GEF IEO Terminal Evaluation Review form (retrofitting of APR2004 cohort)

This form is for retrofitting of the TERs prepared for APR2004. While several topics covered in this form had already been covered in the earlier form, this revised form adds several other performance and impact related concerns.

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		90	
GEF Agency project ID		P008801	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-1	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Biodiversity Conservation Project	
Country/Countries		Russia	
Region		ECA	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP 2: Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems OP 3: Forest Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Russian Ministry of Natural Resources	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Through consultations (represented on Project Supervisory Board)	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 1994 work program inclusion. (CEO approval date not provided in PMIS or project documentation)	
Effectiveness date / project start		November 1996	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		June 2002	
Actual date of project completion		September 2003	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.795	0.781
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		20.1	17.95
Co-financing	IA/EA own		
	Government	4.8	19.705
	Other*	1.1 from Government of Switzerland	1.2 from Switzerland
Total GEF funding		20.895	17.95.
Total Co-financing		5.9	20.905
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		26.795	38.855
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		March 2004	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Serguei Milenin	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Robert Varley	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Josh Brann	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		July 2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Joshua Schneck	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Neeraj Negi	

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

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the final May 1996 Project Document (PD), the Global Environmental Objectives of the project are "to assist the Russian Federation to maintain optimum levels of biodiversity in accordance with the principles of economic and environmentally sound sustainable development. The project will assist in ensuring the enhanced protection of biodiversity, within and outside protected areas, in conformance with the Government's obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity." (PD, pg 3). According to the PD, biodiversity and the ecosystems that support it in Russia face a number of threats including breakdown in the institutions and networks that coordinate the management of protected areas, as well as a general failure to incorporate environmental concerns into decision-making in the public, private, and community spheres.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As stated in the PD, the Development Objectives of the project are as follows:

I. To support the development of federal and regional biodiversity strategies;
II. To develop and implement mechanisms and approaches that will mainstream biodiversity conservation and environmental protection into the policy making process;
III. To assess the protected area institutional framework and subsequently strengthen its effectiveness;
IV. To enable the participation of all interested stakeholders, including aboriginal peoples and local communities in biodiversity conservation; and
V. To develop an inter-regional demonstration of inter-sectoral biodiversity conservation and environmentally sustainable natural resource management.

To achieve these objectives, the project had four components:

1. *The Strategic Overview Component* (13% of total projected costs) –This component had three subcomponents: (a) development of national and regional biodiversity strategies; (b) biodiversity policy support (supporting the mainstreaming of biodiversity and environmental

values into policy formulation and implementation through analysis and other support); (c) development of a biomonitoring information system.

2. *Strengthening of the Protected Areas System* (53% of total projected costs) – This component had four subcomponents: (a) Institutional support, including support to the federal Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources (MEPNR) and Federal Forest Service (FFS); (b) support to protected areas planning and operations; (c) public support and education programs; (d) ecosystem protection /restoration; (e) training program for protected areas staff.
3. *Lake Baikal regional program* (25% of total projected costs) – This component had five subcomponents: (a) inter-regional biodiversity conservation strategy and action plan; (b)development of model biodiversity conservation activities in three participating regions (Goloustnaya River, Tugnuy-Sukhara Rivers, Khilok River watersheds); (c) local biodiversity activities (small grants to institutions, NGOs, communities, and business to encourage small scale biodiversity programs).
4. *Project management and coordination component* (9% of total projected costs) – supporting the operating costs of a Project Implementation Group (PIG) affiliated with the Ministry of Natural Resources.

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

No changes to the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or activities were noted in the TE. However, the geographical scope of activities under Component 3 (Lake Baikal regional program) increased, with additional co-financing from the Russian government (federal, regional and local budgets) going towards the establishment of 10 new protected areas around Lake Baikal that were not part of the original PD objectives (TE, pg 35).

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 is relevant for both the GEF and Russia. As stated in the PD, the project strengthens conservation, management, and sustainable use of ecosystems and habitats that have been identified as national priorities by the Russian government in official policy documents including the *Environmental*

Framework Program of the Russian Federation, as well as in a larger project prepared by the Government and the IBRD, called the *Environmental Management Project*. Moreover, the project responds to the economic and political disruptions happening in the country at the time, and that affect the institutions that safeguard Russia's natural resources (PD, pg 1). For the GEF the project is aligned with the goals and objectives of Operational Programs 2 and 3, which are focused on the conservation and sustainable use of coastal, marine and freshwater ecosystems, and forest ecosystems, respectively. As stated in the PD, the project promotes the conservation of endangered species including the Nerpa Seal and other plants and animals endemic to Russia (PD, pg 1).

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

According to the TE, the project has been successful in achieving most of its stated objectives. For some objectives, including development of financing mechanisms and participation of aboriginal peoples, the TE is not clear on the extent of achievements. However, overall, the TE provides ample evidence of project effectiveness which is therefore rated satisfactory. Progress is detailed further along each of the five stated objectives:

I. *Support the development of federal and regional biodiversity strategies* – This objective was fully achieved as one federal (the National Biodiversity Conservation Strategy and Action Plan for the Russian Federation) and two model regional biodiversity strategies were completed and adopted by the respective governments (TE, pg 8).
II. *Develop and implement mechanisms and approaches that will mainstream biodiversity conservation and environmental protection into the policy making process* – A number of studies were completed in over 25 regional centers in Russia, and supported by a series of publications, seminars and training events. TE states that outcomes of these studies are being incorporated into federal and regional legislation, regulations, and management guidelines (TE, pg 23). TE provides two examples of economic studies but does not mention any work on financing mechanisms, which was stated in the PD as an expected outcome (PD, pg 4 & 17). Thus, the full extent to which this objective was achieved is not certain.
III. *Assess the protected area institutional framework and subsequently strengthen its effectiveness* – This objective, while difficult to assess as the TE is organized by project components and not objectives, nevertheless appears to have been largely met. TE cites a long list of achievements including strengthening the capacity of federal authorities to administer and further develop the PA system; facilitating cooperation and information sharing between authorities and PA management; developing and implementing management plans that provide improved protection services at 38 PAs covering a total area of 140,000 sq km; providing training for PA managers; and improving law enforcement at PAs (TE pg 24-25).
IV. *Enable the participation of all interested stakeholders, including aboriginal peoples and local communities into biodiversity conservation* – TE states that 110,000 people directly participated in project activities, including local communities, NGOs, business and academia (TE, pg 37). Moreover, a web portal, www.biodat.re (still functional, Josh Schneck, 7/2/2014) was created to

provide access to information on biodiversity are related functions in Russia. TE does not specifically mention participation of aboriginal peoples however.

V. *Develop an inter-regional demonstration of inter-sectoral biodiversity conservation and environmentally sustainable natural resource management* – Under this objective, the project developed the Lake Baikal program which involved three regions. Achievements cited in the TE include preparation of the first Biodiversity Conservation Strategy and Action Plan for the Baikal Region, which was subsequently adopted by the sub-national authorities and endorsed by the federal government. TE also states that the project made a "great contribution" to building environmental awareness in the region and provided the basis for development of 10 regulations supporting protection of Lake Baikal (TE, pg 9). Thus, this objective was fully achieved.

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

While the TE does not directly assess project efficiency or provide a rating, it does provide many indications that the project was cost effective, and overall, implemented in a well-coordinated and efficient manner. The GEF grant was almost fully utilized, and realized co-financing ($20.6 million) was more than four times the expected co-financing ($4.8 million). Additional co-financing was used to support the establishment of 10 new PAs in the Baikal Lake region that were not part of the activities expected in the PD (see section 3.3 above). While a comprehensive set of performance indicators linked to implementation targets and procurement plans was not developed at appraisal as this was not a requirement at the time, they were developed following the Mid-term review, and these indicators appear to have been used to effectively guide implementation activities (TE, pg 10). Some disruption of project activities was linked to the large devaluation of the Russian currency in August 1998, which led to a temporary freezing of the project's account, and delay of project activities in the Baikal region for about 1 year (TE, pg 12). At the same time, the delay did not ultimately affect outcomes. TE notes that project start-up was slow, due in part to the need for the Executing agency to adapt to Bank requirements and procedures (TE, pg 15). Support from the Bank was forthcoming, and TE notes that Bank maintained a close working relationship that helped facilitate implementation throughout the project. Lastly, the TE notes that at two points in project implementation, the organization authorized by the government to implement the project changed, requiring changes in legal title of around 750 project-administered contracts (TE, pg 17). The changes in organization were largely in name only, as there was continuity in project staff, and TE notes that the project management team was effective in managing the transitions and preventing them from impacting project activities, and that project management demonstrated strong commitment to the project in doing so (TE, pg 17).

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

While the TE provides a Likely rating for sustainability of project outcomes, this TER finds moderate risks to sustainability of outcomes, particularly regarding provision of adequate financial resources, and thus assesses sustainability to be Moderately Likely overall.

Sustainability is further assessed along the following four dimensions:

- *Environmental sustainability (**U/A**)* – While TE provides ample evidence of improvements in the management of Russia's PAs, strengthening of protections, and of incorporation of environmental concerns into policy and planning, it does not provide any assessment of the viability of, or threats to, Russia's biodiversity, and thus no rating on environmental sustainability is given here.
- *Financial sustainability (**ML**)* - TE provides a qualitative assessment that prospects for follow-on financing of institutions and objectives supported by this project are good (PAs and government ministries and follow-on projects). The TE does not provide an estimation of future operating costs of PAs and conservation initiatives begun under this project, and whether these are commensurate with anticipated public budgets (TE, pg 13). While such an assessment is likely to have been unfeasible given the resources available for final evaluation and availability of information on public expenditures, financial risks cannot be ruled out, given that long-term financing mechanisms that were intended to be assessed by this project do not appear to have been secured.
- *Socio-political sustainability (**L**)* - TE provides many indications that support for this project from governmental and community stakeholders has been strong, and that this support is likely to continue post-project. Examples cited include strong demonstration impacts in the regions, with management approaches that are being replicated in non-project areas, and funded by public, community, and private resources (TE, pg 13). Moreover, the project was successful in supporting the adoption of policies on sustainable resource use in federal and regional legislation, regulations, and management guidelines (TE, pg 23). Finally, TE notes that project investments are already generating "...considerable economic and social benefits. Public and stakeholder participation in the project has been particularly strong, and there are good incentives for participants to sustain the project results (TE, pg 13).
- *Institutional sustainability (**L**)* - TE finds that the project made considerable strides in strengthening the institutions, information systems, and networks responsible for the sustainable management and protection of Russian's natural resources and biodiversity. These include strengthening the capacity of federal authorities to administer and further develop the PA system; facilitating cooperation and information sharing between authorities and PA management; developing and implementing management plans that provide improved protection services at 38 PAs covering a total area of 140,000 sq km; providing training for PA managers; and improving law enforcement at PAs (TE pg 24-25).

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 significantly higher than expected – $21 million vs $6 million expected – and was used to expand the scope of activities in the Baikal lake region to include support for the establishment on 10 new PAs (TE, pg 13). Overall, co-financing was well integrated into all project activities and was by all accounts key to achieving project outcomes and sustainability, and an indication of strong country support for the project's objectives (TE, pg 16).

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?

Project finished a little over one year after expected date of operational closure. TE notes that project experienced a slow start up as the executing agency needed to get up to speed with WB policies and procedures. Additional delays during project implementation resulted from a massive devaluation of the Russian currency in August 1998, which led to a temporary freezing of the project's account, and delay of project activities in the Baikal region for about 1 year (TE, pg 12). In addition, at two points in project implementation, the organization authorized by the government to implement the project changed, requiring changes in legal title of around 750 project-administered contracts (TE, pg 17). The changes in organization were largely in name only, as there was continuity in project staff, and TE notes that the project management team was effective in managing the transitions and preventing them from impacting project activities. TE finds that delays did not affect project outcomes or sustainability.

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:

TE provides many examples of strong country ownership, including provision of higher than expected co-financing, adoption of several policies, laws and regulations on sustainable resource use that were developed by the project, and strong implementation support with technical issues (TE, pg 16). There were two changes during implementation of the organization authorized by the government to implement the project, however the TE attributes this to organizational changes happening in the Ministry of Natural Resources at the time, and not as any indication of lessoning support for the project. By all accounts in the TE and PIRs, country ownership of the project was key to outcome achievements, as well as sustainability in terms of financing and follow-up of project outcomes.

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: **Satisfactory**

TE does not provide a rating for M&E design. The following is based on a reading of the PD and PIRs. Project design called for development of a robust M&E system throughout the project. These included plans for a mid-term review and workshop, establishment of a Joint International Expert Council on Protected Areas to evaluate PA-related project components, and linkages (for evaluative purposes) to the Government of Russia's inter-ministerial Commission for Environmental Protection and Nature Resource Management (PD, Annex 5.1). In addition, while the project lacked performance indicators and targets (they were subsequently developed following MTR and were not required of GEF projects at the time), the PD does provide an extensive set of M&E criteria for each of the project components that were in fact taken up in the design of project indicators (see below) (PD, pg 107). PD also stipulates that all nature reserve management plans supported by the project include discussion of M&E requirements. Lastly, project design included a detailed supervision plan that defined activities to monitor, and who is responsible for monitoring. While M&E activities are not separately budgeted for, PD indicates that they are to be funded through the project management allocation. Overall, a good M&E design for a project of this vintage.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

Implementation of project M&E was effective and, with the development of a comprehensive set of performance indicators following the MTR, was an improvement upon the M&E design at entry. While the indicators developed lack targets in some cases (ex., *Increased level of public participation by beneficiaries in all stages of project management and in conservation activities*) they manage to cover all the activity groupings that comprise the project. TE notes that project results were reviewed and discussed by all concerned governmental and non-governmental stakeholders, both nation-wide and in the regions, as part of the project completion activities and that a detailed (150 page) technical report on project outputs and outcomes was disseminated by the Ministry of Natural Resources to stakeholders, and made publically available in Russian and English, including via the internet (TE, pg 10). Detailed accounting for all project expenditures was achieved – no small task given the size of the project and the number of activities involved – and TE notes that the Bank maintained close supervision in this regard, and that implementation problems, when they did occur, were identified in a timely manner and were addressed adequately and proactively (TE, pg 15). PIRs were informative, and TE notes that project performance ratings were an appropriate reflection of project performance.

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 executing 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: **Satisfactory**

By all accounts in the TE, project implementation was satisfactory, with only minor shortcomings related to a slow implementation start and some minor weaknesses in M&E indicators (see section 6.2). TE notes that project execution problems were identified in a timely manner and were addressed, with the help of the Bank, adequately and proactively (TE, pg 15). Project performance was reviewed regularly as part of Bank supervisory visits, and Bank maintained "close supervision and provided extensive support to the Recipient on implementation matters" (TE, pg 15). TE also notes that Bank was responsive to the financial crisis which struck in 1998 (details not provided in TE), and made procurement procedures more flexible during the course of the project, to allow the project management unit to streamline implementation of multiple small tasks. MTR findings were taken up, including through the development of performance indicators.

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

Project execution had some minor shortcomings related to project delays at start up and two transfers of management, but by and large, the executing agency was successful in satisfactory managing project activities in this large and complex project. TE notes that at two points in project implementation, the organization authorized by the government to implement the project changed, requiring changes in legal title of around 750 project-administered contracts (TE, pg 17). The changes in organization were largely in name only, as there was continuity in project staff, and TE notes that the project management team was effective in managing the transitions and preventing them from impacting project activities, and that project management demonstrated strong commitment to the project in doing so (TE, pg 17). Project supervisory board, consisting of Project and Component Directors, and representatives of the Federal Forest Service, Russian Academy of Sciences, Environmental Research Institute of the Ministry of Natural Resources, and three leading national environmental NGOs, was established as called for in the PD, and was effective in providing support and technical assistance to the project.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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.

No changes in environmental stress or status resulting from the project are documented in the TE.

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 not providing any details, TE notes that the project's demonstration activities have made strong impacts in the regions, with management approaches that are being replicated in non-project areas, and funded by public, community, and private resources, and project investments that are already generating "...considerable economic and social benefits"(TE, pg 13). As a result of the project, "a set of fourteen modern comprehensive textbooks for the graduate-level educational programs were developed and approved for use in higher educational establishments" (TE, pg 23). An extensive public awareness and environmental education campaign was supported by the project, and is reported to have increased public support for PAs in Russia (TE, pg 26).

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 – A number studies were completed in over 25 regional centers in Russia, and supported by a series of publications, seminars and training events. TE states that outcomes of these studies are being incorporated into federal and regional legislation, regulations, and management guidelines (TE, pg 23). TE cites a long list of achievements regarding protected areas management capacity including strengthening the capacity of federal authorities to administer and further develop the PA system; facilitating cooperation and information sharing between authorities and PA management; developing and implementing management plans that provide improved protection services at 38 PAs covering a total area of 140,000 sq km; providing training for PA managers; and improving law enforcement at PAs (TE pg 24-25).

b) Governance – Project is reported to have succeeded in strengthening protection services at 35 federal nature reserves and 3 national parks. New management plans were completed and are being implemented in 2 reserves and 5 national parks. The total area covered by improved protection is 14 million hectares, which is 40% of Russia's total federal protected areas system (TE, pg 37). Moreover, the project was successful in supporting the adoption of policies on sustainable resource use in federal and regional legislation, regulations, and management guidelines (TE, pg 23).

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 are reported to have occurred as a result of the 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.

Project is reported to have been successful in establishing the basis to bring many of the project's piloted approaches to scale, primarily through supporting the adoption of policies on sustainable resource use in federal and regional legislation, regulations, and management guidelines (TE, pg 23). According to the TE, regional strategies and action plans on biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of natural resources have been adopted and are being implemented in 5 regions. Twenty more regions initiated preparation of action plans using their own funding. Moreover, an extensive public awareness and environmental education campaign was supported by the project, and is reported to have increased public support for PAs in Russia (TE, pg 26). Much of the project's success regarding adoption of GEF initiatives as scale appear to have come about through effective targeting of leverage points (legislation, management plans, education awareness programs) that were implemented with strong government and stakeholder support.

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.

TE provides the following key lessons:

- High quality local technical expertise is available in Russia to support the implementation of conservation programs. However, the local institutional infrastructure for providing respective consulting and advisory services is underdeveloped, and the experience in bidding for, and

performing the competitively awarded complex consulting assignments in the sector is still insufficient. There is a need to facility respective institutional change by further adapting the procurement processes.

- The small grants program targeted at local organizations for protected areas management has been an effective vehicle in delivering support and strengthening capacity.
- Close interaction and coordination between the protected areas and the regional/local public education authorities is required to maximize the effectiveness of the protected area-based education programs.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

TE provides the following recommendations:

- Subsequent efforts on conservation in Russia should focus on integrating protected areas into the growth of the local economy based on increased ecosystem services.
- External advisory support to protected areas with respect to management planning is required and should continue in Russia.
- There should be expanded use of Russia's network of PAs for environmental education and awareness-raising.
- There should be accelerated development of interconnected networks of federal, regional and local PAs with relevant conservation regimes within globally important ecoregions of Russia
- There is a need for adaptation of emerging tools for agricultural land market regulation to support the restoration of ecosystem services in the most heavily degraded agrarian regions in South-Central Russia.

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?	TE does an adequate job of assessing relevant outcome and impact of the project. More detail could have been provided on the content of management plans and legislation supported by the project and the extent to which implementation of these policies has led to substantive changes on the ground.	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	In general, TE appears to be insufficiently critical. Although much evidence is provided regarding the extent to which project activities were executed and resulting outcomes, there is insufficient detail on the extent to which implementation of project activities has led to substantive changes on the ground vis a vis natural resource management. TE also does not discuss participation of indigenous people which was an intended outcome discussed in the PD.	**MS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Project sustainability lacks a discussion of the cost of maintaining the various programs, action plans, and investments generated by the project, and whether they are commensurate with budgetary support and projections going forward. In other regards, discussion of project sustainability is reasonable.	**MU**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are reasonable, although more detail could have been provided. For example, small grants program is noted as being effective, but there is no discussion about why it was effective (perhaps it was an effective tool for increasing participation in PA management in Russia?)	**MS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Yes, TE reports actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used.	**HS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE does not rate M&E systems nor adequately discuss their design or implementation. TE does note general aspects of project M&E implementation, and the development of M&E indicators, but does not provide sufficient detail to understand extent to which M&E systems functioned effectively in project management.	**MU**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

Overall TE rating = (0.3 * (5+4)) + (0.1 * (3+4+6+3)) = 2.7 + 1.7 = 4.4 = MS

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