1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		539	
GEF Agency project ID		P008562	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Forest Biodiversity Protection	
Country/Countries		Poland	
Region		ECA	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP 3	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environment Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not involved	
Private sector involvement		Not involved.	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		May 1, 1991	
Effectiveness date / project start		Feb 19, 1992	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		Oct 31 1994	
Actual date of project completion		Dec 31, 1995	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		4.5	4.5
Co-financing	IA own		0
	Government	1.4	3.6 (Poland), 0.3 (Austria)
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.3	0
	Private sector		0
	NGOs/CSOs		0
Total GEF funding		4.5	4.5
Total Co-financing		1.7	3.9
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.2	8.4
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		Feb 25, 1998	
TE submission date		Feb 25, 1998	
Author of TE		Emilia Battaglini, Jamison Suter, Andrew Bond, Stephen Berwick	
TER completion date		December 3, 2014	
TER prepared by		Dania M Trespalacios	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective is to conserve the biological diversity of the Bialowieza Primeval Forest and foster the protection of the remaining biodiversity in the Sudety Mountain Forest in Poland. (PD pg. 8) The Bialowieza and Sudety Mountain forests of Poland are important zones of ecological biodiversity, supporting threatened and endangered species found nowhere else, and they are among Europe's largest expanse of remaining natural forests and areas of high endemism. (PD pg. 2) The forests are threatened by pollution, pests, and inappropriate land use for biodiversity protection (PD pg. 1, 4).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of this project is to provide the Polish government with support to assess the environmental damages to Poland's forests, and to support biodiversity protection in the Sudety Mountains and the Bialowieza Forest. Polish foresters would benefit from the modern approaches to biodiversity protection and management (PD pg. 2)

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

There were **some changes** to the Global and Developmental objectives of this project, as they are stated differently in the Project Document and the Terminal Evaluation.
The Project Document states that the project objectives are to initiate programs that would conserve the biodiversity of key endangered forests, and to provide support to Poland's Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources and Forestry to undertake biodiversity conservation management activities. (PD pg. 3) The TE states that the two objectives of the project are (1) to protect globally significant Polish forest biological diversity at four different levels – genetic, species, association and landscape level - through a balanced approach between in-situ and ex-situ conservation measures, and (2) to define and realize Pilot Phase GEF objectives, including global environmental benefits, innovation, demonstration value and replicability, contribution to the GEF portfolio, sustainability, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. (TE pg. iv)

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 project outcomes are consistent with the GEF's Biodiversity focal area. The forests targeted by this project have been identified as having global biodiversity significance by UNESCO, and by NGOs such as WWF. They support threatened and endangered species found nowhere else, and they offer the "best opportunity" to explore the preservation and management of natural forests in Europe. (PD pg. 1,3)

The project is consistent with Poland's priorities. It was given a high priority by the Polish government, which did not have sufficient funds to carry out the project, and was not willing to borrow at high rates to acquire funding for this project. (PD pg. 2) The TE reports that Poland almost certainly would not have funded such activities on its own at the time. (TE pg. 7)
The project supports Poland's environmental policy framework. (PD pg. 2) The project was one of many activities that the Polish government embarked on to change the way publicly owned natural resources are managed. The project helped to introduce multiple-objective forest management in a country where timber production had been essentially the sole objective. (TE pg. 4)

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The Project Document states that the project objectives were to initiate programs that would conserve the biodiversity of key endangered forests, and to provide support to Poland's Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources and Forestry to undertake biodiversity conservation management activities. (PD pg. 3) To achieve this objective, the Project Document prescribes two major project components:

1- In-situ conservation of biological diversity in the Bialowieza Primeval Forest
2- Ex-situ biodiversity protection in the Sudety Mountains

The Project Document assigns specific activities with defined budgets for each component. (PD pg. 6, 8-14) These activities, and the project's progress towards these activities as reported in the TE, are listed in Table 1.

Table 1- Project Components, Activities, and Achievements

Component 1- In-Situ Conservation of Biodiversity of Bialowieza Forest	Project Achievements	Achieved
• Conservation of Biodiversity in Bialowieza Forest. This includes: - Risk assessment of pollution load on individual sites, including a mobile air and soil monitoring station, an X ray sampling machine, and a high power PC with cartographic plotter - Collection and storage of seed and plant parts - In-situ conservation of native populations, including a 1.2 ha clonal seed production stand - Determination of genetic diversity - Technical equipment support for field and laboratory activities, including electric power stabilization equipment	- Assessment of impacts of current economic activities on the forest, including impacts of pollution. (TE pg. 23) - Several species discovered in Bialowieza Forest, a few that are new to science. Genetic analyses were completed for several important tree species. (TE pg. 25) - Project supported training and technical assistance for the Polish State Forests Administration to undertake such activities during and beyond implementation. (TE pg. 3) - TE does not mention the mobile air and soil monitoring station, X-ray sampling machine, high power PC, clonal seed production stand.	Mostly/ Partly
• Bialowieza Forest Protection and Management. This includes: - Expansion of protected areas - Conservation planning - Supporting applied research in social and economic studies, forest pattern studies, and forest ecosystem processes - Applying environmental impact evaluations - Establishing a Man and the Biosphere Secretariat at Bialowieza - Meeting in 1993 to review project and create plan for future investments.	- Expansion of National Park. Surrounding areas designated as buffer zones. (TE pg. 4) - 125 studies completed on forest protection, natural regeneration, pollution monitoring and reduction, ecological farming and biodiversity protection. (TE pg. 17) - Implementation of the Bialowieza Forest Management Plan's land-use recommendations (TE pg. 23) - A 3-day Town Meeting held in Bialowieza in December 1994, attended by 300+ people from State Forests, National Parks, research institutes, NGOs, government and communities, made the State Forest Agency realize the importance of participatory approaches. (TE pg. 24) - Man and the Biosphere Secretariat established. (TE pg. v) - Environmental Impact Evaluations not mentioned by the TE.	Mostly
• Design and promote GIS-assisted, integrated land-use zoning and conservation planning at the landscape level	The project introduced GIS for land-use planning and forest management (TE pg. vi, 6)	Yes
• Ecological Farming. The project would foster the expansion of ecological farming practices and provide technical assistance and cash incentives to shift to ecologically friendly farming practices. The project would research the different impacts of conventional and sustainable agriculture on farm yields, soil and water quality, and costs.	- Timber extraction plans are reportedly more ecologically sensitive. There is increasing awareness of the unique nature of the Bialowieza Forest, and a desire of local residents to maintain this resource and to develop ecologically sensitive economic activities. (TE pg. 24) - No new economic activities integrating conservation and development were initiated as a result of the project. New, more sensitive forestry practices have been	Partly

	defined for the forest buffer zones. (TE pg. 24)	
• Pollution Monitoring & Mitigation	- 3 pollution reduction investments- 2 for air pollution and 1for sewage treatment, were funded. These activities raised the project's profile locally, but their impact on the forest will not be known since future monitoring of pollution was not planned. (TE pg. 24) - Baseline pollution data collected. (TE pg. 25)	Yes
• Scientific Cooperation with Belarus on Forest Management, including quarterly meetings at the Bialowieza Station.	- Collaboration with Belarusians (meetings between administrators and scientists) was initiated. (TE pg. 25)	Yes
• Professional Development and Training	- Increased capacity to manage the Bialowieza Nat. Park, thanks to multiple training activities. (TE pg. 23) - The training supported by the project was generally highly appreciated, and succeeded in introducing new approaches and tools. (TE pg. 22)	Yes
• Establishment of the Bialowieza Primeval Forest Foundation	(TE refers to the foundation funding project elements on pg. 25)	Yes
Component 2- Ex-situ biodiversity protection of the Sudety Mountains	**Project Achievements**	**Achieved**
• Assessment and seed collection. This includes: - GIS hazards mapping - Development of plans for biodiversity conservation - Collection of seeds and branch tips	- Mixed conifer and hardwood stands employing local native seed sources were established as a pilot ecological restoration project. (TE pg. 5) - Recommendations for restoration of Sudety ecosystems were made, but no firm plans were devised. (TE pg. 26) - Capacity established to use new GIS equipment. (TE pg. 26)	Yes
• Gene bank facility, combined with commercial seed extraction and storage	- Gene bank was constructed, equipped and opened in December 1995. Large quantities of seeds from commercial tree species were stored, seeds and buds/shoots from non-tree and non-commercial species were collected in limited quantities. (TE pg. 26) - To overcome the lack of adequate seed storage facilities a number of collections were grown in the bare root nursery and in a series of plastic green houses near the gene bank. (TE pg. 5)	Yes
• Air pollution monitoring, with international team in Holland, Norway and Sweden	Not achieved.	No
• Professional Development and Training	- Training in ecology and conservation biology was insufficient and should have occurred early in the project. TE pg. 6) - Too few people received training in the operation of certain equipment, like pollution monitoring instruments, to ensure its continued use. (TE pg. 8)	Partly
• Czech/Polish Joint Scientific Committee	- Productive international cooperation	Yes

for the Sudety Mts. that will meet semiannually.	surpassed original project expectations. It was quick to take root and flourish between Poland and four of its neighbors. The first workshop on biodiversity conservation in trans-boundary areas was held jointly with Ukraine and Slovakia in 1994, to support the development of the tri-national park in the Carpathians. (TE pg. 4) - International cooperation fora were created with scientists in the Czech Republic, resulting in regular and productive meetings, in sharing of data related to forestry, pollution and other topics, and in a joint publication. (TE pg. 27)	

From Table 1, it is clear that the project achieved most, though not all, of the expected activities as described in the Project Document. The project successfully met the objectives stated in the Project Document of conserving the biodiversity of the Bialowieza Forest and Sudety Mountains, and of supporting and strengthening Poland's capacity for biodiversity conservation management. The project also met the revised objectives stated in the TE of defining and realizing Pilot Phase GEF objectives. (TE pg. iv)

Although nearly all of the work planned was vigorously pursued, some project activities fulfilled and exceeded their objectives while other activities did not fulfill expectations. This was due to a lack of lack of legal requirements, poor subcontractors, and a lack of common understanding by the project management unit. The activities involving land use zoning/planning, the foreign technical assistance, public participation, and the Man and the Biosphere Secretariat were of particular high value. (TE pg. 4)

The TE concludes that the Bialowieza Forest Conservation Component was successful, but it was "unwilling to make a final judgment on the success of the Sudety Mountains" Component, since the collection of plant material for the gene bank had not been completed as planned during project implementation. (TE pg. 5)

The TE reports that, overall, the project produced satisfactory results. (TE pg. 4) The World Bank's Independent Evaluation Office concurs with this rating. Finding minor shortcomings in the project's delivery of expected outcomes, effectiveness is rated satisfactory.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The project end date was extended by 14 months to allow completion of all project activities, and total project costs increased from $6.2 million to $8.4 million. While some project activities were completed at a lower cost than was originally appraised, other activities were completed at a much higher cost. (TE pg. 16) The gene bank component of the project almost doubled its cost during project life due to an expansion in design and an unexpected increase in construction costs. The implementation of this component was delayed but eventually completed mostly with government financing. (TE pg. 8) The TE does not comment on project efficiency. Because the project was delayed, and required a 35% increase of funds over its initial appraisal amount, project efficiency is rated moderately satisfactory.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately Likely**

Financial Risks – Sustainability Moderately Likely

The Bialowieza Forest Conservation component did not create the financial means to continue project activities. Without having significantly bolstered the economic case for protecting the greater Bialowieza Forest complex, conservation advocates are lacking critical justifications for limiting the Bialowieza Forest's buffer zones to conservation-friendly economic activities only. (TE pg. 8) Poland's State Forest Agency appears committed to maintaining the gene bank financially, and has plans to add a conservation education center to the gene bank, although funds for the education center are lacking. (TE pg. 9, 26) It seems some project components are very likely to have financial sustainability after project completion, while others face financial uncertainty.

Socio-political Risks – Sustainability Likely

The TE reports that Polish officials confirmed repeatedly that the project supported an attitudinal shift towards more ecologically sensitive forestry. (TE pg. 4) Participation of NGOs, universities and other local entities gave visibility to the project and ensured its social sustainability. (TE pg. 10)

The experience exposed the Polish State Forestry Agency and communities and leaders around Bialowieza Forest to new ideas regarding decision-making, and persuaded representatives of the State Forest agency that training in participatory planning, conflict mediation and resolution, and public relations strategies could be useful for similar future efforts. At the local level, local awareness was raised, and local communities became involved in conservation actions in the Bialowieza Forest. (TE pg. 9)

Environmental Risks- Sustainability Likely

The long-term biological integrity of the BPF ecosystem is now undeniably better protected than prior to the project, (TE pg. 8)

Institutional Risks – Sustainability Likely

The value of activities like GIS mapping, interdisciplinary research or participatory planning is much better appreciated and is likely to be used again and refined in the future. (TE pg. 8) The TE reports that the ministerial decree of 1995 and the proposals for project follow–up are proof that the Ministry is committed to "changing its modus operandi". (TE pg. 8) The communication initiated between Polish institutions (SFA/IBL, universities, National Parks, local communities), and between Poland and neighboring countries, is increasing and producing good results. (TE pg. 8) Technologically, the gene bank, pollution monitoring equipment and GIS software remain appropriate for the State Forestry Agengys needs, the State Forest Agency appears committed to maintaining the gene bank, and their maintenance and/or continued use are likely. (TE pg. 9)

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?

The project expected $1.7 million in co-financing at appraisal. By project end, the project received $3.9 million in co-financing from the governments of Poland and Austria. The TE states that the bilateral financing foreseen at project appraisal did not come through and the respective project components had to be modified to be realized within the available resources. (TE pg. 8) It seems clear that co-financing was very important to the achievement of GEF objectives, since it represented more than 45% of the project's total budget.

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?

The project end date was delayed by 14 months, according to the TE, to provide sufficient time to finish all of the project's components. The TE reports that project implementation was delayed because of the recipient's lack of experience with the World Bank's operations, particularly as concerns procurement and project accounting. (TE pg. 8)

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:

It seems country ownership was at first not uniformly high, but strengthened during project implementation, to the great benefit of the project. The TE reports that during project preparation, line ministries and government institutions did not always provide full support, and provided only partial input. As project implementation continued, the institutions involved began to take a proactive role, which ultimately led to the project's success and sustainability. (TE pg. 10)

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: **Highly Unsatisfactory**

The Project Document does not mention monitoring and evaluation activities directly, but states that the Project Management Unit would be responsible for submitting quarterly

progress reports to the World Bank. (PD pg. 4) The Project Document does not mention an M&E plan, and does not prescribe the determination of baseline data, nor evaluation studies performed at specific times with a specific budget. The TE states that there were no key implementation or operation indicators defined in the project document. (TE pg. 15) The TE also states that no monitoring mechanisms were established to measure impacts of certain components, including fuel switching, Bialowieza foundation funded activities, and conservation-friendly economic activities. (TE pg. 4)

> "At the outset, the project did not clearly define what constituted successful achievement of the project objectives. Objectively verifiable indicators were simply left implicit. In this situation, any progress towards meeting the objectives could have been construed as success, and "satisfactory" progress was left open to individual interpretations and expectations, which varied tremendously considering the context in which the project was conceived and implemented." (TE pg. 3)

The lack of monitoring mechanism to measure the impacts of project components is also mentioned by the Polish Forestry Department's comments to the TE. (TE Appendix A) In response to the absence of a M&E plan, and "ill-defined GEF-specific objectives", the project developed specific indicators, and timelines for activities, during project implementation. (TE pg. 3, TE pg. 35- 39)

It is clear that the M&E plan at entry was entirely absent, without indicators, baselines, timeline for evaluation events, or any other specific M&E components. Thus M&E design at entry is rated highly unsatisfactory.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

Due to the complete lack of an M&E plan at the start of the project, M&E activities were developed during the course of the project. The TE explains that, due to uneven identification of success indicators for project components, the evaluation mission judged success against the prevailing conditions in Poland and in the GEF at the time of project preparation, and the mission also devised Indicators for project objectives and components ex-post facto. (TE pg. 4, 35-39)

The World Bank carried out at least 8 supervision missions throughout project, twice a year in 1993, 1994, 1995, and the final mission in 1996 during project completion (TE pg. 18) The TE explains that the World Bank's supervision and evaluation focused on reviews with managers and scientists directly benefiting from GEF support, and did not include stakeholders involved in public meetings, land use plans, environmental education, etc. Thus the World Bank's evaluations were limited on the ability to understand and fully evaluate the project impact and sustainability. (TE pg. 9)

Despite the project's attempt to develop useful indicators after project completion, and constant supervision missions on the part of the Word Bank, there are noticeable shortcomings in M&E implementation, thus it is rated moderately unsatisfactory.

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.

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

The implementing agency was the World Bank. The WB carried out more than 8 supervision missions throughout the project. (TE pg. 18) Supervision was intensive, particularly in the first half of project implementation. The TE reports that the WB's missions were staffed with professionals having appropriate technical expertise to address both the country and GEF's priorities in protecting biological diversity. (TE pg. 9) At project start, the appraisal mission made sure that all major institutions participated fully in project design, and thus most institutions involved in project implementation took a proactive role establishing the basis for project success and sustainability. (TE pg. 10)

The TE points out that poor integration of sub-components into the larger project limited the impact of the project, mostly due to inadequate systems planning at project preparation, lack of critical path analysis during implementation (TE pg. 8) It also states that more operational support could have been provided during implementation, particularly on financial issues, procurement, disbursement and project accounting. (TE pg. 9)

Both the TE and the World Bank's Evaluation Office rate the World Bank's performance in this project as satisfactory. However, the M&E Design at the start of project was highly unsatisfactory, and the World Bank shares responsibility for this poor performance. On this account, quality of project implementation is downgraded from satisfactory to moderately satisfactory.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The executing agency was the Polish Ministry of Environment Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry- MENRF. The MENRF established a Project Management Unit (PMU), supervised by a project manager appointed by the Minister, that would be responsible for coordinating project operations, and for submitting quarterly progress reports to the WB. (PD pg. 4)

The TE reports that the appointment of very qualified, independent and very committed professionals within the PMU ensured a smooth implementation of the project, relatively consistent with the original design. (TE pg. 8) The Polish government's performance during project preparation needed improvement, and its performance improved during project implementation because of the high professionalism and commitment of the PMU director and his staff. (TE pg. 10) The performance of project consultants and contractors was satisfactory, with one exception in the Ecological Farming component. All main legal covenants were met in a timely fashion. The PMU's administrative skills improved during implementation; training and

technical assistance were provided as planned and all legal requirements were met. (TE pg. 10) Thus, the quality of project execution is rated satisfactory.

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 TE reports that the long-term biological integrity of the BPF ecosystem is now undeniably better protected than prior to the project (TE pg. 8) The project convinced the Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources and Forestry to double the size of the Bialowieza National Park and to declare the surrounding area a forest promotion complex designed to protect biodiversity while permitting controlled resource extraction outside the park. (TE pg. 23)

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.

The TE provides evidence that there is improved communication between the State Forest Agency and the many community stakeholders that use and depend on the forests. (TE pg. 6)

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- The TE reports the following changes in capacity:

- Productive international cooperation was quick to take root and flourish between Poland and four of its neighbors. It occurred more rapidly between scientists, and more slowly between managers and administrators. Under the project, the first workshop on biodiversity conservation in transboundary areas was held jointly with Ukraine and Slovakia in 1994, to support the development of the tri-national park in the Carpathians. (TE pg. 4)

- The project introduced new processes of making management decisions to Poland's State Forest Administration. (TE pg. 5) These new paradigms of forest management and new methods of decision-making will have a positive long-term impact on all the biodiversity contained in Poland's state-owned forests. (TE pg. 6)
- The project funded a significant amount of largely high-quality biological, ecological, pollution-related, sociological and economic research, intended to provide the basis on which to construct plans for future conservation and sustainable use in Bialowieza Forest. (TE pg. 5)
- The project has strengthened the perception of Bialowieza Forest as a unique and valuable resource that is worth protecting in spite of lost short-term economic opportunities. (TE pg. 5)
- The project disseminated experiences and lessons through numerous publications, international committees, and extensive domestic and international travel by the project manager to discuss the challenges and results of the project. (TE pg. 7)
- The gene bank, pollution monitoring equipment and GIS software remain appropriate for SFA's needs, and their maintenance and/or continued use are likely. (TE pg. 9)
- Capacity building improved the technical expertise of those managing the ex-situ conservation facilities. The scientific capacity to study and monitor the biological resources of the Sudety Mountains, and to collaborate with Czech counterparts, is strong. (TE pg. 9)
- Baseline information collected on numerous indicator species, forest associations and forest dynamics. Baseline pollution data collected. Attitudinal and demographic surveys conducted. (TE pg. 25)
- The project improved the enabling environment for conservation, which includes the scientific knowledge base of the resources, the priorities and technical and managerial capacity of staff charged with their management, the genetic stock with which to pursue restoration activities, the institutional and legal context for conservation, the appropriate mechanisms to ensure drawing lessons from experience, domestic and international information sharing mechanisms and fora, the economic opportunities and restrictions created by conservation needs, and the general public's awareness of attitudes towards and participation in conservation. (TE pg. 6)

b) Governance - The TE reports the following changes in governance:

- The project introduced multiple-objective forest management in Poland, where timber production had been essentially the sole objective. This change in motivation is evident in the Minister of Environment's decrees in late 1995, as well as in the project follow-up proposal, requesting GEF assistance for the Forestry Education Center which is envisioned as a center for training in multiple-objective, ecologically sensitive forest management. TE pg. 5)
- The project removed barriers, where the barriers were attitudes and entrenched practices in the forestry sector. The Poland Forestry Loan (FY94) and the ministerial decrees creating forest promotion complexes are proof that the project reduced such barriers. (TE pg. 7)
- The project led to the creation of the tri-national Transcarpathian Conservation Trust, a foundation for international cooperation to conserve the Trans-Carpathian Mountains, shared by Poland, Ukraine and the Slovak Republic. (TE pg. 22)
- Two management plans for Biosphere reserves at Bialowieza and Karkonosze National Parks were completed. (TE Appendix A)

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.

The TE reports that the project helped to get tri-lateral cooperation in the Carpathians. During preparation, assistance to a proposal for a cross-border park with Slovakia and Ukraine was proposed. However, it was decided that the available funds could not cover effective interventions at all three proposed sites and it was decided to drop the support for the Carpathians. This idea is being implemented in another GEF funded 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.

The TE reports the following GEF initiatives adopted at scale:

- Various technologies and paradigms, like GIS-assisted land-use planning and Forest Promotion Complexes, we applied to areas beyond the original target sites. (TE pg. 7)
- The Bialowieza initiative was expanded to the neighboring Beloveskaya Forest in Belarus. (TE pg. 7)
- Preliminary restoration efforts in the Polish Sudety Mountains were extended to the Sudety Mountains in the Czech Republic. (TE pg. 7)
- The gene bank was expanded to store genetic materials from more sources than were originally planned. (TE pg. 7)
- The project led to the creation of the tri-national Transcarpathian Conservation Trust, a foundation for international cooperation to conserve the Trans-Carpathian Mountains, shared by Poland, Ukraine and the Slovak Republic. (TE pg. 22)

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 lists the following lessons learned:

- In-situ conservation is more cost-effective than ex-situ conservation, and the time horizon of the threat and outside social and economic forces are factors to consider when allocating scarce resources. Without directly linking in-situ restoration activities to ex-situ conservation, the usefulness of the latter is jeopardized. (TE pg. 7)
- The project was intended to test a balance of in-situ and ex-situ conservation, depending upon the imminence of the threat on the environment. To date, it has demonstrated that in-situ conservation is more cost-effective than ex-situ conservation, and that the time horizon of the threat and outside social and economic forces are factors to consider when allocating scarce resources. Furthermore, it teaches that without directly linking in-situ restoration activities to ex-situ conservation, the usefulness of the latter is jeopardized. (TE pg. viii)

- By today's standards, the project seems under designed. The project design lacked sufficient in-situ actions to follow through on what it initiated. At BPF, for example, the project developed management options that were not binding (until a later ministerial decree made them so); and it did not develop a management plan for the National Park (although it provided a large and focused database for the development of a future management plan which has subsequently been adopted based in large part on the GEF project results). The lack of explicit targets and indicators for measuring progress against implementation plans and project objectives prevented the assessment of success, cost-effectiveness and basic usefulness of most components throughout implementation. Training was insufficient and should have occurred early in the project, integrated through systems analysis into the project. (TE pg. viii)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE does not list any specific recommendations.

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 TE documents relevant outcomes and impacts, and comments on the achievement of project objectives. It does not state the project components and activities as they appear in the Project Document, and does not explain why it states components and objectives differently.	**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.	**S**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE addresses project sustainability very thoroughly.	**HS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by the evidence presented, but there are no recommendations listed.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE provides and detailed and clear report of project costs in total, by activity, by year spent, and by type of fund.	**HS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE recognizes that there was no M&E plan at project start, and documents the attempts made during project implementation to develop M&E activities. However, it seems the TE does not assign any importance to M&E activities, as they are not rated, nor given explicit discussion in any part of the document.	**HU**
Overall TE Rating		**S**

0.3 × (a + b) + 0.1 × (c + d + e + f) = 0.3(10) + 0.1(18) = 3+1.8 =4.8 ~5

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

The World Bank's Independent Office evaluation of this project was used for this TER.