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# Executive Summary

## • Project Information Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  | Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation in to the Agricultural Production Systems Ethiopia Project |
| GEF Project ID: | 2913   |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at mid-term (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 2085 | GEF financing:  | US$ 3,863,600  | N/A |
| Country: | Ethiopia | UNDP financing: | US$ 3,000,000 | N/A |
| Region: Africa |       | Government: | US$ 2,050,000 | N/A |
| Focal Area: | Biodiversity     | Other: | US$ 100,000 | N/A |
|  |  | Total co-financing: | N/A | N/A |
| Executing Agency: | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | US$ 9,013,600 | US$ 9,013,600 |
| Other Partners involved: | Government of Ethiopia/ Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute (EBI)  | ProDoc Signature (date project began): November 2013 |  |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed: December 2015 | Actual: June 2016 |

## • Brief project Description

Ethiopia is recognized as an agro- biodiversity center that shelters important gene pools of cultivated crops as well as wild crop relatives. This is a key context issue for the *"Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation in to the Agricultural Production Systems Ethiopia Project*”. Forest Coffee, Teff, Durum Wheat and Enset (the four crops that are objective of this Project) are all important crops with a vast potential of driving both sustainable and economic development in Ethiopia, as well as to promote food security for the Ethiopian population. Currently, there is a general belief from different sources that in Ethiopia that agricultural-led development can co-exist with and complement agro-biodiversity if policies and programmes supporting agro-biodiversity conservation are locally informed, properly designed and implemented. Furthermore, there are a series of initiatives to integrate biodiversity and ecosystem variables into multiple productive sectors in order to promote more sustainable production practices that maintain land and water ecosystem services as well as to make sustainable use of biodiversity. Ethiopia, furthermore, is considered as international source of agro-biodiversity resources and has one of the important ex – situ gene banks in the region.

Given this context, the Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation into the Agricultural Production Systems of Ethiopia Project was designed to provide Ethiopian farming communities with incentives (such as policies, capacity, markets, and knowledge) in order to mainstream conservation of agro-biodiversity, including crop wild relatives of Teff, Durum Wheat, Forest Coffee and Enset into the farming systems of Ethiopia. It is understood, also, that whereas the noticeable objective of the project is to improve conservation of agro-biodiversity resources (including crop wild relatives) it aims, at the same time, to ensure food security and sustain human wellbeing.

The Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation into the Agricultural Systems of Ethiopia Project has a planned implementation period of four years (2011-2015) with a total budget of US$ 3,863,000. The local project activities are being implemented mainly in four sites:

(i) Minjar Shenkora (Teff conservation site)

(ii) Angacha (Enset Conservation site).

(iii) Yayu (Forest Coffee conservation site)

(iv) Gimbichu (Durum Wheat Conservation site).

The three project expected outcomes are:

* Enabling policy and institutional framework supporting in situ conservation of agro-biodiversity and wild crop relatives
* Markets provide incentive for farmer uptake of agro-biodiversity friendly practices, particularly for Forest Coffee, Enset, Teff and Durum Wheat.
* Crop Wild Relatives and farmer varieties of Forest Coffee, Durum Wheat, Enset and Teff are conserved in in-situ gene banks and on-farm conservation sites.

The project is funded by GEF while UNDP is the implementing agency. The national implementing partner institution in the country is the Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute. The Project also has a series of stakeholders, including Woreda[[1]](#footnote-1) (sub-national) administrations as well as farming communities.

## • Project Progress Summary

In general, after a slow start, the "*Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation in to the Agricultural Production Systems Ethiopia Project” has* effectively achieved several of the expected results to a satisfactory level.The Project has been very successful in engaging with local actors (beneficiaries as well as local authorities) and, through this engagement has been successful in the uptake of several agro biodiversity conservation and sustainable use practices, mainly through the promotion of the use of farmers’ varieties and crop wild relatives. This is expected to be sustained when the Project delivers gene banks and in situ gene sites. Over 500 hectares covered with farmers’ varieties and Enset wild relative were achieved (meeting target), including seedling sites. Local by – laws at the Woreda level dealing with agro-biodiversity issues were approved by local authorities with direct linkage to the Project’s assistance.

Some scaling up and horizontal exchanges are taking place. With the latter is meant that farmers themselves identify that they are educating other farmers in the benefits of using farmers’ varieties and wild relatives. Farmers and Woreda authorities are receiving capacity building / training / awareness raising on marketing (through training, study tours, etc.) as well as biodiversity as it relates to the targeted indigenous crops. Farmers are being aided in setting up associations/cooperatives or to strengthen existing associations in order to work jointly in agro biodiversity conservation coupled with improved market access. Therefore, some linkages have been made with main actors higher up in the value chains (i.e. factories, market) with varying degrees of success, seeking market share and higher prices for the crops.

At the national level, the Project mainly concentrated on policy – level engagement and institutional capacity building as well as in developing materials dealing broadly with marketing strategies for the four targeted products and developing extension packages for some of these crops. Firstly, a very good analysis on the identification of gaps and formulation of recommendations on policies and institutional frameworks in order to mainstream agro-biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in Ethiopia was carried out. The analysis recommends to mainstream agro –biodiversity into policies, laws, strategies and activities of all involved sectors (production systems and landscapes). The review of existing policies also found that there is not articulation between and among relevant policies and that agricultural policy at the national level is aimed to increase productivity using improved varieties, indicating that the country’s extension service give emphasis also improved varieties over agro-biodiversity and farmers’ variety. Regarding marketing, access to markets (both at the international and at the national level has been facilitated by the project at the federal level.

### • MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for *Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation in to the Agricultural Production Systems Ethiopia Project*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **MTR Rating** | **Ratings** |
| **Progress Towards Results[[2]](#footnote-2)** | Objective Achievement Rating | S |
| ***Outcome***  Crop Wild Relatives and farmer varieties of forest coffee, durum wheat, enset and tef are conserved in in situ gene banks and on-farm conservation sitesAchievement Rating | S |
| ***Outcome*** Enabling policy and institutional framework supporting in situ conservation of agro-biodiversity and wild crop relativesAchievement Rating | MS |
| ***Outcome***  Markets for agro-biodiversity friendly products promote farmer uptake of agro-biodiversity conservation imperativesAchievement Rating | S |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management[[3]](#footnote-3)** |  | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) |
| **Sustainability[[4]](#footnote-4)** |  | Moderately Likely (ML) |

### • Concise summary of conclusions

In general, the *Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation in to the Agricultural Production Systems Ethiopia Project* has effectively achieved several of the expected results to a satisfactory level. The design of the Project has had some positive aspects, mainly the vision that the incorporation of agro – biodiversity in farming systems in Ethiopia should be a multi-pronged approach, not only dealing with the provision of farmers’ variety seeds but also tackling issues of green markets, understanding that without market – incentives the incorporation of agro biodiversity in farming will only take place during the duration of a project and not be sustainable over time. Furthermore, the design also acknowledged the need for institutional and policy networks at all levels (local, regional, national). That being said however, there were several components that the design did not contain, such as research and monitoring of effects in order to substantiate findings/conclusions, or how would gender mainstreaming would take place within the Project itself. Furthermore, the design in this case was overly ambitious.

The evaluation has predominantly revealed a very good insertion and engagement within local areas (at the Wareda level as and at beneficiaries/farmers level) and, therefore, has achieved a strong level of support and appropriation both from beneficiaries and local authorities, which is a factor (among financial, socio – economic, governance and environmental risks) for predicting that there is likelihood that some of the outcomes will be sustained over time. Some concrete outcomes are the 500 hectares covered with farmers’ varieties and Enset wild relative that have been attained (meeting target at the time of the evaluation) directly or tangentially due to the local interventions. Also at the local level, the approval of by – laws at the Woreda level dealing with agro biodiversity issues are a major accomplishment which –if their implementation follows—should provide local institutionally, framework and governance abilities to incorporate agro biodiversity principles in farming systems.

The distribution of farmers’ varieties seeds has been an ongoing activity and their use is perhaps one of the key attainments. Other accompanying tasks have taken place which should assure sustainability of several of outcomes such as the ongoing construction of structures which will shelter in situ conservation as well as the setting up of land set aside for providing inputs for these gene banks and the field gene banks. Capacity building has taken place and some development effects are beginning to be reported.

At the national stage less achievements at the outcome levels has been reported or found. A key matter and expected outcome is a national institutional framework that would support the use of farmers’ varieties as well as to mainstream agro-biodiversity in farming systems in Ethiopia. Nevertheless, although a very thorough study has been carried out and disseminated, there is no evidence that there has been uptake of the recommendations.

Some impromptu scaling up, catalyzing and horizontal exchanges are beginning to take place. Given that farmers themselves identify that they are educating other farmers in the benefits of using farmers’ varieties and wild relatives, and that Woredas are spreading knowledge this is indicative of the scaling up and replication potential that this Project can have in the future, not only at the national, but also at the regional and international levels. The next 18 months that the Project cycle has are key to emphasize that the conclusion stage of the Project (that is, after this MTE) should be highly proactive and strong in order to obtain consolidated and sustainable outcomes.

### • Recommendation Summary Table

|  |
| --- |
| *Recommendations for the future programming/design process* |
| The design of a project should encompass all key aspects including research and monitoring of effects with clear indicators and analysis to substantiate findings and conclusions. Gender mainstreaming should be inserted from the design itself and not as an afterthought, with indicative issues well considered from the beginning, such as gender roles differentials, impact of project on daily workload of women, impact of project on time spent by women, increase in women’s income.Furthermore, the design of a project should be more realistic and properly resourced. |
| *Recommendations for the concluding stage of the Project* |
| The Project needs to propose and promote clear management arrangements for in situ conservation mechanisms (gene banks, field gene banks, etc.) in order to sustain and reinforce the initial benefits from the Project. |
| The Project should ‘fill the gaps’ identified in its first stage, in particular gathering information, monitoring and researching vital issues such as productivity, green markets, organic production, as well socio – economic issues such as market value and benefits distribution.  |
| The Project should work directly with beneficiaries regarding matters of financial sustainability, indicating that the project pilots and implements a first stage of processes but that external funding eventually ends and that they should take over this issue, mainly by re investing some of the benefits they have obtained through the intervention. |
| A true gender mainstreaming process should be initiated, not only seeking participation of women in activities and making sure of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, taking into account the concerns, needs, and experiences of women as part of the Project and making sure that the intervention does not damage women’s access to resources, and that women and men benefit equally, and inequality is not perpetuated.  |
| There is a strong need for the Project to push for the completion of overdue products that were supposed to be well underway by the intervention’s mid-term. A case in point, and a main issue, are the extension packages, which not only will be an effort in meeting with expected outputs but also to secure sustainability and continuous backing for the use of farmers’ varieties for the target crops and for the incorporation of agro biodiversity components for farming in Ethiopia.  |
| The Project needs to rejoin the conclusions and recommendations of the gaps identification and framework analysis and provide an impetus for the application of at least some of the recommendations for national – level policies in order to impulse the setting up of upgrading of frameworks that promote the mainstreaming of agro biodiversity conservation, including the use of farmers’ varieties, and for national structures to work with local authorities and farmers’ and community groups in this subject. |
| A knowledge management process and translation needs to take place so that the materials being developed or that will be developed in the second project phase are more ‘user friendly’.  |
| The Project should also strengthen the capacities and provide adequate local project management support so that the project sites can have adequate technical expertise, infrastructure, and guidance to properly implement the local aspects as well as to unquestionably and systematically monitor effects, impacts and processes. |
| The second phase of the Project should also be stage where its catalytic effect is harnessed in order to expand (to other crops), to other regions (within Ethiopia and at the regional African – level) as well as to upscale.  |

# Introduction to the Evaluation

### • Purpose of the Mid Term Evaluation and its objectives

The mid-term evaluation centers upon the valuation of products and processes achieved or in terms of perspective achievement, and has followed GEF and UNDP guidelines on conducting this sort of outcome oriented evaluations. Hence, the Mid-term Evaluation of this UNDP-GEF project was carried out in accordance with the UNDP-GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and facilitated by the UNDP Country Office in Ethiopia. Thus, it was carried out with the aim of providing a systematic and comprehensive evaluation of the performance of the project by assessing its design, processes of implementation, achievement relative to its objectives, and determining whether changes are necessary for implementation of the concluding phase of the Project. The specific objectives of the evaluation are:

1. to determine if and how project results are achieved, and,
2. to draw useful lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

The varied purposes of this evaluation exercise also include monitoring results as well as effects/impacts and promote accountability. Lastly, the evaluation also has as a purpose assembling a set of recommendations in order to aid in the Projects’ implementation in its concluding phase after the mid-term review.

### • Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR

Regarding scope, the evaluation focuses primarily on assessing the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and relevance of the project in light of the accomplished outcomes, objectives and effects. This implies the following specific evaluation scope:

* Assess progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document (albeit keeping in mind that this is a mid-term evaluation).
* Assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results.
* Review the project’s strategy in light of its sustainability risks.

The unit of analysis for this evaluation is the Project in and of itself, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs. The Mid Term Evaluation also analyzes modifications (carried out or to be carried out) and, if pertinent, extension requests. Lastly, the review sets out a series of recommendations in order to harness the positive aspects of the implementation thus far as well as recommended corrective actions in order to meet the expected outcomes and the objectives of the "Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation in to the Agricultural Production Systems Ethiopia Project”.

As to the methodology, and taking into account the above overarching objectives, background and scope in mind, a methodological approach was outlined and followed keeping to procedures and approaches as stated in UNDP Manuals, relevant tools, and other relevant UNDP guidance materials, including *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* manual. The valuation was carried out following a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, project team, and key stakeholders.

Activities and results were evaluated for their:

1. ***Relevance*** – thus, the extent to which the results and activities are consistent with local and national development priorities, national and international conservation priorities, and GEF’s focal area and UNDP’s operational program strategies,
2. ***Effectiveness*** – thus, how the project’s results are related to the original or modified intended outcomes or objectives, and,
3. ***Efficiency*** – thus, whether the activities are being carried out in a cost effective way and whether the results are being achieved by the least cost option. The results, outcomes, and actual and potential impacts of the project were examined to determine whether they were positive or negative, foreseen or unintended.

Finally, the probability of ***sustainability*** of the interventions and results was examined to determine the likelihood of whether benefits would continue to be accrued after the completion of the project. The sustainability will be examined from various perspectives: financial, social, environmental and institutional. In addition, the evaluation examined the ***achievements*** of the project within the realistic political and socio-economic framework of Ethiopia since the start of the implementation of the project.

These aspects and relevant criteria were ranked in this report according to performance benchmarks. A table with the ratings used and explanation of these rankings is found in Annexes. A first step in the conception of the evaluation was the drafting of an evaluation matrix which graphically indicated what the evaluative questions were, what were the indicators that could respond to these evaluation questions, which were the information sources, and what methodologies and instruments were to be used to respond these evaluation questions. The Evaluation Matrix is found in Annexes.

Regarding specific methodologies to gather assessment information, the following tools and methods were used:

* *Document analysis.* In depth analysis of documentation. The documentation analysis examined documents prepared during the different project’s phases (i.e. PIF, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions/audits, national strategic and legal documents). Furthermore other documents, such as publications originating from the project were also analyzed.
* *Key informant interviews:* Interviews were implemented through a series of open and semi-open questions raised to stakeholders directly and indirectly involved with the Project. Key actors (stakeholders) were defined as UN officials, strategic partners of civil society / NGOs / beneficiary groups, government actors, and local actors, among others. The interviews were carried in person during and throughout the evaluation mission, including the site visits.
* *Focal Groups Discussions.* Using the same instruments as above, but in a group format instead of individual interviews.
* *Observation.* Observation of implementation in the four field sites, observing field interventions, gene banks, infrastructure built by Project and other relevant in site interventions.

The mid-term evaluation was developed through three distinct but interconnected stages: preparation, mission, and report production. Before the mission to Ethiopia, a first phase of preparation took place, mainly entailing acquaintance with an examination of project and project-related documents, as well as general acquaintance with project’s context. Also at this stage, logistic and stakeholder interviews were established with the collaboration of UNDP and the Project personnel.

A seventeen day mission for the international evaluator took place, with a twelve day span in Ethiopia where the national and international evaluators worked as team conducting visits and interviews with relevant stakeholders in Ethiopia, meetings with UN personnel and review of materials with key stakeholders, as well as carrying out four site visits with interviews, group discussions, and observation taking place in those four areas. After the mission, data validation and report writing took place, with submittal of a draft report to the project’s coordination and relevant persons. Comments were collected and a final report drafted.

### • Structure of the Mid Term Evaluation report

The present mid-term evaluation report is divided into several sections. Firstly, a summary section which condenses project information, conclusions and recommendations for future action and future programming. The second section describes the context and background of the evaluation and gives a brief description of the purpose, scope and focus of the evaluation, outlines methodology used, and the structure of the report. The third section sums up information on the Project, including development context, project description and strategy. The fourth section of this report is dedicated to the findings related to the Project. The fifth and final section considers the conclusions of the evaluation and the recommendations for action.

In summary, the report is structured as follows:

* Executive Summary
* Introduction to the Evaluation
* Introduction to the Project
* Main Findings
* Conclusions and recommendations.

## Project Description and Background Context

Ethiopia is recognized as an agro biodiversity center that shelters important gene pools of cultivated crops as well as wild crop relatives. This is a key context issue for the "Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation in to the Agricultural Production Systems Ethiopia Project “. Forest Coffee, Teff, Durum Wheat and Enset (the four crops that are objective of this Project) are all important crops with a vast potential of driving both sustainable and economic development in Ethiopia, as well as to promote food security for the Ethiopian population. Currently, there is a general belief from different sources that in Ethiopia that agricultural-led development can co-exist with and complement agro-biodiversity if policies and programmes supporting agro-biodiversity conservation are locally informed, properly designed and implemented. Furthermore, there are a series of initiatives to integrate biodiversity and ecosystem variables into multiple productive sectors in order to promote more sustainable production practices that maintain land and water ecosystem services as well as to make sustainable use of biodiversity. Ethiopia, furthermore, is considered as international source of agro-biodiversity resources and has one of the important ex– situ gene banks in the region.

Furthermore, it is understood that the country’s agro biodiversity is mostly important in relation to food security. Climate variability as well as climate change result in frequent droughts that make Ethiopia’s drylands particularly exposed to the climate – agriculture – food shortage cycles. Other climate phenomena of varying intensity, such as floods, frost, hail and seasonal variations pointedly affects food production, coupled with environmental degradation, increases social vulnerability. This is particularly the case when these issues result in food shortages. These scenarios are further aggravated by inappropriate and uncoordinated agro-biodiversity management practices which have led to fragmentation and duplication of efforts, with little positive impacts.

The underlying premise for this project is that agro biodiversity will only be maintained if the country mainstreams agro-biodiversity conservation into farming systems through strategies that simultaneously promote food production/food security and biodiversity conservation. There is also an expressed perception that to there is a need to change production and business practices and patterns so that they sustain agro-biodiversity. The project aims, consequently, to provide farmers with incentives to mainstream conservation of agro-biodiversity, including crop wild relatives, into the farming systems of Ethiopia

Given this context, the *Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation into the Agricultural Production Systems of Ethiopia Project* was designed to provide Ethiopian farming communities with incentives (such as policies, capacity, markets, and knowledge) in order to mainstream conservation of agro-biodiversity, including crop wild relatives of Teff, Durum Wheat, Forest Coffee and Enset into the farming systems of Ethiopia. It is understood, also, that whereas the noticeable objective of the project is to improve conservation of agro-biodiversity resources (including crop wild relatives) it aims, at the same time, to ensure food security and sustain human wellbeing.

The Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation into the Agricultural Systems of Ethiopia Project has a planned implementation period of four years (2011-2015) with a total budgeted project cost of US$ 9,013,600. [[5]](#footnote-5)

The local project activities are being implemented mainly in four sites:

(i) Minjar Shenkora (Teff conservation site)

(ii) Angacha (Enset conservation site)

(iii) Yayu (Forest Coffee conservation site)

(iv) Gimbichu (Durum Wheat conservation site)

The project plans to deliver benefits to 47,082 households, of which 8,491 live in Yayu (Oromia), 15,153 in Gimbichu (Oromia), 11,138 in Minjar (Amhara) and 12,300 in Angacha (Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples).

The three project expected outcomes are:

* Enabling policy and institutional framework supporting in situ conservation of agro-biodiversity and wild crop relatives
* Markets provide incentive for farmer uptake of agro-biodiversity friendly practices, particularly for Forest Coffee, Enset, Teff and Durum Wheat.
* Crop Wild Relatives and farmer varieties of Forest Coffee, Durum Wheat, Enset and Teff are conserved in in-situ gene banks and on-farm conservation sites.

The Project identifies a series of major barriers that obstruct effective mainstreaming of agro-biodiversity in farming systems. These are:

1. policies that do not have strategies specific to the conservation and sustainable use of agro-biodiversity in general;
2. inability of markets to put successfully price/value agro-biodiversity conservation values, compounded by the failure of the financial sector to recognize crop systems diversification as an asset,
3. inadequate capacity for conservation of crop wild relatives in “set-aside” areas integrated into the farming systems.

The project is funded by GEF while UNDP is the implementing agency. The national implementing partner institution in the country is the Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute. The Project also has a series of stakeholders, including Woreda (sub-national or local) administrations as well as farming communities and farmers associations. The Project, as intended, is being executed under the UNDP National Execution (NEX) modality. UNDP is responsible for provision of resources as well as technical expertise to the project, drawing on its knowledge networks and pool of experts, and through external sourcing, and is responsible –also-- for project assurance, ensuring that the project is implemented in accordance with the rules and procedures for managing UNDP projects.

Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute[[6]](#footnote-6), on behalf of the former Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MoARD) now called Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), has overall responsibility for the project, and involves all other relevant institutions such as Ministries of Agriculture and Trade, Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoFED), The Ethiopia Forest Coffee Forum and regional governments in the implementation of the project

According to planning documents it is intended that the Project be governed by a Steering Committee comprised of about 15 institutions. Also, Annual Monitoring is intended to occur through the Project Steering Committee Meetings (PSCM) as the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of the Project. UNDP as a member of the Board, and with a key role in monitoring, promotes and maintain focus on the expected project outputs; arbitrates on and ensures resolution of any donor priority or resource conflicts. Also UNDP as a member contributes opinions on Project Board decisions on whether to implement recommendations on proposed changes; ensures that any standards defined for the project are met and used to good effect; and monitors any risks in the implementation aspects of the project.

## • Main stakeholders: summary list

The main stakeholders of the project can be summarized and categorized in three broad groups as follows:

* Ethiopian National Government
* Woreda Governments in the four sites
* Farmers and farmers’ associations.

**Findings**

**Project Strategy**

***• Project Design***

The explicit goal and strategy of this project is ensuring food security and sustain human well-being through improved in situ conservation of agro-biodiversity resources. Also, a tangential goal is to promote the conservation of wild crop relatives and landraces in a dynamic and participatory way by smallholder farmers. Jointly, the project is designed addressing local circumstances, interlocking interventions to improve governance over farming systems, including by using better market and non-market based approaches, ensuring that biodiversity management needs are factored in.

As stated elsewhere, the project has three main components. It is expected that through the development of Project’s outputs these components will result and be the outcomes of the intervention:

1. *Enabling policy and institutional framework supporting in situ conservation of agro-biodiversity and crop wild relatives is created.*
2. *Markets provide incentive for farmer uptake of agro-biodiversity friendly practices, particularly for wild Arabica coffee, Enset, Teff and Durum Wheat.*
3. *Crop Wild Relatives and farmer varieties are conserved in in situ gene banks and on-farm conservation sites.*

The problems addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions are well defined. For instance, it is well defined in project design that, despite national and global importance of Ethiopia’s agro-biodiversity, it is highly threatened by several factors. These factors, as they are appropriately defined in the design of the project, include environmental degradation (including land degradation, deforestation, habitat conversion/habitat loss), climate change manifested by droughts, as well as the programmed replacement farmer varieties with hybrid high yielding varieties. This is said to be programmatic since, in response to growing food demand and food security issues, policy implemented through Ethiopia’s extension service places a high emphasis on high yielding varieties even in areas where farmer varieties are better suited, which in turn result in higher market value crops being preferentially cultivated by farmers, leading to displacement of farmer’s varieties, and even mono cropping, which evidently is unfavorable to biodiversity. The project design identifies these as threats to the inclusion of agro-biodiversity in farming food shortages that are forcing farmers to eat their seed, leading to further loss of farmers’ varieties in many regions. The Project identifies root causes that drive agro-biodiversity loss, which include high population growth and changing population dynamics, high reliance on natural resources for development aggravated by low development levels, changes in consumption patterns, conversion to modern, high-input agriculture and the globalization of agricultural markets without adequate protection of agro-biodiversity.

The issue of lack of market opportunities and inadequate policies to ensure the mainstreaming of agro-biodiversity in farming-related sectors is also underlined and barriers identified, such as weak policy and institutional framework without strong policy, financial and operational support that ensures conservation and sustainable use of crop genetic resources.

The project design addresses national priorities as well as international commitments by Ethiopia. Ethiopia as a party in the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (IT PGRFA) reflects Ethiopia’s international commitments regarding in – situ conservation. Furthermore, national plans related to development are addressed within project design, such as the National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBSAP) and other National Agendas [Growth and Transformation Plan, Climate Resilient Green Economy] address the issues of conservation and sustainable use of natural resources, coupled with growth, food security and economic development.

Project Strategy in sum relates to a valuation as to what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results. Regarding project design, therefore, a proper knowledge of the issues and suitable incorporation of matters related to in situ conservation as well as food security are assimilated into the design. Furthermore, threats and barriers are identified properly, and the project concept is in line with most national sector priorities. Therefore, the project is deemed relevant ( R ) to the country since it properly addresses country priorities.

Lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design and design of the project is closely linked to lessons learned from a previous GEF- funded UNDP- implemented project on Agro-biodiversity in Ethiopia as well as other GEF agro-biodiversity projects implemented in similar circumstances. In the design it is also remarked that the Project would also work jointly with several interventions in the country from bilateral and international cooperation sources.[[7]](#footnote-7) However, this evaluation has found that the only linkages with other interventions that exist are those handled by UNDP.

Gender issues were raised in the project design especially after comments by project reviewers indicated that these were lacking in early proposal stages. Yet the ‘how’, i.e. the approach of gender issues and gender mainstreaming is not clear in the ProDoc (i.e. in the design document). It only states that “A gender analysis will also be undertaken to ensure that enterprise groups are based on *existing gender roles* while ensuring improved targeting and fair distribution of benefits between the youth, men and women (italics our own)”. This implies that gender issues were not properly included in the design process from a gender mainstreaming point of view and would, as seen later, have repercussion in the implementation/results seeking process.[[8]](#footnote-8)However, important achievements have been made to address gender issues during the implementation of this project.

This evaluation has found several broad areas of concern regarding the project design, and recommendations for improvement of the design process and future programming is added in the pertinent areas of this report.

* First of all the design is too ambitious with regards to four areas/four crops with which the Project embarks upon in seeking outcomes and results. Although it is fully understood by this evaluation that the project intervenes in remote areas given that this is where the crops are found, it has also been found that each particular intervention is at times narrow given that the Project covers extensive areas, dissimilar crops addressing different agro biodiversity issues. Project seems to have ***overreached in its expected results***, given the differences between the crops, the distances and terrain covered (including ecosystem differences issues) involved in working with four diverse crops in several diverse sections of the country, and with very diverse production and market issues.
* Second, the project lacked research components in its design (which in some cases is being salvaged by adaptive management and budget re allocation). But which would have been better intertwined in the Project if it would have been included from the design stage onward. Research and knowledge gathering in issues such as productivity, pest control, adaptation to climate change, organic agriculture, gender mainstreaming are being added later on the process, almost as a postscript and not properly interwoven by the design itself.
* As indicated above, the project is also lacking in gender mainstreaming within the design process (which reflects in the implementation process). Although attempts are being made to incorporate women in the farmers’ associations and in Project activities, and this is a positive aspect of course, aspects of full gender mainstreaming as related to farming and biodiversity are lacking and are due, in part, to the fact that this issue is not fully developed in the design of the project.
* Fourth, looking retrospectively as an evaluation does, it is understood (not only by this evaluation but also by the most varied stakeholders) that if the project would have taken a broader approach regarding agro- biodiversity and not only concentrate generally in in-situ conservation as such it would have been more useful to the farmers and local governments involved. Although here too this issue is retrieved positively by adaptive changes by management within the Project, it is indicated that a broader approach from the very first inception of the Project would have been positive (for instance, considering integrated natural resource management, sustainable land use, and so on, as pivotal and not only in – situ conservation of crops).

**Results Framework/Log frame**

A critical analysis of the project’s log frame indicators and targets implies, firstly, assessing how “SMART” targets are (i.e. how Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound).[[9]](#footnote-9) In general terms the indicators are specific and measurable, as well as relevant and time – bound. Some of them are attainable within the Project’s time frame, yet others are not, not because they are unattainable in and of themselves but because they are not specific to outcomes but more to products.

Thus far, progress up to now has led to some incipient indicators that the Project can catalyze beneficial development effects (i.e. increased income generation, and women’s empowerment, improved governance). Some of these aspects are included in the results framework (specifically improved governance). Others are not and they should be included in the project as well as monitored in a periodic basis in order to highlight and give credit to the effects and impacts being achieved.

**Progress towards Results**

**• Progress towards outcomes analysis**

The Progress Towards Results section attempts to answer the question to what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far in an analytical way. That is not only looking at outputs and products but also looking at outcomes and results, always with the understanding that this is a mid-term evaluation and that achievements are or should be in process. At the end of this sub – section a table (which follows indications for such a presentation in *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects)* gives a representation of progress toward results in a graphic way.

Some highlights of progress towards achieving results are also narrated in this section in order to give a more general view and description of the evaluation findings, indicating the achievements but also the problems and concerns identified thus far. The description of the findings is divided in *Project Sites, National Level, and Linkage between Sites and National Level*.

* *Project Sites*. The project has a very good insertion at the local level (four project sites). Project has achieved a strong level of support at the local levels both from beneficiaries and at the local authorities level (Woredas). Local offices have been set up in the four sites, yet they are lacking in enough support in many areas (such as training in natural resource management, market value chain and marketing linkage, and gender issues, administrative and financial practices) as well as transport support in order to cover the large areas involved. Over 500 hectares covered with farmers’ varieties and Enset wild relative were achieved (meeting target), including seedling sites. Local by – laws at the Woreda level dealing with agro-biodiversity issues were approved by local authorities with direct linkage to the Project’s assistance. Seeds are distributed. The project is having a spillover positive impact to neighboring Kebeles, especially in Gimbichu Woreda. Problems with goods and infrastructure have been identified. For instance, donation of materials by the project to the farmers associations at times inadequate (threshers, for example, reflects lack of consultation on what their needs are). Two community gene banks (for Teff and Durum Wheat) are in the process of being built (albeit with great delays). Field gene banks (Enset and Coffee) have been set up. Market sheds for seed trading were built in areas where this is relevant. Some scaling up and horizontal exchanges taking place. With the latter is meant that farmers themselves identify that they are educating other farmers in the benefits of using farmers’ varieties and wild relatives. Farmers and Woreda authorities are receiving capacity building / training / awareness raising on marketing (through training, study tours, etc.) as well as biodiversity as it relates to the targeted indigenous crops. Farmers are being aided in setting up associations/cooperatives or to strengthen existing associations in order to work jointly in agro biodiversity conservation coupled with improved market access. Therefore, some linkages have been made with main actors higher up in the value chains (i.e. factories, market) with varying degrees of success, seeking market share and higher prices for the crops. Durum wheat producers have been linked to factories, in the aim to create import substitution practices, yet the links are very precarious (i.e. they have just verbal agreements). In Woreda where Teff is the main crop, a quality branding is being sought in order to encourage the use of farmers’ varieties through the creation of market mechanisms, such as market shares, related to quality. Linkages with relevant third – parties are being initiated by Woredas partly due to the Project that can benefit farmers and production. For instance, some of the Woredas are setting up partnerships with universities and other relevant actors in order to work in ecological and agronomy issues (pest control, cross pollination, organic production) as well as in branding/marketing issues which is expected that in the future it could fill these gaps and incorporate expertise in issues that the Project did not deal with directly but has aided in bringing forth. Moreover, Teff produced from this (Minjar) Woreda is well known for its good quality even in the past and now with the support of the project it is getting more market access at national level as well with the international level since beneficiary community has a contract for exporting. A best practice identified is the case of Yayu Coffee which has been certified, mostly with the support of the Project, and farmers are now (thanks to this certification) dealing directly with international buyers obtaining a price differential for certified coffee. Effects that are being reported as first experiences with directly supplying the market in an associative manner (and which should be carefully monitored by the project with relevant metrics) are increase in income as well as a better positioning of farmer variety crops overall. An positive aspect identified by the stakeholders and validated by this evaluation, is that the stakeholders perceive working with UN as a valued added given the transparency that this implies and the potential for linking with other UN endeavors (for example, Yayu Coffee being cultivated in UNESCO’s Yayu Coffee Forest Biosphere Reserve).
* *National Level*. At the national level, the Project mainly concentrated on policy – level engagement and institutional capacity building as well as in developing materials dealing broadly with marketing strategies for the four targeted products and developing extension packages for some of these crops. Firstly, a very good analysis on the identification of gaps and formulation of recommendations on policies and institutional frameworks in order to mainstream agro-biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in Ethiopia was carried out. The analysis recommends to mainstream agro –biodiversity into policies, laws, strategies and activities of all involved sectors (production systems and landscapes). The review of existing policies also found that there is not articulation between and among relevant policies and that agricultural policy at the national level is aimed to increase productivity using improved varieties, indicating that the country’s extension service give emphasis also improved varieties over agro-biodiversity and farmers’ variety. However, although this gap identification makes thorough recommendations for institutional frameworks at the national level in harmony with local policy levels and community organizations, this evaluation has not found that there is an impulse or momentum from the Project and from relevant stakeholders to promote the incorporation of policies and frameworks as recommended. That is, the Project is concentrating on the products (that is, the study itself, the distribution of copies, or the workshops around the subject carried out) and not an outcome or result (that is, furthering policy and frameworks; the 600 copies distributed and the discussions fostered are products). It would be desirable for the Project to impulse the streamlining of policy and frameworks at the national level in its remaining period of implementation. This is indicated bearing in mind that explicitly the project documents indicate that *“A well-articulated national institutional framework for agro-biodiversity conservation agreed upon by mid-term and implemented by end of project”* and the sought result is the national framework, which implies changes in norms and in institutions. Also, a marketing strategy study has been carried out at the national level for the four products which are the object of this Project. The study seems to have served as a basis for work on marketing carried out at the local levels as well as with communities. Nevertheless, the product is available only in English and as far as this evaluation could understand, it has not been translated in Amharic.[[10]](#footnote-10) If the latter would take place it would help enormously in attaining further results, in being useful for local authorities and community organizations, as well as for the assimilation of the outlaid strategies by local and national non – English speaking beneficiaries and stakeholders.
* *Linkage Between Sites and National Level*. As most GEF – financed UNDP implemented projects, the Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation in to the Agricultural Production Systems Ethiopia Project has national level implementation aspects, project sites implementation, and an expected linkage between both spheres of implementation. In this case, the links were established regarding policies and marketing incentives. Regarding policies, the outcome of policy gaps/overlaps and framework inadequacies have been discussed from federal to local levels, with recommendations for instance to install branches of the national Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute at local levels as well as linking incentive mechanisms between the different policy – making levels. Again, these are recommendations by the Project and it would be greatly beneficial that there should be strategic impulses so that the recommendations truly become policy frameworks. Furthermore, regarding marketing, access to markets (both at the international and at the national level has been facilitated by the project at the federal level.

**• Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective**

The remaining barriers identified in order to fully achieve Project’s objective in the remainder of the project are several.

* First of all, there is strong need to conceive that the project should be looking for outcomes, for results, and not so much for studies, products and so on. This is particularly the case in the sought institutional changes at the national level.
* Second, broadening the scope and taking into account issues that (although were part of the design) have not been worked upon thus far or have only been worked upon slightly, such as the issue of financing for agro-biodiversity.
* Furthermore, a key barrier identified (from the design process onward to this implementation) is how to combine and compound a mainstream policy in the country (that is, the explicit promotion of high yield non-farmer crop varieties) with what the Project proposes and indeed does (that is, the promotion of in situ conservation coupled with sustainable use of agro-biodiversity). This includes defining role of the extension system in Ethiopia in order to incorporate farmer varieties conservation values.

The aspects of the project that have already been successful have been:

* Its very fruitful insertion of the Project at local level (Woredas, community and farmer associations).
* Its support in creating dynamism and interest among all stakeholders at the local level to maintain these local variety crops, mainly Teff and Enset were highly threatened with the introduction of improved seeds
* Its achievements related to the certification of coffee, emphasizing that product certification is one of the best market incentives for farmers to incorporate incentives and sustainability factors.

The Project can further expand these benefits by:

* scaling up;
* multiplying efforts in the areas or subjects that have worked thus far;
* attempt to mainstream the achievements at all policy levels and not remain only as a demonstration project;
* Integrating other Natural Resource Management activities.

**Table 1: Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Project Strategy* | Indicator | Baseline Level | Mid Term Project Target (when available) and End of Project Target | Level in PIR(Self-Reported) | Midterm Eval. Assessment | Achievement Rating[[11]](#footnote-11) | Justification for Rating |
| *Objective: ―To provide farming communities with incentives (policies, capacity, knowledge and markets) to mainstream conservation of agro biodiversity resources, including CWR, into their farming systems. This will be achieved through three outcomes that overcome the barriers identified earlier.* |
| *Crop Wild Relatives and farmer varieties are conserved in in situ gene banks and on-farm conservation sites.* | 500ha established by end of the project | In situ conservation happening in many isolated farms holdings, but no consolidated, deliberately set aside area being managed specifically to maintain wild relatives | At least 300ha of on farm/in situ conservation sites established by project mid-term and 500ha established by end of the project | 534.63 hectare area was covered by respective farmers’ varieties and enset wild relative. This was 107% of the target level at the end of the project period |  | HS | Goal at mid -term evaluation over achieved. In situ conservation sites established. |
|  | 3 agro-biodiversity policies revised to mainstream agro-biodiversity conservation and institutional arrangement for their implementation strengthened | Policy contradictions identified, several key policies (trade, agriculture, forestry) still do not recognize agro biodiversity. Institutional arrangement especially mandates at the Woreda and Kebele levels still unclear, and have weak capacities | At least five policies evaluated for their effectiveness in agro-biodiversity conservation and recommendations for gap filling made by the end of the project; Institutional mandates for agroBD conservation clarified at all levels and Woreda and Kebbele governments. | Seven polices were evaluated and gaps related to the institutional frameworks also analyzed and identified. |  | MS | Policies evaluated (i.e. study carried out) yet to date there is no evidence that Project is assertive in promoting policy change at the national level in tune with gaps identified in national policies and national framework. |
|  | Markets for agro-BD friendly products increased by at least 50% (through expansion of value chains and national and international markets for agro-biodiversity) | Currently there is one international agreement on tef, less than 5% of coffee being sold as specialty coffee, very limited trade on Durum wheat or Enset. | At least three value chains with clear national and international markets established by mid-project and five value chains established by end of project | At national level, three value chains were established with clear commodity exchange trends; for Teff, Enset and durum wheat. One value chain with international market for forest coffee also established. |  | MS | Increasing 50 % markets for agro biodiversity – friendly products is too ambitious. The self-reported clear commodity chains for products (teff, enset and durum wheat) are incipient and not validated as fully accomplished, given that only contacts or at best a first exchange has been identified, yet some have begun, such as the teff/enjera export and the connections between durum wheat farmers and Ethiopian factory using it in their processing of products. and Evaluation coincides that forest coffee’s value chain with international market was promoted with 160 quintal exported direct. |
|  | Reduced or avoided deforestation and forest degradation and improved forest restoration through Payment of Ecosystem Services as conservation incentives | Awareness of the potential for developing a PES project is very high in the country, and some effort is being put to identify specific areas and design projects aimed at the UNREDD initiative. However, no PES project has been submitted to the CDM yet. | At least one PES project (on carbon sequestration with a target of 27.4 M tCO2e ER) initiated through REDD by project mid-term and an integrated forest management/governance structure to ensure continued provision of ecosystem services in place by end of project | Ongoing process to hire national/international consultant that will mentor the technical team members to be established from different federal, regional and woreda offices.  |  | U | Evaluation has not identified any processes /activities/products leading to the implementation of this initiative. No evidence of even hiring of consultant. Demarcation maps not available in country. Project management has no knowledge of this matter or its status. |
| *Enabling policy and institutional framework supporting in situ conservation of agro-biodiversity and crop wild relatives is created.* | Ministries of agriculture, forestry, trade and industry with policies catering agro biodiversity conservation | Currently Agro-biodiversity friendly policies are scattered and inadequate | At least 3 Agro-biodiversity principles mainstreamed into local and national agricultural, trade and industry policies and programs | Three principles mainstreamed:  1. Agro-biodiversity production principles: Extension packages were prepared for the four crops by Ministry of Agriculture.  2.Agrobiodiversity marketing principles  3. Agro biodiversity products processing principles.  |  | MS | Self-reported preparation of four extension packages did not take place as fully as expected thus far. In three cases (durum wheat, enset, and teff) it was indicated to this evaluation that the packages *will* be prepared. Fourth, coffee indicates that they already have one, but that the Project would only aid in upgrading to newer formats. At the national level, gaps and institutional frameworks were identified but there is no impulse or effective actions beyond the study to fill those gaps and upgrade institutionsSome stakeholders reply that extension package is at reviewing stage.The rating therefore is a composite. |
|  | Local institutions have farmer variety bylaws and regulations in 4 pilot areas | There are currently no farmer variety policies in pilot areas | At least 3 local government authorities assisted to develop capacity and accountability to enforce policies, sectorial guidelines and spatial plans in support of agro-biodiversity increased in 5 pilot areas by end of project | In each project sites, offices agriculture, office of cooperative promotion, office of finance and economy development and office of the woreda administrator are responsible for technical implementation and resource administration at local level.  |  | HS | Bylaws approved,  |
|  | Local institutions have farmer variety bylaws and regulations in 4 pilot areas | There are currently no farmer variety policies in pilot areas. | At least 4 FV Policies applied in 4 pilot areas &amp; adopted in 12 woredas / 36 kebeles supporting implementation | Currently, the four crops FVs polices were applied in four project sites including approved and working community bylaws in four project sites. The community bylaws were approved by the council and woreda and kebele levels.  |  | S | Although by laws approved, there is still need to work further and give support on their implementation at the local level, creating capacity and promoting implementing mechanisms. |
|  | National extension program promote farmer varieties and land races | The National extension service has a strong bias to promote HYVs at the expense of traditional farmer varieties | At least 40% of the farmers in the 4 pilot areas provided with skills and knowledge to increase farm productivity (and food security) by 30% using agro-biodiversity friendly practices | Awareness raising training, technical skill enhancements, was provided for 1050 community representative participants in four project sites in which (21% females) and for extension officers and experts. |  | S | Awareness raising activities taking place. Target of 40 percent of all farmers in all four pilot areas very high. |
|  | Local institutions have farmer variety bylaws and regulations in 4 pilot areas | There are currently no farmer variety policies in pilot areas | At least 60% of the CSOs in pilot areas have skills to actively support communities to integrate at least 4 FV into farming systems, and link such production to private sector markets | Farmers’ cooperatives are well organized and developed skills to actively support their members.    |  | S | Farmers’ cooperatives are being organized due to the Project. Some with better success than others, still need to work on credit services/access, complete building of gene banks where relevant, as well as in precise and need knowledge transfer related to in situ conservation, such as land and natural resource management, equity issues (specifically gender), as well as sustainability of outcomes |
|  | An effective M&E for assessing conservation status of agro-biodiversity at community level | Conservation status of FVs and CWR is weak and their contribution to local food security is not well documented. | Agriculture programs in the 4 project sites adopt a participatory M&E system for assessing the conservation status of FV and CWR by mid-term and the contribution of CWR and FV to local food security assessed by end of project. | Document containing refined project impact and M&E indicators were developed by the national consultant including well developed participatory monitoring and evaluation systems to assess conservation status of FVs.  |  | U | The evaluation did not find evidence that the monitoring and evaluation process of fully assessing the conservation status of agro biodiversity at the community level has taken place so far, nor that indicated document is available. Project management did not know of this process. No evidence of assessment of monitoring and evaluation system for assessing conservation status has been found thus far.  |
|  | 500ha established by end of the project | In-situ conservation happening in many isolated farms holdings, but no consolidated, deliberately set aside area being managed specifically to maintain wild relatives | The acreage of in-situ /on farm gene banks in 4 sites increased by 250,000 ha by mid-term and increased to 500,000 ha by end of project to ensure conservation of 4 crops and their wild relatives | Total acreage increased to 193,212.63 (77.3% of the target level during mid-term period of the project). Counting of the permanent fields. |  | HS | With a 77 percent target met by this evaluation, the outcome is highly likely to be met by the end of the project implementation period. |
|  | 500ha established by end of the project | In situ conservation happening in many isolated farms holdings, but no consolidated, deliberately set aside area being managed specifically to maintain wild relatives | Capacities for sustainable management of the 4 conservation sites developed by mid-project and areas certified as sources of landraces and wild crop relatives by end of project | Capacities were created in four project sites in terms of institutional base and infrastructures development and establishment (conservation sites establishment and construction).  |  | HS | Capacity building is taking place in project sites. |
|  | 500ha established by end of the project | In situ conservation happening in many isolated farms holdings, but no consolidated, deliberately set aside area being managed specifically to maintain wild relatives | In situ gene banks management arrangements in 4 conservation sites agreed by mid-term and operational by end of project | One national consultant recruited to study and assess the mandates and capacity gaps related to in-situ /on-farm conservation sites management. |  | U | Evaluation never had access to this study and Project management was not aware of this being carried out. Therefore, it is understood that this output has not begun to take form yet. Legal framework at the local level and field scenarios is a key issue since so much emphasis of this Project, not only in implementation but also in its design is place on the field/local level. |
|  | Effectiveness of institutions in management of in situ gene banks | Degradation of in situ gene banks continue unabated since the national and regional institutions charged with the management of in situ gene banks lack effective management strategies | At least 4 capacity building programs are developed and implemented by mid-term to ensure 50% of the institutions charged with responsibility for managing the in-situ gene banks in 4 sites are effective by end of project. | Ethiopian Biodiversity institute (EBI), Ethiopian Agricultural research Institute (EIAR) and Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) structures from federal to community levels were supported to enhance their responsibility in managing in-situ conservation sites. related to four crops FVs.  |  | S | It is understood that at least at the local / community level capacity building is taking place. |
| *Markets for agro-biodiversity friendly products promote farmer uptake of agro-biodiversity conservation imperatives* | International and national demand for five agro-BD friendly products increased[[12]](#footnote-12) | Though there is a demand for some agro-biodiversity products, there are more opportunities that can be tapped to increase this demand | At least 4 marketing programs identified, differentiated and certified for products from 4 pilot areas (e.g. shade, wild and low caffeine coffee, durum wheat, Enset, Teff, noug) by mid-term and non-certified agro-BD products grown in shade coffee farms and coffee forests developed and implemented through a supply chain approach by end of project | Teff, durum wheat, enset and forest coffee marketing programs were identified and linkages were established (100% achieved). Except durum wheat, through the linkages, commodity exchange was started (75% achievement) |  | S | Although the Project reports 75% achievement, the evaluation finds that achievement is to date of 50% (coffee and teff). The project reports that regarding durum wheat target has not been achieved and this evaluation validates that. Regarding enset, this evaluation has found that although enset fiber has been place collectively in the market, farmers have not been paid after a year, therefore linkage has been deficient. Durum wheat and teff report some incipient linkages, not full ones (ie. Verbal agreements for instance). |
|  | Production, processing and marketing of agro biodiversity friendly products improved in 4 pilot areas through the formation of cooperatives with strong organizational and operational capacities | There are many local level producer societies but there are major gaps in capacity and in particular they are not differentiated by function (production, processing, marketing); they have very limited operational and organizational capacities and fail to link farmers to markets and credits adequately | At least 50% of local level producer societies for specific crops (such as shade and low caffeine coffee, durum wheat, Teff, Ensete) in 4 sites promoted as a mechanism of incentives for adoption by linking farmers to markets and credit | 8 farmers’ cooperatives with FVs conservation, production and marketing objectives were under intensive management with 2083 members (14.4% female). Processing and marketing capacity gaps assessment documents. Supported. |  | S | Associations of producers either created or strengthened. |
|  | Awareness of the importance of Agro-biodiversity-friendly products in promoting conservation and communities’ welfare in Ethiopia raised at local, national and international level | There is limited awareness on importance of Ethiopia’s agro biodiversity; and even more limited awareness of the role this agro biodiversity plays in local economic development and food security; and limited awareness of the options and potential that exist to use specialized products to promote both local welfare, economies and conservation.  | At least 10 international marketing campaigns (trade fairs, online) to establish Ethiopia as an international source of agro-BD friendly products held by mid-term and production of agro-biodiversity products to satisfy the markets increased by 50% by end of project | One international marketing campaign was conducted in Addis Ababa on forest coffee.  |  | MS | One of 10 marketing campaigns indicated in project log frame and according to PIRs has been achieved. |
|  | Business and financial capacity in place to produce agro-BD friendly products and services in 5 pilot sites | There are limited credit opportunities for SMEs involved in agro-biodiversity friendly businesses | At least 60% of micro and SM enterprises engaged in Agro-BD friendly businesses and services assisted to access credit through partnerships and capacity building of financial institutions by end of project | Two farmers’ cooperatives unions provided credit support for the farmers’ cooperatives to support the marketing activities. Institute. They will train respective cooperatives leaders in each project sites. |  | MS | No farmer cooperative reports receiving credit support. This is one of the areas where the local project staff indicates that they will work on, and it would be a much needed peripheral but key issue to work with farmers and community associations. |
|  | Increased and stable income from certified and non-certified products grown in agro-BD friendly areas (shade coffee farms and coffee forest) in 4 pilot sites | The current income levels from agro-biodiversity friendly products are far below the available market opportunities | At least 2 different international crop certification systems established for shade coffee from coffee forest established by mid-term project and production increased by 50% while allowing 60% of the coffee farmer’s in the site to sell products at a premium by end of project | Rain Forest Alliance (RA) certification system and protocol established last year (50% of the target level).  |  | HS | This is one of the best practices, since it provides incentives for agro biodiversity conservation, price differential and insertion in international markets. Great potential for meeting target |
|  | Verification and monitoring compliance of certification | The available certification process needs to be monitored for compliance | At least one protocol to verify and monitor compliance of certification developed by mid-project and used effectively by end of project | Last year Yayu forest coffee was certified by Rain Forest Alliance. Hence, Rain Forest Alliance compliance mechanism was adopted as indicated in audit report format (100% achieved). |  | HS | Same as above. |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

**Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

**• Management Arrangements**

The management arrangements presented in the Project Document (that is, at the design stage) indicated that the Project Coordination Unit should consist of a National Project Coordinator (NPC), a Market Specialist, a Policy Specialist and support staff (financial officer, Project assistant/secretary and a project driver/messenger) at the national level. Activities at each site, according to the project design documents, would be coordinated by a Project Site Management Unit (PSMU) consisting of a Project Site Officer (PSO), Project Site Policy and Marketing Officers and support staff (project administration officer/secretary and driver/messenger).

This structure was changed and at the time of the evaluation, the PCU at the time of the evaluation consists of a National Project Coordinator and support staff (a financial officer and an administrator) same as anticipated in the ProDoc, plus double the proposed basic support staff in terms of driver/messenger.

Regarding the Project Sites, these have also changed from the original anticipated management structure. The Project Steering committee while evaluating the requirements for additional marketing and policy specialists at the Project sites decided that the two specialists at the federal level can cover the task from head office. The Sites, therefore, have only two staff each, a Project Site officer and one Administrative Staff (that is only having 40 percent of the expected project staff). Hence the call for support to the sites.

Regarding decision making within the Project, it was planned that annual monitoring would occur through the Project Steering Committee Meetings (PSCM) and that this would be the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in project implementation, with two meetings per year. At the local Woreda/site levels, there is also (in each one of them) a Steering Committee with diverse participation from different areas of local government as well as representation from farmers associations. This evaluation has validated that these committees have functioned as planned with clear responsibilities and reporting lines and with decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner. Two PSC meeting are being held annually with provided Terms of Reference, and they evaluate and approve Project Budget annual work plan and evaluate achievements every year.

By all accounts, the Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute has been a quality Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s), with a proactive role within the country and internationally regarding in situ and ex situ conservation and providing guidance to the implementation of the project. By all accounts, the quality of support and management guidance provided by the GEF Partner Agency (in this case UNDP) is very high. That is, UNDP support (together with UNDP monitoring and follow up) is very high.

**• Work planning**

The Project suffered delays in project start-up and implementation. Project implementation was delayed for over a year, in particular due to startup problems as well as a high turnover of project management. The time periods of the first two project coordinators had very little delivery. By the time this Mid Term Evaluation took place the Project has had four project managers (the fourth commencing work at the same time the evaluation process began).

This not only caused delays and postponements at the national (PMU) level but it also had repercussions at the local level. As several stakeholders clearly indicated ‘farming has its own times’, meaning that if the project did not start up congruently with farming cycle (i.e. sowing), therefore that year/cycle/period is lost. Also, at the local level, delays in startup caused some trust issues (that is, local stakeholders were not wholly credulous that project would really materialize due to startup delays). At least one Woreda [Minjar] was able to facilitate the funds needed for startup and be reimbursed later. However, the other three sites were not able to do that. However, this did not affect negatively the acceptance level at the time of the mid – term evaluation.

At present, and roughly for the last year – and – a – half, a high degree of delivery took place. To a great degree this has allowed the Project to draw near delivery of products and implement and develop products roughly in line with planned timely outputs. This has also allowed to compensate for lost time as a result of intensive monitoring carried out by UNDP, PSC, and EBI.

The work-planning processes, in particular at the national level but also to some degree at the local level are not totally results-based but more product oriented. The Project Management Unit as well as the local – level staff would benefit from instruction and training on results – based management and indications that the Project, as designed and as current programming of GEF-funded UNDP implemented projects mandates, is results – based. This could feasibly aid in re-orientating work planning to focus on results, particularly as it relates to national – level governance and framework changes sought as outcomes.

The Project has made use of the results framework/ log frame as a management tool, as can be evidenced by PIRs. Its use has been made in terms of outputs/products, yet there is still a lack of awareness that a results framework is that, a framework to seek results and not only to deliver products. As indicated in the pertinent section, some aspects of the Project were missing at the design level (for instance, research aspects), since the Project start these gaps have been identified with pertinent changes made by the Project.

**• Finance and co-finance**

The financial management of the Project follows standard practices. Audits of its financial aspects have indicated that finance management has been carried out in accordance with agreed upon accounting policies in conformity with approved project budgets and for approved purposes of the Project. Furthermore audits indicated expenditures have been carried out in compliance with relevant UNDP regulations, rules, policies and procedures, and are supported by properly approved documents (such as vouchers). At local/Woreda level, financial expenditure was made transparently and in agreement with all actors. Moreover, the money was wired to the Woreda government account and all financial expenses are followed and checked according to government financial rules and regulations. Therefore, it can be concluded that up to this point in time the Project has appropriate financial controls (including financial planning and reporting) which allows management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds. The only problem with the latter, i.e. timely flow of funds was identified for the first year of the Project where funds were not directed in a timely fashion to the local sites. Barring this instance, financial management of the project has been cost-effective.

Other changes that responded to alterations to project implementation Vis – a – Vis design were not as problematic. For instance, when it was decided that project design did not include needed research aspects, adaptively changes were made in implementation and therefore in budgets and fund allocations. Although it is understood that this is within the same component and not such a large change, it is a positive aspect of adaptive management that the pertinent revisions were made and budget re allocated as needed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at mid-term (Million US$)* |
| GEF financing:  | US$ 3863600  | US$ 3863600 |
| UNDP financing: | US$ 3000000 | US$ 3000000 |
|  |  |  |
| Co - financing |  |  |
| Government: | US$ 2050000 | US$ 57722 |
| Other: Ethiopian Coffee Forum | US$ 100000 | US$ 2000 |
| Total co-financing: | US$ 2150000 | US$ 59722 |
|  |  |  |
| Total Project Cost: | US$ 9013600 | US$ 6923322 |

To date leveraged co – financing is 27 % of what was budgeted at endorsement. Most of the co – financing is reported from government and is reported to be for the following items: land at project sites, office and utilities costs, as well as human power.

**Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:**

The monitoring tools being used provide the necessary information and involve key partners at the national and local level, using existing information. Some of the monitoring or reporting documents indicate that reporting at times concentrates on products/outputs and not outcomes. It would greatly benefit the Project if in this concluding stage it would concentrate on monitoring outcomes following established indicators for measuring success within the Project since this is key for the concluding phase.

This mid-term evaluation is the first evaluation of the Project as such (as indicated it would be in the Project document). The only issue is that it did not take place in the true mid – point of the project (May 2013), but it was postponed due to delayed project inception and actual implementation timing. Financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget is being carried out as planned with periodic auditing and with sufficient and effectively allocated resources.

**Stakeholder Engagement**

The project has developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships and overall very good with direct and tangential stakeholders and beneficiaries, in particular at the sub – national (Woreda-level) and beneficiaries level (farmers’ associations, as well as individual farmers). This is related to a high and active degree of participation, both at the Woreda – level and at the farmers/farmers’ associations level in the local project components. Local government stakeholders clearly support the objectives of the project and continue to have an active role in project implementation that underlies project implementation effectiveness, again at the local level.

At the national level, it is clear that the Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute (EBI) supports the objectives of the project, and as related to the project objectives, where different modes of agricultural productivity is promoted (such as the use of non – farmer varieties). This is contrast to national government giving more emphasis to high yield varieties even in areas where farmers’ varieties are favored and/or better suited. This finding is not only an evaluation finding but also clearly outlined in several of the Project’s products, such as in the publication *Identification of Gaps and Formulation of Recommendations on Policies and Institutional Frameworks to Mainstream Agro – Biodiversity Conservation.* The evaluation informants and key stakeholders (at all levels) indicate repeatedly this matter: “farmers’ varieties not a priority for government”; “although government fully supporting of EBI to conserve biodiversity, they continue to stimulate hybrid production”; and in some cases “this is the first time we get government support and acknowledgment regarding our local variety”.

**Reporting**

Adaptive management as it is generally understood (i.e. deep changes following a mid-term review) has not taken place since this customarily follows mid-term reviews such as the one resulting in the present report. Nonetheless the Project has experienced changes during its implementation stage that are accurately reflected in the reporting process, for instance the incorporation of aspects which were not included in the design of the intervention (such as research) which shows flexibility and adaptive management.

**Communications**

Project communication with stakeholders is rather sporadic and informal. There is no formal channel of communications established or a communication strategy that would allow communicating inclusively and periodically, creating instances of knowledge management as well as receiving programmatic feedback. There is no use of regular newsletter or other sort of communications taking place.

This is also true regarding external project communication since there are no proper systematic means of communication established or being established to express continuous and programed Project progress and intended impact to the public and other external actors (as well as internal actors and stakeholders). As stated above, regarding external communications, there are no periodic bulletins or newsletter and there no stand alone web presence (i.e. the Project does not have its own stand-alone web page to communicate with). Although, like other UNDP management project the project information and fact sheets are being shared in the UNDP website, and some information is shared through the EBI website, it lacks a stand-alone web presence.

Regarding outreach and public awareness campaign, given the limited awareness of the importance of agro-biodiversity-friendly products in promoting conservation and communities’ welfare in Ethiopia, 10 international marketing campaigns were included as outputs in the design of the Project such as it is indicated in ProDoc and PIRs, and it was indicated that this would be done by the Project’s mid - term. The intention was that, through trade fairs and online, Ethiopia would be positioned as an international source of agro biodiversity friendly products. Nevertheless, as reported and as validated through the present evaluation, to date only one such occurrence took place during an international meeting on climate change in December 2012 (as a side event) and there is a bill board in Addis Ababa’s international airport (departure area) displaying the Project which has contributed for communicating of these products internationally.[[13]](#footnote-13)

**Sustainability**

When assessing the sustainability the general guidance is to assess the *likelihood of sustainability* of outcomes at project termination. Sustainability in this context is generally considered to be the likelihood of continued benefits after a project ends. Consequently the assessment of sustainability considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes, among other factors. Following these premises, a validation as to whether the risks identified in the Project Document are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. The ProDoc identifies and rates (in some instances) risks as follows:

**Table 2: Project Risks and Risk Ratings**

**Risks Ratings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Failure of private sector to engage: Private sector has shown little interest anywhere in the world to engage in the production of crops without monetary value. In addition, there has been limited ability to interest the private sector in the past, and so markets are not adequately developed.  | N/A[[14]](#footnote-14) |
|  |  |
| Market failure commoditization of the products leading to ordinary demand and supply principles controlling the market, leading to either overharvesting or uneven distribution of benefits along the market chain (with farmers losing out)  | N/A[[15]](#footnote-15) |
|  |  |
| There is a slight risk that consumers in the country and the region fail to develop a taste for the specialized products, particularly brown tef and enset products  | N/A[[16]](#footnote-16) |
|  |  |
| Government attention may continue to be biased on high yielding crops: Government in the past has been strongly promoting hybrid varieties in food surplus areas, with less attention to innovation in drought-prone areas.  | L |
|  |  |
| Failure to maintain the current high levels of willingness to cooperate among various institutions / agencies, sectorial, regions and woredas with responsibility for land management and food production as well as with civil society and private sector, thereby reducing project success and impact.  | M  |
|  |  |
| Climate change, in particular a series of drought years may reduce proponent‘s interest in new agriculture.  | L |
|  |  |

**N/A: Not Available; M: Medium; L: Low.**

First of all, and unfortunately, the Project Document does not rank half the risks identified, therefore an analysis as to whether the rankings are appropriate is not possible in this case. In the other half of the risks identified where the design document does identify risks as to their rating, it is understood that one of them (*Government attention may continue to be biased on high yielding crops: Government in the past has been strongly promoting hybrid varieties in food surplus areas, with less attention to innovation in drought-prone areas.*) is underrated as Low since, as seen in processes thus far, government continues to promote hybrid varieties and as indicated in other pertinent sections of this report, is a barrier to long –term Project benefits sustainability and an obstacle even compounded by projects and programs (some with international cooperation actors) that continue to promote this sort of farming.

Regarding one of the three unranked risks, the first one (*Failure of private sector to engage: Private sector has shown little interest anywhere in the world to engage in the production of crops without monetary value. In addition, there has been limited ability to interest the private sector in the past, and so markets are not adequately developed.* ), although it is perceived by this evaluation as a high risk, it has been mitigated in the most part since (through associative practices and certification) the Project is promoting price differentials which in turn act as incentives for agro biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within farming practices in the most of the crops targeted within the intervention.

Other risk components to sustainability are further analyzed below per UNDP and GEF guidelines. They involve financial, socio – economic, institutional/governance, and environmental risks to sustainability.

**Financial risks to sustainability**

When analyzing financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes an evaluation considers the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once assistance ends. In the context of the *Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation in to the Agricultural Production Systems Ethiopia Project* this is a very perceptible issue. For instances there are question arising from the most varied stakeholders regarding who will finance outcomes once Project concludes. Also, as far as this evaluation was able to gather, funding through government has not been implemented or allocated thus far to continue working and promoting farmers’ varieties and agro biodiversity conservation as is introduced by this Project. Regarding private sector financing and as it relates to risk and sustainability, this evaluation has gathered that beneficiaries do not fully comprehend that future financing is their concern. For instance, continuous certification is needed for differential access to market and market prices, and farmers who have benefitted from the support of the Project do not fully grasp that this has to be factored-in in the future from their financial windfall given the certification obtained. It would greatly benefit the project that, in order to assure financial sustainability in these cases, that they would coach farmers associations in this regard.

**Socio-economic risks to sustainability**

The social and / or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes are varied and variable. First, level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by local governments, farmers’ groups and other key stakeholders) is deemed to be high and, therefore, at least at the local level the risks of sustainability due to low ownership are low. Especially since key stakeholders at the local perceive that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow after the intervention is concluded. Also, there is a high level of public and stakeholder awareness in support of the project’s long-term objectives, particularly at the local level.

On the other hand, however, broad political risks and threats as identified persist, mainly given that by all indications are that government macro policies continue to promote hybrid varieties through explicit policies.

**Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability**

The institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability of project outcomes is the very subject of one of the outputs and expected outcomes of the Project. A thorough gap analysis and framework recommendation work was carried out as part of the Project, basically pointing at framework and governance structures of a national nature.[[17]](#footnote-17) As indicated throughout this report, one of the three outcomes expected out of the Project is enabling policy and institutional framework for in situ conservation of agro-biodiversity. Nevertheless, further to the gap and framework analysis this evaluation has not established any progress in promoting at the national – level resilient and agile institutional frameworks and governance structures for in situ conservation. Furthermore, although planned to have at least two extension packages by project mid-point (i.e. 2013), no national extension packages have been developed yet for Durum Wheat, Enset, nor Teff which, if developed, would greatly aid in reducing framework risks to sustainability. At the local level, there have been a series of outcomes regarding local (Woreda-level) bylaws that do provide a certain degree of governance and framework processes to promote the sustenance of project benefits if they are implemented. With the implementation of the Woreda – level bylaws the risks to institutional sustainability at the local level would be reduced.

**Environmental risks to sustainability**

The environmental risk to sustainability is closely related to the environmental issues presented from the design throughout the project implementation which may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes. For instance, one of the key issues that affects agricultural production in Ethiopia are droughts, associated to climate variability as well as climate change result. The resulting issue of frequent droughts that make Ethiopia’s drylands particularly exposed to the climate – agriculture – food shortage cycles are still very much present and identified. Other climate phenomena of varying intensity, such as floods, frost, hail and seasonal variations pointedly affects food production, coupled with environmental degradation, which increases social vulnerability as it relates to food shortages. All of these environmental threats and scenarios have been pointed out in the ProDoc’s risk analysis, and although this risk has been categorized as low in relation to the project implementation cycle, and no harsh droughts have been identified in the areas of intervention during the project implementation period, these are risks that remain for the future. In order to lower or at least mitigate environmental risks to the sustainability of the project’s results, it would be positive if such risks are factored in, such as working with drought resistant crops or scientifically ascertaining if or how resistant to droughts are the farmers’ varieties in comparison with hybrid varieties.

**Gender Mainstreaming**

Mainstreaming a gender perspective is the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programs, in any area and at all levels. It is a strategy for making the concerns and experiences of women as well as of men an integral part of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programs in all political, economic and societal spheres, so that women and men benefit equally, and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal of mainstreaming is to achieve gender equality.

As seen in the design analysis section of this report, the issue of mainstreaming gender has been probed from the very first stages of the design process with issues raised by earlier reviewers of the project proposals. Although these matters were raised early on in the approval proposed, they were not fully incorporated in the design, which of course results in implementation issues. The project reports also in its latest PIR that a guideline on gender mainstreaming in agro biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilization will be developed for mainstreaming agro biodiversity conservation. Nevertheless, this product has not been produced and there has been no careful consideration of its timing. That is such a product should be developed right at inception and not at the end of a Project, given that if it is developed its incorporation would be belated or impossible to incorporate at the very end. That is, mainstreaming a gender perspective should be integral and imbedded from the beginning of a project and not a postscript.

The Project has had very positive initiatives by including women in capacity building activities as well as giving impulses to women’s participation in farmers’ associations. This has generated some very positive facets where women are beginning to be included at varying levels in the decision – making processes.

Nevertheless, the project does not include a gender mainstreaming approach as such; it only encourages participation in capacity building and farmers associations. Therefore the issue is not fully integrated to the design or implementation. This also indicates that needed resources (financial, human, time) have not been allocated for integrating gender equality into the Project. There is much knowledge within the UN System and other institutions as to the relation of women with biodiversity, women’s differential needs, double and triple working day, and the distribution of benefits, as well as making sure that the project does not have a negative impact of on daily workload of women, and does not decrease women’s incomes. The Project could tap on this knowledge and practices in order to truly mainstream gender. For example, there are many works, studies and projects in biodiversity - gender - production that are not assimilated and that could be assimilated without much effort.

The Ensete case is an excellent example of the dynamic that often takes place when an intervention or project raises the price of a product or a good. Ensete fiber within the community where the Project site is located has experienced an “upgrading” not only in its image (it was considered a poor people’s crop) or in its social status since it was considered of low value and therefore “woman’s crop”. Now that prices are higher due to associated selling by farmers which has been an impulse of the Project, the crop is no longer considered a “female crop”. Consequently, regarding the income that previously that was managed by women it has now been taken over by men within the households.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

**Conclusions**

In general, the *Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation in to the Agricultural Production Systems Ethiopia Project* has effectively achieved several of the expected results to a satisfactory level.

The design of the Project has had some positive aspects, mainly the vision that the incorporation of agro – biodiversity in farming systems in Ethiopia should be a multi-pronged approach, not only dealing with the provision of farmers’ variety seeds but also tackling issues of green markets, understanding that without market – incentives the incorporation of agro biodiversity in farming will only take place during the duration of project support and not be sustainable over time. Furthermore, besides the support of farming practices and marketing support indicated above, the design also acknowledged the need for institutional and policy networks at all levels (local, regional, national). That being said however, there were several components that the design did not contain, such as research and monitoring of effects in order to substantiate findings/conclusions, or how would gender mainstreaming take place within the Project itself. Furthermore, the design in this case was overly ambitious, covering four very dissimilar crops in different and some in remote areas of the country, an issue further compounded by the fact that the adequate structure and support for each site established in the design was further reduced in the implementation process. [[18]](#footnote-18)

It has predominantly revealed a very good insertion and engagement within local areas (at the Wareda level as well as the beneficiaries/farmers level) and, therefore, has achieved a strong level of support and appropriation both from beneficiaries and local authorities. Among one of the main achievements are the 500 hectares covered with farmers’ varieties and Enset wild relative that have been attained (meeting target at the time of the evaluation) directly or tangentially due to the local interventions. The local offices and local staff (reflecting a joint effort by EBI, UNDP and other stakeholders and local level commitment/acceptance) have brokered these results and outcomes to a great degree, yet a general conclusion is that they need strengthening (technical and programmatic) if they are to continue delivering products and effects.

Also at the local level, the approval of by – laws at the Woreda level dealing with agro biodiversity issues are a major accomplishment which –if their implementation follows—should provide local institutionally, framework and governance abilities to incorporate agro biodiversity principles in farming systems. Although it is understood by this evaluation that the approval of the by-laws is an accomplishment of the Woredas and local populations, the approval process was of course strongly supported by the Project, EBI staff and UNDP.

The distribution of farmers’ varieties seeds has been an ongoing activity and their use is perhaps one of the key attainments. Yet other accompanying tasks have taken place which should assure sustainability of outcomes. That is, it is evident that farmers will use the seeds provided for sowing in the implementation period. Nevertheless, other specific accompanying factors will aid in assuring continuing results, among them are the structures which will shelter in situ conservation (the two community gene banks which unfortunately have been delayed in their construction) as well as the land used set aside for providing inputs for these gene banks and the field gene banks.

An unexpected yet positive outcome is the recognition of local varieties as ‘valuable.’ The Project itself, the attention that several indigenous varieties and crops are receiving, have resulted in crops that were not considered as valued in farming either regain or gain social recognition. Similarly, the project has helped to raise awareness about the importance of the four crops each Woreda level and in some cases even nationally and globally, and this will have its role in the sustainability of the project outcomes.

A number of workshops and capacity building and training events have been taking place for farmers and Woreda authorities who are receiving capacity building / training / awareness raising on marketing (through training, study tours, etc.) as well as biodiversity as it relates to the targeted indigenous crops. These activities have also aided in strengthening existing farmers organizations or in given substance to associations/cooperatives being created with the collaboration of the Project.

Some development effects are beginning to be reported. Farmers and local stakeholders report price differential, as well as increased output and productivity, and improved market insertion (varying from crop to crop of course). Although this is an impact issue, it would be greatly beneficial for the Project, for future stages, for scaling up and for other such issues to research, monitor, and verify these professed impacts. Being able to prove that indeed farmers’ varieties are resistant and resilient and that certified varieties do have a market niche that generates development outcomes is elemental not only to measure impact but to promote farmers’ varieties at the national level and up scaling the Project. Moreover, farmers are professing that they are introduced on how to market their products and diversify their products as well. This will have a paramount support and or impact in improving the livelihood of the farmers.

At the national stage less achievements at the outcome levels has been reported or found. A key matter and expected outcome is an institutional framework that would support the use of farmers’ varieties as well as to mainstream agro-biodiversity in farming systems in Ethiopia. Nevertheless, although a very thorough study has been carried out and disseminated, there is no evidence that there has been a full uptake of the recommendations in order to truly mainstream agro biodiversity at the national level. Issues such as the establishment of mandates for biodiversity management institutions to implement comprehensive national policies and strategies, and similar endorsements arising from this study addressed to the national level are crucial yet have not been fostered beyond holding dialogues.

Some linkages have been made between the national level and the local levels in particular relating to market access and marketing strategies for farmers’ varieties. Others are still in order to begin in the concluding phase of the Project, dealing with research and analysis, not only in marketing issues but also in ecological and agronomy issues, which – it would be expected – can also feed the extension package processes that need to swiftly be prepared in the next few months before the Project concludes.

*Best practice.* A best practice identified is the case of Yayu Forest Arabica Coffee which has been certified by the Standards of the Sustainable Agriculture Network , mostly with the support of the Project, and farmers are now (thanks to this certification) dealing directly with international buyers and, in turn due to this, reporting a price differential for certified coffee. This certification responds to a collective vision based on the concept of sustainability, recognizing that the well-being of societies and ecosystems is intertwined and dependent on development that is environmentally sound, socially equitable and economically viable. Therefore certification not only originate and is based on farmers’ practices in using indigenous varieties and shaded coffee that harbors biodiversity, but also from social aspects (such as the accreditation that no child labor is used in farming Yayu Coffee). Effects and impacts that are being reported as first experiences with directly supplying the market in an associative manner (and which should be carefully monitored by the project with relevant metrics) are increase in income as well as a better positioning of farmer variety crops overall. An positive aspect identified by the stakeholders and validated by this evaluation, is that the stakeholders perceive working with UN as a value added given the transparency that this implies and the potential for linking with other UN endeavors (for example, Yayu Coffee being cultivated in UNESCO’s Yayu Coffee Forest Biosphere Reserve). This is identified as a best practice given the win – win situation.

Some impromptu scaling up, catalyzing and horizontal exchanges are beginning to take place. Given that farmers themselves identify that they are educating other farmers in the benefits of using farmers’ varieties and wild relatives, and that Woredas are spreading knowledge this is indicative of the scaling up and replication potential that this Project can have in the future, not only at the national, but also at the regional and international levels.

All of the above being said, however the long start – up delays, the high staff turnover given the four changes in national project coordinators (and this is up to the time of the mid-term review evidently), were detrimental to effectiveness and efficiency which in turn has led to ‘catch – up ‘ situation in the latter periods. The next 18 months of Project implementation are key to emphasize that the conclusion stage of the Project (that is, after this MTE) should be highly proactive and strong in order to obtain consolidated and sustainable outcomes.

**Recommendations**

*Recommendations for the future programming/design process*

This a recommendation for future programming and design processes, as asked for mid-term evaluations.

* The design of a project should encompass all aspects of a project including research and monitoring of effects with clear indicators and analysis to substantiate findings and conclusions. Gender mainstreaming should be inserted from the design itself and not as an afterthought, with indicative issues well considered from the beginning, such as gender roles differentials (in this case in relation to farming and biodiversity) impact of project on daily workload of women, impact of project on time spent by women, increase in women’s income, with great specificity and a gender mainstreaming vision. Furthermore, the design of a project should be more realistic, for instance in terms of how many crops it deals with, in which areas of the country. All of the above properly resourced in order to effectively and sustainably implement in the field.

*Recommendations for the concluding stage of the Project.*

These are recommendations, as asked from mid-term evaluations, for the concluding stage of the Project.

* The Project needs to propose and promote clear management arrangements for in situ conservation mechanisms (gene banks, field gene banks, etc.) in order to sustain and reinforce the initial benefits from the Project. This should clarify who and how these structures and land, banks, etc., will be managed, who will be responsible for them and how after Project completion, making sure that these arrangements are sustainable, properly resourced and equitable.
* The Project should ‘fill the gaps’ identified in its first stage, in particular gathering information, monitoring and researching vital issues such as productivity, green markets, organic production, as well socio – economic issues such as market value and distribution of benefits. This should be done making sure that there is no duplication of efforts given that many of the studies and analysis proposed in several of the crops have already been carried out and institutions at the most varied level are repositories of this knowledge.
* The Project should work directly with beneficiaries regarding matters of financial sustainability, indicating that the project pilots and implements a first stage of processes but that external funding eventually ends and that they should take over this issue, mainly by re investing some of the benefits they have obtained through the intervention.
* A true gender mainstreaming process should be initiated, not only seeking participation of women in activities and making sure of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, taking into account the concerns, needs, and experiences of women as part of the Project and making sure that the intervention does not damage women’s access to resources, and that women and men benefit equally, and inequality is not perpetuated.
* There is a strong need for the Project to push for the completion of overdue products that were supposed to be well underway by the intervention’s mid-term. A case in point, and a main issue, are the extension packages, which not only will be an effort in meeting with expected outputs but also to secure sustainability and continuous backing for the use of farmers’ varieties for the target crops and for the incorporation of agro biodiversity components for farming in Ethiopia. The extension packages are the underpinning of the uptake and sustainability of the outcomes and accomplishments. The extension packages in Durum Wheat, Enset, and Teff need to be developed and the extension package in Coffee needs to be upgraded, with enough time and resources to pilot them before the Project concludes. They need to adopt a formal and integrated approach as well as a clear strategy to promote the use of farmers’ varieties and agro biodiversity principles and draw upon rigorous knowledge and expertise from this Project as well from other research, knowledge generation and processes that are within and without the Project (such as research and knowledge within the UN System, EBI, and other relevant national / regional / international institutions).
* The Project needs to rejoin the conclusions and recommendations of the gaps identification and framework analysis and provide an impetus for the application of at least some of the recommendations for national – level policies in order to impulse the setting up of upgrading of frameworks that promote the mainstreaming of agro biodiversity conservation, including the use of farmers’ varieties, and for national structures to work with local authorities and farmers’ and community groups in this subject.
* A knowledge management process needs to take place so that the materials being developed or that will be developed in the second project phase are more ‘user friendly’. This includes also a recommendation that materials should be translated to Amharic and to local languages.
* The Project should also strengthen the capacities and provide adequate local project management support so that the project sites can have adequate technical expertise, infrastructure, and guidance to properly implement the local aspects as well as to unquestionably and systematically monitor effects, impacts and processes.
* The second phase of the Project should also be stage where its catalytic effect is harnessed in order to expand (to other crops), to other regions (within Ethiopia and at the regional African – level) as well as to upscale. The Project should begin to document its demonstration value in order to strengthen its possibility of replication, and of upscaling through knowledge transfer or through expansion. The project should also provide farmers with appropriate information; especially in a written form so that this can aid the dissemination of knowledge about these four crops is enhanced from where it is now. Similarly, good practices of the project needs to be compiled and made easily accessible for national and international partners.

**Annexes**

**Annex: MTE ToR**



**GENERAL INFORMAION**

**Services/Work Description:** Mid Term Review

**Project/Program Title:** Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation in to the Agricultural Production Systems Ethiopia Project

**Post Title:** International Consultant

**Consultant Level:** Senior Specialist

**Duty Station:** Addis Ababa with travels to the four project sites with in

The Country Office

**Expected Places of Travel: Amhara, Oromiya and SNNP Regions**

**Duration:** One Month

**Expected Start Date:** Immediately after Concluding Contract Agreement

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full*-sized project titled Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation into the Agricultural Production Systems of Ethiopia (PIM 2913) implemented through the Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute, which is to be undertaken in 2014. The project started on June 2011 and is in its *third* year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the third Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*.

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation into the Agricultural Production systems of Ethiopia project was designed to provide farming communities with incentives (policies, capacity, markets and knowledge) to mainstream conservation of agro-biodiversity, including crop wild relatives of *Teff, Durum Wheat, Forest Coffee and enset* into the farming systems of Ethiopia. While the goal of the project is to improve in situ conservation of agro-biodiversity resources (including crop wild relatives) secures biodiversity values, ensures food security and sustains human wellbeing.

The Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation into the agricultural systems of Ethiopia project implementation has a period of four years (2011-2015) with a total budget of US$ 3,863,000 and the source of funding is GEF. The project activities are being implemented in four sites: (i) Minjar Shenkora (Teff conservation site), North Shoa zone, Amhara Regional State, (ii) Angacha ( Enset Conservation site ), Kembata & Tembaro zone , Southern Nations Nationalities Peoples Regional State, (iii) Yayu ( Forest Coffee conservation site) , Illibabore zone, Oromiya Regional State and (iv) Gimbichu (Durum Wheat Conservation site), East Shoa zone, Oromiya Regional State.

The project has three expected outcomes, which include:

* Enabling policy and institutional framework supporting in situ conservation of agro-biodiversity and wild crop relatives
* Markets provide incentive for farmer uptake of agro-biodiversity friendly practices, particularly for forest coffee, enset, teff and durum wheat.
* Crop Wild Relatives and farmer varieties of forest coffee, durum wheat, enset and tef are conserved in in situ gene banks and on-farm conservation sites.

The institutional arrangement of the project implementation is Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute is the Implementing Partner of the project. The UNDP is the implementing agent and the respective woreda administrations are key stakeholders of the project.

**3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR**

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project’s strategy, its risks to sustainability.

**4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation into the agricultural systems of Ethiopia project MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

 The Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation into the agricultural systems of Ethiopia project MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[19]](#footnote-19) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[[20]](#footnote-20) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to:

1. Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute Director General
2. The project manager at the PMU
3. The Ministry of Environment and Forest, GEF OFP
4. The four project site officers
5. Representatives of the Project Steering Committees (both at the federal and site level)
6. The UNDP CO and Regional Service Center (UNDP-GEF);

 Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to the project sites*,* including the following project sites:

(i). Minjar Shenkora (Teff conservation site), North Shoa zone, Amhara region,

(ii) Angacha ( Enset Conservation site ), Kembata & Tembaro zone , Southern Nations Nationalities Peoples Region,

(iii) Yayu (Wild Coffee conservation site), Illibabore zone, Oromiya Region and

 (iv) Gimbichu (Durum Wheat Conservation site), East Shoa zone, Oromiya.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

**5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR**

 The Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity Conservation into the agricultural systems of Ethiopia project MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

**i. Project Strategy**

Project design:

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
* Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country?
* Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
* If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
* Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
* Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits, if needed – i.e. if the current indicators of the project are found to be wanting.

**ii. Progress Towards Results**

Progress towards Outcomes Analysis:

* Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

**Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[21]](#footnote-21)** | **Baseline Level[[22]](#footnote-22)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[23]](#footnote-23)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[24]](#footnote-24)** | **Achievement Rating[[25]](#footnote-25)** | **Justification for Rating**  |
| **Objective:**  | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

**iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

* Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
* Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
* Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
* Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
* Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

* Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
* Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

* Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
* Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
* Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
* Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

* Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
* Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
* For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

**iv. Sustainability**

* Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
* In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

* What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

* Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

* Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[26]](#footnote-26)

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

**Ratings**

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

**Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (*Project Title*)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **MTR Rating** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Etc.  |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately four weeks *(four weeks)* starting September 2014*,* are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| *September 25, 2014* | Application closes |
| *September 29,2014*  | Select MTR Team |
| *October 1, 2014* | Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents) |
|  *October 2, 2014 (3 days)*  | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report |
|  *October 4, 2014 (2 days )* | Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission |
|  *October 14, 2014 (10 days))* | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits |
| *October 16, 2014 (2 days)* | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission |
| *October 23, 2014* *( 7 days)* | Preparing draft report |
| *October 25, 2014 ( 2 days)* | Draft Report subMission |
| *October 26, 2014* | Preparation & Issue of Management Response |
| *(date)*  | (optional)Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTR team) |
| *October 30, 2014* | Expected date of full MTR completion |

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

1. **MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | September 29, 2014 | MTR team submits to the CRGG unit of the UNDP and EIB Director General |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | October 14, 2014 | MTR Team presents to UNDP CO and EBI |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | October 16, 2014 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| **4** | **Final Report\*** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report | October 19, 2014 | Sent to the CRGG unit of the UNDP and EBI Unit |

\*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

1. **MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the CRGG unit.

The CRGG unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Management Unit of the Agro-biodiversity project will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two independent consultants (one international and one national) will conduct the MTR – The International consultant, the team leader (with international experience and exposure to projects/programmes evaluations) will be working with the national consultant (who has rich expertise in evaluating biodiversity or environment conservation programmes/projects at national level) as the MTR team. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

1. **Evaluation Criteria**

| **Criteria** | **Weight** | **Max. Point** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Technical Competence (based on CV, Proposal and interview (if required))** | **70%** | **100** |
| **a.Educational relevance: close fit to post**A Master’s degree in Biodiversity, Botany, Environmental science, Natural resource management or other closely related field  |  | 10 |
| **b. Understanding the scope of work and organization of the proposal**• Application of result-based management evaluation methodologies; • Application of SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;• Demonstrate understanding of issues related to GEF Climate Change adaptation projects: experience in gender and climate sensitive evaluation and analysis.• Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF Biodiversity focal areas;• Experience in working with GEF or conduct GEF- programmes evaluation• Demonstrable analytical skills• Excellent communication skills |  | 50 |
| **c. Experience in similar assignment**•At least 10 years of progressive international work experience in designing, management, monitoring & evaluation of development programmes •Extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in the field of evaluation of development programmes, mainly climate change adaptation or environment projects |  | 30 |
| **d. Previous work experience in Africa/ Ethiopia**• Experience working in GEF or other international environment programmes in Africa Region |  | 10 |
| **Financial (Lower Offer/Offer\*100)** | **30%** | **30** |
| **Total Score**  | **Technical Score \* 70% + Financial Score \* 30%** |

1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report

30% upon submission of the draft MTR report

60% upon finalization of the MTR report

Or, as otherwise agreed between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team.

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS[[27]](#footnote-27)**

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:**

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[28]](#footnote-28) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[29]](#footnote-29));
3. **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

**All application materials should be submitted to UNDP by email at the following address “**procurement.et@undp.org **referencing “Consultant for** **the Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity into the agricultural system of Ethiopia project Midterm Review”. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration**.

**Annex: MTE evaluative matrix**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?**  |
| ***Relevance:***Is the project relevant and coherent with Ethiopian needs, policies and strategies?Is the project coherent with UNDP programming strategy for Ethiopia?To what extent is the project suited to local and national development priorities and policies?To what extent is the project is in line with GEF operational programs?The extent of which project objectives and design still appropriate compared to the relevance the project had at inception? | Coherence with explicit national development plansCoherence with UNDP and GEF operational programming | Project DocumentsUNDAFUNDP Programming DocumentsEthiopian development plans | Document analysis |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** |
| ***Effectiveness and efficiency:***The extent to which the project has enabled policy and institutional support for in situ conservation of agro-biodiversity and wild crop relatives in Ethiopia.To what extent has the project provided market-based incentive for farmer uptake of agro-biodiversity friendly practices, particularly for forest coffee, enset, teff and durum wheat?To what extent have Crop Wild Relatives and farmer varieties of forest coffee, durum wheat, enset and teff been conserved in situ gene banks and on-farm conservation sites?To what extent has there been increased food security and food production in relation to the Project in Ethiopia?The extent to which the project has led to a) mainstreaming climate change in participating countries; b) delivered demonstration projects; c), shared knowledge regionally.What factors have led to projects (or parts of projects) working well, and what national Ethiopian (and/or regional) lessons can be learnt from this?The extent to which the results have been achieved with the least costly resources possible, compared with alternative approaches to attain the same results.The extent to which the project was delivered on time and budget, and reasons/lessons for discrepancies. | Data from indicators, especially those stated in Log FrameAnalysis of indicators (SMART analysis) | Project DocumentsPIRSProject staffProject partnersBeneficiaries | Document AnalysisInterviews with stakeholders |
| **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation?** |
| Has the project been implemented efficiently, and cost-effectively?Has the project been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation? | Specific activities conductedAdaptation to changes, if anyMonitoring outcomes | PIRSProject staffProject partnersBeneficiaries | Interviews with stakeholdersDocuments [for instance Minutes of the Mainstreaming Agro-biodiversity into the agricultural system of Ethiopia project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)] |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** |
| •How likely is the ability of the project to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion in Ethiopia?To what extent is the project environmentally, financially and socially acceptable, and how does this impact upon the likelihood of sustainability?To what extent has there been in Ethiopia a development of capacities at different levels to aid in sustainability of outcomes? | Specific activities carried out with sustainability in mind (capacity building, policy, budgeting)Quality of risk mitigation strategies | Project staffProject partnersBeneficiaries | Interviews with stakeholdersPolicy documents |

**Annex: Example Questionnaire/ Interview Guide for data collection**

|  |
| --- |
| What have been the projects’ positive aspectsIs the project relevant and coherent with Ethiopian needs, policies and strategies?To what extent is the project suited to local and national development priorities and policies?The extent of which project objectives and design still appropriate compared to the relevance the project had at inception? |
| The extent to which the project has enabled policy and institutional support for in situ conservation of agro-biodiversity and wild crop relatives in Ethiopia.To what extent has the project provided market-based incentive for farmer uptake of agro-biodiversity friendly practices, particularly for forest coffee, enset, teff and durum wheat?To what extent have Crop Wild Relatives and farmer varieties of forest coffee, durum wheat, enset and teff been conserved in situ gene banks and on-farm conservation sites?To what extent has there been increased food security and food production in relation to the Project in Ethiopia?The extent to which the project has led to a) mainstreaming climate change in participating countries; b) delivered demonstration projects; c), shared knowledge regionally.What factors have led to projects (or parts of projects) working well, and what national Ethiopian (and/or regional) lessons can be learnt from this?The extent to which the results have been achieved with the least costly resources possible, compared with alternative approaches to attain the same results.The extent to which the project was delivered on time and budget, and reasons/lessons for discrepancies. |
| Has the project been implemented efficiently, and cost-effectively?Has the project been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation? |
| How likely is the ability of the project to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion in Ethiopia?To what extent is the project environmentally, financially and socially acceptable, and how does this impact upon the likelihood of sustainability?To what extent has there been in Ethiopia a development of capacities at different levels to aid in sustainability of outcomes? |
| Recommendations? |
| Further inputs. |

**Annex: Ratings Scales**

***Six point rating scale for Progress Towards Results and for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating**  |  **Explanation** |
| **Highly satisfactory (HS)** | The aspect had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |
| **Satisfactory (S)**  | The aspect had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |
| **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** | The aspect had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |
| **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** | The aspect had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |
| **Unsatisfactory (U)**  | The aspect had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** | The aspect had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |

***Four point rating scale for Sustainability***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating**  | **Explanation** |
| **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 |
| **Highly Unlikely (HU)**  | Expectation that few if any outputs or activities will continue after project closure |

**Annex: MTE mission itinerary**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 17November | Departure International Evaluator From Argentina |  |
| 19 November | Arrival international Evaluator |  |
| 19 - 20 November | * + Meeting of National and International Evaluators (Team Meeting)
	+ Documentation Analysis
	+ Presentation of Evaluation Approach
	+ Meetings with UNDP / Project Stakeholders
 |  |
| 22November – 27 November | Field Mission Visits to the following sites in this order: Gimbichu (Durum Wheat Conservation site), East Shoa zone, Oromiya Regional StateMinjar Shenkora (Teff conservation site), North Shoa zone, Amhara Regional State Angacha (Enset Conservation site ), Kembata & Tembaro zone , Southern Nations Nationalities Peoples Regional StateYayu (Forest Coffee conservation site) , Illibabore zone, Oromiya Regional State |  |
| 28 November | First findings Presentation |  |
| 1 December | Departure from Addis Abbaba |  |
| 5 December | Arrival Argentina for International Evaluator |  |

**Annex: List of persons interviewed**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Name** | **Institution** | **Role** |
| 1 | Sinkinesh Beyene | UNDP CO | Team Leader |
| 2 | Wubua Mekonnnen | UNDP CO | GEF Analyst |
| 3 | Gemedo Dalle [Dr] | EBI, Director | Steering Committee Chair |
| 4 | Semere Tesfaye | MoFED | Steering Committee Member |
| 5 | Tadesse W/Mariam | ECFF | Steering Committee Member |
| 6 | Habtamu Haile | MoA | Former NPC |
| 7 | Debela Bersisa | EBI | NPC |
| 8 | Gimibichu Woreda Site Officers | EBI | 2 Site Officers |
| 9 | Gimbichu Woreda Cabinet  | Different offices | Woreda Steering Committees |
| 10 | Chefe Donsa Farming Communities | Gimbichu Woreda | Beneficiaries |
| 11 | Areda Area Local Varieties Crop Protection Association | Gimbichu Woreda | Beneficiaries |
| 12 | Minjar Shenkora Woreda Site Officers | EBI | 2 site Officers |
| 13 | Minjar Shenkora Woreda Cabinet | Different Offices | Woreda Steering Committees |
| 14 | Bolo Silassie Cooperatives | Minjar Shenkora Woreda | Beneficiaries  |
| 15 | Angacha Woreda Site Officers | EBI | 2 Site Officers |
| 16 | Angacha Woreda Cabinet | Different Offices | Woreda Steering Committees  |
| 17 | Ambericho-Wasera Kebele | Angahca Woreda | Beneficiaries |
| 18 | Yayu Woreda Site Officers | EBI | 2 Site Officers |
| 19 | Yayu Woreda Cabinet | Different Offices | Woreda Steering Committees |
| 20 | Geeci Cooperatives | Yayu woreda | Beneficiaries |
|  |  |  |  |

**Annex: List of documents reviewed**

* + 2011 Annual Report Agrobidiversity
	+ Back to the Office Reports (BTORs), 1 through 4.
	+ *Identification of Gaps and Formulation of Recommendations on Policies and Institutional Frameworks to Mainstream Agro – Biodiversity Conservation Report.* June 2014.
	+ *Marketing Stratey for Agrobiodiversity Products (Forest Coffee, Teff, Drum Wheat and Enset.*  May 2012.
	+ Minutes of the First Meeting of the Project Steering Committee
	+ National steering committee presentation
	+ PIF
	+ PIRs (2012 and 2014)
	+ Project Document (ProDoc).
	+ PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING: MINUTE NUMBER 02/2011
	+ Local Bylaws [Minjar Shenkora]
	+ Yayu Biosphere Forest Coffee Certification Audit Closing Report May 1, 2013

**Annex: Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form for international evaluator**

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**MTR Consultant Agreement Form**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: Maria ONESTINI

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant)

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at Buenos Aires, Argentina on October 27th, 2014

Signature:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Woredas (also written as Weredas) are the third-level administrative divisions of Ethiopia. They are made – up of a number of divisions/wards (called kebeles) or neighborhood associations, being the kebeles the smallest units of local government in the country. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Six point scale used: Highly Satisfactory (HS); Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Criteria for scale included in Annexes. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Six point scale used; see above footnote. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Four point scale used: Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U). Criteria for scale included in Annexes. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The total budgeted project cost is made up of the following planned contributions: GEF financing: US$ 3,863,600; UNDP financing US$ 3,000,000; Government US$ 2,050,000, and Other contributions: US$ 100,000. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. In some of the materials and documents the Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute (EBI) appears as the Biodiversity Conservation Institute of Ethiopia given that this was the name of the institution during the design and early implementation stages of the Project. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. As indicated in the ProDoc “The project will coordinate with the FFEM home-garden support programme and the German / FFEM experiences with coffee certification, as well as NGO initiatives with organic farming and green markets (including co-finance). The biggest linkages will be to the major food security interventions underway in the country (e.g. WFP, UNDP, GTZ supported). This will be especially critical at decentralized levels. There are several ongoing dry-land agriculture initiatives in Ethiopia (e.g. Farm-Africa and ICRISAT on legumes). These projects place a varied emphasis on the in situ management of FV. The project will also link with the project on “Under-Utilised Crops (minor cereals, ensete etc.) financed by the government of Netherlands. “ [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Perhaps as reference, it can be pointed out that the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* indicates that gender issues should be addressed in the following manner: G•Gap-minded: Addressing the gaps and inequalities between women and men, boys and girls; En•Encompassing: Developed on the basis of participatory approaches and inclusive processes; D•Disaggregated: By sex, and wherever possible by age and by socio-economic group (or any other socially significant category in society); E•Enduring: Having a long-term, sustainable perspective, because social change takes time; and R•Rights observing: In accordance with human rights laws and standards. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. UNDP and GEF define SMART as S•Specific: Indicators must use clear language, describing a specific future condition; M•Measureable: Indicators, must have measurable aspects making it possible to assess whether they were achieved or not; A•Achievable: Indicators must be within the capacity of the partners to achieve; Relevant: Indicators must make a contribution to selected priorities of the national development framework; T•Time-bound: Indicators are never open-ended, there should be an expected date of accomplishment. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. This finding is reinforced by the statement that translation, both in Amharic and Oromopha, is planned to take place in 2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Using six point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, and HU (the criteria for this scale are explained further in Annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Note, at times there are mentions of five products or products which are not part of the Project per se (wild and low caffeine, noug, for example). It is understood that this is perhaps due to earlier versions of the Log Frame. Therefore it would benefit the Project if a revision of documents (including PIRs) would be made so that it truly reflects what products or crops is committed to work with and in order that the Project is not held accountable for crops and products it is not supposed to be working with at all. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. UNDP reports to this evaluation, however, that there would be other trade events in 2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Unfortunately the Project Document does not provide a rating for this Risk. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Unfortunately the Project Document does not provide a rating for this Risk. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Unfortunately the Project Document does not provide a rating for this Risk. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. As thoroughly laid out in the report *Identification of Gaps and Formulation of Recommendations on Policies and Institutional Frameworks to Mainstream Agro – Biodiversity Conservation.* [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Despite this challenge, many of the targets have been achieved or are in the process of being achieved (as indicated in the color-coded table “Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets”). [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undg.org/docs/11653/UNDP-PME-Handbook-%282009%29.pdf), Chapter 3, pg. 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-29)