

TERMINAL EVALUATION

Project ID:	9866
Project Name:	Support to Preparation of the Interim National Report on the Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol
Countr(ies):	Global, Antigua and Barbuda, Albania, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Comoros, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Congo DR, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyz Republic, Lao PDR, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, Pakistan, Philippines, Moldova, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Eswatini, Tajikistan, Togo, Uganda, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, South Africa
Implementing Agency:	UNEP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW3

A. Description3

B. Key Dates3

C. Disbursements4

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES4

A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings4

B. Stakeholder Engagement4

C. Gender Equality5

D. Knowledge Management5

III. CORE INDICATORS5

IV: CO FINANCING5

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS6

VI. ANNEX6

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name

Support to Preparation of the Interim National Report on the Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol

Country

Global, Antigua and Barbuda, Albania, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Comoros, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Congo DR, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyz Republic, Lao PDR, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, Pakistan, Philippines, Moldova, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Eswatini, Tajikistan, Togo, Uganda, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, South Africa

GEF ID

9866

Implementing Agency

UNEP

Executing Entity

National Executing Agencies

Trust Fund

GET

Project Type

MSP

Objective

To Assist GEF-Eligible Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing to prepare and make timely submission of their Interim National Reports on measures that each party has taken to implement the Protocol in line with Article 29

B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval

8/22/2017

Agency Approval

9/22/2017

Implementation Start

9/1/2017

First Disbursement

9/22/2017

Expected MTR

MTR Submission

6/4/2026

Actual MTR

Expected Completion

12/31/2020

Actual Completion

12/31/2020

Actual TE

12/10/2025

TE Submission

6/4/2026

Final Disbursement

12/16/2019

C. Disbursements

Project Financing 1,565,850.00	Cumulative Disbursement 1,287,750.61
-----------------------------------	---

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings

The project assisted GEF-eligible Parties to the Nagoya Protocol to prepare and submit their Interim National Reports (INRs) on measures taken to implement the Protocol, with submission through the Access and Benefit-Sharing Clearing-House (ABSCH), in line with Article 29 and Decision NP-1/3 on monitoring and reporting. Activities were delivered globally under UNEP's Ecosystems Division/GEF Biodiversity Unit, using Small-Scale Funding Agreements (SSFAs) to channel grants and advisory support to National Executing Agencies. The reporting cycle covered September 2017–June 2020, with the project closing per country upon receipt of required terminal documents (Annexes 6B, 7, 8, and 10B) and confirmation of INR publication on the ABSCH.

The GEF Trust Fund contributed US\$ 1,430,000, complemented by government co-financing estimated at US\$ 1,111,321 (in-kind/cash) to support preparation of the interim National Reports to the eligible parties. The project targeted 65 eligible Parties spanning Africa, Asia-Pacific, GRULAC, and other regions. By closure, 59 Parties had submitted interim reports; 55 country projects were closed after receipt of all terminal deliverables. A small subset remained pending due to publication or SSFA issues; the Philippines declined funding, citing the internal bureaucratic challenges in accessing the funds, as the timelines for reporting were short. The Philippines, however, prepared and submitted the report within the timelines required from its own resources - <https://absch.cbd.int/en/pdf/documents/absNationalReport/ABSCH-NR-PH-240066/1>.

Unintended Positive Outcomes:

- Peer learning and cross-sector dialogue: Several Parties reported that INR preparation fostered cross-sector collaboration and helped institutions clarify roles in ABS implementation beyond reporting.
- Identification of policy integration opportunities: Stakeholders proposed additions for future reporting (e.g., links between ABS and incentives for conservation; integration with sector policies; explicit treatment of traditional knowledge).

Unintended Negative Outcomes:

- Resource constraints in some LDCs: Limited budgets hindered broader consultations (e.g., Liberia held fewer workshops than planned and relied more on desk review due to funding limitations).
- Administrative hurdles: A small number of cases lacked valid SSFAs despite INR publication (e.g., Kenya, South Africa), delaying formal closure; some countries had valid SSFAs but had not yet published (Micronesia, Marshall Islands, Vanuatu).
- One country declined funding: The Philippines formally declined UNEP funding support (28 November 2017), affecting participation through the project mechanism. The Party, however, met its reporting obligation and published its interim national report.

B. Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholders Engagement

The project promoted broad stakeholder engagement at the national level, including government ministries and agencies, academia and research institutions, civil society, indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs), standards institutions, and private sector entities. Guidance emphasized participatory and transparent reporting, with attention to traditional

knowledge and, where applicable, gender representation. Their role was to provide sector-specific information, traditional knowledge, and feedback during the national consultative and validation workshops

C. Gender Equality

The project incorporated gender-responsive considerations primarily through its emphasis on inclusive and participatory stakeholder engagement processes rather than through explicit gender-targeted indicators or a formal gender action plan. Activities such as national consultations and validation workshops were designed to ensure broad representation of stakeholders, with guidance explicitly encouraging attention to gender representation alongside the inclusion of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs). These processes contributed to gender-sensitive outcomes by creating spaces for diverse perspectives, including women’s inputs, in the preparation of Interim National Reports (INRs), and by raising awareness of Access and Benefit-Sharing (ABS) issues across different societal groups

D. Knowledge Management

The project’s knowledge management (KM) approach, as implemented, focused on facilitating global knowledge generation, sharing, and accessibility of information related to Access and Benefit-Sharing (ABS) under the Nagoya Protocol through the preparation and publication of Interim National Reports (INRs). Central to this approach was the use of the ABS Clearing-House (ABSCH) as a global platform for disseminating standardized national data, ensuring transparency and enabling cross-country learning. The project supported countries in collecting, validating, and uploading nationally generated knowledge through structured stakeholder consultations, thereby capturing diverse institutional and sectoral insights, including legal, policy, and practical implementation experiences. Additionally, the process contributed to global synthesis by providing baseline data for the Convention’s assessment and review processes under Article 31, while resources such as guidance materials, FAQs, and reporting tools further facilitated knowledge exchange. Lessons from implementation highlight that early familiarization with ABSCH systems, clear technical guidance, and well-structured stakeholder engagement are critical to effective KM, while future efforts could strengthen the approach by enhancing systematic documentation of lessons, improving data usability, and reinforcing continuous knowledge-sharing mechanisms beyond reporting cycles.

III. Core Indicators

Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female				0
Male				0
Total	0	0	0	0

IV: Co Financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Anticipated at CEO(\$)	Materialized at MTR(\$)	Materialized at TE(\$)
Recipient Country Government	National Executing Agencies	In-kind		1,111,321.00		1,025,111.00
Total Co-financing				1,111,321.00	0.00	1,025,111.00

Comments

These was an enabling activity

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
			Low

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

The project presented generally low environmental and social risks, consistent with its nature as a global enabling activity focused on reporting, capacity-building, and knowledge generation rather than on-the-ground physical interventions. The main environmental and social considerations were linked to ensuring inclusive, participatory, and transparent stakeholder engagement processes, particularly involving government institutions, civil society, academia, private sector actors, and Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs). Potential social risks included limited participation or exclusion of key stakeholder groups, especially in contexts with resource constraints (e.g., Least Developed Countries), which could affect the comprehensiveness and legitimacy of the Interim National Reports (INRs). Additionally, challenges such as insufficient funding for consultations, uneven institutional capacity, and administrative hurdles (e.g., SSFA delays) posed risks to equitable implementation and timely delivery. No significant direct environmental risks were identified, as project activities did not involve physical investments; however, the quality and completeness of the reports could indirectly influence future environmental decision-making under the Nagoya Protocol. Overall, the project mitigated potential risks through structured stakeholder consultations, UNEP technical oversight, and adherence to reporting standards, though lessons highlight the need for adequate resourcing, stronger institutional coordination, and sustained capacity support to ensure inclusive participation and minimize social risks in future initiatives.

VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category	Prefix	Title

M and E Document	Terminal Evaluation (TE)	Simplified_OCR_Template_EAs_9866_signed
------------------	--------------------------	---