing country level activities. In the 2010 PIR, the target for this indicator was considered too ambitious.</p> <p>In spite of the effort put in by the CBD Secretariat to obtain national reports on time, there are always delays. Yet, comparison between CBD Parties that benefitted from the project and CBD Parties in general shows that the project made an important difference in terms of timely submission:</p>	Not achieved. Only 19% of countries submitted their 4NR to the CBD on time. Ultimately all 90 countries did submit their 4NR, although nine countries submitted after the COP. Considering that the project was not completed until 2018, all countries did submit

Project Priorities	Product expected	Progress made	Comments	Terminal Evaluation Assessment
national level through a country-wide, stakeholder consultation process and to appropriately report and communicate on it.		<p>from the project (n = 90), the statistics are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timely submission to the CBD, i.e. no later than end Mar-2009: 18 countries or 20% of total; This number increased to 26 countries (29%) one month after the deadline; and to 36 countries (41%) three months after deadline. The 60% mark (counting 53 countries) was effectively achieved on 13 Oct 2009 with Togo's submission, i.e. approximately 6 months after the CBD deadline. <p>(Refer to Annex Table 1 for details)</p>	<p>The numbers show that:</p> <p>(i) To date (Jan 2013), 100% for project participants (90 CBD Parties) submitted their 4NR to the CBD, compared with 87% for all CBD parties (172 out of 193)</p> <p>(ii) 20% of project participants submitted their 4NR before the deadline, compared with 12% of all CBD Parties;</p> <p>(iii) 29% of project participants submitted their 4NR one month after the deadline, compared with 20% of all CBD Parties; and</p> <p>(iv) 41% of project participants submitted their 4NR three months after the deadline, compared with 27% of all CBD Parties.</p> <p>Therefore, project participants fare better than average in terms of meeting their obligations under the CBD, when compared to non-project participants. The latter group includes OECD countries.</p> <p>All in all, project participants are in average 38% more likely to submit their reports on time to the CBD (i.e. no later than 3 months after the deadline, considering the deadline flexibility that normally permeates convention reporting).</p> <p>In addition, the statistics for timely submission of 4NRs show a major improvement vis-à-vis those for the third national report (3NR), when only two CBD parties submitted reports by the deadline.</p> <p>A more timely submission was generally one of the goals of the CBD Secretariat with this project. Perhaps, a more reasonable percentage for indicator #1 could have been around 15%.</p>	their 4NR "before project end".

Project Priorities	Product expected	Progress made	Comments	Terminal Evaluation Assessment
			<p>The project has successfully created a fast and transparent funds disbursement mechanism -- funds that flow from the GEF to UNDP HQ and from there to national counterparts through Country Offices with the adequate levels of accountability that UNDP's country presence and control systems can provide. Funds are aimed at financing consultations in connection with the preparation of the 4NR by GEF eligible CBD parties.</p> <p>Substantive guidance in the form of a publication has been available since COP9 in the CBD Website.</p> <p>This umbrella modality served as inspiration to UNEP, which submitted a similar MSP to the GEF for financing additional 4NR requests in 30 countries, based on the UNDP's MSP.</p> <p>Indicator #1 was proposed because it focuses on an end-result, rather than a process.</p> <p>Finally, it is worth mentioning that although UNDP has strongly encouraged CBD parties that benefitted from the project to fulfill their obligations to the Convention, UNDP is not an intermediary in the relationship between the CBD COP and its Parties. It is each country's own responsibility to submit their report to the CBD COP on time. UN agencies' role in the project is one of support.</p>	
	2. GEF projects adopt the results of the 2010 Targets Assessment in the monitoring and evaluation of their impact.	This will be assessed by the project evaluation which is due.	n/a	Partially achieved. It is not possible for the evaluation to assess this result in a detailed a specific way, which would require analysis of the results frameworks of all GEF biodiversity projects

Project Priorities	Product expected	Progress made	Comments	Terminal Evaluation Assessment
				funded over the past 10 years. However, considering that the GEF itself has significantly integrated the CBD biodiversity targets into the GEF Strategic framework for the biodiversity focal area, it may be assumed that this result has been at least partially achieved. The GEF relies on “tracking tools” for each focal area, including the biodiversity focal area, to track results at the global level. The GEF tracking tools for biodiversity have been adapted and structured to significantly reflect the CBD biodiversity targets. Many GEF projects include elements of the CBD biodiversity targets in their results framework indicators and targets.
	3. By 2010, at least 40 developing countries have explicitly incorporated the achievement of the 2010 Biodiversity Targets in their efforts to achieve	This will be assessed by the project evaluation which is due.	n/a	Unable to assess. As of the time of this terminal evaluation (2018) the CBD COP and UN have moved on to focusing on the Aichi biodiversity targets for 2020, and the

Project Priorities	Product expected	Progress made	Comments	Terminal Evaluation Assessment
	MDGs.			Sustainable Development Goals (for 2030). Even if these “next generation” targets are applied in place of the 2010 CBD targets and MDGs, it would be beyond the time and resources of this evaluation to analyze national SDG strategic plans (to the extent such documents exist in a unified form) to determine the extent to which they have explicitly incorporated the Aichi targets.
Priority 1: Outcome 1) Countries supported financially and substantively with their 2010 Biodiversity Targets National Assessments and the production of the fourth national report and other associated reports in a timely and expedited	4. A minimum of 40 countries assisted under Phase I and 44 under Phase II. 5. Average dwell time in processing country requests from receipt of eligible request till their approval (i.e. signed Framework Service Agreement issued) is maintained at max 31.5 days.	A total of 90 countries received funding through the project, 45 under phase I and 45 under phase II (refer to Annex table 1). The average dwell time has been 32.4 working days (3% above the target) and hence generally meeting it. (from previous PIR – no new calculations made)	Target met.	Achieved. Concur with self-assessment.

Project Priorities	Product expected	Progress made	Comments	Terminal Evaluation Assessment
manner.				
Priority 2 Outcome 2) Monitoring, Learning, Adaptive Feedback & Evaluation	6. Towards 2010 Guidebook disseminated among all CBD Parties. 7. 4NR Portal fully developed.	The Guidebook has been available in the CBD Sec website since COP9. The CBD Sec kept the Portal up-to-date. Now the focus is on 5NR.	n/a	Achieved. Concur with self-assessment.

I. Annex 9: 3-4 NR Project Mainstreaming of UNDP Programme Principles

The below table is typically required for UNDP-GEF project evaluations, in order to assess the extent to which UNDP programme principles are mainstreamed into project implementation.

In the case of the 3-4 NR projects this is not considered to be a relevant analysis, since these projects are simply aggregate Enabling Activities, designed to specifically support countries in their CBD reporting requirements. It would theoretically be feasible to analyze the extent to which the below programming principles are reflected in national 3 NR and 4 NR reports, but this would be beyond the time and resources available for this evaluation, as it would require in-depth analysis of all 3-4 NR submitted to the CBD that were funded with support of the 3 – 4 NR projects.

Programming Principle	Project Principle Mainstreaming Approach
UNDAF / CPAP / CPD	N/A
Poverty-Environment Nexus / Sustainable Livelihoods	N/A
Disaster Risk Reduction, Climate Change Mitigation / Adaptation	N/A
Crisis Prevention and Recovery	N/A
Gender Equality / Mainstreaming	N/A
Capacity Development	N/A
Rights	N/A