

TERMINAL EVALUATION

Project ID:	2123
Project Name:	Conservation & Management of Pollinators for Sustainable Agriculture through an Ecosystem Approach
Countr(ies):	Global, Ghana, Kenya, South Africa, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Brazil
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 INDICATORS6

IV: CO FINANCING7

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS8

VI. ANNEX9

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name

Conservation & Management of Pollinators for Sustainable Agriculture through an Ecosystem Approach

Country

Global, Ghana, Kenya, South Africa, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Brazil

GEF ID

2123

Implementing Agency

UNEP

Executing Entity

FAO (other EA listed under remarks)

Trust Fund

GET

Project Type

FSP

Objective

The development goal of the project is to conserve, sustainably use and manage pollinators. The project has three principal objectives. The project will (1) develop and implement tools, methodologies, strategies and best management practices for pollinator conservation and sustainable use. (2) build local, national, regional and global capacities to enable the design, planning and implementation of interventions to mitigate pollinator population declines, and establish sustainable pollinator management practices, and (3) promote the co-ordination and integration of activities related to the conservation and sustainable use of pollinators at the international level to enhance global synergies.

B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval

7/31/2008

Agency Approval

11/20/2008

Implementation Start

11/1/2008

First Disbursement

5/18/2010

Expected MTR

9/1/2012

MTR Submission

9/17/2025

Actual MTR

7/1/2013

Expected Completion

9/30/2013

Actual Completion

12/31/2015

Actual TE

5/31/2025

TE Submission

9/17/2025

Final Disbursement

8/17/2016

C. Disbursements

Project Financing 8,576,643.00	Cumulative Disbursement 7,663,832.00
-----------------------------------	---

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings

This Desk-based study established that the GPP was well on its way to achieving its development objective of improved food security, nutrition and livelihoods through enhanced conservation and sustainable use of pollinators; and its immediate objective to harness the benefits of pollination services provided by wild biodiversity for human livelihoods and sustainable agriculture, through an ecosystem approach in selected countries. At completion, the GPP was a well-designed, ambitious and innovative project addressing the important area of work with regard to the “sustainable use of pollinators in crop production”. The project’s objectives were met using the outcomes of a set of activities that logically followed from the objectives. It commenced its work by building a strong body of literature; and a knowledge base using existing scientific research and traditional knowledge of the stakeholders and also expanded this with original and well-designed fieldwork based on common protocols. The GPP produced a large body of Literature and findings that helped create awareness and allowed for making substantial progress in an otherwise highly fragmented body of knowledge. Post completion of the project a number of scientific studies were produced which continue to be used to design best practices for farmers and farming communities, amend and develop pollinator-friendly policies, integrate pollinators, pollination and the ideas of sustainability in the educational curricula, and raise awareness of the importance of pollinators as ecosystem service providers for human food production. The multinational and multidisciplinary nature of this project strongly determined the potential of its impact and implementation at a broader scale. Financial sustainability of the project needed additional financing measures to ensure that the 7 national projects could be sustained as evidenced by the failure of six partner countries and the lead global agency FAO in sustaining the platforms that were built during the Project cycle. Only one country, South Africa had an active platform and documentation during the course of this TE phase. However, the FAO site provided information on a number of publications that were produced after project completion and provided important background materials required for the TE phase.

B. Stakeholder Engagement

Project design was built with a comprehensive problem analytical approach combined with extensive stakeholder consultations carried out during the Project Development Funding Phase B (PDF-B). This contributed in large measure to significant strengthening of the design as it ensured alignment with the needs of participating countries, informed selection of species, project sites as well as building essential partnerships in a complex programmatic framework.

Another important element was the inclusion strategy for identifying stakeholders at both national and global levels. The project identified and contacted a wide range of stakeholders during the project design phase who indicated their interest in the outcome of the project. These included coordinators of other regional initiatives carrying out similar activities in their regions; taxonomic experts willing to assist in the development of user-friendly identification tools; biodiversity information portals, such as the Global Biodiversity Information

Facility (GBIF), that were also interested in including project-generated data in their database systems; and pollination experts agreeing to serve as resource people throughout the project cycle⁵².

The investment by GEF in funding the PDF-B phase was a major contributor to effective partnerships and stakeholder buy in of the project. At commencement the project managed to engage the right partners who effectively delivered the project as National Executing Agencies and continued to sustain most of the project activities after closure. All relevant stakeholders were engaged in projected management as members of the National Steering Committees at the Country levels. The addition of Technical Advisers in these areas of focus, resulted in multiple areas of success.

These enabled the project to leverage resources in additional cofinancing and easily influence policy changes as well as institutionalization of conservation efforts throughout the project cycle. Engagement of grassroots partners at national levels, was also a success factor. There was no significant difference with respect to the engagement of stakeholders from the time of the MTR to completion. This was broadly the result of the care that was taken to integrate careful design elements for identification of stakeholders at multiple levels during the inception phase of the project.

C. Gender Equality

Under Factors Affecting Performance/Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equality: The project design had an in-built mechanism for gender inclusion. It captured the multidimensional nature of the mechanisms of Conservation and Management of Pollinators for Sustainable Agriculture and Ecosystems, shifting away from the typical sector-defined boundaries that were common to these definitions. Additionally, care was taken to ensure that training was provided to a range of relevant stakeholders including farmers, training of trainers, etc., awareness raising. Gender integration was predominant feature of national level work in the agricultural farming sectors in all 7 countries, especially, India, Nepal, Kenya, South Africa, and Brazil.

Gender and indigenous peoples issues: All farmers were targeted in this project, including women. Indigenous communities were considered specifically through work undertaken through co-funding, on pollination deficits and fed into policy considerations. Through co-funding the Indigenous Partnership on Agrobiodiversity and Food Sovereignty developed a protocol for the peer review of scientific findings on pollination, as a contribution to IPBES during the last phase of the project cycle.

Additionally, the project actively involved women in research and project management (both at the global and national coordination levels as well as at the STEP sites). In some countries women's groups specifically were trained, and women were part of the groups of farmers that worked at the STEP sites. Both male and female students were involved in formal education (i.e. pursuing PhD's, for example). At the international policy workshop held in Kenya, there was a fair balance of female/male policy makers attending. In addition, the findings that yields can be most substantially increased in smallholdings, in response to ecological/biological inputs such as pollination, is of great interest to gender equality, as the majority of smallholder farmers in many parts of the world are women, who often have less access to external inputs. Knowing how to utilize and promote naturally occurring biological inputs can make a large difference in their lives.

D. Knowledge Management

The Knowledge Management approach and Component of the GPP project was the most valuable component at completion. All 7 countries had established Knowledge Platforms, and in 2014, the GPP team focussed on

“Post Project Sustainability” discussions. PIR FY 2016, page 11, provides a graphic representation of the PIMS growth of users rising to as many as 135,151 at completion. Project partners developed and implemented strategies for outreach to farmer groups and land areas to attain targets by project end, through training of lead farmers and trainers who then undertook training of farmers.

A list of best agricultural practices for pollinator conservation and sustainable use was identified and refined based on information gathered through the FAO Initial version of Global Survey of Good Pollination Practices, expert opinion and the Handbook for Participatory Socioeconomic Valuation of Pollinator-Friendly Practices. At the global level, a compilation of best practices profiles is undertaken. Work was undertaken on outreach and engagement with farming communities in all STEP sites in each country. Using information collected through monitoring protocols, pollination deficits and participatory socio-economic surveys, Pollination Management Plans (PMPs) were developed in all countries (in South Africa, this was modified to focus on forage resources).

In Brazil, due to the characteristics of commercial crops under study, as well as the continental dimensions of Brazil, it was decided to include the information produced in STEP sites in the agricultural sector policies related to family agriculture (Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Agrarian Development), to address the targets in terms of land area and people. In terms of lessons learned the reaction from the executing agencies at national level was mixed. Throughout the implementation phase all 7 countries felt that the project objectives were important, and feasible. At completion, reports indicate that several partners felt project monitoring and evaluation was over-complicated and could cause problems – particularly in a multi-national project where English was not everyone’s first language.

It was also felt that the planned outcomes, outputs, activities, deliverables, indicators etc were fairly confusing. This was especially pertinent considering that there were outputs at the component level and then outputs under the outcomes – but those output numbers did not match up to the activity numbers. The framework as required by GEF could be made more straightforward they stated. After completion of the GEF Project Cycle, several publications in scientific journals by the GPP team led by the FAO Global Coordinator, linked to various focal areas of the Project were published. Although the citation index and the footfall of the articles could not be assessed the potential impact was plausible at multiple levels. These included the government agencies taking into account the findings of the GPP in their policy frameworks and usage of the GPP inputs and findings into the design of future GEF/UNEP projects linked to trends in the Biodiversity and Agrocentric areas.

Discussions with the South Africa SANBI and Ghana Team leader indicated that the primary objective of the Project was somewhat ambitious for a five-year project phase. The former FAO Global Leader stated that the M&E profiling needed to be built on greater operational relevance in the context of Pollination, Ecosystems and Agro ecological terrains. She also questioned the UNEP and GEF profiling of evaluation that seemed to focus on areas that were not particularly relevant to environmental impacts in an environment that was becoming more complex and problematic for implementation zones. Sustainability of GEF full scale projects needed to be thought through with greater care, she stated, with greater emphasis on financial sustainability in the environmental ecological framework of operations.

During the TE phase, however, other than the SANBI site (South Africa) none of the other sites, neither FAO PIMS or the six other national sites were active. The FAO site provided links to a few GPP publications. Monitoring and Reporting Profiles were limited to only one country, South Africa for review.

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(\$)
Multilateral	FAO (in-kind)			841,075.00		
Multilateral	FAO (in cash)			1,400,020.00		
Recipient Country Government	Governments (in-kind)			8,195,970.00		15,481,250.00
Recipient Country Government	Goverenments (in-cash)			7,194,159.00		9,338,812.00
Other	Global Bio Information Facility (in-kind)			75,000.00		
Other	Global Bio Information Facility (in-cash)			200,000.00		
Bilateral	ICIPE (in-kind)			225,000.00		
Bilateral	ICIPE (in-cash)			267,000.00		
Multilateral	IFAD (cash)			200,000.00		
Bilateral	Others (in-kind)			49,097.00		
Other	Other sources	Grant				2,643,740.00
Other	Other sources	In-kind				329,414.00

Recipient Country Government						
Recipient Country Government						
Recipient Country Government						
Other						
Total Co-financing				18,647,321.00	0.00	2,973,154.00

Comments

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 adopted a Results Framework, an M&E Plan and a Risks Framework. The Monitoring, Progress Reporting and Evaluation Plan designed at the onset of the project was adequate. The monitoring profiles shared by the South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) reflected the fact that the profiles were requested based on topical areas of focus, and these would be submitted to the FAO Office in Rome and these reports would then be provided to the UNEP Project Team Leader.

Although the team did formulate a Risk Framework a more detailed analytical approach to defining Risks at multiple levels needed to be adopted as evidenced in the early project implementation delays that occurred due to difficulties faced by a few of the Partner Countries in the signing of the Cooperation Agreements.

The project identified a series of risks as part of its risks framework. However, in terms of external content, there were no significant external risks that were identified or that occurred. The only issues faced by the GPP were operational delays internal to the country programme management areas of document approvals, and few regulatory and staffing issues. These were spread at different levels and times, with a majority of

them occurring at inception of the Project Preparation Phase. The national executing agencies were able to work with the authorities to find solutions in a timely manner.

VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category	Title TT
Document Category	Title TT
Document Category	Title TT
Document Category	Title TT
Document Category	Title TT
Document Category	Title TT
Document Category	Title TT
Document Category	Title TT
Document Category	Title TE
Document Category	Title TT
Document Category	Title TT
Document Category	Title TT
Document Category	Title TT
Document Category	Title TT
Document Category	Title TT