

development sector and policy sectors of partner countries”, is also dependent on the willingness of other actors to be mainstreamed for biodiversity and hence not entirely a function of CEBioS as the ‘provider’ side.

Efficiency: very good; CEBioS fully agrees, and confirms that the human resources are the most important asset, given CEBioS’ function and mandate.

Impact: fair; CEBioS would have preferred a more positive score about the impact potential with some explanations about expected impact or, alternatively, even an absence of score, since long term impact cannot be measured after 3 years anyway. The orientation towards poverty reduction and sustainable development changes remains a generally acknowledged challenge in this sector, which is not specific to CEBioS alone, (see e.g. William. M. Adams, et al., 2004. Biodiversity Conservation and the Eradication of Poverty. Science 306, 1146;
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.726.2644&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Sustainability: very good; CEBioS fully agrees.

See separate chapters, further down in the table.

-The ET accepts the premise that the core purpose of the Cebios programme (building capacities in biodiversity knowledge and management) empowers people and provides relevant support to – and have therefore impact on - development and poverty reduction.

-The ET is aware how challenging it is to demonstrate, measure or describe impact in the field of development and poverty reduction. Impact means positive change, that happens hardly at once and that is hardly provoked by a single action or programme. Achievements that are expected from a given action or component must therefore be fairly in proportion with that action, and not expect or promise achievements that are of proportion.

-The rather poor appreciation of the impact of the programme does not question its relevance, but questions how it defines its expected achievements. Together with the main recommendation to shift to a result oriented management, it is understood as an incentive to define more clearly (or: to better motivate) the expected outcomes of a given component in regard to development, and how targeted audiences, processes or activities relate to it. In other words, while keeping the excellent quality and relevance of the offer, we have to improve the target definition, justification and reach, and adapt the monitoring and reporting tools accordingly.

2.1 Summary assessment from desk phase consultation process

<p>2 Table 7 : Strengths weaknesses and risks identified from the written</p>	<p>Strengths: CEBioS agrees with the findings of the ET, which cited assets as ownership and alignment as crucial as they are principles of the OECD backed Paris declaration (and following declarations of Accra and Busan) on effectiveness of aid, see</p>	<p>Weaknesses: The gap between signature of contracts and execution can be shortened if RBINS agrees to shorten the administrative handling time between contract and payment. CEBioS will</p>
--	---	---

consultation of CEBioS stakeholders	http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/parisdeclarationandaccraagendaforaction.htm	continue collaborating with the central administration to find adequate solutions.	
	<p>Weaknesses: CEBioS generally agrees with the conclusions of the ET. However, CEBioS understands this ‘weakness’ in a positive way, as it implies that the ET wants CEBioS to play an even more prominent role in development cooperation concerning cooperation and synergies with other actors and sectors.</p>	<p>Even though there is some truth that support to individuals is generally seen as less impacting than support to a team within an institution, the reality is that the supported individuals must as eligibility criterion benefit their team and their affiliated institution. CEBioS takes notice that institutional cooperation could be further encouraged.</p>	
	<p>Risks: CEBioS agrees with the risk analysis of the ET. HR management is a general concern at RBINS, inherent to the federal scientific institutes, while distance monitoring in the South has its pitfalls and limitations, but cannot be changed without a substantial increase of budget. CEBioS tries to compensate this by working with highly trusted partners and local representatives.</p> <p>Concerning the ‘vision’, see http://www.biodiv.be/cebios2 and http://www.biodiv.be/cebios2/About/mission-vision</p>	<p>Given the complexity of the programme architecture and the multiplicity of interventions, it is true that CEBioS documents tend to become bulky. CEBios will pay extra attention to render them more user-friendly.</p>	
	<p>Cebios was born as a consequence of the role of RBINS as CBD NFP: the primary purpose of the Cebios programme is to support the partner countries of Belgium in their implementation of the CBD.</p>	<p>The process-output-impact discussion is inherent to the sector, and CEBioS is aware of it. Programme performance assessment will be more integrated in the individual project formulations and the formulation of phase II and better reported, next to the planned end evaluation in 2022-2023.</p>	
	<p>The ‘risk’ of tailoring to RBINS offer is indeed present, but not necessarily a mitigating or ‘risk’ factor, since one of the reasons of hosting CEBioS at RBINS is its available expertise and role at the interface between science and policy. This however does not exclude cooperation with external expertise as well, as is the case through a number of projects, including externally funded ones by e.g. Belspo, VLIR-UOS, ARES, IFS.</p>	<p>Concerning the vision and identity of the programme, CEBioS is planning a ‘theory of change’ workshop at the end of February 2018 in order a.o. to re-define/confirm/adjust its vision and identity.</p>	
3	<p>Table 8 : Consensus on achievements and desirable evolution identified from the written consultation of CEBioS stakeholders</p>	<p>Consensus on phase I achievements CEBioS is proud of the consensus identified from the stakeholders.</p> <p>Consensus on suggested evolution for phase II CEBioS agrees with the suggested evolution in phase II.</p>	<p>Consensus on phase I achievements In phase II, all these elements should be continued, as they contribute to the success of CEBioS.</p> <p>Consensus on suggested evolution for phase II These suggested evolution will be integrated in the 5 year plan of</p>

phase II.Improvements in the annual reporting will already be implemented the the years 2017 and 2018 of phase 1.

2.2 Assessment of CEBIOS 6 specific objectives

4	SO1 - To strengthen the scientific and technical knowledge base on biodiversity and on its linkages with ecosystem services and poverty reduction (Knowledge base & GTI)	<p>Strong points CEBioS appreciates the positive evaluation by the stakeholders of SO1 and the reference to the clear success stories, including the in situ trainings and the work on marine modelling.</p> <p>Points of attention SO1 is indeed large and complex and often overlaps with other SOs. CEBioS generally agrees. However, the perceived ‘silo’ of marine modelling is remediated by full integration in team meetings and communication since the onset. The particular nature of this specialised intervention tends to give that impression of silo. The logframe and eligibility criteria as well as the strategy are very important in order to decide which priorities CEBioS should focus on and on which pool of experts we can be based.</p>	<p>How to improve? CEBioS agrees that results of SO1 should be consolidated and improved in the second phase. The formulation of phase II will simplify the structure, stimulate an integrated approach and understanding of SO1 and eventually adjust budget. CEBioS widens the pool of expertise if needed.</p> <p>CEBioS insists on the value of long term impact initiated by knowledge transfer at formal higher education level, as e.g. abcTaxa has demonstrated over the years, being now a recognised and appreciated tool.</p>
5	SO2 - To enhance the information base on biodiversity and on its linkages with ecosystem services and poverty reduction and on associated governance processes (CHM)	<p>Strong points CEBioS agrees.</p> <p>Points of attention CEBioS agrees with these points which are all related to the fragility of governance and management as well as logistics in the partner countries.</p>	<p>How to improve? CEBioS will continue addressing the weak points of CHM in collaboration with CBD in Montreal, will further explore CBD small grants opportunities, and will continue financing partner participation in CBD meetings and and start supporting CHM steering committees not only in Burundi but also elsewhere in order to increase ownership.</p>
6	SO3 - To raise awareness and communicate on the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services for poverty reduction and sustainable development (Awareness)	<p>Strong points CEBioS agrees.</p> <p>Points of attention It is indeed a point of attention to approach awareness interventions ‘step by step’ with our partners and to tailor them to the right target audiences. The principle handled by CEBioS is to empower the partners gradually to discover for themselves how best they can tackle awareness in their country.</p> <p>A more clear definition of the targeted topics, audiences, and actors, is requested when defining the action plan, and the evaluation of the</p>	<p>How to improve? Capacity deficiencies of partners concerning their abilities to conduct awareness raising should be better identified and tackled with, by encouraging a step by step learning process and input of training from experts in behavioural sciences or change management. This would not only empower the South, but CEBioS as well, if done properly on specific occasions. Budget should be set aside for more follow-up and evaluation projects and cooperation with Enabel. Exchange of best practices in South-South context and more co-creation of</p>

projects should benefit more (or make more use) of the existing internal (to RBINS) competences for awareness raising in a wide variety of audiences. A change in the process, and/or internal a training programme strengthening the competences of the team in respect to education, sensitization, and public engagement, will be considered.

In regard to the overall recommendations to focus on outcomes instead of activities, a redesigned SO3 component should focus on awareness only (as an expected outcome) and leave communication (that is an activity) out (see also hereunder the comment on visibility).

Regarding visibility, we need a strategic communication plan, aiming at improving the visibility of the outcomes of each SOs by their relevant stakeholders. It is worth stressing that “visibility” is not a goal per se but a way to become more effective, that needs a clear definition of the expected impact on the targeted stakeholders. In other words, the challenge is not to “broadcast” information by means of classical communication channels such as leaflets and logos, or booths at fairs, but to make sure that the relevant information reaches the relevant target. “Last mile delivery” is key, for policy briefs as well as for training programs, and should be included from the beginning in the design of each activity or work plan. As it is a crosscutting issue for most of the SOs to become more visible if they want to reach their target groups, establishing a strategic communication plan for the Cebios programme needs an integrative development process based on the visibility requirements for each SO, as well as a clear positioning both in the South and in the North. It is not a separate component but needs a reflection that is central to the whole process.

awareness products (eg policy briefs) with scientists and policy makers will be stimulated and supported. A ToC workshop will re-define the exact mandate of CEBioS concerning awareness in Belgium and the link to identity and visibility of CEBioS as a side effect, as well as clear objectives and indicators. The last steering committee of 2017 concluded that the target audience in Belgium should be other policy and development actors and scientists.

A junior communication manager will be recruited before April 2018. See <https://www.naturalsciences.be/fr/about-us/organisation/jobs>

The team will be completed again by a junior communication and graphical designer for the implementation of information support (possibly part time), and the strategic communication issue will be addressed along the other recommendations for the SOs in general, linked to visibility towards clearly identified target groups.

7 SO4 - To improve the mainstreaming of biodiversity and ecosystem services in policy sectors that have a high relevance

Strong points CEBioS appreciates that it is seen as ‘added value for many development actors’. The involvement with IPBES is acknowledged, although we would like to stress that CEBioS is even more involved with SBSTTA and COP of the CBD, at national and EU levels.

How to improve?

CEBioS agrees that SO4 is important to strengthen the role in science-policy-development interface. It is acting to get a FEDtWIN profile (see <http://www.presscenter.org/nl/pressrelease/20161110/fed-twin-programma-voor-een-duurzame-samenwerking-op->

<p>for development (Mainstreaming)</p>	<p>Points of attention It remains indeed a challenge to find ‘a clear entry point for non-biodiversity related units in DGD.’ CEBioS agrees that the mainstreaming in the South is focused on e.g. supporting focal points for participation to SBSTTA and COP, rather than reaching out to other development actors. There is certainly room for extending these activities, but the limitation of not having a local representative cannot be underestimated. Nevertheless, CEBioS tries to participate to local fora of Belgian actors (e.g. FOBAC, FABAC) and to make contacts with other development actors, but it remains punctual and often without consequences for synergies.</p>	<p>onderzoeksvlak-tussen-de-) in the next year in this field. We are active in the strategic dialogues and are continuously seeking new contacts in the development sector. The visibility and the link with development actors, as well as their federations will be further strengthened in phase II. CEBioS is now an observing member of Fiabel, see https://www.fiabel.be/fr/notre-histoire/membres/irsnb and since 1.5 year member of Educaid, see https://www.educaid.be/nl/member/cebios CEBioS is about to sign MoUs with Enabel and WWF-Belgium</p>
<p>8 SO5 - To improve the knowledge on the measurement, reporting and verification of policy choices and activities linked to biodiversity and ecosystem services (MRV and Aichi targets)</p>	<p>Strong points CEBioS agrees.</p> <p>Points of attention CEBioS agrees about some overlap between SO3 and SO5. Any output can contribute to awareness (SO3), but also information (SO2). When awareness serves the science-policy interface in the realm of MRV, it should rather belong to SO5. Only recently the effectiveness (see also 1st table,) of the MRV program started showing in DRC (series of small projects, Workshop with 3 policy briefs, series of small sensitisation projects as follow up, working with parliamentary commission based on the policy briefs). Approach could be copied for other countries if possible.</p> <p>The calls launched in the framework of this SO do not support awareness activities. Only the closing workshops aim at creating visible outputs based on the projects results and on lessons learnt (policy briefs and papers). The awareness call related to the MRV calls was launched and funded under SO3, for dissemination of the projects results and of the outputs jointly created at the workshop.</p>	<p>How to improve?</p> <p>CEBioS takes notice to put more input and time into SO5 in phase II and to focus on a proper dissemination and use of the output such as workshops and participative action based policy briefs, as well as sensitisation actions with specific target groups. Target audiences should indeed be clearly defined for each intervention, that is defined in the eligibility criteria of the calls. The interaction between MRV, information and awareness should further be clarified during the next ToC workshop of February 2018.</p> <p>The excellent cooperation with KLIMOS shall be continued. MRV will be adapted to the SDGs and post-Aichi targets of the CBD strategy.</p>
<p>9 SO6 - To raise awareness on, and build capacities for, the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (Nagoya protocol)</p>	<p>Strong points CEBioS agrees but would like to add that the Nagoya protocol should be well understood by all scientists in both North (scientists sampling in the South) and South, and that some interventions are therefore done in Belgium.</p>	<p>How to improve?</p> <p>CEBioS takes up the suggestion of the ET to ‘identifying key stakeholders in more detailed manner, maybe be more selective in the target groups and to build or identify tools to communicate on this protocol with support of CBD and NGO’s</p>

		<p>Points of attention The lack of implementation of the Protocol of Nagoya at national level during 2014-2017 is now being resolved (competencies at federal and regional levels) and the NP is now in a phase of implementation process, meaning that training needs are increasing. This should stimulate CEBioS activities in this field, especially towards the federal state organisations as was already the case in phase I.</p>	<p>to produce concrete outcomes’, and will base further work on the initiated success stories in Burundi and the training in RDC.</p> <p>We also take up the suggestion about what and who is in CEBioS sphere of control, sphere of influence and sphere of interest, which can be addressed during workshops in 2018.</p>
Nr.	Chapter from mid-term evaluation	General comment	Follow-up
	2.3	Answers to the evaluation questions (EQ)	
10	EQ1: Do the services and deliverables comply with the strategy of CEBioS?	<p>Strong points CEBioS acknowledges the findings by the ET about the added value, the recognized level of quality, the benefit for the South in the long run and the uniqueness of its capacity building.</p> <p>Points of attention CEBioS does not entirely agree with the analysis of the ET concerning the lack of integration with development. Capacity development is intrinsic part of development. Deliverables made accessible to development actors is only one aspect, since the aim of CEBioS is to strengthen capacities of local government and university stakeholders in the first place, and not so much of development actors in other sectors. We believe we are building a good network in development spheres through e.g. the strategic dialogues initiated by DGD and own initiatives with VVOB, VLIR-UOS, ARES, WWF, Enabel, Fiabel and Educaid. CEBioS strongly believes in local empowerment of local actors and co-production of output for local dissemination and supports this as much as possible.</p>	<p>How to improve CEBioS fully agrees that the work with the ‘ecoguardes’ should be continued in phase II, as well as the participative work with GTI alumni on science-policy-development interface.</p> <p>CEBioS recognises the good suggestion and need to involve more official partners than the traditional partners for the co-production and dissemination of participation-based output, in order to promote multiplier effects.</p> <p>However CEBioS is aware that it should not overstretch according to available staff, nor overstretch local partners who already work at the limit of what is possible, even showing life threatening health problems for several persons.</p>
11	EQ 2: Are CEBioS services and deliverables related to the 6 CEBioS specific objectives adequate and of good quality?	<p>Strong points CEBioS agrees.</p> <p>Points of attention CEBioS agrees that more attention should be devoted to ‘reflecting enough on the impact of these activities on the overarching goal: social and developmental change via biodiversity protection’.</p>	<p>How to improve The CEBioS programme is of course based on the paradigm or assumption that (1) we believe in change management or social engineering and more specifically (2) that ‘strengthening scientific knowledge and capacity will lead to better valuation of biodiversity and to its protection etc...’. However, this is</p>

		<p>subject to academic debate as stated in the comments to the executive summary. In the ToC workshop this can be debated and fine-tuned. Clusters of work as reflected in the logframe will be reviewed for phase II, based on a thorough analysis of problems and solutions.</p>
<p>12 EQ 3: Are the workforce and composition of the staff adequate? (including questioning the structure/governance of CEBIOS itself)</p>	<p>Strong points CEBioS very much appreciates the praise by the ET of the team and that the team ‘is coordinated in a way that values dialogue and team spirit, and a real attention is given to monitoring activities and output for respecting planning and budgetary commitments’. Also the quality of the steering committee and its flexibility are appreciated.</p> <p>Points of attention CEBioS agrees with the fact that ‘temporary status that is extended in time, and a limited perspective in terms of career evolution are factors of frustration’. However, the fact found by the ET that the colleagues work in relative isolation and the work is not well known amongst them is not reflecting the office reality. Since the onset, the mechanism of weekly team meetings allows each team member to explain their activities and to participate to the collective reflexion of the team. The type of work with specific sub programmes assigned to responsible officers induces a certain autonomy rather than isolation, and the autonomous officers meet every week to exchange about their activities and potential cooperation on specific issues. It is however true that burnout was an issue amongst support staff and meaningful solutions were found in order to mitigate or remediate this.</p>	<p>How to improve Team building: CEBioS agrees with the propositions and is thankful for the advice, being aware that the frequency of meetings is sufficient, but the format can be improved and some team building activities are needed.</p> <p>CEBioS status: The proposed alternatives to the current status are worth analysing to think out of the box. Practical implementation however will be limited by federal administration regulations. However we remain open for any institutional changes which might improve current career paths and the functioning of CEBioS.</p> <p>CEBioS acknowledges that it has now more the profile of an institutional organisation, unit or department than merely a programme (which is perceived as positive), as the staff is dedicated fulltime to it, including some external projects where CEBioS as such is official co-promotor or partner. This situation of core financing by DGD ensures a stability, a perspective and a strategic framework, as well as an official Belgian mandate in the field of biodiversity and development cooperation and should be maintained.</p>
<p>13 EQ 4: Are the tools and modalities appropriate to assess the progress towards strategic objectives and the success of its activities?</p>	<p>Strong points CEBioS confirms.</p> <p>Points of attention CEBioS agrees that the piloting of implementation can further be improved by a clearer logframe, target audiences and more results and impact oriented indicators. Reports could be also more synthetic and integrating the various components. CEBioS agrees that these issues are points of attention: a rigid results-based budgeting procedure that is imposed for financial planning and</p>	<p>How to improve A collaborative workshop on the theory of change envisioned for CEBioS will be implemented in February 2018 in order to reconsider the CEBioS logframe for phase II, including more qualitative indicators. Attention will be given to more tabular reporting as suggested by the MTE, including reporting on impact. The multi-annual perspective and more infographics</p>

		monitoring, an unclear strategic division between SOs allowing for overlaps and a far too unbalanced budget between the different budget headings (that correspond to the different SOs).	will be developed in the next annual reports, where more detailed reporting will be put in annexes.
14	EQ 5: How effective and efficient is the RBINS/CEBIO S coordination in its implementation management and monitoring procedure?	<p>Strong points no comments</p> <p>Points of attention The administrative burden is partly structural and partly due to gaps in process optimization. The calls are online and available, with clear eligibility criteria.</p>	<p>How to improve</p> <p>We will explore whether the calls could indeed include respective attribution criteria, scoring grid and weighting system. We should however be careful not to put unnecessary burden on the programme officers if unselected partners start arguing about the selection process in endless discussions. Further optimization of administrative and control processes will be done together with RBINS central administration.</p>
15	EQ 6: How effective and efficient is the institutional cooperation with each of the 5 countries Benin, Burundi, DR Congo, Peru and Vietnam? EQ 7: How effective and efficient is the cooperation in the other partner countries?	<p>Strong points We are happy to learn that the reputation of CEBioS with the partners is overall positive and having a real specificity compared to what other countries are doing, with the South-South strategy, the institutional approach, the networking, capacity building being the key pillar of CEBioS. We agree that Short term wins are not a strong driving force, thus creating space for a strategic approach and CEBioS having a positive impact on the career path of CEBioS alumni.</p> <p>Points of attention CEBioS agrees with the 3 main success factors identified by the MTE. Buying ‘hardware’ is indeed sometimes a real need for proper implementation. Visibility is indeed more or less restricted to the beneficiaries and the network.</p>	<p>How to improve</p> <p>We agree a more integrated approach is indeed per institutional partner, although efforts in that sense have already been made, but often are stuck by individual rather than team or synergetic priorities. CEBioS through Biopols is applying for a FEDtWIN profile, including a more social science approach, and is recruiting a communication officer (Febr. 2018).</p>
16	EQ 8: How effective are the synergies identified and developed by CEBioS through partnerships with Belgian institutions	<p>Strong points CEBioS agrees with the strong points.</p> <p>Points of attention We agree that the search for effective synergies and collaboration with other development actors in Belgium has not reached its full potential yet.</p>	<p>How to improve</p> <p>CEBioS will continue intensifying cooperation with other development actors and link natural sciences with development. While agreeing that physical presence makes a difference, CEBioS is reluctant to attend every meeting in the South as it is cost and timewise not efficient with reference to available man power, besides being ecologically not responsible. However, the missions that are planned anyway could be scheduled to fit back to back with the agenda of such meeting whenever possible.</p>

17	EQ 9: How should the CEBioS-programme at RBINS evolve in terms of management and coordination	<p>With respect to CEBioS strategy We agree that the purpose and focus of each SO need more clarity, an approach using a work by package of services might help avoiding scattered impact of the programme.</p> <p>With respect to planning and monitoring tools No comments</p> <p>With respect to finance and contract management No comments</p> <p>With respect to CEBioS sustainability Thank you for these words of praise about CEBioS being a unique tool that provides capacity building and policy support on biodiversity with the science-development cooperation interface.</p>	<p>With respect to CEBioS strategy The idea of work packages as well as indicators of stories about benefits for stakeholders, also in management and coordination tools can be integrated in phase II.</p> <p>With respect to planning and monitoring tools For 2018 we will improve the reporting and include qualitative reporting as well. For the logframe we will follow the idea to have a master logframe and sub programme logframes per SO. For that purpose a Theory of Change (ToC) workshop will be held in February 2018 with an external facilitator.</p> <p>With respect to finance and contract management We take up the suggestions by the ET and will explore possibilities of improvements.</p> <p>With respect to CEBioS sustainability CEBioS: no comments</p>
1. Recommendations			
18	3.1. CEBioS and change management	No comments	No comments
19	3.2. Recommendation to CEBioS implementing team	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen team spirit 2. Coordinate a strategic reflection on CEBIOS identity (secretariat/Training center/ expertise center) and communicate clearly on it. 3. Strengthen the link between CEBIOS vision for the future and the team capacities: 4. Strengthen learning and communication strategy of CEBIOS 5. Develop more strategically CEBIOS partnerships 	<p>CEBioS will implement the proposed recommendations from 2018 onwards and more explicitly in phase II. More specifically concerning the 7 recommendations:</p> <p>(1) we will hold a working session about the conclusions of the midterm review and discuss implications, starting with the output of the written consultation and the outputs of the focus group on improving strategy and implementation modality. We will continue organizing weekly staff meetings and explore different formats. We will act as a team on activity packages, including all administrative staff of CEBioS whenever possible.</p>

	<p>6. Strengthen the CHM component:</p> <p>7. Strengthen management tools:</p>	<p>(2) we will organize strategic thinking exercises at several levels, being staff, steering committee, strategic committee and ToC workshop.</p> <p>(3) At the February workshop the ToC will become more explicit and linked to the capacities of CEBioS. We will explore ways to strengthen capacities in awareness and communication.</p> <p>(4) We will recruit a communication officer and together develop an overarching communication strategy and implementation, including a more clear idea of target audiences per SO, communication means and methods. We will ask support from e.g. the Belgian platform for Biodiversity.</p> <p>(5) we will analyse our partnership and expand them if necessary, taking care not to overstretch ourselves, and will be further proactive towards DGD and the ONGs or their platforms. We will continue exploring synergy options within the current strategic dialogue process. We will continue networking with key national and international fora (NFP, BBPf, BES-NET, IPBES, GEOBON, CBD, etc...).</p> <p>(6) CEBioS will continue optimizing CHM together with CBD and their possible support through small grants.</p> <p>(7) As stated earlier in this table, we will explore ways of optimizing accounting and reporting. We will implement the splitting up of the logframe in a master and in SO logframes from phase II onwards, as it is too early to implement this already in 2018 and would add incoherence and confusion to phase I.</p>
<p>20 3.3. Recommendation to the financing and hosting institutions BELSPO and DGD</p>	<p>8. Continue CEBioS programme and encourage its evolvement</p> <p>9. Allow for flexibility in implementation and reporting</p> <p>10. Explore with CEBioS how mainstreaming biodiversity in development cooperation sector can be further stimulated,</p>	

	<p>based on a joint discussion about efforts so far. (for DGD in particular)</p> <p>11. Decide in close collaboration with CEBioS coordinator and RBINS the desired position of CEBioS. (for BELSPO in particular)</p> <p>12. Select partners which should be included and identify which relations should be intensified.</p>	
<p>21 3.4. Recommendation to the implementing organisation - RBINS</p>	<p>13. Reflect on the required imago to influence policy in Belgium</p> <p>14. Increase the efficiency of financial and contractual processes</p> <p>15. Improve human resource management</p> <p>16. Give more visibility to CEBioS</p> <p>Preliminary remark: the RBINS is named “implementing organisation”. This denomination that is to be found under diverse wordings doesn’t reflect the role of the RBINS as partner of the DGD with the common aim to support the implementation of CBD requirements, recommendations and goals in Belgium partner countries. In other words, the Cebios team is not an operational agency of DGD hosted by the RBINS, but the Cebios programme is the common agreement between RBINS (as Focal point to the CBD and scientific institution expert in biodiversity) and DGD/MD8 (as the federal body in charge of the cooperation for development policy in fields related to biodiversity and the environment) to improve the capacities of partner countries in the field of biodiversity knowledge and management, and CBD implementation.</p> <p>Regarding visibility of Cebios in RBINS’ institutional communication, it is worth saying that the RBINS’ annual report is result-oriented and puts in the light the major outcomes of the previous year. In this respect, no single annual report can’t be the absolute reference: mentions depends if the “story of the year” that can be put forward. It happened that is was not the case in 2016. Doing so meets already some of the recommendations of the ET to be more result-oriented, encouraging qualitative reporting and storytelling (in the fair sense of this word). This remark may come from a confusion between an annual activity report and an institutional booklet. Indeed in case the</p>	<p>Recommendation 13 dealing with imago and influence is to be addressed together with similar recommendations made to the programme itself. It is very likely that a sound reflection with and within the team about key audiences in the North (SO4) will have an impact here.</p> <p>In regard to recommendations 14 and 15, it is worth reminding that the Cebios programme is part of the RBINS that is part of the Federal State: the answer is framed in the (pretty rigid) ruling for federal money and federal employment. In this respect, the request for a more fair and transparent salary grid is rather difficult to understand, as the Federal salary grid has a unique way to calculate on basis of diploma, experience and function. Moreover, the Cebios programme is by no mean an exception in the RBINS activities. In other words, looking for smart solutions is permanently ongoing – whether or not the Cebios team is aware on it - with indeed limitations due to technical abilities, available finances, or workload. In the particular case of financial reporting from partner countries, the dialogue has started again and specific solutions are currently investigated. More explanation about the federal rules and how they apply will be given, and possible gaps and bottlenecks will be investigated.</p>

		RBINS would develop one, the Cebios programme and its achievements would be an important component.	
Annexes			
22	Logframe (annex 7)	No comments	We will re-structure the whole logframe for phase II
23	Monitoring table (annex 7)	No comments	We will take the comments into account while formulating the indicators.

2. Management response by DGD

Nr.	Chapter from mid-term evaluation	General comment	Follow-up (short term and long term)
	Executive summary based on the OECD DAC evaluation criteria		
	No comments		
2.2	Assessment of CEBIOS 6 specific objectives		
4	SO1 - To strengthen the scientific and technical knowledge base on biodiversity and on its linkages with ecosystem services and poverty reduction (Knowledge base & GTI)		MD8: concerning the priorities CEBioS should focus on the activities that have the biggest impact on development/poverty reduction.
5	SO2 - To enhance the information base on biodiversity and on its linkages with ecosystem services and poverty reduction and on associated governance processes (CHM)		

6	SO3 - To raise awareness and communicate on the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services for poverty reduction and sustainable development (Awareness)		
7	SO4 - To improve the mainstreaming of biodiversity and ecosystem services in policy sectors that have a high relevance for development (Mainstreaming)		How to improve? MD8 will structurally involve CEBioS in the preparation of cooperation programs in those countries where CEBioS is active. Considering the current reform of Enabel and its impact on the role of DGD, CEBioS and DGD will further reflect on how to improve mainstreaming of biodiversity related issues in the Belgian Development Cooperation.
8	SO5 - To improve the knowledge on the measurement, reporting and verification of policy choices and activities linked to biodiversity and ecosystem services (MRV and Aichi targets)		
9	SO6 - To raise awareness on, and build capacities for, the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (Nagoya protocol)		
Nr.	Chapter from mid-term evaluation	General comment	Follow-up
2.3	Answers to the evaluation questions (EQ)		
10	EQ1: Do the services and deliverables comply with the strategy of CEBioS?	MD8 agrees with the comment of CEBioS that capacity development is an intrinsic part of development but agrees also with the comment of the ET that in the future CEBioS needs to show the impact of their activities on development and the reduction of poverty.	How to improve
11	EQ 2: Are CEBioS services and deliverables related to the 6 CEBioS specific objectives adequate and of good quality?		

12	EQ 3: Are the workforce and composition of the staff adequate? (including questioning the structure/governance of CEBIOS itself)		
13	EQ 4: Are the tools and modalities appropriate to assess the progress towards strategic objectives and the success of its activities?	MD8 emphasizes the importance of a good monitoring system with clear indicators, particularly at the level of results.	How to improve MD8: there is a flexibility to adjust the budget allocation, if necessary, after consultation and approval by the steering committee
14	EQ 5: How effective and efficient is the RBINS/CEBIOS coordination in its implementation management and monitoring procedure?		
15	EQ 6: How effective and efficient is the institutional cooperation with each of the 5 countries Benin, Burundi, DR Congo, Peru and Vietnam? EQ 7: How effective and efficient is the cooperation in the other partner countries?		How to improve MD8 agrees with the importance of combining the soft with hard support. It is certainly possible to further investigate how this could be included in future workplans and within the foreseen budget. However MD8 thinks that the focus should remain on providing soft skills.
16	EQ 8: How effective are the synergies identified and developed by CEBioS through partnerships with Belgian institutions		
17	EQ 9: How should the CEBioS-programme at RBINS evolve in terms of management and coordination		

3. Recommendations

18	3.1. CEBioS and change management		
19	3.2. Recommendation to CEBioS implementing team	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen team spirit 2. Coordinate a strategic reflection on CEBIOS identity (secretariat/Training center/ expertise center) and communicate clearly on it. 3. Strengthen the link between CEBIOS vision for the future and the team capacities 4. Strengthen learning and communication strategy of CEBIOS 5. Develop more strategically CEBIOS partnerships 6. Strengthen the CHM component 7. Strengthen management tools 	

20	3.3. Recommendation to the financing and hosting institutions BELSPO and DGD	<p>8. Continue CEBioS programme and encourage its evolvement</p> <p>9. Allow for flexibility in implementation and reporting</p> <p>10. Explore with CEBioS how mainstreaming biodiversity in development cooperation sector can be further stimulated, based on a joint discussion about efforts so far. (for DGD in particular)</p> <p>11. Decide in close collaboration with CEBioS coordinator and RBINS the desired position of CEBioS. (for BELSPO in particular)</p> <p>12. Select partners which should be included and identify which relations should be intensified.</p>	<p>8. In the budget of 2019 an amount is foreseen for the second phase of the program. This is only a prevision, the Minister decides 1) if a second phase will be approved and 2) the amount granted. Concerning a multiannual perspective over the total programme budget there is a flexibility to transfer resources from one year to the other or between SOs. These reallocations should be based on solid argumentation and approved by the SG. But the amount of yearly installments is fixed by royal decree and should be decided on when phase 2 is approved (each year the same, or different amounts). See also EQ3 for external budget.</p> <p>9. DGD allows a flexibility in implementation and reporting but according to the Royal Decree CEBioS needs to report every year (narrative and financial). But these issues can be discussed further in the steering committee.</p> <p>10. useful recommendation, MD8 will reflect together with CEBioS how to enhance mainstreaming biodiversity in development cooperation</p> <p>12. MD8 agrees with the recommendation.</p>
21	3.4. Recommendation to the implementing organisation - RBINS	<p>13. Reflect on the required imago to influence policy in Belgium</p> <p>14. Increase the efficiency of financial and contractual processes</p> <p>15. Improve human resource management</p> <p>16. Give more visibility to CEBioS</p>	
Annexes			
22	Logframe (annex 7)	No comments	
23	Monitoring table (annex 7)	No comments	

3. Management response by BELSPO

Nr.	Chapter from mid-term evaluation	General comment	Follow-up (short term and long term)
	Executive summary based on the OECD DAC evaluation criteria		
	No comments		
	2.2 Assessment of CEBIOS 6 specific objectives		
	No comments		
	2.3 Answers to the evaluation questions (EQ)		
10	EQ1: Do the services and deliverables comply with the strategy of CEBioS?		
11	EQ 2: Are CEBioS services and deliverables related to the 6 CEBioS specific objectives adequate and of good quality?		
12	EQ 3: Are the workforce and composition of the staff adequate? (including questioning the structure/governance of CEBIOS itself)		<p>How to improve</p> <p>BELSPO: agrees with the ET that balance should be improved between workload, staff costs and co-financing activities (meaning new financing, new projects to cover staff costs ... but also additional workload). BELSPO is of the view that DGD provides funding to CEBIOS to fulfil its clearly defined core mandate in terms of capacity building activities. Seeking additional funds from science portfolio to carry out policy-support research in developing countries is worth but should be worked out at an early stage, discussed and reported within the steering committee.</p>
13	EQ 4: Are the tools and modalities appropriate to assess the progress towards strategic objectives and the success of its activities?		

14	EQ 5: How effective and efficient is the RBINS/CEBIOS coordination in its implementation management and monitoring procedure?		
15	EQ 6: How effective and efficient is the institutional cooperation with each of the 5 countries Benin, Burundi, DR Congo, Peru and Vietnam? EQ 7: How effective and efficient is the cooperation in the other partner countries?		
16	EQ 8: How effective are the synergies identified and developed by CEBioS through partnerships with Belgian institutions	How to improve	BELSPO: as stated by the ET, in order for CEBIOS to be recognized as "the" capacity building body for biodiversity for the South in Belgium, Cebios needs to structurally reinforce the partnership with key Belgian actors (RMCA, Plantentuin Meise, ACROPOLIS, Enabel, ARES, EDUCAID, FIABEL, NGOs..). With this intention, BELSPO recommends to enlarge the steering committee with representatives of all thoses institutions carrying out activities driven by SDG and CBD -Post-Aichi targets.
17	EQ 9: How should the CEBioS-programme at RBINS evolve in terms of management and coordination		BELSPO welcomes the ET suggestion of exploring scenarios to prepare for sustainability of CEBioS missions and services With this view, Belspo is willing to participate to the ToC workshop aiming to prepare phase II and implement it.
4. Recommendations			
18	3.1. CEBioS and change management	No comments	No comments
19	3.2. Recommendation to CEBioS implementing team	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen team spirit 2. Coordinate a strategic reflection on CEBIOS identity (secretariat/Training center/ expertise center) and communicate clearly on it. 3. Strengthen the link between CEBIOS vision for the future and the team capacities: 4. Strengthen learning and communication strategy of CEBIOS 5. Develop more strategically CEBIOS partnerships 6. Strengthen the CHM component: 	

7. Strengthen management tools:		
20	3.3. Recommendation to the financing and hosting institutions BELSPO and DGD	<p>8. Continue CEBioS programme and encourage its evolvement</p> <p>9. Allow for flexibility in implementation and reporting</p> <p>10. Explore with CEBioS how mainstreaming biodiversity in development cooperation sector can be further stimulated, based on a joint discussion about efforts so far. (for DGD in particular)</p> <p>11. Decide in close collaboration with CEBioS coordinator and RBINS the desired position of CEBioS. (for BELSPO in particular)</p> <p>12. Select partners which should be included and identify which relations should be intensified.</p>
		<p>9&10. make use of BBPf experience in terms of improving the way of reporting (simpler and more attractive) and of strategic communication.</p> <p>11. In the framework of the strategic committee (DGD-BELSPO), Belspo is willing to analyse within its limits of financial means and possibilities) any scenarios provided by RBINS for a desired sustainable position of CEBIOS</p>
21	3.4. Recommendation to the implementing organisation - RBINS	<p>13. Reflect on the required imago to influence policy in Belgium</p> <p>14. Increase the efficiency of financial and contractual processes</p> <p>15. Improve human resource management</p> <p>16. Give more visibility to CEBioS</p>
Annexes		
22	Logframe (annex 7)	No comments
23	Monitoring table (annex 7)	No comments