

Terminal Evaluation of The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) National Implementation: Reflecting the Value of Ecosystems and Biodiversity in Policymaking

VOLUME II OF THE TEEB EVALUATION (see also Main Report)



January 2018



Evaluation Office of UN Environment

Photos Credits:

This picture on the cover of this report was taken by Justine Braby in Bhutan

@UN Environment/ (Ms. Justine Braby), UN Environment Evaluation Mission (2017)

This report has been prepared by independent consultant evaluators and is a product of the Evaluation Office of UN Environment. The findings and conclusions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the views of Member States or the UN Environment Senior Management.

For further information on this report, please contact:

Evaluation Office of UN Environment
P. O. Box 30552-00100 GPO
Nairobi Kenya
Tel: (254-20) 762 3389
Email: unenvironment-evaluation-director@un.org

Terminal Evaluation of the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) Phase III and ENRTP-funded sub-component: National Implementation: Reflecting the Value of Ecosystems and Biodiversity in Policymaking
PIMS Id. 1692
January 2018
All rights reserved.
© (2018) Evaluation Office of UN Environment

Evaluation Consultants
Ms. Sarah Humphrey and Ms. Justine Braby

Evaluation Office of UN Environment
Michael Spilsbury – Evaluation Manager
Mela Shah – Evaluation Programme Assistant

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Terminal Evaluation was prepared for the Evaluation Office of UN Environment by Sarah Humphrey, specialist in environmental management, policy and governance, as the Lead Consultant, with support from Justine Braby, who has extensive experience evaluating projects on ecosystems management, economics and sustainability. The report benefits from a peer review conducted within Evaluation Office of UN Environment.

Sincere appreciation is expressed to all the people who took time to be interviewed, provide further information and to comment on the draft report.

ABOUT THE EVALUATION¹

Joint Evaluation: Yes

Report Language(s): English

Evaluation Type: Terminal Project Evaluation

Brief Description: This report is the second volume of the terminal evaluation of the projects 'the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity' (TEEB) Phase III and ENRTP-funded sub-component: 'National Implementation: Reflecting the Value of Ecosystems and Biodiversity in Policymaking' implemented between 2014 and 2018. This volume contains material specific to the ENRTP-funded component.

The project aims to promote a better understanding of the value of ecosystem services and to offer economic tools that take proper account of this value. It was designed around three interlinked activity areas which build on previous phases of the TEEB initiative, namely: i) advance natural capital accounting by undertaking country assessments and assessments in 'externalities heavy' industry sectors; ii) deepen the analysis on specific 'biomes' and 'sectors'; iii) support in-depth examinations to identify ways to 'work with nature' to meet country-specific policy priorities, with an initial focus on five pilot countries.

Key words: ecosystem services; biomes; economic tools; biodiversity; natural capital.

¹ This data is used to aid the internet search of this report on the Evaluation Office of UN Environment Website

Contents

ACRONYMS	7
SUB-PROJECT IDENTIFICATION TABLE	8
I. INTRODUCTION AND APPROACH TO EVALUATION	9
A. Introduction	9
B. Evaluation Methods	9
II. PROJECT CONTEXT	12
A. Context	12
B. Objectives and Components	13
C. Target Areas/Groups	13
D. Key Dates in Project Implementation	15
E. Project Governance and Implementation Structure	16
F. Project Financing	17
G. Project Logical Framework and Theory of Change	18
III. EVALUATION FINDINGS	19
A. Strategic Relevance	19
B. Quality of Project Design	20
C. Nature of External Context	20
D. Effectiveness	21
a. Achievement of Outputs	21
b. Achievement of Direct Outcome	26
c. Likelihood of impact	28
E. Financial Management	29
F. Efficiency	31
G. Monitoring and Reporting	32
H. Sustainability	33
I. Factors Affecting Project Performance	35
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	41
A. Conclusion	41
B. Lessons Learned	44
C. Recommendations	45
VI. ANNEXES	47
Annex 1: Evaluation Itinerary	48

Annex 2: Logical Framework of the ENRTP Project 52
Annex 3: Financial expenditure summary 59
Annex 4: List of Documents Reviewed..... 60
Annex 5: Response to project team and stakeholder comments received 64

ACRONYMS

ANCA	Advanced Natural Capital Accounting
BIOFIN	Biodiversity Finance Initiative
BMB	Biodiversity Management Bureau (Philippines)
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
COP	Conference of the Parties
DG DEVCO	Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development (European Commission) (formerly, Directorate General for Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid)
DG ENV	Environment Directorate-General (European Commission)
EC	European Commission
ENRTP	Programme for the Environment and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources, including Energy (of European Commission)
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency (Liberia)
EPN	National Polytechnic School (Ecuador)
ESPOL	Guaraquil Litoral Polytechnic School (Ecuador)
GIZ	German International Collaboration for Development
IKI	International Climate Initiative
IRA	Institute of Resource Assessment (University of Dar-es-Salaam)
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
MAGAP	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Aquaculture and Fisheries (Ecuador)
MEER	Ministry of Electricity and Renewable Energy (Ecuador)
MIPRO	Ministry of Industry and Productivity (Ecuador)
NAMH	National Institute of Meteorology and Hydrology (Ecuador)
PCG	Project Coordination Group
PoW	Programme of Work
REECS	Resources, Environment and Economics Centre for Studies (Philippines)
SAGCOT	Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania
SCA	Strategic Cooperation Agreement
SEEA	System of Environmental-Economic Accounting
SENAGUA	National Secretary of Water (Ecuador)
SENPLADES	National Planning and Development Agency (Ecuador)
TAB	TEEB Advisory Board
TEEB	The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity
TESSA	Toolkit for Ecosystem Services Site Assessment
TOC	Theory of Change
UFZ	Heimholtz Centre for Environmental Research
UK DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (United Kingdom)
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UN Environment	United Nations Environment
UNESCO-IHE	Delft Institute for Water Education
UNITA	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
UN-REDD	United Nations Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
UWICE	Ugyen Wangchuk Institute for Conservation and Environment (Bhutan)
ValuES	Methods for integrating ecosystem services into policy planning and development
WAVES	Wealth Accounting and the Valuation of Ecosystem Services
WBCSD	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
WCMC	World Conservation and Monitoring Centre

SUB-PROJECT IDENTIFICATION TABLE

UN Environment PIMS ID	1692 (part of TEEB Phase III)	Sub-programme:	Ecosystem Management
Expected Accomplishment(s):	Enhanced capacity of countries and regions to integrate an ecosystem management approach into development planning processes	PoW Output(s):	PoW 2012/13 #312 PoW 2014/15 #332 PoW 2016/17 #332
EC Approval Date:	30 May 2012	Expected Start Date/Actual Start Date:	March 2012/17 October 2012
Region(s):	Africa, Asia Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean	Countries:	Ecuador, Liberia, Tanzania, Bhutan, Philippines
Planned Completion Date:	February 2015	Actual Completion Date:	30 June 2017
Planned EC Project Budget at Approval:	EUR 3,000,000.00	Total Expenditures reported as of []:	
Planned Environment Fund Allocation:	0	Planned Extra-budgetary Financing:	EUR 3,000,000.00 (ENRTP)
No of Revisions:	3	Date of Last Revision:	15 April 2017
Implementing office:	TEEB Office, DTIE, UN ENVIRONMENT, Geneva	Mid-term Evaluation:	ENRTP Case Study from 2016 evaluation of UN ENVIRONMENT UN Environment – European Commission Strategic Cooperation Agreements
		Terminal Evaluation:	February - August 2017

I. INTRODUCTION AND APPROACH TO EVALUATION

A. Introduction

1. The subproject "National Implementation: Reflecting the Value of Ecosystems and Biodiversity in Policymaking" was funded through the EU Thematic Programme for Environment and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources including Energy (ENRTP) as part of a Strategic Cooperation Agreement (SCA) between UN Environment and the European Commission, and implemented through the TEEB Office of the Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE), Economics and Trade Branch (ETB) at UN ENVIRONMENT in Geneva.
2. The SCA ENRTP project was designed to support country implementation component of "The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity" TEEB Phase III project, a global initiative that focused on making nature's value economically visible. The subproject focused on five developing countries which would undertake TEEB country studies responding to their specific policy needs.
3. The subproject started in October 2012, and had an intended duration of three years. The project was extended (at no cost) three times, bringing the duration to 4 years and 9 months.
4. A Terminal Evaluation of the TEEB Phase III project was conducted during project closure, of which this report is a case study evaluation of the ENRTP subproject. The aim of this case study evaluation is to assess project performance, determine its outcomes and impacts as well as their sustainability, and identify lessons learnt and next steps.

B. Evaluation Methods

5. The case study evaluation was conducted by an independent consultant (herein after referred to as the 'evaluator'), together with the Lead Consultant of the overall TEEB Phase III project, and informs the overall TEEB Phase III Terminal Evaluation. The evaluation was carried out between February 2017 and August 2017 under the overall responsibility and management of the UN Environment Evaluation Office in Nairobi, in consultation with the UN Environment TEEB Office in Geneva.
6. The Inception Meeting took place with the Evaluation Office and the UN Environment TEEB Office in Geneva in the presence of both evaluation consultants, between 8 and 10 February 2017.
7. In line with the TOR (Annex 2), the ENRTP subproject was assessed with respect to a minimum set of evaluation criteria grouped into five categories:
 - (i) **Strategic Relevance:** focuses on whether the project objectives were consistent with the global, regional and national priorities.
 - (ii) **Achievement of Outputs:** assessing the project success in producing the programme outputs and milestones as per the logical framework.
 - (iii) **Effectiveness: Attainment of Objectives and planned Results:** covers project preparation and readiness, implementation approach and management, stakeholder participation, cooperation and partnerships, communication and public awareness, and country ownership and driven-ness, financial planning and management, supervision and backstopping, and monitoring and evaluation.

8. The quality of project design was assessed in the Inception Report.
9. As per UN Environment guidance, the evaluation ratings are on a six-point scale.²
10. The methods used to evaluate the project achievements against the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts consisted of:

- Desk review: A desk review of all key project documentation supplied by UN Environment project staff, country partners, as well as the website and social media (a list of documents reviewed can be found in Annex 4).
- Skype interviews and phone calls: Skype interviews/phone calls took place with TEEB Office staff, global partners and governing bodies, and the project implementing partners and selected stakeholders in Ecuador, Tanzania and Philippines. A list of people contacted can be found in Annex 1.
- Email interviews: Email questions were sent to those stakeholders who did not have time for Skype interviews. Questions were tailored for the specific stakeholder. These were mainly conducted for Liberia. A list of people contacted can be found in Annex 1.
- Face to face meetings with TEEB Office in Geneva: The consultant pair tasked with the Terminal Evaluation visited the TEEB office as part of the Inception Meeting and conducted face to face interviews with the key project staff (including the Project Manager, Communications Officer, staff coordinating national implementation, Funds Management Officer, Governance body members and other staff). A list of people contacted can be found in Annex 1.
- Country visits to Bhutan and Tanzania: Two of the five participating countries were visited in person. Face to face meetings were conducted with several respondents with varying involvement in the project, including policymakers. For the country schedule, see Annex 1.
- Face to face meetings with UN Environment DEPI in Nairobi: Meetings were held with key project staff at UN Environment Headquarters in Nairobi (in relation to the TEEB being subsumed under Ecosystem Management in Nairobi and shared with DTIE). For the list of interviews held, see Annex 1.
- Feedback mechanisms: Feedback was conducted during the country visits to gauge results collected. A note of preliminary findings was shared with the Evaluation Office in May 2017. Various feedback meetings took place with the project team via Skype, as well as in person in Nairobi in May.

Limitations to the Evaluation

11. Generally, the evaluation was not limited significantly. A few small limitations are outlined below:

12. The country visit to Tanzania was not easy to organise due to the focal point travelling at the last minute, and the study lead being too busy to support the organisation of meetings with external stakeholders. That said, the core team was interviewed face to face.

² Highly Satisfactory (HS); Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated from Highly Likely (HL) down to Highly Unlikely (HU).

13. Only one respondent from Liberia responded to the evaluation, despite efforts to include more stakeholders in the evaluation.
14. In Ecuador, despite repeated attempts to engage the focal point, no response was received from government staff during the evaluation. This is possibly due to the turnover in government staffing and elections during the time of the evaluation.
15. These limitations did not significantly affect the evaluation.

II. PROJECT CONTEXT

A. Context

16. The TEEB national implementation subproject was initiated out of the interest to take TEEB to the national level to build national, regional and local government capacity to produce tailored economic assessments of ecosystems and biodiversity and support to mainstream this information into policy-making. It also evolved from a strong demand at country level for support to put economic value to ecosystems services and biodiversity.

17. The TEEB initiative was launched in 2007 in response to the request of the G8+5 Environment Ministers to develop a global study on the economics of biodiversity loss, which culminated in the TEEB Phase I. The Interim Report, which was the output of this phase, laid a broad foundation for the valuation of ecosystems and biodiversity. It stimulated further interest in the TEEB initiative and led to calls for additional economic analyses as well as the production of various publications, including TEEB for National and International Policy Makers, TEEB for Business, TEEB Climate Issues Update, and TEEB for Local and Regional Policy, among others, forming part of TEEB Phase II. These publications were supported by a communications and outreach programme.

18. The ENRTP Project was developed and started implementation in 2012, and subsequently became part of the TEEB Phase III project in 2014.

19. As part of the continuation of TEEB, TEEB Phase III has focused on two main streams, namely 1) country level economic assessments responding to policy, and 2) deeper analyses of specific biomes and sectors.

20. The TEEB coordination and implementation structure is outlined in detail in the main Terminal Evaluation of TEEB Phase III. The following pertains specifically to the ENRTP subproject. The ENRTP was coordinated from the TEEB Office, hosted by UN Environment (Geneva Office) under the Economics and Trade Branch of the Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE)³. During the ENRTP lifetime, the project team consisted of one staff member⁴, and five consultants who provided day to day implementation and administration of the TEEB portfolio. Oversight of the TEEB initiative is given by the TEEB Advisory Board.

21. The TEEB national implementation subproject was designed to provide support to the country component of the TEEB Phase III. Assistance was provided to a set of five developing countries that were selected early in the implementation phase to undertake country studies tailored to country policy needs.⁵ The project received EUR 3 million from the ENRTP, and was planned to be implemented over three years. After three revisions, the project was eventually implemented over 4 years and 9 months.

22. Countries were planned to be selected based on a set of criteria outlined in the project document. Countries selected were Ecuador, Liberia, Tanzania, Bhutan and Philippines. Implementation arrangements at country level were through Small-Scale Funding Agreements (SSFAs) between country partners and UN Environment. Each country had a Focal Entity (a Government Body), and a host institution (study lead). In Ecuador, the national focal point was the Ministry of Environment, and the study leads Guayaquil Littoral Polytechnic School (ESPOL) and the National Polytechnic School (EPN). In Liberia, the national focal point and the study lead

³ Now renamed the Economy Division

⁴ Another full time staff member joined in the beginning of 2017.

⁵ See Paragraph 25-27, under C. Target Groups, for selection process.

were the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). In Tanzania, the national focal point was the Vice President's Office and the study lead was the University of Dar-es-Salaam. In Bhutan, the national focal point was the Ministry of Agriculture and Forests, and the study lead was the Ugyen Wangchuk Institute for Conservation and Environment (UWICE). In Philippines, the national focal point was the Biodiversity Management Bureau, and the study lead was the Resources, Environment and Economics Center for Studies (REECS).

B. Objectives and Components

23. The objective of the TEEB national implementation subproject was to draw attention to the economic benefits of biodiversity highlighting the growing cost of biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation and drawing together expertise from the fields of ecosystem science, economics and development policy to support the mainstreaming of biodiversity and ecosystem considerations in national policy making.

24. The project aimed to provide technical support for specific national-level TEEB studies. This was to be achieved through compiling practical guidance for TEEB implementation and training national partners. The project was made up of three components, outlined with corresponding activities, in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Components and their activities as outlined in the Project Document

Components	Activities
Component 1: Compilation of practical guidance for national TEEB implementation and training of national partners	1.1. Guidance manual for TEEB implementation at national level
	1.2. Training for national partners
Component 2: Implementation of country projects	2.1. Selection of Country Partners and country project coordination
	2.2. International inception workshop
	2.3. First national workshops (launch of country projects and framing of biophysical data compilation)
	2.4. Compilation of biophysical data and modelling in the countries
	2.5. Economic valuation in the countries
	2.6. Second international workshop (peer review of economic valuation exercises)
	2.7. Second national workshops (presentation of draft implementation plans)
	2.8. Publication and release of TEEB national studies
Component 3: Communication and outreach servicing TEEB networks	3.1. Update and delivery of communications strategy
	3.2. Expansion and servicing of TEEB networks

C. Target Areas/Groups

25. The project (that later formed part of TEEB Phase III) focused on five countries as part of a pilot programme to implement TEEB studies at national level. According to the project document, the project would consider the following general criteria for the selection of each country:

- (i) Geographic balance across Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean;

- (ii) Focus on developing countries, with a strong representation of least developed countries (LDCs);
- (iii) Expressed government interest and request for support;
- (iv) Explicit alignment with national policies and priorities;
- (v) Demonstrated country commitment to mainstreaming biodiversity concerns into national development;
- (vi) Availability and demonstrated capacity of institutions to lead the process and compiling biophysical data;
- (vii) Availability and demonstrated capacity of institutions to lead the process and compiling economic data.

26. In addition, the project hoped to seek explicit synergies with related projects, such as World Bank's WAVES (Wealth Accounting and the Valuation of Ecosystem Services).

27. In fact, countries were selected through various discussions at meetings of the TEEB Advisory Board and the TEEB Coordination Group, as well as various consultations by the TEEB Office, including a short listing through exchanges with EC colleagues. Political will and commitment was identified as a key element, but it was considered that institutional capacity could be more variable since capacity building was embedded into the project implementation plan. The countries chosen through this process were Ecuador, Liberia, Tanzania, Bhutan and Philippines.⁶ These countries were contacted by TEEB Office (through, in some cases, the Regional Office)⁷ to determine government interest. Countries subsequently were solicited for letters of interest.

28. The main target group for the recommendations of the studies and in terms of impact, included the government decision-makers from the Ministries of Environment and other ministries in the five countries. The key target groups of the project are outlined in the table below per country TEEB study.⁸ These stakeholders were selected by the country teams and were either (a) those likely to be affected by the results of the study, (b) decision-makers who can integrate results in decision-making processes, and (c) those who could contribute to the results of the study.

Table 2. Key partners and Target Groups engaged through the TEEB National Implementation Process

TEEB Study/Country		Host Institution/ Study Lead	National Focal Point	Target Groups/Stakeholders
Ecuador	Coca watershed: Hydropower ecosystem services provisioning	Escuela Politecnica Nacional (EPN) (National Polytechnic School)	Ministry of Environment	National Planning and Development Agency (SENPLADES), Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Aquaculture and Fisheries (MAGAP), Vice-Presidency Office (Productive Matrix Change Committee), Ministry of Industry and Productivity (MIPRO), National Secretary of Water (SENAGUA), Ministry of Electricity and Renewable Energy (MEER), National Institute of Meteorology and Hydrology (NAMH), CELEC Hidronacion, Ministry of
	Guayas watershed: Change of	Escuela Superior Politecnica del Litoral (ESPOL)		

⁶ Minutes of the TEEB Coordination Group: 8 December 2011, 30 August 2012, 27 September 2012. Minutes of the TEEB Advisory Board: 19 March 2012, 10 September 2012, 17 October 2012.

⁷ In case of Philippines, Interview with Philippines Country Team, 27 April 2017.

⁸ Source of table contents: TEEB website, interviews with TEEB Office, interviews with country partners, workshop reports from each country.

TEEB Study/Country		Host Institution/ Study Lead	National Focal Point	Target Groups/Stakeholders
	productive matrix, case study cacao	(Littoral Polytechnic School)		Environment Projects: BIOFIN, Socio Bosque, UN-REDD, Vulnerability Analysis of Hydroelectric Power Stations Monitoring of Natural Patrimony Project, SEEA accounting project; GIZ ValuES, UNDP
Liberia: Coastal mangrove management scenarios		Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	EPA	Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry Development Authority, Bureau of National Fisheries, Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy, Bureau of Maritime Affairs, Liberia Institute of Statistics and Geoinformation Services, Ministry of Gender, Local Communities, Conservation International
Tanzania: Land use scenarios Rufiji River Basin		Institute of Resource Assessment, University of Dar- Es-Salaam	Vice President's Office	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives, President's Office Planning Commission, Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development, Ministry of Water, Tanzania Forestry Research Institute, UNDP Tanzania, Tanzania Forestry Services Agency, Ministry of Land, Housing and Human Settlement, Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania (SAGCOT Centre)
Bhutan: Ecosystem services provisioning under hydropower development		Department of Forests and Park Services, Ministry of Agriculture and Forests	Ugyen Wangchuk Institute for Conservation and Environment (UWICE)	Druk Green Power Corporation, Department of Agriculture, Department of Renewable Energy, National Environment Commission, Ministry of Finance, Forest Resources Management Division, WWF Bhutan, UNDP Bhutan, National Biodiversity Centre, Gross National Happiness Commission
Philippines: Coastal development Manila Bay		Resources, Environment and Economics Center for Studies (REECS)	Biodiversity Management Bureau (BMB)	National Economic and Development Authority, Climate Change Commission, Department of Environment and Natural Resources, BIOFIN, World Bank WAVES Project, Palawan Council for Sustainable Development, Foreign Assisted and Special Projects Office, Ecosystems Research and Development Bureau

D. Key Dates in Project Implementation

Table 3. Major milestones in project design and implementation of the TEEB National Implementation (ENRTP)

Milestone	Date
Approval date (By EC)	30 May 2012
Actual start date	17 October 2012
Intended completion date	April 2016

Planned Duration	42 months
International Workshop TEEB National (Vilm)	May 2013
Scoping Workshop Ecuador	First mission November 2013
Scoping Workshop Liberia	June 2014
Scoping Workshop Tanzania	May 2014
Scoping Workshop Bhutan	March 2014
Scoping Workshop Philippines	March 2014
International Workshop (Cancun)	December 2016
Final Workshop Ecuador	June 2017
Final Workshop Liberia	May 2017
Final Workshop Tanzania	May 2017
Final Workshop Bhutan	June 2017
Final Workshop Philippines	June 2017
Date of Completion	June 2017
Terminal Evaluation (Completion)	August 2017

E. Project Governance and Implementation Structure

29. TEEB is an independent initiative hosted by United Nations Environment Programme (UN Environment) and has an established governance structure that has managed the initiative since 2008. The ENRTP TEEB National Implementation project fits into this existing structure, with its own national implementation partners.

30. The TEEB Advisory Board (TAB) consists of high-level members and senior experts in the field of TEEB, and meets at minimum twice a year (although during the ENRTP project life span, met on average every three months). The TAB provides strategic direction for the project, and was active in final country selection for the ENRTP project.

31. The TEEB Project Coordination Group (PCG) consists of representatives from TEEB donors, the UN Environment Executive Director, the TEEB Office and TEEB technical experts. The PCG provides guidance on TEEB operational issues and activities, and meets at least on a monthly basis.

32. The UN Environment TEEB Office provides day-to-day implementation and administration of the TEEB initiative, including for the TAB and the PCG. During the ENRTP lifetime, the TEEB Office was hosted by the UN Environment Economics and Trade Branch, Economy Division, in Geneva (now UN Environment Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Branch, Ecosystems Division). The TEEB Office had a facilitation role in country implementation of ENRTP,⁹ with country partners leading implementation. The Office consisted of one staff member (Coordinator) and five consultants, including two focusing on ENRTP countries.

33. Each country (Ecuador, Liberia, Tanzania, Bhutan, Philippines) had a government National Focal Point, and the Host Institution which was the main study lead. Please see Table 2 for these per country. Together, these were the implementers in-country. In addition, each country, according to the TEEB National Manual and six-step approach, was to set up National Steering Committees¹⁰ to offer direction and guidance to national implementation.

⁹ TEEB PCG Minutes.

¹⁰ In practice, this did not happen in all countries, see paragraph 164 for details.

F. Project Financing

34. The total project budget at project approval was USD 4,844,959¹¹, of which USD 3,649,687 was a contribution from the European Commission (EC), USD 245,777 from Sweden, USD 145,318 from UN Environment as an in-kind contribution, and USD 576,896 unsecured funds from other donors.¹²

¹¹ TEEB National Implementation: Reflecting the Value of Ecosystems and Biodiversity in Policymaking. Project Document. Project Cost (Project Document Template Section 1)

¹²Ibid. See E. Financial Management for actual budgets and expenditures.

G. Project Logical Framework and Theory of Change

35. The ENRTP sub-project falls within the TEEB Phase III project and its logical framework. It is important to discuss the ENRTP project results in the context of this (please refer to TEEB Phase III Evaluation Report, most notably the logical framework) under which this project forms a major component. Within the logical framework of the overall TEEB Phase III, the ENRTP project was intended to contribute to a limited extent to Outcome 1 (Increase the capacity of countries and companies to incorporate natural capital into their policy and decision-making processes), and to a much larger extent, to Outcome 2 (Policy recommendations for integrating ecosystem services vital for sustainable development identified and adopted in participating countries).

36. The first milestone under Outcome 1 of the TEEB Phase III logical framework was to update the Guidance Manual for TEEB country studies by December 2014.

37. For Outcome 2 of the TEEB III the second milestone was that fact files describing the scope of individual TEEB country studies would be released.

38. The logical framework for the ENRTP subproject can be found in Annex 2, and includes updates on progress and related findings as per the evaluation (See Section III D).

39. The ENRTP project logical framework as it falls under the logical framework of the overall TEEB Phase III echoes the Theory of Change (please refer to the Theory of Change diagram in the TEEB Phase III Terminal Evaluation report). Project Outcome 2 in the Theory of Change is directly under the responsibility of the ENRTP project. In this regard, Outcome 2, in implementation and move to the Intermediate State (Services and benefits derived from ecosystems are integrated into development planning and accounting), makes the assumption that the political will is there to do this (formulated in the overall TOC as an Intermediate State). This assumption seems to have held in most country cases, as (a) policy focus was chosen by the country in terms of their priorities, and (b) there already were direct paths to specific policy areas that the study would feed into.

40. Three main project outputs were formulated for the ENRTP project. Output A referred to developing practical guidance for countries implementing TEEB at national level, and consisted of a six-step approach to implementation. Output B spoke to the actual country implementation and studies done by each country. Output C related to communication and outreach, as well as the expansion of the TEEB network of experts and practitioners. The achievement of outputs will be discussed in more detail under Section III D.

III. EVALUATION FINDINGS

A. Strategic Relevance

41. The ENRTP project outcomes speak to the overall themes of the **UN Environment Medium-Term Strategies** (as planned, MTS, 2010-2013, and also 2014-2017).

42. The ENRTP project was designed to contribute to Output 312 of UN Environment's **Programme of Work** (PoW) 2012-2013 (Policy dialogue with all sectors of society using economic evidence of the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services is promoted and used for development planning). This is under the Expected Accomplishment "Enhanced capacity of countries and regions to integrate an ecosystem management approach into development planning processes" of UN Environment's subprogramme for Ecosystem Management. To an extent, it also contributes to the subprogrammes on Environmental Governance and Resource Efficiency.

43. The project became part of the larger TEEB Phase III project that was intended to contribute to PoW 2014-2015 through "building knowledge and enabling conditions (EA3.c. increasing number of countries that integrate ecosystem approach in development planning, increase in number of countries that integrate priority ecosystem services into their national accounting processes; Biodiversity and ecosystem service values are assessed, demonstrated and communicated to strengthen decision-making by governments, businesses and consumers).

44. The outcomes and the achievements of the ENRTP project also aligned to the **Bali Strategic Plan** because it aligned to country policy priorities and also had a large capacity development component.

45. The project is classified under **ENRTP EC priority 2** (Environment for Development, sub-priority 2.1. Biodiversity, forest conservation and desertification). The work under this priority is linked to ecosystem assessments and the assessment of natural capital accounts. It also speaks to sub-priorities 2.3. (Green Economy) and 3.3. (Support for mainstreaming and promoting governance and transparency for natural resource management).

46. At country level, the selection was not strictly by country demand. Letters of request from UN Environment were sent to the countries to be part of the TEEB implementation.¹³ As a result, while the evaluator is convinced that in most cases the country prioritised this work at national level, the lack of demand-led process at selection implies a risk to results sustainability in terms of studies leading to decision-making at national level (as related to the TOC impact).¹⁴ However, once in implementation, studies did focus on policy priorities, which enhanced ownership and drivenness of the project at country level. All of the countries maintained that this was a relevant and important project and were committed to taking TEEB forward, thanks to their involvement in the ENRTP.

47. The ENRTP Project, from its design phase, made an effort to complement and find **synergies** with existing interventions. The development of the Guidance Manual was developed through various writeshops and partners, and actively sought inputs from related projects and programmes like WAVES, GIZ, UNDP, Conservation International. At country level, selection of countries also gave attention to creating synergies of work with WAVES and BIOFIN, particularly

¹³ Minutes PCG.

¹⁴ See Section III (I) Factors Affecting Project Performance, under Country Ownership and Driven-ness for discussion,

in Philippines, Liberia (to an extent) and Ecuador. For example, the WAVES national steering committee was then also used to steer TEEB (Philippines, work done by WAVES on mangroves in Liberia was integrated in the TEEB study of Liberia, and BIOFIN worked closely with TEEB study implementers in Ecuador. GIZ ValuES also worked in collaboration in e.g. Ecuador. In fact, work by TEEB and GIZ (through IKI) is following on from ENRTP TEEB in Tanzania. Many other synergies exist, including through the various TEEB Phase III projects (e.g. ANCA SEEA in Bhutan, where the TEEB study lead was invited to various SEEA workshops and vice-versa, research commissioned by ANCA supported TEEB in ENRTP countries, such as livestock systems in Tanzania, rice production in Philippines, and maize production in Ecuador).

48. The rating for strategic relevance is Highly Satisfactory.¹⁵

B. Quality of Project Design

49. A review of the Project Design was conducted in a detailed manner during the Inception Phase of the Evaluation. Project preparation was lacking in detailed and comprehensive problem statements and situation analyses. However, there was a strong analysis of existing project initiatives and enhancing synergies with these.

50. The logical framework had good output level indicators, but outcome level indicators were not all appropriate in terms of behaviour change and integration into national development planning processes. Monitoring and evaluation components were developed with a clear budget in the Project Document.

51. Governance and supervision arrangements were well planned and outlined in the Project Document. Capacities of global partners were assessed in the TEEB Phase III Project Document, but no capacity assessments were conducted of national partners design phase, since countries had not yet been selected. Existing capacity was, however, one of the key criteria in selecting country partners.

52. Learning, communication and outreach formed a large and important part of the project development and planned implementation. Various indicators in the logframe focused particularly on communication strategies and a broadening network of experts in TEEB.

53. Risks were outlined in the Project Document, but political buy-in as well as risks associated with the external operating environment were not considered. Sustainability strategies were outlined in the Project Document, although not fully detailed.

54. The main project design weakness raised by the UN Environment Project Review Committee (for the TEEB Phase III project, but with specific reference to the ENRTP work) and that the evaluator feels was not sufficiently addressed was stakeholder engagement and listing of the pilot countries at the design phase. Although the criteria were there for country selection, the evaluator is of the view that stakeholder analyses and capacity checks, and country selection, would have been better placed at project design.

55. The rating for quality of project design is Satisfactory.

C. Nature of External Context

56. The external context for project implementation was favourable at the start of the project and was considered as part of the criteria for country selection. This is further discussed below.

57. At project design phase, there was no likelihood of conflict (given the criteria involved in choosing the countries, the implicit mentioning of stability through demonstrated country

¹⁵ Based on country respondents prioritisation of project at country level, as well as the strategic relevance at global scale.

commitments and expressed government support). Generally, the operational environment was not likely to negatively affect the project (this is based on the criteria involved to select the countries).

58. One issue that was not anticipated at design, or at country selection, was the Ebola outbreak in Liberia (see paragraph 127 (iii)).

59. The rating given for nature of external context is Favourable.

D. Effectiveness

a. Achievement of Outputs

60. The achievement of project outputs and milestones is detailed in Annex 2. How these fit into the overall TEEB Phase III logical framework is elaborated in Section II G of this report.

Output A: Practical guidance for national TEEB implementation and capacity building of national partners

61. Output A related directly to enhancing the capacity of countries to implement TEEB, and included two activities (also outlined as indicators), namely developing a guidance manual and training material for countries to use (available for download), and conducting training for national partners.

Activity 1.1. Guidance Manual for TEEB implementation at the national level

62. A Guidance Manual¹⁶ for TEEB National Studies was prepared through a partnership with UFZ and others, and through two writers workshops, and was publicly launched in May 2013. The countries implementing as part of the ENRTP project made use of this Guidance Manual.¹⁷ Most respondents found the manual useful, with particular reference to the policy prioritisation during study selection.¹⁸ This was not a prerequisite for the ENRTP project, but it would bode well to update this manual based on experiences of TEEB country implementation.¹⁹

Activity 1.2. Training for national partners

63. Training material was developed.²⁰ In addition, capacity development initiatives took place in all five countries and at international platforms for the countries. These are outlined in detail in the ENRTP Logframe (Annex 2).

64. **Output A** was achieved through the above two activities, and these directly contributed to achieving the Output level indicators (One Guidance manual and training material available for download; Number of countries that have implemented trainings).

Output B: Country studies on the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services feeding into national development planning

65. Output B related to the implementation of TEEB studies at country-level, with study results feeding into national development planning. This output included eight activities, namely the selection of country partners and country project coordination, hosting an international

¹⁶ Downloadable at <http://www.teebweb.org/resources/guidance-manual-for-teeb-country-studies/>.

¹⁷ Country interviews.

¹⁸ Country interviews.

¹⁹ This was prerequisite of the TEEB Phase III project, see under Section II G. See under Section IV (C) Recommendations (A) for recommended updating in next phase.

²⁰ Ibid.

inception workshop, launching the TEEB studies through first national workshops which would focus on framing the biophysical data compilation, the compilation of biophysical data in each country, the economic valuation in each country, hosting second national workshops to present the implementation plans, and finally, the publication and release of TEEB national studies. The achievement of each activity is outlined below.

Activity 2.1. Selection of Country Partners and country project coordination

66. Five countries were selected based, mostly, on the criteria listed in the project document. The criterion not completely fulfilled was; 'expressed government interest and request for support'. While arguably, this was fulfilled through the letters of confirmed interest, the actual request came from UN Environment to work together, which leads the evaluator to believe that the country Governments, to varying degrees, did not necessarily demand to run the pilots, but were interested.²¹ The countries were selected by consensus with the European Commission (DG ENV and DG DEV) and TEEB's Advisory Board (as well as the Coordination Group).

67. All five countries appointed national focal points, as well as host institutions (study leads) for the TEEB project. A framework for project implementation was drafted. Each country had SSFAs that included detailed deliverable workplans.

Activity 2.2. International Inception Workshop

68. The Inception Meeting took place between 21 and 25 May 2013 at the International Academy for Nature Conservation, Isle of Vilm, Germany. Tanzania, Liberia and Bhutan were represented.²² The meeting took the form of an international expert workshop 'TEEB Country Studies: learning from experience and how to utilize the results'.

Activity 2.3. National workshops (launch of country projects and framing of biophysical data compilation)

69. Various scoping workshops took place. The first scoping mission to **Ecuador** took place in November 2013, but due to various delays and complications (related to (a) Ecuador needing clarification about valuation of TEEB being beyond valuation in terms of price, and (b) identifying the scope and policy focus of the study²³), the first implementation meeting took place in February 2015.

70. In **Liberia**, the national workshop took place in June 2014, in **Tanzania** in May 2014, **Bhutan** 2014, and in **Philippines**, March 2014.

71. In **Ecuador**, two host institutions each implemented a separate TEEB study. The EPN conducted a pilot study to inform policy options for a private hydropower finance mechanism for integrated management of hydrological resources at the wider landscape level (complementing the Socio Bosque Conservation Programme, and informed the change of energy matrix). The ESPOL implemented a pilot study to inform policies towards an inclusive and sustainable growth in the cocoa value chain, facilitated by irrigation infrastructure projects (informing the change of productive matrix).

²¹ Request letters were sent to the countries (source: minutes of PCG), interest and commitment was reflected in interviews with country respondents during evaluation.

²² At this point, not all countries had been selected. As a result, two countries were not present during the inception meeting. However, this did not affect the project results in the five countries comparatively (national workshops were sufficient as inception meetings at national level).

²³ Interviews with TEEB Office, Project Coordination Group minutes, interviews with country team. (March to May 2017)

72. In **Liberia**, the study was implemented by the EPA and aimed to provide policy evidence of the benefits of establishing marine protected areas through community based conservation agreements, in combination with the introduction of alternative livelihood activities.

73. In **Tanzania**, the study was implemented by the Institute of Resource Assessment (IRA) at the University of Dar-es-Salaam. It aimed to inform national policies on agricultural development through examining the changes in water availability due to land use changes that relate to increasing cash crop production in Rufiji (specifically Kilombero) River Basin.

74. In **Bhutan**, the study was implemented through UWICE and examined watershed level changes during the construction of hydropower dams.

75. In **Philippines**, the study was implemented through REECS, and examined a reclamation project in Manila Bay to identify various changes in ecosystem services due to construction.

Activity 2.4. Compilation of biophysical data and modelling in the countries

76. In **Ecuador**, the ESPOL study took slightly longer because biophysical data had to be collected (e.g. soil samples), which did not affect project timelines significantly.²⁴ The biophysical analysis was of high quality.²⁵ Both the ESPOL and the EPN reports on the integrated biophysical valuation assessment were delivered (ESPOL, October 2016, EPN September 2016).

77. In **Liberia**, the biophysical valuation assessment was submitted in September 2016.

78. Systems and other modelling support was given to **Bhutan** and **Tanzania** (through workshops, see Table 4). Each of these countries also submitted their reports (Bhutan in July 2016, Tanzania in February 2017).

79. **Philippines** submitted their final report by January 2017.

Activity 2.5. Economic valuation in the countries

80. Most countries, with the exception of Philippines, faced some form of capacity challenges in developing the economic valuations.²⁶

81. Particularly in **Ecuador** for the EPN study, the economic valuation posed some challenges due to a lack of capacity among chosen external consultants, which necessitated additional consultants to be hired to support the finalisation of the work.²⁷

82. Lack of capacity in **Tanzania** and **Liberia** necessitated external consultants to be hired to conduct and support the economic valuation.²⁸ This was also the case for **Bhutan**.

83. In the end, all countries submitted their economic valuations. But there is a lesson to be drawn from these experiences that highlights the need for extensive capacity assessments at the start (and even for selection)²⁹ of country studies.

Activity 2.6. Second international workshop (peer review of economic valuation exercises)

84. An international ENRTP workshop took place for all five countries in Cancun on the sidelines of the CBD COP13 between 5 and 7 December 2016, and focused on (a) learning

²⁴ Interviews with TEEB Office and country teams.

²⁵ Interviews with TEEB Office.

²⁶ Interviews with country teams.

²⁷ Interviews with Ecuador, interviews with TEEB Office. There was some frustration with the study team about lack of capacity assessment support from the TEEB office at the start and that there was not enough focus on the technical capacity aspects at the start (more focus on the politics).

²⁸ Minutes of PCG, 22 August 2014 and 5 September 2014, interviews with TEEB Office.

²⁹ Particularly if the project does not include enough time or budget to conduct required development of capacity.

exchanges within the team of five countries, (b) learning exchanges with other countries invited on second day, including Brazil, Germany, India, China and Mexico, and (c) communications and media outreach training.

85. Generally, countries found the learning exchanges particularly helpful. One respondent found that more could have been achieved by spending more time on receiving feedback on the valuations.³⁰

86. All countries found the media and communications training helpful.³¹

Activity 2.7. Second national workshops (presentation of draft implementation plan)

87. Second workshops took place during the first half of 2016 to discuss the implementation plan and to work out the study authorship roles and responsibilities.

88. Final country study validation workshops took place during May and June 2017 in all five countries. Here study findings and draft recommendations were presented to stakeholders at the national level.

Activity 2.8. Publication and release of TEEB national studies

89. Each country has finalised a consolidated TEEB national study, as well as policy briefs to disseminate key findings to decision-makers, and to inform policy integration. After the final workshops, the reports are being finalised incorporating stakeholder inputs from these workshops. At all final workshops, there was high level commitment to integrate the study findings into decision-making.³²

90. Overall, **Output B** was delivered, with some minor shortcomings due to delays and capacity shortfalls (especially with regard to the economic valuations). The project teams did their best to adapt to these delays and shortfalls, and lessons (e.g. capacity assessment at beginning of project) can be taken from this experience for future improvement of project implementation. As per the indicator, the project met its target: (a) number of countries that implement national-level projects (5), which included Ecuador, Liberia, Tanzania, Bhutan and Philippines.

Output C: Information on the economics of biodiversity and ecosystem services provided to media and expansion

91. The ENRTP had a large focus on outreach and communications, and Output C related to information dissemination and outreach through various channels. The activities included under this output were to update and deliver a communications strategy, and to expand and service the TEEB network.

Activity 3.1. Update and delivery of communications strategy

92. This output was measured by how many interviews were secured for the members of the TEEB community (a target of 10), and how many feature articles would be published on TEEB topics (also a target of 10). The indicators did not define the content or type of interviews or articles. The evaluator does not believe that as such, the indicator was robust. As a result, the articles and interviews did not always align to the ENRTP-relevant work.³³ In addition to this outreach, it was planned in the project logical framework that up to 200 experts would be participating in the TEEB network.

³⁰ Interviews with country teams.

³¹ Interviews with country teams.

³² Update on TEEB country studies, document to TAB, July 2017, workshop reports.

³³ Evaluator opinion.

93. In total, 35 interviews were conducted during the project lifespan, and these interviews can be accessed online on the TEEB website.³⁴ Most of these interviews focused on the theme of wetlands, and on various TEEB experts and practitioners working at international level. Some of the TEEB country partners are part of this interview list (e.g. Bhutan, Philippines, Ecuador). However, it would have been useful to have seen more focus on TEEB country implementers experiences. On another thread, TEEB Liberia had developed a video that showed glimpses of such experiences.

94. When the ENRTP sub-project was subsumed under TEEB Phase III, a revised Communications Strategy was produced in the form of a package of media and communications training tools tailored to the five countries, including the support of country communication and identification of platforms as elaborated in the project document.³⁵

95. Outreach on the TEEB Country studies was conducted during various events:

- (i) Forest Europe Conference, Belgrade, Serbia, September 2014;
- (ii) TEEB China Multi-Stakeholder Workshop, Beijing, China, January 2015;
- (iii) Technical Meeting on Payment of Ecosystem Services, Windhoek, Namibia, March 2015;
- (iv) Third International TEEB Dialogue, Goa, India, September 2015;
- (v) The Impact of Consumption on Ecosystems and Biodiversity Beyond Borders - A TEEB Perspective - International Workshop, Isle of Vim, Germany, October 2015;
- (vi) International Ecosystem Services Symposium, Republic of Korea, October 2015;
- (vii) Regional Green Economy Knowledge Sharing and Learning Forum for Latin America, November 2015;
- (viii) TEEB Country Studies and TEEB Agriculture and Food, MilanEXPO, 2015;
- (ix) 8th Sino-German Conference, Berlin, Germany, 2015;
- (x) International Training Workshop, Cancun, CBD COP13, December 2016.

96. The website has various news items, including different stories related to country studies. The Newsblog has 45 articles, the website has 14 press releases, and countless newsletters. There are almost 40 stories posted on the TEEB4me Facebook account.³⁶ Various videos have been posted to the TEEB youtube channel (as well as three live Facebook broadcastings).³⁷

97. TEEB currently has more than 7400 facebook fans, and 11800 followers on Twitter. The TEEB website has an average of 16000 visitors per month.

Activity 3.2. Expansion and servicing of TEEB networks

98. It was envisaged that, through this project, the Network of TEEB experts would be better structured, maintained and serviced. While there was no documented list, the servicing of the network of practitioners and TEEB experts have been coordinated through the TEEB office during the project duration.³⁸

³⁴ <http://www.teebweb.org/teeb-news/>

³⁵ Media and communications package shared through TEEB Office.

³⁶ <https://www.facebook.com/TEEB4me/>

³⁷ Country studies media report.

³⁸ Interview with Project Manager - network is based on TEEB Office knowledge of extended network of peers within TEEB community.

99. For **Output 3**, the project did well to reach the target as per one of the indicators. In fact, the project over-achieved on the interviews and press releases, and had an extensive media and communications training programme (which included two workshops focused on training countries to better communicate their results to high level), which went beyond the project results. The communications strategy could have been developed in the form of a targeted, strategic communications plan, but the package that was developed was sufficient to create buy-in for results integration into decision-making.³⁹

Achievements under the overall TEEB Phase III Logframe

100. The first milestone under Outcome 1 of the TEEB Phase III logical framework was to update the Guidance Manual for TEEB country studies by December 2014. Under Outcome 1, the Guidance Manual needed to be updated. A contract had been signed in December 2016 with UNITAR on adapting the Guidance Manual to make it more user-friendly. An update of the Guidance Manual should include the experiences of the ENRTP countries, but this has, so far, not been done. Nor was this an expressed project result in the ENRTP logframe (Annex 2).

101. For Outcome 2 of the TEEB III the second milestone was that fact files describing the scope of individual TEEB country studies would be released. As of December 2016, fact files had been created for all five countries.⁴⁰ Of particular importance under Outcome 2, is Output C (Ways to 'work with nature' to meet specific policy priorities of a country identified). The TEEB country studies of the ENRTP project identified policy priorities of focus for their studies. These have been finalised and were validated at the final national workshops in each country. Each country had their scoping workshops, as well as various capacity building workshops, and stakeholder consultation meetings during project implementation. The first (inception) workshop took place in Vilm in May 2013. Scoping workshops in all countries took place between December 2013 and June 2014 (with a second scoping workshop in Ecuador in February 2015). Second national workshops took place between February 2015 and May 2016. Capacity building workshops can be seen in the logframe above. An international workshop took place in December 2016, and final national workshops took place between May and JUN Environment 2017. These illustrate achievement of the four milestones developed for Output C of TEEB Phase III.

102. **Overall**, achievement of outputs is rated as Satisfactory. There was substantial all round delivery, with minor shortcomings (e.g. capacity assessments, lack of delivery on a few activities).

b. Achievement of Direct Outcome

103. The project's outcome was 'Policy dialogue with all sectors of society using economic evidence of the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services is promoted and used for development planning'. There was also a strong capacity development component embedded in the project for the countries.

104. According to the evaluation evidence, the project was successful in increasing capacity of countries to incorporate natural capital into their policy and decision-making processes. In **Bhutan**, most authors reflected the importance of them having been part of the TEEB study in building their own capacity.⁴¹ In fact, one of the authors received a PhD scholarship in Germany as a result of the work in TEEB Bhutan.⁴² The capacity development around systems modelling was very much appreciated in both **Bhutan** and **Tanzania**. The Cancun media training was particularly helpful for the countries to learn how to strategically communicate their study

³⁹ Evaluator opinion.

⁴⁰ <http://www.teebweb.org/areas-of-work/teeb-country-studies/>

⁴¹ Interviews with study authors.

⁴² Interview with study authors.

results, as was the tailored communications training per country during the final national workshops.⁴³

105. As per the outcome of policy dialogues activated, this has been successful mainly due to the fact that each topic was chosen as per policy priority, and there was a wide participation of stakeholders in this prioritisation, which enhanced relevance for the country (see Section III, A: Strategic Relevance).

106. In **Ecuador**, for the ESPOL study, a meeting with government was organised to present the results, and the topic selected by government was very timely and relevant, so the confidence is there that results will be taken up.⁴⁴ During the final workshop, the Minister of Environment set out a commitment to have a valuation task force set up in the Ministry, and commented on how useful both studies are to their decision-making. For the EPN study, SENAGUA will be supported in making the business case (based on the study results) for a tariff mechanism to charge hydroelectric projects for the use and management of water. There are also plans for long term financing of the National Incentives programme, which would focus on sites of hydrological importance, and creation of watershed committees linked to hydrological resources, allowing for the participation of multiple stakeholders in watershed management. For the ESPOL study, the results will inform policy instruments on the different growth scenarios in the primary sectors prioritised in the change of productive matrix.⁴⁵

107. In **Liberia**, the study showed that the mangrove ecosystem plays a significant role in the fisheries sector upon which 70% of the coastal population depends. It further provided civil society and regulatory services with evidence to advocate proactive actions for ecosystems-based management (and adaptation to climate change) of resources even beyond the scope of the study. It highlighted the need for policy change in favour of better protection.⁴⁶ During the final workshop, recommendations were made on how to pull the results forward. The TEEB results contributed to the establishment of local management plans. The EPA has identified the possibility of introducing a levy system on artisanal, motorized and industrial fishing practices. This includes a transparent benefit-sharing mechanism for local communities. There was also a suggestion of introducing a Conservation Agreement scheme as a tool to preserve mangroves.⁴⁷

108. In **Tanzania**, there has already been demand from SAGCOT for the results of TEEB to inform decision-making, and the key findings are planned to be used.⁴⁸ At the final workshop, it was decided that SAGCOT would use the recommendations coming from the TEEB study to inform its policy on agricultural intensification. Various recommendations came from the workshop which necessitates further study (e.g. further crop based assessments need to be done to ensure better water budgeting, impacts of reducing water flow and quality on the Rufiji delta need to be explored further).⁴⁹

109. In **Bhutan**, the wide stakeholder and review process, especially at high level, has great potential to inform decision-making. In addition, the policy focus was chosen at the highest level (Minister of Agriculture), which will give a stronger link to the integration of results into policy. There was also a plan to integrate results into the development of their 12th year development plan.⁵⁰ At the final workshop, the Minister of Agriculture stated that he will discuss the results of the study in Cabinet, and make the case for using part of the 1% royalty fee from hydro and

⁴³ Interviews with country teams.

⁴⁴ Interviews with ESPOL team.

⁴⁵ TEEB Country studies update, document to TAB, workshops reports, July 2017.

⁴⁶ Email interview Liberia respondent.

⁴⁷ TEEB Country studies update, document to TAB, workshop reports, July 2017.

⁴⁸ Interviews with Tanzania country team and stakeholders.

⁴⁹ TEEB Country studies update, document to TAB, workshop reports, July 2017.

⁵⁰ In-country interviews with various high level stakeholders.

afforestation and/or payment for ecosystem services scheme.⁵¹ Among the recommendations coming from the workshop, UWICE will be conducting a follow up study to identify the source of sediments, and technical capacity will be enhanced in conducting valuation studies (e.g. through systems dynamics training).⁵²

110. In **Philippines**, valuation of ecosystem services has been institutionalised after many years of working on this. As a result of the TEEB study, the Philippines Reclamation Authority, Manila Bay Coordination Office and the Department of Natural Resources have developed a think tank to bring together wide range of data and management options for Manila Bay. The key engineer on planning for Manila Bay was involved from beginning and had highlighted the uptake of the key findings into their planning.⁵³ The final workshop focused on the integration of ecosystem services into the development and implementation of Environmental Impact Assessments for development projects.⁵⁴

111. The only way to know if the study findings in each country have significantly influenced policy is to have evidence-base of such policy implementation in the coming years, but the evaluator is confident that all countries are planning to do so.

112. Based on the above findings, the direct outcome has not (yet) been achieved, but there is a strong likelihood that it will. As a result, achievement of outcome is rated as Satisfactory.

c. Likelihood of impact

113. The Project Document Logical Framework does not accommodate objectives higher than the project outcome. However, the impact in the Theory of Change presented in the TEEB Phase III Evaluation, is 'Biodiversity maintained' and 'Ecosystem services provided in a sustainable and equitable manner amongst countries'.

114. The following factors indicate that there is a good likelihood that the national interventions will contribute to achievement of the long-term impact.

115. The project's intended outcome is likely to be delivered (as far as it can be without evidence of actual policy integration) and there was a process initiated towards the political will for change (intermediate state) through the evidenced studies of the importance of ecosystems within the development nexus. There is a strong intention to integrate the services and benefits derived from ecosystems into development planning in each of the countries (see under Achievement of Outcome above for details). The assumption that there was appropriate engagement of relevant actors including government agencies, businesses and policy-makers held.⁵⁵ Such stakeholders recognised, through the process of the TEEB implementation in-country, the values of biodiversity and ecosystem services (intermediate state).⁵⁶ The drivers (tailored communications) and (multi-stakeholder consultations and consensus building) were put in place to support the move to impact.

116. Overall, the long-term impact depends on the continuation of TEEB and other economic valuations of ecosystem services in-country and the continuation of exposure to this in the policy arena.

117. The ENRTP project has made a contribution to the wider TEEB body of knowledge, and the project experience should contribute to improving country-level implementation in other

⁵¹ TEEB Country studies update, document to TAB, workshop reports, July 2017.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Interview with Philippines country team.

⁵⁴ TEEB Country studies update, document to TAB, workshop reports, July 2017.

⁵⁵ Evaluator opinion based on interviews in-country, as well as workshop documentation.

⁵⁶ Based on interviews with relevant stakeholders in-country.

TEEB-related contexts. The updating of the Guidance Manual for TEEB national implementation would be of great value here.

118. The rating for likelihood of impact is Likely.

119. The overall rating for effectiveness is Satisfactory.

E. Financial Management

120. As per the Project Document, the total project budget was USD 4,844,959.00. The European Commission contributed, through DG DEVCO, USD 3,649,687.00⁵⁷. The project document identified further sources at project approval as follows: UN Environment contribution of USD 146,318.00 and Sweden USD 245,777, with unsecured funding totalling USD 576,896.00.

121. The latest reporting for the project shows co-financing as being 20% of the project budget, and that EUR 57,750.00 was sourced from UK DEFRA, and EUR 542,250.00 was sourced from NORAD^{58,59}. The NORAD funding forms part of the ANCA project that contributed to TEEB Phase III. Activities under this project, including a set of sector studies that focused on agriculture, contribute to the understanding of TEEB implementation, including in the countries covered by the ENRTP countries, and to the project outcome.

122. By April 2017, recorded expenditure was USD 3,040,892.⁶⁰ Financial means were enough to deliver on project results, although the move over to Umoja (a new resource planning system taken on across the entire UN Secretariat in 2015) meant that the project never knew exactly how much funding was available to them, and in fact only had USD 500,000.00 become available three months prior to project end, which meant a scramble to align the last funding with activities they were not able to afford years prior. This additional funding was adequately spent during the final months of the project.⁶¹ The rates of expenditure are detailed in Annex 3.

123. Small-scale Funding agreements were signed with partners in each country. These outlined activities and deliverables expected to be achieved by the partner during agreed timelines. These were generally standard across the SSFAs, and included activities related to the studies (e.g. Scope finalisation and scenario development, biophysical data - assessment of data availability, gaps for carrying out scenario analysis, and valuation data - assessment of data available and gaps for carrying out scenario analysis). All countries had to have extensions to the SSFAs, partly due to some delays at country level, but mainly due to delays in payment (mostly as a result of the Umoja transition). In most countries, the SSFAs had to be extended up to three/four times, and payments were often delayed. In Ecuador, implementation was delayed by six months (EPN) due to administrative issues at UN Environment.⁶² With ESPOL, they had signed the initial SSFA and by the time the first tranche came through, the SSFA had already expired.⁶³ Tanzania had a similar case, and the country team lost one of their key experts as a result of the delays in payment.⁶⁴ In Bhutan, the first funds transfer was a challenge

⁵⁷ Actual grant was in EUR, and the amount was EUR 3,000,000.00

⁵⁸ both of these were actually for the ANCA project, which was related and implemented projects in ENRTP countries linked to the TEEB studies, 2016 Annual Report to Donor for ENRTP.

⁵⁹ See 2016 Annual Report to Donor for ENRTP.

⁶⁰ Notes from TEEB Office, as well as interviews with TEEB Office.

⁶¹ Reporting of expenditure through additional contracts for training workshops and final workshops.

⁶² Interviews with country teams.

⁶³ Interviews with country teams.

⁶⁴ Interviews with country teams (in-country). In fact, the team had apparently agreed on February 2017 for the final workshop, but had not received any correspondence from the TEEB Office despite the team emailing the TEEB Office on several occasions to ask what the progress was.

and caused a major delay.⁶⁵ In Liberia, the transfer in funds from UN Environment was also delayed by six months.

124. The amendments of the SSFAs included reference to the start date of the original SSFA. In most cases, work continued during the intervals between the expiry and initiation of amendments to the SSFAs, and partners showed extraordinary goodwill and flexibility in the face of uncertainty around timing of contracting.⁶⁶ However, the following incorrect financial procedures were picked up which is important to highlight for future project implementation:

- (i) As mentioned already, work continued during intervals between expired SSFAs and amendments,
- (ii) Letting SSFAs expire incurred additional administration procedures to renew them (which was a time-consuming burden); better monitoring of the overall ENRTP project end date by UN Environment⁶⁷ (which in term determined SSFA expiry) would have allowed better planning for timely extensions (rather than time-consuming renewals),
- (iii) The challenges for the management of the project were complex and multi-fold. The Project Manager had to deal with a work load that is above most other projects, in addition to having a team of mostly consultants (i.e. non-staff members). The work load, compounded by multiple renewals of country SSFAs would have, at best of times, been a difficult task to manage. Adding in the additional Umoja delays (see paragraph 125 below) made this project further compounded this task, and the evaluator believes that the team did as best they could under difficult circumstances. It is the evaluator's opinion, based on various interviews, that more regular liaisons between the Project Manager, the FMO and the consultants dealing with facilitating the work on the ground could have improved some of these challenges. The day-to-day administration tasks (including communication about SSFAs with countries) was handled by the consultants under the oversight and management of the Project Manager.⁶⁸ The evaluator is of the opinion that responsibility was devolved to consultants with limited authority associated with said responsibility. The consultants were expected to deliver in a highly professional manner, but for this to happen it is crucial that the system is in place to support this. However, it was not e.g. Umoja, regular liaisons, more authority i.e. staff positions instead of consultants would have supported the devolving of responsibility with authority. With all these challenges and gaps in the system, it made it difficult to smoothly run all transactions. In addition, the incorrect login by UN Environment of the project end date could only have further compounded these challenges.

125. The biggest reason for delays in payments and extensions of SSFAs was the introduction to UN Environment in 2015 of a new enterprise resource planning system called Umoja which generated a backlog in management of contracts and payments but also due to internal red tape of the UN Environment payment and contracting processes. In some cases, countries delayed the contracting (e.g. in the case of Philippines, where contracting was delayed due to the tender process of the BMB).

126. There were significant delays and associated effects on implementation, some of which were not always in project's control. It needs to be highlighted that there were various drivers

⁶⁵ Interviews with country teams (in-country).

⁶⁶ Various country level interviews, review of all SSFAs and their extensions.

⁶⁷ Overall ENRTP Project end date was logged in the UN Environment system incorrectly (Source: comment in previous draft by Project Manager)

⁶⁸ Multiple interviews with project team and country teams.

that compounded the challenges of financial management for this project, mostly due to delays with Umoja (see paragraph 125 above), amongst others. There is not a concern specifically with the management of the funds, but instead with the overall system in which the project had to operate. As a result, financial management is rated as Moderately Unsatisfactory.

F. Efficiency

127. Time: The project was set to start in March 2012, and its implementation was officially launched in October 2012, with the selection of the five countries taking up most of the time in between these dates. In fact, scoping missions to the countries only took place late 2013, early 2014. The project suffered from multiple delays, and as such had undergone three revisions. Initial delays were caused by underestimating the time it would take to hone in on policy focus areas for TEEB in-country, particularly in Ecuador. The first formal extension request was submitted in August 2014 for a six-month extension.⁶⁹ By October 2014, SSFAs had been sent to Bhutan, Philippines and Tanzania, as well as Liberia. Further delays were caused by Umoja (the new enterprise resourcing system), as well as delays in-country (mostly to do with capacity lacking in terms of economic valuations and thus recruitment was delayed, some contracting issues on the part of the country institution as in the case of the Philippines), and to allow for the international meeting that took place on the fringe of the CBD COP13 in December, the project requested a further no-cost extension. At this point, project implementation was delayed due to⁷⁰:

- (i) National institutions were recommended by their Ministries to increase country ownership, and thus as a result due to limited capacity in some areas of the TEEB analysis the quality of some reports was lacking. Thorough review of such reports needed to be conducted by the small TEEB Office with international TEEB expert support, while retaining ownership of TEEB results in-country. This process was more time-consuming than anticipated.
- (ii) The Ebola outbreak in Liberia in 2014 meant that UN Environment had to put all project activities on hold in-country for an entire year. In fact, the project had various challenges that nearly resulted in cancellation of its implementation, mostly due to Ebola.⁷¹ The economic valuation in particular: the three experts that were supposed to do this work had left the country due to the Ebola outbreak, and the TEEB Office had to hire an international consultant to conduct the work.⁷²
- (iii) The contracting process in Philippines required an open tender process to be completed first (as per BMB regulations) and thus contracting through the SSFA in Philippines took an entire year.
- (iv) The political sensitivities around the valuing of nature in terms of 'commoditizing nature' meant that extensive discussions had to be held in Ecuador to come to an agreement and achieve buy-in. In addition, the difficulty to hone in on a policy focus and topic also delayed the process.
- (v) The turn over to the SAP-based IT system installation - Umoja -- which made many processes time-consuming, including payments and contracting, among other administrative issues. In most countries, SSFAs were extended several times (see paragraph 123 above for details).

⁶⁹ PCG Minutes, 22 August 2014.

⁷⁰ April 2016 Final No-cost extension request from TEEB Office.

⁷¹ Email interview with Liberia respondent.

⁷² Email interview with Liberia respondent.

128. A further extension request was submitted to allow for the project to end in December 2017 (along with the TEEB Phase III) (to allow for more time for finalisation and organising country workshops), but this extension request was denied, and the project managed to conduct all five final workshops and finalise the project by the end of June 2017.

129. Due to various unforeseen circumstances beyond the project's control, but also some circumstances that the project could have been better prepared for (e.g. creating buffer for contracting processes in-country, e.g. issue SSFAs for longer periods and monitor their expiry dates, country scoping missions and policy focus area discussions, asking for more time with the extension process), this project under-estimated the time the project would need to come to fruition.

130. Cost-effectiveness: The project was very good at building on existing foundations and creating synergies (both within other projects under TEEB Phase III, as well as at country level, e.g. Ecuador and Philippines with existing valuation projects).⁷³ Financial means were sufficient to deliver on project results, although the move over to Umoja meant that the project never knew exactly what funding was available to them, which created additional challenges (see paragraph 123 above).⁷⁴ Given this, the project did very well, especially at country level, to conduct activities at relatively low cost. Some countries did claim that funding was tight in terms of running activities, and particularly human resources (i.e. authors of the study) were sometimes not sufficient (or time was not sufficient, as many authors had other work to complete in many cases).⁷⁵ All countries had seemingly gone out of their way to do this work that was highly valued at country level, both in terms of project results and impact, but also in terms of building capacity in-country.⁷⁶ In addition, in-kind support (e.g. through the Heimholtz Centre) through unremunerated support of the wide TEEB governance structure also worked towards project results coming to fruition beyond the formal funding structure.

131. The rating for Efficiency is Moderately Satisfactory.

G. Monitoring and Reporting

132. Project reporting: The overall TEEB Phase III project reporting in the UN Environment Project Information Management System (PIMS) was weak. However, the ENRTP project had annual reports to the EC that outlined all achievements against outputs. These were generally quite comprehensive and formed part of the requirement as per the ENRTP Strategic Cooperation Agreement.⁷⁷ Each annual report gave a summary of project status, detailed output performance, discussed challenges, management actions and risk mitigation plans, and spoke to the move towards the overall project outcome. The report also detailed country-level implementation results. Each annual report also had a detailed work plan for the next reporting period, which helped to increase adaptive management in the project. This also strengthened liaisons with the donor. In addition to this, regular updates were given during TAB and PCG meetings (and these were minuted), and often included write-ups for such meetings.⁷⁸

133. Monitoring design and budgeting: The ENRTP project had a logframe with clear SMART indicators at output level. The Milestones were appropriate to track progress at output level. Targets were specified for indicators of outputs and outcomes. The key performance indicators had baselines. The workplan did not factor in enough time to allow for various UN Environment

⁷³ Project documentation, incl. PCG and TAB minutes, Project Annual Reports; and various interviews.

⁷⁴ Notes from TEEB Office, as well as interviews with TEEB Office.

⁷⁵ Interviews with countries teams.

⁷⁶ Interviews with countries teams.

⁷⁷ ENRTP Annual Reports.

⁷⁸ TAB and PCG Minutes - all.

in-house administrative procedures as well as time required for in-country inception activities.⁷⁹ Funds were allocated sufficiently to the implementation of the monitoring framework.

134. Monitoring implementation: The yearly annual reporting to the donor included timely tracking of results and progress towards achieving project outputs, and created an adaptive management process. Discussions held at PCG and TAB level were conducive to allowing for adaptation as necessary. The evaluator feels that the TEEB Office underestimated the time it would take to achieve outputs, and this could have been better adapted as the Office became aware of the various constraints during project implementation.

135. Monitoring and reporting is rated as Satisfactory.

H. Sustainability

136. The evaluation of sustainability focuses on three aspects of sustainability: socio-political, financial sustainability, institutional sustainability, and looks at the catalytic role the project played.

Socio-political Sustainability

137. All five countries have, to varying degrees, a political environment that is conducive to sustaining project results vis-a-vis policy integration of the study findings (into development planning). The fact that the country chose the focus of the study and which policy area, already laid the foundation (as per the six steps) for the integration into policy and decision-making.

138. The next steps and way forward for study results to be integrated into decision-making process are elaborated in detail in IV D. Effectiveness b. Achievement of Outcomes (paragraphs 106-110).

139. Socio-political sustainability is rated as Likely.

Financial Sustainability

140. In **Ecuador**, the TEEB study has encouraged ESPOL to continue conducting TEEB research (already there is a PhD student working on expanding this work), and the Ministry of Agriculture has also taken on more studies around the topic of cacao plantations and valuation. These are seemingly self-funded.⁸⁰ Such studies will inform decision-making with regard to agriculture (and feed into the task force that is to be set up within the Ministry of Environment).

141. In **Liberia**, the workshop recommendations showed various ways in which the results will be taken up in-country (into development planning).⁸¹

142. In **Tanzania**, further work will be conducted with funding through the IKI project, focusing on advancing the foundation laid by the TEEB work.⁸² In addition, many recommendations were made for SAGCOT to take on the results.⁸³

143. In **Bhutan**, study results will be integrated into policies, but for any further studies to be done, funding would be needed (there is a study that UWICE will be conducting further as per workshop recommendations, but it is not clear to the evaluator whether funding has been secured for this)⁸⁴. Bhutan have recently launched the 'Bhutan For Life' concept which is a

⁷⁹ More detailed descriptions of such are elaborated under IV F: Efficiency.

⁸⁰ Interviews with ESPOL.

⁸¹ See Paragraph 107 for details.

⁸² Interviews with TEEB Office.

⁸³ See paragraph 108 for details.

⁸⁴ See paragraph 109 for details.

strategy document that is used as a strategy tool to source more funding towards the safeguarding of natural resources in the country.⁸⁵

144. In **Philippines**, a bigger framework and strategy has been development as of 2017 in order to allow for funding to be channelled under one framework looking at ecosystem valuation. The strategy includes programmatic expenditure towards valuation of ecosystem services; the 2017 budget has a budget of regional offices allocation of USD 600,000.00 just to start in a few priority areas.⁸⁶

145. Overall, in most countries, there are at least steps taken to either source more funding towards TEEB-related work, or to self-fund some priority areas.

146. Financial sustainability is rated as Likely.

Institutional Sustainability

147. Sustaining project results and the move to impact in the case of this project is dependent on institutional frameworks and governance. In all countries, the institutional frameworks in place seem robust enough to sustain project results. Of course, in some countries the likelihood of environmental safeguarding will depend on political will to do so beyond the seeming necessity to grow country economies (depending on the shift toward what type of economy the country is driving towards).

148. In **Ecuador**, there has been a recent change-over in government. This said, it is understood that the new leadership has the same line of thinking vis-a-vis the project and sustaining the results. The institution ESPOL seems to have quite eagerly taken up TEEB work as a new focus for the institution. For EPN, the fact that most of the work was outsourced from the university implies that the institution does not have capacity, nor necessary interest to build capacity, within the institution. Some individuals have benefitted from the experience from the project and might become the new leaders/champions in this field in Ecuador.⁸⁷ At ministerial level, there seems to be commitment towards instituting a task force responsible for valuation of ecosystem services.⁸⁸

149. In **Liberia**, the EPA has its mandate over environmental matters, and has shown interest regarding building its capacity to better understand valuation (although some of this was also outsourced). The governance and relationship of partners to make this happen and further results in the country would need to be tied down and improved to build a strong institutional framework conducive to TEEB implementation in the long-run.⁸⁹ Some recommendations toward this have been made during the final workshop.⁹⁰

150. In **Tanzania**, there is a lot of interest from Government to lead TEEB further, the National Bureau of Statistics is keen to know how to go about incorporating Natural Capital Accounting into Gross Domestic Product⁹¹. However, there seems to be a lack of coordination and partnership both internally and externally in Government. Until this coordination is improved, TEEB work might end up being conducted piece-meal. At the final workshop, recommendations were made to integrate the study into formal processes.⁹²

151. In **Bhutan**, UWICE has been quite instrumental in taking this study forward and working together with the important institutions. However, as an environmental research institution, it

⁸⁵ Interviews with Bhutan team in-country, as well as 'Bhutan for Life' Book.

⁸⁶ Interview with Philippines team.

⁸⁷ Various interviews with Ecuador stakeholders.

⁸⁸ See paragraph 106 for details.

⁸⁹ Interview with Liberia, as well as background notes, minutes PCG, interview with TEEB Office.

⁹⁰ See paragraph 107 for details.

⁹¹ Interviews with country respondents.

⁹² See paragraph 108 for details.

seems that it will take time to wield power to economic considerations.⁹³ The collaborative atmosphere in Bhutan, in addition to its good governance, allows for a conducive environment for results to be achieved and TEEB and other ecosystem valuation work to continue in country.

152. In **Philippines**, the institutional framework has been set up over the last decades to allow for synergy as well as for strong governance around ecosystem valuation. Ecosystem valuation in the country has been fully institutionalised, with programmatic overview and government resource allocation.⁹⁴

153. Institutional sustainability is rated as Likely.

154. Sustainability is rated as Likely.

I. Factors Affecting Project Performance

Preparation and Readiness

155. Once the project began implementation, it took quite a long while to get started at country level. The evaluator believes that this could have been avoided by having selected the countries at design phase, and having had countries directly demand for TEEB implementation in their country. The selection of countries, as well as then the letters of request sent to the countries to join the project took time. The evaluator considers this was a flaw in the design of the project.

156. However, scoping missions to each country were successful in terms of gauging interest and demand at country level, and did well to enhance country ownership, through country selection of topic, national focal points being in Government, and involving local research institutions (even when lacking in capacity, this capacity was envisaged to be built).

157. The engagement of stakeholder groups by the project teams in-country was effective, from entry point to the inception of the project at country level. The evaluator can see that much thought was put into the project at the start of implementation to ensure that project results are driven by country and that the TEEB Office merely facilitates. In this sense, other projects can learn from this experience and the six-step approach of TEEB.

158. Preparation and readiness is rated as Satisfactory.

Quality of Project Management and Supervision

159. The project was implemented within the overall framework outlined by the project document. It was facilitated through the UN Environment TEEB Office with governmental bodies coordinating in-country, and research institutions running the studies at national level. Stakeholders were involved appropriately throughout the project. In some cases, international experts were brought on board to support in capacity development, but also in supporting the development of the study (mostly in the case of the economic valuation).

160. The TAB and the PCG met regularly during the project period to inform and guide the TEEB Office, and the evaluator, based on the minutes of meetings of both groups, believes there may have been some overlap in the functions of the two groups.

161. The countries all highlighted the fact that they appreciated the oversight and facilitation of the TEEB manager and the TEEB Office. The Office was mostly swift and responsive, and the fact that one person at the TEEB Office was assigned to a country made it easy for countries to have a relationship with the TEEB Office and good interaction.⁹⁵ In some isolated cases there

⁹³ Interviews with stakeholders in Bhutan.

⁹⁴ Interview with Philippines team.

⁹⁵ Interviews with country teams.

were frustrations of a lack of email communication from the TEEB Office.⁹⁶ It was also highlighted that regional offices could have been included more, and where they were, they were effective in supporting country-level implementation.⁹⁷ Even if technical expertise sits with the TEEB Office, it would still be beneficial to have Regional Offices support the work, through e.g. a facilitation and entry-point role (and in this sense, presence on behalf of UN Environment TEEB Office at some meetings - this would also help contribute to capacity development of TEEB within the Regional Offices).⁹⁸

162. At country level, national steering committees were meant to have been set up to guide the process and ensure high level buy in.⁹⁹ This did not work out in practice in most of the countries, with the exception of Philippines who used the existing set-up WAVES committee, and Bhutan who used a set of reviewers of the final study results report. For instance, in Tanzania, the Steering Committee discussion only happened at the end. When asked why one was not set up, one of the reasons given was funding, and specifically the time taken to enact a full UN Environment procurement process for venue hire and catering.¹⁰⁰ Eventually, assistance was received through UNDP. One respondent mentioned that a dedicated fund for setting up of a Steering Committee may have supported the set up from the onset.¹⁰¹

163. Most countries had a good implementation structure at country level. In some countries, however, the role of the focal point/Government was not that well-defined. In Tanzania, the focal point felt that they were left out after the host institution had signed and sometimes did not have easy access to information of the study.¹⁰² In Ecuador, in the case of the EPN study, the management of the country study team was not very strong, and the various study contributions were lacking as a result of this as well as others e.g. lacking capacity.¹⁰³ In this case too, there was some frustration about the TEEB Office not spending time, at the onset, on assessing the country team's capacity to carry out the work.¹⁰⁴

164. The project management and supervision was rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

Stakeholder Participation and Cooperation

165. Stakeholder participation and cooperation was a strong component of the project, and every country did well to include as many stakeholders in the inception process as possible, and then keep collaboration with the relevant set of stakeholders once the study priority area was agreed on.¹⁰⁵

166. In **Ecuador**, the project did well to enhance synergies with ongoing projects in-country (e.g. UNDP BIOFIN), and were good at taking opportunities to include relevant stakeholders throughout the process.¹⁰⁶

167. In **Liberia**, the community (target group) engagement and participation was possibly the best part of the implementation of TEEB in the country, and had a strong part to play in

⁹⁶ Interviews with country teams.

⁹⁷ E.g. ROLAC have been particularly helpful with moving TEEB forward in Latin America.

⁹⁸ See Section IV (C) Recommendations (C)

⁹⁹ See Section II (E: Project Governance and Implementation Structure)

¹⁰⁰ Interviews TEEB project team.

¹⁰¹ Interview with project respondent in-country.

¹⁰² E.g. VPO was not included in a lot of communication, and when they requested for status updates and information they were asked to wait for confirmation of sharing from the TEEB Office first.

¹⁰³ Interviews with stakeholders and EPN team.

¹⁰⁴ Interview with respondent shared that the Office was more interested in the politics than in reviewing and advising on the technical side.

¹⁰⁵ Evaluator opinion based on various interviews.

¹⁰⁶ Evaluator opinion based on country interviews.

enhancing ownership. Partnerships and other stakeholder involvement, particularly civil society, could have been stronger.¹⁰⁷

168. In **Tanzania**, while stakeholder involvement, particularly at entry point was good and well facilitated by UN Environment country office, some stakeholders could have been more involved, e.g. National Bureau of Statistics, Ministry of Finance and Planning. Another comment made was that there was no 'task team' or steering committee (although some technical experts did meet a few times in the beginning phase of the project), and this may have helped bring the players together more. Particularly, the focal point felt that they were not as included once the host institution (IRA) had signed their SSFA and all correspondence with the TEEB Office was then with IRA.

169. In **Bhutan**, the project did extremely well in stakeholder inclusion (in fact, the authors of the study were all representing the key institutions which created strong ownership). The UWICE did not manage to engage the National Environment Commission as they had hoped and tried through various ways to engage them (through an invitation to join the study author team), but were not successful. For scoping, the country had a very broad stakeholder list, but honed in on appropriate stakeholders once the project had a focus for the study. The reviewers of the study would be the higher levels and stakeholders who were ultimately responsible for the take-up of study results. One of the weaknesses here was that, while institutions had representing authors on the study team (which should have then created a sense of ownership at institutional level), these authors did not communicate the process up-ward. To this effect, the higher levels at the institutions were very unaware of the study until the end. More upward communication within the various institutions by each author could have improved institutional ownership.¹⁰⁸

170. In the **Philippines**, there were strong synergies made with other projects, including through using the WAVES committee as the Steering Committee of the project. The ecosystem valuation is institutionalised in this country, and both WAVES and now Natural Capital Accounting is operating in-country. All relevant stakeholders were appropriately engaged in the TEEB work to such an extent that decision-making recommended by the study was effectively taken up. The host institution and focal point had a strong working relationship, and through the partnership, the BMB successfully built the capacity of its staff through working with REECS.¹⁰⁹

171. Stakeholder participation was rated as Highly Satisfactory.

Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equality

172. The project outlined, in its project document, the environmental rule of law and how it pertains to human rights and connections to natural systems. The description of gender analysis is implicitly embedded into the six-step approach of TEEB. The evaluator is not entirely convinced, however, that the TEEB studies, particularly those policy recommendations that were relevant to the wellbeing of indigenous communities and gender disaggregation, was appropriately covered in each of the TEEB studies (e.g. in Liberia, Tanzania, even Bhutan - how the results affected different groups differently).

173. Responsiveness to human rights and gender equality is rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

Country Ownership and Driven-ness

174. Because of the TEEB Office attention to detail taken in scoping missions, as well as the use of the six-step approach (particularly the choosing of topics by the country), country ownership of the TEEB studies was strong in all countries.

¹⁰⁷ Evaluator opinion based on multiple interviews and project documentation.

¹⁰⁸ Bhutan country visit, various interviews.

¹⁰⁹ Interview with Philippines team.

175. In **Ecuador**, the level of ownership of the EPN study results by the main stakeholders depends on high level buy in of the approach, the final workshop seemed to bring results forward in terms of integration into decision-making.¹¹⁰ The ESPOL study had good ownership and both the university (who is very interested to carry on with the work and will be taking this forward) and the Ministry of Agriculture want to take this work forward.¹¹¹

176. In **Liberia**, ownership of results rests with the EPA, but due to the significant role of the study to a proportion of the population, the national team is convinced that the country will own the results and take them forward.¹¹²

177. In **Tanzania**, the VPO has highlighted its demand and interest in continuing this work, and expects this will be possible through the forthcoming TEEB IKI project. The National Bureau of Statistics has also shown interest to include Natural Capital Accounts into its work streams. The choice of the work in the Rufiji Basin has meant that a lot of stakeholders have been involved, and particularly SAGCOT (the key planner for the basin in terms of development) has shown a keen interest to take up the results into its decision-making process.¹¹³

178. In **Bhutan**, country ownership is particularly strong. Stakeholders were appropriately involved in the entire process, and the validation process inherent in the country implementation will ensure buy-in from the decision-makers. Already, based on discussions with high-levels, the stakeholders responsible for results up-take were wanting it to inform the decision-making process.¹¹⁴ Commitment to integrate results into decision-making was made at the final workshop.¹¹⁵

179. In the **Philippines**, appropriate involvement of stakeholders in the entire process, including the Philippines Reclamation Authority, Manila Bay Coordination Office, among others, were part of a think tank to inform and integrate the work of the study into the development plan of Manila Bay. In addition, the fact that ecosystems valuation is now institutionalised in the country bodes well for continued work into redefining the economic valuation towards including ecosystems and their services.¹¹⁶

180. Country ownership and driven-ness is rated as Highly Satisfactory.

Communication and Public Awareness

181. Communication was an important part of the project, making up the third output. A communication strategy was developed in the form of detailed media and communications training targeted for each country (on communication of results to policy-level),¹¹⁷ and outreach was conducted through multiple workshops and side events through the project lifespan and dissemination of various articles on the TEEB website.¹¹⁸

182. The international workshop in Cancun was a great opportunity for countries to share results and experiences.¹¹⁹ Country individual stories were also communicated via both the TEEB website, facebook, but also in-country through various media channels (see Annex 2 for details). In Liberia, an outreach video was developed and shared widely.

¹¹⁰ See paragraph 106 for details.

¹¹¹ Interviews with Ecuador stakeholders.

¹¹² Email interview with Liberia respondent, and workshop report, see paragraph 107 for details.

¹¹³ Various interviews in-country, and final workshop report, see paragraph 108 for details.

¹¹⁴ Interviews in-country.

¹¹⁵ See paragraph 109 for details.

¹¹⁶ Interview with Philippines team.

¹¹⁷ Media and communication training material.

¹¹⁸ See Table 4 above.

¹¹⁹ Activity 2.6., see paragraph 84 to 86 for details.

183. Communication between the TEEB Office and the country teams was prompt and usually frequent (with the exception of the Tanzania example of no response in the beginning of 2017).¹²⁰

184. The various workshops in all five countries provided feedback opportunities to workshop participants. There was constant consultation and communication among the country stakeholders and the country implementation teams. In some instances, communication could have been improved between the host institution and the focal points (e.g. in Tanzania). In the instance of Bhutan, upward communication could have been improved between the representing authors and the institutions in which they worked. This said, Bhutan was a striking example of how stakeholder participation and constant inter-communication can be effective in enhancing ownership of project results. The validation of the report through a stakeholder review process encouraged strong buy in of the study findings.¹²¹

185. Media training was popular and helpful to the country respondents, and these took place both at the international workshop in Cancun, but also at each final workshop in-country.¹²² In fact, at the final workshop, the communications training was tailored to the country context.

186. The final (validation) workshops held in each country with the TEEB Office present worked towards the final push to own and buy-in to the results and findings, as well as to move to impact.¹²³

187. Overall, communication and public awareness is rated as Satisfactory, as it was (mostly) strategic in supporting change and towards achievement of results (especially in-country). Ways to improve could have included more strategic messaging directed at target groups (e.g. for instance, direct messaging of results to policy-makers). While this was addressed at the final national workshops, it is not certain (as of yet) that this will relate into targeted messages for move to impact, it would have also been helpful to develop short policy briefs targeting the decision-making process (this took place in some of the countries, not in all).

Catalytic Role, Replication and Scaling Up

188. The fact that in most countries there have been next step activities (see paragraphs 104 to 110 above) shows that the capacity and understanding has promoted behavioural changes and resultant action of promoting and integrating project results into decision-making processes.

189. Policy changes are expected to take place as a result of the TEEB studies in each of the five countries. In all countries, the study recommendations will affect decision-making process, as is evidenced by the commitments made during the final workshops.¹²⁴

190. In some countries, e.g. Ecuador, the institutions have started taking on TEEB as a long-term approach (e.g. ESPOL, and the Ministry of Agriculture, and the task force set up in the Ministry ¹²⁵). In others, e.g. Philippines and Bhutan, ecosystem valuation has been institutionalised now through various means (e.g. in case of Bhutan 'Bhutan for Life' and Payment for Ecosystem Services, in case of Philippines, a programmatic approach to

¹²⁰ Interviews with country teams.

¹²¹ Various interviews in Bhutan with stakeholders.

¹²² Interviews with country teams, interviews with TEEB Office.

¹²³ Verify after workshop reports review.

¹²⁴ See paragraphs 106 to 110 for details.

¹²⁵ See paragraph 106 for details.

ecosystem valuation). Funding, however, remains an issue, and is dependent on external sources.¹²⁶

191. In Tanzania, the IKI project will ensure that the TEEB study laid a foundation for further TEEB-related work and implementation has already begun to build on the TEEB study. In fact, the IKI project has learned from the results of the ENRTP and will continue the work done at country level through the TEEB Office.

192. The Guidance Manual for TEEB national implementation has already provided opportunities for other countries to implement TEEB at national level and be guided by the manual. What would be more effective for replication of TEEB into other countries would be the updating of the manual using the experiences of the ENRTP.

193. These steps above shows some ownership regarding sustaining results, but more steps are needed for scaling up and catalysing. Catalytic role, replication and scaling up is rated as Satisfactory.

194. Factors affecting project performance is rated as Satisfactory.

¹²⁶ Interviews with country teams, Philippines, Bhutan, Tanzania.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Conclusion

195. The ENRTP project was one of the key implementation components of the TEEB Phase III, aiming to pilot TEEB nationally. If we want sustainable development as per the global agenda for the Sustainable Development Goals, we need to bring natural capital and ecosystem services into development planning. The five countries chosen to pilot TEEB in their country gave a good and varied spectrum (in terms of capacity, geography, governance, among others) in implementation of the six-step approach.

196. Under the umbrella of sustainable development, and redefining the value system towards including valuing those systems that support (human) life on Earth, this project was a highly relevant contributor to this. It also made strides, in-country, towards the move to impact as defined in the reconstructed Theory of Change (biodiversity is maintained).

197. The implementation structure was generally appropriate for the project, with the TEEB Office mainly facilitating the project. However, there is some merit to discussing the appropriateness of consultants based in Geneva facilitating the country projects (as well as the use of consultants instead of staff). While the capacity was appropriate, this function would have been ideally set at regional level.¹²⁷ There is a desire for a stronger regional presence (in terms of functional approach and facilitation at country level) which could reinforce the TEEB Secretariat functions (which include TEEB governance). The limited budgets of course make this realisation difficult.

198. At country level, the country teams were in charge of implementation, with the TEEB Office facilitating the process. The choice of focal point to coordinate from government, and research institutions to work closely with the focal point and conduct the study, was an important part of creating enhanced ownership of TEEB results. This said, the roles of the two entities in-country were not always clearly played out during implementation (as per the Tanzanian case, see paragraph 168 in the evaluation findings section).

199. The project did well to deliver all of its outputs, although the country TEEB studies were of varying quality. The TEEB Office (along with both the PCG and the TAB) had made the decision that ownership of the results was more important than hiring external experts to produce a high quality report. For this reason, the host institutions could deliver on some aspects on the study, but had to either/and (a) have capacity development, and (b) hire additional (sometimes international) support to the study, particularly with reference to the economic valuation. This was a compromise to be made, and in the end it worked out very well to enhance ownership of the results as these were hosted in-country.

200. In addition to this, the host institutions (study leads) appreciated the opportunity to work on TEEB in their countries, and have in some of the countries, as a result of both the experience, as well as the additional capacity development support, taken on TEEB in their own right to sustain results and move TEEB forward (through e.g. individuals now doing their PhDs in TEEB related work, e.g. Bhutan and Ecuador, or institutionalising ecosystem valuation in-country, e.g. Philippines, or conducting follow-on work through other intervention projects e.g. Tanzania).

201. One of the key successes to the project was giving the country complete ownership over the focus of the study, and the policy to inform. As per the six-step approach, this is a vital component to not only enhancing ownership of the study, but sustaining the results in the long-term through actually increasing the potential to integrate results into decision-making. In each

¹²⁷ Evaluator opinion.

of the countries this approach worked well. In some of the countries, already there are plans in place to directly feed into development planning processes (e.g. results in Bhutan informing the 12th five year plan, results in Tanzania informing SAGCOT decision-making).

202. One of the missing components in terms of the six-step approach was that most countries struggled to put together a Steering Committee. This seemed a difficult step for some of the countries (e.g. Tanzania), and they were not formed as a result. This did not seem to have impeded the sustaining of project results in any of the countries (in view of strong stakeholder participation and institutional ownership), but deserves further consideration when experiences of TEEB implementation in this project are used to update the manual.

203. The country teams (Bhutan and Tanzania) that benefited from systems thinking training and support were highly appreciative of this development of their capacity and believed that this improved the quality of their study. Capacity developed in other instances was also highly valued and in some cases has led to using the developed capacity in related work streams (e.g. systems dynamics modelling in Bhutan). All countries were particularly enthused by the communications and media training received at the international workshop, and this created demand to do this in-country during the final workshops. The TEEB Office did well to address this demand with such training, even if it prolonged the final workshops slightly. It would be good to see the outcomes of the communications training in developing strategies and messages for country results to move to impact in each country.

204. The communication of the project was an important component and the communications strategy implementation did well to create as much momentum around the project as possible.

205. The stakeholder involvement and participation in all countries, but particularly in Bhutan, was a strong example how good stakeholder engagement can affect a higher level outcome when done properly. The key institutions were represented in the authorship of the team to ensure that such results were properly understood and taken up by the institutions in question. The only caveat was the lack of regular upward communication of the authors to their seniors in the institutions, which meant, in practice, that the higher levels of the institutions knew very little about the project. This was out of the host institution's hands, but is a good example of learning how one can better support representation in such a way that upward communication happens and that knowledge is not left only with the individual.

206. The project had multiple needs for extending the project timeline, for various reasons, many of them out of the TEEB Office's control. However, it is important to note that both for the project design, but also adaptiveness of project implementation, it would have served the project better to have created more buffer time during design and/or submit requests for longer extensions. Country selection, as well as topic selection, and in-country contracting issues, need for external support and more capacity building, as well as UN Environment red tape (including to a major extent, Umoja issues), all played on the limited time of the project. The evaluator believes some of these issues could have been anticipated, to a degree, and resulted in better planning and adaptive management with regard to time extensions, as well as closer monitoring of contract durations.

207. Overall, the project did well to achieve its results and to lay the foundations for further work in the project countries. The TEEB national implementation piloting in the five countries lays a good foundation for future countries to be inspired to do the same implementation of their key areas of focus, with the intention of broader scale economic valuation of components that are important for societies to thrive.

208. The overall rating for the ENRTP project is Satisfactory. The ratings for the individual criteria are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Summary assessment and ratings by evaluation criterion for the ENRTP TEEB National Implementation project

Criterion	Summary Assessment	Rating
A. Strategic Relevance		HS
1. Alignment to MTS and POW	The project objective was consistent with global environmental needs. The project was linked directly to UN ENVIRONMENT PoW 2012-2013 and 2014-2015. It was also aligned to the ENRTP EC priorities. The project did very well to complement and find synergies with existing interventions.	HS
2. Alignment to UN Environment /GEF/Donor strategic priorities		HS
3. Relevance to regional, sub-regional and national environmental priorities		S
4. Complementarity with existing interventions		HS
B. Quality of Project Design	Generally well planned out, although with no real situation analyses, clear logical framework, but no real risk assessment nor stakeholder engagement possible without country selection.	S
C. Nature of External Context	Operational context was not likely negatively affect project results, although this was not easy to tell given the lack of knowledge at design stage of which countries the project would be working with.	F
D. Effectiveness		S
1. Achievement of outputs	All outputs were achieved, although capacity was lacking in the economic modelling for the studies (in some countries). Capacity development and comms of particular importance.	S
2. Achievement of direct outcomes	Project will most likely achieve its outcome (this did not yet happen by project end), mainly due to policy focus set at beginning of project in each country.	S
3. Likelihood of impact	Likelihood is strong based on the manner in which the focus was selected at country level, but depends on continuation of TEEB and other economic valuations of ES in-country.	L
E. Financial Management		MUS
1. Completeness of project financial information	Financial reporting generally okay, with some missing links and no output specific reporting of expenditure. Mostly reporting to donor EC.	MS
2. Communication between finance and project management staff	Communication between project management and finance could have been stronger, especially with regard to understanding of contracting and spending within countries. SSFA issues, UMOJA not allowing expenditures to be known.	MUS
3. Compliance with UN Environment standards and procedures	SSFA issues not following financial procedures.	MUS
F. Efficiency	Project suffered many delays, was cost-effective but not very good with time.	MS
G. Monitoring and Reporting		S
1. Monitoring design and budgeting	Budgeted generally okay, although mostly donor-driven.	S
2. Monitoring of project implementation	Logframe and indicators - generally good implementation, but workplan did not factor in UN Environment administrative procedures.	S
3. Project reporting	Annual reporting to donor.	S
H. Sustainability		L
1. Socio-political sustainability	Mostly had political environment conducive to sustaining project results.	L
2. Financial sustainability	Mostly countries are seeking more funding in house and sourcing from outside to continue working on ecosystem valuation and sustaining project results.	L
3. Institutional sustainability	In most cases institutional frameworks robust enough to sustain project results.	L

Criterion	Summary Assessment	Rating
I. Factors Affecting Performance		S
1. Preparation and readiness	Generally well-planned, implementing agents and stakeholder analysis not done until inception. Project management and partnership arrangements in place.	S
2. Quality of project management and supervision	Generally good management, with overall guidance TAB and PCG, the TEEB Office facilitated well, country implementation managed by countries, although focal points not always good coordinating position once research got going.	S
3. Stakeholders participation and cooperation	Stakeholder participation very strong in this project.	HS
4. Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity	Generally outlined, but not specific how roles were disaggregated in studies.	MS
5. Country ownership and driven-ness	Country ownership and drivenness very strong.	HS
6. Communication and public awareness	Very good outreach, training helpful, target group analysis could have been better for more direct messaging.	S
7. Catalytic Role and Scaling Up	Good move to sustaining results, most countries committed to carrying on, more steps needed for upscaling	S
Overall project rating		S

B. Lessons Learned

There are a few lessons learned from the process of this project that would be helpful for future UN Environment (and other) projects, and future TEEB national implementation. These should also be viewed in the context of the broader TEEB strategy.

Lesson 1: Capacity is very important - either existing or developing it, as a means to ensure project results are sustained

209. Capacity analysis was conducted by the TEEB Office during scoping missions to varying degrees in the countries and this is an important component to understanding the needs of the countries before implementation should even begin. Of course, this is easier said than done, and in some of the cases lacking capacity could only be identified during implementation of the project. Capacity gaps during implementation were dealt with reasonably, and lacking capacity was also a risk that the project took to enhance ownership of results (versus getting an external consultant in to do the study).

210. However, seeing the power of the exposure as well as the developed capacity through the project, in terms of creating 'champions' of TEEB who have seemingly either integrated facets of the work into their work, or have chosen career paths linked to TEEB, it is important to make sure that developing capacity (not short bursts through workshops, but through real exposure and shadowing experts) is a vital component of projects such as these.

211. Existing capacity or at least developing it properly has a large influence over final ownership of results.

Lesson 2: More buffer time needs to be given around project implementation, especially at inception phase

212. One of the key lessons learnt from the project is that there are many aspects that may delay a project. The Umoja delays in this case were out of the hands of the project implementers, but some delays could have been anticipated.

213. The selection of countries, the creation of buy-in of the approach, as well as the country selection of topic, along with contracting, could have benefitted from having more time

allocated to it. Especially when working with countries and institutions for the first time, buffer time is essential to allow for any contingent issues to arise and be dealt with. In the case of this project, not much time was allocated to this, and the subsequent delays here had knock-on effects for the timeline of the project, and necessitated requests for extensions.

Lesson 3: Timing important related to decision-making (e.g. policy review, development planning periods)

214. Countries chose their topic and policy focus area, which helped a lot towards the potential of integrating the TEEB study results into decision-making. In the case of Bhutan, this was well timed with the development of the 12th five year plan. Policy review periods are also good timing for the inclusion of study results. Timing in this sense is crucial for integration of results, and if these results are not timely it decreases the ultimate probability of being included (particularly if policy review and development planning processes take place within years of study results being released).

Lesson 4: Building in policy focus area approach into TEEB implementation strengthened ownership and commitment to project results

215. One of the biggest success factors for the ENRTP project was allowing the country to have autonomous decision-making as to what their priority focus are should be. This allowed for a much more engaged stakeholder participation, and enhanced ownership and sustaining of results. This should be a key factor in country implementation, and care should be given to not have the focus be outside-driven.

C. Recommendations

216. Based on the lessons learned and the conclusions of the Terminal Evaluation, a few recommendations for sustaining results further and reaching impact, are outlined below.

(A) Update the TEEB Manual building on the experiences from the TEEB national implementation

217. The TEEB Manual was developed as part of the ENRTP project, and was helpful to countries who worked on the six-step approach. It was built on lessons from other countries, but this was the first testing ground for its use, and for the continuation of TEEB in other countries, the experiences from the ENRTP project could feed well into updating the manual and making it more user friendly. **Who?** TEEB Office, with feedback from ENRTP countries. **When?** Before TEEB III closing in December 2017.

(B) Build buffer time into future TEEB national implementation projects (and increase efficiency through better and more adaptive planning)

218. As TEEB continues, and takes on more of a national approach, it will be important to have additional time set into the design and inception of the project. The lesson that the ENRTP project has taught us, is that time is always underestimated when it comes to initial country contextualisation and contracting. Taking the pressure off by allocating more time to this process will ensure that the project runs more smoothly into implementation. In addition, it is important to deal with efficiency with regard to time. Some of the delays in the project were out of the project management's hands, but some could have been anticipated. Efficiency (and adaptiveness should be embedded into the project design). **Who?** TEEB Office and other UN Environment project development teams. **When?** When project development takes place in relation to the next phase of TEEB and TEEB implementation projects.

(C) Build in regional support to country-level implementation

219. Based on the interest and capacity of the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, there was a strong engagement for more country-level support through the regional

office. The evaluator believes that this engagement has been beneficial to the country implementation, and has in some ways led to the increasing demand for TEEB-related work in Latin America. Cognisant of the tight budget that TEEB has for operation, as well as the requirements for capacity that might be lacking in regional offices, the evaluator believes it would be beneficial to make more use of Regional Offices to pull TEEB forward at country levels in that various regions of operation. Ways to do this effectively and efficiently should be discussed during a strategizing session with the TAB. Some examples include using the Regional Office in a facilitation/ entry point role, have them attend all meetings, etc. **Who?** TEEB Office, TAB and Regional Offices. **When?** Brought up at appropriate TAB meeting at TEEB Office discretion.

VI. ANNEXES

1. Evaluation itinerary and list of respondents
2. ENRTP Logical Framework including progress and evaluation findings
3. Financial summary
4. Reference List
5. Response to stakeholder comments received

Annex 1: Evaluation Itinerary

Table 5. List of respondents interviewed

Name	Organisation	Designation	Type of Interview
TEEB Office			
Salman Hussain	TEEB Office	TEEB Coordinator	Face to face (Feb 2017), various Skype and email correspondence
Tomas Declercq	TEEB Office	TEEB Ecuador, Liberia	Face to face (Feb 2017), various Skype and email correspondence
Kavita Sharma	TEEB Office	TEEB Tanzania, Bhutan, Philippines	Face to face (Feb 2017), various Skype and email correspondence
Dustin Miller	TEEB Office	Sectoral Studies and Events Coordination	Face to face (Feb 17)
David Diaz Martin	TEEB Office	Communications	Face to Face (Feb 17), email correspondence
Monica Lopez	Ecosystems, Nairobi	Programme Officer	Face to Face (Feb 17), Face to Face (May 17), various email correspondence
Ardeshir Zamani	TEEB Office	FMO	Face to Face (Feb 17), various email correspondence
Other UN ENVIRONMENT			
Steven Stone	Economy	Chief	Skype 9 May 2017
Mette Wilkie	DEPI	Director	Face to Face, 18 May 2017
Maxwell Gomera	Ecosystems	Director of Branch	Face to Face, 18 May 2017
Pushpam Kumar	Ecosystems	Senior Economic Advisor	Face to Face, 18 May 2017
Niklas Hagelberg	Ecosystems	Senior Programme Officer (Programmes development)	Face to Face, 18 May 2017 (also met with SH 2 May via Skype)
Sandrine Marques	UN ENVIRONMENT PMU EC ENRTP		Skype 23 JUN Environment 2017
Other			
Sylvia Facchin (DG DEV), Phillippe Mayaux (DG ENV), Dimitri Harmegnies	EC		Email interview after Skype interview 9 JUN Environment 2017
Andrea Bassi	KnowlEdge Srl	Consultant	Skype 13 April 2017
Heidi Wittmer	PCG	Member	Notes received from SH Interview 13 JUN Environment 2017
Jasmin Hundorf	IKI	Programme Officer	Notes received from SH interview 22 May 2017
Lars Mueller	EC		Notes received from SH interview 11 May 2017

James Vause	WCMC		Notes received from SH interview 30 May 2017
TAB interview notes received from SH various interviews			
ECUADOR			
Maria Cristina Torres	EPN	TEEB Study Lead	Skype 4 May 2017
Maria de los Angeles	Consultant	Support (Economic Valuation) to EPN	Skype 3 May 2017
Paul Herrera	ESPOL	TEEB Study Lead	Skype 12 May 2017
Robert Pacheco	ROLAC	Regional Coordinator	Skype 9 May 2017
Various other contacts, including focal point - no response			
LIBERIA			
JS Cammue	EPA	TEEB Study Lead (took over toward end)	Email interview, May 2017
Various other contacts, no response			
TANZANIA			
Raphael Mwalyosi	IRA University of Dar-Es-Salaam	TEEB Study Lead	Face to Face, 27 March 2017 (country visit)
Joel Norbert		TEEB Study Author	Face to Face, 27 March 2017 (country visit)
Amos Majule		TEEB Study Author	Face to Face, 27 March 2017 (country visit)
Pius Yanda	IRA	Director	Face to Face, 27 March 2017 (country visit)
Lydia Albert	IRA	FMO	Face to Face, 27 March 2017 (country visit)
Clara Makenya	UN ENVIRONMENT Tanzania	National Coordination Officer	Face to Face, 27 March 2017 (country visit)
Selemani Kisimbo	VPO		Face to Face, 27 March 2017 (country visit)
Donata Kemirembe	VPO		Face to Face, 27 March 2017 (country visit)
Thomas Cali	VPO	National Focal Point	Skype 28 April 2017
BHUTAN			
Sangay Wangchuk	UWICE	Study Lead	Face to Face, 21 March 2017 (country visit)
Karma Tshewang	Department of Hydropower	Chief Engineer	Face to Face, 22 March 2017 (country visit)
Ugyen Norbu	National Accounts and Price Statistics Division, National Statistics Bureau	Chief	Face to Face, 23 March 2017 (country visit)
Tashi Namgay	NSB	Environmental Stats Team	Face to Face, 23 March 2017 (country visit)
Tobdeu	NSB	Environmental Stats Team	Face to Face, 23 March 2017 (country visit)
Mewang Gyeltshen	Department of Renewable Energy	Director	Face to Face, 23 March 2017 (country visit)
Lyonpo Yeshey Dorji	Ministry of Agriculture and Forests	Minister	Face to Face, 21 March 2017 (country visit)
Ugyen Namgyal	Druk Green Power Corporation	Director of Finance	Face to Face, 20 March 2017 (country visit)
Chador Tenzin	Druk Green Power Corporation	Head Project Department	Face to Face, 20 March 2017 (country visit)
Tandin Tshering	Druk Green Power Corporation	Environment, Study Author	Face to Face, 20 March 2017 (country visit)
Chencho Norbu	National Environment Commission	Secretary	Face to Face, 20 March 2017 (country visit)

Mr Puntsho	Department of Forests and Park Services	GIS, Study Author	Face to Face, 20 March 2017 (country visit)
Mr Kaka	Department of Watershed Management Division	Forestry Officer, Study Author	Face to Face, 21 March 2017 (country visit)
Norbu Nawang	UWICE	Director	Face to Face, 21 March 2017 (country visit)
PHILIPPINES			
Neneng Andres	Biodiversity Management Bureau	National Focal Point	Skype group meeting (boardroom), 27 April 2017
Gem Castillo	REECS	Study Lead	Skype group meeting (boardroom), 27 April 2017
Mark Ramirez	REECS	Executive Director	Skype group meeting (boardroom), 27 April 2017
Anne Angeles	Independent	Advisor to Study	Skype group meeting (boardroom), 27 April 2017
Jona Vasquez	BMB	Technical Team	Skype group meeting (boardroom), 27 April 2017
Rachel	BMB	Technical Team	

Table 6.

ENRTP Project Terminal Evaluation Scheduled Itinerary Bhutan, 20 - 24 March 2017

Date	Time	Who	Remarks
20/03/2017	10.30 AM	Arrival in Paro, Bhutan	
	12.00 PM	Arrival in Thimphu	
	2.00 PM	Director Finance, DGPC Druk Green Consultang. DGPC Mr. Tandin Tshering, Dy. Manager, Env. CDM Section, DGPC-TEEB Core Team	
	4.00 PM	Secretary, National Environment Commission	
	4.30 PM	Mr. Phuntsho, Forest Resources and Management Division, Department of Forests and Park Services	TEEB Core Team
21/03/2017	9.30 AM	Mr. Sangay Wangchuk, UWICE	TEEB Core Team
	11.30 AM	Honourable Minister, Ministry of Agriculture and Forests	
	12.30 PM	Mr. GyaltshenDukpa, Chief Forestry Officer, Thimpuhu Forestry Divison	
	2.30 AM	Mr. Kaka, Forestry Officer , WMD	TEEB Core Team
22/03/2017	11.00 AM	Mr. Karma Tshewang, Chief Engineer- Department of Hydro Power and Power Systems	
	12.30 PM	Dr. Nawang Norbu, Director, UWICE	
	3.00 PM	RR, UNDP-Bhutan	
23/03/2017	10.00 AM	Director, Department of Renewable Energy	
	11.30 AM	Mr. Ugyen Norbu, Chief Finance Officer, National Statistical Bureau	Focal for Green Accounting
24/3/2017	9.15 AM	Mr. Norbu Wangchuk, Chief Planning Officer, Gross National Happiness Commission	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Focal

	10.30 AM	Travel to Paro	
--	----------	----------------	--

Table 7. ENRTP Project Terminal Evaluation Scheduled Itinerary Tanzania, 26 to 28 March 2017

Date	Time	Who	Remarks
26/3/2017	16:30	Arrival in Dar-Es-Salaam	
27/3/2017	09:30	Clara Makenya, UN ENVIRONMENT Tanzania Coordinator	Facilitator of project
27/3/2017	11:00	Pius Yanda, Director of IRA	Courtesy visit
27/3/2017	11:30	Lydia Albert, FMO, IRA	Questions about delays, funding
27/3/2017	12:00	Raphael Mwalyosi, Joel Norbert, Amos Majule	Project Core Team - Study Authors
28/3/2017	09:30	Selemani Kisimbo, Donata Kemirembe, Esther Makwaia (was absent)	VPO team

Annex 2: Logical Framework of the ENRTP Project

Table 8. Logical Framework of the TEEB National Implementation (ENRTP) Project, as taken from Project Document

TEEB National Implementation (ENRTP) Intervention Logic		Project Results Achievements
Project Outcome (Expected Accomplishment or PoW Output): Policy dialogue with all sectors of society using economic evidence of the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services is promoted and used for development planning (PoW Output 312)	Indicators	
Output A: Practical guidance for national TEEB implementation and capacity building of national partners	One Guidance Manual and training material available for download	Guidance manual was launched in May 2013 Guidance manual as well as training materials available online for download (http://www.teebweb.org/resources/guidance-manual-for-teeb-country-studies/)
	Number of countries that have implemented trainings (5 countries)	The following capacity development initiatives took place ¹²⁸ : Ecuador: - TEEB Country Study Workshop included capacity building component (interactive scoping exercises), February 2015 - Regional Green Knowledge Sharing and Learning Forum for Latin America, November 2015, and (TEEB Ecuador Study Leads and Focal Points attended) - Technical workshop included training on spatial modelling of ecosystem services, JUN Environment 2016 TEEB Study Leads and Focal Points participated in two GIZ ValuES trainings, Colombia, October 2016 and Mexico, December 2016 - PhD student training in Belgium as part of TEEB study

¹²⁸ Annual ENRTP Project Reporting 2015, 2016. Interviews with Ecuador team, May 2017.

TEEB National Implementation (ENRTP) Intervention Logic		Project Results Achievements
		<p>Bhutan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training course spatial modelling of ecosystem services, May 2015 - Training course on systems dynamics, JUN Environment 2016 <p>Tanzania:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training course on systems dynamics and spatial modelling of ecosystem services, and continued post-workshop training <p>Liberia</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacity building through TESSA 4 day workshop, JUN Environment 2016 <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TEEB Tanzania, Philippines, Bhutan shared experiences on National Implementation at Third International TEEB Dialogue in India - Cancun Workshop at CBD COP13 (experience sharing, media and communications training) for all five countries
Output B: Country studies on the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services feeding into national development planning	Number of countries that implement national-level TEEB studies (5 countries)	<p>Ecuador, Liberia, Tanzania, Bhutan and Philippines conducted TEEB studies</p> <p>Ecuador:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pilot study by <u>EPN</u> inform policy options for a private hydropower finance mechanisms for integrated management of hydrological resources at the wider landscape level, complementing the Socio Bosque Conservation Programme (change of energy matrix). Pilot study by <u>ESPOL</u> inform policies towards an inclusive and sustainable growth in the cocoa value chain, facilitated by irrigation infrastructure projects (change of productive matrix)

TEEB National Implementation (ENRTP) Intervention Logic		Project Results Achievements
		<p>Liberia: Study to provide policy evidence on benefits of the establishment of marine protected areas via community based conservation agreements, in combination with introduction of alternative livelihood activities.</p> <p>Tanzania: Study to inform national policies on agricultural development. Examine the changes in water availability due to land use changes that relate to increasing cash crop production in Rufiji (specifically Kilombero) River Basin.</p> <p>Bhutan: Study to examine watershed level changes during construction of hydropower dams.</p> <p>Philippines: Study examined a reclamation project in Manila Bay, and identified various changes in ecosystem services due to construction.</p>
Output C: Information on the economics of biodiversity and ecosystem services provided to media and expansion of TEEB network	Number of interviews secured for members of TEEB community (10 media interviews) and feature articles published (10 articles)	<p>Interviews¹²⁹:</p> <p>The following 35 interviews were conducted with members of TEEB community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ritash Kumar, Conservation Programme Manager of Wetlands International, South Asia (Connecting the dots from Wetlands to poverty alleviation) - Various interviews (Isabel Renner, GIZ; Strahil Christov, EC DG Env; Jerome Nyenka, EPA Nigeria; Nawan Norbu, UWICE Bhutan; Nathalie Rizzotti, Federal Office for Environment Switzerland; Kees Hendriks, Wageningen University Netherlands) at

¹²⁹ TEEB Website. <http://www.teebweb.org/category/news/interviews/>

TEEB National Implementation (ENRTP) Intervention Logic		Project Results Achievements
		<p>International Workshop on TEEB country studies (How TEEB results can support national development planning)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nick Davidson, Deputy Secretary General of Ramsar (The Ramsar Convention: Advocating for Wetlands for over 40 years) - Various (Anada Tiega, Former SG Ramsar; Kenneth Irvine, Aquatic Ecosystem group UN ENVIRONMENTSCO-IHE; Fabien Hountondji, Global Water Partnership Benin; Lucy Iyango, Wetlands Uganda; Paul Ouederago, Ramsar; George Otiango Owiti, Kenya Wildlife Training Institute; Emmie Chigamane, Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Management Malawi; Paul Mafabi, Ministry of Water and Environment Uganda; Nzula Kitaka, Egerton University Kenya; Kaigama Francoise, Nile Basin Initiative) at International Forum Wetlands: Wise Use, Smart Plans (Sharing notes on how to promote wise use of wetlands in Africa - Various (Marlynn Mendoza, BMB Phillipines; Nirawan Pipitsombat, Ministry of NR and Environment Thailand; Daniel Lee bin Abdullah, Ministry of NR and Environment Malaysia; Maheshwar Dhakal, Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation Nepal; Sangeeta Mangubhai, IUCN; Jan Steffen, GIZ; Nicolas Pascal Insular Research Centre Honduras; Keren Klass, Israel National Ecosystem Assessment; Bern Hansjuergens, Helmholtz Centre UFZ; Dolf de Groot, Wageningen University; Norman Emmanuel Ramirez, ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity), at first TEEB Training Workshop at 6th Annual International Ecosystem Services Partnership Conference (Insights into how the TEEB approach can support wise use of wetlands in Asia)

TEEB National Implementation (ENRTP) Intervention Logic		Project Results Achievements
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Violaine Berger, Manager Ecosystems at WBCSD (Water valuation and Corporate Responsibility) - Aruwa Bendson, Programme Officer Freshwater Ecosystems Unit UN ENVIRONMENT (Water Quality is as important for ecosystems as for people) - Barry Gardener, UK MP and Shadow Minister for Energy and Climate Change (Ecosystem Services Valuation Talks) - James Vause, Lead Economist, UN ENVIRONMENT - WCMC (Ecosystem Services Valuation Talks) - Stig Johanson, Senior Forestry Specialist WAVES (Ecosystem Services Valuation Talks) - Alexander Müller, TEEB AgriFood Study Leader (Five questions with Alexander Müller) <p>Feature Articles¹³⁰: The Website has various news items. The Newsblog has 45 articles, the website has 14 press releases, and countless newsletters. There are almost 40 facebook articles, outreach via multiple conferences.</p>
	Number of experts participating in the TEEB network (200 experts)	Number of experts participating not fully recorded, but good knowledge of network within TEEB Office (not confirmed as many as 200). ¹³¹
Project Milestones:	Delivery Date	
Component 1 Milestones: 1. TEEB Guidance Manual and training material available online	1. 6 months	1. Yes, launched May 2013, work was started during early implementation of project, and was finalised within first 8 months of project.

¹³⁰ TEEB Website. <http://www.teebweb.org/teeb-news/>. As well as TEEB4ME Facebook page <https://www.facebook.com/TEEB4me/>

¹³¹ Interviews with TEEB Office.

TEEB National Implementation (ENRTP) Intervention Logic		Project Results Achievements
2. Training organised in all countries	2. 12 months	2. Yes, training organised in all five countries within first year of project implementation, although some training more demand-led later on (e.g. systems dynamics training for Tanzania and Bhutan)
Component 2 Milestones: 3. International inception workshop convened	3. 6 months	3. An International Expert Workshop 'TEEB Country Studies: Learning from Experience and How to Utilize the Results' took place 21-25 May 2013 at International Academy for Nature Conservation, Isle of Vilm, Germany. (Tanzania, Liberia and Bhutan were represented) ¹³²
4. First national workshop convened in countries	4. 12 months	4. First national workshops conducted in Ecuador (first mission Nov 2013, inception workshop Feb 2015), Liberia (JUN Environment 2014), Tanzania (May 2014), Bhutan (March 2014), Philippines (March 2014). These took longer than the envisaged 12 months because countries had not been selected early on, and in many cases study leads needed to be identified first.
5. Intermediary Reports 2A (Assessment of data availability and gaps) and 2B (Compilation of biophysical data, including relevant mapping and modelling results against selected scenarios) issued in the countries	5. 18 months	5. Assessment of data availability and gaps and biophysical data reports delivered by all five countries, Intermediary reports were submitted by all countries within six months of the first workshop. Compilation of biophysical data was submitted later than 18 months (this due to some capacity gaps in modelling).

¹³² Participants List and Programme of 'Inception Workshop' at Vilm.

TEEB National Implementation (ENRTP) Intervention Logic		Project Results Achievements
6. Intermediary report 2C (Review of existing valuation data) issued in the countries	6. 24 months	6. Delivered by all countries only in year three (due to capacity gaps, but also due to issues related to contracting with regard to UN Environment delays with SSFAs).
7. Intermediary report 2D (Valuation results) issued in the countries	7. 30 months	7. 6. Delivered by all countries only in year four (due to capacity gaps, but also due to issues related to contracting with regard to UN Environment delays with SSFAs).
8. National TEEB studies published	8. 36 months	8. Final drafting and validation at final national workshops, in year 5.
Component 3 Milestones: 9. TEEB communication strategy updated	9. 6 months	9. Strategy in form of media and communications training package (could have been more strategically developed). ¹³³
10. TEEB expert database developed	10. 12 months	10. Database of experts developed within TEEB Office team, but not documented. ¹³⁴
11. Media and communications personnel training delivered to 5 countries	11. 36 months	11. International training workshop for all five countries in Cancun on sidelines of CBD COP13 (year 4), and supplementary training at final national workshops, also training on communications at all five final workshops (year 5).

¹³³ Review of communications package.

¹³⁴ Interviews TEEB Office.

Annex 3: Financial expenditure summary

Table 9. Expenditure by component for the ENRTP Project (in USD)

Component	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017 ¹³⁵	Total
Personnel	12,900	582,402	459,584	150,081	329,084		
Sub-contract	24,900	460,092	492,283	177,659	284,637		
Training	0	89,400	104,867	36,334	238,790		
Equipment	0	29,000	29,000	19,334	17,877		
Misc	0	41,435	44,635	70,954	7179		
Totals	37,800	1,202,329	1,130,368	454,362	877,567		
6.2% Programme Support Cost	2344	74,544	70,083	28,170	45,347		
Grand Total	40,144	1,276,873	1,200,451	482,532	922,914		

¹³⁵ Waiting for final figures once TEEB Office comes back from leave.

Annex 4: List of Documents Reviewed

For a comprehensive list of documents reviewed, please revert to Annex y of the main Evaluation Report of TEEB Phase III. The below documents pertain specifically to the country-level outputs, and related documents.

Governance Bodies Documentation

TEEB Advisory Board Minutes, all meetings 2011 - 2016.

TEEB Coordination Group Minutes, all meetings 2011 - 2016.

Country Reports

Institute of Resources Assessment. (2015). Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity in Tanzania: The Case of Rufiji River Basin: Final Report on the Assessment of Biophysical Data Availability and Gap Filling

University of Dar Es Salam. (2015). Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity In Tanzania: The Case Of Rufiji River Basin: Final Scope Finalization And Scenario Development Report

Wangchuk, S., Norbu, N., Tshering, C., Tshering, T. Wangmo, T., Lhundup, J., & Tshering, K. (n.d). The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB): Scope Finalization and Scenario Development Report- Underpinning Policy and Management Reviews

Wangchuk, S., Norbu, N., Tshering, C., Tshering, T. Wangmo, T., Lhundup, J., & Tshering, K. (n.d). The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB): Final Report on Database of valuation studies (3.2) & Final Narrative report on Ecosystem Service Valuation Data and Gap Analysis (3.4)

Herera, P. (2016). Integrating the Value of Ecosystem Services in the Cocoa Value Chain: the case of the Daule-Vinces Irrigation project in the Guayas River Basin, Ecuador.

Gem, C. (2016). TEEB: The Phillipines Country Study

Charlie, T. (2016). TEEB – Tanzania

Torres, M, C. (2016). Ecuador TEEB Pilot Study: Coca Watershed Ecuadorian Amazon

Torres, M, C. (2016). TEEB Ecuador Study: The role of ecosystem services in Ecuador's new energy matrix

Wangchuck, S. (2016). TEEB-Bhutan

Wangchuk, S., Norbu, N., Tshering, C., Tshering, T. Wangmo, T., Lhundup, J., & Tshering, K. (n.d). The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB): Assessment of Biophysical data availability and gaps

TEEB. (n.d). Biophysical Modeling and Economic Valuation of Ecosystem Services for the Rufiji River in Tanzania

Small Scale Funding Agreements and related Documents

Bhutan:

SSFA between UN Environment and GNHC. Signed 27-02-2015.

SSFA Annex 1 - 21-01-2015

SSFA Annex 2 and 3 - 28-01-2015

Budget details (excel)

Amendment 1 to SSFA. 10-03-2016

Routing Slip - 02-06-2016

Ecuador:

SSFA between UN Environment and ESPOL. 14-04-2015.

Financial statements for SSFAs (pdfs). (ESPOL)

Performance evaluation for SSFA (ESPOL)

SSFA 2 EPN. (signed, no date)

Routing Slip 15-05-15. (EPN)

Liberia:

Expenditure Report (first SSFA)

Liberia TEEB Financial Report

SSFA No 2 with EPA Liberia 09-06-16.

Annex 1 TEEB Liberia 06-07-16

Routing Slip 07-06-2016

Philippines:

Evaluation for SSFA payments for BMB (First SSFA 14-07-15)

Financial Report (Letter)

Routing Slip 18-08-2016

Tanzania:

SSFA UDS TEEB 17-11-17

Annex 1-4. (Progress Reports)

Routing Slip - 24-10-14

Amendment 10-07-2015

Routing Slip July 2015

Amendment 2 03-10-16

Evaluation and Expenditure Report.

Workshop Reports and Mission Reports

UNEP. (2014). The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) National Scoping Workshop for Bhutan: Workshop Report (Draft). Trimphu, Bhutan

UNEP. (2014). The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) National Scoping Workshop for the Philippines: Workshop Report (Draft). Quezon City, Philippines

Mission Reports to all countries (Hussain)

UNEP. (n.d). Inception Report: The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) in the Philippines

UNEP. (2014). TEEB Tanzania: National Scoping Workshop Report

Hussain, S. (2016). TEEB Phase III: Mainstreaming biodiversity into national and sectoral development plans and processes CBD-COP-13 11 December

Martin, D, D. (2016). TEEB Country Studies Media Training

Datuama, C. (2016). Reflecting the Values of Ecosystem & Biodiversity"- The Liberian Experience TEEB Liberia Project, TEEB Workshop in Cancun/Mexico

Related ENRTP Outputs/Deliverables

TEEB - The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (2013): Guidance Manual for TEEB Country Studies. Version 1.0. (Wittmer, H., Van Zyl, H., Brown, C., Julian, R., Ozdemiroglu, E., Bertrand, N., Patrick, T. B., Seidl, A., KettUN Environmentn, M., Leonardo, M., Manns, F., Hundorf, J., Isabel, R., Christov, S. & Sukhdev, P. (2013). TEEB Guidance Manuel for Country Studies)

Project Documents and Annual Reports

UNEP. (2013). Project Document: The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) Phase III

UNEP. (2011). ENRTP Proposal – TEEB National Implementation: Reflecting the Value of Ecosystems and Biodiversity in Policymaking (Sub programme 3: Ecosystem Management, Output #331, CP/4050-08-02)

UNEP. (2012). Project Document: TEEB National Implementation: Reflecting the Value of Ecosystems and Biodiversity in Policy Making

UNEP. (2016). TEEB National Implementation: Reflecting the Value of Ecosystems and Biodiversity In Policymaking

Annual Reporting 2014

Annual Reporting 2015

Annual Reporting 2016 ENRTP Annex 6 (Budget)

Annex 4a. Annual Project Progress Report Final

Final No Cost extension request. 2016 (and associated revised Prodoc)

Evaluations and Case Studies

Pritchard, D. (2011). The Terminal Evaluation of the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB Phase II)

TEEB SCA Evaluation Case Study. 2016. Project: The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) National Implementation: Reflecting the Value of Ecosystems and Biodiversity in Policy-making. (TEEB Phase III)

Website reviewed

<http://www.teebweb.org/>

Annex 5: Response to project team and stakeholder comments received

Stakeholder Comments	Paragraph Number	Evaluator Response	Evaluator Changes made to original text (if any)	EO Comments
Main Body				
Thank you. I also have some comments on the articles on Financial Management. When I read the report I really do not see major issues with the management of the funds themselves. The issues are in late payments due to Umoja and in some cases partners had not even spent initial funds UN Environment had sent to them when they were asking for more, or they are related to Umoja deployment and thus rather technical issues and not management issues. Finally, it is very normal to have to produce brand new Agreements if earlier ones have expired in order, to allow for new dates for implementation. I would like this to be clearly reflected in the report.	Section E. Financial Management (General)	Guidance the evaluator(s) got from the EO was to include issues related to delays in payment related to Umoja in the financial management section. There is an agreement overall that there is no concern specifically with the management of funds; rather that the system in which the management of funds had to run was heavily flawed and necessitated unnecessary time and effort and put into what should have been relatively simple. Regarding both these, as well as what is considered normal vis-a-vis setting up agreements, is understood. However, given that these systems need to be changed in order for projects to run more efficiently and without so much 'red tape', the evaluator believes that it is necessarily to bring these problems to light in order to rectify them by fixing the overall system, and not the individual project management problems and challenges. Added a few sentences to make this clear in main text.	Added sentence in paragraph 126: It needs to be highlighted that there were various drivers that compounded the challenges of financial management for this project, mostly due to delays with Umoja (see paragraph 125 above), renewal of agreement procedures, amongst others. There is not a concern specifically with the management of the funds, but instead with the overall system in which the project had to operate.	
The SSFA deadlines were monitored by the project manager. The issue was	124 (ii)	N/A	Accepted track changes in report. Added footnote explaining in the incorrect login of the project end date.	

Stakeholder Comments	Paragraph Number	Evaluator Response	Evaluator Changes made to original text (if any)	EO Comments
rather that we could not extend beyond the end date of the ENRTP project. The issue was rather that the overall ENRTP project end date was incorrectly logged in the UN Environment system.				
I am not sure what is meant here. The SSFAs were managed by the manager (UN staff member, TEEB coordinator) but of course consultants (as they should) assisted in this process.	124 (iii)	From various interviews it is clear that consultants managed day to day administration with country teams, including communication regarding the SSFAs, with oversight and overall management by PM. The evaluator has changed the wording, but challenges arising from the fact that consultants (who should have been allocated staff positions) were given responsibilities without the needed authority to undertake such responsibilities. These were compounded by SSFA renewals, project login mistake, as well as Umoja delays (all interwoven). This needs to be clearly stated, because UN Environment needs to learn how to put better support systems in place for project teams to run more smoothly, even in difficult circumstances.	<p>Changed wording from:</p> <p>It is the evaluator's understanding that the SSFAs were managed by consultants within the TEEB Office (under supervision of the Manager), which was not the correct delegation of authority. Given the team structure, and the limited time availed by permanent staff to the project (the country implementation from UN Environment side depended fully on the consultants within the TEEB Office), this issue rests on the fact that instead of consultants, UN Environment staff should have been allocated this work.</p> <p>to</p> <p>The challenges for the management of the project were complex and multi-fold. The Project Manager had to deal with a work load that is above most other projects, in addition to having a team of mostly consultants (i.e. non-staff members). The work load, compounded by multiple renewals of country SSFAs would have, at best of times, been a difficult task to manage. Adding in the additional UMOJA delays made this project further compounded this task, and the evaluator believes that the team did as best they could under difficult circumstances. It is the evaluator's opinion, based on various interviews, that more regular liaisons between the Project Manager, the FMO and the consultants dealing with facilitating the work on the ground could have improved some of these challenges. The day-to-day administration tasks (including communication about SSFAs with countries) was handled by the consultants under the oversight and management of the Project Manager.¹³⁶ The evaluator is of the opinion that responsibility was devolved to consultants with limited authority associated with said responsibility. The consultants were expected to deliver in a highly professional manner, but for this to happen it is crucial that the system is in place to support this. However, it was not e.g. UMOJA, regular liaisons, more authority i.e. staff positions instead of</p>	

¹³⁶ Multiple interviews with project team and country teams.

Stakeholder Comments	Paragraph Number	Evaluator Response	Evaluator Changes made to original text (if any)	EO Comments
			consultants would have supported the devolving of responsibility with authority. With all these challenges and gaps in the system, it made it difficult to smoothly run all transactions. In addition, the incorrect login by UN Environment of the project end date could only have further compounded these challenges.	
<p>There was no lack of funding per se for the Steering Committee meetings.</p> <p>We struggled with procurement, in part owing to the lack of responsiveness of the Vice President's Office in Tanzania, but then were assisted by UNDP on the ground.</p>	162	One respondent (outside of VPO) had mentioned that there was not a dedicated fund to set up a Steering Committee. The evaluator accepts the track changes, but it is important that this voice is heard.	Track changes accepted. Added sentence 'One respondent mentioned that a dedicated fund for setting up of a Steering Committee may have supported the set up from the onset.'	
<p>I would request a rephrasing. "The EPN study management team in Ecuador themselves acknowledged that their management of the study team was not very strong"</p> <p>This was an internal EPN issue; UN Environment should not/cannot manage the internal processes within a contracted institution. All reviews were provided within what we consider a reasonable time frame (usually two weeks). This is thus factually incorrect, and</p>	163	<p>Changed sentence in order to make it clear that this was the country team.</p> <p>The issue was not about the reviews of the study. The issue was about the frustration of the country study team that initially requests had been made to ask about whether the appropriate people and their capacity had been tasked to do the job; the country team had also elaborated on the fact that at onset, the team had asked the TEEB office if they were capacitated enough to accept the challenge of</p>	<p>In Ecuador, in the case of the EPN study, the management of the country study team was not very strong, and the various study contributions were lacking as a result of this as well as others e.g. lacking capacity.</p> <p>Changed In this case too, there was some frustration about the TEEB Office not spending time on reviewing and assessing the team's capacity to carry out the work. To In this case too, there was some frustration about the TEEB Office not spending time, at the onset, on assessing the country team's capacity to carry out the work.</p>	

Stakeholder Comments	Paragraph Number	Evaluator Response	Evaluator Changes made to original text (if any)	EO Comments
<p>we would ask for it to be removed.</p> <p>We provided detailed feedback that clearly (and frustratingly) was entirely unattended to in subsequent re-submissions from EPN</p>		<p>this work given their capacity, but that during country visits the TEEB office 'were more concerned about the politics than supporting the technical capacity...should have been more involved...from the beginning should have said that this is not the correct person but unfortunately that did not happen'. The commenter says that this should have been an internal EPN issue re the procurement, but the evaluator suggests that capacity assessments in-country should also be the obligation of the project management team - and probably should have been given a better focus as capacity assessment and development should be a key component of such a project vis-a-vis creating long term engagement with TEEB.</p>		
<p>In light of the comments above, I wonder if this overall assessment might be revised?</p>	164	<p>The evaluator has given some re-thought, and based on the above considerations regarding the complexity of the project, the lack of appropriate systems in place by UN Environment for the TEEB management team, as well as challenges of management by country teams, the decision is to keep the rating as Moderately Satisfactory, unless the EO strongly disagrees with this assessment.</p>	<p>Stays at Moderately Satisfactory.</p>	

Stakeholder Comments	Paragraph Number	Evaluator Response	Evaluator Changes made to original text (if any)	EO Comments
<p>The evaluator has graded the stakeholder participation and cooperation as being Highly Satisfactory as well as Country-ownership. The project assumed that economic valuation which is communicated to stakeholders who participate and cooperate in the study, and which is owned by the country will translate to enhanced wellbeing.</p> <p>We tried to ensure gender balance in the workshops and the economic valuation in all five countries will – if policy is changed – impact disproportionately highly on women, and improve the livelihoods of women.</p> <p>I thus do not feel that this is an appropriate comment, and would also ask the evaluators to consider the overall evaluation for this area.</p>	172	<p>While strong stakeholder participation and country-ownership can be rated highly, this does not automatically translate into a high responsiveness to human rights nor a strong inclusion of gender equality. It is clear that enhanced ecosystem wellbeing translates to enhanced human wellbeing (there is a lot of research that supports this), but we still make an assumption that economic valuation of such ecosystems and their services will translate to enhanced wellbeing. The evaluator makes the argument that there are assumptions that we make that we have not tested properly, and in fact this transition includes a few steps we have not counted in. That said, the evaluator has re-read the statement and feels that the last sentence ('The project makes the assumption that economic valuation of ecosystem services alone will translate to enhanced wellbeing') is not appropriately placed under 'Responsiveness to human rights and gender equality' and has deleted the sentence. This statement has been made already in the overall theory of change, where it is more appropriately placed.</p> <p>However, the comment about ensuring gender balance in the</p>	<p>Deleted sentence 'The project makes the assumption that economic valuation of ecosystem services alone will translate to enhanced wellbeing'</p> <p>Stays at Moderately Satisfactory.</p>	

Stakeholder Comments	Paragraph Number	Evaluator Response	Evaluator Changes made to original text (if any)	EO Comments
		workshops and the economic valuation in all five countries, if policy is changed, will impact disproportionately highly on women is not substantiated with evidence. Firstly, there is a difference between having gender balance and having gender equality. There are many factors at play in terms of gender inequality, and just because an equal number of women are present at the table does not automatically increase gender equality. It is much more complicated than that. In addition, the evaluator reviewed all studies and did not feel that gender equality and differentiated roles were sufficiently integrated and mainstreamed in the studies or their implementation. Given the studies could have had stronger impacts on the ground regarding differentiated roles, the evaluator feels that this is a missed opportunity. Rating stays as is.		
This was one of the main purposes of the five final workshops, attended by senior-level policy-makers in all cases.	187	Yes, the evaluator is aware of this, and had meant to be more clear about the follow up and messaging methodology. Changed sentence accordingly.	Added sentence While this was addressed at the final national workshops, it is not certain (as of yet) that this will relate into targeted messages for move to impact, it would have also been helpful to develop short policy briefs targeting the decision-making process (this took place in some of the countries, not in all).	
I think that this area (Catalytic role, replication and scaling up) has been one of the biggest achievements of	193	The evaluator believes that some steps have been taken in some countries (not all, evidenced by e.g. Liberia), to move ecosystem valuation	Added sentence to paragraph 190: Funding, however, remains an issue, and is dependent on external sources.	

Stakeholder Comments	Paragraph Number	Evaluator Response	Evaluator Changes made to original text (if any)	EO Comments
<p>the project, and points 188-192 seem to support this. I would have thought that this would merit a rating of 'highly satisfactory'.</p>		<p>forward (as illustrated only by commitment, and not by evidence). This is not without its challenges, and is still dependent on external funding in many cases. In addition, next steps might illustrate sustainability of project results, but not necessarily scaling up or replication in the best possible outcome-sense. Highly satisfactory is usually only given to absolute best practice examples. Unless EO disagrees, the evaluator argues to keep rating at Satisfactory.</p>	<p>Added sentence to paragraph 193: These steps above shows some ownership regarding sustaining results, but more steps are needed for national scaling up and catalysing.</p>	