

## Management Response: Implementation Plan for Evaluation Recommendations

### General Information

Eval ID	732
Evaluation Manager	Susan Mugwe
Project Evaluation Title	Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP/GEF project "Development and Application of Decision-Support Tools to Conserve and Sustainably Use Genetic Diversity in Indigenous Livestock And Wild Relatives
PIMS #	
GEF ID	1902
UNEP Sub-programme	SP3 – Healthy and Productive Ecosystems
GEF Focal Area	Biodiversity
Project Manager/ Task Manager	Johan Robinson
Office/Division	Ecosystems Division
Branch & Unit	Biodiversity and Land Branch
Final PDF Report distributed by Evaluation Office (Date)	18/12/2023
Total # of Recommendations as per Report	5
Implementation Plan Sent to PM/TM (Date)	06/02/2024
Implementation Plan Returned by PM/TM (Date)	04/03/2024
Implementation Plan finalized (if different from the date above)	15/04/2024

### 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	Promoting Business cases for Conservation Enterprises - In all the countries, there was greater focus on domesticated Indigenous livestock (poultry, pigs and goats) and less focus on their wild relatives, though there were some cross breeding done on pigs in Vietnam. The countries also organized shows and cultural events to promote some of the FAnGR and their relatives which however did not continue after the project. The evaluator therefore noted that the reason for greater focus on the domesticated FAnGR was	Future projects by UNEP / GEF to facilitate development of business cases on biodiversity conservation. These should be designed in a manner to de-risk the private sector by providing blended financing so as to invest in the business cases	Opportunity for improvement	Partners	BD task managers	Ongoing	Partially Accepted	GEF only provides targeted de-risking and blended finance	Where appropriate, incorporate funds for de-risking private sector finance and blended finance in projects

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
	because of economic incentives, which were not well captured with wild relatives. Hence, business cases for conservation enterprises could create the incentive for sustainable conservation of FAnGR.								
2	Documentation of models - The project had developed some successful models that could have been documented, packaged and shared with other organizations implementing similar projects for replication. UNEP could incorporate this activity in its future projects.	UNEP together with executing agencies to document and package models developed by the project for replication in similar contexts.	Important	Partners			Partially Accepted	The project has come to an end and all funds exhausted.	UNEP will write to main executing agency requesting for that they compile and document models developed by the project for replication.
3	Holistic approach to conservation of FAnGR - The project put greater focus on conservation of specific breeds with less attention to their ecology. For instance this could have included identifying what plants are important for existence of FAnGR and their wild relatives, determining which are at risk especially given the negative impacts of climate change on biodiversity thereafter incorporating the conservation measure for such ecological requirements.	Future projects intervening on conservation of FAnGR should integrate the animal and its ecology so as to address all the causes of biodiversity loss. For instance in goats (both domestic and wild relatives) the project should consider the conservation of goats as an animal species as well as its forage in the wild.	Opportunity for improvement	Partners	BD task managers		Accepted		Ensure that any project intervening on conservation of FAnGR integrate the animal and its ecology.
4	Extra Support on Research - A lot of samples were collected for molecular characterization. However due to short duration of time and the limited budget a large amount of samples were not analysed during the life of the project. There was need to have all the samples analysed beyond the project period, because they could give other insights and also reveal important trends to further influence decisions on FAnGR and their wild relatives. Additionally this could ensure full utilization of the research capacity by the project.	Future projects to consider putting aside some grant to continue supporting the research after project closure. This would allow important trends to be studied in the future.	Important	UNEP-wide			Not Accepted	The suggestion has merit, but UNEP not in a position to influence, this recommendation should be targeted towards the donor	

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
5	<p>Improvement of M&amp;E System - Project reports focused on activities and provided limited information on outcomes. At the field site level, <b>there were no systems for capturing the outcomes</b> and impacts of the interventions on a regular basis. For instance data on how much income farmers were earning after selling the eggs every month; how did the certain traits improve over time as a result of the selection and breeding activities, among others.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The studies undertaken at the start of the project served as both project activities and baseline studies. The TE established that there were <b>no baseline values for some indicators</b>. Further there was <b>no indicator tracking plan</b> developed after the studies, showing the baseline values for all indicators and periodically populated with data coming from regular monitoring activities. This could have been used in tracking the performance against targets as well as provide information for evaluations especially in this project where there is a significant time lapse between the end of project operations and TE.</li> </ul>	<p>UNEP to adopt a result based monitoring system to enable continuous monitoring of project at results level. The M&amp;E system should have an indicator tracking system, which should be developed immediately after baseline surveys. At MTR, UNEP could incorporate a review of the M&amp;E system and allows for its reconstruction, if need be.</p>	Important	UNEP-wide	PPD		Partially Accepted	<p>The PIR and Progress Reports are designed to fulfil the requirements set forth by the UNEP monitoring policy and the GEF Policy on Monitoring. This suite includes PIR, Mid-Term Reviews/Evaluations (MTR/E), and Terminal Evaluations. The PIRs, conducted annually, constitute a "result-based monitoring system designed to enable continuous monitoring of projects at the results level." Should the term 'system' imply the digitization of this process, as introduced in the UNEP Monitoring Policy of 2010 where an older system was in use, we would like to refer to the ongoing process to fully utilise IPMR as the relevant platform for all projects, regardless of funding source.</p>	