

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3518	
GEF Agency project ID		4051	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Strengthening the Marine and Coastal Protected Areas of Russia	
Country/Countries		Russian Federation	
Region		Europe and Central Asia	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SO1: Catalysing the Sustainability of Protected Area (PA) Systems SP2: Increasing representation of effectively managed marine protected areas in protected area systems, SP3: Strengthened National Terrestrial Protected Area Networks	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE) - Government of Russia / State Service of Protected Areas	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Ecology and Business (NGO): secondary executing agency	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		March 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		June 2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 2013	
Actual date of project completion		NA (the project was still running when the TE was conducted)	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.07	NA
	Co-financing	0.07	NA
GEF Project Grant		4.00	4.00
Co-financing	IA own	0	0
	Government	8.9	9.6
	Other multi-/bi-laterals	0.17	0.09
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	0.30	1.81*
Total GEF funding		4.07	4.0**
Total Co-financing		9.47	11.5**
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		13.54	15.5**
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		February 2015	
Author of TE		Stuart Williams	
TER completion date		January 27, 2016	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Molly Watts	

* *This figure includes contributions from the WWF and BFN, but other funds leveraged from the private sector, NGOs and partner research institutions which the TE has not broken down into individual contributions were not included (?).

* Excluding the Project Preparation Grant, for which the TE does not report financial figures.

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	MS	MS	--	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	--	L	--	L
M&E Design	--	S	--	MS
M&E Implementation	--	S	--	MS
Quality of Implementation	--	S	--	MS
Quality of Execution	--	MS	--	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	--	--	--	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

Russia has a vast territory and a very long coastline, and harbors biologically diverse marine habitats and species. There are currently “35 marine and coastal protected areas (MCPA) within Russia’s national system of protected areas (PA) : 19 *zapovedniks* (strict protected areas); two national parks; and ten *zakazniks* (wildlife refuges), or approximately 14% of Russia’s entire national system of protected areas” (PD p.4).

This project is part of a larger vision for Russia to have a marina and coastal Protected Areas System that is ecologically representative, resilient to climate change and effectively managed. More specifically, the project’s environmental objective is “to facilitate expansion of the national system of marine and coastal protected areas and improve its management effectiveness” (PD p.47).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

More specifically, the project’s environmental objective is “to facilitate expansion of the national system of marine and coastal protected areas and improve its management effectiveness” (PD p.47). In order to do that, the project focuses on the following three outcomes:

1. Improved MPA system-level capacity enables the expansion of the MCPA system.
2. MPA management know-how is demonstrated, expanded and reinforced
3. Strengthened MCPA system effectively captures knowledge and enables replication of best practice.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There were no changes in objectives or planned activities during implementation.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates relevance as satisfactory. This TER also rates relevance as satisfactory due to the project's good alignment with both Russian and GEF priorities.

Russia prepared its first National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) in 2001. This plan defines national biodiversity conservation priorities and lays out a programme of action. Establishing and effectively managing protected areas are core priorities of the NBSAP, and coastal and marine areas are clearly outlined as national conservation priorities (TE p.13). Other pieces of federal legislation support marine conservation, including the "Ecological Doctrine of the Russian Federation (2002), Federal Law "On Protected Areas" (1995) (...), Law on Fisheries (2004), the Water Code (2006), the Law on Fauna (1995 with revisions) and the Administrative Code" (TE p.13). In particular, the Federal Law on Fisheries and Protecting Biological Resources of the Seas (Dec 2004) "provides significant support for and generates new opportunities to develop and implement an ecosystem-based conservation-oriented framework for fisheries management" (PD p.14). More concretely, between 2004 and 2007, the Government increased its financing to Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (MCPAs) by 93% (PD p.54). Overall, the project seems to reflect Russian priorities as expressed by its adopted laws and funding decisions.

This project is also consistent with GEF priorities, supporting the Biodiversity Strategic Objective 1 (Catalyzing the Sustainability of Protected Areas) and the Strategic Program 2 (Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine PA in PA systems). This project will address ecosystem coverage gaps in the Russian Protected Areas system, and will work towards an improved management for Russia's MCPA network. This project is part of a portfolio of GEF projects aiming at increasing, diversifying and improving the Protected Areas network in Russia.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	--

The TE rates project effectiveness as moderately satisfactory. This TER also rates it as moderately satisfactory for the same reasons, namely that "the overall *system* of MCPAs – that was really the focus

of the project – was not realised and instead the project results were fragmented and unsystematic. (...) Taken independently, some of the outcomes were, however, satisfactory” (TE p.ix).

Outcome 1. Improved MCPA system-level capacity enables the expansion of marine and coastal protected areas

The main target under this outcome was for the project to expand the MCPA network by 2.5 million hectares. At project end, only 150,000 were in the process of being established, and there was no clear timeframe for their establishment. Similarly, the project aimed to strengthen protection in at least 10 marine mammal zones, but only two zones successfully increased protection. On the other hand, based on the data collected as part of the ‘MCPA Capacity Scorecard’, a measure of effectiveness in the management systems of the Protected Areas, MCPAs have successfully and significantly increased their management effectiveness. However, according to the TE, while individual MCPAs are more effective, there is little evidence that the MCPA system as a whole is more effective. In addition, under this outcome, a gap analysis of the marine and coastal zones in Russia was done and resulted in recommendations for further development of the MCPA network to ensure a better representation of the Russian biodiversity.

Overall, this outcome should be rated as moderately unsatisfactory due to failure of the project to expand the MCPA network as planned.

Outcome 2. MCPA management know-how is demonstrated, expanded and reinforced in pilot sites

The main goal under this outcome was to improve management effectiveness at the three pilot sites. This was largely achieved. At three pilot sites, various activities took place to improve management, including field conservation capacity building activities, improved sustainable tourism management practices and better invasive species management. The pilots were successfully conducted and resulted in the demonstration of know-how in specific areas. It remains unclear how this will benefit the MCPA network going forward. Regardless, this outcome was satisfactorily achieved.

Outcome 3. Strengthened MCPA system effectively captures knowledge and enables replication of best practice

The main target under this outcome was for the project to develop the systemic capacity of the MCPA network by enabling knowledge sharing and replication. As part of this outcome, a monitoring system within the MCPAs was successfully developed, and changes to the research programs have been recommended. However, replication policies were not developed as planned. Overall, the effectiveness of this outcome should be considered as moderately satisfactory.

Overall Effectiveness

According to the TE, the most important and meaningful project achievement was not captured by project indicators:

“Most notably, the project resulted in the appreciation within the MNRE that (...) i) there *are* differences between terrestrial protected areas, and marine and coastal protected areas and, as a consequence, these differences need to be taken into account when considering the effective management of MCPAs, ii) that there was a need for resources – human, financial and equipment – for and investment in the MCPAs and iii) some different management techniques are necessary (e.g., satellite monitoring of shipping).” (TE p.30)

The Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment also established a working group on Marine Protected Areas, which systematically plans and coordinates MCPA activities and management approaches. While this was not part of the logical framework for the project, this new understanding will certainly improve the effectiveness of the MCPA system going forward.

Overall, the project objective has only been partially achieved. The MCPA network has been expanded – although not as much as planned – as a result of the project, and MCPAs are more effectively managed. However, given the lower than expected magnitude of the project accomplishments, a rating of moderately satisfactory is warranted.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
----------------	--

The TE rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory, a score this TER agrees with. Indeed, “the project satisfactorily implemented the usual tools to increase value-for-money. However, the set up with an NGO (Ecology and Business) administering the subcontracts and procurement for the project proved to be less cost-effective.” (TE p.ix).

The project appears to have operated with value for money and cost effectiveness in mind. Rigorous procurement processes were used to ensure good value for money. However, the way the project’s finance and procurement processes were set up led to important inefficiencies. The NGO Ecology & Business was given the contract to manage the project subcontracts and payment processes. There was confusion on their end, and the NGO ended up not fulfilling its financial management role. As mentioned in the TE (p.51), “all in all, this seemed a rather inefficient mechanism for project management and administration.”

A cost effectiveness analysis had been done at the project design stage and calculated that GEF’s expenditure per protected hectare of land and seascape would be only US\$0.14/hectare (PD p.59). However, given that the area the project was able to designate as Protected Area was much smaller than expected, costs per hectare were higher than expected. While there isn’t a benchmark at which conservation is no longer considered cost effective, it is necessary to realize that the project’s lack of success did impact its cost effectiveness.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Likely
--------------------	-----------------------

The TE rates sustainability as likely, as does this TER. While there are minor concerns related to financial sustainability and the capacity of the MNRE to effectively manage the MCPA network, sustainability of the project outcomes appears likely.

Financial Sustainability – Moderately Likely

According to the TE, Government support for the MCPA network should continue following project end. MCPAs are part of a national network of protected areas, and federal budget is available for their maintenance. However, given the recession and crisis in Russia, which are affecting the price of oil and Russia's budget more generally, funding for protected areas could be reduced. According to the TE, "the greatest threat, however, is that the gains that have been made by the project – and specifically the *increases* in the budgets for the MCPAs – are either reversed or (...) not returned to their former levels"(TE p.55). Overall, financial sustainability appears moderately likely.

Socio-Political Sustainability – Likely

Socio-political risks are low. As mentioned above, in case of a worsening of Russia's economy, the budget for protected areas could be cut. This remains a minor concern only. Another minor concern is that most MCPAs are in districts where primary economic activities revolved around fisheries (PD p.12). Local populations are still allowed to continue fishing within the MCPAs, but it will remain important to keep good relationships with those communities to ensure they maintain their support for the MCPAs which, in theory, should contribute to protecting their livelihoods.

Institutional Sustainability – Likely

Institutional risks appear fairly low. Marine and Coastal Protected Areas are being managed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment (MNRE), "secure and sustainable" institutions (TE p.55). That being said, the capacity of the MNRE to manage MCPAs has been increased as part of the project, and the institutional risks to those protected areas are now lower than they were initially. The TE shows skepticism towards the MNRE's ability to make good decisions regarding the management of MCPAs. For example, it criticizes the MNRE for not having used the 'gap analysis' done as part of this project as a resource for the MNRE's 2012-2010 program for the expansion of protected areas (TE p.vii).

Environmental Sustainability – Likely

There are no known environmental risks to the project.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? 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 so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Co-financing was slightly higher than expected. The TE does not describe the way in which the higher co-finance influenced project outcomes. However, given that co-finance made up most of the project budget, in particular due to the large amount provided by the Government of Russia, it is safe to claim that the project could not have taken place without it.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. 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 so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Despite the official project start in June 2009, real project implementation did not start before the second half of 2010. The delays were caused by the slow approval of the official project work plan and the resignation of the first Project Manager. As a result of those delays, a one year no-cost extension was granted.

5.3 Country ownership. 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:

Country ownership for this project was not particularly strong. As discussed above in the 'relevance' section, the project was well aligned with Russia's conservation priorities. However, when it came to project execution, ownership issues affected the project. Indeed, according to the TE, "one significant issue faced by the project was the degree of ownership. The MNRE's interest was to secure inputs for the MCPAs, not build a systemic approach to MCPAs with implications (as necessary) for policy and legislation, institutional arrangements and cooperation, capacity (systemic, site-level and individual), (re)definition of protected areas, financial sustainability, systems that operate at the systemic level (...) Part of the disinterest may be attributable to the lack of capacity and time that the protected areas staff members in MNRE have to allocate to thinking, planning and implementing systemic-level activities. [1] Finally and as a further testament of the lack of ownership and distance between the project and the MNRE, the MNRE produced its own program (spanning 2012-2020) to expand the protected area system within the country" (PD p.viii). Overall, this low level ownership can explain some of the unsatisfactory outcomes of the project, and the fact that the project's vision was not respected during implementation.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E design at entry as satisfactory despite criticizing the logframe. This TER rates M&E design at entry as moderately satisfactory due to some logframe shortcomings that will be discussed below, but recognizing that the project had all other necessary components of a strong M&E framework.

All aspects of a standard M&E framework were planned from the start – monitoring reports, data collection, evaluation activities, responsibilities, plan for learning and knowledge sharing, budget, etc. The project successfully collected baseline data so as to better measure project achievements in the later stage of the project. The M&E framework was also well funded with \$US 365,000 allocated to M&E, or 9.1% of the project budget (TE p.25).

The logframe indicators are specific, measurable and time-bound. However, some of them are not relevant or achievable. For example, some of the indicators for the accomplishment of the overall objective relate to animal populations present within specific MCPAs. The target is for animal populations to remain stable over the course of the project. However, as noted by the TE, these indicators are “virtually meaningless (...) [since] the only thing that would affect these species over such a project’s lifespan is catastrophic change that would, almost without exception, be beyond the control of the project” (TE p.9). Another example of an indicator that was not achievable was the expected 40% increase on baseline METT (Monitoring Effectiveness Tracking Tool) score for all MCPAs across the country, which was too ambitious over the short project implementation period. On the other hand, other indicators were not ambitious enough. For example, one of the main indicators was the ‘area of MCPA in the process of establishment’; this could have been upgraded to ‘area of MCPA established’. That being said, project budget was limited and, while an upgraded objective would have been a better match to the project objective, it is unclear the project would have had sufficient resources to meet that upgraded objective. Overall, those shortcomings are minor and did not significantly affect the project (TE pp.7-12).

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E Implementation as satisfactory due to the good adaptive management displayed as part of the project and to the regular M&E that was conducted. This TER rates it as moderately satisfactory only due to the large number of Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) recommendations that were not adopted by the project team.

The project's M&E framework was implemented as planned, although "there were small delays in the implementation of the M&E plan, with the reporting in the PIR and MTE being delayed from the originally envisaged date" (TE p.25). The project "displayed adaptive management particularly when it was realised that the establishment of the IZ [the Ingermanland *zapovednik*¹⁷⁷_{SEP} Ingermanland Reserve, a planned MCPA] might not be successful" (TE p.ix). This issue was picked up as part of the Mid Term Evaluation and, as a result, the project team shifted its focus from attempting to establish the IZ to investing more heavily in improving newly established MCPAs. On the other hand, "the project failed to deliver on some of the recommendations from the MTE" (TE p.19). It is this TER's understanding that no justification was provided from the team for not implementing some of the recommendations from the MTE.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
---------------------------------------	--

The Implementing Agency for this project was the UNDP. The TE rates project implementation as satisfactory because "the UNDP-CO and UNDP-RTC provided good support to the project with no shortcomings." (TE p.viii). The project documents reviewed as part of this exercise provide very little information about the way in which the UNDP managed this project. However, because of some weaknesses in project design, a rating of moderately satisfactory is assigned.

This project's effectiveness was not as high as expected and the project experienced several problems. However, according to the TE, "all decisions made along the process of implementation were made in good faith but *misfortune* befell the project, and [it] was not apparent that poor decision-making or management lay at the core of the issues with project implementation" (TE P.26).

That being said, the project was very ambitious in scope, and more could have been done at the formulation stage to better focus the project. Indeed, according to the TE, "this project should have been more focused and selected fewer components and done a better job at "demonstrating success" –

in other words, the components of the designed were not flawed but both in design and implementation it was not as focused as it could have been“ (TE p.29).

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
----------------------------------	--

The executing agency for this project was Russia’s Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE). The TE rates the quality of project execution as moderately satisfactory. This TER rates it as moderately unsatisfactory due to the important ownership and housing issues that took place within the MNRE.

The MNRE is responsible for the management of all of Russia’s federal MCPA with one exception. It was therefore a natural choice as the executing agency for this project. However, there were several issues with the MNRE that affected the project. First, the project had to be transferred to another department one year after implementation began. Second, the Deputy Director was “so busy and felt relatively little ownership of the project (partly because he was not involved in the development of the project), he did not take it forward (especially the systemic aspects of the project) with the passion it demanded” (TE pp.viii). Third, the Project Manager (PM) changed twice, causing implementation delays and problems with project continuity. Indeed, the original PM resigned in October 2009, and there was a gap of six months before the next PM was in place (in May 2010). The second PM also resigned, and the last PM “was put into a position after the MTR to pick up the pieces and do whatever he could to secure some results for the project. In these circumstances, he has done a good job” (TE p.26). Taken together, all those issues arising from the MNRE created delays and had a negative impact on project execution.

On the other hand, the MNRE has shown good adaptive management, and the project developed good relationships with partners and sub-contractors. Overall, the MNRE was effective at executing planned project activities and at ensuring that project timelines were respected.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The project's impact on biodiversity is indirect. By having worked towards the establishment of new MCPAs and the improved management effectiveness of existing MCPAs, the project strengthened Russia's M CPA network and therefore contributed to protecting biodiversity. However, biodiversity gains cannot be measured as they will take time to materialize.

Other project environmental accomplishments include more regulated "fishing on Russia's Commander Island [and] a decline in the number of ships straying into the CIZ waters since the adoption of the ScanEx system" (TE p.56).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

While this was not a specific objective of this project, "by protecting the biodiversity and ecological processes of the marine and coastal areas of the country, the project was contributing to sustainable livelihoods of the people. This is something that is not necessarily formally recognised in the literature at any of the levels but is of great significance." (TE p.49).

In addition, the project implemented micro-credit schemes in the community of Nikolskoye on Bering Island. Unfortunately, the results from the schemes were not available at the time the TE was written, and their impact cannot be assessed. (TE p.56)

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

Improving the management capacity of MCPAs was an important objective of this project, and one that was successful. As mentioned above, based on the data collected as part of the 'MCPA Capacity Scorecard', a measure of effectiveness in the management systems of the Protected Areas, MCPAs have successfully and significantly increased their management effectiveness. However, according to the TE, while individual MCPAs are more effective, there is little evidence that the MCPA system as a whole is more effective.

b) Governance

One of the most important and meaningful project achievements is one that will affect MCPA governance going forward:

“Most notably, the project resulted in the appreciation within the MNRE that (...) i) there *are* differences between terrestrial protected areas, and marine and coastal protected areas and, as a consequence, these differences need to be taken into account when considering the effective management of MCPAs, ii) that there was a need for resources – human, financial and equipment – for and investment in the MCPAs and iii) some different management techniques are necessary (e.g., satellite monitoring of shipping).” (TE p.30)

The Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment also established a working group on Marine Protected Areas which systematically plans and coordinates activities and management approaches to MCPA. This new governance structure will certainly improve the management of MCPAs going forward.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts were recorded as part of this project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

There is no evidence that project initiatives had been mainstreamed, replicated or scaled up by project end.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE proposes the following key lessons and recommendations:

1. *Get it right from the outset of the project – institutions, ownership and personalities!* These elements need to come together right from the project’s outset – the institutional housing, the NPD, the Project Manager and the team. *Ownership* of the project is one of its key elements as are the *personalities* involved. ^[1]_{SEP}

2. *Systemic prosecution service for foreign fishing vessels.* Prosecuting foreign (fishing) vessels that stray into their protected waters is beyond the capacity and mandate of the protected area staff. A systemic service could have been established to carry out this support work for all MCPAs. [L] [SEP]
3. *The threat of invasive species was underestimated.* The project produced one invasive species plan – for the FEMR1. While there may be significant invasive species threats in the FEMR (as it is beside the international port of Vladivostok), it is odd that invasive species plans were not developed for island systems – particularly the CIZ – because: i) invasive species were identified as a key threat to island systems in the project document and ii) CIZ was identified as a target for developing an invasive species plan. However, it transpires that, for whatever reason and in contradiction to the project document, the MNRE “does not see this problem”. In addition to dealing with invasive species, management of domestic animals and other “weed” species associated with humans and biosafety regarding visitors (including researchers and tourists) to remote islands should have received attention. [L] [SEP]
4. *Interagency issues.* Poor interagency cooperation is something that stifles effectiveness and efficiency in all countries of the world. Therefore, that this project encountered it – specifically between the MNRE and the FAF – is unsurprising. To overcome such issues requires coordination, collaboration and leadership – the sorts of things that require a systemic view. [L] [SEP]
5. *Plan for what can be achieved.* While some degree of ambition is necessary (for GEF project are about overcoming fears and demonstrating success), over-ambition can be lead to disillusion and disappointment. [L] [SEP]
6. *Monitoring of knowledge and awareness, and monitoring impact in general.* Like many others, the project carried out some awareness raising but also like many others, the project neglected to determine the impact that this was having. Ideally, the impacts of activities should be monitored and there are some good tools for measuring the impact on changes of knowledge and behaviour – for example, using an adapted Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) survey. [L] [SEP]
7. *Carry out socio-economic surveys.* The staff of the CIZ regretted not carrying out socio- economic surveys over the course of the project. This would have been useful for a number of reasons, not least because it would allow the impact of the micro-finance grants to be measured. [L] [SEP]
8. *Climate change.* Despite being identified as the single, over-arching threat to Russia’s marine biodiversity, climate change was not mentioned once during the course of the TE mission to Russia and, for example, if and how climate change adaptation was built into management plans. [L] [SEP]

(TE pp.x-xii)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE proposes the following key lessons and recommendations:

1. *Complete the outstanding work* – including a number of publications that needed completion (publications on salmon, sea lions and Gulf of Finland teaching aids for schools). [L] [SEP]
2. *Addendum on management plan guidelines*. The UNDP-GEF project in the Komi Republic produced a set of guidelines for developing management plans for protected areas. The lessons that have been learned in the MCPA project on developing management plans for MCPAs should be included as a brief addendum to this set of guidelines.
3. *Ingermanland zapovednik*. With regard to the Ingermanland *zapovednik*, there are two urgent actions that need to be taken: first, the validity of the documents expires in February 2015. Thus, either the issue needs to be resolved by then or an extension of the validity is requested. Second, the UNDP-CO and its partners should apply whatever political capital they can muster to persuade the Ministry of Defence (via whatever channels are available to them) to urge the Ministry of Defence to approve the document. Lessons should also be learned from the *process* that the project underwent.
4. *Conflict resolution*. The antagonism in the Commander Islands between the staff of the CIZ (and more particularly the Director) and the administration of Nikolskoye (and more specifically the Head of the Administration) needs to be urgently resolved. [L] [SEP]
5. *Complete equipping out of CIZ boat*. Dependent on the availability of funding, the boat could be equipped with useful scientific equipment: GPS units, depth finders/sounder, air compressor, diving equipment, telescope and binoculars, camera equipment, rubber dinghy for landing ashore, underwater sound recording equipment and playback equipment. [L] [SEP]
6. *Re-categorization of CIZ*. Apparently, the decision to re-categorise the CIZ into a National Park (Commander Islands National Park) has already been taken. Planning the implications of and implementing this decision will have to be taken carefully so as not to reduce funding and staffing for the protected area. In addition, the zonation of the national park will also have to be carefully considered. [L] [SEP]
7. *Be ambitious for the coverage of the protected area coverage*. There are many reasons why Russia should continue to expend its MCPA network in the coming years. The precedent has now been set by Gabon with 23% of its EEZ set aside for marine protected areas but other countries are targeting even higher proportions! [L] [SEP]
8. *Broaden the definitions of protected areas*. In a changing world, re-defining protected areas may be useful – especially when one *broadens* the definitions! [L] [SEP]
9. *Treat tourism as an ecosystem service*. In many places across the globe, tourism has been recognised as an ecosystem service to the tourists that visit; if this changed in Russia, fees could

be charged as, apparently, Russian legislation only allows fees to be collected if a service is being provided. [L]
[SEP]

(TE pp.x-xii)

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report contains a good assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project, as well as achievement of objectives.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent and the evidence presented is complete. Most ratings are well substantiated, but some (for example, Project Implementation) could have been more clearly justified.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report discusses sustainability very clearly and provides a good analysis of what will happen following project end.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by evidence and the discussions provided elsewhere in the report. They appear comprehensive.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Total costs and costs per outcome are reported, as well as actual co-financing received by the project. Costs per activity are not provided	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report provides a good analysis of the M&E system, and a good description of how M&E was implemented and some of the issues encountered.	S
Overall TE Rating		S

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

No additional sources were used in the preparation of this TER.