



## **United Nations Environment Programme**

Terminal Evaluation of Project “International  
Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystems”,  
GF/3010-08-20 (4A21)  
GEF ID: 3811

Camille Ban

Patricia Kameri-Mbote

Evaluation Office

March 2011

# Executive Summary

---

## *Background*

The Global Legislators Organization for a Balance Environment (GLOBE) is a network of legislators that brings together legislators, scientists, economists and policy experts to focus on developing coordinated legislation across the major economies.

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment cited land use change as the most important factor contributing to ecosystem service degradation. This project, implemented by GLOBE, was driven by the need to more meaningfully engage legislators, as a key constituency, in the creation of a legislation that places a value on ecosystems and addresses the multiple challenges of land use change. As stated in the Project Document the main objective of the project was to ‘assist legislators and parliamentarians in a global discourse on developing regulatory tools and applied public policy to address land use change and ecosystem degradation’.

GLOBE is leading the way in demonstrating the important role legislators can play in promoting the sustainable use of natural resources. The International Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystems established by the project represents the first and only parliamentary body pushing the agenda on sustainable land use. Such a process is key to overcoming political barriers on these issues, and thereby facilitating the development of effective legislation.

In two years the project has successfully established a network of parliamentarians from almost 40 countries. There has been significant engagement with legislators who have shown a huge amount of interest. The project’s initial focus was on the G8+5 countries<sup>1</sup>, however the Commission evolved to incorporate countries outside this group with important forest resources and marine resources, while the CBD at Nagoya towards the end of the project period effectively opened up the Commission to all interested countries.

The project was executed through a cooperation agreement between UNEP GEF and the GLOBE. The total cost of the project, including co-financing and in-kind contributions, was US\$ 2,000,000.

## *Overview of Terminal Evaluation*

This Terminal Evaluation covers Phase 1 of the project. The project has been evaluated against eleven criteria as is standard for all GEF projects. A summary of the project’s performance against each criteria A-K is provided below. Overall the project is rated as Satisfactory (S).

### **A. Attainment of Objectives and Planned Results.**

**A1. Effectiveness, ‘BA’.** The evaluation of the project’s effectiveness adopted the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) methods, taking into consideration the fact that the project is a political initiative working towards the introduction of new legislation and therefore attributing the impact of a two year project on the likely / actual change in environmental status is not straightforward. In terms of achieving its outcomes the projected is rated as ‘B’

---

<sup>1</sup> The G8 plus 5 consists of Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, United Kingdom, United States, Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa.

that is 'The project's intended outcomes were delivered, and were designed to feed into a continuing process, but with no prior allocation of responsibilities after project funding'. While there are examples of the outcomes progressing to intermediate states, legislators, particularly in developing countries, require more support to translate the outcomes achieved over the past two years into concrete legislation and the associated environmental improvements.

The project's rating on progress towards intermediate states is 'A' defined as 'The measures designed to move towards intermediate states have started and have produced results, which clearly indicates that they can progress towards the intended long terms impacts.' This is based on the Commissions involvement in, for example, passing legislation on illegal logging in the European Parliament 2010, the establishment of a marine protected areas in Chagos Archipelago, and the passing of climate change and waste legislation in Brazil.

**A2 Relevance. Highly Satisfactory (HS).** The project is highly relevant to UNEP's wider remit and work areas. It has established strong links with the UNFCCC and the CBD and other UNEP/GEF projects.

**A3. Efficiency. Highly Satisfactory (HS).** The project achieved a great deal with a small core team of 3.5 staff. The project was able to enlist considerable input from a range of experts on a *pro bono* basis.

**B. Sustainability of Project Outcomes. Moderate Likely (ML).** There are moderate risks that affect the sustainability of the project.

**B1 Financial. Moderate Likely (ML).** An increase in financial resources are considered to be necessary to maintain and develop project outcomes

**B2. Socio Political. Moderate Likely (ML).** While legislators have demonstrated a strong demand and interest in the work of the Commission, many lack the capacity to follow up on the Commission's recommendations.

**B3. Institutional Framework. Moderate Likely (ML).** The project has set up an institutional framework to spearhead the development of environmental legislation that needs to be maintained and developed. Additional support is required to assist some countries to overcome institutional barriers.

**C. Catalytic Role and Replication. Satisfactory (S).** The project is innovative and has successfully catalyzed institutional and policy changes in some countries. It can be successfully replicated with the right support.

**D. Stakeholder Participation and Public Awareness. Highly Satisfactory (HS).** Stakeholders have been very keen to participate in the Commission and the project successfully secured media coverage of its Natural Capital programme at Nagoya CBD COP, and worked with innovative media tools.

**E. Country Ownership / Drivenness. Highly Satisfactory (HS).** There are many examples of countries promoting the work of the Commission.

**F: Achievement of Outcomes and Activities. Highly Satisfactory (HS).** Overall, the project has delivered on all its programmed activities in a timely and effective manner.

**G: Preparation and Readiness. Satisfactory (S).** By design the project proposal allowed a degree of flexibility to ensure the legislators had ownership of the Commission.

**H: Implementation Approach and Adaptive Management. Satisfactory (S).** The project had a clear management structure and was executed in a highly adaptive way, responding to both the requests from legislators and the international policy process.

**F: Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E). Satisfactory (S).** The M&E process designed was consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, PIR reports were completed and legislators were actively asked for feedback.

**G: Financial Planning and Control. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU).** Accurate financial reports were submitted to UNEP, but were often late, and GLOBE staff, consultants and partners often faced (significant) delays in payment.

**K: UNEP Supervision and Backstopping. Highly Satisfactory (HS).** Positive feedback was received on the role that UNEP played in steering and supporting the project.

### *Recommendations*

The recommendations presented relate to the design and focus of Phase 2 of the project. Given the status and momentum the project has established over Phase 1, and the essential link it provides between the science and decision makers a ramping up of the project is considered justified. Phase 1 provided a foundation for working with legislators to change policy and legislation, but the project now needs a shift in scale and focus in order that it can increase its outreach beyond the international meetings it has so successfully executed in Phase 1. The next step is to advance and implement the Commission's recommendations at the regional and national scale. The project would also benefit from the ability to operate from a position of financial (resource) security.

#### **Summary of Specific recommendations**

**Funding.** Additional funds are required to realize the Commission's full potential. One option is to find a collaborating partner for each work stream.

**Expand Core Team and skill set.** An increase in resources is needed to better match the needs and requests of the legislators. A larger core project team is needed, increasing from its current size of 3.5 to around 15-20. Suggested roles include a deputy to the Secretary General responsible for delivery, a Finance Director, an Administrator, a Communications Manager and a lead for each workstream. A key appointment would be a Finance Director responsible for managing budgets and fund raising for the Commission's work. The number of staff assigned to each workstream could be: Natural Capital (3), Marine Ecosystems (3) and Forestry (7). This extra capacity is needed to prepare documents and tailored guidance to regions and countries.

**Long Term Strategic Planning.** The project's program is broad and consideration needs to be given to what areas should be focused on given the resources it is likely to have available. Long term strategic planning to work out objectives, priority activities, partners etc is needed so that the project is focussed on issues where the most impact can be made and where there is political will.

**Support to Developing Countries.** The work of the Commission is highly relevant to developing countries, both in terms of its approach of informing legislators of the science and bridging the science - policy gap and in terms of its selected workstream. However, the recommendations of the Commission tend to be challenging for developing countries to implement. More interaction with legislators between forums could be used to help make the outputs more relevant to developing countries. Another suggestion is to undertake case studies from countries at different stage of development to demonstrate how the Commission's recommendations can be adapted to suit a country's capacity and resources.

The project could provide invaluable additional help to developing countries, e.g., providing support to attend forums, for the development and introduction of domestic legislation, and for training.

# Table of Contents

---

1.	Overview of Evaluated Project .....	2
2.	Scope, Objective and Methods .....	4
2.1	Scope and methods .....	4
2.2	Objective .....	4
3.	Project Performance and Impact.....	6
3.1	A: Attainment of objectives and planned results .....	6
<b>3.1.1</b>	A1: Effectiveness.....	6
<b>3.1.2</b>	A2: Relevance .....	18
<b>3.1.3</b>	A3. Efficiency.....	19
3.2	B: Sustainability.....	20
<b>3.2.1</b>	B1: Financial resources.....	20
<b>3.2.2</b>	B2: Socio-political .....	21
<b>3.2.3</b>	B3: Institutional framework .....	22
3.3	C: Catalytic role and replication.....	23
<b>3.3.1</b>	Catalytic role.....	23
<b>3.3.2</b>	Replication approach.....	24
3.4	D: stakeholder participation/ public awareness .....	24
<b>3.4.1</b>	Stakeholder engagement .....	24
<b>3.4.2</b>	Public awareness activities .....	26
3.5	E: Country ownership/ drivenness.....	27
3.6	F: Achievement of outputs and activities.....	30
3.7	G: Preparation and readiness .....	35
3.8	H: Implementation approach and adaptive management.....	36
<b>3.8.1</b>	Implementation approach.....	36
<b>3.8.2</b>	Adaptive management .....	37
3.9	I: Monitoring and evaluation .....	38
<b>3.9.1</b>	M & E design .....	38
<b>3.9.2</b>	M & E implementation .....	38
<b>3.9.3</b>	Budgeting and funding for M & E activities.....	39
3.10	J: Financial planning and control.....	39
3.11	K: UNEP supervision and backstopping.....	41
4.	Conclusions and Ratings .....	41

5.	Lessons Learned .....	46
5.1	Timing .....	46
5.2	Project timeframe .....	46
5.3	The benefits of interdisciplinary working .....	46
5.4	The importance of scale .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
6.	Recommendations .....	47
6.1	Funding .....	47
6.2	Developing national level processes .....	47
6.3	Expand core team and skill set .....	48
6.4	Long term strategic planning .....	49
6.5	Support to developing countries.....	49
7.	Annexes .....	51
7.1	Annex 1: Stakeholder interviews.....	51
7.2	Annex 2: Documents reviewed.....	52
7.3	Annex 3: Project co-financing arrangements .....	53
7.4	Annex 4: Statement of project expenditure by activity .....	54
7.5	Annex 5: Survey of legislators.....	56
7.6	Annex 6: Associate evaluator's report.....	58
7.7	Annex 7: Overview of planned activities for the commission in Phase 2. ....	72
7.8	Annex 8: Views of legislators on the main barriers to implementing the commission's recommendations, and the priorities for Phase 2 .....	73
7.9	Annex 9: Terms of reference.....	75
7.10	Annex 10: The expertise of the evaluation team .....	92

### **Project Identification Table**

<b>GEF Project ID:</b> 3811 (GFL/2328-2715-xxxx; PMS: GF/3010-08-xx)
<b>Project duration:</b> 25 months
Commencing: November 2008
Completion: December 2010
<b>Country:</b> Global
<b>Project Title:</b> International Commission on Land Use Change & Ecosystems
<b>GEF Implementing Agency:</b> UNEP
<b>Other Executing partners:</b> Globe International
<b>GEF Strategic Objective:</b> BD2

## 1. Overview of Evaluated Project

1. The Global Legislators Organisation for a Balance Environment (GLOBE) is a network of legislators that brings together legislators, scientists, economists and policy experts to focus on developing coordinated legislation across the major economies. As country delegations are cross-party, the GLOBE process helps depoliticise issues and identify areas of policy consensus for governments/parliaments to advance legislation. By building cross-party support for progressive legislation on environmental issues, GLOBE can play a critical role in international efforts to conserve biodiversity. Historically, the GLOBE process has emphasized legislation and policies related to climate change and energy security. With the establishment of the GLOBE International Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystems, GLOBE has expanded its remit to policies related to land use change, sustainable management of marine ecosystems, the provision of ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation.
2. GLOBE is the only program focussed on members of parliament that addresses environmental issues. As such it can play a key role in securing political support for sustainable management options by bridging the gap between scientists and decision makers.
3. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment cited land use change as the most important factor contributing to ecosystem service degradation. This project, implemented by GLOBE, was driven by the need to more meaningfully engage legislators, as a key constituency, in the creation of a legislation that places a value on ecosystems and addresses the multiple challenges of land use change.
4. As stated in the project document the main objective of the project was to 'assist legislators and parliamentarians in a global discourse on developing regulatory tools and applied public policy to address land use change and ecosystem degradation'. More specifically, the project sought to:
  - Engage senior politicians from across the globe in the development of key regulatory and legislative measures to address land use change and its drivers.
  - Develop market incentives that will place a value on ecosystem services.
  - Incorporate environmental considerations into non-environmental legislation and policy making.
5. In November 2008 the project established a Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystems (hereafter referred to as 'the Commission'), comprised of senior legislators and key international figures. In the period from November 2008 to October 2010, the Commission's work was focused on three major workstreams: (1) tropical forests, (2) marine ecosystems, and (3) the valuation of natural capital. The adoption of these three workstreams was based on the interests of legislators involved in the GLOBE process, as well as expert advice.
6. Through the Commission the project has created a highly credible **policy development model**. The model involves legislators in direct dialogue with leading scientists, economists and policy experts as they jointly produce the Commission's policy positions. This has resulted in a set of high-level policy tools to support legislators in their efforts to address key drivers of ecosystems degradation in the marine environment and unsustainable land use change from deforestation that contribute to climate change and biodiversity loss. This collaborative policy



development process has enabled maximum interaction and avoided third party interpretation being presented to legislators.

7. In two years the project has successfully established a network of parliamentarians from almost 40 countries. GLOBE is leading the way in highlighting the important role legislators can play in the delivery of objectives related to sustainable natural resource use. Overall there has been significant engagement with legislators and a huge amount of interest. This interest has grown steadily through the project. The project's initial focus was on the G8+5 countries, however the Commission evolved to incorporate countries outside this group with important forest - and marine resources, while the CBD at Nagoya towards the end of the project period effectively opened up the Commission to all interested countries.
8. The project was executed through a cooperation agreement between UNEP GEF and the GLOBE. The total cost of the project, including co-financing and in-kind contributions, was US\$ 2,000,000.
9. Some of the key achievements of the project are summarized in Box 1.

#### **Box 1. What are the Commission's Greatest Achievements?**

**GLOBE Network established.** The project has successfully established a network of parliamentarians from 40 countries and has achieved a significant level of buy in and trust among legislators.

**Formal recognition of parliamentarians at Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).** Through GLOBE's efforts the CBD is the only convention that now formally recognizes parliamentarians as its own group. The CBD invited GLOBE to host the Nagoya Parliamentarians Forum during the CBD COP10 and invited legislators from 192 focal points. This provided GLOBE with a more inclusive platform and has increased its credibility. This is a strong platform on which to build.

**Development of Forestry Proposals.** In advance of the UNFCCC COP15 at Copenhagen 2010 GLOBE was instrumental in increasing the understanding of legislators on the role of tropical forests in climate change. It was able to get consensus across G20 on the rapidly developing field, setting the ground work for further progress on REDD+ at Cancun COP 16<sup>2</sup>.

**Marine Ecosystems.** The Commission worked with major fishing nations to reach a consensus on a **Marine Ecosystem Recovery Strategy** Part 1 (marine fisheries) and Part II (tropical coral reefs). The work of GLOBE was also instrumental in the **establishment of the largest Marine Protected Area (MPA) in the world** – Chagos Archipelago in the British territorial waters of the Indian Ocean, through the lobbying of GLOBE co-chairman Barry Gardiner MP.

**Natural Capital Program.** The Commission was successful in reaching agreement on its Natural Capital Plan in Nagoya. GLOBE International as part of the World Bank Partnership, announced at Nagoya 2010, to assist developing countries in the integration of the benefits provided by ecosystems into national accounts.

---

<sup>2</sup> Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD). REDD+ includes the role of forest conservation, sustainable management of forest and enhancement of carbon sinks.

## 2. Scope, Objective and Methods

### 2.1 Scope and methods

10. This evaluation was undertaken between November 2010 and January 2011. The evaluation included:
  - A desk-based review of GLOBE's technical reports and management records for the project period. A list of documents reviewed is provided in Annex 1;
  - Site visits to GLOBE, the Zoological Society London (ZSL), the London School of Economics (LSE) and interviews with key project staff and consultants - Adam Matthews, Chris Stephens, Barry Gardiner MP, Dr Jonathan Baillie (ZSL) Dr Natasha Pauli (ZSL) and Dr Sam Fankhauser (LSE);
  - In addition face to face meetings were held with Sir John Bourn and Lucky Sherpa MP.
  - Telephone interviews were held with Alex Rodgers (ZSL) and Steve Twomlow (UNEP). An overview of the interviewees undertaken for the evaluation is provided in Annex 2.
  - A survey questionnaire was emailed to all parliamentarians associated with the project in order to provide them with the opportunity to comment on the project's performance. The survey instrument is provided in Annex 5.
11. This evaluation covers Phase 1 of the project for the period October 29 2008 to 31 October 2010. A second phase of the project is anticipated, contingent on the success of Phase 1. For this reason the evaluation has placed a strong focus on identifying recommendations for a potential second phase.
12. The Evaluation was conducted by two evaluators, the Lead Evaluator (LE) and the Associate Evaluator. The Associate Evaluator focused on reviewing the Commission's policy frameworks and their relevance to developing countries. Her report is provided in Annex 6, and is referenced as appropriate in this main report.

### 2.2 Objective

13. The objective of this Terminal Evaluation is to examine the extent and magnitude of any project impacts to date and to determine the likelihood of future impacts.
14. The evaluation also assesses project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results.
15. Since this is an evaluation of the first phase of the project, emphasis has been placed on providing recommendations for improving in the next phase.
16. The evaluation addresses the following questions set out in the terms of reference (TOR)<sup>3</sup>:
  - The Project aimed to address the key drivers of ecosystem degradation and unsustainable land use through regulatory and legislative measures; did the Project succeed in defining the key drivers?

---

<sup>3</sup> These questions are addressed through the main evaluation presented in the main report and also in Annex 6 by the Associate Evaluator.

- Did the project improve understanding among legislators, finance ministers and heads of governments of the links between land use change and global environmental challenges?
- Did the project increase the capacity of legislators and policy makers to develop public policy responses in order to address problems of land use change and biodiversity loss?
- Has high level debate on land use change and ecosystem services increased as a consequence of the Project?
- Did the project succeed in developing new policy and legislative tools to address the problems of land use change and are there indications that the Commission's policy recommendations will be incorporated into national legislation?
- Has the Project succeeded in developing market incentives to place a value on ecosystem services?
- Did the project succeed in engaging 'new actors' in the development of policy recommendations for land use change?
- Has the project succeeded in identifying new directions or opportunities, and if so, what?
- What recommendations could be made to improve delivery / impacts / involvement of the legislators in similar future projects?
- Did the project meet the expectations of the legislative stakeholders? If not, what improvements could be made?
- What synergies does the project have with UNEPs Programme of Work?

### 3. Project Performance and Impact

17. This section provides the main evaluation of the project. As discussed in section 2, the analysis is based on a review of project documents and reports and interviews with project staff and stakeholders. The methodology follows that proposed by the Terms of Reference (Annex 9). The project was evaluated against eleven criteria as is standard for all GEF projects. A discussion of the project's performance against each criteria, A-K, is provided below.

#### 3.1 A: Attainment of objectives and planned results

18. This sub-section assesses the extent to which the project's major objectives were effectively and efficiently achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and their relevance. Project effectiveness is discussed in section 3.1.1, relevance in 3.1.2 and efficiency in section 3.1.3.

##### 3.1.1 A1: Effectiveness

19. In order to assess the effectiveness of the Project, the **Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI)** method has been adopted, as recommended in the Terms of Reference. This is the standard evaluation format for GEF projects and includes two main outputs: (i) an impact pathway analysis, and; (ii) a rating of the project's achievement of its outcomes and its progress towards intermediate states.

20. The ROtI process identifies project activities, outputs and outcomes and assesses the likelihood of project outcomes progressing through potential intermediate states to final desired impacts<sup>4</sup>. The primary aim of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and of GEF projects, is to achieve "**Global Environmental Benefits**" (GEBs) defined as: "*Lasting improvements in the status of an aspect of the global environment that safeguards environmental functioning and integrity as well as benefiting human society*". The ROtI's theory of change approach seeks to overcome the challenges of measuring impacts by identifying the sequence of **conditions** and **factors** deemed necessary to convert **project outcomes** into the ultimate impact.

21. GLOBE represents the first and only parliamentary body pushing the agenda on sustainable land use. Such a process is key to overcoming political barriers to sustainable resource use, and thereby promoting the development of environmental legislation. However it is challenging to assess the impact of this project within the ROtI framework for the following reasons:

- The project is essentially a **political initiative**, and it is difficult to therefore link the project through to an actual change in environmental status. The main objective of

---

<sup>4</sup> Under the ROtI framework the following definitions apply: **activities** are the practical, time bound actions that the project undertakes in order to achieve the desired project outputs (such as training workshops, technical advice, communications, research activities); **outputs** are the goods and services that the project must deliver in order to achieve the project outcomes, such as trained individuals or the formation of institutions; **outcomes** are the short to medium term **behavioural or systematic effects** that the project makes a contribution to (e.g., adoption of new practices, changes in attitudes and issues, improved institutional competency, implementation of a new revised policy). Outcomes are designed to achieve the project's impact.

the first phase of this project has been to bring a political audience together and to introduce them to the issues.

- Parliaments have a key role in driving legislation forward, but there are **multiple actors** involved. Therefore, it is hard to quantify the precise role of the Commission in influencing the policy debates in the large number of countries that this project influenced.
  - The **timescale** for advancing and implementing legislation is typically much greater than the two years that this project has been operational over. Furthermore, improvements in environmental status resulting from legislation are unlikely to be instant. Therefore, the true influence and impact of this project may well not become apparent for years to come.
  - The Commission includes a diverse set of countries, at different levels of development with a broad range of capacities to promote its recommendations. Therefore, while some countries have already been able to achieve changes in legislation on the back of the Commission's work, achieving change globally is a much more challenging and long term aspiration.
22. However, the ROtl methodology states "Projects that are a part of a long-term process need not at all be "penalized" for not achieving impacts in the lifetime of the project: the system recognizes projects' forward thinking to eventual impacts, even if those impacts are eventually achieved by other partners and stakeholders, albeit with achievements based on present day, present project building blocks."
23. The project has therefore been evaluated with these considerations in mind. The project has achieved a lot within two years and it has established the building blocks for making a very important contribution to the sustainable management of global environmental resources in the future.
24. An impact pathway analysis for the project is provided in Table 1. This analysis attempts to link the established project activities and outputs (synthesized from the project documents and interviews with project executants and key stakeholders) with the project outcomes and with the likely intermediate states required to secure a lasting and beneficial impact on the global environment. The project's results framework provides a list of activities, outputs and indicators. For the purposes of the ROtl analysis, 'indicators' have been renamed as 'outputs' and the 'outputs have been renamed as 'outcomes'. The Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) for 2009 and 2010 were also used to develop the impact pathway analysis. The analysis draws out the assumptions, drivers and risks that can influence the way in which project outcomes might – or might not – move towards having an impact. The approach therefore maps out the overall likelihood of the project achieving its intended *impact* based on an understanding of the outcomes realized by the project. Table 1 organizes the project activities under general activities and those related to the projects three key work streams – forestry, marine ecosystems and natural capital.

**Table 1. Outcomes to Impact Pathway**

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Assumptions / Intermediate state / Drivers	Impact
<b>General</b>				
Detailed mapping exercise to provide a clear basis from which the Commission will begin its work and to guide the Commission's policy recommendations.	Detailed mapping of legislation	<p>New 'actors' (legislators and parliamentarians) have engaged in the development of measures that will challenge our regulatory failure to address the scientific warnings outlined in the MEA and the inter-linkages with climate change</p> <p>Legislators are better informed and therefore more able to design and influence regulation</p>	<p><b>Intermediate state:</b> Development and implementation of key regulatory and legislative measures to address land use change and its drivers as well as to develop market incentives that will place a value on ecosystem services</p> <p><b>Assumptions:</b> National /Global agreement can be reached</p> <p>National GLOBE chapters have the resources and capacity to develop legislation domestically.</p> <p>Legislation, once passed, is enforced</p> <p><b>Drivers:</b> Global initiatives in PES and creation of markets in ecosystem services</p> <p>World Bank initiative on Natural Capital</p>	<p>Lasting improvements in, and reduced threat to the status of ecosystems, habitats, species and other life support systems</p>
Establishment of a high level international policy commission of senior legislators / parliamentarians and key international figures	The GLOBE International Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystems launched in November 2008.			
Recruitment of Chairman of International Standing	Achieved in Q1			
Creation of high level Advisory board on science and economics and subcontracts developed for scientific advisory boards	Appointment of scientific and economic advisors from the ZSL and LSE respectively. Early 2009			
Recruitment of Senior Technical Advisor to tie Commission and Chairman	Achieved Q1			
First Commission planning meeting April 2009	Shortlist of three terrestrial and three marine ecosystems was developed			
Rome Legislative Forum June 2009	Attended by 100 legislators from major economies and held in Italian Senate. Adopted 6 ecosystems			
Co-hosting of Parliamentarians and Biodiversity Forum at the	Presentation of final recommendations on forest			

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Assumptions / Intermediate state / Drivers	Impact
CBD COP10 in Nagoya, Japan.	policy and marine ecosystems to a large number of legislators from around the world, and endorsement of work on natural capital.			
<b>Forestry</b>				
<p>Commission meetings held in: Nairobi (July 2009), Pittsburgh (September 2009), GLOBE Legislators Copenhagen forum (October 2009), UNFCCC COP15 (hosted with the World Economic Forum)</p> <p>Production of briefing papers</p>	<p>Development of GLOBE Forestry Proposals (including policies on illegal logging)</p> <p>In Pittsburgh during the G20 meeting developed a public-private dialogue on forest financing</p> <p>COP15 Preparation of background legislative briefings relating to the science, economics and policy landscape of tropical forest and REDD.</p>	<p>Commission legislators agreed to advance recommendations within their own parliaments and to encourage the governments to support the adopted principles in international agreements.</p> <p>A number of the Commission's legislators played a central role in the improving and leading the legislation that was passed by the European Parliament in July 2010 on illegal logging.</p>	<p>Legislation on illegal logging passed by European parliament July 2010</p>	<p>Contribution to sustainable forestry practices</p>

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Assumptions / Intermediate state / Drivers	Impact
<b>Marine Ecosystems</b>				
<p>Establishment of Marine Technical Advisory Group (MTAG)  Meeting in London November 2009  Second session at GLOBE Copenhagen Forum (October 2009) highlighted the potential impacts of climate change on coral reefs  Presentation of latest scientific and socio-economic thinking  2010 identification of legislators to lead Commission's work on Marine Ecosystems  Creation of network of experts  GLOBE Japan Marine Fisheries Workshop (January 2010), UK Industry Stakeholders Workshop (March 2010), European Parliament Marine Fisheries Workshop (March 2010), meeting with staff from the US Senate Commerce Sub-Committee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries and Coastguard (April 2010) and consulting with GLOBE Korea (May 2010). GLOBE World Oceans Day Meeting held in London (June 2010), CBD COP10 Nagoya.  Briefing papers produced</p>	<p>Marine Technical Advisory Team established</p> <p>Part I of the GLOBE Marine Ecosystem Recovery Strategy: Marine Fisheries.</p> <p>Part II of the GLOBE Marine Ecosystems Recovery Strategy: Coral Reefs presented at the CBD COP10 in Nagoya.</p>	<p>Engagement of legislators on the marine environment.</p> <p>The Commission legislators who attended London meeting agreed to advance marine recommendations within their own parliaments and to encourage their governments to support the adopted principles in international fora.</p>	<p><b>Intermediate state</b></p> <p>Development and implementation of Marine Ecosystem Recovery Strategy</p> <p><b>Assumptions:</b>  National /Global agreement can be reached</p> <p>National GLOBE chapters have the resources and capacity to develop implement strategy domestically.</p> <p>Regulation and legislation, once passed, is enforced</p> <p><b>Drivers:</b></p>	<p>Lasting improvements in, and reduced threat to the status marine ecosystems, habitats, species and other life support systems</p>



Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Assumptions / Intermediate state / Drivers	Impact
<b>Natural Capital</b>				
Briefing sessions for legislators on the Valuation of Natural Capital	Introduction of Commissions approach, focussed on economic aspects on degradation to legislators	New 'actors' (legislators and parliamentarians) engaged at Nagoya  Increased understanding of legislators of the importance of valuing natural capital	<p><b>Assumptions:</b> Countries have the resources and expertise to value ecosystem services and implement the natural capital initiative; Ministries of Finance support the initiative</p> <p><b>Intermediate state:</b> Key ecosystem services are correctly valued and incorporated into national accounts / considered in decision making</p> <p><b>Drivers:</b> World Bank and other initiatives on Natural Capital valuation and accounting</p>	Lasting improvements in, and reduced threat to the status marine ecosystems, habitats, species and other life support systems
2010 identification of legislators to lead Commission's work on Natural Capital Creation of network of experts				
Co-hosting of Parliamentarians and Biodiversity Forum at the CBD COP10 in Nagoya, Japan.	Endorsement of work on natural capital.			

### Activities and outputs

25. Table 1 summarize the activities of the project and their related outputs over the past two years
26. Key outputs of the project include:
  - The establishment of the GLOBE's International Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystem in November 2008
  - The recruitment of Ian Johnson, the former Vice President for Sustainable Development at the World Bank and a leading international economist, as the technical chair of the Commission. Mr Ian Johnson's brought a wealth of experience to the project and his contributions were acknowledged and greatly appreciated by the legislators and core project staff.
  - The collaboration with the Zoological Society of London (ZSL) and the London School of Economics (LSE) and the subsequent establishment of marine and terrestrial technical advisory groups, which has ensured that the policy options developed for the Commission reflect the latest scientific understanding.
  - An impressive number of briefing papers have been produced by the Commission as listed in GLOBE's Final report. As an example the following briefing papers were produced for the forestry workstream: The Role of Terrestrial Carbon in Climate Change; The Economics of Avoided Deforestation; The State of Play of Forests in Climate Change Policy; Monitoring and Measuring Changes in Above Ground Biomass in Tropical Forest; and, Rewarding Local land Stewards for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation.
  - Presentation of final recommendations on forest policy and marine ecosystems to a large number of legislators from around the world, and endorsement of work on natural capital.

### Outcomes

27. The outcomes of the project have been comfortably achieved.
28. The project has achieved its high level ambition of **engaging new actors in the development of measures** to address the threats set out in the Millennium Ecosystems Assessment and the inter-linkages with climate change. Over the past two years GLOBE has established through the Commission a network of parliamentarians from over 40 countries, and has achieved a significant level of buy in and trust among legislators. The Commission has been able to engage legislators from relevant countries in all the policy areas of the Commission and to reach political consensus on key policy challenges. The CBD Nagoya meeting attracted new members to GLOBE. For example, Nepal, who have subsequently established a GLOBE chapter in Nepal.
29. The project has succeeded in **informing legislators such that they are more able to design and influence regulation**. The Commission has played a key part in informing and broadening the knowledge base of legislators of the issues. It has provided the necessary technical support to scrutinize national and international policy processes, and presented accessible briefing materials that have been very popular.
30. Notably the Commission has established a core group of legislators on the different policy areas that have become an international leadership group to advance thinking in the respective field. In some cases this has resulted in debates within their respective legislatures, committee hearings, meetings with ministers and heads of government

31. The project outcomes in general have *implicit forward linkages* to intermediary stages and impacts in that a network has been established and the capacity of legislators has been enhanced. In some cases there is evidence of the project's outcomes having a *definite and explicit forward linkage* to intermediary stages and impacts, as discussed below. However some legislators, particularly in developing countries, require more support to translate the recommendations of the Commission into concrete legislation in order to reap the associated environmental improvements. For this reason, the achievement of the project's outcomes has been rated 'B'- that is 'The project's intended outcomes were delivered, and were designed to feed into a continuing process, but with no prior allocation of responsibilities after project funding'.
32. Based on responses to the legislator's email survey undertaken for this evaluation most legislators felt that the project had been successful in meeting its objectives<sup>5</sup>. Box 2 provides evidence of legislator's support for the Commission's marine work.

**Box 2. Legislators Support for the Commission's Marine Work**

**Member of European Parliament Fisheries Committee**

"It is critical that legislators from around the world begin to work together to address the ongoing degradation of the marine environment. It is our responsibility to show political leadership to promote the conservation and restoration of our marine fisheries, coral reefs and coastal marine ecosystems. The GLOBE Marine Ecosystems Recovery Strategy is a powerful document that outlines what legislators can do to set our oceans on a path to a sustainable future".

**Chair, US Senate Finance Committee Sub-Committee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries and Coast Guard**

"Oceans and marine fisheries cannot be protected unilaterally, which is why GLOBE's meetings are so important. International Forums like GLOBE International are essential for achieving the protections the oceans desperately need".

**Member, US Senate Finance Committee Sub-Committee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries and Coast Guard**

"I applaud GLOBE's efforts to develop a Marine Ecosystems Strategy and support your four main themes of economic incentives, an integrated marine policy, high seas management, and ensuring compliance... As you move forward with your discussions today and beyond, I want to thank you again for all of your efforts as we seek to further our joint goals. You have my very best wishes for a successful meeting, and you have my support for your Recovery Strategy."

**Intermediate stage**

33. The **intermediate stage** indicates achievements that lead to Global Environmental Benefits, especially if the potential for scaling up is established. The intermediate stage reflects the fact that while the project has been successful in achieving its outcomes, which are defined as behavioural and /or systemic changes, there are

---

<sup>5</sup> Based on 7 survey responses, 5 legislators felt the project had been successful in achieving its objective, one respondent was not sure and there was one non-response.

intermediate steps required to transform the project outcomes into an ultimate impact.

34. The intermediate stage for this project is defined as – the development and implementation of key regulatory and legislative measures to address land use change and its drivers as well as to develop market incentives that will place a value on ecosystem services.
35. Success at the intermediate stage assumes that: national and global agreements can be reached; that National GLOBE chapters have the resources and capacity to develop legislation domestically, and; that once legislation is passed, it is enforced. Drivers contributing to the uptake and success of the intermediate stage include recent initiatives on natural capital and on sustainable management. Box 3 traces the collaboration of the World Bank and GLOBE on the Natural capital Initiative. The support of such high profile international organizations is an important driver facilitating the work of the Commission.

**Box 3. The Commission’s partnership with the World Bank in the promotion of the National capital Initiative.**

During the UNFCCC COP15 in Copenhagen in December 2009, a group of 15 GLOBE legislators met with Mr Bob Zoellick, President of the World Bank. GLOBE legislators highlighted the importance of integrating the true value of ecosystem services into policy making processes in order to achieve sustainable development and strongly urged the Bank to undertake an initiative on this area in time for Nagoya.

Following this meeting, Barry Gardiner MP and the GLOBE International Secretariat spoke with the leading experts on green national accounting in the World Bank’s Environment Department, Glenn-Marie Lange and Kirk Hamilton and also with the new Vice President for Sustainable Development, Ms Inger Andersen. GLOBE discussed previous attempts to promote green accounts and the important role that parliamentarians can play in future attempts to ensure that there is a twin engagement strategy with governments and parliaments. This is a component that was freely recognised as being lacking in previous attempts to embed green accounting in finance ministries. Often after the initial engagement, political attention has been focussed elsewhere resulting in limited policy application.

In Nagoya, the World Bank President launched the Global Partnership for Ecosystem Valuation and Wealth Accounting. This initiative will work with a leadership group of developing countries to provide them with the tools they need to integrate the economic benefits that ecosystems such as forests, wetlands and coral reefs provide, into national accounting systems. The goal is to introduce the practice of ecosystem valuation into national accounts at scale so that better management of natural environments becomes “business as usual”.

In a further meeting with GLOBE legislators in Nagoya, the World Bank President recognised the importance of ensuring a parliamentary track within this initiative and strongly referenced the need to engage legislators to compliment the initiative. As a result GLOBE International has been invited to be part of this partnership and to coordinate the parliamentary track of the initiative going forward. It is clear that the work of the Commission showed foresight and was able to make a strategic intervention one year ahead of the launch.

36. The concept of ‘fingerprinting’ the legislative outcomes of the Commission is inherently problematic considering the numerous and synergistic influences on legislation. However, the level and scope of political discourse achieved over the two years of its work, and the calibre and volume of the Commission’s policy outputs, indicate the positive contribution the International Commission has made to political

decision-making on issues of land use change and ecosystems. There remains enormous potential to strengthen this.

37. The scope of the Commission has been ambitious both in subject areas covered and the diversity of countries now involved in the process. Given that Phase 1 of the project has required a focus on setting up the network and establishing its credibility, it is encouraging that nonetheless examples of how the process can feed through to the development of legislation already exist upon which lessons can be drawn. Examples of the Commission's clear contribution to influencing legislation and policy development include:

- Illegal logging was a key part of GLOBE's Forest Policy Proposals and a number of the Commission's leading legislators played a central role in the improving and leading the legislation on illegal logging that was passed by the European Parliament in July 2010.
- Establishment of the largest Marine Protected Area (MPA) in the world – Chagos Archipelago in the British territorial waters of the Indian Ocean, through the lobbying of GLOBE co-chairman Barry Gardiner MP.
- Brazil's successes in climate legislation, marine policy and waste management legislation are elaborated on in Box 4.
- GLOBE UK provides an example of how the Commissions work can be followed up on domestically. Following the endorsement of the GLOBE Marine Ecosystems Recovery Strategy (MERS) Part I: Marine Fisheries, Barry Gardiner MP sent a letter and a copy of the recommendations to every UK MP with a coastal constituency. He also filed an Early Day Motion (EDM), which proposes that the UK government adopt the GLOBE recommendations, which has received 96 signatures from UK MPs (to date). The GLOBE World Oceans Day Meeting was also attended by Richard Benyon MP, UK Minister for the Natural Environment and Fisheries, who has since invited GLOBE to a meeting to discuss how these recommendations can be taken forward by the UK Government. Box 5 describes the role that GLOBE has played in influencing the development of the UK Natural Capital Programme.
- The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) Study was broadened to include coral and marine issues within its scope as a direct result of the Commission's policy papers in this area.
- The World Bank is engaging in a major initiative on the incorporation of the valuation of natural capital within government decision making. This initiative has been specifically advocated by the Commission and the GLOBE is part of this partnership (see Box 3).

#### **Box 4. GLOBE Brazil and the International Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystems**

GLOBE International's engagement with the Brazilian Congress began in 2006 during the "G8+5" climate change and illegal logging dialogues. As part of these processes, the Brazilian Congress hosted its first GLOBE meeting in February 2008, which was attended by Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, President of Brazil at the time. Following the launch of the GLOBE International Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystems in late 2008, the GLOBE Brazil chapter has gone from strength to strength and has engaged in a cross-party manner in all of the Commission's workstreams. There have been three particular successes where members of GLOBE Brazil have played an important role in improving the environmental policy in Brazil based on the Commission's work.

- Following the UNFCCC COP15 in late 2009, Brazil passed national climate change legislation that supported its Copenhagen commitments of voluntarily reducing its emissions by 36.1% to 38.9% by 2020 with the year 2000 as a baseline. Considering that 75% of Brazil's emissions come from deforestation, a central part of this target was the commitment to reduce the rate of forest loss by 80% by 2020. A number of leading members of GLOBE Brazil played a central role in gaining the cross-party political support that ensured that this legislation was adopted. These Brazilian legislators were involved in the Commission's workstream in 2009 on reducing tropical deforestation and have since cited GLOBE's work as an extremely helpful contribution to their domestic efforts.
- The second policy area where the Commission has supported GLOBE Brazil's efforts is the marine environment. The GLOBE World Oceans Day Meeting in London in mid-2010 was the first time that members of GLOBE Brazil had been brought into a policy dialogue on marine fisheries sustainability. Despite having no prior experience working on marine policy, the evidence and recommendations from this meeting inspired the members of GLOBE Brazil, led by Senator Serys Shessarenko, to create the "Permanent Mixed Commission on Oceans". This bicameral body consists of 11 deputies and 11 senators and has the responsibility to monitor and review Brazil's comprehensive oceans policy and laws, including the impact of climate change on the oceans, gas and petroleum exploration, ocean transport, coastal development and tourism, marine conservation areas, along with the fishing sector.
- GLOBE Brazil's third success highlights the positive spillover effects that GLOBE's cross-party approach can deliver. In August 2010, President Lula signed the country's new National Solid Waste Law after twenty years of deadlock in Congress. The bill was re-tabled and supported through Congress by GLOBE Brazil. This legislation calls for mandatory producer responsibility for a host of products, including electronics, lamps and batteries, and further strengthens Brazil's role as a regional leader in environmental matters. While waste management was not a focus topic of the Commission, the cross-party relationships formed through GLOBE Brazil's work enabled the three leading members (Senadora Serys, Senator Lucena (opposition) and Senator Casagrande) to jointly advance the legislation. They attributed this success directly to their engagement in the Commission and GLOBE.

**Sources:** GLOBE Climate Change Legislation Review; GLOBE Interview with Senadora Serys Shessarenko; Environmental Intelligence Analysis ([www.eiatrack.org/r/2230](http://www.eiatrack.org/r/2230))

**Box 5. From outcomes to impacts – An example of GLOBE’s role in the embedding Natural Capital in UK legislation**

Prior to the meeting in Nagoya, two leading members of GLOBE UK, Barry Gardiner MP and Zac Goldsmith MP, met with the UK Minister for the Natural Environment, Richard Benyon MP, to discuss GLOBE’s work on **natural capital** and specifically how the paper could be advanced. GLOBE’s recommendations were discussed with the Minister who confirmed that they would be taken into consideration in the **UK Government’s White Paper on the Natural Environment**.

Following the endorsement of the GLOBE **Natural Capital Action Plan** at the Nagoya Parliamentarians Forum, this document was sent to the UK Prime Minister, Rt Hon David Cameron MP, the UK Chancellor of the Exchequer, Rt Hon George Osborne MP, and the UK Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, Rt Hon Caroline Spelman MP.

The **UK Government’s White Paper on the Natural Environment** is due to be published in early 2011. At this stage GLOBE has influenced the Department for the Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) new business plan for 2011-15, which has been updated so that the White Paper objectives now include, “measures to value natural capital, complementing national accounts”. A senior DEFRA official has confirmed that this addition is due to GLOBE’s work on the topic. Further consideration is being given by the UK Treasury to the measures and ministerial level meetings are due to be held with GLOBE to discuss this in the coming months. The President of GLOBE, Lord Deben, was also invited to present the GLOBE recommendations to the top civil service oversight board of the White Paper. Considering that the White Paper will be a Government document, it will be supported by all government departments.

In parallel, GLOBE members have outlined the Natural Capital Action Plan in a debate on Nagoya. This had support from Members of Parliament from government and opposition parties, and was given further endorsement in Parliament by the responding Minister.

Most recently the **Environmental Audit Select Committee** invited the President of GLOBE, Lord Deben, to give evidence during a session on “embedding sustainable development across government”. Barry Gardiner MP spoke on his behalf and outlined the measures in the Natural Capital Action Plan to the Committee. GLOBE UK then sent a follow up letter to each MP on the Committee stressing the key messages of this work.

It is expected that as a result of this intervention that in early Spring 2011 the UK government will announce its intention to adopt many of the recommendations within the Natural Capital Action Plan.

38. Based on these achievements the project’s rating on progress towards intermediate states is rated a ‘A’ defined as: ‘The measures designed to move towards intermediate states have started and have produced results, which clearly indicates that they can progress towards the intended long terms impacts.’

**Impact**

39. The project impact relates to actual changes in environmental status. The impact of this project has been defined as ‘providing lasting improvements in, and reduced threat to the status of ecosystems, habitats, species and other life support systems’

**Summary of ROTI analysis**

40. Assessed against its original objectives, the Commission has been successful in the first two years of its existence, placing issues of ecosystems degradation and land use change on the agendas of key political actors within parliaments across the G20

and other critical nations, and making a great contribution to the appreciation of the issues by legislators from around 40 countries.

41. The Project has been rated in terms of its ability to achieve its outcomes and progress towards intermediate states as 'BA' i.e. highly likely to achieve impact.
42. This ranking assumes that continued support for the Commission will be forthcoming. It should be noted that for some countries the outcomes are insufficient to move towards the intermediate stages and to the eventual achievement of GEBs. This is because the capacity to develop environmental legislation and /or to value ecosystem services and incorporate natural capital into national accounting systems does not exist or is extremely limited. Follow up activities are required in these countries such as additional training and advice on how to develop legislation and /or develop a national natural capital initiative. Consideration also needs to be paid to the time frame to firstly develop legislation and secondly to realize the impact on that legislation on environmental improvement.

### 3.1.2 A2: Relevance

43. This part of the evaluation examines if the project's outcomes are consistent with the wider UNEP program objectives, focal areas and operational program strategies. The project is closely aligned to the major conventions – The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) as discussed below. Linking legislators to the key conventions is seen as a very positive step towards achieving the targets set out in these conventions. There is also scope to link to other conventions in the future such as the Convention of International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance.
44. **UNFCCC.** The initial six months of the project were focused on forest ecosystems in order to develop policy positions ahead of the UNFCCC COP15 in Copenhagen in 2009. The Project identified and promoted specific measures to help to reduce the destruction and conversion of forests.
45. **UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD):** As part of the Commission's work, GLOBE International developed a strong relationship with the CBD. Ahmed Djoghlaif, Executive Secretary of the CBD, therefore invited GLOBE to host the Nagoya Parliamentarians Forum during the CBD COP10 to ensure that legislators were at the heart of the deliberations in Nagoya, and to showcase and agree the final results of the Commission. The CBD invited legislators from 192 focal points to COP10 in Nagoya 2010. This has provided GLOBE with a more inclusive platform and has increased its credibility. Through GLOBE's efforts the CBD is the only convention that now formally recognizes parliamentarians as its own group. This is a strong platform on which to build.
46. Furthermore, the GLOBE Commission was keen to strengthen the role of parliamentarians in the formal Convention and to provide them with a stronger mandate to help achieve the objectives of the CBD. The Commission, through its Co-chairs, lobbied the CBD Secretariat and key CBD Focal Points to include three sections of text in the "Updating and revision of the Strategic Plan for the post-2010 period" document that was formally adopted at the CBD COP10. The following extracts from Section V "Implementation, Monitoring, Review and Evaluation" were added as a result of GLOBE's efforts:

*"Broadening political support for this Strategic Plan and the objectives of the Convention is necessary, for example, by working to ensure that Heads of State and Government and the*



*parliamentarians of all Parties understand the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services. Parties to the Convention should be encouraged to establish national biodiversity targets that support the achievement of the Strategic Plan and its global targets and outline the measures and activities that will achieve this, such as the development of comprehensive national accounting, as appropriate, that integrates the values of biodiversity and ecosystem services into government decision-making with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities and other stakeholders.”*

*“Parliamentarians, by responding to the needs and expectations of citizens on a regular basis, should play a role in reviewing the implementation of the Convention at the national and sub-national levels, as appropriate, to help governments produce a more comprehensive review.”*

*“... and promoting the engagement of parliamentarians, including through inter-parliamentary dialogues will contribute to the implementation of the Strategic Plan.”*

47. **Links with other GEF/UNEP projects:** The Commission has acted as a reference point / political testing ground for recommendations generated by key international studies, namely the GEF/UNEP Payment for Ecosystem Services Project, the UNEP and German Government’s TEEB study on The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity and the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), as well as the consortium of international organizations to follow-up on the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, including its network of sub-global assessments.

48. The project’s relevance is rated as Highly Satisfactory (HS).

### 3.1.3 A3. Efficiency

49. The project cost US\$2 million. Project co-financing amounted to around US\$1.1 million, including in-kind contributions of around US\$581,000 (see Section 3.10 and Annex 3) relating to recorded time given on a *pro bono* basis. This is considered to be an underestimate of the actual unpaid time provided by a range of experts to the commission.

50. The project has a small core team consisting of 3.5 people, which has helped to keep costs low. Furthermore the project has built up a strong cadre of senior advisors and members who provide services to GLOBE at below cost and/or on a *pro bono* basis. These include experts drawn from industry, financial and management consultancy firms, former World Bank staff, academia and legislators. Given the level of in-kind contributions from senior and experienced individuals the project has been highly cost effective. People’s willingness to work on a *pro bono* basis is due to their support for the initiative and the desire to engage with legislators. Some examples of *pro bono* activities are provided below.

51. The greatest unremunerated contribution to the Commission has been from Ian Johnson, the Commission Chair. Over the life of the project, Ian has contributed around 40 days of work to the Commission. In addition to his own time, Ian has leveraged in considerable technical and political support from his network to support the work of the Commission.

52. A short paper on the **role of terrestrial carbon in climate change** was written by the ZSL based on documents provided by the Terrestrial Carbon Group (TCG) for the Pittsburgh Commission Meeting. The TCG is an internationally renowned group of specialists from science, economics, and public policy with expertise in land

management, climate change and markets. This contribution to the Commission's efforts was obtained *pro bono*

53. A paper on the State of Play of Forests on Climate Change Policy was written by the GLOBE International Secretariat in collaboration with the Global Canopy Programme (GCP). This document provides a succinct summary and analysis of the international, regional and national efforts related to including forests in climate change policy. GCP are the authors of a series of short books on climate change policy, including The Little REDD(+) Book and The Little Climate Finance Book, and agreed to help create a useful legislators' summary of The Little REDD+ Book to provide the Commission with a view of the latest developments in REDD policy and to help identify good practice. GLOBE International benefited from the existing, high quality work carried out by GCP in analysing the international, regional and national efforts related to including forests in climate change policy. In addition, copies of GCP's short books were distributed to the Commissioners. This contribution to the Commission's efforts was obtained *pro bono*.
54. The project's efficiency is rated as Highly Satisfactory (HS).

## 3.2 B: Sustainability

55. In the context of this evaluation, sustainability has been taken to relate to the probability of continued long term project derived outcomes and impacts if funding of Phase 2 is not forthcoming or of a sufficient level. Three aspects of sustainability are addressed below financial, socio-political and institutional frameworks. The project anticipated a high sustainability payoff in cases where new legislation and regulations are introduced at the national level, where strong presence at the biodiversity COP results in enlightened and informed global public policy, or where public policies shift in countries. Over all the project is rated as ML (Moderate Likely), that is there are moderate risks that affect the sustainability of the project.

### 3.2.1 B1: Financial resources

56. The project has been highly successful in establishing a forum for legislators and in developing recommendations with legislators that have been broadly endorsed. However, greater financial resources and security is required in the future to build on the project's achievements in Phase 1.
57. The core project team needs to expand as there is considerable pressure on existing resources. Although this pressure has been managed by GLOBE over the project period under evaluation this is likely to become harder in the future, *if* Phase 2 is to move beyond the successes of Phase 1.
58. Many chapters, especially from developing countries lack the resources to take the next step and set up the processes needed to integrate the recommendations into domestic legislations and policies. Additional support in these countries is essential therefore if national legislations is to be developed in support of sustainable resource management.
59. Each of the Commission's three policy workstreams has become an independent GLOBE programme and GLOBE is in discussion with a number of potential funding partners for each programme. The **GLOBE Legislator Forest Initiative** has already received seed finance from the German Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). GLOBE is further talking to the UK Department for International

Development (DfID), the Norwegian International Climate and Forest Initiative (NICFI), the UN-REDD programme, the Climate and Land Use Alliance (CLUA) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

60. Following the Commission's work on **natural capital**, GLOBE has been invited to be part of the World Bank's Wealth Accounting and Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES) partnership and is exploring funding opportunities through this. The Commission's **marine programme** will focus on the reform of the EU's Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) and GLOBE is in discussion with the Oak Foundation and the Prince Albert II of Monaco Foundation about potential funding.
61. While there are a number of potential sources for new funds, additional financial resources are considered to be necessary for the Phase 2 to be effective, and therefore need to be secured. The impact of financial resources on sustainability is rated 'Moderately Likely' – there are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

### 3.2.2 B2: Socio-political

62. Stakeholders (legislators) are on the whole very keen to take ownership of GLOBE outcomes, however as discussed many key countries face financial and capacity limitations and will be unable to progress the recommendations of the Commission in their own countries without additional support.
63. The risk of losing legislators due to general elections always exists; however, GLOBE is experienced in managing this by working with a broad group of legislators.
64. As evidence of stakeholder awareness and support for the long term objectives of the project, legislator's responses to the Commission's Natural Capital Initiative have been used as an example (Box 6).

**Box 6. Support from Legislators for GLOBE's Natural Capital Initiative....**

**Naoto Kan (Prime Minister, Japan).** The Japanese Prime Minister, Naoto Kan, addressed the Nagoya Parliamentarians Forum and endorsed GLOBE's efforts to integrate the value of natural capital into government policy making processes. In addition, Takeshi Maeda, President of GLOBE Japan, is the Chair of the Diet's Upper House Budget Committee and presented the recommendations to this group of legislators.

**Perry Chanda MP (Zambia, Chair of the Energy and Environment Committee).** "In developing countries, it can be difficult to get policies on nature conservation implemented because of limited budgets. Evidence of the economic and social benefits of these policies could help to convince finance committees to fund these policies, as suggested by GLOBE."

**Ahmed Djoghlaif (Executive Secretary, CBD).** "As legislators and parliamentarians...you have three core mandates in support of the Parties you represent – mandates that make your engagement in the finalization and implementation of the 2011-2020 biodiversity strategy both something we cannot do without, and a deep responsibility. First, you turn the decisions and goals of the Convention into laws and regulations at all levels of government. Second, you monitor the implementation of biodiversity plans and programmes of their respective governments in a "watchdog" function. And third, through their regular exchanges with constituents and during elections, you gauge voters' needs and expectations related to biodiversity, and translate those trends into laws, supporting national governments in implementing the Convention."

**....and Plans to implement the Natural Capital Initiative.**

**Baijayant 'Jay' Panda MP (Indian Rajya Sabha).** "India is taking a major step forward in accepting the report on The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity. Our Prime Minister is about to commit India to having a national accounting system for natural capital. The GLOBE network has been vocal in promoting the merits of this approach to better manage our natural assets."

**Winifred Masiko MP (Ugandan National Assembly).** "I agree with the GLOBE recommendations. Our auditor general should be directed to undertake an environmental audit on national policies, so that we can see how effectively our natural capital is being used in public policy decisions. Better decisions might be made if we knew more about the economic value of natural capital."

**Irene Depute Neto (Angola, President of the Finance Commission).** "I am convinced that in order to develop Angola's economy, environmental sustainability must be ensured. We plan to follow GLOBE's recommendations and consider how the value of our forests and freshwater systems might be affected by development, and ensure that we do not lose valuable natural capital in the process."

**Source:** Transcript of interventions in Nagoya Forum

65. The socio-political sustainability of the project is rated Moderate Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

**3.2.3 B3: Institutional framework**

66. The project has set up an institutional framework to spearhead the development of environmental legislation. This framework needs to be maintained and developed. Institutional, legal and governance structures are also needed at the domestic levels for environmental policies, legislations and regulations to be passed and enforced. In some countries such structures are under developed limiting the ability to translate the recommendations produced at the global level meetings into nationally tailored policy and law. Additional support is required to assist such countries to develop their legal and governance structures. The implications of the institutional framework on the sustainability of the project is rated ML.

### 3.3 C: Catalytic role and replication

#### 3.3.1 Catalytic role

67. The project is the only forum for parliamentarians addressing issues of land use change and ecosystems. Its innovative approach has been successful in demonstrating how new approaches can work towards increasing the likelihood of attaining global environmental benefits.
68. The project was designed to play a key role in promoting **institutional change**, by informing legislators on the risks facing the global environment and working with them to develop consensus solutions to these problems. The project was extremely successful in communicating and educating legislators on issues that some were poorly informed on such as coastal acidification and coastal bleaching.
69. In a fair number of cases the work of the Commission have contributed to **new legislation and policy changes** as discussed in Section 3.1.1. In the case of the legislation passed on illegal logging, many legislators are keen to take this legislation further. The recent legislation bans illegally-harvested timber at the first placement on the market, but does not prohibit its onward sale along the supply chain. Therefore, a number of the Commission legislators are now looking to pass further national legislation in order to further reduce the trade of illegal timber in key EU member states.
70. The project has had some success in catalyzing **follow-on financing** from Government and/ or other donors. Germany has committed funding and the UK is considering providing funding. There will also be support going forward for the three Parliaments who will host regional forestry process in Phase 2 (i.e., Brazil, Indonesia and Cameroon).
71. The project has had many 'project champions' who have recognized the impact the process could have in facilitating the sustainable management of the global environment, and contributed to the project's success in its initial two years. Box 7 provides just three examples.

### Box 7. Key Project Champions

**Serys Shhessarenko (Brazil Senate):** Senadora Serys, the Vice-President of the Brazilian Senate and President of GLOBE Brazil, has been at forefront of advancing the Commission's recommendations nationally across the range of policies covered by the Commission. She was instrumental in passing the national legislation on climate change (2009) and solid waste (2010), along with creating the bicameral "Permanent Mixed Commission on Oceans" (2010). See more in the GLOBE Brazil summary.

**Satu Hassi and Caroline Lucas (European Parliament):** These two leading members of GLOBE EU were at the centre of the European Parliament's efforts to strengthen the "due diligence" regulation on illegal logging that the European Commission published in 2008. During 2010, these two MEPs regularly consulted with the Commission Co-Chair, Barry Gardiner MP, regarding the best approach to create effective illegal logging legislation. Although the final version of the legislation does not include a prohibition right across the supply chain, the significant progress made in creating a ban at first placement within the EU can be strongly attributed to the GLOBE EU MEPs acting on the recommendations of the Commission.

**Akhmad Muqowam (Indonesian House of Representatives):** GLOBE Indonesia was formed as part of the Commission's activities with Akhmad Muqowam being appointed as the inaugural President. This was the first time that a cross-party group from both Indonesia's Houses in Congress has been engaged in an international dialogue to discuss environmental policy. This group's interaction with world class experts and other legislators from around the world has fed directly into the development of Indonesia's policies for the sustainable management of their forests and marine ecosystems.

### 3.3.2 Replication approach

72. The successes of Phase 1 could be replicated in a broader range of countries in Phase 2, and scaled up. The success of Phase 1 is anticipated to increase the demand from countries and (their legislators) who didn't participate in the first phase. It would also be possible to scale up the effort through focussed national or regional processes. GLOBE is already considering with the Chairman long term replication and sustainability.
73. The legislators attending the GLOBE meetings are those that are interested in the subject. A key challenge is for these legislators to convince their Executive Government to take up the recommendations. The National capital Initiative stresses the need to convince Ministries of Finance / Treasury. Furthermore to incorporate the recommendations comprehensively in most countries a lot of trained staff would be required.
74. The project's catalytic role and replication approach has been rated Satisfactory (S).

## 3.4 D: stakeholder participation/ public awareness

### 3.4.1 Stakeholder engagement

75. *'The staff working on this project did a wonderful job and should be commended for their organization and hard work'.*

*'This project was excellent in drawing together the issues and the science'.*

**Source:** Email survey of parliamentarians.

76. Stakeholders have been keen to engage in the process, which they have found effective in terms of information dissemination and bringing legislators up to spend on complex global environmental issues.
77. Early on in the Commission's development it became apparent that it was too demanding to work with just one set of legislators across all of the Commission's policy areas. In order to strengthen the deliberations leadership groups of legislators were created in the different policy areas. For example, for the development of the Marine Ecosystems Recovery Strategy: Part I Marine Fisheries, Commissioners were selected that have direct responsibility as Committee Chairs, or policy leads on fisheries issues within their respective legislature. When deliberations of the Commission were complete the recovery strategy was then circulated widely within the GLOBE network and formally presented to the Legislators Forum.
78. As discussed above, the Commission's initial objective was to focus on G8+5, but the Commission's broad workstream allowed GLOBE to reach out to a number of countries of particular relevance. For example, the forestry workstream included a number legislators from rainforest nations (e.g., Colombia and DRC) while the marine fisheries meeting included legislators from West African states (e.g., Senegal and Sierra Leone). The expansion of the network as the project evolved brought the rich and varied experiences to the Commission's deliberations. The GLOBE CBD Parliamentarians and Biodiversity Forum at the CBD COP10 in Nagoya, Japan, was the first time that GLOBE was responsible for convening legislators at a UN Convention. This gave all countries that are Party to the Convention the opportunity to send a legislator to attend the event and take part in developing the GLOBE Natural Capital Action Plan.
79. The collaboration of legislators and scientists through the project process has resulted in clear benefits to both parties. Legislators have been able to work with top scientific and economic experts and have been presented up to date information in an accessible format, while scientists have had the opportunity to learn about the priorities of legislators and their requirements. Box 8 summarises the views of legislators on the successes and usefulness of the Commission, based on the email survey of legislations undertaken for this evaluation.

### **Box 8. The Views of Legislators on the success and usefulness of the Commission**

#### **Legislator's Views on the Commission's greatest achievement**

- Raising the issue of natural capital within government and the importance of integrating natural capital into national accounting frameworks
- The focus on involving all the relevant actors that can achieve a change in the concept of the economic value of ecosystems and biodiversity
- Engaging decision makers on the issues of the preservation of marine biodiversity, and raising these issues to the heart of the concerns of legislators
- Developing strong science based material on land use change and ecosystems, bringing together the team to present the facts & then presenting possible solutions.
- Producing an attractive and informative set of reports and policy documents laying down its political vision, and succeeding at gathering a substantial critical mass of parliamentarians behind its initiatives
- The project served as a school on a new set of issues for legislators
- Putting on the top of decision makers agenda the importance of urgent action on issues that were peripheral before

#### **Legislator's views on what aspects of the Commissions work was most useful**

- The setting of a timely agenda, which enabled the government to give its full support to GLOBE Japan and GLOBE international
- The opportunity given to legislators to know and discuss biodiversity and ecosystems through the organisation of international events
- Being on the commission from the start allowed a skill level to develop.
- The material presented was very valuable in developing ongoing presentations & speeches to be used domestically
- Marine Ecosystem recovery matters and the role of forestry in mitigating climate change
- The possibility to listen to the presentation of arguments based on facts and science by scientists dedicated to the study of these matters as well as the interaction between different countries and the sharing of their experiences and points of views.
- Setting out the relationship between ecosystems and livelihoods and the role of public policy in developing an integrated approach to Ecology, Economics and Politics

**Source:** Email Survey of Legislators

80. Legislators have in general been very enthusiastic about the presentations and what they have learnt. However, a consistent concern / constraint is the lack of capacity they face and this can block their enthusiasm. Requests from legislators for additional support from GLOBE are common, such as to provide translation and additional training and expert support, but GLOBE has not been resourced to provide this at Phase 1 of the project. A key challenge for the project has been to meet the demands for legislators. There are also a number of recommendations regarding membership of the Commission going forward (see Annex 8).

#### **3.4.2 Public awareness activities**

81. There has been international media coverage of the Commission's outputs and meetings as documented in GLOBE's final report. A focus of the project was securing media coverage and referencing following its meeting in Nagoya during the CBD COP10, in which it was successful. For example, the World Bank referred to GLOBE International in its press release announcing the launch of its global partnership on



green national accounts, and the BBC reported on GLOBE's natural capital plan launched in Nagoya.

82. According to GLOBE's Final Report, innovative forms of communication have also been deployed through communicating through legislators in parliaments, the production of a 'Commission Video' and through the publication of a children's book and cartoons. The Commission has also acted to raise awareness within mainstream media in key countries.
83. The Commission has involved as much media as it can, but doesn't pay for media monitoring. In terms of public awareness GLOBE's focus is to inform the public of the role of legislators in environmental protection.
84. The performance of the project in terms of stakeholder participation and public awareness has been rated as Highly Satisfactory (HS).

### 3.5 E: Country ownership/ drivenness

85. The level of country ownership is considered to be high. The project was effective in providing and communicating information on land use management, ecosystem services and biodiversity that catalyzed action in participating countries to improved decision making. The briefings provide by the project were very popular with the legislators offering accessible information on subjects that some legislators had had little previous exposure to. The workstreams selected were highly relevant to developing and developed countries alike (see Annex 6 for details on relevance of workstreams and policies to developing countries).
86. The GLOBE International network now includes national chapters in 18 countries, where a cross-party group of legislators meets regularly to discuss both national legislation and appropriate action within the relevant UN conventions. There are sixteen GLOBE chapters from the G20 countries (UK, France, Germany, Italy, European Union, Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Japan, South Korea, China, India, Indonesia, Russia, South Africa and the USA). Three of these were established during the Commission's timeframe (Mexico, Indonesia and South Africa) and a number (including Brazil) were strengthened by their involvement in the Commission. In addition to the G20 chapters, GLOBE national chapters exist in Colombia and Nepal; these were both formed during the Commission's lifespan.
87. Following the finalisation of **GLOBE's Forestry Policy Proposals in 2009**, the Commission legislators agreed to advance these recommendations within their own parliaments and to encourage their governments to support the adopted principles in international agreements. To support these efforts, a considerable number of background *Legislator Briefing Papers* were prepared for the Commission relating to the science, economics and policy landscape of tropical forests and REDD.
88. The culmination of GLOBE's **marine fisheries policy development** was the GLOBE World Oceans Day Meeting held in London (June 2010), which resulted in the final version of Part I of the GLOBE Marine Ecosystem Recovery Strategy: Marine Fisheries. The Commission legislators who attended this meeting agreed to advance these recommendations within their own parliaments and to encourage their governments to support the adopted principles in international fora.
89. Examples of how specific countries have used the information and recommendations of the Commission are provided in Box 9. However, there is a certain level of

frustration by some countries who, faced with little support following the international meetings, are unable to progress the Commission's recommendations domestically.

**Box 9. Examples of how Legislators have contributed to & progressed the work of the Commission**

**GLOBE Japan** raised the profile of the Commission's work with the Japanese Government, the host country for COP10, in order to generate maximum support for 'GLOBE COP10 Parliamentarians and Biodiversity Forum.' GLOBE Japan is in frequent contact with the relevant people in Government to share the work of GLOBE. However more time is required to integrate the Commission's policy recommendations into legislation. GLOBE Japan is functioning as a platform of cross party discussion on environmental issues and has established several law-maker initiated legislation like the Biodiversity Act.

**Mexico: All Commission topics**

GLOBE Mexico's Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystems (Comisión de Cambio de Uso de Suelos y Ecosistemas) is co-chaired by Senator Francisco Castellón and Deputy Ignacio Pichardo. It is one of the three commissions that were simultaneously established with the Mexican Chapter of GLOBE International.

Deputy Pichardo represented the Commission at the meeting organized by GLOBE International and UNEP to agree on a Marine Ecosystems Recovery Strategy. London 2010. In subsequently presented the results of the meeting to GLOBE Mexico. Nationally, GLOBE Mexico recently held a two day forum titled "Forests, a National Project", where different stakeholders including legislators from all political parties, government representatives, civil society, academy and indigenous people expressed their opinion, proposals and concerns on these issues. The Forum's objective was to collaboratively develop an integrated national forestry project that protected and increased forest land, transforming Mexican forests in a sustainable development engine locally, regionally and nationally.

On November 24, GLOBE Mexico held a meeting with civil society to promote a dialogue on Climate Change and COP 16. One of the topics of the forum was agriculture, forests and rural territories, where representatives of different social organizations held a dialogue with members of GLOBE Mexico's Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystems. The results of the forum will serve as a building block for GLOBE Mexico's activities post COP 16.

**Suseno Sukoyono (Secretary General, GLOBE Indonesia).** 05/07/10. "With regard to policy development in Indonesia, I would like to kindly share with you that on 6<sup>th</sup> – 9<sup>th</sup> July, our Ministry will conduct a coordination forum on fisheries resources management. The meeting will focus on the topics that we discussed at GLOBE meeting last month. The forum will be participated by representative institution from both central and local government, universities, researcher, association, NGOs and Industry'

**Albert Tarawali MP (Sierra Leone and APPEL<sup>6</sup>).** Informed APPEL of GLOBE International and its work at their Annual Executive Conference 2010. APPEL subsequently expressed their willingness to collaborate on the issues.

**EU/Greece: Fisheries.** Hon Costas Cartalis MP of Greece presented the GLOBE Marine Ecosystems Recovery Strategy Part I: Marine Fisheries to Maria Damanaki, the EU Commissioner for Fisheries, and recommended that she integrate the recommendations into the upcoming reform of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP).

**Sri Lanka: Natural Capital.** A.H.M. Azwer MP from Sri Lanka will present the GLOBE Natural Capital Action Plan to the Sir Lankan Parliament and he will recommend that they ratify the declaration.

---

6 APPELL is the Alliance of Parliamentarians and Local Elected Representatives for the Protection of the Environment on the Coast of West Africa

90. The performance of the project in terms of country ownership / Drivenness has been rated as Highly Satisfactory (HS).

### **3.6 F: Achievement of outputs and activities**

91. Table 2 summarizes the projects programmed activities and comments on the quality and timeliness of their delivery. Overall, the project has delivered on all its programmed activities in a timely and effective manner, and the project is rated Highly Satisfactory in terms of its achievement of proposed outputs and activities.

**Table 2. Summary of Programmed Activities and their Implementation by the Project**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Implementation status as of 30 October 2010 (%)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Activity 1: Creation of International Commission on Land Use Change & Ecosystems	100%	The International Commission was convened at the UNEP offices on Nairobi, Kenya July 2009. Within the Commission's structure, there are now three workstreams: Forestry, the Marine Environment (both marine fisheries and coral reefs) and Natural Capital
Activity 2: Recruitment of Chairman of International Standing	100%	Mr Ian Johnson was appointed late 2008. Mr Johnson is the former Vice President of Sustainable Development at the World Bank and is extremely well qualified to guide the technical work of the Commission in each of its workstreams.
Activity 3: Creation of high level Advisory Boards on Science and Economics & Subcontracts developed for Scientific Advisory Board	100%	<p>The Zoological Society of London (ZSL) was contracted as the convening body for the scientific advisory working group to the Commission and a Terms of Reference was signed in April 2009. The Chief Terrestrial Scientific Advisor from ZSL is Professor Jonathan Baillie, the Director of Conservation Programmes at ZSL. The Chief Marine Scientific Advisor is Dr Alex Rogers, a Fellow at the Institute of Zoology.</p> <p>In order to support Professor Baillie and Dr Rogers, ZSL recruited two full-time staff to work directly for the Commission. Dr Natasha Pauli was appointed as the Terrestrial Scientific Advisor to the Commission and Dr Simon Harding was appointed as the Marine Scientific Advisor to the Commission. ZSL recruited two interns to assist the scientific advisors, Miss Elizabeth Clark and Miss Anisha Grover, who worked on the marine and terrestrial programmes, respectively, and have subsequently been taken on as paid research assistants.</p> <p>In May 2009, GLOBE International recruited Dr. Sam Fankhauser from the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment at the London School of Economics (LSE) as GLOBE's Chief Economist.</p>

Activity	Implementation status as of 30 October 2010 (%)	Comments
		Commission Chairman, ZSL and LSE have coordinated the involvement of advisors of the highest level in the Commission's various workstreams.
Activity 4: Recruitment of Senior Technical Advisor to the Commission & Chairman	100%	<p>Due to the broad range of policy topics being covered by the Commission and the decision to create specific groups of legislators to address each of these areas, the GLOBE International Secretariat needed to recruit a second member of staff to assist the Commission Director. In January 2010, the Commission's Policy Advisor was recruited (following a 6-month internship) and took responsibility of managing the Commission's work on the marine environment.</p> <p>In addition to the Commission Director and Policy Advisor, the GLOBE International Secretariat has recruited six interns to contribute to the work of the Commission. The combined commitment from the GLBOE interns is 18 months of work.</p>
Activity 5: Quarterly Meetings of the Commission	100%	Due to the geographic spread and high workloads of the Commissioners, it was unrealistic to have quarterly meetings of the entire Commission. However, the Commission core team met on a quarterly basis and the GLOBE International Secretariat arranged regular communication with the other legislators. The Commission actually met on multiple occasions but specific leadership groups of legislators on particular issues were developed.
Activity 6: Commission working groups to meet as needed / demanded by Commissioners	100%	The Commission's structure evolved into three workstreams, as described previously. Each of these policy-focused programmes were timed and designed to respond and feed into an ongoing UN process. This staggered approach (as outlined in Annex 1) allowed for considerable learning to take place between each of the workstreams. In addition, it meant that policy approaches (e.g. the phased approach proposed for REDD+ financing could be adopted to address other ecosystem degradation).

Activity	Implementation status as of 30 October 2010 (%)	Comments
Activity 7: Development of communications strategy	100%	The main Commission communications took place in Nagoya. Communication of the work of the Commission has taken place at key meetings.
Activity 8: Development of nationally focused parliamentary engagement for Commissioners	100%	<p>The Commission relies up on the ever-increasing GLOBE International network to improve national level support for the Commission. This network is continually being strengthened with a particular focus on broadening the political base in the major emerging economies, who are key constituents in the Commission's ongoing work.</p> <p>The GLOBE International network now includes national chapters in 18 countries, where a cross-party group of legislators meets regularly to discuss both national legislation and appropriate action within the relevant UN conventions.</p> <p>In addition, to the formal national GLOBE chapters, the Commission's broad workstream has allowed GLOBE to reach out to a number of countries that are of particular relevance to the workstreams. For example, the forestry workstream included a number legislators from rainforest nations (Colombia, DRC etc) while the marine fisheries meeting included legislators from West African states (Senegal, Sierra Leone etc). The GLOBE CBD Parliamentarians and Biodiversity Forum at the CBD COP10 in Nagoya, Japan, was the first time that GLOBE was responsible for convening legislators at a UN Convention. This gave all countries that are Party to the Convention the opportunity to send a legislator to attend the event and take part in developing the GLOBE Natural Capital Action Plan.</p>
Activity 9: Independent evaluation of Project	80%	The Project Final Report is completed. A draft Terminal Evaluation is available (this report).

Activity	Implementation status as of 30 October 2010 (%)	Comments
Activity 10: Development of Climate Change policy	100%	<p>Two of the Commission's work streams are particularly relevant to climate change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forest Policy Proposals. This document included recommendations on how to integrate forest carbon into the post-2012 international climate change agreement. This was endorsed in October 2009 (100%).</li> <li>• Action Plan for Coral Reef. In 2009, the Commission raised considerable awareness regarding the impact of climate change on tropical coral reefs. In 2010, the Commission is developing a strategy to boost the resilience of coral reefs, which will be finalised in Nagoya in October 2010 (70%).</li> </ul>
Activity 11: Administration of Project & Commission	90%	The first project phase has been completed and the terminal evaluation has begun.

**Source:** Based on PIR FY10 and assessment of lead evaluator.



92. Table 3 outlines the Commission's major events over the project period and their key outcomes. The Commission reported in advance of the UNFCCC COP in Copenhagen, the Convention on Biodiversity COP in Japan in 2010 and to finance ministers and G8 leaders. In addition interim reports were submitted twice yearly to a Forum of over one hundred senior legislators from the G8 and +5 countries (Brazil, China, India, Mexico & South Africa).

**Table 3: Timeline and Outcomes of Major Commission Events**

Timeline	Event	Outcomes
<b>Planning Stage</b>		
November 2008	GLOBE Americas Legislators Forum in Mexico City	Official launch of the Commission
June 2009	GLOBE Legislators Forum in Rome	Priority policy areas identified and endorsed: 6 marine and terrestrial ecosystems
<b>Delivery Stage 1</b>		
July 2009	Commission Meeting in Nairobi	Scientific advice presented and scope of priority areas further defined, Natural Capital session
September 2009	Commission Meeting in Pittsburgh	Focus on Tropical Forests workstream; creation of a public-private dialogue on financing REDD
October 2009	GLOBE Legislators Forum in Copenhagen	Endorsement of final Forest Policy Proposals; presentation of scientific advice on Coral Reefs
November 2009	First Meeting of GLOBE's Marine Technical Advisory Group in London	Initial development of marine fisheries workstream and policy recommendations
December 2009	GLOBE Meeting at UNFCCC COP15 in Copenhagen	REDD Public-private event with WEF, Coral Reef side event
<b>Delivery Stage 2</b>		
January-May 2010	Series of Marine Fisheries Policy Events in Japan, the UK, the EU, the US and Korea	Further development of marine fisheries workstream and policy recommendations
April 2010	First meeting of GLOBE's coral reef technical advisory group	Begin development of the coral reef workstream
June 2010	World Oceans Day Meeting in London	Endorsement of Marine Ecosystems Recovery Strategy Part I: Marine Fisheries Recovery
<b>Delivery Stage 3</b>		
October 2010	"Parliamentarians and Biodiversity" Forum and Coral Reef Meeting at CBD COP10 in Nagoya, Japan	Launch of Natural Capital Action Plan, Launch of Marine Ecosystems Recovery Strategy Part II: A Global Coral Reef Emergency Strategy

**Source:** Final Report, GLOBE International, 2010

### 3.7 G: Preparation and readiness

93. By design the project proposal was not too prescriptive. The project approach allowed scope to respond to legislators and for them to have some say in the project's design and priorities. A lot of the issues needed to be narrowed down, so a level of flexibility was essential – UNEP was very supportive of this. This approach was necessary to ensure the legislators had ownership of the Commission, without which participation would not have been forthcoming. The project's objectives were clear, although the Commission took on a very ambitious program of work. Key staff and consultants were hired after the project had commenced. The project's preparation and readiness has been rated as Satisfactory (S).

## 3.8 H: Implementation approach and adaptive management

### 3.8.1 Implementation approach

94. The project put in place a clear management structure and operated with strong leadership from the Chairman. The management structure comprises a steering group, a project management team and a technical group. The **steering committee** met roughly twice year, sometimes by phone, to discuss the work of the Commission<sup>7</sup>. The project Management team consists of Ian Johnson, Barry Gardiner, Adam Mathews and Chris Stephens. This team was responsible for the day to day management of the project and for refining the project's strategic direction. The management team was supported on technical matters by a scientific advisory group, who met on a six monthly basis and included experts from ZSL. However it should be emphasised that underlying this structure were the legislators, who were taken by the project to be the guiding influence on the direction and focus of the project.
95. The project experienced some delays at the start due to the fact that it took longer than anticipated to establish the Secretariat to support the Commission.
96. For the three main work streams the Commission adopted a leadership group of legislators responsible for guiding the Commission's ongoing work and communicating regularly with the Commission co-chairs, as facilitated by the GLOBE International Secretariat. As the end of the project phase, preliminary discussions regarding the future work of the Commission have taken place amongst each of the three leadership groups.
97. A key aspect of the project's implementation strategy was its initiative to bridge the divide between science and policy. This was achieved through the development of a policy development model, which involved placing legislators in direct contact with scientists and economists throughout the policy development process. This helped allay legislators concerns about 'third party interpretations' of the latest science and economics. The success of this approach could inform the work of the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).
98. The Commission made a considerable effort to provide the legislators with an accurate map of relevant legislation already in place in key countries for each of its workstream. This mapping is important as it allows analysis and comparison of existing legislation and an identification of where the policy gaps exist. It has not been possible to comprehensively map all legislation relevant to the Commission's work in Phase 1 due to resource limitations. The Commission has requested that Phase 2 provides more information on existing policies through a 'legislation library'. This will allow legislators to identify existing policy gaps and to learn from effective legislation that has been successfully implemented in other countries. This work is already underway for GLOBE's work on climate change and the coral reef emergency strategy.
99. Internal communications were considered to be good (PIR FY10) – especially once the senior technical advisor was recruited enabling regular communications. This view is supported by the interviews undertaken for the evaluation.

---

<sup>7</sup> The steering group comprised – Hon Barry Gardiner MP, Adam Matthews and Chris Stephens from GLOBE and Maryam Niamir-Fuller and Jyoti Mathur-Filpp/Steven Twomlow from the Division of GEF Co-ordination (DGEF) of UNEP.

100. Due to the small core team the project has faced administration challenges. The project does not have a dedicated administrator or financial manager, so these activities (including booking hotels for participants to international meetings, paying staff and consultants and managing the budget) have been covered by the core technical team. Payment has been an issue for some project partners who have faced significant delays in receiving payments.
101. The PIR FY10 reports that funds were correctly managed and transparently accounted for, and that reports were supplied as requested although timeliness was challenging.
102. Box 10 summarises the approach taken by the Commission to reach consensus between its members.

**Box 10. Reaching consensus between a diverse group of countries**

The Commission meetings provide an opportunity to convene diverse groups of legislators to discuss and negotiate the Commission policy papers that will support the work of GLOBE members. The negotiation process begins by establishing the scientific and economic evidence base, with presentations provided by world leading experts. The meeting Chair then conducts a free discussion amongst legislators around the main topics in the draft paper, providing an opportunity for specific concerns to be raised and discussed with the experts. In addition to the open discussion, the meeting Chair conducts bilateral negotiations with each country about their view on the draft paper.

Once all of the proposed amendments have been included in the document, the final version of the recommendations is presented to the plenary. Any remaining issues are then raised and discussed before the final paper is endorsed by the Commission, and the individual legislators commit to advance the recommendations nationally.

The process has been developed by GLOBE based on the experience of Lord Michael Jay, former head of the UK Foreign Office and the Sherpa (lead official) for the 2005 Gleneagles G8 Summit.

### 3.8.2 Adaptive management

103. Since the concept of GLOBE's International Commission on Land Use Change was developed during 2008, the Commission's direction, strategy and structure have evolved to reflect the interests of the legislators, the progress of the relevant policy debates, the global economic situation and latest scientific information. In particular, the structure of the Commission has evolved significantly during the last 12 months to ensure that the programme can maximize its influence in the policy areas that it is operational in (PIR 2010).
104. As originally conceived the project focused on the G8+5. The objective was to build networks and capacity within the G8+5 countries and to use the group as a leadership group. However as the project progressed, legislators were keen to broaden the countries involved. For example therefore, the marine workstream evolved to include core fishing nations and those that would be impacted by the introduction of new legislation. This greatly improved the process and some of these newer countries, such as Indonesia have developed into a strong group. At the end of Phase 1 the CBD effectively provided all countries the opportunity to become involved in the

Commission. This provides a strong inclusive and legitimate platform for the project to develop from in Phase 2.

105. Throughout this project, the GLOBE International Secretariat has been able to apply lessons from the earlier workstreams in designing and implementing the more recent programmes. As an example, in the later workstreams, the GLOBE International Secretariat assigned increased resources and capacity to the post-meeting work that focuses on the legislators advancing the Commission's proposals. The work of the Commission has entailed an ongoing learning process which has allowed internal reviews of effectiveness to feed directly into the next engagement of the commission.
106. The Commission considerably expanded its breadth over the project life cycle to cover three separate policy workstreams. This evolution in the structure of the project effectively meant that there were three "Commissions" operating over the project period, with an equivalent increase in the workload and resulting interventions.
107. The project's performance in terms of implementation approach and adaptive management has been rated as Satisfactory (S).

### **3.9 I: Monitoring and evaluation**

#### **3.9.1 M & E design**

108. The project M&E processes were designed to be consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. The Project Document included a Project Results Framework, which included SMART indicators for each expected outputs. M&E costs for the Terminal Evaluation were included in the overall project budget, however other M&E activities were not. At the time of project approval around 80% of baseline data was considered to be available (Project Document, 2008). The Project Document sets out an approach for collecting the remaining baseline data.
109. Baseline data was gathered through three different methods - desk research by GLOBE International Secretariat, contributions from GLOBE experts and advisors, and presentations by GLOBE legislators at the Commission events. It is GLOBE's view that while the collection of baseline data for the Commission was adequate for this phase of the project, future GLOBE programmes, which are more focused at national level implementation, will require a more detailed approach.
110. The project's Results Framework provided indicators against each intended output and associated targets for those indicators. These indicators were appropriate and quantifiable. For example, for the intended output 'high level debate stimulated on land use change and ecosystem services' an indicator was that Commission policy platforms were developed in time for the CBD COP in 2010 and a related target for this indicator was that a G8 positions was advanced ahead of the CBD COP in 2010. However, the indicators in the results framework do not match the indicators used in the PIR.
111. The performance of the project in terms of M&E design is rated as Satisfactory (S).

#### **3.9.2 M & E implementation**

112. Project Implementation Review (PIR) reports were completed for the project in 2009 and 2010. These reports were accurately completed and provide a good overview of the status of the project. There was no mid-term evaluation of the project as this was not considered necessary given the short timeframe and the intention to undertaken PIRs.

113. The PIR's documented baseline levels for project objectives and outcomes, and track achievement of these objectives against a mid-term and end of project target, using appropriate indicators.
114. PIR FY09 rated the quality and implementation of the M&E plan as satisfactory. The PIR FY10 notes that after each of the Commission meetings, the legislators involved were asked for verbal feedback on the quality of the background documents produced, the relevance of the final outcomes and the coordination of the meeting to ensure the correct balance of presentations, open discussions and conclusions.
115. The GLOBE Secretariat also undertook internal reviews of each engagement of the Commission to ensure that each event / meeting could be improved upon. Regular discussions were also held between the Chair of the Commission and the Parliamentary Co-Chairs with the Secretary General of GLOBE to examine progress against objectives and to provide feedback to the Secretariat on improvements to the work of the Commission.
116. The Commission has sought to establish **baselines** for each of the policy areas / work stream by mapping the existing legislation and policy in the relevant countries. This understanding will underpin the next phase of the Commission's activities where there will be particular focus on implementing the recommendations that the Commission produced. In addition, the GLOBE International Secretariat identified the key political actors within the policy sphere. This allowed improve the Commission's knowledge of the policy challenges and facilitate the design of the Commission's strategy.
117. The performance of the project in terms of M&E implementation is rated as Satisfactory (S).

### 3.9.3 Budgeting and funding for M & E activities

118. The project budgeted US\$20,000 for Production of Final M&E Report. There was no dedicated budget for other M&E activities, such as PIRs and progress reports, and it is assumed that these were covered under administrative support.
119. The performance of the project in terms of budgeting and funding for M&E activities is rated as Satisfactory (S).

### 3.10 J: Financial planning and control

120. Table 4 summarizes final project expenditure against budget. In addition to the expenditures incurred by GLOBE of US\$979,099.46 detailed in Table 4, UNEP/DGEF will incur a cost of US\$20,900.54 to pay for the Terminal Evaluation. Therefore all GEF funding will be fully spent by the time the project is closed. Annex 4 provides the final expenditure statement by activity for the project.

**Table 4. Summary of Final Expenditure against Budget**

Object code	Description	Total original budget	Expenditure for the period November - December, 2008	Expenditure for the period January - September, 2009	Total Expenditures as at 30th September, 2009
1101	Commission Technical Advisor	150,000.00	10,000.00	95,828.00	105,828.00
1301	Administrative Support	50,000.00	20,000.00	18,000.00	38,000.00
1601	Chair and Technical Support	50,000.00	13,819.00	15,330.00	29,149.00
1602	Commission Policy Meetings (Small groups)	100,000.00	0.00	51,858.00	51,858.00
2101	Scientific Advisory Board	300,000.00	0.00	300,000.00	300,000.00
3301	Commission meetings and Legislators Forums	300,000.00	126,005.00	275,479.00	401,484.00
3381	18-19 July 2009, Globe International Meeting Nairobi Kenya	0.00	0.00	52,780.46	52,780.46
5301	Project Management	30,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5581	UNEP Independent Evaluation (to be paid by UNEP)	20,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,000,000.00</b>	<b>169,824.00</b>	<b>809,275.46</b>	<b>979,099.46</b>

Source: UNEP

121. Annex 3 presents the co-financing arrangements for the project. This includes cash and in-kind contributions and totals around US\$1.1 million. However, this may be an underestimate as some activities such as a number of events hosted by parliamentarians, and the pro-bono time of key people such as the Chair – Mr Ian Johnson are not recorded.

122. The cash advances made by UNEP are summarised in Table 5. The project document was signed by UNEP and GLOBE on the 6th November 2008 and the first cash advance was made on the 7th November 2008 followed by a second payment on the 19th November 2008. There was a delay in the third disbursement because expenditure and technical progress reports from GLOBE were outstanding.

**Table 5. Cash Advances made by UNEP to GLOBE**

Cash Advance Number	Date	Amount (US\$)
1	7/11/2008	200,000
2	19/11/2008	300,000
3	30/04/2009	273,116
4	13/01/2010	100,000

Source: UNEP

123. Quarterly reports on expenditure were provided to UNEP and signed off by the Secretary General of GLOBE and by UNEP's Project Task Manager. UNEP is expecting a final audit report from Globe before closing the project. This independent audit exercise is reportedly at an advanced stage.

124. The PIR2010 states that funds were correctly managed and transparently accounted for and that all reports were submitted, albeit with some delay. A number of interviewees for this evaluation identified the need for improved financial management in the second phase of the project. In Phase 1 delays in payment were faced by staff, core partners and consultants. The reason for these delays is traced to the limited resources within the Commission's core team, and the difficulties of juggling all aspects of management as well as delivering of the technical objectives of the project. The need for improved financial management has already been picked up by the board of GLOBE.
125. The performance of the project in terms of financial planning and control is Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU).

### 3.11 K: UNEP supervision and backstopping

126. Positive feedback was received on the role that UNEP played in steering and supporting the project. In particular UNEP has been commended on supporting the project's flexible approach. It was essential to ensure that the Commission had the flexibility to respond to the demands of the legislators as they steered the direction of the Commission's work. This has ensured that political Commissioner's specific inputs were listened to, considered and incorporated into the direction of the work plan. This has required careful political management especially when issues have had national sensitivities. In some instances the Commission has had to tread lightly before being able to advance detailed dialogues. It should be noted that the willingness of UNEP/GEF to support an initiative that was to have flexibility within its objectives is acknowledged gratefully by the Commissioners.
127. The project's performance in terms of UNEP's supervision and backstopping has been rated as highly satisfactory (HS).

## 4. Conclusions and Ratings

128. The project has been evaluated against the criteria A-K as set out in the TOR. Table 6 sets out the ratings for each criteria and comments on their application. A summary of the ratings used is provided in Table 7. Overall the project has been rated as 'Satisfactory' (S).
129. Overall Phase 1 of the project has been extremely effective and there is strong support from the legislators for the project to progress to a second phase so that the successes if Phase 1 can be capitalised on.
130. The project has successfully achieved its goal of establishing a global network of parliamentarians, increasing the capacity of the network and demonstrating that consensus can be reached on sensitive environmental issues, such as the management of forest and marine resources. The Commission has grown in status through the project period, and has served to provide an essential link between the science and decision makers.
131. It is important to recognize that the original project criteria were focused on G8+5 legislation and the Commission's recommendations were appropriate to the political systems within these countries. However the project evolved to include 40

countries, including a number of developing countries, and looking forward, recommendations need to be tailored to countries at different stage of development.

132. Phase 1 provided a foundation for working with legislators to change policy and legislation, but the project now needs a shift in scale in order that it can increase its outreach beyond the international meetings it has so successfully executed in Phase 1. The next step is to advance the recommendations agreed at the international meeting at the regional and national scale. The project would also benefit from the ability to operate from a position of financial (resource) security. It was described by one interviewee as living from hand to mouth. Resources have been very stretched putting project activities at risk.

133. Because Phase 1 has been successful, there is a general view that Phase 2 needs to be of a different nature pushing beyond the Phase 1 objectives and providing follow up at the regional and national level, with an emphasis on implementation. Within the ROTI framework this can be characterized as moving beyond the delivery of outcomes to securing the intermediate conditions required to realize global environmental benefits.



**Table 6. Overall Ratings**

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
<b>A. Attainment of Project Objectives and Results (overall rating)</b> <b>Sub criteria (below)</b>		HS
A. 1. Effectiveness - overall likelihood of impact achievement (ROtl rating)	Conceptually the project is strong and the groundwork to establish the Commission has been successfully achieved in Phase 1 of the project. There is evidence that the Commission has already resulted in the adoption of legislation and policies. However many countries require additional support to actually implement legislation and/or value their ecosystem services	Highly Likely 'BA' (ROtl rating)
A. 2. Relevance	Strong links with UNFCCC and CBD and other UNEP/GEF projects	HS
A. 3. Efficiency	The project achieved a great deal with only a small core team, aided by a considerable <i>pro bono</i> input. This pro bono input reflects the support by senior professionals for the project's objectives and their interest in working with legislators.	HS
<b>B. Sustainability of Project Outcomes (overall rating)</b> <b>Sub criteria (below)</b>		ML
B. 1. Financial	Increased financial resources are required to maintain and develop project outcomes	ML
B. 2. Socio Political	Legislators have demonstrated a strong demand and interest in the work of the Commission, but many lack the capacity to follow up on the Commission's recommendations	ML
B. 3. Institutional framework	The institutional framework established by Phase 1 of the project is strong and needs to be developed and supported in phase 2. Institutional support is also required at the regional and domestic level	ML
B. 4. Environmental	n/a	n/a
<b>C. Catalytic Role and Replication</b>	The project is innovative and has successfully catalyzed institutional and policy changes in some countries. It can be successfully replicated with the right support.	S
<b>D. Stakeholder Participation/ Public Awareness</b>	Stakeholders have been very keen to participate in the Commission, and this interest is growing. The project successfully secured media coverage of its Natural Capital programme at Nagoya CBB COP, and worked with innovative media tools through the project.	HS
<b>E. Country Ownership/ Drivenness</b>	Legislators, through being involved in the development of the Commission's recommendations have a high level of ownership in the outputs and are generally keen to integrate the recommendations into national decision making and legislation, but many lack the resources and capacity to do so.	HS
<b>F. Achievement of Outputs and Activities</b>	Overall, the project has delivered on all its programmed activities in a timely and effective manner	HS
<b>G. Preparation and</b>	By design the project proposal allowed flexibility in	S

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
<b>Readiness</b>	delivery to allow legislators a say in the activities and focus of the Commission.	
<b>H. Implementation Approach and Adaptive Management</b>	The project had a clear management structure and was executed in a highly adaptive way, responding to both the requests from legislators and the international policy process.	S
<b>I. Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)</b>		S
I. 1. M&E Design	The M&E process designed was consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy	S
I. 2. M&E Plan Implementation	PIR reports were completed and Legislators were actively asked for their feedback on the project's products and processes,	S
I. 3. Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities	A budget was available for Terminal Evaluation but not for other M&E activities	S
<b>J. Financial Planning and Control</b>	Financial reports were submitted, but were often late, and staff, consultants and partners often faced delays in payment.	MU
<b>K. UNEP Supervision and Backstopping</b>	Positive feedback on the role of UNEP received through the evaluation.	HS
<b>Overall Rating</b>	Overall the project has successfully achieved its objectives and provided an excellent foundation for working in more detail at the regional and national level.	S

**Table 7. Ratings Applied to Criteria A-K**

Criteria	Ratings
A. Project Objective and Results (in terms of Effectiveness, Relevance and Efficiency)	<p>Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives</p> <p>Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.</p> <p>Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.</p> <p>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives</p> <p>Unsatisfactory (U) The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives</p>
B: Sustainability	<p>Highly Likely (HL): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.</p> <p>Likely (L): There are minor risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.</p> <p>Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.</p> <p>Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.</p> <p>Unlikely (U): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability</p> <p>Highly Unlikely (HU): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.</p>
C. Catalytic Role & Replication D. Stakeholder Participation / Public Awareness E. Country Ownership / Drivenness F. Achievement of Outputs & Activities G. Preparation & Readiness H. Implementation Approach & Adaptive Management	<p>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</p> <p>Satisfactory (S)</p> <p>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</p> <p>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</p> <p>Unsatisfactory (U)</p>
L: M & E	<p>Highly Satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&amp;E system.</p> <p>Satisfactory(S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&amp;E system.</p> <p>Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&amp;E system.</p> <p>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&amp;E system.</p> <p>Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&amp;E system.</p> <p>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&amp;E system.</p>

## **5. Lessons Learned**

134. The creation and development of the Commission was a new initiative for GLOBE in response to requests from legislators to broaden the policy areas addressed by its activities. General applicable lessons learnt from this initiative, drawn from GLOBE's Final report and supported by the interviews and research undertaken for the Terminal Evaluation include:

### **5.1 Timing**

135. It took longer to establish the Secretariat to support the Commission than originally intended and the Commission did not function effectively until a Director for the Commission was recruited. This caused delays in the project implementation. In future projects it would be advisable to recruit key project personnel as early as possible at the preparatory stage to allow for a swift and efficient progress of in project implementation.

### **5.2 Project timeframe**

136. The project demonstrates the long lead times required to effect changes in legislation, and therefore highlights the need for long term planning and support to achieve carefully designed and widely supported policy changes and legislation in future projects.

### **5.3 The benefits of interdisciplinary working**

137. The project developed a policy development model central to which was the close collaboration at all stages of the process of scientists, economists and legislators. The project therefore provides a model example of the benefits of interdisciplinary teams and working. Given that good science underpins the valuation of ecosystem services, the collaboration of scientist and economists on future projects is very important to the generation of reliable ecosystem service valuation initiatives.

## **6. Recommendations**

138. The recommendations discussed below relate to the design and focus of Phase 2 and are based on the interviews undertaken for the Terminal Evaluation, the survey responses from the legislators, and GLOBE's proposals for a Phase 2 as presented in its Final Report (these proposals are summarised in Annex 7).

### **6.1 1 ) Funding**

139. 1 a) One interviewee commented that the project was 'Very close to making a difference and therefore it was very important that it was properly funded in Phase 2'. GLOBE has proved that a considerable amount can be achieved with limited resources. The range of policy areas that the Commissioners wanted to engage in were limited to ensure that resources could match expectations. Even so the core team was very stretched which negatively impacted administration aspects of the project. Phase 1 has demonstrated that there is a desire to continue the work of the Commission in much greater detail but to do so requires considerably greater resources. GLOBE acknowledges that additional funds are required to realise the Commission's full potential. It is therefore recommended that GLOBE continues working to identify additional funding sources, for example in form of a collaborating partner for each work stream. It is also recommended to appoint a finance director responsible for raising funds, as well as managing budgets.

140. 1 b) Another consideration is the timeframe for which funds are secured. Legislation typically takes years to develop and enact and therefore a longer time frame is needed to monitor legislative impact. At the moment the project has relatively short term funding despite having long term objectives. It makes more sense to have a longer project period and funding to allow proper project planning, with built in project reviews. To enable a successful follow up, Phase 2 either needs to revisit the project document and revise the objectives to be more feasible within the given timeframe or alternatively to secure additional funding for a longer project period.

141. 1 c) Currently all GLOBE outputs are published in English but a number of legislators do not speak or read the language. It is recommended that funding is secured for translation of core GLOBE documents as an essential priority need in going forward.

### **6.2 2) Developing national level processes**

142. 2 a) At the international level the Commission is functioning effectively however, the key issue for the Commission's future is the capacity of legislators to translate the work of the Commission into national level achievements and more specifically legislation/regulation. For example, the Marine Recovery Strategy Document was very successful but needs now to be implemented at the regional / national level. Developing legislation at the regional level requires working more closely with local people who understand the issues, government structures, and agencies in order to tailor information and recommendations to regional and national relevance. A second phase therefore needs increased resourcing to enable greater national level support for the Commissioners. All Commissioners have used the Commission process to test thinking,

advance ideas and to contribute to the resulting consensus on different policy areas. However, the Secretariat of the Commission has had limited capacity to be able to respond to demands for greater national level support.

143. 2 b) Drafting 'model legislation' should be a central part of the next phase. This would allow the analysis to move beyond the mapping of existing legislation to an understanding of which policies have been successful and why. Model legislation could then be fine-tuned to the specific case of each country by the legislators involved. The Commission Co-chairs believe that this is essential in order for the Commission to truly have an impact at the national level.

144. Annex 8 provides information on the key barriers to implementing the Commission's recommendations from the point of view of legislators and what they would like to see in Phase 2.

### **6.3 3 ) Expand core team and skill set**

145. 3 a) The current project team is overstretched and this could impact on the quality of outputs and events in the future as the Commission grows. More resources are required to better match the needs and requests of the legislators. The project needs a larger core team, increasing from its current size of 3.5 to around 15-20. Suggested roles include

- a deputy to the Secretary General responsible for delivery;
- a Finance Director responsible for financial flows both in and out. In addition to managing budgets, the Finance Director would be responsible for fund raising for the Commission's work and ensuring funding continuity;
- an Administrator;
- a Communications Manager responsible for internal and external communications;
- a lead for each workstream

3 b) The recommended number of staff assigned to each workstream could be: Natural Capital (3), Marine Ecosystems (3) and Forestry (7). Relatively more staff are required for the Forestry programme as three regional forest forums are proposed in Phase 2 supported by the parliaments of Brazil, Indonesia and Cameroon. The issues are very different between these areas, therefore local legislators need to meet and refine legislation at a regional scale. These regional programmes could have two dedicated staff each with an overall head for the forestry programme. This extra capacity is needed to prepare documents and tailor guidance to regions and countries.

3.c) To support the National Capital Initiative, it is recommended that staff or consultants with an understanding of Government Departments, and an understanding of national and commercial accounting be contracted. In addition legal consultants are required to help draft laws

## 6.4 4 ) Long term strategic planning

146. 4 a) The project's program is broad and consideration needs to be given to what areas should be focused on given the resources it is likely to have available. It is widely acknowledged that emphasis should be placed on working more closely with legislators in Phase 2, for example through more meetings and technical type discussions and workshops at the regional / national scale. A key question then is how to decide on the level and type of support to be provided to delegations at the regional / national level. Long term strategic planning to work out objectives, priority activities, partners etc is needed so that the project is focussed on issues where the most impact can be made and where there is political will. The Commission's high level advisors could play a role in the strategic development of phase 2.

4 b) **Action plans for phase 2** need to be further developed. For example, the National Capital Initiative<sup>8</sup> currently sets out six broad activities<sup>9</sup> which need to be developed into a detailed set of actions that relate to specific outcomes and set timelines for their achievement.

4 c) Phase 2 should be designed to be consistent with **ROtl evaluation framework and terminology**. This will help future evaluations, and help all parties to be clear on what is realistic to achieve within the project timeframe.

## 6.5 Support to developing countries

147. 5) As discussed in Annex 6, the work of the Commission is highly relevant to developing countries, both in terms of its approach of informing legislators of the science and bridging the science - policy gap and in terms of its selected workstreams. However, the recommendations of the Commission tend to be challenging for developing countries<sup>10</sup>. More interaction between forums could be used to help make the outputs more relevant to developing countries. Another suggestion is to undertake case studies from countries at different stage of development to demonstrate how the Commission's recommendations can be

---

<sup>8</sup> The GLOBE Natural Capita Initiative was launched at Nagoya Japan and to support the implementation of the Natural Capital Action Plan.

<sup>9</sup> Creating an international leadership group of countries supported at both a governmental and parliamentary level to advance this agenda through legislation and government policy change; Improving the political understanding within government and parliaments about why valuing ecosystem services and natural capital is important and yields economic benefits; supporting the testing and refining of the most developed and accounting and valuation methodologies in order to provide case studies of their effectiveness; Demonstrating and documenting best practice for use by legislators; Improving the communication between policy makers and technical experts to accelerate the integration of the value of natural capital into policy making; Developing competencies within parliament to prepare terms of reference for national auditing and accounting bodies and, ultimately, to pass legislation to underpin this transition.

<sup>10</sup> Note that Phase 1 of the project was focused on G8+5 countries, and the Commission's recommendations were successfully targeted at this group.

adapted to suit a country's capacity and resources. Good work by countries at the same level can be more powerful at inspiring action than case studies from countries which do not closely match a country's profile. Such a case study approach was successfully undertaken by the Working Group on Environmental Auditing of the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions. This group has around 30 members. For developing countries work on simpler approaches could be undertaken.

5 a) The GLOBE network should provide additional help to developing countries, e.g., by providing support to attend forums, technical assistance in the development and introduction of domestic legislation, and training. Training courses should be run at the regional level to develop capacity, which is likely to vary across regions.

5 b) Phase 1 of the project was targeted at the G8+5 countries, who were well represented across all the Commission's workstreams. However, the project evolved to effectively open up the Commission to all member countries of the CBD resulting in a further 20 emerging / developing countries being represented on the Commission. Assuming that the project will work with this larger group of countries in Phase 2, a review of the regional balance of the Commission is recommended to strive towards a balanced representation of members of developed and developing countries. This would help in understanding the issues to be addressed as well as developing ownership by the legislators.



## 7. Annexes

### 7.1 Annex 1: Stakeholder interviews

Name	Organisation	Role	Contact details	Interview date & location
Stephen Twomlow	UNEP GEF	Project Task Manager	stephen.twomlow@unep.org	4 November 2010 / telephone
Martin Okun	UNEP GEF	Project Fund Managing Officer	martin.okun@unep.org	Email communication
Adam Matthews	GLOBE	Secretary General	adam.matthews@globeinternational.org	11 November, Portcullis House, Westminster
Chris Stephens	GLOBE	Senior Technical Advisor	chris.stephens@globeinternational.org	11 <sup>th</sup> and 25 <sup>th</sup> November, 2010 Portcullis House Westminster
Sam Frankhauser	GLOBE / London School of Economics	Chief Economist - GLOBE	S.frankhauser@lse.ac.uk	11 November LSE
Lucky Sherpa	Member of Parliament – Nepal	Chair of GLOBE Chapter Nepal	sherpalucky@yahoo.com	18 November and 18 December, Kathmandu, Nepal
Barry Gardiner	Member of Parliament – UK	Co-chair of GLOBE International Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystems	House of Commons, Westminster London, SW1A 0AA	25 November 2010
Jonathan Baillie	Zoological Society London (ZSL), Director of Conservation Programmes	Chief Scientific Advisor to GLOBE	Jonathan.baillie@ioz.ac.uk	1 December 2010, ZSL
Natasha Pauli	Zoological Society London (ZSL)	Scientific Advisor	Natasha.pauli@zsl.org	1 December 2010, ZSL
Alex Rogers	Zoological Society London (ZSL)	Chief Marine Scientific Advisor to GLOBE International	Alex.rogers@zoo.ox.ac.uk	3 December 2010, telephone interview
Sir John Bourn	Foundation for Governance Research and Education	Advisor (Former UK Comptroller & Auditor General)	JBourn@mayfairoffice.com	7 January 2011, London

## 7.2 Annex 2: Documents reviewed

Project Document / Project Co-operation Agreement (PCA) for the Medium Size Project Global: International Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystems’.

GLOBE International, 2010. ‘Final Project Report. GLOBE International Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystems’

Nagoya Meeting Reports

Natural capital: The new political imperative. An interim report prepared for the ‘Parliamentarians and Biodiversity Forum’ at the tenth conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Nagoya, Japan. October 2010.

Natural Capital Action Plan

Nagoya Declaration on Parliamentarians and Biodiversity

Nagoya Parliamentarians Forum: Valuing Natural Capital to Mainstream Biodiversity. Summary of the proceedings of the meeting, held on 25-26 October 2010, in Nagoya, Japan, in parallel with the 10<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD COP10)

A Marine Ecosystem Recovery Strategy Part II: Coral Reef Resilience

GLOBE Action Plan for Coral Reefs, October 2010

UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2009 and 2010

Progress report: GFL-2328-2715-4A21. The Global Legislators Organisation (GLOBE) Limited. 28 April, 2009

Minutes of Steering Committee Meeting 23 October 2009

Ecosystem Services and Biodiversity Programme

Developing a Marine Ecosystem Recovery Plan

7.3 **Annex 3: Project co-financing arrangements**

Source of Co-finance	Cash Contributions			In-kind Contributions			Comments
	Budget original (at time of approval by GEF)	Budget latest revision	Received to date	Budget original (at time of approval by GEF)	Budget latest revision	Received to date	
GLOBE International	400,000	202,202	202,202	400,000	363,170	363,170	
Private Sector (McKinsey)	0	0	0	200,000	0	0	
Private Sector (Shell)	0	378,960	378,960	0	0	0	
Japan Ministry of Environment	0	0	0	0	141,200	141,200	Contribution to Nagoya Forum
Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs	0	0	0	0	17,130	17,130	Contribution to Nagoya Forum
Japanese Bank of International Cooperation	0	0	0	0	59,811	59,811	Contribution to Nagoya Forum
<b>Total</b>	400,000	581,162	581,162	600,000	581,311	581,311	

## 7.4 Annex 4: Statement of project expenditure by activity

UNEP Budget Line		GEF-approved budget		Actual expenditures incurred*						Cumulative unspent balance to-date	
		Total project budget	2010 budget	Cumulative expenditures from previous period, year 2008 & 2009	Jan-Mar 2010 Qtr 1	Apr-Jun 2010 Qtr 2	Jul-Sep 2010 Qtr 3	Oct-Dec 2010 Qtr 4	Current year total		Cumulative expenditures to-date
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H=D+E+F+G	I=C+H	J=A-I
<b>1100</b>	<b>Project personnel</b>	150,000		155,608	66,444	64,666	64,561	17,931	<b>213,602</b>	<b>369,210</b>	<b>(219,210)</b>
1101	Commission Technical Advisor										
<b>1199</b>	<b>Sub-total</b>										
<b>1300</b>	<b>Administrative support</b>	50,000		44,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	37,767	<b>55,767</b>	<b>99,767</b>	<b>(49,767)</b>
1301	Commission Administrative										
<b>1399</b>	<b>Sub-Total</b>										
<b>1600</b>	<b>Travel on official business</b>	150,000		81,695	14,641	11,664	173	913	<b>27,391</b>	<b>109,086</b>	<b>40,914</b>
1601	Chair and technical support										
1602	Commission Policy Mtgs (Small w. groups)										

<b>1699</b>	<b>Sub-total</b>										
<b>2100</b>	<b>Sub-contracts (UN entities)</b>										
2101	Scientific Advisory Board	300,000		300,000	-	12,300	6,160	15,899	<b>34,359</b>	<b>334,359</b>	<b>(34,359)</b>
<b>2199</b>	<b>Sub-total</b>										
<b>3300</b>	<b>Meetings/ conferences</b>										
3301	Commissions meetings and Legislators	300,000		485,880	20,247	137,020	7,027	18,566	<b>182,860</b>	<b>668,740</b>	<b>(368,740)</b>
<b>3399</b>	<b>Sub-total</b>										
<b>5300</b>	<b>Sundry</b>	30,000							-	-	<b>30,000</b>
5301	Project Management										
<b>5399</b>	<b>Sub-total</b>										
<b>5500</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	20,000									<b>20,000</b>
5581	UNEP Independent Evaluation (to be paid by UNEP)										
<b>5599</b>	<b>Sub-total</b>										
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>1,000,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,067,183</b>	<b>107,332</b>	<b>231,650</b>	<b>83,921</b>	<b>91,076</b>	<b>513,979</b>	<b>1,581,162</b>	<b>(581,162)</b>

# GLOBE International Commission on Land Use Change and Ecosystems Survey of Legislators

---

1. The project's overall objectives were to place issues of ecosystem change and biodiversity loss on the political agenda of senior legislators, finance ministers and heads of government, develop applied public policy response and provide a platform for outreach to political actors who are not traditionally engaged in this policy area.

In your opinion, how successful has the project been in meeting its objectives? Please select from the following options by placing an 'x' after your choice:

- A. Very successful
- B. Somewhat successful
- C. Not too successful
- D. Not successful at all
- E. Not sure

2. In your opinion what has been the Commission's greatest achievement?

3. What aspect of the Commission's work has been most useful to you?

4. How were you were involved in the development of the Commission's work areas?

5. What steps have been taken to integrate the Commission's policy recommendations into national legislation in your country?

6. In your opinion, what are the main barriers to implementing the Commission's recommendations?

7. Did the project meet your expectations? If not, why and what improvements could be made?

8. What are your recommendations for the second phase of the project?

9. Any other comments?

**Please return to: [Camille.bann@enveconsulting.com](mailto:Camille.bann@enveconsulting.com) by Monday 29<sup>th</sup> November.**

## 7.6 Annex 6: Associate evaluator's report

### Relevance of GLOBE's Recommendations to Developing Countries

The development of environmental law and policy has neither been systematic nor strategic. It has been *ad hoc* and as a response to specific environmental threats whereby scientists observe phenomena on the basis of which policymakers act and come to international agreements which are then taken on by national governments to inform activities at the national level. For developing countries, international environmental law and policy are key anchors of national environmental laws and policies. It is therefore commendable that the Commission identified the science-policy gap which is a big issue for developing countries. The Commission recognises the inter-connections of national, regional and international policies and hence the need to intervene at all levels by providing forums for knowledge sharing and consensus building backed by state of the art scientific knowledge.

At a broad level, the Commission's policy frameworks are relevant to developing countries that usually draw principles of national environmental law and policy from international frameworks. The process of stepping these norms down involves legislators and it is imperative that they have a sound understanding of the issues. This has been done by involving legislators in direct dialogue with leading scientists, economists and policy experts to jointly produce the Commission's policy positions. This capacity enhancement process can benefit developing country legislators by broadening their knowledge base. In this respect it is noteworthy that even though only five developing countries (Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa) are part of the core project, political Commissioners have been drawn from a host of other developing countries who are not as well endowed economically as the core five. These are Cameroon, Cape Verde, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, Guinea Bissau, Indonesia, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Nepal.

The focus on the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is also strategic for developing countries, many of which are grappling with the impacts of biodiversity loss and climate change. The two exemplify the ecological interdependence of the earth and humanity's collective interest in activities even when they occur within national boundaries. Having policy frameworks informed by current scientific knowledge will enable the legislators and policy makers in developing countries to make informed choices.

#### A. Ecosystems Identified

The ecosystems that the project focused on are those that, in the Commission's view, are environmentally vulnerable and politically relevant. Six key ecosystems were identified namely tropical forests; coastal ecosystems; freshwater ecosystems (representing terrestrial systems) and marine fisheries; coral reefs; and shallow and enclosed seas (representing marine systems). The evaluation period covered tropical forests; marine ecosystems and natural capital. The marine and terrestrial ecosystems chosen are relevant for developing countries. For instance, millions of people in developing countries depend on fish for protein. (FAO 2009). Developing countries have coastlines with coral reefs and many people are highly dependent on them and many of them are dealing with negative impacts of forest degradation.

With regard to natural capital, the evidence of ecosystem services having a direct impact on policy formulation and decision-making especially in developing countries is very important. Many developing countries are poor yet they are endowed with immense natural resources. The need to



engage people outside of the environment circles is also important for developing countries. This provides leverage for natural resources by enlisting the support of political actors with authority to influence government policy decisions such as:

1. Finance Ministers and heads of State appreciating the relationship between the environment and the economy in order for policies to be adopted that prevent the continued loss of biodiversity and degradation of natural capital.
2. Legislators with oversight responsibility over government spending and economic policy making (finance and public audit committees, economy and expenditure effectiveness and efficiency oversight). Sensitise them to future costs and benefits of policy decisions affecting the environment and encouraging them to identify trade-offs and compatibilities between environmental, economic, and social benefits.

The Commission developed working models for policy makers and legislators to analyze ecosystem services, assign economic values and consider trade-offs with development priorities. Through such engagements, developing countries would be able to link natural capital with national development, economies and social well being.

The policy making process is also a good way to engage developing country legislators. This is done in the steps followed in the project:

- Identification of priority policy areas through dialogue between senior legislators and leading scientists.
- Understanding of the latest science through succinct papers outlining current state of the chosen ecosystems, highlighting the drivers of degradation and future projections, and presenting these to the legislators to improve their scientific understanding.
- Overlaying economic analysis by identifying and summarising the latest economic analysis of the chosen ecosystems to outline cost of policy inaction and the potential financial benefits of the policy solutions.
- Preparation of draft policy solutions by policy experts to address the drivers of ecosystem degradation.
- Working at the national level by circulating draft policy papers to the legislators and organising national policy workshops, requesting feedback and further information on the political trade-offs and national priorities from each country.
- Advancing policy and legislation - Once the Commission has endorsed the final policy proposals, the legislators advance recommendations within their own parliaments and encourage their governments to support the adopted principles in international agreements.

## **B. Proposals**

### **1. Focus on Regions**

There is need to work at the regional level by using regional meetings for legislators and negotiators in the international forums and other relevant actors at regional and national levels. This is because *one*, there are transboundary ecosystems that are environmentally vulnerable and politically relevant and which require cooperation between different countries in a region and work at the national level may not suffice. *Two*, developed and developing countries alike use regional groupings to marshal force at international forums and to get buy in across the region. *Three*, some of the individual developing countries may be too small and weak in terms of capacity to participate as such and can therefore benefit from a regional forum or group. Indeed, the rainforest

nations who included members beyond the G8 and 5 countries (Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa) wanted to host regional legislator forums and under the marine fisheries initiative, regional fisheries management organisations were identified as a critical stakeholder.

## **2. Enhancing Developing Countries' Capacities for Uptake of Commissions' Policy Frameworks**

We cannot assume that developing countries will be able to translate the Commission's policies into national level policies and legislations because of capacity deficits and competing financial needs. It may therefore be necessary to provide further resources to developing country nations and regions for follow through. The proposal for greater national level support for the Commission's work will be even more necessary once more developing countries are enlisted in the project but a focus on regions may be more effective in some instances.

Capacity to legislate is limited in many developing countries and it is not unusual for them to source law drafters abroad. The idea of model legislation will therefore be particularly appealing to developing countries. This has been used in other areas such as genetic resources' use, benefit-sharing and biosafety. It will facilitate access to the Commission's products by legislators in countries that are not participating in the Commission work directly granted that currently there are only a limited number of developing country actors.

### **B. Specific Policy Frameworks**

It is noteworthy that legislators were involved from the beginning of policymaking process to the conclusion. The ecosystems chosen were of interest to the legislators and also relevant and the Commission's work provided an opportunity for engagement with science and economics directly bridging the science-policy gap where policymakers would have been unaware of latest science in the areas that they made policies on.

#### **1. Globe Forest Policies Frameworks**

Forests are environmentally vulnerable and politically relevant in developing countries as they provide a lifeline for many people. Deforestation and change of forestland to cropland contributes significantly to greenhouse gas emissions. The Commission put forward proposals on a Forest Policy that if adopted, can successfully reduce deforestation, a critical component of preventing dangerous levels of climate change. One of the ways to influence the adoption of these proposals was by providing a text for Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+), - strategies to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, combined with enhancement of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and forest conservation - at the UNFCCC COP15. The policy sought to focus on the underlying causes of deforestation particularly the role of demand for commodities in tropical deforestation; the underlying causes of deforestation in forest nations; and an international forest carbon framework to address deforestation.

Below are some of the recommendations taken from the forest policy text.

No	Policy recommendation	Relevance to developing countries
1	Developing countries should be rewarded for mitigation in the forestry sector.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate change an important global environmental challenge</li> <li>• Progress towards achieving MDGs challenged by Climate change</li> <li>• Loss of tropical forests accounting for 18 to 20% of annual global greenhouse gas emissions</li> <li>• Biodiversity conservation</li> <li>• Food security</li> <li>• Livelihood protection</li> <li>• <b>No mention of adaptation which is key in Sub-Sahara Africa</b></li> </ul>
2	All countries shall support REDD+ actions by undertaking policies and measures that identify and address the diverse social and economic drivers of deforestation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical assistance in assessing national forest carbon stocks</li> <li>• Technical assistance in calculating national reference scenarios for deforestation</li> <li>• Technical assistance in designing monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) systems</li> <li>• Support from the political class to meet the objectives</li> <li>• Designing national forest policies that underpin a REDD+ strategy</li> <li>• Drivers of deforestation differ from country to country hence the need for different approaches specific to a country.</li> </ul>
3	All countries that consume forest products should implement policies and measures to support the laws and legal frameworks of other sovereign states	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poverty eradication</li> <li>• Involvement of all producer and consumer countries will assist developed countries know the source of the timber, help prevent degradation in tropical countries</li> </ul>
4	The implementation of REDD+ to be supported through a combined market and fund approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Help deal with the varying circumstances in developing countries</li> <li>• Encourage the involvement of the private sector</li> <li>• Sharing best practice in monitoring and scrutinising international finance flows to national governments</li> </ul>
5	The establishment of an independent and international monitoring reporting and verification (MRV) institution to coordinate the crediting of forest carbon mechanisms etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports other international initiatives such as the UNFCCC</li> </ul>
6	Legislator Rainforest initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotes ownership of the strategies developed</li> <li>• Creates a dialogue for legislators to discuss national strategy for reducing deforestation with key stakeholders from civil society,</li> </ul>

To move the REDD+ debate from one of policy dialogue to concrete action the Commission convened a meeting that brought together a set of actors that can deliver a practical architecture for REDD+, including senior legislators from key forest and Annex 1 nations and leaders from businesses with significant investment potential alongside experts from civil society and the scientific community. Using the Carbon Capture and Storage demonstration project experience as a partial model, this group will focus on two inter-related objectives – (i) to design and build a REDD+ incentive system that can attract much needed investment from the private sector, and (ii) to build momentum for a set of large-scale early actions for REDD+ that involve significant private finance and can offer proof points for the construction of enabling national and international policies for REDD+. Implementation of the REDD+ proposals from developing nations has already begun at the local level and has been seen as one of the achievements so far during the UNFCCC COP16 meeting in Mexico.

### **(a) Rainforest Initiative**

The GLOBE Legislator Rainforest Initiative will benefit developing countries. The Initiative places rainforest nation legislators at the forefront of sustainably managing the world's tropical forests and advancing effective strategies to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. Reducing deforestation by 50% by 2020 and halting forest losses by 2030 is an ambitious target but necessary if indeed the impacts of climate change have to be reversed. The Brazilian Senate, the Indonesian House of representatives and the Cameroon Assemblée have agreed to support the initiative and offered to host the Legislator Forest Forums. This initiative will ensure legislators from all rainforest nations are actively engaged in advancing coordinated legislation that meets the targets for 2020 and 2030 targets. Equally important will be the strengthened scrutiny and transparency of the REDD+ process.

The Globe rainforest strategy outlines the key steps that legislators can take to develop progressive forest policy strategies that meet national deforestation targets. The series of legislator forest forums will bring together legislators from all the rainforest nations in each region to share best legislative practice and develop a "GLOBE Regional Forestry Strategy" that responds to the circumstances in each of the regions.

## **2. Policy Framework on Illegal Logging**

Illegal logging is a global phenomenon. Timber is deemed to be illegally logged if it does not comply with the national legislation that applies to the place of felling. In this context, the relevant legal framework covers all laws and statutory provisions related to logging and deforestation. Hence policies developed to prohibit illegal logging at the regional level can only work if those at the national level are designed to achieve the same goal. In addition policies developed to avert the impacts of climate change such as REDD will only be achieved when policies in related sectors are in place. The Commission, guided by this understanding, looked at the different policies on illegal logging at the global level especially the US Lacey Act-style legislation. At the regional level, the European Union plans to work with their colleagues in the parliaments of the major European purchasers to introduce similar national legislation in order to send a united message.

The report provides the following recommendations on developing policy proposals on illegal logging.

No	Policy Recommendations to address illegal logging	Relevance to developing countries
1	Introduction of a Global system for recognising and supporting source country licensing Schemes for legal timber, encompassing all major timber source and consumer countries	Such a system will recognize and respect the laws of each producer country
2	Introduction of domestic legislation within G8 countries to reinforce the legislation passed by producer countries	Prevents the importation of timber produced illegally.
3	Building protected markets for legal and sustainable timber products to help raise the market price for legal and sustainable timber.	Encourage economic incentives
4	The G8 to support the introduction of a global Forestry Transparency Initiative. FTI to be developed with international finance institutions and pilot tested at a country level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant financial information provided to improve accountability and governance of national forest resources.</li> <li>• Public and Private bodies will be required to participate and comply with the requirements of FTI</li> </ul>
5	<p>Finance for sustainable forest management ( G8 to direct ODI to producer countries)</p> <p>G8 to create mechanisms through international finance institutions and others such as GEF to encourage realistic private capital investment.</p> <p>G8 to commit to develop options for financing sustainable forest management based on payment for Eco-system services</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building</li> <li>• Implementation of sustainable forest management activities</li> <li>• Value addition in timber processing capacity within producer countries rather than exporting raw timber</li> <li>• Transition from timber producers to multiple revenue (goods and services)</li> </ul>

### 3. Globe Marine Fisheries Policy Frameworks

GLOBE has provided a comprehensive list of policy recommendations in the Marine sector as provided by the Marine Technical Advisory Group. The Commission also noted the key issues to be addressed if marine fisheries are to become sustainably managed.

The main themes highlighted as priorities for legislators to act on either at the national level or regional level in the near future included.

- Complete revision of the way most fisheries are managed with issues such as subsidies, overcapacity and current RFMO practice all requiring immediate attention.
- Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported fishing as a priority, sufficient technical and logistical capacity, potential benefits of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and raising the capacity and effectiveness of nations to manage their marine waters within a coordinated framework.

Below are some of the recommendations taken from the Marine Fisheries Policy Framework.

No	Policy recommendation	Relevance to Developing Countries
1	Redirect inappropriate subsidies which artificially increase the profitability of fishing, leading to overcapacity and over fishing	Food security and sustainable fisheries
2	Mandate the United Nations to review and monitor RFMO performance by providing comprehensive global oversight and ensuring effective science based decision making, referring to existing benchmark standards for RFMOs in the UNFSA	Capacity building
3	Hold states accountable by using the international tribunal on the law of the sea (ITLOS) to better enforce the international legal responsibilities of states, specifically compliance and performance, when operating in the high seas	Improvement in compliance and enforcement
4	Revise RFMO mandates to specifically include a precautionary, eco-system based approach to management, protection of biodiversity in the marine environment and long term sustainability of fish stocks (as already required by UNFSA)	RFMOs will be able to set catch limits according to scientific recommendations and manage fish stocks
5	Apply environmental, economic and social assessments to all fisheries to determine the optimal way to operate the fishery and achieve maximum economic value of specific social goals, within the framework of sustainable eco-system based fisheries and environmental management	Sustainable management of fisheries
6	Investigate a “Cap and Restore” approach for severely depleted fisheries that would impose a temporary moratorium or drastic reduction in catches and effort to allow fish stocks to recover.	Modernization of the fishing industry
7	Fishing and Traceability	Improvement in compliance and enforcement

The Commission also provided a set of high level policy recommendations to improve the biological and economic sustainability of marine capture fisheries. The three main aspects in these series of policies were

- Regulation of Fisheries
- Overcapacity
- Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)

Under the International Regulation of Fisheries, it was noted that although each country has implemented international agreements, developing countries often lack the capability making it impossible to implement such agreements. The United Nations Convention on Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and the 1995 Fish Stocks Agreement (UNFSA) establish the fundamental principles and obligations for the management of fisheries under international law. The regional and sub-regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs) also exist. However, there is clear evidence that the increasing numbers of overexploited or collapsed fish stocks is as a result of the failure of the States to comply with their obligations under international law and the failure of RFMOs to sustainably manage fisheries.

A set of policy recommendations on overcapacity in marine fisheries aimed to provide economic security for fishers while reducing over fishing, thereby encouraging economic and environmental sustainability. Among them were:

- the establishment of a rights based management system to create incentives for economically efficient fishing;
- the discussions on tradable catch rights;
- discipline subsidies that promote overcapacity and over fishing; and
- continue subsidies that promote sustainability.

However, it was noted that although many of the fisheries managed by RFMOs currently need to reduce overcapacity, ways to balance the fishery development rights of developing countries have become a major problem in recent years.

The MPAs as a Fisheries tool was cited as one of the tools to implement the comprehensive management measures. This tool is important for achieving an ecosystem approach to fisheries' management and as a rational and practical way of managing marine resources. Community-based MPA management or co-management initiatives are also an important and often highly successful approach for small-scale artisanal subsistence fisheries as part of integrated coastal zone management. The recommended policies included:

- implementation of a Global Network of Marine Protected Areas;
- integrating the use of MPAs as a management tool into regional fisheries management programmes at the ecosystem level to complement other approaches such as Transferable Quotas;
- supporting both small scale co-management initiatives and traditional management practices involving MPAs; and
- providing funding for further MPA research.

The policy papers from GLOBE Japan, Korea, United Kingdom and European Union provide detailed policy frameworks at country level and regional levels on Marine fisheries. Such case studies showcase the best practices and innovations that currently exist within the fishing industry and can be useful for developing countries seeking to develop and improve their fishing industries.

#### 4. Policy Frameworks on Tropical Coral Reefs.

The latest scientific research reveals that coral reefs have adversely been affected by climate change and rising carbon-dioxide levels. Those in the tropics will be degraded and eventually collapse due to climate change and human impacts. The restoration and adaptation measures for coral reefs and forest dependent communities require policies to increase their resilience especially in developing countries. The Commission based the recommendations on social and economic reasons in order to provide decision makers with clear economic choices. This will establish both the estimated value of tropical coral reefs and the known and potential costs of their degradation and loss. The Commission prioritised the improved management and control of direct human impacts such as over fishing, destructive fishing, coastal pollution and uncontrolled development. Since many coral reefs are located within the waters of developing countries, technical and financial assistance to improve the management of these ecosystems was required. These actions could be supported through the use of large networks of no-take marine protected areas and other direct management interventions, such as the improved control of watershed-based activities whose effects on coastal water quality can be severe.

A number of other policy and management actions were recommended as follows:

No.	Policy recommendations	Relevance
1.	Saving Coral Reef as a functional ecosystem  (Reduce emissions to stabilise CO2 concentration and reduce or eliminate anthropogenic impacts on coral reefs ecosystems so that they can cope with the effects of climate change)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source of livelihood for countries</li> <li>• Enhancing carbon sinks through management of land-based and aquatic carbon sinks</li> <li>• Saving coral reefs</li> <li>• Poverty reduction</li> </ul>
2.	Planning for Climate change impacts on Coral Reefs and providing funding for research into the likely biophysical and socio-economic consequences of the loss of coral reefs as a functioning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparedness to deal with climate change</li> <li>• Capacity building</li> <li>• Sustainable management of coral reefs</li> </ul>

#### II. Other Terms of Reference

**The Project aimed to address the key drivers of ecosystem degradation and unsustainable land use through regulatory and legislative measures; did the Project succeed in defining the key drivers?**

- Climate change has been cited as one of the drivers of ecosystem degradation. The report has successfully addressed the impacts of climate change on forests, marine and coral reefs and designed policies and strategies to address the climate change challenge.
- The loss of forests in developing countries has risen significantly. So far 25 countries have lost their forest cover. The loss is attributed to expansion of cropland for agriculture and pastures. The forest proposals developed by the Commission contributed to the REDD+ text in the UNFCCC negotiations. The REDD+ scheme seeks to address the degradation of forests by all country parties.



- The increasing human population was identified as a driver that increases pressure on marine capture fisheries as well as lead to increasing impacts from sedimentation and coastal pollution from land use changes, agriculture and industry.
- Ocean acidification has a widespread effect on coral reefs. The coral reefs change from complex structures into degrading and eroding ones within a few decades under present rates of Carbon-dioxide of 14% missions.
- Increased acidity in the water causes decreased growth rates and skeletal strength in reef building. A drop in growth rate of 14% has already been observed for coral of the Great Rift Barrier Reef.

**Did the project improve understanding among legislators, finance ministers and heads of governments of the links between land use change and global environmental challenges?**

- The project managed to create different groups which helped to improve the understanding among legislators and heads government on the links between land use change and global environmental challenges. The sub-groups of legislators with an interest in each of the specific topics created by the parliamentary co-chairs helped to maximise the impact within each policy. The Tropical forest group that was established in 2009 remained active and continues to expand and evolve. In 2010 the secretariat identified the relevant legislators to lead the Commission's work on Marine Ecosystems and Natural Capital.
- A number of background legislator briefing papers were prepared for the Commission relating to the science, economics and policy landscape of tropical forests and REDD which were shared. The working paper on *Coral Reefs and Climate Change* for example provided legislators with an overview of the known and predicted impacts of climate change on tropical coral reefs.
- The establishment of a network of relevant experts that kept the Commission informed on the new policy areas helped in the understanding of the links between land use change and global environmental challenges. It is through such networks that positive responses have been received by a number of parliamentarians keen to profile their country's efforts to increase investment in conserving natural capital, whether through passing specific legislation or by supporting large scale coordinated projects.
- The series of national and regional policy workshops held throughout the process contributed to the mapping of the existing policy landscape in addressing land use change and ecosystem degradation and enabled the identification of policy gaps and best practice for Commissioners.

**Did the project increase the capacity of legislators and policy makers to develop public policy responses in order to address problems of land use change and biodiversity loss?**

- The Commission developed Forestry proposals in 2009 with input from the legislators during the Nairobi (July 2009) and Pittsburgh (September 2009) and endorsed at the GLOBE legislators Copenhagen Forum (October 2009). The proposals fed into the REDD+ text at UNFCCC COP15. The finalisation of the document led to the Commission legislators agreeing to advance these recommendations within their own parliaments and to encourage their governments to support the adopted principles in international agreements.
- In Copenhagen (October 2009), the Commission held a session which highlighted the potential impacts of climate change on tropical coral reefs. The Commission's advisors presented the latest scientific and socio-economic understanding of how this critical marine ecosystem could be threatened with extinction by the dual pressures of ocean acidification and ocean warming if atmospheric carbon dioxide levels were not reduced to below 350

parts per million. GLOBE members were given the opportunity to respond to the latest scientific analysis of the threats to coral reefs and discussed what policy tools were needed in order to enable legislators to make informed decisions on mitigation and adaptation measures.

- Illegal logging was a topic that was a key part of GLOBE's forest policy proposals and a number of the Commission's leading legislators played a central role in the improving and leading the legislation that was eventually passed by the European Parliament in July 2010. Despite the establishment of a ban of illegally-harvested timber at the first placement on the market, this new legislation does not prohibit its onward sale along the supply chain. Therefore, a number of the Commission legislators are now looking to pass further national legislation in order to further reduce the trade of illegal timber in key EU member states.
- The technical support provided by advisory groups helped legislators to scrutinise national and international policy processes and facilitate cross-national strengthening of the role of parliamentarians in shaping national and international policy ecosystems and land use change.
- The collaboration with the Zoological Society of London and the subsequent establishment of marine and terrestrial technical advisory groups ensured that the policy options developed for the Commission reflect the latest scientific understanding.
- The Commission played a critical role in assisting parliamentarians to achieve the objectives of the CBD as outlined in the strategic plan of the CBD during CBD COP 10 in Nagoya. The key elements for the successful implementation of the Convention as advocated by the Commission was to support the approval of a new strategic plan for the CBD; greater financial support for the GEF as the financing mechanism for the Convention; establishment of the Access and Benefit Sharing (ASB) Protocol under the CBD and increased financing support for developing countries in order to ensure that the necessary measures can be implemented. Working with the CBD secretariat and the party delegations from Brazil and Malawi, the Commission Director managed to include three sections of text into the draft strategic plan that refer to the need for parliamentarians to be more actively engaged within CBD.

**Has high level debate on land use change and ecosystem services increased as a consequence of the Project?**

- The increase in the level of debates is evidenced by the numerous invitations presented to Globe international to make presentations in different forums. A notable example is the Parliamentarians and Biodiversity Forum where GLOBE International was invited to co-host the meeting with GLOBE Japan and CBD Secretariat.
- The Commission, made valuable input at the Nagoya meeting CBD (COP 10) where it called for a transition to a new global economy where biodiversity, ecosystem services and natural capital are carefully integrated into policy making processes at all levels of government, private sector and civil society as proposed in the GLOBE Natural Capital Action Plan.
- The work of the Commission has been recognized to an extent that they have been able to present their outputs at two UNFCCC meetings of the Conference of Parties including the COP 15 in Copenhagen Denmark and COP 16 in Mexico. There are plans to present the project outputs at the next UNFCCC COP 17 that will be held in South Africa in 2011.

**Did the project succeed in developing new policy and legislative tools to address the problems of land use change and are there indications that the Commission's policy recommendations will be incorporated into national legislation?**

- The numerous proposals developed and refined along the process is a clear indication of the success made in developing new policies. In the UK for, example, a bill was presented to the UK House of Commons to prohibit the sale of timber and wood products that were produced illegally in their country of origin and for connected purposes. However, the general elections were called almost at the same time when this bill had just been presented to the House of Commons. The new coalition government has produced a programme for government which includes a commitment to introduce measures to make the import or illegal sale of timber a criminal offence.
- In October 2008, The European Commission published its draft 'due diligence' regulation which was then debated by the European Parliament and Council during 2009. The Councils revised version was published in March 2010 prompting a lively debate in the European Parliament on ways to potentially strengthen the amendments.
- The Commission put forth proposals on forest policy to be adopted to successfully reduce deforestation - a critical component of preventing dangerous levels of climate change. One of the ways used to influence the adoption of these proposals was by providing a text for REDD+ at the UNFCCC COP15.

**Did the project succeed in engaging 'new actors' in the development of policy recommendations for land use change?**

- The project succeeded in engaging new actors but a lot more could have been done through the already established networks of the Commission. A notable new actor was the private sector. As part of the Commission's work on tropical forest policy, funding requirements for the REDD mechanism was key. The Commission meeting in Pittsburgh during the G20 meeting developed a public-private dialogue on forest financing. At the UNFCCC COP 15, the Commission co-hosted a meeting with the World Economic Forum, which brought together senior GLOBE legislators and leading representatives from the private sector and industry.
- The project through its reports highlighted how legislators can play a critical role in encouraging the private sector to value ecosystem services and biodiversity in their decision making. The secretariat plans to work with MEPs from GLOBE EU and the Japanese Ministry of Environment and the Brazilian and Mexican governments to develop these recommendations.

**Has the project succeeded in identifying new directions or opportunities, and if so, what?**

- The project has indicated the next steps that it intends to take on after the first phase under Tropical forests, marine fisheries, tropical coral reefs and natural capital Under the Natural capital, the Commission will advance the recommendations from the GLOBE Natural Capital Action Plan with a select group of 10-12 developed and developing countries. These proposals will outline the steps that legislators should take to recognise the full value of ecosystem services and biodiversity in policy making, with a particular focus on 'greening' national income accounts or integrate ecosystem valuation into economic growth strategies.
- The Commission intends to request countries to prepare comprehensive accounts that include natural capital under the broader conceptual framework of environmental accounting. This will help address the shortcomings of traditional accounts regarding the treatment of environment.

- The project also intends to involve end users of environmental accounts and ensure that parliamentarians support this approach and appreciate the need to value natural capital.
- The GLOBE initiative also intends to work with a number of partner organizations in order to bring together leading experts with key parliamentarians in each country. The initiative will target RIO+20 events in mid 2012 as an opportunity to reflect on early progress and is expected to run through 2015.
- On tropical forests there is an opportunity for the GLOBE international secretariat to work with key rainforest nations to create an effective REDD+ mechanism. These ideas have been formulated into a draft proposal that has been given the working title of the GLOBE Legislator Rainforest Initiative.
- The Commission had the opportunity to launch the GLOBE initiative at the GLOBE Mexico City Legislators Forum during the UNFCCC COP 16 at a special session that focused on the role of legislators in reducing tropical deforestation. It is also targeting the next COP (17) which will be held in South Africa. Here the legislators from all the rainforest nations shall have the opportunity to present their existing efforts to advance legislation and to monitor their government strategy and commitments.
- The International Year of Forests, 2011 also presents another opportunity for the initiative to focus on the national implementation and a series of legislator forums will be hosted by three rainforest nations in the first quarter of the year. Thereafter the initiative shall develop and advance effective legislation that implements the “GLOBE Regional Forestry Strategies” developed at the forums. In mid-2012, at Rio+20 the initiative shall outline how they have advanced coordinated legislation that contributes to dramatically reducing tropical deforestation.
- Following the European parliament approving the new legislation in July 2010 on illegal logging, the Commission has adopted the position that key member states of the EU should advance national legislation that creates a comprehensive ban on the trade of illegal timber. The Commission hopes that this legislation will not be delayed on the grounds that there is now a more progressive position within Europe.
- In the marine fisheries, the Commission future priorities for the marine environment are to advance the existing proposals on marine fisheries (part 1) and to develop and advance the recommendations for tropical coral reefs (part 11) and coastal shelf ecosystems (part 111) in order to complete the GLOBE Marine Ecosystem Recovery Strategy.
- Once agreed in full, the Commission will present the GLOBE Marine Ecosystems Recovery Strategy to the GLOBE plenary session at an International Oceans Forum on Earth Day in April 2011. The commission will seek endorsement for the strategy from the wider GLOBE network and report back on the achievements within their national governments. The work of the Commission’s marine programme will culminate at the Rio+20 event in 2012 when legislators will report to the international community on the progress made to achieve long term sustainable marine ecosystem recovery. Such an opportunity could serve as an opportunity to extend the initiative a further three years based on achievements over the project period.

- All selected sub-groups identified the gaps in legislation and identified priorities for the next steps to be undertaken in order to bridge the gap between science and policy. The UK All parliamentary fisheries group while addressing the issue of overcapacity, they called for improved fisheries management to control capacity and increasing compliance with existing or new regulations to help eliminate the negative effects of excess capacity. More scientific research for improved results fisheries management was also identified. This was in regard to stock assessments for quota and non-quota species, the potential benefits of MPAs for conservation and fisheries objectives in European waters. Devolvement of fisheries management to the regional or local level was also identified as the next step.

## 7.7 Annex 7: Overview of planned activities for the commission in Phase 2.

**Tropical Forests.** The GLOBE International Secretariat has been in close communication with senior legislators from the key rainforest nations about how GLOBE can continue this workstream to help create an effective REDD+ mechanism. These ideas have been formulated into a draft proposal that has been given the working title of the ‘GLOBE Legislator Rainforest Initiative’. In addition, GLOBE Brazil, Indonesian and Cameroon have committed to hosting a Regional Forest Forum in their parliaments as part of this initiative. The initiative will take place over an initial 2-year period, starting in late 2010 at the UNFCCC COP16, running through 2011, the International Year of Forests, and concluding at the “Rio +20” event in 2012. By developing and advancing progressive forestry legislation that meets national deforestation targets and encourages sustainable growth, GLOBE aims to complement the ongoing inter-government process to reduce, and ultimately halt, deforestation.

**The Marine Environment.** The Commission’s future priorities for the marine environment are to advance the existing proposals on marine fisheries (Part I) and to develop and advance the recommendations for tropical coral reefs (Part II) and coastal shelf ecosystems (Part III), in order to complete the GLOBE Marine Ecosystems Recovery Strategy. These recommendations will evolve from a similar process of national and regional workshops that bring legislators, expert advisors, industry representatives and community stakeholders into discussion. Part III of the strategy will be developed by the first quarter of 2011. The Commission’s work on coastal shelf ecosystems will focus on Sustainable Mariculture, Coastal and Offshore Development, Eutrophication and Debris.

The Commission will present the GLOBE Marine Ecosystems Recovery Strategy to the GLOBE plenary session at an International Oceans Forum on Earth Day in April 2011. The work of the Commission’s marine programme will culminate at the “Rio+20” event in 2012, when legislators will report to the gathered international community on the progress made to achieve long-term, sustainable marine ecosystems recovery. This will serve as a platform to extend the initiative a further three years based on achievements over the past two years.

**Natural Capital.** Following the endorsement of the GLOBE Natural Capital Action Plan at the Parliamentarians and Biodiversity Forum in Nagoya in October 2010, the Commission will advance these recommendations with a select group of 10-12 developed and developing countries. These proposals will outline the steps that legislators should take to recognise the full value of ecosystem services and biodiversity in policy making, with a particular focus on ‘greening’ national income accounts to integrate ecosystem valuation into economic growth strategies. A key point of departure is that many parliaments have responsibility over national accounts/statistical offices and not governments.

An early component of this initiative will be to involve the end-users of environmental accounts and ensure that parliamentarians, who in many cases have oversight for the production of national income accounts, support this approach and appreciate the need to value natural capital. In particular, the Commission will work with legislators who sit on the Public Accounts Committee, finance committees, or equivalent parliamentary body, who are responsible for examining the public expenditure of the government. This GLOBE initiative will work with a number of partner organisations in order to bring together the leading experts with the key parliamentarians in each country. The initiative will target the “Rio+20” event in mid-2012 as an opportunity to reflect on

early progress and is expected to run through to 2015. (Source of Annex: GLOBE, 2010 Final Report).

## 7.8 Annex 8: Views of legislators on the main barriers to implementing the commission's recommendations, and the priorities for Phase 2

According to the legislators responding to the email survey the main barriers to implementing the Commission's recommendations include: political instability and/or inertia in some countries; the applicability of the recommendations at the national level and the need for economic incentives to promote sustainability; the need for the information to be more widely presented and understood including improved public awareness as public opinion is important to politicians; getting politician who are typically elected on a four year cycle to focus on environment issues, which are often seen as long term issues, instead of the economy and jobs; co-ordination at the Legislature and Government levels, whether at local, provincial or national levels; difficulties evaluating the economic value of nature according to international definitions due to a lack of trained professionals to execute the job; and, limited financial resources.

### Legislator's recommendations for Phase 2

- **Governance and Transparency.** The governance of the GLOBE community worldwide is unclear and there is no formal decision making body. A discussion is needed over the merits of a federal model integrated by national chapters forming GLOBE regions and a centralised system in which a GLOBE international secretariat based in the UK would manage the national and regional staff of GLOBE chapters. More transparency is required over the Commission's operations for example the current level of funding, range of donors and fundraising strategy of GLOBE International, and how technical partners and advisors are selected.
- **Selection of experts.** Involvement of GLOBE chapters in the screening and selection of scientific experts to increase the legitimise of the Commission and ensure that the range of scientific and political sensitivities across the regions is adequately reflected.
- **Implementation of recommendations.** The Commission needs to move on with the next building blocks, so that specific recommendation can be implemented. There should be a focus on country and regional specific issues.
- **Relevance of recommendations at country scale.** The recommendations are too ambitious for some countries, for example setting up a separate Ministry under the National Capital Initiative. In some developing countries it is necessary to first sensitise MPs to the issues. A slower, two tiered process is therefore needed for developing countries. It is recommended that pilot countries are used to test how to support domestic / national approach. Nepal, for example, would be keen to be a pilot country and would be an interesting candidate given the significance of its natural resources and the fact that it is about to draft a new constitution presenting an opportunity for the inclusion of new environmental legislation.
- **Representation of Europe.** The current selection of countries in Europe is problematic insofar as it does not provide a satisfactory answer to the European integration process and its policy development reality. France, Germany, the UK and Italy are represented independently as Members of the G-8 but not as Members of the EU, although their environmental policies are necessarily aligned by virtue of their EU Membership - most of the national environmental policy of the UK, France, Italy and Germany is done in Brussels, not in London, Paris, Rome or Berlin. Further the EU itself is represented as an equal, additional "country", with a weight equal to Canada's or Italy's. In the meantime, other non-G-8 Members of the European Union, some of which are global environmental policy actors (i.e. NL, Norway), are not represented at all - and any solution involving the inclusion of yet more European countries would make the region of Europe even more over-represented. A formula reflecting more accurately the reality of European environmental policy could involve having a single European delegation integrated predominantly by MEPs from the EP Environment Committee, from G-8 countries or otherwise, plus MPs from the European G-8 countries if necessary.
- **Others:** Greater involvement of countries in the African continental coast; continued emphasis on science; and development of a communications strategy to get the material more broadly available

**Source:** Based on email survey of legislators and interview responses



## 7.9 Annex 9: Terms of reference

### Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP GEF project GF/3010-08-20 (4A21)

“International Commission on Land Use Change & Ecosystems” GEF Id No. 3811

#### 1. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

**GEF Project ID:** 3811 (GFL/2328-2715-xxxx; PMS: GF/3010-08-xx)

**Project duration:** 25 months

Commencing: November 2008

Completion: December 2010

**Country:** Global

**Project Title:** International Commission on Land Use Change & Ecosystems

**GEF Implementing Agency:** UNEP

#### Project rationale

Significant analytical and research work has been undertaken to establish the ecological and economic value of managing the planet’s biological diversity in a prudent and sustainable manner. Despite our understanding that biological systems have an inherent value to society only rarely is such value captured in markets or built into public policy decision making. The recent experience with the evolution of carbon markets under the Kyoto Protocol suggests that there is scope for market based solutions to better align the economic value of environmental services with financial markets. The question is whether there is scope for enlightened public policy to play a role in encouraging markets for other high value ecological services.

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment concluded that land use change is the most important driver to degradation of ecosystem services. However, this important message has not trickled down effectively to the policy level. Legislators are a key constituency that has yet to meaningfully engage with regard to the creation of a regulatory structure that places a value on ecosystems and addresses the multiple challenges of land use change. The global significance of the ‘International Commission on Land Use Change & Ecosystems’- project will be the opportunity to create a unique and unrivalled platform to engage senior politicians from across the globe in the development of key regulatory and legislative measures to address land use change and its drivers as well as to develop market incentives that will place a value on ecosystem services. It will further increase momentum to incorporate environmental considerations into non-environmental legislation and policy making, in particular focusing on developmental policy.

The Project goal as stated in the Project Document was:

“Key drivers of degradation of ecosystems and unsustainable land use change that are contributing to climate change and biodiversity loss will be addressed through regulatory and legislative measures”

The Project objective as stated in the Project Document was:

“To assist legislators and parliamentarians in a global discourse on developing regulatory tools and applied public policy to address land use change and ecosystem degradation”

### **Relevance to GEF Programmes**

*The project feeds into the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy and into its long-term objective 2 (BD-2; Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes/seascapes and Sectors). The project is compliant with GEF Strategic Priorities SP-4<sup>11</sup> and SP-5<sup>12</sup> through a multi-pronged approach that supports the strengthening of policy and regulatory frameworks for mainstreaming biodiversity, while removing critical knowledge barriers and fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services.*

### **Executing Arrangements**

The Implementing Agency (IA) for this project was UNEP and the Executing Agency (EA) was Globe International. GLOBE, the Global Legislators Organisation for a Balanced Environment, was scheduled to provide overall management and oversight for the Project from its Secretariat headquarters in London, UK. A small project oversight committee between UNEP & GLOBE was also to be established.

### **Planned Outputs and Outcomes**

For the first six months the Project was planned to focus on forest ecosystems to enable advance positions to the development of the UNFCCC COP in Copenhagen. Thereafter the Commission was planned to broaden its scope to address other land use conversions including sustainable biofuels. The Commission was planned to develop proposed regulatory and legislative measures in order to address key drivers of land use change and resulting contribution to climate change and biodiversity loss.

**The Project Outputs were designed to contribute to four Project Outcomes as stated in the Project Document’s Result Framework as follows;**

---

<sup>11</sup> Strengthening the policy and regulatory frameworks for mainstreaming biodiversity

<sup>12</sup> Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services

- a) Public policy assessed through a lens of state-of-the-art scientific knowledge, and new policy and legislative tools developed
  - To map international efforts of what is happening to address land use change and biodiversity loss and how this inter-links with international efforts to address climate change.
  - To better understand the lessons from successful and unsuccessful applied public policy to address land use change and biodiversity loss.
  - To provide focus to develop applied public policy responses to key drivers of land use change and biodiversity loss.
- b) High level debate stimulated on land use change and ecosystem services
  - To place issues of land use change and biodiversity loss on the political agenda of senior legislators, finance ministers and heads of government.
  - To stimulate a high level debate on the overarching approach to valuation of ecosystem services.
- c) Capacities built for legislators and policy makers through outreach and communications
  - To provide a platform for outreach to political actors not traditionally engaged in this policy area.
- d) Project Management
  - To deliver the project on time and to budget.

## **Budget**

The total cost of the project was US\$2,000,000 of which US\$1,000,000 was GEF financing.

Cost to the GEF Trust Fund: US\$1,000,000

Cash contribution from the Executing Agency: US\$400,000

In-kind contribution from the Executing Agency: US\$600,000

Total cost of the project: US\$2,000,000

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION**

### **1. Objective and Scope of the Evaluation**

The objective of this Terminal Evaluation is to examine the extent and magnitude of any project impacts to date and determine the likelihood of future impacts. The evaluation will also assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. Since this is an evaluation of the first phase of the project, emphasis should be given to providing actionable recommendations for improvement of the project for the next phase. The evaluation will focus on identifying the corrective actions needed for the project to achieve maximum impact. Evaluation findings will feed back into the project management processes through specific recommendations and 'lessons learned' to date.

The evaluation will focus on the following main questions:

- The Project aimed to address the key drivers of ecosystem degradation and unsustainable land use through regulatory and legislative measures; did the Project succeed in defining the key drivers?

- Did the project improve understanding among legislators, finance ministers and heads of governments of the links between land use change and global environmental challenges?
- Did the project increase the capacity of legislators and policy makers to develop public policy responses in order to address problems of land use change and biodiversity loss?
- Has high level debate on land use change and ecosystem services increased as a consequence of the Project?
- Did the project succeed in developing new policy and legislative tools to address the problems of land use change and are there indications that the Commission's policy recommendations will be incorporated into national legislation?
- Has the Project succeeded in developing market incentives to place a value on ecosystem services?
- Did the project succeed in engaging 'new actors' in the development of policy recommendations for land use change?
- Has the project succeeded in identifying new directions or opportunities, and if so, what?
- The evaluation should also concentrate on the following questions regarding the Project's next phase:
  - What recommendations could be made to improve delivery / impacts / involvement of the legislators in similar future projects?
  - Did the project meet the expectations of the legislative stakeholders? If not, what improvements could be made?
  - Identify broader synergies with UNEPs Programme of Work

## **2. Methods**

This Terminal Evaluation will be conducted as an in-depth evaluation using a participatory mixed-methods approach, during which the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, key representatives of the Executing Agencies and other relevant staff are kept informed and consulted throughout the evaluation. The consultants will liaise with the UNEP Evaluation Office and the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager on any logistic and/or methodological issues to properly conduct the review in as independent a way as possible, given the circumstances and resources offered. The draft report will be delivered to the UNEP Evaluation Office. The Chief of the Evaluation Office will circulate the report to UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, who will then distribute the report to key representatives of the Executing Agencies for comments. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to the UNEP Evaluation Office for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary or suggested revisions.

The Evaluation will be conducted by a team of two evaluators, the Lead Evaluator (LE) and Associate Evaluator (AE). The Associate Evaluator will focus on reviewing the Commission's policy frameworks and especially focus on their relevance to developing countries. The Lead Evaluator will collate the findings of the AE into his/her draft report and work in cooperation with the AE to finalise the report.

The findings of the evaluation will be based on multiple approaches:

1. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:

- (a) The project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNEP and GEF annual Project Implementation Review reports), Project Terminal Report and relevant correspondence
  - (b) Notes from the Steering Group meetings
  - (c) Other project-related material produced by the project staff or partners
  - (d) Relevant material published on the project web-site
2. Interviews with project management and technical support
  3. Interviews and telephone interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved with this project, including in the participating countries and international bodies. The Consultant shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of donor agencies and other organisations. As appropriate, these interviews could be combined with an email questionnaire, online survey, or other electronic communication.
  4. Interviews with the UNEP/DGEF project Task Manager and Fund Management Officer, and other relevant staff in UNEP as necessary. The Consultant shall also gain broader perspectives from discussions with relevant GEF Secretariat staff.

In addition the Lead Evaluator will conduct

5. Field visits<sup>13</sup> to project staff and possibly target audiences. The evaluator will visit Globe International Secretariat in London and the project's main technical partner, the Zoological Society of London.

### **Key Evaluation Principles**

In attempting to evaluate any outcomes and impacts that the project may have achieved, evaluators should remember that the project's performance should be assessed by considering the difference between the answers to two simple questions "***what happened?***" and "***what would have happened anyway?***". These questions imply that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. In addition it implies that there should be plausible evidence to **attribute** such outcomes and impacts **to the actions of the project**.

Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluator, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.

### **3. Project Evaluation Parameters and Ratings**

The success of project implementation will be rated on a scale from 'highly unsatisfactory' to 'highly satisfactory'. In particular the evaluation shall **assess and rate** the project with respect to the **eleven categories (A-K)**<sup>14</sup> defined below.

---

<sup>13</sup> Evaluators should make a brief courtesy call to GEF Country Focal points during field visits if at all possible.

<sup>14</sup> However, the views and comments expressed by the evaluator need not be restricted to these items.

It should be noted that many of the evaluation parameters are interrelated. For example, the ‘achievement of objectives and planned results’ is closely linked to the issue of ‘sustainability’. Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts and is, in turn, linked to the issues of ‘catalytic effects/ replication’ and, often, ‘country ownership’ and ‘stakeholder participation’.

The **ratings for the parameters A-K will be presented in the form of a table (see Annex 1)**. Each of the eleven categories should be rated separately with **brief justifications** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The following rating system is to be applied:

HS	= Highly Satisfactory
S	= Satisfactory
MS	= Moderately Satisfactory
MU	= Moderately Unsatisfactory
U	= Unsatisfactory
HU	= Highly Unsatisfactory

**A. Attainment of Objectives and Planned Results:**

The evaluation should assess the extent to which the project's major relevant objectives were effectively and efficiently achieved or are expected to be achieved and their relevance.

- *Effectiveness:* Evaluate the **overall likelihood of impact achievement**, taking into account the “achievement indicators”, the achievement of outcomes and the progress made towards impacts. UNEP’s Evaluation Office advocates the use of the **Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI)** method (described in Annex 6) to establish this rating.
- *Relevance:* In retrospect, were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/ operational program strategies? Ascertain the nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the CBD and the UNFCCC and the wider portfolio of the GEF.
- *Efficiency:* Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing, and any additional resources leveraged by the project, to the project’s achievements. Did the project build on earlier initiatives; did it make effective use of available scientific and/ or technical information? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

**B. Sustainability:**

Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes

of the project, e.g. stronger institutional capacities or better informed decision-making. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes. The evaluation should ascertain to what extent follow-up work has been initiated and how project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced over time. **Application of the ROTI method** described in Annex 6 will also assist in the evaluation of sustainability.

Four aspects of sustainability should be addressed: financial, socio-political, institutional frameworks, and environmental (if applicable). The following questions provide guidance on the assessment of these aspects:

- *Financial resources.* Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes and onward progress towards impact? What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will not be available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)? To what extent are the outcomes and eventual impact of the project dependent on continued financial support?
- *Socio-political.* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes and onward progress towards impacts? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- *Institutional framework.* To what extent is the sustenance of the outcomes and onward progress towards impacts dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/ benefits to be sustained? While responding to these questions consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how are in place.
- *Environmental.* Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The TE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example; construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralize the biodiversity-related gains made by the project; or, a newly established pulp mill might jeopardise the viability of nearby protected forest areas by increasing logging pressures; or a vector control intervention may be made less effective by changes in climate and consequent alterations to the incidence and distribution of malarial mosquitoes. Would these risks apply in other contexts where the project may be replicated?

**C. Catalytic Role and Replication:**

The catalytic role of the GEF is embodied in its approach of supporting the creation of an enabling environment, investing in activities which are innovative and showing how new approaches and market changes can work. GEF aims to support activities that upscale new approaches to a national (or regional) level to sustainably achieve global environmental benefits.

In general this catalytic approach can be separated into three broad categories of GEF activities: (1) “**foundational**” and enabling activities, focusing on policy, regulatory frameworks, and national priority setting and relevant capacity (2) **demonstration** activities, which focus on demonstration, capacity development, innovation, and market barrier removal; and (3) **investment** activities, full-size projects with high rates of co-funding, catalyzing investments or implementing a new strategic approach at the national level.

The three categories approach combines all the elements that have been shown to catalyze results in international cooperation. Evaluations in the bilateral and multilateral aid community have shown time and again that activities at the micro level of skills transfer—piloting new technologies and demonstrating new approaches—will fail if these activities are not supported at the institutional or market level as well. Evaluations have also consistently shown that institutional capacity development or market interventions on a larger scale will fail if governmental laws, regulatory frameworks, and policies are not in place to support and sustain these improvements. And they show

In this context the evaluation should assess the catalytic role played by this project by consideration of the following questions:

- **INCENTIVES:** To what extent have the project activities provided incentives (socio-economic/ market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholder behaviour?
- **INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE:** To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviours?
- **POLICY CHANGE:** To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
- **CATALYTIC FINANCING:** To what extent did the project contribute to sustained follow-on financing from Government and/ or other donors? (This is different from co-financing.)
- **PROJECT CHAMPIONS:** To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?

(Note: the **ROtl analysis** should contribute useful information to address these questions)

Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects: *replication proper* (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or *scaling up* (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources).



Is the project suitable for replication? If so, has the project approach been replicated? If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the strategy/ approach adopted by the project to promote replication effects.

**D. Stakeholder Participation/ Public Awareness:**

This consists of three related and often overlapping processes: (1) information dissemination, (2) consultation, and (3) “stakeholder” participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF- financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project. Note: the RoTI analysis should assist the evaluator in identifying the key stakeholders in each step of the causal pathway from activities to objectives. The evaluation will specifically:

- Assess the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders in each participating country and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism was successful, and identify its strengths and weaknesses with respect to the achievement of the intended outcomes and objective of the project..
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of collaboration/ interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of any various public awareness activities that were undertaken during the course of implementation of the project.

**E. Country Ownership/ Drivenness:**

This is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements. The evaluation will:

- Assess the level of country ownership. Specifically, the evaluator should assess whether the project was effective in providing and communicating information on land use management, ecosystem services and biodiversity that catalyzed action in participating countries to improved decision making.
- Assess the level of country commitment to the generation and use of research related to land use management and biodiversity conservation during and after the project, including in regional and international fora.

**F. Achievement of Outputs and Activities:**

- Delivered outputs: Assessment of the project’s success in producing each of the programmed outputs, both in **quantity and quality** as well as **usefulness and timeliness**.
- Assess the soundness and effectiveness of the methodologies used for developing the technical documents and related management options in the participating countries
- Assess to what extent the project outputs produced have the weight of scientific authority/ credibility, necessary to influence policy and decision-makers, particularly at the national level.

**G. Preparation and Readiness:**

Were the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly

considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place?

#### **H. Implementation Approach and Adaptive Management:**

This includes an analysis of the project's management framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management. The evaluation will:

- Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed and whether the project document was clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation.
- Assess the role of the various committees established and the project execution arrangements at all levels policy decisions: (1) Steering Group; (2) day to day project management in each of the country Executing Agencies.
- Assess the extent to which the project responded to the mid-term review/ evaluation (if any).
- Evaluate the effectiveness, efficiency and adaptability of project management and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project.
- Identify administrative, operational and/ or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project.

#### **I. Monitoring and Evaluation:**

The evaluation shall include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The Terminal Evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for 'project design of M&E' and 'the application of the Project M&E plan' (see minimum requirements 1&2 in Annex 4). GEF projects must budget adequately for execution of the M&E plan, and provide adequate resources during implementation of the M&E plan. Project managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to adapt and improve the project.

#### **M&E during project implementation**

**(1) M&E Design.** Projects should have sound M&E plans to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART indicators (see Annex 4) and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.

The evaluator should use the following questions to help assess the M&E design aspects:

### SMART-ness of Indicators

- Are there specific indicators in the logical framework for each of the project objectives and outcomes?
- Are the indicators relevant to the objectives and outcomes?
- Are the indicators for the objectives and outcomes sufficient?
- Are the indicators quantifiable?

### Adequacy of Baseline Information

- Is there baseline information?
- Has the methodology for the baseline data collection been explained?
- Is desired level of achievement for indicators based on a reasoned estimate of baseline?

### Arrangements for Monitoring of Implementation

- Has a budget been allocated for M&E activities?
- Have the responsibility centres for M&E activities been clearly defined?
- Has the time frame for M&E activities been specified?

### Arrangements for Evaluation

- Have specific targets been specified for project outputs?
- Has the desired level of achievement been specified for all Indicators of Objectives and Outcomes?

**(2) M&E Plan Implementation.** A Terminal Evaluation should verify that:

- An M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period (perhaps through use of a logical framework or similar);
- Annual project reports and Progress Implementation Review (PIR) reports were complete, accurate and with well justified ratings;
- That the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs;
- And that projects had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities.
- 

**(3) Budgeting and Funding for M&E Activities.** The Terminal Evaluation should determine whether support for M&E was budgeted adequately and was funded in a timely fashion during implementation.

## **J. Financial Planning and Control:**

Evaluation of financial planning requires assessment of the quality and effectiveness of financial planning and control of financial resources throughout the project's lifetime. Evaluation includes actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. The evaluation should:

- Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding

the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables.

- Present the major findings from the financial audit if one has been conducted.
- Identify and verify the sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing (in co-operation with the IA and EA).
- Assess whether the project has applied appropriate standards of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
- The evaluation should also include a breakdown of final actual costs and co-financing for the project prepared in consultation with the relevant UNEP Fund Management Officer of the project (table attached in Annex 2 “Co-financing and leveraged resources”).

**K. UNEP Supervision and Backstopping:**

The purpose of supervision is to work with the Executing Agency in identifying and dealing with problems which arise during implementation of the project itself. Such problems may be related to project management but may also involve technical/substantive issues in which UNEP has a major contribution to make. The evaluator should assess the effectiveness of supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP/DGEF including:

- (i) The adequacy of project supervision plans, inputs and processes;
- (ii) The emphasis given to outcome monitoring (results-based project management);
- (iii) The realism/ candor of project reporting and rating (i.e. are PIR ratings an accurate reflection of the project realities and risks);
- (iv) The quality of documentation of project supervision activities; and
- (v) Financial, administrative and other fiduciary aspects of project implementation supervision.

In summary, accountability and implementation support through technical assistance and problem solving are the main elements of project supervision (Annex 5).

**L. Complementarity with UNEP Medium Term Strategy and Programme of Work:**

UNEP aims to undertake GEF funded projects that are aligned with its strategy. Whilst it is recognised that UNEP GEF projects designed prior to the production of the UNEP Medium Term Strategy (MTS)<sup>15</sup>/ Programme of Work (POW) 2010/11 would not necessarily be aligned with the Expected Accomplishments articulated in those documents, complementarity may exist nevertheless. For this reason, the complementarity of GEF projects with UNEP’s MTS/ POW will not be formally rated, however, the evaluation should present a brief narrative to cover the following issues:

Linkage to UNEP’s Expected Accomplishments The UNEP Medium Term Strategy specifies desired results in six thematic focal areas. The desired results are termed Expected Accomplishments. Using the completed **ROtl analysis**, the evaluation should comment on whether the project makes a tangible contribution to any of the Expected Accomplishments specified in the UNEP MTS. The magnitude and extent any contributions and the causal linkages should be fully described.

---

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.unep.org/PDF/FinalMTSGCSS-X-8.pdf>

Project contributions that are in-line with the Bali Strategic Plan (BSP)<sup>16</sup>. The outcomes and achievements of the project should be briefly discussed in relation to the objectives of the UNEP BSP.

South-South Cooperation is regarded as the exchange of resources, technology, and knowledge between developing countries. Briefly describe any aspects of the project that could be considered as examples of South-South Cooperation.

In addition, taking into consideration the next phase of the Project, the Evaluator should identify and recommend future possible synergies with UNEP Programme of Work

#### **4. Evaluation Report Format and Review Procedures**

The report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain; the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible and include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

The evaluation will rate the overall implementation success of the project and provide individual ratings of the eleven implementation aspects as described in Chapter 3 of this TOR. ***The ratings will be presented in the format of a table (Annex 1) with brief justifications based on the findings of the main analysis.***

Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. Any dissident views in response to evaluation findings will be appended in an annex. The evaluation report shall be written in English, be of no more than 50 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

- i) **A Project Identification Table:** Identify: (1) Project ID, (2) Title, (3) Location, (4) Start and End Date, (5) Mid-Term Evaluation (if applicable), (6) Executing and Implementing Agencies, Partners, (7) and Budget.
- ii) An **Executive Summary** (no more than 3 pages) providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation;
- iii) **Introduction and Background** giving a brief overview of the evaluated project, for example, the objective and status of activities;
- iv) **Scope, Objective and Methods** presenting the evaluation's purpose, the evaluation criteria used and questions to be addressed; The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2006, requires that a TE report will provide summary information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; the key questions; and, the methodology;
- v) **Project Performance and Impact** providing *factual evidence* relevant to the questions asked by the evaluator and interpretations of such evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report. The evaluator should provide a commentary and analysis on all eleven evaluation aspects (A – L above);
- vi) **Conclusions and Rating** of project implementation success giving the evaluator's concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given evaluation criteria and

---

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.unep.org/GC/GC23/documents/GC23-6-add-1.pdf>

standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to questions about whether the project is considered good or bad, and whether the results are considered positive or negative. The ratings should be provided with a brief narrative comment in a table (see Annex 1);

- vii) **Lessons (to be) Learned** presenting general conclusions from the standpoint of the design and implementation of the project, based on good practices and successes or problems and mistakes. Lessons should have the potential for wider application and use. All lessons should 'stand alone' and should:
- Briefly describe the context from which they are derived;
  - State or imply some prescriptive action;
  - Specify the contexts in which they may be applied (if possible, who when and where).
- viii) **Recommendations** suggesting *actionable* proposals for improvement of the current project. In general, Terminal Evaluations are likely to have very few (perhaps two or three) actionable recommendations. However, for this evaluation, recommendations targeted to the second phase of the Project would be highly important.

*Prior to each recommendation*, the issue(s) or problem(s) to be addressed by the recommendation should be clearly stated.

A high **quality recommendation** is an actionable proposal that is:

1. Feasible to implement within the timeframe and resources available;
  2. Commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners;
  3. Specific in terms of who would do what and when;
  4. Contains results-based language (i.e. a measurable performance target);
  5. Includes a trade-off analysis, when its implementation may require utilizing significant resources that would otherwise be used for other project purposes.
- ix) **Annexes** may include additional material deemed relevant by the evaluator but must include:
1. The Evaluation Terms of Reference (**TOR**),
  2. A **list of interviewees**, and evaluation timeline,
  3. A **list of documents** reviewed/ consulted,
  4. Summary **co-finance information** and a **statement of project expenditure by activity**,
  5. Details of the project's 'impact pathways' and the '**ROtI**' analysis,
  6. The expertise of the evaluation team (**brief CV**).

TE reports will also include any formal response/ comments from the project management team and/ or the country focal point regarding the evaluation findings or conclusions as an annex to the report, however, such will be appended to the report by UNEP Evaluation Office.

Examples of UNEP GEF Terminal Evaluation Reports are available at [www.unep.org/eou](http://www.unep.org/eou).

## **Review of the Draft Evaluation Report**

Draft reports shall be submitted to the Chief of Evaluation. The Chief of Evaluation will share the report with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The DGEF staff and senior Executing Agency staff are allowed to comment on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. Where, possible, a consultation is held between the evaluator, Evaluation Office Staff, the Task Manager and key members of the project execution team. The consultation seeks feedback on the proposed recommendations and lessons. UNEP Evaluation Office collates all review comments and provides them to the evaluator(s) for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

All UNEP GEF Evaluation Reports are subject to quality assessments by UNEP Evaluation Office. These incorporate GEF Office of Evaluation quality assessment criteria and are used as a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluator (see Annex 3).

#### **5. Submission of Final Terminal Evaluation Reports**

The final report shall be submitted in electronic form in MS Word format and should be sent directly to:

Segbedzi Norgbey, Chief,  
UNEP Evaluation Office  
P.O. Box 30552-00100  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel.: (+254-20) 762 3387  
Fax: (+254-20) 762 3158  
Email: [segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org](mailto:segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org)

The Chief of Evaluation will share the report with the following individuals:

Stephen Twomlow  
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF)  
P.O. Box 30552-00100  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: (+254-20) 762 5076  
Fax: (+254-20) 762 3158/ 4042  
Email: [Stephen.twomlow@unep.org](mailto:Stephen.twomlow@unep.org)

Maryam Niamir-Fuller, Director  
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF)

P.O. Box 30552-00100

Nairobi, Kenya

Tel: (+254-20) 762 4686

Fax: (+254-20) 762 3158/ 4042

Email: [Maryam.Niamir-Fuller@unep.org](mailto:Maryam.Niamir-Fuller@unep.org)

The final Terminal Evaluation report will be published on the Evaluation Office website [www.unep.org/eou](http://www.unep.org/eou) and may be printed in hard copy. Subsequently, the report will be sent to the GEF Office of Evaluation for their review, appraisal and inclusion on the GEF website. The full list of intended recipients is attached in Annex 7.

## **6. Resources and Schedule of the Evaluation**

This Evaluation will be undertaken by a team of Evaluators contracted by the UNEP Evaluation Office. The contract for the Lead Evaluator will begin on **1<sup>st</sup> November 2010** and end on **21<sup>st</sup> January 2011** (21 days spread over 12 weeks including 17 days for preparing the draft and 4 days for finalizing the report). The evaluator will submit a draft report on **10<sup>th</sup> December 2010** to UNEP/EO. Evaluation Office will circulate the draft to UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, and key representatives of the Executing Agency for comments. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP/EO for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary revisions. Comments to the final draft report will be sent to the consultant by **22<sup>nd</sup> December 2010** after which, the consultant will submit the final report no later than **21<sup>st</sup> January 2011**.

The contract for the Associate Evaluator will begin on **15<sup>th</sup> November 2010** and end on **21<sup>st</sup> January 2011** (14 days spread over 12 weeks including 12 days for preparing the draft and 2 days for finalizing the report). The AE will submit a draft report by **30<sup>th</sup> November 2010** to the LE. Comments to the final draft report will be sent to the Evaluators by **22<sup>nd</sup> December 2010** after which, the AE will submit the revisions no later than **14<sup>th</sup> January 2011** to the LE.

The Lead Evaluator will after an initial telephone briefing with the staff of the UNEP Evaluation Office and UNEP/GEF Task Manager conduct initial desk review and later meet with project executing agency, Globe International, and the project's main technical partner, the Zoological Society of London.

The Associate Evaluator will after an initial telephone briefing with the staff of the UNEP Evaluation Office and UNEP/GEF Task Manager conduct desk based study of the relevant documentation and if required, organize telephone interviews with relevant project partners.

In accordance with the evaluation policies of UNEP and the GEF, all GEF projects are evaluated by independently contracted evaluators. The evaluator should have the following qualifications:

The Lead Evaluator should not have been associated with the design and implementation of the project in a paid capacity. The Evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation Office, UNEP. The Evaluator should have a Master's degree or higher in economics, environmental resource management or relevant field and at least 7-10 years of experience in environmental economics and/or environmental policy and regulation. The Evaluator should



possess a sound understanding of land use, biodiversity and climate change issues. The Evaluator should have the following minimum qualifications: (i) experience in working on international environmental policy issues; (ii) knowledge of the processes of international high-level policy making; (iii) Understanding and experience in market based solutions for sustainable use of natural resources (iii) experience in working with issues related to environmental research targeted at policy-influence and decision-making; (iv) experience in project evaluation. Knowledge of UNEP programmes and GEF activities is desirable. Fluency in oral and written English is a must.

The Associate Evaluator should not have been associated with the design and implementation of the project in a paid capacity. The evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation Office, UNEP. The evaluator should have a Master's degree or higher in environmental law, environmental politics or relevant field and at least 7-10 years of experience in environmental policy making and environmental economics in developing countries. The Evaluator should possess a sound understanding of land use, biodiversity and climate change issues. The Evaluator should have the following minimum qualifications: (i) experience in working on international environmental policy issues; (ii) knowledge of the processes of international high-level policy making; (iii) Understanding and experience in market based solutions for sustainable use of natural resources (iii) experience in working with issues related to environmental research targeted at policy-influence and decision-making; (iv) experience in project evaluation. Knowledge of UNEP programmes and GEF activities is desirable. Fluency in oral and written English is a must.

## **7. Schedule Of Payment**

### **Fee-only Option**

The evaluator will receive an initial payment of 40% of the total amount due upon acceptance of the draft report. Final payment of 60% will be made upon acceptance and satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual SSAs of the evaluator and is **NOT** inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses. Ticket and DSA will be paid separately.

In case, the evaluator cannot provide the products in accordance with the TOR, the timeframe agreed, or his products are substandard, the payment to the evaluator could be withheld, until such a time the products are modified to meet UNEP's standard. In case the evaluator fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP, the product prepared by the evaluator may not constitute the evaluation report.

## 7.10

### Annex 10: The expertise of the evaluation team

#### Dr Camille Bann

**Address: 10 Lysia Street. London SW6 6NG**

**Email: Camille.bann@envecconsulting.com**

**Tel: 07553 380163**

I am an economist with twenty years of experience working in the area of environmental policy and regulation. My expertise is in the valuation of natural resources and project and policy appraisal. I have worked across a number of policy areas and sectors (e.g. water, agriculture, forestry, industry, climate change, ecosystem services and protected areas) in over 15 countries. Prior to becoming a freelance consultant in June 2009 I was Head of Environmental Economics at Jacobs UK Ltd where I managed a team of nine economists, and led over 20 projects. Before this I was Principal Economist at the Environment Agency for England and Wales leading on Water Framework Directive economic appraisal. From 1993 to 2003 I worked as an international consultant with a focus on South East Asia for range of private, public, academic and third sector clients. I also worked for a number of years for a policy research group – The Centre for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment at University College London, whose remit covered climate change and biodiversity. I hold a PhD in economics from University College London.

#### Experience Record

**June 2009- present**

**Independent Consultant**

**Economic Valuation Tools for Wetlands in Nepal. UNDP/GEF. Team Leader.**

**Strengthening Protected Area Network of Turkey: Catalyzing Sustainability of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas. UNDP/GEF. International Environmental Economy and Management Expert**

**Southern African Development Community (SADC) Groundwater and Drought Management Project: Valuation of Groundwater. World Bank / UNOPS. Lead economist (Atkins /eftec/Nambia Nature Foundation consortium).**

**Preparation of Cambodia's Second National Communication to the UNFCCC. UNDP. Lead Consultant.**

**Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services: Why these are important for sustained growth and equity in Latin America and the Caribbean. UNDP. Sector Coordinator (Phase II) Agriculture.**

**Dhaka, Bangladesh, Environment and Water Program Project. The World Bank. Economic and financial analysis of proposed industrial wastewater demonstration project.**

**Review of Cost-Benefit Analysis and Benefit Valuation. UK Water Industry Research Limited. Member of eftec team (Cascade, ICS Consulting and eftec consortium)**

**Global Environment Facility, Medium-Sized project: Enhancing Coverage & Management Effectiveness of the Subsystem of Forest Protected Areas in Turkey's National System of Protected Areas. United Nations Development Program. Protected Area Sustainable Finance Expert. Drafting of business plan, sustainable finance options and economic values for Kure Mountains National Plan and guidance for replicating findings to other forest protected areas in Turkey.**

**Environment Agency Better Regulation Team. Support to the Environment Agency on the economics of Better Regulation.**

**The Benefits of Inland Waterways Phase 2, IWAC/Defra. Project Director. Testing of benefits assessment guidance developed in Phase 1 on selected case studies.**

**Thames Weir Environmental Prioritisation – with Jacobs for the Environment Agency**

Review and update of tool developed in 2004 to prioritise replacement and repair work on the 45 weir complexes on the non-tidal Thames. The work focused on the inclusion of environmental impacts associated with potential weir failure in the prioritisation tool.

**Eastern European/Central Asian Training Workshop on assessing and valuing benefits of protected areas, International Academy for Nature Conservation, Germany/WWF.**

Seminar on sustainable financing of protected areas.

Sept 2006 to June 2009 Head of Environmental Economics - Jacobs UK Ltd

**Selected Project Experience**

**The Benefits of Inland Waterways- IWAC/Defra.** Project Director on this 6 month study to identify the range of benefits provided by inland waterways in England and Wales using an Ecosystem Services Approach. A Benefits Transfer Valuation Framework has been drafted as part of this project. This will form the basis for the presentation of suitable transfer values and provide details of required adjustments for use in future benefits transfer exercises. A detailed review of the valuation literature was also undertaken as part of this study.

**Cost Benefit Analysis of Low Head Hydropower – Environment Agency. Project Director.** Development of a framework capturing the high level generic costs and benefits (including environmental and social costs) of three main types of turbines. The framework is to be used to assess the viability of low head hydro power schemes in England and Wales.

**Provision of advice in relation to the application of Article 4.7 of the Water Framework Directive to RWE npower PLC – REW npower PLC.** Scoping note and advice provided for two potential hydro-electric power sites.

**Environmental and Social Costs and Benefits of Demand Management Options – Technical Lead- Thames Water.** Development of environmental and social cost benefit estimates of AMP5 leakage reduction and demand management options, and development of the decision making framework for the Water Resource Management Plan.

**Impact Assessment of seven draft River Basin Management Plans – Project Director – The Environment Agency.** Working with the Environment Agency to deliver the Impact Assessment required for the Draft River Basin Management Plan under the Water Framework Directive.

**Assessing the costs of 2007 floods: Implications for Flood Risk Management Appraisal – Lead Economist - The Environment Agency.** Review of evidence on the impacts of the 2007 floods so as to identify any gaps or improvements needed in the current PAG appraisal methods used for flood risk management schemes in the light of climate change

**Alternative Ways to Allocate Water – Project Director – The Environment Agency.** This project identified different options for making water available for abstractors whilst protecting the environment taking into account water availability and climate change. The project involves a review of the pro and cons of the current 'first come, first served' system, a review of allocation approaches used in other countries, and recommendations on ideas suitable for England and Wales.

**Assessment of the Economic Value of England's Terrestrial Ecosystem Services, Project Director, Defra.** Assessment of the total value of England's terrestrial ecosystem services. The study developed a typology of benefits related to ecosystem services and a methodology for combining, aggregating and dis-aggregating different types of values, at different temporal and spatial scales. Forest carbon benefits were considered as part of this project.

**Environmental Accounts for Agriculture, Project Director, Defra.** Update of the UK environmental accounts for the agricultural sector taking into account both the positive and negative impacts of agriculture on the environment (e.g. impacts to landscapes, biodiversity, water bodies, climate change and air quality considered).. The study considered the conceptual issues around how the estimates are constructed and used and scoped out a time-series methodology.

**Expert Witness (Economics) for Environment Agency in Inquiry relating to United Utilities appeal against discharge consents.**

**Environmental and Social Costing for Water Resource Plan – Project Director – A Water Company.** Development and application of a screening tool to all ‘schemes’ to be considered as part of the Water Resource Plan. The environmental and social impacts (positive and negative) of the screened water resource schemes were assessed. A wide range of environmental and social impacts are considered within this project including water quantity and quality, recreation, biodiversity, visual impacts, social /public disamenity and climate change.

**Review of Natural Resource Values – Project Director - America Somoa Government.** A review of the options for using economic natural resource values in policy decisions, planning, enforcement and public education in American Somoa

**Penton Hook Landfill Re-Establishment, Lead Economist – The Environment Agency.** Assessment of the environmental costs and benefits of the options for rehabilitating Penton Hook Land fill site.

**Valuation and optimisation model for PR09. Project Director, a Water Company.** Construction of a cost-benefit analysis tool to assess future maintenance and investment work for a water only company. Large regional stated preference surveys of domestic and commercial water customers undertaken to capture their willingness to pay for water service improvements and inform the optimisation model.

**PR09 Water Resources Plan Options Appraisal Study. Project Director, a Water Company.** Development and application of the Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) methodology for the appraisal of approximately 65 options for the water company’s Resources Plan with the aim of arriving at a preferred option in economic, environmental and social terms.

**The Water Framework Directive Preliminary Cost Effectiveness Analysis (pCEA), Project Manager, The Environment Agency.** Project managing the Agency’s pCEA project designed to co-ordinate and optimise the Agency’s input into the Defra/WAG’s national pCEA.

**Hinkley A decommissioning end-state option appraisal, Project Director, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA).** Development and application of a multi-criteria option appraisal framework for prioritisation of decommissioning end-state options for Hinkley A facility.

**Waterline Economy, EU Interreg project, The Environment Agency.** Design and delivery of a two day workshop for the seven countries of the North Sea region. The Workshop developed an approach for identifying and assessing the full range of benefits associated with the Waterline Economy projects.

#### **April 2003-July 2006                      Principal Economist at the Environment Agency (EA)**

- A specialist on the EC Water Framework Directive (WFD)
- The Agency’s lead on the UK Collaborative Research Programme (CRP) on Economics for the WFD, which developed the economic appraisal tools for the Water Framework Directive.
- Responsible for integrating the CRP products into Agency business
- Managed the economics team’s work on agricultural issues
- Project managed a number of studies including: two studies designed to set out the business-as-usual baseline for Agriculture for the WFD; a study of non-use valuation, a study on groundwater valuation, and a study of cost-effective options for reducing TBT (a priority hazardous substance).
- Review of non market valuation approaches for water industry price review - PR04

#### **Jan 1995- March 2003                      Independent Consultant**

**2003**

**International Institute for Environment and Development, London.** Reports prepared on markets for environmental services.

**2002**

**ASEAN Regional Centre for Biodiversity Conservation (ARCBC) – Philippines.** Lead facilitator at research conference on biodiversity valuation in Manila.

**2001**

**Vietnam-Sweden Mountain Rural Development Project (MRDP) – Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.** Assessment of the impacts of tree planting activities, carried out under the MRDP project, on local livelihoods in northern Vietnam.

**2000**

**Management of Krau Wildlife Reserve, Capacity Building and Human Resource Development, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.** Preparation of a guide on the economic valuation of protected areas in Malaysia with special emphasis on Krau Wildlife Reserve. Delivery of training workshop on the economic valuation of protected areas and its relevance to management.

**Lecturer, University of Sussex.** Cost Benefit Analysis and the Environment, MA programme in Environment, Development and Policy

**'The Valuation of Biological Diversity for National Biodiversity Action Plans and Strategies'. The United Nations Environment Program (UNEP).** Delivery of a one week workshop in Fiji for the Pacific Island countries on the Valuation of Biological Diversity. A Guide for trainers in this area was also prepared.

**1999**

**Development of A Sustainable Integrated Management Plan for the Mangroves of Johor, Malaysia'. Johor State Forestry Department / DARUDEC/DANCED.** Responsible for economic valuation studies of the mangroves of Johor to inform the development of an integrated management plan for the area

**1998**

**Lead Consultant, Turkey Forestry Sector Review.** Management of the World Bank's Global Environmental Overlay Program (GOP) of Turkey's Forest Sector Review. Responsibilities included: development of methodology for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and other global environmental objectives into the forestry sector policies and programmes; identification of additional resources/incentives required for local resource managers to conserve globally important biodiversity; development of TORs, budget and workplan for Government counterparts; and development of mechanisms for dissemination of findings.

**EEPSEA/SEARCA/EDI-World Bank Regional Training Course in Environmental Economics, Los Banos, Philippines.** Resource Person

**1977**

**The Economy and Environment Programme for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA). Cambodia Program**

Design and management of two eighteen month policy related research projects: 'An Economic Analysis of Tropical Forest Land Use Options in Ratanakiri Province, Cambodia'; and, 'An Economic Analysis of Alternative Mangrove Management Options in Koh Kong Province, Cambodia'. A parallel objective of the program was to train a team of Cambodian researchers from relevant Government ministries in the economic analysis of natural resources through regular training workshops and research assignments.

**Vietnam Research Network in Environmental Economics. EEPSEA/EEU (Environmental Economics Unit, National University of Vietnam).** Supervisor for two projects: 'An Economic Analysis of Can Gio Mangrove Management Scheme, Hochiminh City, Vietnam', and, 'A Comparative Economic Analysis of Farming Systems in Brackish Water Areas of the Mekong Delta'.

**Cambodia Environmental Management Project, USAID.** Advice and training to the Department of Policy and Planning of the Ministry of Environment, Cambodia.

**1996**

**Lithuania, Biodiversity and Landscape Conservation. European Union, PHARE.** Development of Business Plan and methodology for the economic analysis of Varniai Regional Park, Lithuania, as a model for other protected areas within the country.

**National Institute for Scientific & Technological Policy and Strategic Studies (NISTPASS) Vietnam & the University of Toronto, Canada Training Project in Environmental Management (Vietpro-2020).** Responsible for designing and delivering a workshop on the Economic Valuation of Natural Resources, Hanoi, Vietnam

**EEPSEA/UAF (University of Agriculture and Forestry, Hochiminh City, Vietnam).** 'The Economic Valuation of the Environment and Environmental Cost Benefit Analysis', Training Course in Environmental Economics. Lecturer.

**Natural Resources Valuation Manuals.** Preparation of two manuals to be used by researchers in Southeast Asia on: 'The Economic Valuation of Tropical Forest Land Use Options'; and, 'The Economic Valuation of Mangroves'. Funded by EEPSEA

**1995**

**Research/Training Project in Environmental Economics. Ministry of Environment, Cambodia/EEPSEA.** Design and management of environmental economics research/training project on the costs and benefits of fuel efficient stoves in Prey Veng Province, Cambodia. Basic course in environmental economics held at Ministry of Environment.

**Wetlands Action Plan, Cambodia. Wetlands International (Malaysia).** Technical review and editing of 'Wetland Action Plan for the Royal Government of Cambodia'.

**Ecotourism Action Plan Malaysia. World Wide Fund (WWF), Malaysia.** An economic analysis of ecotourism in Malaysia as part of an Ecotourism Action Plan being prepared by the WWF for the Malaysian Government. The reports prepared discuss ways in which ecotourism in Malaysia might best be managed in order to maximise ecological, economic and local community benefits. Case studies of three ecotourism sites in Malaysia are used to highlight key management issues.

**Wholesale Market Project, Bucharest, The Republic of Romania The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD).** Environmental impact analysis of retail markets in Bucharest.

**June 1993- Dec 1994      The Cambodia Environmental Advisory Team (CEAT).**

**Resource Economist. United Nations Development Program, Office for Project Services, (UNDP/OPS). Phnom Penh, Cambodia.**

Responsibilities and Activities:

- (i) Provision of technical advice to the Government, and in particular the Ministry of Environment (MOE), in the areas of resource management and conservation. Advice provided on: the organisational structure of the MOE; environmental impacts of investment proposals; financing mechanisms for environmental and natural resource management activities in Cambodia; and, the economic benefits of environmental and natural resource management and techniques for valuation of these benefits.
- (ii) Management of CEAT's 'Small Scale Initiatives Program'. Under this program twelve community level, environmentally sensitive projects were funded.
- (iii) Chief author and editor of Cambodia's First State of the Environment Report, 1994.

- (iv) Report prepared on a sustainable development strategy for the remote and underdeveloped areas of Cambodia. The report highlights the development priorities, main environmental issues and areas of economic potential for three provinces in Cambodia. Economic and fiscal mechanisms for attracting investors to these areas are also discussed.
- (v) Training. Lectures given on a range of environmental topics at CEAT's three training courses organised for the staff of the Ministry of Environment. Training course in 'Economics, Energy and the Environment' run for the staff at the Ministry of Industry Energy and Mines.
- (vi) Preparation of speeches and papers to be presented by the Minister of Environment.
- (vii) Assistance in the preparation of a draft timber concession contract for Cambodia.
- (viii) Organisation of First National Workshop on Environment and Development, December 1993.

**1992-1993**                      **Research Associate, Centre for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment, (CSERGE). University College London.**

Research on: (i) The environmental challenges to international oil companies with particular emphasis on the global environmental concerns of climate change, deforestation and biodiversity loss. Paper prepared in collaboration with Fridtjof Nansens Institute, Norway; (ii) The role of international carbon offsets by private companies as a mechanism for controlling greenhouse gas emissions; (iii) The position of renewable energy technologies and energy conservation in the United Kingdom within a 'sustainable' energy policy.

**1992**                                **Environmental Economic Consultant, London Environmental Economic Centre (LEEC) / International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)**

Research on: (i) The economic linkages between the international trade in tropical timber and the sustainable management of tropical forests and the economic effects of the trade and policy options available to improve forest management. Report prepared for the International Timber Trade Association, (ITTO); (ii) The economic value of species and biochemical prospecting information provided by the Costa Rican National Biodiversity Institute; (iii) The development of a methodology to assess the social costs and benefits and distributional consequences of alternative tropical forest land use options. Report prepared for the U.K. Overseas Development Administration. (6 month seconded from CSERGE)

**1991-1992**                      **Research Associate, Centre for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment (CSERGE)**

Report prepared for the UK Department of Trade and Industry on the social costs of fuel cycles in the UK. Following a comprehensive literature review of the monetary assessments of the external costs of energy use, the report prepared derives preliminary estimates of the social cost 'adders', in terms of pence per kWh, for each of twelve U.K. fuel technologies under review.

**1990**                                **Swastic Surfactants Ltd. Bombay, India. Environmental Consultant**

Report prepared detailing the steps that chemical companies might take to try to alleviate environmental problems in India. Research performed through meetings with a number of chemical companies, environmental groups and government ministries.

**1990**                                **The Centre for Accountability and Debt Relief, Research Assistant**

Research on the debt crisis in developing countries, and on the development of a global debt write-off program for sustainable development.

**1988-1990**                      **Arthur Andersen & Co., London**

Chartered accountants. Trainee chartered accountant in Financial Markets Audit Group.

## Education

2003: PhD, Economics, University College London

1991: MSc Environmental Economics and Resource Management, University College London

1988: BA (Hons) 2.1 Economics and Philosophy, University College London

## Selected Reports and Papers

Jacobs, 2009 (contributing author/project director). 'The Benefits of Inland Waterways'. Report to Defra / IWAC

Jacobs, 2008 (contributing author/project director). 'Valuing England's Terrestrial Ecosystem Services', a report to Defra

Jacobs, 2008 (contributing author/project director). 'Cost Benefits Analysis for PR09: Valuation and Optimisation Model'. Report to South East Water.

Jacobs, 2007 (contributing author/project director). 'Environmental Accounts for Agriculture.' Report to Defra, Welsh Assembly Government, Scottish Executive and Department for Agriculture and Rural development (N.Ireland)

Bann, C., Fisher, J., and Horton, B., 2003. 'The Benefits Assessments Guidance for PRO4: Review of Non-use Values for Water Quality and Water Resources and Values for Bathing Water Improvements'. Environment Agency.

Bann, C. 2003. 'The Economic Valuation and Market Capture of Forest Functions in Developing Countries'. PhD Thesis, University College, London

Bann, C. 2003. 'Sustainable Financing of Natural Resource Management – Markets for Environmental Services'. Report to IIED, London

Bann, C. 2003. 'Sustainable Financing of Natural Resource Management – Private Sector Community Partnership'. Report to IIED, London

Bann, C. 2002. 'The Economic Arguments for Biodiversity Conservation' paper presented at the ASEAN Regional Centre for Biodiversity Conservation Third Research Conference. Biodiversity Valuation: Approaches and Case Studies. 17-19 June 2002, Sulo Hotel, Quezon City, Philippines.

Bann, C. 2002. 'Biodiversity Valuation – An Overview of Valuation Techniques: Advantages and Limitations' paper presented at the ASEAN Regional Centre for Biodiversity Conservation Third Research Conference. Biodiversity Valuation: Approaches and Case Studies. 17-19 June 2002, Sulo Hotel, Quezon City, Philippines.

Bann, C. 2002. 'The Economic Value of Tropical Forests'. Paper presented at Tropenbos International Seminar 2002 – Forest Valuation and Innovative Financing Mechanisms. March, 2002. The Hague.

Bann, C. 2001. 'Assessing the Impacts of Tree Planting on Local Livelihoods in Northern Vietnam - A Discussion of Methodology and Preliminary Findings'. Prepared for the Vietnam-Sweden Mountain Rural Development project, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.

Bann, C. 2000. 'The Economic Valuation of Protected Areas in Malaysia: Methodology and Implications for Management, with a Case Study Example of Krau Wildlife Reserve, Pahang, Malaysia'. Management of Krau Wildlife Reserve, Capacity Building and Human Resource Development. Department of Wildlife and National Parks Malaysia/DANCED.

Moran, D. and C. Bann. 2000. 'The Valuation of Biological Diversity for National Biodiversity Action Plans and Strategies: A Guide for Trainers'. The United Nations Environment Program.

Bann, C. 1999. 'An Economic Assessment of the Mangroves of Johor State, Malaysia'. Johor State Forestry Department/ DANCED: Preparation of an Integrated Management Plan for the Sustainable Use of the Mangroves of Johor.



- Bann, C. 1999. 'A Contingent Valuation of the Mangroves of Benut, Johor State, Malaysia'. Johor State Forestry Department/DANCED: Preparation of an Integrated Management Plan for the Sustainable Use of the Mangroves of Johor.
- Bann, C. 1998. 'Turkey: Forest Sector Review – Global Environmental Overlays Program'. Report to World Bank, July, 1988.
- Bann, C. 1998. 'An Economic Analysis of Tropical Forest Land Use Options: A Manual for Researchers'. The Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA), April 1998.
- Bann, C. 1998. 'The Economic Valuation of Mangroves. A Manual for Researchers'. The Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA). April, 1998.
- Bann, C. 1997. 'An Economic Analysis of Alternative Mangrove Management Strategies in Koh Kong Province, Cambodia'. The Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA), Research Report Series November 1997.
- Bann, C. 1997. 'An Economic Analysis of Tropical Forest Land Use Options Ratanakiri Province, Cambodia'. The Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA), Research Report Series, November 1997.
- Bann, C. 1996. 'An Economic Analysis of Non-Timber Forest Products in Ratanakiri Province, Cambodia: A Discussion of the Research Approach and Preliminary Results'. Prepared for the Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA) Biannual Workshop, 21-13 May, 1996.
- Bann, C. 1996. 'Maximising the Economic and Ecological Benefits of Ecotourism in Malaysia: A Case Study of Kampung Kuantan Fireflies', WWF Malaysia, Project Report, March 1996.
- Bann, C. 1996. 'Maximising the Economic and Ecological Benefits of Ecotourism in Malaysia: A Case Study of Kinabatangan River, Sabah', WWF Malaysia, Project Report, March 1996.
- WWF, 1996 (contributing author) . 'Malaysian National Ecotourism Plan'.
- Bann, C. 1995. 'An Economic Analysis of Fuel Efficient Stoves in Prey Veng Province, Cambodia', Ministry of Environment, Royal Government of Cambodia, Economy and Environment Program for South East Asia, December 1995.
- Bann, C. 1995. 'Economic Analysis Report. Bucharest Wholesale Market Project. Municipality Component'. Report to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD). March 1995.
- Bann, C. (Chief author and editor) 1994. 'Cambodia: First State of Environment Report: 1994'. Ministry of Environment. Royal Government of Cambodia.
- Woodsworth, G. and C. Bann, 1994. 'The Status of the Kingdom of Cambodia's Environment: Emerging Policies and Strategies'. Paper presented by H.E. Dr. Mok Mareth, Minister of Environment, at the Fourth Pacific Environmental Conference: Strategic Alliances for Environmental Governance in the Pacific Century, East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii, 27-29 March 1994.
- Bann, C. 1994. 'Towards a Sustainable Development Strategy for the Remote and the More Underdeveloped Regions of Cambodia'. The Cambodia Environmental Advisory Team, UNDP.
- H.E. Mok Mareth, D. Vanderstighelen, C. Bann, et al., 1994. 'UNTAC, CEAT Other International Actions and the Restoration of Cambodia's Forestry Policy'. Paper presented at The 5th Global Warming International Conference, April 4-7 1994, San Francisco.
- IIED, 1994 (contributing author). 'Economic Evaluation of Tropical Forest Land Use Options. A Review of Methodology and Applications'. Report to UK Overseas Development Administration.
- Bann, C. 1993. 'The Private Sector and Global Warming Mitigation', Center for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment (CSERGE) *mimeo* .

Pearce, D.W. and C. Bann, 1993. 'North-South Transfers and the Capture of Global Environmental Value', Paper for Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon.

Bergesen, H., C. Bann and D. Pearce, 1992. 'Environmental Challenges to International Oil Companies', Fridtjof Nansens Institute, Norway, 1992.

D.W. Pearce and C.A. Bann, 1992. 'The Social Costs of Fuel Cycles', Report to the U.K. Department of Trade and Industry, London: HMSO, 1992.

Pearce, D.W. and C.A. Bann, 1992. 'Environmental and Non-Environmental Externalities in the UK Fuel Cycle', Paper for OECD/IEA Conference on Life Cycle Analysis. Paris, May 1992.

Barbier, E., J. Burgess, J. Bishop, B. Aylward and C. Bann 1992. 'The Economic Linkages Between the International Trade in Tropical Timber and the Sustainable Management of Tropical Forests'. London Environmental Economics

## Prof. Patricia G. KAMERI-MBOTE

---

PO Box 2394-00202, Nairobi, Kenya

**Email:** [pkameri-mbote@ielrc.org](mailto:pkameri-mbote@ielrc.org); [kameri-mbote@wananchi.com](mailto:kameri-mbote@wananchi.com);  
[pkmbote@strathmore.edu](mailto:pkmbote@strathmore.edu)

**Website:** [www.ielrc.org](http://www.ielrc.org)

**Telephone:** 254-20-606155 (Office)

254-20-3871202 (Residence);

0733-726511(Cellular)

**Nationality:** Kenyan

### Biographical Summary

Patricia Kameri-Mbote is a Professor of Law at Strathmore University. She previously worked as an Associate Professor of Law at the School of Law, University of Nairobi and is an Advocate of the High Court of Kenya. She has served as Chair of the Department of Private Law and Acting Dean at the School of Law, University of Nairobi. She has also served as the Director of Research and Policy Outreach and Acting Executive Director at the African Centre for Technology Studies, Nairobi. She was a member of the Committee of Eminent Persons appointed by His Excellency the President of Kenya in February 2006 to advise the government on the way forward for the stalled constitution review process. She has also been identified by the World Conservation Union (IUCN) as a renowned thinker in the global environment and sustainable development field and served as a Policy scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

Prof. Kameri-Mbote studied law in Nairobi, Warwick, Zimbabwe and Stanford and currently teaches Natural Resources Law and Property Theory at the School of Law, University of Nairobi. She also teaches Biotechnology Law at the Centre for Biotechnology and Bioinformatics at the College of Physical and Biological Sciences of the University of Nairobi and Environment Conflict Management at the Institute for Diplomacy and International Studies, University of Nairobi.

She has also taught international environmental law at the University of Kansas; Trade, Environment & Law at the University of Stellenbosch, Cape Town, South Africa; and Women, Access to Resources and the Law at the Women's Law Centre, University of Zimbabwe. She has been invited to teach a January Term Course on Biotechnology and Law at the University of Ottawa in January. She serves as external examiner to the Faculties of Law at the Universities of London, Makerere and Dar es Salaam.

She is the Chair to the Seeds and Plant Varieties Tribunal, a member of the IUCN Commission on Environmental Law and the Kenya National Academy of Sciences and a member of the UNEP Expert Advisory Group on Environment, Conflict and Peace-building. She serves on the boards of the Pell Centre

for International Relations; the Scientific Steering Committee, Global Environmental Change & Human Security Project, International Human Dimensions Programme; the Arts & Humanities Research Board (AHRB) Research Centre for Law, Gender & Sexuality, University of Kent; and the Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment (ACODE-Uganda). She is also a trustee in the Kenya Land Conservation Trust and has served as a board member of the Kenya Copyright Board.

She has consulted for many international and national agencies including the UK Department for International Development, the World Bank, the United States Agency for International Development, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) and the Government of Kenya. She has published widely in the areas of international law, environmental law, women's rights and property rights and participated in international, regional, national and local conferences. Patricia also chaired the Kenya Nile Discourse Forum from 2003 to 2005.

Her research interests include environment and natural resources law and policy, human rights, women's rights, land rights, intellectual property rights, biotechnology policy and law and economic law.

## **Current Position**

Professor of Law, Strathmore University

March 1, 2009 to February 28, 2011, to prepare, plan, initiate and implement Strathmore Law School

Associate Professor of Law, University of Nairobi

Department of Private Law, Faculty of Law 2005- to date (On Unpaid leave of Absence from March 1, 2009 to February 28, 2011)

Chair, Association of Environmental Law Lecturers in African Universities (ASSSELAU)

Director, Africa Programme, International Environmental Law Research Centre

Editor-in-Chief, East Africa Law Journal,

Peer reviewed journal published by the Faculty of Law, University of Nairobi

Editor, Journal of Law, Environment and Development (LEAD)

Peer reviewed journal edited by the School of Oriental & African Studies, University of London, United Kingdom and the International Environmental Law Research Centre and published by Butterworths, India

Member, Editorial Board, Global Environmental Politics (GEP)

Peer reviewed Journal published by the MIT Press, Cambridge Massachusetts, USA.

Member, Editorial Board, Journal of Human Rights and the Environment,

Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, United Kingdom

Member, International Advisory Board, East African Journal of Peace and Human Rights

Makerere University Human rights and Peace Centre

## **Teaching and Research Interests**

International & comparative environmental law and policy; Law of Property in Land; Intellectual property rights; Law and development; Environmental Sources of Conflict; Law, Science and Technology; Research Methodology; and Gender and Law.

## Courses Teaching & Taught in Last Five Years

### ***Master of Laws Programme***

- Natural Resources Law
- Biotechnology & the Law
- Law & development
- Environment Conflict Management
- Feminist Jurisprudence
- Medical Law

### ***Bachelor of Laws Programme***

- Property Theory
- Law, Science & Technology

### ***Masters Degree in Women's Law at the Southern & Eastern African Research Centre on Women's Law, University of Zimbabwe***

- Women & Access to Resources  
(Taught once every two years)

### ***Nairobi International Law Institute, an American Bar Association accredited Summer Programme carried out in collaboration with Widener University, USA bringing students from across the US to study Law at the School of Law, University of Nairobi***

- International Intellectual Property Law (2006)
- International Intellectual Property Law (2005)
- International Trade and Environmental Law (2005)
- Comparative Family Law (2004)

## Education

**Doctor of the Science of Law (J.S.D.) (1999)**  
**Stanford University, Stanford Law School**

**Juridical Sciences Master (J.S.M.) (1996)**

***Stanford University, Stanford Law School***

**Diploma in Women's Law (DWL) (1995)**

**University of Zimbabwe**

**Master of Laws (LLM) in Law in Development (1989)**

**University of Warwick**

**Diploma in Legal Education (1988)**

**Kenya School of Law**

**Bachelor of Laws (LLB) (1987)**

## Honors

**Distinguished Visiting Research Scientist**, awarded fellowship by the Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science under the Programme for Advanced Research Institutions, to visit the Institute of Natural Medicine at the University of Toyama and participate in a international discussion forum on *Innovative Ideas in Natural Medicine Research*, February 2010

**Keynote speaker**, delivered a keynote speech on *Gender, Rights to Land/Environmental Resources & Development: An East African Perspective* at the Norwegian Research Council Meeting at the end of a ten year Research Period dubbed Development Paths in the South, Oslo, 10-11 March, 2008

**Keynote speaker, South Africa Land Conference**, delivered a keynote address at the *Conference on Land, Memory, Reconstruction and Justice: Perspectives on Land Restitution in South Africa* held in September 2006

**Committee of Eminent Persons**, 15 person committee appointed to advise the government on the way forward in the stalled Constitution Review Process (February-May, 2006)

**IUCN (The World Conservation Union) Renowned Thinkers**, Identified as one of 15 members globally to a unique gathering of persons recognized as leaders in the global environment and sustainable development field to discuss new directions in the global environmental movement (January 2006)

**Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars**, Awarded Open Society Institute Africa Policy Scholar Fellowship (2005-2006)

**Rockefeller Foundation**, Fellowship to participate in a team residency to complete manuscript on *Biotechnology Law and Policy in Africa* at the Foundation's Study and Conference Center in Bellagio, Italy (July, 2005)

**International Development Research Centre**, Research grant to carry out research on trends in intellectual property rights research and laws in Africa (2003-2004)

**Stanford Institute of International Studies**, O'Bie Schultz Research Grants (1996-97, 98-99)

**Fulbright Scholar** (1995-1999)

**Stanford Program in International Legal Studies**, Visiting Fellowship (1995-1996)

**Norwegian Agency for International Development**, Study Fellowship (1994-1995)

**Overseas Development Authority Shared Scholarship (ODASS)** (1988-1989)

## Work experience

**University of Nairobi** (2005-2009). Associate Professor of Law, School of Law

**University of Nairobi** (November 2002-May 2008). Chair, Department of Private Law, School of Law

**University of Nairobi** (2002- 2005). Senior Lecturer, Department of Private Law, Faculty of Law

**University of Nairobi** (Nov. 2003- April 2004). Acting Dean, Faculty of Law

**Co-Director, Nairobi International Law Institute** (2004-2006). Administering, organising and managing on behalf of the Dean of the faculty of Law a Joint Summer Law Programme of the Faculty of Law University of Nairobi and Widener University Law School, Delaware United States of America (includes Albany University, New York from this year) teaching law courses for credit to law students from Universities across the United States of America

**IGAD Somali Reconciliation Conference** (2002-2003). Facilitating the work of Committee Three on Land and Property Rights & Gender Mainstreaming of Reconciliation Conference Documents

**University of Nairobi** (1992-2002). Lecturer, Faculty of Law, Department of Private Law

**University of Nairobi** (1991-1992). Assistant Lecturer, Faculty of Law, Department of Private Law

**University of Nairobi** (1990-1991). Part-Time Lecturer, Faculty of Law, Department of Private Law

**African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS)**, Nairobi (2002). Acting Executive Director

**African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS)**, Nairobi (2000 - 2003). Director of Research & Policy Outreach, Part-Time

- *Providing intellectual leadership to the development of a new strategy and programme of work for ACTS*
- *Leading ACTS' researchers in formulating new research projects and raising funds for the projects*
- *Quality assurance for ACTS' publications and research outputs*
- *Overseeing the implementation of ACTS' projects*
- *Carrying out research on agricultural biotechnology in sub-Saharan Africa*
- *Mounting and conducting training courses on intellectual property rights and other aspects of biopolicy for policymakers in African countries*
- *Liaising with donors and reporting to them on research aspects of the projects*
- *Establishing and maintaining international links*
- *Organising seminars and workshops*
- *Representing ACTS at national, regional and international forums*

**University of Stellenbosch, Cape Town** (July 2002). Visiting Lecturer, Faculty of Law, *Trade & Environment*

**United States International University-Africa (USIU-Africa)**, Nairobi (Winter 2000). Guest Professor, International Relations, *International Organizations*

**African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS)**, Nairobi (1999 - 2000). Post-Doctoral Research Fellow, Part-time

- *Capacity-building in biotechnology and public policy*
- *Policy research on environment, biotechnology, intellectual property rights*

**African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS)**, Nairobi (1990 -1999). Research Associate  
*Policy research on environmental law, climate change, intellectual property rights, gender and structural adjustment programmes (SAPs)*

**University of Kansas** (Fall 1998). Visiting Professor, School of Law

**Legal Consultant, Government of Kenya**

- *Review of the Wildlife Policy & Law, Lead Technical Person (2006-)*
- *National Land Policy Formulation Process, resource Person & Member of Drafting Team (2005-)*
- *Task Force formulating National Biotechnology Policy & Biosafety Law (2002-2004)*
- *Task Force compiling State of the Environment Report (2003)*
- *Constitution Review Commission, Consultant of Gender Issues (2001)*
- *Task Force Reviewing Laws Relating to Women, Researcher (1994-1996)*
- *Task Force Reviewing Criminal Laws (1994)*

**Women and Law in East Africa Research Project** (1992-1996). Regional and national coordinator

- *Initiated, developed and co-ordinated the Women and Law in East Africa Research Project (comprising of researchers from Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania)*
- *Raised funds for research*
- *Planned, organized and participated in social science research methodology workshops for researchers in the Project*
- *Planned, organized and participated in national and regional workshops to discuss research findings at various stages during my tenure*
- *Co-ordinated and took part in field research on laws and practices affecting women in East Africa*

**Kenya School of Law** (1989 to 1995). *Taught courses on the Law of Evidence and Property at graduate level and examined students for Admission to the Roll of Advocates*

## Selected Publications

### Articles & Papers

1. **'Courts as Champions of Sustainable Development: Lessons from East Africa'**, 10/1 Sustainable Development Law & Policy 30-8, 83-4 (2009) (With Collins Odote)
2. **'What Would it Take to Realise the Promises? Protecting Women's Rights in the Kenya National Land Policy of 2009'**, Standpoint, *Feminist Africa Land, Labour and Gendered Livelihoods*, Issue 12 (2009).
3. 'Property Rights for Poverty Reduction', in Joachim von Braun et al, *The Poorest and Hungry: Assessments, Analyses, and Actions: An IFPRI 2020 Book*, IFPRI, (2009) (With Ruth Meinzen-Dick and Helen Markelova)
4. 'Trouble in Eden: How and Why Unresolved Land Issues Landed "Peaceful Kenya" in Trouble in 2008', *Forum for Development Studies*, Oslo, Norway, Volume 1, 2008 (January, 2009)
5. 'Gender, Rights and Development: An East African Perspective', *Forum for Development Studies*, Oslo, Norway, Volume 1, 2008 (August 2008)
6. 'Righting Wrongs: Confronting Land Dispossession in Post-colonial Contexts', *East African Law Review*, University of Dar es Salaam (2009).
7. 'Separating the Baby from the Bath Water: Women's Rights and the Politics of Constitution-Making in Kenya', *East African Journal of Peace & Human Rights*, Journal of the Human Rights and Peace Centre (HURIPeC), Faculty of Law, Makerere University, Volume 14 Issue 1(2008) (With Nkatha Kabira)
8. 'Achieving the Millenium Development Goals in the Drylands: Gender Considerations' *Annals of Arid Zones*, Vol 46 (2007)
9. 'Use of the Public Trust Doctrine in Environmental Law', *Law, Environment and Development Journal* Vol. 3, Number 2 (2007)
10. 'Women, Land Rights and the Environment: The Kenyan experience', *Development*, Volume 49, Number 3 (September 2006)



11. 'Towards Greater Access to Justice in Environmental Disputes in Kenya: Opportunities for Intervention', *Law Society Digest* (July, 2005)
12. 'Sustainable Management of Wildlife Resources in East Africa: A Critical Analysis of the Legal, Policy and Institutional Frameworks', *East African Law Review* (2004).
13. 'Towards a Liability and Redress System under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety: A Review of the Kenya National Legal System', *East African Law Journal*, (2004).
14. 'The Coverage of Gender Issues in the Draft Bill of the Constitution of Kenya, 2002: Have the Hens Finally Come Home to Roost for Kenyan Women?', *University of Nairobi Law Journal* (2004)
15. 'Community, farmers' and Breeders' Rights in Africa: Towards a Legal Framework for *sui generis* Legislation' reprinted in *The ICAI Journal of Intellectual Property Rights* (Volume II Number 4 November, 2003).

## Book Chapters

1. "Realising Access to Land and Environmental Resources for Women: Strategies for Challenging and Overturning Dominant Legal Paradigms", in Amy Tsanga et. Al. eds., *Women and Law in Africa: Innovative Regional Approaches to Teaching, Researching and Analysing*, (The North-South Legal Perspectives Series, Weaver Press, Harare, Forthcoming 2011) (With Anne Hellum & Pauline Nyamweya)
2. 'Implementation of the Right to Water and Sanitation in Kenya: Analyzing the Water Sector Reforms', in *The Right to Water: Theory, Practice and Prospects*, Edited by Malcolm Langford (University of Oslo) and Anna Russell (University of Oxford) Cambridge University Press, 2011
3. "The Genetic Use Restriction Technologies, Intellectual Property Rights and Sustainable Development in Eastern and Southern Africa" in Pedro Rolfe et al (eds.), *Development Agendas: Diverse Views on Intellectual Property*, International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD), Geneva (Forthcoming, 2011) (James Otieno-Odek)
4. "Securing Property Rights in Land in Kenya: Formal Versus Informal", in Paul Collier et. al., eds. *Kenya Policies For Prosperity*, Oxford University Press (Forthcoming 2011) ( With Joseph Kieyah)
5. "Monsanto vs. Schmeiser: Implications for Land Rights of Kenyan Farmers", in Moni Wekesa & Bernard Sihanya eds., *Intellectual Property Rights in Kenya*, Konrad Adenauer Foundation, Nairobi (2009)
6. "The Land Question in Kenya: Legal and Ethical Dimensions", in *Governance: Institutions and the Human Condition*, Strathmore University and Law Africa (2009)
7. "The Role of the Judiciary in Environmental Governance in Kenya", in Kurt Deketelaere, Louis Kotze & Alexander Paterson, *The Role of the Judiciary in Environmental Governance: Comparative Perspectives* (Wolters Kluwer Law International, 2009)
8. "Law, Gender and Environmental Resources: Women's Access to Environmental Justice", In Jonas Ebbesson & Phoebe Okowa, *Environmental Law And Justice in Context* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2009)
9. "Engendering Environmental Management for Sustainable Livelihoods", in Sara Ruto, Patricia Kameri-Mbote & Jacinta Muteshi (eds.), *The Promises and Realities: Taking Stock of the 3<sup>rd</sup> International Women's Conference*, African Women & Child Feature Service & Ford Foundation (2009).

## Books

1. *Women and law in Africa: Innovative Regional Approaches to Teaching, Researching and Analysing*, The North-South Legal Perspectives Series (Weaver Press, Harare, Forthcoming 2011) (With Amy Tsanga, Julie Stewart, Anne Hellum & Sylvia Tamale)

2. *Coping with Global Environmental Change, Disasters and Security – Threats, Challenges, Vulnerabilities and Risks* (Hans Günter Brauch, Úrsula Oswald Spring, Czeslaw Mesjasz, John Grin, Patricia Kameri-Mbote, Béchir Chourou , Pal Dunay, Jörn Birkmann, (Eds.)), Hexagon Series on Human and Environmental Security and Peace, vol. 5 ( Berlin – Heidelberg – New York: Springer-Verlag, 2010).
3. *The Promise and the Reality: Taking Stock of the 3<sup>rd</sup> International Women’s Conference*, African Women & Child Feature Service & Ford Foundation ( 2009) (With Jacinta Muteshi & Sara Ruto).
4. *Facing Global Environmental Change: Environmental, Human, Energy, Food, Health and Water Security Concept* (Hans Günter Brauch, John Grin, Czeslaw Mesjasz, Navnita Chadha Behera, Béchir Chourou, Ursula Oswald Spring, P. H. Liotta, Patricia Kameri-Mbote (Eds.)), Hexagon Series on Human and Environmental Security and Peace, vol. 4 (Berlin – Heidelberg – New York – Hong Kong – London – Milan – Paris – Tokyo: Springer-Verlag, 2009)
5. *Environmental Governance in Kenya: Implementing the Framework Law*, East African Education Publishers, Nairobi (2008) (With C.O. Okidi & Migai Akech).
6. *Globalisation and Environmental Challenges: Reconceptualising Security in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (Hans Günter Brauch, John Grin, Czeslaw Mesjasz, Navnita Chadha Behera, Béchir Chourou, Ursula Oswald Spring, P. H. Liotta, Patricia Kameri-Mbote (Eds.)), Hexagon Series on Human and Environmental Security and Peace, vol. 3 (Berlin – Heidelberg – New York – Hong Kong – London – Milan – Paris – Tokyo: Springer-Verlag, 2007)
7. *Land Use for Sustainable Development* (Cambridge University Press, New York (2007) (With N. Chalifour, L.L Hye & J. Nolon,)
8. *Public Involvement in Environmental Decisionmaking in Asia and East Africa: Law and Practice* (The Legal Vice Presidency, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, Washington DC, 2003) (With N. Rukuba-Ngaiza, Z. Hamid, R. Nshala & G. W. Tumushabe)
9. *Property Rights and Biodiversity Management in Kenya*, ACTS Press, Nairobi (2002).
10. *Women Inheritance Laws & Practices*, WLEA, Nairobi (2002) (With Winnie Mitullah, Okech Owiti, Wambui Kiai, Njeri Karuru & Kamau Mubuu)