

countries. However, complex implementation and support structures and limited in-country capacity have meant that progress has been slower than originally anticipated. There have been limited opportunities for feedback and validation of proposals developed during the ROAMs and Business Case Studies. Stakeholders consulted which may have limited overall effectiveness.

The overall performance score for monitoring and evaluation is "unsatisfactory with some positive elements". The MEL strategy and plan developed by IUCN headquarters was well presented and clear in terms of providing guidance and tools for project staff. Furthermore, useful learning exercises were facilitated around some key areas of relevance to the project by the IUCN MEL team. However, other than the learning events which were well received, the MEL strategy was not implemented consistently in large part due to staff being over-burdened with other project management responsibilities. As a result, there is very limited evidence with which to track progress against key milestones and indicators.

It has not been possible to assess impacts given the short-term nature of this project. Project outcomes are expressed in terms of implementation and action by private sector partners as a result of their engagement in the three landscapes (outcome indicator 1) and as a result of their participation in the community of practice (outcome indicator 2). With the benefit of hindsight, these indicators were too ambitious and not possible to achieve within this first phase of work. By the end of the 18-month no-cost extension, business cases were prepared for all three sites, but only shared with Peru. Communications with Tanzania have stalled due to non-disclosure of the EIA for the sugar company's planned expansion area. Implementation of the business cases has yet to take place, in large part due to questions over financing, which was not foreseen in the original project design. While there has been significant engagement with global private sector actors, there is no evidence to suggest that this has been translated into them showing "high level support and the allocation of resources to unlock FLR implementation". As such, performance has been assessed as "unsatisfactory with some positive elements".

Overall, efficiency has been scored

recommendations to their respective boards, senior managers and finance teams

- Develop practical action plans for all three companies with regard to the implementation of FLR recommendations in the business cases and where needed additional areas of external technical support from IUCN
- Help companies identify and pursue new sources of financing including public private partnerships
- Undertake feedback sessions in-country with stakeholders consulted (particularly those outside the private sector partners) and identifying opportunities for additional financing to support wider landscape interventions
- Publish and communicate key learning points regarding engaging with the private sector on FLR – including initial discussions, planning, data needs and sharing, communication and moving into implementation

Three additional recommendations are provided based on learning from this project

-

ReSupply Final Evaluation - Management Response

	Resupply Final Evaluation
	25.04.2022 30.06.2023

recommendat ons



partnerships	<p>However, being project funded does not allow IUCN staff to spend the necessary amount of time to engage in a working relationship with the companies to identify new sources of funding. In addition to recommendation number 1, IUCN will pursue fundraising with the past donor for an extension of the project.</p>	<p>extension submitted.</p> <p>Consider integration into NbS projects the application of the guide</p>					

—
Undertake feedback sessions in-country with stakeholders

IUCN does not have funding to



