

Project Name	Niger Delta Biodiversity Conservation Project (PIMS ID: 2047 GEFSEC Project ID: 4090)				
Type of Evaluation	Terminal Evaluation				
Unit Responsible for providing management response	Energy, Environment & Climate Change				
Recommendations					
Evaluation recommendation 1					
Recommendation	1.1 TE mission recommends to the FMoE and UNDP to introduce as compulsory formal cost-benefit evaluation of the important project activities. It is fundamental for the project sponsoring institution such as GEF, UNDP, or Government not solely to receive the accounting information but also know the values of outputs they financed.				
Management Response	Fully accept - agrees entirely with all the recommendation and will seek actions to achieve the recommendation.				
Key Actions		Responsible	Due Date	Status	Comments
	For subsequent projects with resources from the same donor, the CO will conduct cost-benefit evaluation of the important project activities to enable GEF, UNDP, or Government know the values of outputs financed.	UNDP	Jan 2021	Not started	This would be implemented as soon as possible and with other GEF projects
Recommendation	1.2 TE mission recommends to the FMoE and UNDP to make the allocation of budget during the project execution conditional on the completeness of the M&E reporting				
Management Response	Fully accept - agrees entirely with all the recommendation and will seek actions to achieve the recommendation.				
Key Actions		Responsible	Due Date	Status	Comments

	For subsequent projects with resources from the same donor, the CO would develop an M&E template for verifying each of the performance metrics in the results framework, along with allocation of resources and responsibilities conditional on the completeness of the M&E reporting.	UNDP	Jan 2021	Not started	To be implemented in the as soon as possible
Evaluation recommendation 2					
Recommendation	2.1 To FMoE. Critically evaluate the value of the project outcomes in terms of (i) importance of their contribution to the realization of the Ministry's objective, (ii) feasibility and replicability, (iii) cost-benefit and feasibility, and (iv) degree of acceptance by the direct beneficiaries. For the priority outcomes, evaluate the costs of their support and timeframe of execution, and identify the source of financing				
Management Response	Fully accept - agrees entirely with all the recommendation and will seek actions to achieve the recommendation.				
Key Actions		Responsible	Due Date	Status	Comments
	Federal and State MoEs to critically evaluate the value of the project outcomes in terms of (i) importance of their contribution to the realization of the Ministry's objective, (ii) feasibility and replicability, (iii) cost-benefit and feasibility, and (iv) degree of acceptance by the direct beneficiaries	FMoE & SMoE	Jan 2021	Not started	Will have further discussions with the IP on how this can be implemented as soon as possible.
Recommendation	2.2 To FMoE. Evaluate the technical value of the project documentation deposited in the Ministry; place in the WWW the documents judged important.				
Management Response	Fully accept - agrees entirely with all the recommendation and will seek actions to achieve the recommendation.				
Key Actions		Responsible	Due Date	Status	Comments

	FMoE will evaluate the technical value of the project documentation deposited in the Ministry and place in the WWW the documents judged important.	FMoE	Jan 2021	Not started	Will take up the discussion with the Federal Institutions.
Recommendation	2.3 To the FMoE. To strengthen the rural communities' interest in sustainable biodiversity exploitation and conservation, require that the other existing and the future projects with biodiversity protection components consider the rural communities as the key stakeholders and incorporate their leaders into the projects steering institutions, implicated directly in activities execution and in M&E.				
Management Response	Fully accept - agrees entirely with all the recommendation and will seek actions to achieve the recommendation.				
Key Actions		Responsible	Due Date	Status	Comments
	Beneficiary rural communities are considered as key stakeholders. Their leaders will be consulted before project inception and they will be represented into the projects steering institutions at the right level, ensure their active participation in activities execution and M&E.	FMoE & SMoE	n/a	On-going	This has been incorporated into other GEF community projects. The projects have the buy-in of the various communities
Recommendation	2.4 To UNDP. Require the projects to produce the exit strategy document and discuss its utility as a contribution to the reinforcement of the project sustainability and impact.				
Management Response	Fully accept - agrees entirely with all the recommendation and will seek actions to achieve the recommendation.				
Key Actions		Responsible	Due Date	Status	Comments
	UNDP to discuss and develop project exit strategy document and discuss its utility as a contribution to the reinforcement of the project sustainability and impact. This draft exit strategy will be done at planning stage of the project, reviewed and finalized at the project MTR	UNDP	Jan 2021	Not started	Will take up the discussion with the Federal Institutions

Evaluation recommendation 3.					
Recommendation	3.1 To UNDP. Projects with an important set of activities concerning the rural or urban communities should prepare an adjustable plan of engagement with decentralized stakeholders. This plan should include a description of the community project implementation modality, plan of integration with other project's structures and other projects operating in the region, and the follow-up activities.				
Management Response	Fully accept - agrees entirely with all the recommendation and will seek actions to achieve the recommendation.				
Key Actions		Responsible	Due Date	Status	Comments
	UNDP working with SMOEs will identify existing community groups and platforms to work with on important set of activities. Technical support will be provided including provision of description of the community project implementation modality, plan of integration with other project's structures and other projects operating in the region, and the follow-up activities	UNDP	Jan 2021	Not started	This would be implemented as soon as possible and with other GEF project
Recommendation	3.2 To SMOE and UNDP. Since the community environmental management and biodiversity protections interest stakeholders of various ethnic origin and of different education levels, for the sake of efficiency and economy, the project should complete its consultants' roster by specialists coming from the beneficiaries' communities				
Management Response	Fully accept - agrees entirely with all the recommendation and will seek actions to achieve the recommendation.				
Key Actions		Responsible	Due Date	Status	Comments
	Project will identify and include in its consultants' roster specialists coming from the beneficiaries' communities	SMoE and UNDP	Jan 2021	Not started	To be discussed with the government partners moving forward

Evaluation recommendation 4					
Recommendation	4.1 The TE team recommends to SMoE and UNDP to introduce as compulsory the RBM of the projects and require the project managers to demonstrate that their proposed work program is cost effective and/or cost efficient.				
Management Response	Fully accept - agrees entirely with all the recommendation and will seek actions to achieve the recommendation.				
Key Actions		Responsible	Due Date	Status	Comments
	A result-based management approach will used in subsequent projects and incorporated from the design stage as well as during implementation to ensure the project is managed in a cost-efficient manner	UNDP	Jan 2021	Not started	This would be implemented as soon as possible and with other GEF project