

Management Response: Implementation Plan for Evaluation Recommendations

General Information

Eval ID	721
Evaluation Manager	Pauline Marima
Project Evaluation Title	Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP/GEF Project "Integrating Traditional Crop Genetic Diversity into Technology: Using a Biodiversity Portfolio Approach to Buffer Against Unpredictable Environmental Change in the Nepal Himalayas" GEF Id 4464
PIMS #	
GEF ID	4464
UNEP Sub-programme	SP3 – Healthy and Productive Ecosystems
GEF Focal Area	Biodiversity
Project Manager/ Task Manager	Sang Jin Lee; Marieta Sakalian
Office/Division	Ecosystems Division
Branch & Unit	Biodiversity and Land Branch
Final PDF Report distributed by Evaluation Office (Date)	15-03-23
Total # of Recommendations as per Report	4
Implementation Plan Sent to PM/TM (Date)	30-03-23
Implementation Plan Returned by PM/TM (Date)	31-03-23
Implementation Plan finalized (if different from the date above)	10-04-23

Implementation Plan

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
1	The evaluation noted a lack of clarity on the roles and responsibilities in managing local-level initiatives such as Community Seed Banks (CSBs) among the three tiers of the government. In addition, there was inadequate collaborative work between the government tiers and with sectoral ministries such as Ministry of Forests and Environment (MoFE) and Ministry of Agriculture and	The government of Nepal could consider improving mechanisms and policy frameworks that support local-level initiatives to conserve and use agrobiodiversity and promote collaborative work of all tiers of governments, sectoral ministries, provincial governments and other stakeholders including the private sector. The Biodiversity and Land	Important	Partners	Biodiversity and Land Branch - UNEP Ecosystems Division Ministry of Forests and Environment (MoFE) and Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development	Communicate this recommendation to the relevant Ministries in the Government of Nepal (e.g. MoFE, MoLALD) within the next 12 months	Accepted		Communication with relevant Ministries in the Gov. of Nepal will be done by sharing recommendations for their future intervention. The persons that will be contacted are: 1) Shabanam Shivakoti, Chief – Food Security and Food Technology Division, Joint Secretary / Ministry of Agriculture and

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
	<p>Livestock Development (MoALD). Institutional and sector 'silos' within the government agencies were visible.</p> <p>(Refer to paragraphs: 148, 156, 158, 160, 166, 168, 174, 175, 176, 224, 237, 239, 255, 259, 267, 290, 291, 295.)</p>	<p>Branch ought to communicate the following recommendations to the relevant Ministries in the Government of Nepal:</p> <p>i) develop and support regulatory measures for Community Seed Banks (CSBs);</p> <p>ii) provide institutional and capacity-building support for enhancing market access (diversification, mechanization, seed trading certificates and engaging the private sector);</p> <p>iii) integrate Community-Based Management (CBM) best practice into the regular programmes;</p> <p>iv) provide additional support for crop registration and in-situ conservation;</p> <p>vi) further strengthen the capacity of the national Gene Banks for conservation of genetic material repatriation; and</p> <p>vii) engage stakeholders and MoFE to develop national policies and/or legal mechanisms on agrobiodiversity conservation, and Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) in agrobiodiversity.</p>			(MoALD), Government of Nepal				<p>Livestock Development; 2) Dr Ram Krishna Shrestha, Chief, Centre for Crop Development and Agrobiodiversity / MoALD; 3) Dr Bal Krishna Joshi, Senior Scientist, Nepal Agriculture Research Council; 4) Dr Prakash Acharya, Under Secretary, Seed Quality Control Centre /MoALD; 5) Megh Nath Kafle, Environment and Biodiversity Division, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Forests and Environment; and 6) Mahesh Kharel, Director, National Planning Commission.</p>
2	<p>The project included women in the training workshops, among other project activities, and also as a part of the Community Seed Banks (CSBs), but there was no contextual analysis of gender roles in agrobiodiversity, neither was there any consideration for</p>	<p>Women are considered the main custodians of agrobiodiversity in mountain agriculture, therefore, gender equity issues should get greater attention by undertaking a gender gap analysis during project design, and identifying gender-responsive actions to</p>	Important	Project	Biodiversity and Land Branch - UNEP Ecosystems Division	Within the next 12 months during the design of projects that are in the pipeline to be started soon, or are in the early stages of implementation,	Accepted		<p>Currently, the PNG project (GEF 10580), Full-Sized Project (FSP) is about to start implementation. For this project, gender analysis, strategy and action were developed to address equity issues with detailed</p>

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
	<p>the implications of gender gaps in agriculture resource mobilization and access and benefit sharing of resources. No specific interventions regarding gender equity were identified based on the assessment. (Refer to paragraphs: 147, 213, 225, 280 – 282, 287, 312)</p>	<p>address equity issues in agrobiodiversity management.</p> <p>The evaluation recommends that for agrobiodiversity projects, UNEP should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) carry out a socio-economic analysis to identify gender roles and and possible gender gaps; ii) identify gender-responsive actions to address gender equity issues; iii) develop gendered baseline data using disaggregated data collection tools/methods; and (ii) carry out monitoring to identify periodic changes in position and status. 				and that are of a similar nature to GEF 4464			<p>information. The project developed the gender analysis, strategy and action for the participating country to consider. The document called “the gender analysis, strategy and action” contains detailed information on 4 recommendations addressed – 1) socio-economic analysis (pages 12, 20); 2) gender response action (page 26-32); 3) develop baseline date (page 14); and 4) monitoring (page 25). All recommendations will be monitored during the whole project period.</p>
3	<p>The project mainly focused on the research and documentation of local crops but there were very few activities that related to livelihoods promotion and income generation. Consequently, the project did not create a strong incentive for the communities to protect and conserve the local crops. (Refer to paragraphs:107, 108, 205, 240, 241, 246, 247, 251, 253)</p>	<p>Future interventions similar to this project should prioritize, and equally emphasize the promotion of people’s livelihood and income generation, which will directly strengthen the economic interest of the community in agrobiodiversity conservation.</p> <p>In designing agrobiodiversity projects similar to GEF 4464, UNEP should consider the whole value chain of the crop (i.e., research, promotion, mechanization, processing, product diversification, market information, accessing the market, capacity building, etc.). This should, preferably,</p>	Important	Project	Biodiversity and Land Branch - UNEP Ecosystems Division	<p>Within the next 12 months during the design of projects that are in the pipeline to be started soon, or are in the early stages of implementation, and that are of a similar nature to GEF 4464</p>	Partially Accepted		<p>The project (GEF 10907) which is still in design phase and currently in review by GEF Sec. contains various activities related to livelihoods promotion and income generation. As described in outcomes 2 and 3, this project intends to promote people’s livelihood and income generation by building national capacity for aquaculture production (refer to pages 48. Throughout the review process with GEF Sec., a TM will check and</p>

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
		include mechanization, product diversification, market information and access, eco-tourism, and possibly other income streams such as organic agriculture certification.							emphasize the issues raised above. As of 18 Apr. 2023, the project (GEF 10907) is about to be approved with technical information given. Also this project is not for the area of agrobiodiversity but for aquaculture sector to promote people's livelihood and income generation. Considering the time and circumstances given, it will be hard to meet the suggestion with recommendation of promoting people's livelihood and income generation, as a means of incentivising agrobiodiversity at this stage, and also, no ongoing projects under my portfolio are being considered. However, when developing GEF-8 projects, the recommendation given will be seriously considered and applied to the project proposal in close consultation with stakeholders from project design stage.
4	The project did not systematically record baseline data (outputs and outcome). Project progress reports presented data in a partial form or with units	All projects should establish a strong monitoring framework with a simple but complete project management information system (MIS), including	Opportunity for improvement	Project	Biodiversity and Land Branch - UNEP Ecosystems Division	Within the next 12 months during the design of projects that are in the pipeline to	Partially Accepted		Points made at the recommendation are good and will be applied to the project 10907 being reviewed by GEF Sec. As

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
	<p>that were inconsistent with the log frame indicators, and did not always give a clear and comprehensive overview of the project's progress in achieving its expected results. In addition, the baseline data was not available in some cases. There are comprehensive electronic mechanisms to store and analyse data which can be used during reporting and review. (Refer to paragraphs: 122 - 124, 191, 192, 195, 212-227, 234 and 235)</p>	<p>assigning an M&E officer for better management of the monitoring functions. There are comprehensive electronic mechanisms to store and analyse data which can be used to review project performance (focusing on improvement and learning), including monitoring of progress towards high-level changes expected. The evaluation recommends that planned and ongoing UNEP projects should have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) a results-based monitoring and evaluation plan and implementation strategy; ii) a dedicated staff for project monitoring; iii) a simple computer-based management information system (MIS) which is well aligning with the results framework; iv) a clear scaling-up mechanism and exit strategy. 				<p>be started soon, or are in the early stages of implementation, and that are of a similar nature to GEF 4464</p>			<p>described in the monitoring and evaluation plan (page 14) of Project 10907, TM will be in close contact with executing partners for monitoring and evaluation plan during annual PSC meeting to be held yearly basis and check and monitor the progress. Also, regular check on technical issues will be done by annual project implementation report (PIR) by TM. As for the recommendation (iv), it's a good and practical one worth of considering, however, considering the stage the project (10907) is being placed, which is getting close to get approval shortly, and also no ongoing projects under my portfolio being reflected, it's hard to meet the recommendation in a given timeframe. However, when developing the GEF-8 projects, the recommendation (iv) will be considered.</p>