

TERMINAL EVALUATION

Project ID:	5688
Project Name:	UNEP-GEF Project for Sustainable Capacity Building for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH)
Countr(ies):	Global
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	4
C. Gender Equality	4
D. Knowledge Management	4
III. CORE INDICATORS	5
IV: CO FINANCING	5
V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS	6
VI. ANNEX	7

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name

UNEP-GEF Project for Sustainable Capacity Building for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH)

Country

Global

GEF ID

5688

Implementing Agency

UNEP

Executing Entity

UNEP-DELIC and National

Executing Agencies

Trust Fund

GET

Project Type

FSP

Objective

To provide support to eligible parties for GEF funding in order to sustain and build capacity for effective participation in the BCH in line with COP/MOP Decisions, specifically BS VI/5 para 2f.

B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval

6/22/2016

Agency Approval

9/16/2016

Implementation Start

10/1/2016

First Disbursement

10/24/2016

Expected MTR

12/10/2019

MTR Submission

6/18/2026

Actual MTR

12/10/2019

Expected Completion

12/31/2025

Actual Completion

3/31/2025

Actual TE

4/20/2026

TE Submission

6/18/2026

Final Disbursement

C. Disbursements

Project Financing 5,146,154.00	Cumulative Disbursement 4,516,309.66
-----------------------------------	---

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings

Relevance: Highly relevant to CPB obligations and GEF/UNEP strategies, addressing critical global needs for biosafety information exchange. Sources: 4.1, 5.1

Effectiveness: Delivered extensive outputs (workshops, training materials, regional cooperation) and strengthened BCH use, though outcome achievement was uneven across countries. Sources: 4.4, 5.1

Efficiency: Implementation generally efficient with strong global coordination, but delays in SSFA signing and variable national capacities affected timeliness. Sources: 4.6, 5.1

Monitoring & Reporting: Monitoring systems were largely output-focused and inconsistent across countries, limiting outcome-level tracking and evaluability. Sources: 4.7, 5.1

Sustainability: Moderately likely due to strong capacity gains, but long-term continuity is constrained by limited national budgets, staff turnover, and reliance on project-driven finance of RA support. Sources: 4.8, 5.1

Factors Affecting Performance: Project management and stakeholder engagement were generally satisfactory, though responsiveness varied and inclusiveness of non-traditional stakeholders remained limited. Overall, 45% women participation in project workshops. Sources: 4.9, 5.1.

B. Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder engagement strengthened substantially after the MTR, becoming broader, deeper and more institutionalized across national, regional and global levels. Participation expanded significantly, with more than 2,000 national-level trainees, predominantly public-sector duty-bearers and nearly half women, alongside increased involvement of NFPs, CNAs, customs officials, researchers and universities, supported by the rapid growth of the VLE, which reached more than 2,300 users from 181 countries. Regional cooperation intensified through updated regional roadmaps, establishment of three BCH regional nodes, identification of regional institutions and experts, and expanded ToT participation, including at COP/MOP 10. These gains were tempered by COVID-19 disruptions, NFP/CNA turnover, uneven regional readiness and limited participation of non-state actors including the private sector. Nevertheless, by project completion, stakeholder engagement had led to strengthened national procedures, greater peer-to-peer learning, more active regional collaboration and a higher likelihood of sustained BCH use, representing a marked improvement over the engagement level at mid-term. Source: 4.9.2

C. Gender Equality

The project effectively promoted and implemented gender-responsive measures that resulted in meaningful gender outcomes across national, regional and global levels. A consistent 50% gender-balance target guided the nomination process for all workshops, resulting in 45% female participation across national trainings—substantially strengthening the representation of women in biosafety information management roles. Inclusive training design, hybrid learning formats and open-access e-learning tools reduced structural barriers to women's participation, while targeted engagement ensured that women in NFP, CNA, NAU and related technical roles gained practical skills in BCH data entry, validation and use. Women also benefited from increased visibility and professional exchange through regional workshops, case-study development, and COP/MOP training events, contributing to broader networks of biosafety practitioners. As a result, the project not only met its gender-responsive commitments but also produced tangible gender results, expanding the pool of technically skilled women supporting biosafety governance in participating countries. Source: 4.9.3

D. Knowledge Management

The project's KM Approach—originally defined in the ProDoc through components on global and sub-regional networking, production of multilingual educational materials, and strengthening the Regional Advisors system—was broadly implemented but faced several structural and operational challenges that shaped its outcomes. At CEO Approval, the project committed to producing BCH education packages in all UN languages, establishing virtual learning

tools, generating knowledge products, supporting sub-regional experience sharing, and creating mechanisms for sustainability through national and regional systems. These commitments translated into an extensive suite of KM deliverables: the project developed a multilingual VLE, published more than 55 webinars and multiple online courses, and created 65 virtual courses before the MTR in 2019; it also supported 137 national workshops and 9 regional/sub-regional workshops that produced regional roadmaps to facilitate cross-country knowledge exchange. In addition, the development or upgrading of national BCH portals, along with a significant increase (187%) in national records on the BCH Central Portal, constituted major KM outputs tied to strengthened information management systems. However, implementation was slowed by several challenges: delays in launching the harmonized BCH portal and in migrating training materials, limited digital literacy and poor Internet connectivity in some participating countries, and high turnover among national focal points that required repeated training. The MTR found that the project's results-oriented KM pathways were not clearly articulated in the original logical framework, reducing the ability to monitor how KM products translated into learning outcomes and decision-making improvements. Despite these constraints, the project generated a strong body of lessons learned and good practices, such as the importance of regional champions (e.g., the "Asian BCH Family"), the value of nationally contextualized training, and the critical need to institutionalize knowledge systems beyond focal point turnover. Adaptive management actions included shifting several workshops to virtual modalities (even prior to COVID-19), developing printed and asynchronous guidance for countries with low bandwidth, and migrating the VLE to UNEP's institutional server to ensure long-term accessibility and institutional ownership. Overall, the KM approach delivered substantial, multilingual learning assets, expanded BCH participation, and strengthened information systems globally, even as structural IT limitations, uneven country capacity, and delays in global platform upgrades constrained the full realization of the knowledge-to-impact pathways envisioned at CEO Approval. Source: 4.4.2

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				955
Male				1,167
Total	0	0	0	2,122

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	Participating Country	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	7,073,531.00	3,723,662.00	626,898.00
GEF Agency	UNEP	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	585,320.00	129,288.00	324,620.00

Multilateral	SCBD	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	596,640.00	393,081.00	478,038.00
Other	Government of Korea	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00	133,000.00	500,000.00
Total Co-financing				8,755,491.00	4,379,031.00	1,929,556.00

Comments

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
			Not available at this stage

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Based on the Safeguards Plan at CEO Approval, the PIR 2025 risk ratings, the ProDoc, and the MTR evidence, implementation of environmental and social management measures under BCH-III has progressed largely as expected for a non-infrastructure, capacity-building project with minimal direct E&S risks. The Safeguards Plan (ProDoc Appendix 17) identified no significant environmental or social impacts, with most items rated N/A and only a few social aspects flagged as relevant—namely stakeholder participation, respect for human rights and cultural property, institutional strengthening, and avoidance of corruption. These were addressed through the project's extensive programme of global, regional, and national trainings, the establishment of national procedures and sustainability plans, and wide stakeholder engagement, having reached over 2,100 stakeholders with 45% women's participation, strengthened national BCH portals, and enhanced transparency through public-facing information systems. The Social and Environmental Safeguard Management section of the PIR reports no non-compliance cases and confirms that activities remained low-risk and aligned with UNEP safeguards requirements. Risk ratings—which were “Low” for many consecutive years—were raised to “Moderate” in the final PIR, reflecting residual institutional and operational risks rather than E&S concerns; these classifications are consistent with the project's documented challenges around country uptake, staff turnover, and uneven institutional capacity, as outlined in the MTR and subsequent PIR analysis. Overall, the management measures envisioned at CEO Approval were effectively implemented: stakeholder inclusion mechanisms functioned, transparency and information-access safeguards were strengthened through national BCH portals, and fiduciary safeguards (including anti-corruption measures) were applied through UNEP systems. Evidence from the MTR and PIRs also indicates that the project generated relevant lessons, particularly the need for: (i) sustained institutional capacity to maintain BCH systems; (ii) better integration of BCH functions into national biosafety frameworks; and (iii) adaptive management to address high turnover and uneven technical capacity across countries. As a result, the current “Moderate” overall risk rating is justified, and the safeguards-related measures can be assessed as *largely effective* in managing low inherent risks while contributing to long-term institutional sustainability. Source: 4.9.4

VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category	Prefix	Title
M and E Document	Terminal Evaluation (TE)	Terminal Evaluation Report