1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	1097
IA/EA Project ID	GF/2328-2712-4627
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Project Name	Development of a Wetland Site and Flyway Network for Conservation of the Siberian Crane and Other Migratory Water birds in Asia
Country/Countries	China, Iran, Kazakhstan and Russia
Geographic Scope	Regional
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	UNEP
Executing Agencies involved	International Crane Foundation (ICF)
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Involved as main executing agency
Involvement of Private Sector	No- Not Involved
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	BD -2 Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems
TER Prepared by	Sandra Romboli
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Negi
Author of TE	Dr. Philip Edwards
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	26/02/2003
Project Implementation Start Date	01/03/2003
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	31/01/2009
Actual Date of Project Completion	01/12/2009
TE Completion Date	01/02/2012
IA Review Date	
TE Submission Date	8/30/2012

2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant	-	
Co-financing for Project Preparation		
Total Project Prep Financing	-	-
GEF Financing	10.00	10.00
IA/EA own		
Government		
Other*	13.33	22.77
Total Project Financing	23.33	32.77
Total Financing including Prep	23.33	32.77

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

3. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF Evaluation Office TE Review
Project Outcomes	HS	HS	HS	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	Likely	Likely	ML
Monitoring and Evaluation	S	S	S	S
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	S	S	S
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	HS	HS

4. Project Objectives

4.1. *Global Environmental Objectives of the project:*

To improve the ecological integrity of a network of globally important wetlands that are of critical importance for migratory waterbirds and other wetland biodiversity, using the globally threatened Siberian Crane as a flagship for this effort". (Source TE). There was no change in GEO.

4.2. *Development Objectives of the project:*

External threats to wetlands reduced through a more integrated approach to planning, improved conditions of wetlands, Strengthened mechanism for inter-sectoral collaboration and integrated wetland management. (Source TE). There was no change in the DOs.

4.3. *Changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities:*

Criteria	Change?	Reason for Change
Global Environmental Objectives		
Development Objectives		
Project Components	Yes	Any other (specify to the right)
Other activities		

5. GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

5.1. *Relevance* – ***Satisfactory***

The relevance section in the TE does not elaborate on the relevance of the project to the priorities of the four countries involved. However, this project is designed to support the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity CBD which all four participating countries have ratified. The project also adheres to the principles of the Joint Work Plan (1998) between the CBD and the Ramsar Convention, and addresses many of the objectives of the Ramsar Convention Work Plan 2000-2002. The Project has used the flagship species approach to implement a wide range of actions that have made significant contributions to site-, national-, and regional-level wetland conservation needs along two major Asian flyways, acting in a fully integrated and concerted way to demonstrate the full range of benefits and added value that a

flyway-scale approach can bring to the conservation of migratory ecological systems. The project is feeding into GEF Operational Programme #2 – Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems and as part of Biodiversity Strategic Priorities "I. Catalyzing sustainability of Protected Areas" and "II. Mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and sectors (2003).

5.2. *Effectiveness* – ***Satisfactory***

Overall the Project has achieved most of its relevant objectives and contributed towards global environmental benefits, with some shortcomings. All outcomes reported progress although levels varied between the countries. For example: Outcome 1.1 Enhanced legal protection through clear regulations and identified enforcement responsibilities at selected project sites. Results under this outcome include; Establishments of Ramsar sites, protected areas and wetlands at various levels in the four countries. Significant extensions to Naurzum Zapovednik (103,687 ha plus 116,726 ha buffer) and inclusion of whole in new Saryaka Steppe and Lakes of Northern Kazakhstan UNESCO World Heritage Site has enhanced legal protection of site and enforcement is active if limited. Urkash-Zharsor Zakaznik also created and included under jurisdiction of Naurzum, and two inspectors posted.

Under outcome 2.1 Sustained biodiversity protection through participatory and effective site management results were achieved mainly in China and Kazakhstan. For example in China: Implementation of management plans current at each site, with commendable water plans available at Momoge, Xianghai, and Zhalong NNRs; all financed by State, provincial, and/or local governments. Local people have been involved in Project activities agreeing to take up alternative activities in return for changed behavior towards nature reserves, but this always limited to 1-2 villages when up to 40 may be present in any single reserve. All but one site show increased PATT scores, though some of these are only small. In Kazakhstan; Management plan prepared for Naurzum being implemented on the ground, although shortage of financing, which the FHC recognizes needs to be increased, suggests that long-term intended impact may not be achieved. Urkash-Zharsor Zakaznik also created and included in Naurzum management plan, but the same shortcomings apply. Clear evidence that fully participatory site management committee is still operative. Large increases in PATT scores.

Overall Key Project achievements include (UNEP TE, page 23):

- the designation of new protected areas and upgrades to the legal status of existing ones was attained for 814,583 ha of wetlands; and extensions were made to existing protected areas of an additional 1,674,323 ha – total 2,488,906 ha;
- twelve of the 16 Project sites were also officially designated as Wetlands of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention while nomination documentation was prepared for the remaining four sites;
- Naurzum Zapovednik now forms part of the World Heritage Site – Saryarka Steppe and Lakes of Northern Kazakhstan (450,344ha), which was inscribed on 12th July 2008;

- water management agreements and wetland restoration activities approved, funded, and implemented at four NNRs in NE China and a Basin Agreement signed by stakeholders at Naurzum, Kazakhstan;
- management plans have been developed for 1314 Project sites and approved for 1115 of these;
- national wetland management planning guidelines were developed for Russia;
- progressive improvements in management effectiveness were made at most individual protected areas as measured by Protected Area Tracking Tool with a few showing significant gains;
- improved capacity for waterbird monitoring resulted in development of flyway monitoring network in China and development of consistent annual waterbird counts across Poyang Lake Basin, expansion of long-term surveys of breeding birds and development of migration monitoring in Yakutia, aerial surveys of breeding birds in western Siberia, migration surveys of waterbirds in northern Kazakhstan, and development of systematic waterbird monitoring at project sites in Iran;
- establishment of a regional database to store and share data and to support publications on Siberian Cranes and other species;
- unquantifiable development of capacity at site and provincial level through training, technical assistance and provision of equipment, considered by many to be the Project's most important achievement;
- significant levels of applied research conducted to inform management decisions, e.g. studies to determine numbers and distribution of Siberian Cranes in relation to water levels and the occurrence of the plant Vallisneria spiralis, satellite tracking of Siberian Cranes to categorically determine migration routes, and guidelines for the reduction of avian influenza risks at wetlands of importance were included as part of Ramsar Resolution X.21 and published as a SCWP Technical Brief; and
- a huge range of public awareness-raising activities completed that were estimated to have reached over 30,000 people in Kazakhstan alone.

5.3. *Efficiency* – ***Satisfactory***

As per TE: Project management costs were trimmed to 67% of those originally budgeted, and the RCU and NCUs have worked efficiently. The project finished officially on 31 March 2009, with an extension approved to 31 December 2009 for all project countries except Russia (due to ongoing administrative problems).

5.4. *Sustainability* – ***Low/Moderate Risks***

Regionally and institutionally, continuity and support were built into the Project by the ICF and CMS through ensuring that its activities were fully integrated into parallel annual work plans of outside bodies. Many international processes were occurring in parallel, but the Project also invested a lot of time and resources into these to ensure not only continuity but, as result, of its own achievements, e.g. the West Central Asian Site Network for Siberian Cranes and other

migratory waterbirds which was established through the Project, and the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership which the Project made significant inputs to, especially through the NE Asian Crane Site Network. The TE refers to the draft of Resolution 10.3 on the Role of Ecological Networks in the Conservation of Migratory Species adopted by the CMS Scientific Council at its 17th meeting for consideration by the CMS COP 1081, which reads: "WELCOMES the establishment in 2007 of the Western/Central Asian Site Network for the Siberian Crane and Other Migratory Waterbirds under the UNEP/GEF Siberian Crane Wetland Project to further implement the MOU concerning the Siberian Crane as a framework for the management of the network of internationally important sites for waterbird and other migratory species; and the designation of internationally important sites by six Parties (Iran, India, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan)" (TE page 86). From the national perspective the sustainability varied between the countries - and the TE has reported on it dividing it up by financial, socio-political, institutional, environmental and economical for each of the countries.

In summary:

- China the sustainability is between Likely and Moderately Likely with a mode of Likely;
- Iran the sustainability is between Likely and Unlikely with a mode of Moderately Unlikely;
- Kazakhstan the sustainability is between Moderately Likely and Unlikely with a mode of Moderately Likely; and
- Russia the sustainability is between Likely and Unlikely with a mode of Likely or Moderately Unlikely

6. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

6.1. *Co-financing*

6.1.1. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project?

The TE reports that "The co-financing was essential as fewer sites and fewer Ha of land would have been put under protected areas if not all funding had been there. An example is co-financing committed and not received, e.g. from the Iranian DoE for the game-guard stations at the two Project sites and these remain incomplete as a result". More detailed information was not available in the TE.

6.1.2. If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

According to the TE: The initial budget contained within the Project Document had co-financing of some US$ 23 million committed, and while some of this did fail to be realized,

additional funding was subsequently contributed, primarily through China, by a net amount of US$ 9.57 million to a total of US$ 32.7 million. However, this was not part of the co-financing envisaged at the start of the program. It is difficult to make out which exact funding was additional and new from the tables in the TE. Furthermore:

- All types of grant co-financing (international agencies, multi-lateral agencies, local government, private sector, and NGOs) produced more funding in cash than was originally proposed;
- The total amount of funding in cash received was 41.0% more than originally pledged – US$ 12,477,672 against US$ 8,847,700; an increase of US$ 3,629,972;
- In-kind co-financing produced only 84.3% of that budgeted – a total of US$ 8,341,795 against US$ 9,892,340; a shortfall of US$ 1,550,545 although much of this was from organizations where increases in cash co-financing were made, e.g. the Chinese NNRs. However, in one or two cases, co-financing committed was not received, e.g. from the Iranian DoE for the game-guard stations at the two Project sites and these remain incomplete as a result.

6.2. Delays

6.2.1. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Delays occurred in project implementation and completion. The project finished officially on 31 March 2009, with an extension approved to 31 December 2009 for all project countries except Russia (due to ongoing administrative problems). In the final stage of implementation, most outputs have been completed except for a restricted number of outputs that had been extended (PIR 2009).

As per the TE: Low initial capacity in project management in all countries except Kazakhstan, exacerbated by conflicting demands on project managers' time, in all countries except Kazakhstan; chronic late reporting at national level in Russia, resulting in financial delays for all other countries because of UNEP (or UN system) ideally requiring full reports from all prior to further release of funds to any, although some flexibility was shown to try to overcome this. Other delays were cause by frequent organizational changes within the Department of Environment, each of which affected the Project, and personnel changes, e.g. three NPDs, all of which caused delays to the work plans; In Kazakhstan, the UNDP Country Office was used as to channel the funds (i.e. acting as a bank) rather than being accepted as a partner specifically in order to reduce delays inherent in the UNDP bureaucracy when acting as a partner; There were significant delays and problems with the disbursement of quarterly cash advances. Delays were apparent both with respect to cash advances from RCU reaching the NCU and consequently the flow of funds from the NPU to the PSOs [Project Site Offices]. Consistently and at all levels, throughout the MTR process this fact was highlighted as a major concern and a major factor holding up effective project implementation.

6.3. Country ownership

6.3.1. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The assessment of country ownership is inherently difficult for projects involving a large number of countries; however the four constituent countries were involved directly in the conceptual design. The TE reports that "It would, however, be hard to suggest that the countries, at least at governmental level, were responsible for driving the Project – this fell largely to the ICF and a number of interested scientists in China, Iran and Russia who, while they may have been in the employ of the government or academic institutions, were largely exhibiting personal levels of commitment rather than fully representing active government policies". Nevertheless, once underway, national and provincial governments exhibited varying levels of commitment and cooperation. As per TE (page 97): "Country driven-ness and coordination is largely irrelevant to a project driven at a supra-national level through the CMS and led by a very competent international NGO, the ICF. Nonetheless, full engagement of countries' central authorities, even in a supportive rather than leading role, apparently makes a huge difference – the results from Kazakhstan and China being particularly praiseworthy, while those from Iran have been more modest, and those from Russia attributable more to the dedication of the scientists involved rather than to any government involvement, although provincial government assistance particularly in Yakutia has compensated for a lack of central level support. In view of the mixed experiences, country driven-ness and coordination is evaluated as Satisfactory by the TE (but with Russia evaluated as Highly Unsatisfactory).

7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

7.1. *M&E design at entry –S**atisfactory***

The design of M&E was of a standard commensurate with the design period (GEF -3), and while no plan as such was included in the project design, the Project Document covered all the various M&E steps including the allocation of responsibilities. The absence of a clearly defined budget allocation in the design is a concern, but it appears to have been included within other categories, hence monitoring and evaluation design has been evaluated as Satisfactory by the TE (page 76).

7.2. *M&E implementation- **Satisfactory***

According to the TE: Overall, M&E implementation has been mixed, with excellent progress monitoring and strong internal activity monitoring by the RCU, but that this has been depreciated by less good internal activity monitoring by the NCUs and poor or absent impact monitoring, and importantly neither of the latter two being fed back to influence management decisions. Strong responses to the mid-term review and the risk assessments have helped

offset this to a large degree, hence the implementation of monitoring and evaluation has been evaluated as Satisfactory (TE page 81). The TE has evaluated the M&E of the project extensively and in a coherent manner on 3 different levels, as follows:

- Progress monitoring, internal activity monitoring and Impact monitoring. Progress monitoring has been very good and has been made through consolidated progress reports, also referred to as Semi-annual Reports (SAR), to the Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination UNEP, Nairobi. The progress reports provided relevant information and analysis of Project progress and impact, as well as ease of overview thereby benefitting Project oversight. Even so, each still comfortably exceeded 100 pages. The quality of these reports is of the highest order – they are comprehensive, well-structured, well written and accessible, highly detailed and informative, and contain excellent concise executive summaries complete with quantitative estimates of progress, and tabulated information on key issues containing proposed action, deadline, and allocated responsibilities. Unusually but commendably, there is a section entitled "Project Impact - Monitoring of Objectives and Outputs" which provides a significant level of detail on the monitoring work undertaken by each country against the Development and Intermediate Objective indicators.
- Internal activity monitoring undertaken by the RCU has been very thorough comprising a range of mechanisms that have been used together to keep abreast of the situation in all four countries and to respond quickly and effectively to areas of concern. These comprised many of the methods used to track progress but to use the results pro-actively to ensure activities were kept on track. They included preparation of the SARs and the quarterly work plans and budgets which enabled detailed pictures of the situations in each country to emerge at least every three months; regular visits by RCU members to the NCUs; and regular telecommunication contact.
- Impact monitoring has been the least well developed, but to give credit, most of the NCUs were aware of the idea and had attempted to apply it in some shape or form. In some cases, some of the logframe indicators provided excellent information on impact, e.g. the PATT scores from the Project sites.

8. Assessment of project's Quality of Implementation and Execution

8.1. *Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution* – ***Satisfactory***

8.2. *Overall Quality of Implementation-* ***Satisfactory***

According to the TE (page 64) UNEP has provided a very high level of backstopping and supervision to this Project. Key aspects of supervision were made through the Task Manager's involvement in the PSC meetings and through the annual PIRs, but at least weekly contact (phone/skype), sometimes more frequent, was made between the Project Director and the Task Manager and the latter was copied into all key technical material. Members of the RCU made it clear during interviews how helpful and supportive both Task Managers were during the implementation period, responding quickly to provide good guidance, honest and

constructive criticism, and help overcome particular problems as necessary. They were also open to one-on-one approaches directly from the NCUs. The RCU also reports significant assistance from, and close cooperation with, UNEP's Funds Manager, Sandeep Bhambra, in dealing with the Project's finances.

8.3. *Overall Quality of Execution* – ***Satisfactory***

According to the TE the ICF has implemented this Project particularly well. The TE reports that "overall, the Project has been well-organized and well-managed throughout providing products of the highest technical quality while responding effectively to a range of internal and external challenges through excellent adaptive management. Only in Russia, where there have been significant and chronic management problems in the national and western Siberian coordination units, has implementation been less than acceptable. The TE reports that "the two lead members of the RCU – the Project Director and the ITA – were both technical specialists with project management experience but, crucially, they recognized their own limitations and employed a specialist project manager as an Operations Manager to facilitate smooth running of the administrative and financial systems. Backed by a capable team, they provided excellent service to the four NCUs. But the ICF was more than just the RCU, the specialist unit it formed to run this Project. Members of its senior management team played an important role in supporting the RCU and in helping to solve problems and find additional financial contributions. While its inexperience was clearly evident in not dealing quickly enough with the inadequacies of the NCU in Russia, it continued to use its body of goodwill and wide range of contacts to maintain informal links with a government reluctant to engage officially and with provincial governments, to maximize progress wherever possible".

9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

Criteria	Rating	GEF EO Comments
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	**Highly Satisfactory**	Very comprehensive report.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	**Satisfactory**	Very comprehensive report.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	**Satisfactory**	Section on sustainability is good.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	**Satisfactory**	Lessons comprehensive and substantiated in the text. However some lessons seem less useful than others e.g. "hire the right people from the start" or "do not delay in making changes where project management is failing".
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	**Satisfactory**	Yes
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	**Satisfactory**	Comprehensive.

10. Other issues to follow up on

11. Sources of information

Annex I – Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office

Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated or improved?	No

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

Is there evidence that the knowledge was used for management/ governance?	Yes

HOW WAS THIS KNOWLEDGE USED AND WHAT RESULTED FROM THAT USE?

Management plans have been developed for most project sites, following the Ramsar Convention's approach to participatory, science-based management. For the majority plans were developed, and implementation initiated, during the second phase following the development of guidelines and an international training workshop held at Poyang in 2006. Information was gathered to promote effective site management including survey, monitoring, and data management activities. Results were incorporated into the management plans as well as the documentation for Ramsar site designations. However the TE suggests that many of the plans developed may not have a real impact in reserve management and that co- management in its purest sense has never really been achieved, or where in some cases it got close, it did so only briefly and now no longer actively (TE page 36-37). Other management plans (under output 1.3) have been more successful for example in China with the development of water management plans for all four Project sites in the north-east with support from national and local hydrological experts. Support from provincial and local governments has resulted in environmental flow releases to Zhalong, Momoge, and Xianghai NNRs, and ecological monitoring at the first two of these is providing feedback on delivery of these environmental flows in relation to wetland restoration objectives. These are the first instances of China's national policy for the need for ecological water provision being put into practice and could form a model for replication at other wetland nature reserves in China (TE page 37).

Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO INFORMATION BEING COMPILED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE TO MANY?

For awareness raising activities see below. Databases and networks were created, for example: A Siberian Crane regional database has been established to store and share data and to support publications on the species such as the Atlas of Key Sites for the Siberian Crane and Other Waterbirds in Western/Central Asia (see TE paragraph 55). Training has been provided to all countries on use of this database which will be maintained by ICF on behalf of the range states to the Siberian Crane CMS MoU. The Western/Central Asia Site Network (WCASN) for Siberian Cranes and other Migratory Waterbirds was launched officially and certificates assigned at CMS COP 9, initially comprising ten sites in five countries (India, Iran, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan) designated on 18th May 2007. A further 14 sites in six countries were proposed pending government approval. During the Project, the capacity of China's National Bird Banding Centre (and NCU) developed significantly for flyway coordination both within China and in East Asia. In East Asia, the Project supported the development of the North East Asian Crane Site Network (NEACSN) under the emerging EAAFP. The Project countries participated in the International Crane Workshop held in Gumi, Korea 23-24th October 2008 and gave presentations and shared experiences, which were subsequently presented at a side event at Ramsar COP 10. Regional databases were established on experts, projects, network sites and waterbird monitoring results. Data from national census activities was compiled at the flyway level and made available for conservation status assessments in relation to the relevant flyway plans. The RCU took the lead on a regional database that will be maintained beyond the Project by the ICF, as a service to the CMS MoU. (TE page 50-53).Results and lessons learned from the Project were shared widely through international meetings, publications, electronic media and other means. Project outputs including national and site level technical reports, fact sheets and technical briefs, and an image database have been archived by ICF and are available through the ICF Library, the project website and on CD. Two websites were established linked to SCWP activities (www.scwp.info) and for activities linked to the CMS MoU (www.sibeflyway.org). Since the end of the Project, these have been merged (www.sibeflyway.org).

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?	Yes

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?
WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

The results from information being made accessible to others is reported to be that awareness is raised and there is an increase in protected areas. Results and lessons learned from the Project were shared widely through international meetings, publications, electronic media and other means. Project outputs including national and site level technical reports, fact sheets and technical briefs, and an image database have been archived by ICF and are available through the ICF Library, the project website and on CD. Two websites were established linked to SCWP activities (www.scwp.info) and for activities linked to the CMS MoU (www.sibeflyway.org). Since the end of the Project, these have been merged (www.sibeflyway.org).

Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised?	Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

The project has an output aimed at awareness raising (1.7) Under this component: Communication, education, and public awareness (CEPA) activities formed a big part of the Project, although somewhat surprisingly a Communication Strategy for the Project was not produced until relatively late on. For example, in Kazakhstan, questionnaire surveys around Naurzum in 2005 showed that 99% of the local population was unaware of the significance of the area where they lived. By 2008 as a result of activities under this Output, 100% of respondents knew that their areas were internationally recognized for biodiversity conservation. Also in Kazakhstan, a number of television shows and performances were organized. Innovative approaches were taken that included the organization of large-scale actions and campaigns which have never before been organized in the poorest areas of Kazakhstan, e.g. crane festivals, contests, youth ecological forums, and regional athletics games. The latter, organized by the NCU under the symbol of the Siberian Crane, involved more than a thousand participants each of whom received Siberian Crane athlete stickers. Two 20 meter-high billboards depicted Siberian Cranes in the stadium. An electronic network was created comprising 120 internet users from all the district schools and NGOs in the Kostanay Oblast. Web-sites for the Project in Kazakhstan and for the Naurzum Reserve were established. Information display stands on the Project were installed in all schools in the vicinity of the Project sites, and more than 5,000 booklets about the Project were disseminated as well as 500 CDs and DVDs with Project films. Four films were produced in Kazakhstan in three languages and shown in workshops and festivals to more than 30,000 people (TE page 45).

Was any ***positive*** change in behavior reported as a result of these activities?	UA

WHAT BEHAVIOR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT?

Did the project activities contribute to building technical/ environmental management skills?	Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO ***TECHNICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS*** BEING BUILT OR IMPROVED?

According to the TE the Project contributed to the development of the management capacity at the Project sites through significant numbers of diverse training courses, technical assistance, and the provision of substantial levels of equipment, including vehicles, boats, communications equipment, computers, optics, and GPS. The latter was seen by the Project as especially important for Kytalyk and Middle Aldan sites in Yakutia, Russia, where lack of equipment was a serious constraint for effective management. The Project supported numerous short-term training courses for site staff to build their capacity, but only very limited funding from the country budgets went to international consultants. Three of the four countries had considerable technical capacity within country, and the Project considered it more cost-effective and more strategic to use consultants from within the countries as a way of developing domestic experience and skills, but in Iran international consultants were used because locating local expertise on some progressive aspects of wetland management was a challenge. The RCU convened two international training courses on data management (2004) and site management planning (2006), and these were followed up by more in-depth training and consultancy support at national and site levels. Training on waterbird monitoring was significant for Iran (South Caspian lowlands); Kazakhstan (joint Russian-Kazakhstan monitoring included training for site staff at Naurzum); and China (all sites, with major effort for Poyang Lake Basin, where 200 people in 40 teams received annual training before coordinated winter counts) (TE page 43).

Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained?	Yes

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

The TE reports on trained people applying their newly acquired skills, for example, * progressive improvements in management effectiveness were made at most individual protected areas as measured by Protected Area Tracking Tool with a few showing significant gains; * improved capacity for waterbird monitoring resulted in development of flyway monitoring network in China and development of consistent annual waterbird counts across Poyang Lake Basin. etc.

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks?	Yes
Were these adopted?	Yes

WHAT LAWS/ POLICIES/ RULES WERE ADOPTED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

This project has a component aimed at enhancing conservation of wetland biodiversity through national and sectoral legislation (outcome 2.1) and another component (outcome 1.1) Enhanced legal protection through clear regulations and identified enforcement responsibilities at selected project sites however there was only uneven achievements in this regard. The Project facilitated a significant increase in the levels of protection and recognition in the targeted sites and neighboring areas. A total of 814,583 ha of new or upgraded protection was achieved, while an additional 1,674,323 ha was added to existing protected areas. Other positive outcomes were found in China and Kazakhstan e.g. Waterbird protection and management regulations have been approved for Keerqin and Poyang Lake NNRs (TE page 26) and The China Waterbirds Conservation Action Plan is included as one part of the **China Wetlands Conservation Action Plan approved by the State Council of China in 2004.** This provides a long-term framework to continue project activities with specific responsibilities allocated. It is reported that wildlife conservation has been improving since the Wildlife Protection Law was approved by the National People's Congress in August 2004, and there is evidence of increased levels of financing towards this. In Iran, Russia and partly in Kazakhstan no substantive achievements were made in terms of enhancing legislation or policy.

Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures?	Yes
Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures?	Yes

WHAT OFFICES/ GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WERE CREATED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

The TE reports that mainly networks were created - as per the TE (page 86) Institutionally, continuity and support were built into the Project by the ICF and CMS through ensuring that its activities were fully integrated into parallel annual work plans of outside bodies. Many international processes were occurring in parallel, but the Project also invested a lot of time and resources into these to ensure not only their sustainability but, as a result, that of its own achievements, e.g. the West Central Asian Site Network for Siberian Cranes and other migratory waterbirds which was established through the Project, and the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership which the Project made significant inputs to, especially through the NE Asian Crane Site Network. The TE further states that the project has always been seen by all the lead players simply as a big step on a much longer journey. This is probably the single most important lesson learned from the SCWP – that instead of it being a stand-alone intervention, this Project was designed to fit into a bigger process guided by the requirements of the Conservation Plans for the various flyways of the Siberian Crane drawn up under the Siberian Crane MoU within the auspices of the CMS.

Did the project contribute to structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance?

Yes

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

Yes

WHAT STRUCTURES/ MECHANISMS/ PROCESSES WERE SUPPORTED BY THE PROJECT THAT ALLOWED MORE STAKEHOLDERS/ SECTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES?

In addition to the stakeholders involved a Governmental level, the project followed a participatory approach leading to a wider reach in terms of participation in environmental governance. The project followed a participatory approach to biodiversity conservation - e.g. in Output 1.2: Participatory management plans for the conservation of selected project sites developed and implemented satisfactory (accordingly to the TE page 6). Developed participatory management plans and increased the management capacity for 11 PAs although markedly different levels of participation and implementation between countries. The project also created networks for example: The Western/Central Asia Site Network (WCASN) for Siberian Cranes and other Migratory Waterbirds was launched officially and certificates assigned at CMS COP 9, initially comprising ten sites in five countries (India, Iran, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan) designated on 18th May 2007. A further 14 sites in six countries were proposed pending government approval. During the Project, the capacity of China's National Bird Banding Centre (and NCU) developed significantly for flyway coordination both within China and in East Asia. In East Asia, the Project supported the development of the North East Asian Crane Site Network (NEACSN) under the emerging EAAFP.

Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution?

UA

WHAT PROCESSES OR MECHANISMS FACILITATED TRUST-BUILDING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION?
WHAT RESULTED FROM THESE?

Did the project contribute to any of the following:		Please specify what was contributed:
Technologies & Approaches	No	
Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	No	
Financial Mechanisms	No	

Did **replication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place?

No

SPECIFY WHICH PLACES IMPLEMENTED WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH.

WHAT WAS THE RESULT IN THOSE PLACES (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **scaling-up** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place? | No |

SPECIFY AT WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE & ECOLOGICAL SCALE AND WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS ADOPTED.

HOW WAS IT MODIFIED TO FIT THE NEW SCALE? WHAT WAS THE RESULT AT THE NEW SCALE/S (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **mainstreaming** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place? | No |

SPECIFY HOW (MEANS/ INSTRUMENT) AND WHICH ASPECTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING SYSTEM. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OR STATUS (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **removal of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place? | No |

SPECIFY HOW DEMAND HAS BEEN CREATED FOR WHICH PRODUCTS/ SERVICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO GEBs.

Based on most of the project's components and/or what it generally intended to do, what type of project would you say this is?

Institutional Capacity (governance) <--*dropdown menu*

If "combination", then of which types?

[ ] & [ ] <--*dropdown menu*

*QUANTITATIVE OR ANECDOTAL DETAILS ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **PRESSURE HAS BEEN REDUCED/PREVENTED** OR ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **STATUS HAS CHANGED** AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES AS A CONTRIBUTION/RESULT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES. FOR SYSTEM LEVEL CHANGES, SPECIFY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR ECOLOGICAL SCALES.*

Was stress reduction achieved? | Yes |

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

x	Local	x	Intended (local)		Unintended (local)

		Systemic		Intended (systemic)		Unintended (systemic)
How was the information obtained?	x	Measured	x	Anecdotal		

Was there a change in environmental status? No

If so, at what scales?	Please mark 'x' for all that apply					
		Local	x	Intended (local)		Unintended (local)
		Systemic		Intended (systemic)		Unintended (systemic)
How was the information obtained?		Measured		Anecdotal		

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the **local level**

At the site level, the TE reported on concrete measures taken in the protected areas (in addition to declaring them PAs). The Project has increased the protection status of almost 2.5 million ha of land and there are a number of examples of stress reduction as well as threat reduction in the TE. Progressive improvements in management effectiveness were made at most individual protected areas
as measured by Protected Area Tracking Tool with a few showing significant gains according to the TE (page 23). For example, output 1.3: external threats to sites reduced through off-site activities e.g. "the Project mitigated some immediate threats including the removal of an exploratory oil well from inside a protected area at Konda Alymka" and " in Kazakhstan, a buffer zone of 116,726 ha was established at Naurzum Zapovednik in order to safeguard the lakes and wetlands in the three core areas from degradation of surrounding uplands by controlling the numbers of livestock and other human activities" (TE page 37). Other examples include, Saryaka Steppe and Lakes of Northern Kazakhstan UNESCO World Heritage Site has enhanced legal protection of site and enforcement is active if limited (TE page 26).

Evidence of intended stress reduction at a **systemic level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at the **local level**

No explicit change in environmental status reported in the TE.

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at a **systemic level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **systemic level**

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place during the project?

Environmental	Yes
Socioeconomic	Yes

To what extent were arrangements in place and being implemented during the project? Briefly describe arrangements.

Arrangements for Impact monitoring were put in place by the project and efforts made to conduct impact monitoring were made. Examples of development objective indicators were: "Status of globally threatened species and globally significant concentrations of waterbirds remain within limits of acceptable change specified in site management plans" and Monitoring in final year of project indicates that the total areas of wetland habitats at project sites (ha) have not declined beyond baseline determined for site management plans (no net loss)" . However as reported in the TE these activities were not implemented properly and were not being fed back to influence management decisions. For example Socio-economic surveys were also made at most of the villages where alternative livelihood interventions were made, and these plus local people's estimates of gross income provided some indication of impact, but no achievement targets were set prior to activities commencing and the TE could find no evidence that any material so obtained by any NCU was used to feedback into the management and decision-making of the Project itself (TE page 81). The TE further describes that "**the area of monitoring where the Project excelled was in counting birds**, and while development of this was a prescribed activity (see paragraph 50) there is an issue prevalent in biodiversity projects (and especially those concerned with birds), in that impact monitoring, if it does occur, almost exclusively focuses on bird counting, the rationale being that if numbers are climbing then the project is having a beneficial impact. While superficially this may be the case, it does not take account of natural variations in breeding and survival nor of factors such as the project maybe simply attracting birds from nearby, but somewhat less attractive, sites. In this Project, for the Siberian Crane alone, this is probably not the case; the species inhabiting very few but well-studied sites and **interventions at these by this Project appear to have had significantly beneficial effects**" (TE page 81).

To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/ indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?

Impact monitoring was weak as described above, however some aspects of it ie. Counting birds worked particularly well. (see section above).

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?

UA

To what extent were arrangements put into place to function after GEF support had ended? Briefly describe arrangements.

Unclear, but the networks established seem likely to continue their work including M&E (to maintain established database).

Was there a government body/ other permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and/or socioeconomic status?

No

Has the monitoring data been used for management? UA

How has the data been used for management? Describe mechanisms and actual instances.

According to the TE: "The TE could find no evidence to suggest that the considerable work undertaken in monitoring the impact indicators was ever used by any of the NCUs to influence in any way the considerable adaptive management that the Project has practiced. As often seems the case, the adaptive management of the Project has been influenced to a much greater extent by external variables and overcoming the problems (or taking opportunities) that these have presented" (page 81).

Has the data been made accessible to the public? Yes

How has the data been made accessible to the public? Describe reporting systems or methods.

The project made efforts in this regard in that: "The knowledge base was developed as planned through supporting surveys and monitoring of poorly known areas, and developing centralized databases **in order to improve access to available information**. Regional databases were established on
experts, projects, network sites and waterbird monitoring results. Data from national census activities was compiled at the flyway level and made available for conservation status assessments in relation to the relevant flyway plans. The RCU took the lead on a regional database that will be maintained beyond the Project by the International Crane Foundation (ICF), as a service to the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) MoU. Large effort were put into public awareness campaigns and a huge range of public awareness-raising activities completed that were estimated to have reached over 30,000 people in Kazakhstan alone.

"SOCIOECONOMIC" REFERS TO ACCESS TO & USE OF RESOURCES (DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS), LIVELIHOOD, INCOME, FOOD SECURITY, HOME, HEALTH, SAFETY, RELATIONSHIPS, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF HUMAN WELL-BEING .AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, INCLUDE "BEFORE" AND "AFTER" NUMBERS, YEARS WHEN DATA WAS COLLECTED, AND DATA SOURCES.

Did the project contribute to **positive** socioeconomic impacts? UA

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

☐ Local ☐ Intended (local) ☐ Unintended (local)

		Systemic		Intended (systemic)	Unintended (systemic)
How was the information obtained?		Measured		Anecdotal	

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts? UA

Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report

A total of 19 lessons are provided by the TE. The lessons centered on these areas: communication, technical management, finance, project management, design and strategic lessons. For full list please see page 100-107 in TE. Some are more useful than others; for example "hire the right people from the start" or "do not delay in making changes where project management is failing" - seem more like obvious statements than real lessons. More useful lesson example would be: Changing people's behavior takes time – allow for it in design. Most projects involve the aim of changing people's behavior, including site managers and local communities. This usually involves training, education, or other means of introducing new concepts. In all cases, designers tend to allow enough time for these activities, but not always enough time for the implementation of the behavioral change itself, which often requires continual reinforcement. It is not that projects need to be longer, rather that the changes sought need to be introduced earlier in the project to enable them to bear fruit.

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

Only 1 recommendation was provided by the TE, as follows: The GEF Secretariat should take cognizance of the joint SCWP/WOW/UNEP publication "The Experience of UNEP GEF and Partners in Flyway Conservation". This publication provides some
important insights and lessons learned from the joint experience of the two projects and some excellent recommendations covering the technical design, management arrangements, and monitoring and evaluation of flyway-scale projects. Unfortunately, the publication was reviewed by a member of the STAP roster who
appears to have had little if any experience of dealing with migratory systems or the design and implementation of large GEF projects, and as a result it appears that the GEF never took formal note of this publication. The GEF Secretariat should reconsider this by having the publication re-reviewed as soon as possible by a member of the STAP with relevant experience of GEF projects, and distribute it to design teams and management teams of future flyway projects.