

TERMINAL EVALUATION

Project ID:	3004
Project Name:	Review of the National Biodiversity Strategy, Development of the Action Plan and Participation in the National Clearing House Mechanism
Countr(ies):	Ghana
Implementing Agency:	UNEP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW	3
A. Description	3
B. Key Dates	3
C. Disbursements	3
II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES	4
A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings	4
B. Stakeholder Engagement	5
C. Gender Equality	6
D. Knowledge Management	6
III. CORE INDICATORS	7
IV: CO FINANCING	7
V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS	7
VI. ANNEX	7

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name

Review of the National Biodiversity Strategy, Development of the Action Plan and Participation in the National Clearing House Mechanism

Country

Ghana

GEF ID
3004

Implementing Agency
UNEP

Executing Entity

Ministry of Environment and Science and the National Biodiversity Committee

Trust Fund
GET

Project Type
EA

Objective

The overall goal of this project is to enable Ghana better meet its immediate obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity, especially in relation to Article 6: General Measures for Conservation and Sustainable Use; Article 13: Public Education and Awareness; Article 18: Technical and Scientific Cooperation.

B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval
8/1/2008

Agency Approval
11/3/2008

Implementation Start
11/3/2008

First Disbursement
1/7/2008

Expected MTR

MTR Submission
12/5/2025

Actual MTR

Expected Completion
12/31/2021

Actual Completion
12/31/2019

Actual TE
11/20/2025

TE Submission
12/5/2025

Final Disbursement
7/6/2012

C. Disbursements

Project Financing
473,000.00

Cumulative Disbursement
360,000.00

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings

The GEF Project “Review of the National Biodiversity Strategy, Development of the Action Plan and Participation in the National Clearing House Mechanism” was implemented by UNEP to assist Ghana in meeting its obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The Convention requires Parties to develop and implement national strategies and action plans for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, as well as to promote public awareness and technical cooperation. This project was designed to revise Ghana’s 2002 National Biodiversity Strategy, finalize a comprehensive Action Plan, and strengthen the Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) to improve information exchange and stakeholder engagement.

Implemented with Global Environment Facility (GEF) funding of USD 430,000 and government co-financing of USD 80,000, the project adopted a country-driven, consultative approach involving government agencies, research institutions, NGOs, and local communities. Activities were structured to review existing obligations, assess capacity gaps, and produce updated policy instruments aligned with CBD work programmes and 2010 targets. The project also supported technical improvements to the CHM, enabling Ghana to host and maintain its biodiversity information system nationally.

To achieve these objectives, the project carried out a series of coordinated activities, including stocktaking of biodiversity data, stakeholder workshops, capacity assessments in key thematic areas, and development of public awareness materials. These efforts contributed to GEF’s strategic priority on capacity building (CB-1) by creating enabling conditions for effective implementation of biodiversity-related commitments.

Key Activities:

1. Revision of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan

- Reviewed the 2002 National Biodiversity Strategy (NBS).
- Incorporated CBD decisions and work programs.
- Finalized the Action Plan (NBSAP).
- Conducted stakeholder workshops and prepared a policy brief.

2. Established and Strengthened of Clearing House Mechanism (CHM)

- Developed a home-grown CHM.
- Acquired hardware and software for hosting and updating the CHM.
- Linked existing biodiversity databases and created a roster of institutions.
- Trained staff on information management systems.
- Updated and expanded the CHM website.

3. Capacity and Needs Assessment

- Formed thematic working groups for:

- Taxonomy
- In situ and ex situ conservation
- Invasive species
- Agricultural biodiversity
- Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS)
- Indigenous knowledge and practices
- Held workshops to assess capacity gaps and develop strategies.
- Prepared action plans for each thematic area.

4. Public Awareness and Policy Integration

- Organized national and regional workshops.
- Published awareness materials (newsletters, press releases).
- Disseminated the revised NBSAP and related information.
- Prepared policy briefs for decision-makers.

Link to Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) obligations:

- **Article 6:** Required Parties to develop national strategies, plans, or programs for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.
- **Article 10:** Integration of biodiversity into sectoral and cross-sectoral plans
- **Article 18:** Promoted technical and scientific cooperation among Parties.
- **Article 13:** Public education and awareness through information sharing.
- **Article 7:** Identification and monitoring of biodiversity components.
- **Article 8 & 9:** In-situ and ex-situ conservation measures.
- **Article 15:** Access to genetic resources and equitable benefit sharing.
- **Article 13:** Public education and awareness to encourage participation.
- **Article 6(b):** Integration of biodiversity considerations into national decision-making.

B. Stakeholder Engagement

The project involved extensive stakeholder participation throughout its implementation. Engagement was structured through a multi-tiered approach that included a Steering Committee (SC), a National Coordinating Committee (NCC), and thematic working groups. These bodies ensured representation from key government ministries, research institutions, academia, NGOs, and local communities. Stakeholders contributed to technical reviews, policy discussions, and validation processes, creating a broad consensus on biodiversity priorities.

Stakeholder Engagement

- Government Agencies: Ministries of Environment and Science, Food and Agriculture, Justice, and Local Government actively participated in policy alignment and decision-making.

- Research Institutions: The Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) and its specialized institutes provided technical expertise in taxonomy, conservation, and agricultural biodiversity.
- Academia: Universities of Ghana and Cape Coast contributed to scientific assessments and capacity-building workshops.
- Civil Society and NGOs: Organizations such as Conservation International and Friends of the Earth supported awareness campaigns and community-level consultations.
- Media and Communication: The Ghana News Agency facilitated dissemination of project outputs and public awareness materials.

Capacity Development

- Technical Training: Project staff and CHM technical teams were trained in information management systems, database development, and web-based biodiversity information sharing.
- Policy and Planning Skills: Stakeholders gained experience in revising national strategies, developing action plans, and integrating CBD guidelines into national frameworks.
- Knowledge Sharing: Workshops and consultations enhanced understanding of thematic areas such as invasive species management, ABS, and indigenous knowledge systems.
- Institutional Strengthening: The establishment of operational networks for CHM and thematic working groups improved coordination and sustainability of biodiversity initiatives.

C. Gender Equality

The project adopted a multi-sectoral and inclusive approach to gender responsiveness throughout its implementation. It ensured that consultations and planning processes brought together representatives from government institutions, NGOs, academia, and local communities, with deliberate efforts to create safe and enabling spaces for women to express their views and priorities. Targeted workshops and community dialogues were organised to facilitate meaningful participation, and balanced gender representation was prioritised in technical committees and decision-making forums. Women were not only present but actively contributed to biodiversity policy discussions. The project also collected and analysed gender-disaggregated data to better understand the differentiated needs, knowledge, and contributions of men and women in biodiversity management. These measures aligned with UNEP and GEF gender mainstreaming policies and reinforced the principle that sustainable biodiversity conservation required the empowerment and participation of all social groups.

D. Knowledge Management

The project established robust knowledge management systems to support evidence-based decision-making and stakeholder capacity building. Technical training was provided to project staff and Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) teams in information management systems, database development, and web-based biodiversity information sharing. Workshops and consultations enhanced understanding of thematic areas such as invasive species management, access and benefit sharing (ABS), and indigenous knowledge systems. The operational networks for CHM and thematic working groups improved coordination and sustainability of biodiversity initiatives. Furthermore, the project invested in digital platforms like the CHM, which facilitated transparency, monitoring, reporting, and stakeholder engagement, thereby multiplying the benefits of knowledge sharing and strengthening institutional practices for environmental governance.

III. Core Indicators

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(\$)
Other	National Contribution			80,000.00		
Total Co-financing				80,000.00	0.00	0.00

Comments

This is an Enabling Activity for which co-financing is not mandatory.

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
			Low

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

As this project was an enabling activity, major physical environmental risks are relatively low. However, there are still potential social or economic negative effects, e.g. exclusion of stakeholders, conflicts over land and resource rights, misrepresentation of communities, etc. There were no significant unintended negative impacts or environmental harm from developing strategy or reports.

VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category	Title
M and E Document	Simplified_OCR_Template_EAs_3004_Updated