

1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	1776
IA/EA Project ID	GFL/4842
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Project Name	Strengthening the Network of Training Centers for Protected Area Management through Demonstration of a Tested Approach
Country/Countries	Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan
Geographic Scope	Regional
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	UNEP
Executing Agencies involved	Environmental Education Centre "Zapovedniks"
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Among the executing agencies
Involvement of Private Sector	No- Not Involved
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	BD SP1 and 2. Operational program 1,2,3,4
TER Prepared by	Sandra Romboli
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Negi
Author of TE	Ms. Kozlova and Mr. Paltsyn
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	11/05/2005
Project Implementation Start Date	01/07/2005
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	30/06/2008
Actual Date of Project Completion	30/06/2008
TE Completion Date	01/10/2012
IA Review Date	Not reviewed
TE Submission Date	11/20/2012

2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant	0.03	0.03
Co-financing for Project Preparation		
Total Project Prep Financing	0.03	0.03
GEF Financing	0.98	0.93
IA/EA own		
Government	0.95	
Other*	0.43	1.85
Total Project Financing	2.35	2.78
Total Financing including Prep	2.37	2.81

*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	S	S	Not reviewed	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	S	Not reviewed	ML
Monitoring and Evaluation	S	MS	Not reviewed	MS
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	S	Not reviewed	S
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	Not reviewed	S

4. Project Objectives

4.1. Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's overall goal was to improve biodiversity protection and rural livelihoods through a better management of protected areas in Northern Eurasia. There was no change GEB (as per TE and ProDoc).

4.2. Development Objectives of the project:

The project's two main development objectives were to (i) Improve the skills of Protected Area (PA) managers and staff in critical aspects of PA management through the establishment of permanent and sustainable PA management training Centers and programs in four countries: Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus; and (ii) Secure stronger political and other stakeholder support for PAs in the region. (There was no change as per TE and ProDoc).

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 TE elaborates on the relevance of the project to the countries mostly on PA level as follows: The project was highly relevant to the needs of PAs (better management, more advanced conservation and social activities, additional funding, stronger political support) and local communities (sustainable livelihood, participation in PA management, healthy environment) living within or outside PAs in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan. The project also met the needs of politicians responsible for PA management in these countries by setting up sustainable training Centers (TCs) for PA staff and professional specialists to improve PA management; help with legislation and policies related to PAs; assist PAs staff in the

development of collaboration with socially responsible businesses. At least 6 PAs in Russia developed strong ties with business companies as a result of the UNEP project. Also, governmental protected areas agencies in Russia and Kazakhstan confirmed the high level of importance of the TCs for capacity building of PA staff and outlined the leading role of the UNEP project in the development of strategic documents and improvement of PA national systems. The TE does not elaborate in detail on the relevance to legislation or policies, ratified conventions or similar in the respective countries. However the Pro Doc includes a section on the four countries' relevant regional priorities, action plans and programs (pro doc page 2-4). With regards to the GEF this project is in line with the BD operational program 1,2,3,4 and GEF strategic priorities 1. Catalyzing Sustainability of PA and 2. Generation and dissemination of best practices.

5.2. *Effectiveness – Satisfactory*

The project contributed to the achievement of Overall Goal to “Improve biodiversity conservation and rural livelihoods through a better management of protected areas in Northern Eurasia” and resulted in some important changes in PA legislation and management though increased number of professional staff, involvement of business and local communities in PA support in four project countries. As per the TE (page17) Objective 1 “Improve the skills of PA managers and staff in four project countries in critical aspects of PA management” was completely achieved in the four project countries. All interviewed PA managers and specialists confirmed that they use knowledge and skills learned on the trainings in the framework of the UNEP-GEF project. PA managers reported that effectiveness of work and motivation of staff increased considerably after the training. New initiatives were developed at the PAs as a result of the project: improved management plans; better financial planning; using Geographic Information System (GIS); developed sustainable livelihood programs for local communities such as ecotourism and rural tourism, and designing of ecological trails for education purpose; as well as joint projects with businesses. The TE mentions that "the achievements were different in the four countries and depended on the political and social situation as well as on available funding". Objective 2 “Secure stronger political and other stakeholder support for PAs in the region” was achieved generally in Russia and was only partly implemented in other three project countries. National strategies (concepts or programs) for PAs development were approved by Governments in Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan in 2008-2011. The National Program for PA Development in Ukraine, prepared in the framework of UNEP-GEF project, is still not approved. Important changes in PA legislation were made in Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan. Unfortunately the project did not influence any considerable changes in the governmental funding for PAs in Russia, Ukraine and Kazakhstan. In Belarus governmental funding of existing PAs and salaries of PA staff increased after the project (TE page 20). Furthermore as per the TE: Considerable additional funding is required to make steady improvements in PA management in the project countries. Lack of sustainable financing for TCs is the main issue faced by all four project countries. However, the project countries succeed to sustain project results continuously for 4 years after the project. The project implemented a

sustainability strategy to maintain the project results over time: the training programs of the TCs were approved by Governments; cooperation was built between TCs and government PA agencies; changes in national PAs legislation were approved by governments; cooperation of PAs with business and local communities was established in Russia.

5.3. *Efficiency – Satisfactory*

Overall the project is deemed to be satisfactory in the area of Efficiency. As per the TE, the project used a range of means to be as cost-effective as possible. For example; * training costs of PAs staff were lower when training was organized using existing infrastructure of PAs rather than renting training facilities in Kiev or Minsk, * The “Nomadic Model” was a cost-effective approach: instead of bringing PA staff for trainings to Astana and paying high prices for hotels, classroom rent and food, the team of trainers went to different PAs in the country and organizes training using PAs facilities. The weak point of this model was that not all trainers have enough time to visit PAs located far from their homes, * It was cheaper to hire trainers just for the training period, than to retain them as staff, * Well-developed trainings programs (based on participatory approach of the participants in the exercises) proved to be more cost-effective compared with traditional methods of trainings (when one person talks and students listen) in terms of the quality of the outcomes occurring after the trainings: faster application of learned knowledge and skills, training other colleagues, attracting new donors, and getting much more funding from governmental agencies. Etc. Furthermore, actual in cash co-financing was 1.6 times greater (US\$1,050,184 instead of US\$668,000 planned); and actual in-kind co-financing was 1.2 times more (US\$799,578 instead of US\$680,000 planned) (TE page 21-22). This project completed its activities on schedule.

5.4. *Sustainability – Low/Moderate Risks*

The TE took place 4 years after project closure and could therefore assess sustainability of project efforts in "real-time". The project design had identified factors that might influence the project results and progress toward impact in four countries as insufficient PA funding; low interest of governments to develop PA systems; weak legislation to support PAs; poor local communities living inside and outside PAs; small number of socially responsible businesses in the target countries, and others. According to the TE: The project activities were therefore designed at dealing with all these factors and actively involved stakeholders in the project implementation when necessary. The project implemented a sustainability strategy to maintain the project results over time: the training programs of the Training Centers (TCs) were approved by Governments; cooperation was built between TCs and government PA agencies; changes in national PAs legislation were approved by governments; cooperation of PAs with business and local communities was established in Russia. At the time of the evaluation (TE page 26) "Considerable additional funding is required to make steady improvements in PA management and developing new conservation practices (especially to keep on the payroll highly professional managers and specialists). At present, PAs are able to raise additional funding from business companies, as well as different foundations and international programs

(for instance, UNDP/GEF and WWF) when there is limited governmental funding". Lack of sustainable funding for Training Centers is the main issue faced by all four project countries, which experience severe budget restrictions. TCs in the project countries depend on grant support and funding from UNDP/GEF and World Bank on-going projects. Only the TC in Moscow earns additional funds from payment for training by PA staff and business companies. The general project activities were directed to capacity building of PAs. As a result, every TC found its own way to survive and continue to provide services to PAs involving governments, businesses companies and local communities. Thus, the TE concludes that the institutional framework established under the UNEP project to deliver the outcomes towards impacts was effective. However, positive changes in PA management are slowed down by the quick rotation of authorities at national PA agencies and poor funding of the PA systems from governments and local sources (TE page 27). The project outputs and outcomes contribute to environmental sustainability in the target countries through better management of the PA systems and conservation of ecosystems and endangered species populations. The tendency of increasing number of PAs in Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Russia will positively influence the future flow of project benefits through replication of the project results in new PAs by the TCs (TE page 27).

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 components supported by co-financing were well integrated into the project and essential to the GEF objectives. For example the UNEP project budget was used to establish four training centers (TCs) in the four countries - other funding went to train the PA staff in these TCs (TE page 21).

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?

Project attained co-financing to a level greater than it was planned in the beginning. Actual in cash co-financing was 1.6 times greater (US\$1,050,184 instead of US\$668,000 planned); and actual in-kind co-financing was 1.2 times more (US\$799,578 instead of US\$680,000 planned). Components supported by co-financing were well integrated into the project. Very detailed information is not provided by the TE in terms of where the additional funding was used (what component or activity). To what extent this affected project outcomes or sustainability specifically is difficult to attain from the TE.

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?

There was no delay in this project.

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:

According to the TE, the governments were responsive to the project in their countries providing coordination to the project and administrative support (when necessary). Governments were also responsive to UNEP guidance, UNEP supervision and recommendations. The TE reports that it is possible to claim that the UNEP project increased the interest of relevant government agencies towards PAs and their problems (approved amendments to PA legislative and strategic documents, participation of governments in the project events and the approval of training modules developed by TCs). The Governments in all four project countries assumed responsibility for the project and provided adequate support to project execution. Nevertheless, the level of support provided varied as follows:

(a) The highest level of government involvement in the project was in Kazakhstan and Belarus: all project activities had approval from the government, including training programs.

(b) In Russia, the level of governmental support was less intensive: they approved the training programs, participated in the trainings as trainers, but did not take active part in the monitoring of project results (no feedback on reports).

(c) In Ukraine, government took part in the project during the planning stage, participated in trainings as observers. The government did not approve trainings programs, but agreed on the project activities and reports. (TE page 90).

7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

7.1. M&E design at entry – **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The indicators in the logframe are not well formulated. The indicators are unclear as to what and how to measure as well as aiming to measure several different things in the same indicator. One of the objectives reads: "secure stronger support" which is not easily defined or measured. Baseline information and targets are not included in the logframe. No method for baseline data collection. Limited budget for M&E. The responsibilities for M&E activities were not clearly defined.

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

According to the TE (page 92) Overall, the project had an M&E system in place, but without proper training, instruments and resources for parties responsible for M&E. The TE further elaborates that: "From the very beginning the project did not have a clear M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. The M&E plan did not include baseline information related to the level of skills and knowledge of PAs staff on various topics and attitude of local communities, governments and business towards PAs (including data, methodology, etc.). The project Logframe and Monitoring Plan from 2005 to 2007 did not have SMART indicators and data analysis systems and evaluation studies were not planned at specific times to assess the progress and results in every project country (including the analysis of factors of successes and failures).

The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs and outcomes assessment, including people responsible for conduction of monitoring research were not clearly specified in the Project documents. Quality of the project Logframe as a planning and monitoring instrument was poor until the end of the project. Also, there were several Logframes in the project (Logframe in Project Document, revised Logframe (2007) and Logframe used in Project Implementation Review reports to report progress towards achieving project objectives). The responsibilities for M&E activities were not clearly defined. The data sources and data collection instruments were appropriate. The frequency of various monitoring activities was not specified. The Executive Agency's Project Manager prepared simple forms for the project partners to provide necessary data. Then, these data was used to complete UNEP forms.

Specific targets were not specified for project outputs. The desired level of achievement was not specified for all indicators of objectives and outcomes. There were adequate provisions (e-mail and phone calls, adapted templates, consultations and experience exchange) for project partners to fully collaborate in evaluations. The budget for monitoring project progress was limited (\$2500), but some monitoring activities are conducted along other project activities and did not require additional funding.

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- *Moderately Satisfactory*

As per the TE (page 37) "The supervision from UNEP for the project was not very effective due to change of Task Managers during the project life. The project had three UNEP Task Managers, each staying for a very short time. All country managers said that reporting system was ineffective as it concentrated on quantitative measures that did not reflect the keys to success and failures. The first issue was about the turnover of UNEP DEPI GEF task managers and the second issue was about knowledge of task managers of the project regions and conservation project planning tools. Despite these issues the overall implementation seems to have moderately satisfactory.

8.3. Overall Quality of Execution – *Satisfactory*

According to the TE (page 37): The project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been fully followed by the Executive Agency and its project partners and were effective in delivering project outputs and outcomes. The TE further reports that "there were some administrative, operational problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project. First of all, there were no special trainings for the project team to help them to prepare application form with SMART Logframe and manage the project effectively: capacity-building trainings for the team, result-based management, time management, team-building, conflict-management, problem-solving, strategic planning, UNEP/UNDP policies/monitoring/reporting system' (TE page 30).

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?	Satisfactory	The report assesses outcomes and impacts appropriately.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Satisfactory	The report is consistent. There is no explicit assessment of the executing agencies in the TE.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Satisfactory	There is a section addressing four aspects of sustainability (environmental, institutional, financial and socio-political).
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Satisfactory	Lessons are developed for each of the headings in the report.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Satisfactory	The TE includes a section on project costs (expected vs actual).
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Satisfactory	M&E is addressed in the report.

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?

No

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

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

Yes

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

The TE reports that: Positive experience and results of the UNEP-GEF project were intensively used by 9 UNDP/GEF and World Bank projects in 2008-2012 in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan. Training Centers (TCs) and their effective training programs have played leading role in capacity building of PA staff (especially, environmental inspectors and environmental education experts) and development of joint projects with local communities. Resource publications, training programs and community-based projects development models of TCs were distributed to other countries of the former Soviet Union. Resource and methodical publications (in Russian) published under the UNEP project are available for all countries of Northern Eurasia on the project web-site www.wildnet.ru. Experience exchange and horizontal learning (peer-to-peer learning) between TCs of project countries occur via meetings of project teams and trainers at conferences and workshops. Also, TCs send their trainers to each other to conduct trainings and share the methodologies. The overall evaluation rating for “Catalytic role” in the TE was Highly Satisfactory (see Table 11, page 27, for more details).

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 project catalyzed the development of new approach for education of PA staff beyond four project countries. For example, participatory-based training methodologies developed by the EcoCentre Zapovedniki and its project partners were introduced to the countries of Northern Eurasia (far beyond the project countries) at common seminars, workshops and conferences. For instance, the methodologies were used by other partners from former Soviet Union for conduction of similar trainings: Georgia, Armenia, Tajikistan and Kirgizstan. Also, with regards to catalyzing changes in legislation related to PAs - Important changes in PA legislation and policies for PA systems development in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan were catalyzed by the UNEP project. These changes resulted in the establishment of new PAs and improvements in PA management (for example, the government approved programs for GIS development in Belarus, ecotourism programs in Belarus and Russia, and management plans in Kazakhstan). Moreover, in terms of catalyzing capacity-building for PAs - New progressive forms of PA activities started to be developed after the project in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan: improved management plans; better financial planning; sustainable livelihood programs for local communities; joint conservation and ecological education programs between PAs and business companies; ecotourism programs; ecological trails for educational purpose; and others. Successful model projects (for instance, planting trees and cleaning the forests from litter) of effective cooperation of PAs, local communities and businesses were introduced in Russia. A widespread network of TCs and PAs in Northern Eurasia was established in the framework of UNEP project that has become the first step for exchanging experiences and horizontal learning (specialists of the same level) in the field of PA management for the countries of this part of the World.

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 activities that contributed to awareness raising and knowledge are as follows: Information dissemination among stakeholders under the UNEP project occurred through e-mails, roundtable meetings and workshops. UNEP project staff took part in numerous public events (conferences, celebrations, etc.), where they did presentations and distributed information about the project. The TE concludes that the project was mostly focused on educating PAs staff (about 90% of the project activities) than on conducting public awareness campaigns for local communities, business and governmental agencies. There were no specific publications and events for local communities and government institutions (as stated in this section, the project raised their awareness about PAs mostly through PAs). In addition, there was no social research to assess public awareness (local communities, government, and business) before, during, and after the project (TE page 89).

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

No

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?

The project focused on educating PAs staff. In turn, the Training Centers started to train people from forestry, tourism, businesses, local communities, and regional administrations in Russia and Kazakhstan. As a result, in Russia and Kazakhstan the project particularly increased understanding of the needs for biodiversity conservation among target groups as a means of achieving sustainable development (TE page 34) (see also section on specific skills /training.)

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

Yes

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

There are clear signs of training skills being used in the 4 countries after project closure (2008): (TE page 76): In all countries before and after the trainings the organizers interviewed the participants to assess their level of knowledge. However, there was no assessment made to get the feedback from trained PAs staff (in project countries) on the exact impact of the project results: how PA staff are applying new skills in PA management in the four project countries. Training applied in **In Russia**: *Every year approximately 100-150 PA specialists are trained by the TC (2008-2012). On average TC organizes about 8-10 trainings a year. More than 1500 of PA staff were trained in 2005-2012 by the TC. *Directors of interviewed PAs (7 PAs) confirmed that after the trainings their staff started to apply new skills in practice (anti-poaching, environmental education, ecotourism, financial management, cooperation with local communities and business). *Trainings helped the participants to improve their career in the PAs, generate new ideas of PA management, build connections and exchange experience with other PA staff. *Other finding about the trainings is the development of PAs staff informal network so as PA specialists can consult one another and share their experience in the field of PA management and practice. Managers of interviewed PAs confirmed that effectiveness and motivation of trained staff increased considerably after the trainings. * About 30 specialists from PAs staff now are involved in the trainings of the TC as instructors. etc. **In Ukraine**: Until 2012 – more than 300 (approximately 10% from all PA staff in Ukraine in 2012) of PAs staff were trained by the TC. About 50 PA specialists are trained annually. UNDP/GEF projects in Ukraine regularly organize trainings of PA staff at the base of the TC established by UNEP project. *The staff of 4 PAs interviewed during the evaluation trip (Kanevsky Zapovedniki, Rivnensky Zapovedniki, Ichnyansky National Park and Piryatinsky National Park) confirmed that they learned necessary knowledge and got useful skills during the trainings in 2005-2008: anti-poaching techniques and legislation on law enforcement, environmental education, financial management in PAs, and fundraising. They said that they use obtained skills and knowledge in their everyday work at PAs. Some of the specialists were promoted to the higher positions at PAs due to knowledge they got at the trainings, etc. **In Belarus**: *About 2-3 trainings for PAs staff are organized annually by the Ministry of Nature Resources and Environment at the TC in Berezinsky Biosphere Reserve. *After the UNEP project trainings, all PAs according to the respondents started to use new knowledge on management planning, ecotourism and GIS initiatives development in their everyday work. *Management plans for all PAs in the country were developed in 2008-2012 due using UNEP project training materials and publications. *As a result of the UNEP project state program on GIS application for PA and nature resource management was developed etc. **In Kazakhstan**: *Until 2012 - 1005 PA specialists were trained at the TC “Tabigat Alime”. The TC organizes about up to 18 trainings annually (not only for PA staff, but also for foresters and local communities). The training programs of the TC established by UNEP project are actively used by UNDP/GEF and World Bank projects in Kazakhstan. * Staff of interviewed PAs (36 specialists from 7 PAs) confirmed that they used learned knowledge and skills in their work. *Especially valuable for PA staff were the knowledge on management, law enforcement, environmental education, biodiversity monitoring and fire management. As in other project countries the respondents said that trainings were of great importance for new PAs, 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?

The project addressed this area through Output 2.1.1: National PA strategies and draft legislation developed and promoted to governments and there was evidence of achievements as follows: **In Russia** - The Strategy for PA system development (2008-2015) was not officially approved by the Ministry of Nature Resources. But nearly all materials of the Strategy were included in the National Concept of PA system development in Russia (2010-2020). The Concept was officially approved by the Ministry of Nature Resources. **In Ukraine:** The State Program for PA system development in Ukraine (2006-2020) is still not approved by the Ministry of Environment. But in 2009 the President of Ukraine issued the Order #611/2009 which played considerable role in the development of PA system in this country: 22 new PAs in Ukraine were established in 2009-2012. **In Belarus:** In the framework of the project, the National Program for PA system development (2008-2014) was drafted, considered by the Ministry of Nature Resources and Environment of Belarus and approved by Government (order of the President of Belarus on March 6 2008). Important amendments were made to the Law of Belarus “On Protected Areas” as a result of the UNEP Project. **In Kazakhstan:** As a result of the implementation of the National Program of PA system development in Kazakhstan 3 new PAs were established in the country in 2009-2012. Management planning and biodiversity monitoring became obligatory for all PAs in Kazakhstan due to amendments to the law on Protected Areas made in the framework of the UNEP project. Government funding of PA system in Kazakhstan increased since 2008 (partly in result of establishing of new PAs) but it is still deficient.

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 Training Centers (TCs) created by this project were integrated into national structures in different ways in the different countries (examples in the text here below a-e). Overall the TE reports that the "institutional framework established under the UNEP project to deliver the outcomes towards impacts was effective". According to the TE: The UNEP project considerably relied on the four countries' institutional framework to sustain and develop the project results towards impacts (as per TE):

- a. National strategic and legislative documents were developed and approved by governments to support further development of PA national systems in all four project countries.
- b. National PA agencies were actively involved in the project activities.
- c. Two Training Centers (TCs) were integrated into PA structures (Ukraine and Belarus), two others were recognized by National PA agencies as national PA educational centers (Russia, Ukraine).
- d. TC in Ukraine was fully supported and maintained by Kanevsky Zapovednik and Kiev State University.
- e. TC in Belarus was converted into the National Environmental Education Centre, but lost its role as a center for education of PA staff.

This TE was conducted 4 years after project completion - (TE page 26) and reports: "At present, PAs are able to raise additional funding from business companies, as well as different foundations and international programs (for instance, UNDP/GEF and WWF) when there is limited governmental funding". Lack of sustainable funding for TCs is the main issue faced by all four project countries, which experience severe budget restrictions. TCs in the project countries depend on grant support and funding from UNDP/GEF and World Bank on-going projects. Only the TC in Moscow earns additional funds from payment for training by PA staff and business companies. The general project activities were directed to capacity building of PAs. As a result, every TC found its own way to survive and continue to provide services to PAs involving governments, businesses companies and local communities. Thus, it is possible to conclude that the institutional framework established under the UNEP project to deliver the outcomes towards impacts was effective. However, positive changes in PA management are slowed down by the quick rotation of authorities at national PA agencies and poor funding of the PA systems from governments and local sources" (TE page 27).

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

UA

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

UA

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

This area remains unclear in terms of allowing more stakeholders to participate in environmental governance. The TE reports that "The project mostly focused on educating of PAs staff (about 90% of the project activities) than on conducting public awareness campaigns for local communities, business, and governmental agencies. While the project focused on educating PAs staff, in turn, the Training Centers started to train people from forestry, tourism, businesses, local communities, and regional administrations in Russia and Kazakhstan. As a result, in Russia and Kazakhstan the project particularly increased understanding of the needs for biodiversity conservation among target groups as a means of achieving sustainable development". (see section above for specific processes for skills /training.)

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

No

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

--

Did the project contribute to any of the following:

Technologies & Approaches	No
Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	No
Financial Mechanisms	No

Please specify what was contributed:

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

Yes

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

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

<p>The TE provides only partial evidence of replication as follows: "The project outputs and outcomes contribute to environmental sustainability in the target countries through better management of the PA systems and conservation of ecosystems and endangered species populations. The tendency of increasing number of PAs in Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Russia will positively influence the future flow of project benefits through replication of the project results in new PAs by the TCs (TE page 27). Such project outputs as methodologies and training programs positively affect the sustainability of project results because the participants of the training use them in their daily work to write management plans, develop educational and scientific programs and raise funding from various donors. Therefore, application of the project outputs is likely to positively affect the environment in terms of improving the quality of conservation projects in PAs". Positive experience and results of the UNEP-GEF project were intensively used by 9 UNDP/GEF and World Bank projects in 2008-2012 in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan. TCs and their effective training programs have played leading role in capacity building of PA staff (especially, environmental inspectors and environmental education experts) and development of joint projects with local communities. Resource publications, training programs and community-based projects development models of TCs were distributed to other countries of the former Soviet Union. Resource and methodical publications (in Russian) published under the UNEP project are available for all countries of Northern Eurasia on the project web-site www.wildnet.ru. Experience exchange and horizontal learning (peer-to-peer learning) between TCs of project countries occur via meetings of project teams and trainers at conferences and workshops. Also, TCs send their trainers to each other to conduct trainings and share the methodologies. The overall evaluation rating for "Catalytic role" in the TE was Highly Satisfactory (see TE Table 11, page 27, for more details).</p>
--

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?

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?

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?

<--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?

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

Was there a change in environmental status?

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local	<input type="checkbox"/>	Intended (local)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unintended (local)
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Systemic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Intended (systemic)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unintended (systemic)
How was the information obtained?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Measured	<input type="checkbox"/>	Anecdotal		

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

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

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

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

Socioeconomic

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

No impact monitoring and reporting was put in place and the project M&E system was not sufficiently developed or fully functioning.

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

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

No

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

U/A

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.

Has the data been made accessible to the public?

UA

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

“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?

No

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?

No

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

The lessons included in the TE are described in the context from which they are derived and specify the contexts in which they may be useful. Lessons learned are extracted from the main findings of the evaluation and lessons are rooted in "real project experiences", i.e. based on good practices and successes which could be replicated or derived from problems encountered and decisions made which should be taken into account in future. The lessons are grouped under the following themes: Country ownership/ driven-ness, project preparation and readiness, project implementation approach, monitoring and evaluation and UNEP and UNDP Supervision and backstopping. (See page 37-40 in TE)

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The TE recommendations are based on the conclusions of the report. Recommendations are presented here: 1) Select a facilitator for the network of the Training Centers of the Northern Eurasia;
2) Arrange feedback from trained PAs staff in the project countries and other countries of Northern Eurasia on the best practices in PA management developed after the training to sustain the impact of the project results;
3) Include in the annual budget of TCs in Ukraine and Kazakhstan payment for the training by PA staff and specialists of other governmental agencies that take part in the training;
4) TCs are to increase the number of training and develop the new ones