

ANNEX 1 TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE TERMINAL EVALUATION

Final Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF Project

“Conservation and Sustainable Use of Wild Salmonid Biological Diversity
in Russia’s Kamchatka Peninsula”
00014641

I. INTRODUCTION

UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and final evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation. A final evaluation of a GEF-funded project (or previous phase) is required before a concept proposal for additional funding (or subsequent phases of the same project) can be considered for inclusion in a GEF work program. However, a final evaluation is not an appraisal of the follow-up phase.

Final evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects.

Project objectives

The objective of this project is the conservation and sustainable use of salmonid biological diversity in four river systems on Russia’s Kamchatka Peninsula. Upon successful completion of the project, stakeholders will devise innovative and adaptive ecosystem management practices to mitigate and prevent threats to river ecosystem integrity and apply new partnerships, conservation tools, information, and sustainable livelihoods to conserve salmonid diversity maintained therein.

GEF support secures the global benefits of conserving salmonid diversity of actual and potential value for food and aquaculture. The project should enable stakeholders to make the financial and policy commitments necessary, protect crucial salmonid habitat by establishing protected areas and participatory management regimes, construct a diversity information baseline by conducting field surveys, lay the foundation for long-term financing of salmonid diversity conservation, pilot diversity-friendly commercial fishing practices and sport-fishing ecotourism, forge new partnerships among local and international stakeholders, and strengthen the capacity of civil society institutions.

Project location: Kamchatka Kray

Project sites: four river systems along the Western Coast of the Kamchatka Peninsula: 1) the Bolshaya; 2) the Kol/Kekhta; 3) the Sopochnaya; and 4) the Utkholok/Kvachina.

The main expected outcomes of the project are:

- Improved fishery management practices for salmonid diversity conservation purposes
- River ecosystem integrity is conserved in four sites using a variety of conservation tools and approaches
- Implementation of educational programs, information sharing, preservation of indigenous peoples’ knowledge, and awareness raising build constituencies for salmon diversity conservation in four river sites
- Stakeholders successfully develop alternative livelihoods in river site areas
- Sustainable financing for salmonid conservation

The project is executed by the Federal Agency for Fisheries of the Russian Federation with participation of Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology, Sevostroybvd, Kamchatka Kray Administration, KamchatNIRO, Moscow State University, Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Wild Salmon Centre and other partners. Project implementation is conducted by the Project Implementation Unit situated in Petropavlosk-Kamchatsky, and overall management of the project is the responsibility of Project Manager, who is a full time employee of the project.

Originally the project was planned as a first phase of a longer intervention addressing Kamchatka salmon diversity. Therefore, many of the original project's activities and outputs were of preparatory nature that should have led to the second phase. Since the beginning of the project, GEF priorities in the biodiversity focal area have changed significantly. Russian developmental context has also changed considerably over the last 5 years. As a result the second project phase may not be developed and implemented as planned. To accommodate this change, the current project plans were reviewed by the project stakeholders in order to (a) better focus project activities; (2) ensure that priority outputs and outcomes are sustainable; (3) avoid risks of investing project resources into interim activities/outcomes that will not be further pursued or supported. These changes were discussed among project stakeholders and reported to UNDP/GEF. This should be taken into account by the evaluation mission while analyzing the project implementation vs the original project document.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

This Final Evaluation is initiated by the UNDP Russia as the Implementation Agency for this project and it aims to provide managers (at the Project Implementation Unit, UNDP Russia Country Office and UNDP/GEF levels) with a comprehensive overall assessment of the project and an opportunity to critically assess administrative and technical strategies, issues and constraints associated with large international and multi-partner initiatives.

The purpose of the Evaluation is:

- To assess overall performance against the Project objectives as set out in Project Document and other related documents
- To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Project
- To critically analyze the implementation and management arrangements of the Project
- To assess the sustainability of the Project's interventions.
- To list and document initial lessons concerning Project design, implementation and management
- To assess Project relevance to national priorities.

Project performance will be measured based on Project's Logical Framework (see Annex III, incorporated into Rate Table 1), which provides clear performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification.

The Report of the Final Evaluation will be stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions.

III. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

The evaluation report outline should be structured along the following lines:

1. Executive summary
2. Introduction
3. The project(s) and its development context
4. Findings and Conclusions
 - Project formulation
 - Implementation
 - Project Finances
 - Results
5. Recommendations
5. Lessons learned
6. Annexes

The length of report normally should not exceed 50 pages in total. The draft report will be submitted to UNDP/GEF and the Federal Agency for Fisheries of RF no later than March 15th 2009. Based on the feedback received from stakeholders a final report will be prepared by 31th of March 2009.

The report will be submitted both electronically and in printed version, in Russian and English.

The report will be supplemented by Rate Tables (Annex III).

Summary presentation of findings to be presented in final evaluation meeting.

Evaluator will conduct a final debriefing for selected stakeholders and prepare summary presentation of conclusions and findings of the Final Evaluation. The presentation will be followed by a question & answer session and round-table discussions.

IV. METHODOLOGY FOR EVALUATION APPROACH

The Final Evaluation will be done through a combination of processes including a desk study, selected site visits and interviews - involving all stakeholders (but not restricted to): Federal Agency for Fisheries of RF, UNDP, Government officials on different levels, Regional administrations and local municipalities, NGO's, communities etc.

Evaluators should seek guidance for their work in the following materials:

- GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy (<http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>)
- UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (<http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>)
- Measuring Results of the GEF Biodiversity Programme (http://www.undp.org/gef/05/documents/me/Measuring_the_Results_of_Biodiversity.pdf)

The methodology for the evaluation is envisaged to cover the following areas:

- Desk study review of all relevant Project documentation
- Consultations with Federal Agency for Fisheries, UNDP , Project implementation unit
- Field site visit within project territories
- Interviews with stakeholders
 - Federal Agency for Fisheries of RF
 - Kamchatka Kray Administration
 - Sevvostrybvod
 - Fishery research and academic institutions: VNIRO, KamchatNIRO, Moscow State University
 - Wild Salmon Center
 - Local Municipalities
 - Local community representatives
 - NGO's and educational institutions from Kamchatka region
 - Indigenous community groups
 - Local fishery businesses and private sector stakeholders

V. EVALUATOR QUALIFICATION:

The Final Evaluation will be carried out by an individual consultant or a team of two external consultants. Evaluation team should possess the following qualifications:

- Expertise in areas of international projects' monitoring and evaluation with the focus on conservation of aquatic and freshwater ecosystems, mainstreaming biodiversity into fishery and other productive sectors, species conservation, protected areas, sustainable livelihoods, participatory conservation approaches;
- Knowledge/understanding of Russian conservation policies and legislation, fishery management policies and institutional system, protected areas system, additional knowledge on NGO/indigenous community would be an asset.
- A physical ability to intensive two-week travel is needed

More specifically candidates should demonstrate:

- (i) Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- (ii) Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;
- (iii) Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- (iv) Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- (v) Recent knowledge of UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures
- (vi) Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management projects;
- (vii) Recognized expertise in the management and sustainable use of biodiversity;
- (viii) Familiarity with protected area policies and management structures in Russia;
- (ix) Demonstrable analytical skills;
- (x) Work experience in relevant areas for at least 10 years;
- (xi) Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported conservation projects;
- (xii) Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- (xiii) Excellent English communication skills.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

Evaluation management arrangements

- Role of Project Manager (located in Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky)
 - Coordination of evaluation activities and logistics in Kamchatka
 - Arrangement of field site visits
 - Organization of meetings with selected stakeholders
 - Compiling and providing to the evaluator necessary project reports and materials produced by the project
- Role of UNDP
 - Coordination of evaluation activities in Moscow
 - Administrative and logistical support for the evaluators in Moscow

Tentative timeframe

- Selection of evaluators December 2008 - January 2009
- Briefing for evaluators February 2009
- Desk review February 2009
- Debriefings in Moscow and Petropavlovsk-Kamchatksy February 2009
- Trip to the field sites (including allocation for travel), interviews with local stakeholders, questionnaires February – March 2009
- Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of initial reports for comments, meetings and other types of feedback mechanisms March 2009
- Preparation of final evaluation report March 2009 2008

APPLICATION: Please send your applications, detailed CVs and a brief concept paper (no more than 2 pages outlining the approach and methodology you will apply to achieve the assignment) to Ms. Nataly Olofinskaya, UNDP CO Russia, nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org . Deadline for applications is 5 December 2008.

VII. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION- SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED.

This section describes the categories that the evaluation will look into in line with the evaluation report outline included in section III. It also highlights specific issues to be addressed under each broad category.

1. Executive summary

- Brief description of the project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

2. Introduction

- Project background
- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- The outputs of the evaluation and how will they be used
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

3. The project and its development context

- Project start and its duration
- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

4. Findings and Conclusions

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all **criteria marked with (R) should be rated** using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory

4.1. Project Formulation

Conceptualization/Design (R). This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.

Country-ownership/Drivenness. Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.

Stakeholder participation (R) Assess information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in design stages.

Replication approach. Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also related to actual practices undertaken during implementation).

Cost-effectiveness

UNDP comparative advantage

Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

Management arrangements

4.2. Project Implementation

Implementation Approach (R). This should include assessments of the following aspects:

- (i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M and E activities if required.
- (ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or; changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.
- (iii) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.
- (iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.
- (v) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.

Monitoring and evaluation (R). Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.

Stakeholder participation (R). This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:

- (i) The production and dissemination of information generated by the project.
- (ii) Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena.
- (iii) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.
- (iv) Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.

Risk management

Coordination and operational issues

4.3 Project Finances

Financial Planning: Including an assessment of:

- (i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities
- (ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements
- (iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)

(iv) Co-financing ¹

- Budget procedure
- Disbursement
- Effectiveness of funding mechanism
- Risks
- Sustainability. Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities.

Execution and implementation modalities. This should consider the effectiveness of the UNDP counterpart and Project Co-ordination Unit participation in selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants and national counterpart staff members and in the definition of tasks and responsibilities; quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs for the project with respect to execution responsibilities, enactment of necessary legislation and budgetary provisions and extent to which these may have affected implementation and sustainability of the Project; quality and timeliness of inputs by UNDP and GoC and other parties responsible for providing inputs to the project, and the extent to which this may have affected the smooth implementation of the project.

4.3. Results

Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives (R): Including a description *and rating* of the extent to which the project's objectives (environmental and developmental) were achieved using Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory ratings. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established.

Sustainability: Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end.

Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

5. Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Lessons learned

This should highlight the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.

7. Evaluation report Annexes

Evaluation TORs

Itinerary

List of persons interviewed

Summary of field visits

List of documents reviewed

Questionnaire used and summary of results

Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

VIII. TERMS OF REFERENCE ANNEXES

Annex I: Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations

Annex II: Financial Planning Cofinancing

Annex III: Rating Tables

Annex IV: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

¹ Please see guidelines at the end of Annex III of these TORs for reporting of co-financing

Annex I. Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations

Implementation Approach includes an analysis of the project's logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

Country Ownership/Drivenness is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans

Some elements of effective country ownership/drivenness may include:

- Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
- Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
- Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
- The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
- The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives

For projects whose main focus and actors are in the private-sector rather than public-sector (e.g., IFC projects), elements of effective country ownership/drivenness that demonstrate the interest and commitment of the local private sector to the project may include:

- The number of companies that participated in the project by: receiving technical assistance, applying for financing, attending dissemination events, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project, etc.
- Amount contributed by participating companies to achieve the environmental benefits promoted by the project, including: equity invested, guarantees provided, co-funding of project activities, in-kind contributions, etc.
- Project's collaboration with industry associations

Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement consist of three related, and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

Information dissemination

- Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

Consultation and stakeholder participation

- Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

Stakeholder participation

- Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
- Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
- Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

- Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy.
- Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives).
- Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector.
- Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives.
- Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
- Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) .

- Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes).
- Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities.
- Achieving stakeholders consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

- Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
- Expansion of demonstration projects.
- Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions.
- Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions.

Financial Planning includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

Effective financial plans include:

- Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing².
- Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
- Due diligence due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

Co financing includes: Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, Other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

- Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.
- The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned.
- The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

Monitoring & Evaluation. Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project's logical framework.

Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project's achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project.

² Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing.

Conservation and sustainable use of salmonid biological diversity in four river systems on Russia's Kamchatka Peninsula	Salmonid diversity	List of # species known in all four river sites at project start; # of the species known to be in each site: Bolshaya -10 Kohl/Kehta - 9 Utholok - 9 Sopochnaya- 9	All historical species present in river sites with more complete data set. # of the species known in each site: Bolshaya-10 Kohl/Kehta - 9 Utholok - 9 Sopochnaya- 9 A separate table with species names, and listing of known intra-specific diversity for each river site will be produced prior to final evaluation.	Biannual biological surveys. Biannual biological surveys Monitoring records/Evaluation results.	Continued GoR/RG support for salmonid conservation Conservation of salmonid habitats Natural factors and man-made disasters, (e.g. disease and/or overfishing at-sea) do not harm anadromous population status by species.		
	Population health: presence, #s and distribution of juveniles by stream segment	Incomplete information on commercial species, absence of information on non-commercial species. No specific data on project sites.	Data for stream segments monitored is within the range for normal natural fluctuation. Number of juveniles (# per m2): Bolshaya (Nachilova)- up to 2; Kohl/Kehta-up to 5; Utholok - up to 3; Sopochnaya - n/a				
	Number of hectares of salmonid habitat protected	0 No specific protected areas for salmonids. No specially managed areas for salmonids on other river sites	280,000 hectares; 1 PA established. Design of the 2nd PA is developed. Total # of hectares: 420,000				

	Ecosystem health; Insect biomass and diversity	Incomplete information for Bolshaya river, absence of information on other river sites.	No decrease from mid-term baseline indicator. Very good: 66-100% of median biomass. Good: 40-66% of average. List of insect species identified for Kohl and biomass determined for Kohl				
	Abundance of salmon. Data on salmon escapement levels in Russia is classified. Indicator to be measured on a relative basis by expert review of escapement level data and reported by KNIRO	Baseline level data is classified	Kohl and Utkholok - abundance at the same level with baseline; Bolshaya - increased by 5% over baseline				
	Restoration: In-stream habitat a) # of streams to which fish access is restored in Bolshaya Basin b) Area of spawning habitat (SH); Rearing habitat (RH) to which access by salmon is restored.	a)Unknown b)No restoration	a)17 streams restored b) 70,000m2 of SH and RH restored				

	Diversity management principles and criteria are integrated into policy, local development, practices and awareness.	Not integrated - Do not exist.	Principles integrated into: a) new policies on fishery; b) livelihoods; c) sustainable use of salmonids; d) public awareness and education materials.				
OUTCOMES	MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME	BASELINE LEVEL	FINAL TARGET	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS	STATUS OF DELIVERY	RATING
Improved fishery management practices for salmonid diversity conservation purposes	Diversity management principles and criteria are integrated into hatchery management practices.	Diversity management principles and criteria are not addressed with enough attention in hatcheries practices	Diversity management principles and criteria are developed and proposed for 2 hatcheries in Bolshaya basin. (e.g. Hatcheries release fry timing is set to minimize competition with wild fish; Use hatchery fish	Data and information in database. Field reports. Program description/ field results Monitoring program analysis Materials broadly available Policy documents; Evaluation of expert abilities.	GoR priorities may change preventing progress from being made on salmonid diversity conservation. Institutional walls blocking cross-sector collaboration can be overcome.		
	Salmonid diversity and ecosystem health requirements incorporated into escapement and harvest management.	Escapement management does not include salmonid diversity and ecosystem health. Rare, threatened and non-dominant species not considered in fishery management	Diversity and ecosystem health escapement goals are established and applied to Kol River project site.	Published & approved guidelines; Conclusion of independent scientific review committee The guidelines broadly available Enforcement patrol records; Interviews/ field visits. Interviews with RYBVOD and NIRO officials.	Naturally occurring conditions could alter baseline level of salmonid diversity.		
	New public-private partnership for management of non-commercial fish species	No partnership for management of non-commercial species.	Fish management agencies utilize public-private partnership to manage sport fishery on two pilot sites.	Conclusion of independent scientific review committee. Signed international cooperative agreements			

	Russian fishery legislation incorporates salmonid diversity	Not reflected in existing Fishery legislation.	New system of fishery regulations and policy (fishery	w/partner institutions in other Pacific basin countries		
	Fisheries agencies manage project river sites based on systematized and up to dated information on biodiversity	No systematized and up to dated information on biodiversity in the project river sites.	Fisheries agencies maintain complete picture of site ecosystem health through a continually updated database for project sites. Atlas on salmonid diversity produced and in use.	Best practice documents. Legal proceedings to revise law Survey and monitoring results		
River ecosystem integrity is conserved in four sites using a variety of conservation tools and approaches	Community partnerships demonstrated for river site management, (Protected Area management, Environment protection	Local communities do not participate in river systems protection or management.	Kol River PA partnership; Utkholok River PA partnership. Monitoring partnership involving river keepers for Sopochnaya. Environmental and	Survey and water quality results; Policy documents/Interviews; Field Visits. Stakeholder agreements Management plan documents; local riverkeeper reports, local resource user committee minutes.	Regional/national scientific institutions maintain their technical capacity. Funding for additional staff will be made available by GoR and regional Governments. Communities support, collaborate with the project, and government, collaborates with local communities.	
	New conservation tools applied in protected areas management.	No salmon PAs in the river sites.	Salmon conservation programs are piloted in Kol. Utkholok protected area is being designed in such a way that	Field visits; Mid-term evaluation Project reports; mid-term evaluation. Monitoring measurements of water quality, invertebrate populations, field visits.		
	Strengthened environmental mitigation of development activities in Kamchatka.	Construction of the gas Pipeline endangers integrity of spawning rivers in Western Kamchatka	Pipeline company adopts environmental mitigation tools into their work.	Training evaluation B & A. Staff records; field visits		
	Decreased poaching • #of anti-poaching partnerships • Presence on river – Kol and Utholok research stations. • River keepers on the Sopochnaya	No anti-poaching partnerships. No presence on project rivers. No river keeper program.	3 anti-poaching partnerships in project river sites. Kol PA & research camp and Utholok research camp. River keeper program on the Sopochnaya.			

Implementation of educational programs, information sharing, preservation of indigenous peoples' knowledge, and awareness raising build constituencies for salmon diversity conservation in four river sites	Level of support for salmonid conservation among school students and general public in Kamchatka.	Not determined.	Increased by 20% compared to mid term level (2005 survey - see next column). Target: 1. Salmon is essential for the future of Kamchatka-86% 2. Ready to participate	Survey of awareness levels before and after. Review of materials Minutes from meetings; records of training sessions; Project records Community historical records. Written descriptions; Anthropological evaluation Interviews/records of round table discussions/ revised management methods.	NGOs will maintain support for outreach and education objectives. Popular media will remain willing and able to implement a media campaign. Stakeholders willing to share information.		
	Kamchatka Salmon Ecological Center and other interpretive displays operational.	No visitor center exists; no interpretive materials.	Kamchatka Salmon Ecological Education Center educates 1,000 visitors per year. Center on sustainable	Published papers incorporating traditional & scientific knowledge. International press releases; memoranda of understanding Articles in peer-reviewed journals. Research program reports.			
	Salmonid diversity and ecology curricula developed and introduced throughout local school curriculum.	No salmonid diversity Education materials or Curricula exists in ecological education	Components on Salmonid diversity, ecology and sustainable use developed and in use in 20 local schools by year 4				
	Indigenous people begin to record knowledge and develop education programs	No databases; No synthesized materials, No interviews of elders to capture knowledge in modern media form; traditional knowledge not being recorded and learned.	TEK Database available on DVD and CD created and used by indigenous communities and associations.				
Stakeholders successfully develop alternative livelihoods in river site areas	An enabling environment for local communities to pursue Sustainable livelihood based upon local salmon resources.	No tradition of community development rooted in local salmon resources.	Pilot community program developed and endorsed by local and regional authorities in one district.	Project field records; Field visits; interviews with local people; Progress reports. Regulations promulgated; ToR for committees; Committee meeting notes. Written guidelines;	Targeted levels of funding will be realized External factors do not inhibit the development of tourism in site areas. Local residents are willing to change resource use practices given certain benefits.		
	Local stakeholder capacity to develop alternative livelihoods being strengthened through access to micro-credit & business training.	No access of local people to micro-credit facilities and business training; No training in business development or management.	20 people from project sites are trained in business development and in operating new biodiversity friendly small business. At least 10 micro-loans in project site areas	Description of feedback mechanism and financial results; Training manual/schedule; knowledge survey B/A; economic data Lessons learned docs;			

	Eco-tourism operating in at least one project site and involving local people in project site.	Ecotourism development is hampered by lack of information	Ecotourism product operating in at least one project site and employing local people.	Participants lists; Survey of knowledge before & after.			
	# of livelihood programs developed by the project supported by 3rd party financing.	0 — alternative livelihood options do not exist.	Pilot programs cover local population in one project site.				
Sustainable financing for salmonid conservation	Salmonid Diversity Conservation Fund legally established by end of year 3	No sustainable financing Mechanisms for diversity Conservation exist	Salmonid Diversity Conservation Fund legally established	Project reports.	GoR/RG support for an autonomous trust fund will be maintained. Momentum to capitalize this trust fund will be maintained.		
	Commitments for Fund endowment.	No funding for long-term mechanism.	Preliminary commitment of US \$1.5 million obtained.				
	Kamchatka based local funding mechanism established.	No mechanism	Donation box at PK airport. "Green Tour" voluntary contribution Program operational with at least 3 partnerships with resource users.				

* STATUS OF DELIVERY:

- GREEN / COMPLETED** = Indicators show successful achievement
- YELLOW** = Indicators show expected completion by end of Project
- RED** = Indicators show poor achievement - unlikely to be complete by end of Project

** RATINGS: Highly Satisfactory = HS

- Satisfactory = S
- Marginally Satisfactory = MS
- Unsatisfactory = U

TABLE 2: PROJECT RATINGS

Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), and Unsatisfactory (U)

PROJECT COMPONENT OR OBJECTIVE	RATING SCALE				RATING
	U	MS	S	HS	
PROJECT FORMULATION					
Conceptualization/Design					
Stakeholder participation					
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION					
Implementation Approach					
The use of the logical framework					
Adaptive management					
Use/establishment of information technologies					
Operational relationships between the institutions involved					
Technical capacities					
Monitoring and evaluation					
Stakeholder participation					
Production and dissemination of information					
Local resource users and NGOs participation					
Establishment of partnerships					
Involvement and support of governmental institutions					
PROJECT RESULTS					
Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives					
Achievement of objective					
Outcome 1					
Outcome 2					
Outcome 3					
Outcome 4					
Outcome 5					
OVERALL PROJECT ACHIEVEMENT & IMPACT					

Annex IV. List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluator

Following documents can be used as a basis for evaluation of the project:

Document	Description
Project document	The Project Document and Revisions
Project reports	Project Inception Reports Mid-term Evaluation Report
Annual Project Report to GEF	Project Implementation Reports for 2004-2008
Other relevant materials	Financial Audit Reports 2004-2007 Memorandums of understanding Co-financing agreements Mission Reports of International Experts Press articles Maps Various database Research results

ANNEX 2 DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND CONSULTED

A) Hardcopy and electronic documents

Project Brief
STAP Review
Project Document
Inception Report
Mid-term Evaluation Report
PIR/APRs for 2004-2008
Quarterly Progress Reports
Project Work Plans
Memorandum of understanding (UNDP / WSC)
Co-financing agreements
Various reports and advisory notes from the Project Adaptive Management Advisor
Project Steering Committee Minutes
Press articles
Research reports and publications

UNDP (1998) *Kamchatka GEF Programme : A brief description of proposed UNDP-GEF interventions for Russia's Kamchatka Peninsula*. Internal UNDP discussion document

Global Environment Facility (2006) *The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*

Global Environment Facility (2002) *GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures*

DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation (2002) *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*. OECD, Paris

Fishery justification for prospective establishment of Utkholok State Biological (Salmon) zakaznik, Kamchatski Krai (KamchatNIRO, IPEE RAN, VNIRO). – Petropavlovsk-Kamchatski, 2008

Shatilo, I.V. and V.N. Leman (date) *Amateur and Sport Fishing in Kamchatka*

Leman, V.N. and E.V. Yesin (date) *Illustrated Handbook of Kamchatka Salmonids*

B) Websites

http://www.npacific.ru/np/library/publikacii/shatilo_leman/sportfishing_in_kamchatka.pdf

http://www.npacific.ru/np/library/publikacii/leman_esin/atlas.pdf

<http://russiansalmon.ru/ru/content/sozdan-zakaznik-na-reke-kol>

<http://www.kamchatkasalmon.ru/english/>

<http://www.undp.ru/index.phtml?iso=RU&lid=1&cmd=programs4>

www.fishkamchatka.ru

<http://www.kamchatkasalmon.ru/russian/about.php>

<http://gefweb.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/MEPTtools/meptstandards.html>

http://www.wildsalmoncenter.org/programs/kamchatka/strongholds_07.php

<http://www.undp.ru/index.phtml?iso=RU&lid=1&cmd=programs4>

ANNEX 3 PERSONS MET AND CONSULTED

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Office

Ms Elena Armand, Assistant Resident Representative Programme
Ms Florida Perevertaylo, Assistant Resident Representative Administration
Ms Natalia Olofinskaya, Head of Environment Unit
Ms Ludmila Khorosheva, Programme Associate, Environment Unit

UNDP/GEF Bratislava Regional Centre

Ms Adriana Dinu, Regional Team Leader & Regional Technical Advisor, Biodiversity, Europe & CIS

Federal Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography (VNIRO)

Mr Nikolai Antonov, Deputy Director
Dr Vsevolod Leman, Chief, Laboratory of Salmon Reproduction

Federal Agency for Fisheries (FAF)

Mr Sergei Podolian, Deputy Head and National Project Director
Mr Sergei Maximov, Head, Dept Field Research of Aquatic Bioresources and Total Allowable Catch

Moscow State University (MSU)

Prof Dmitry Pavlov, Chief, Russian Academy of Sciences A.N. Svartzov Inst Ecology and Evolution
Prof Ms Ksenia Savvaitova, Senior Researcher, Dept of Ichthyology

Centre for Support of Indigenous Peoples of the North (CSIPN/RAIPON)

Dr Rodion Sulyandziga, Director
Mr Nikita Vronsky, Head WG on Development of Kamchatka Programme of Ecotourism Marketing

UNDP/GEF Project – Conservation and Sustainable Use of Wild Salmonid Biological Diversity in Russia's Kamchatka Peninsula

Mr Vladimir Pischelev, Project Manager *a.i.*
Ms Victoria Sharakhmatova, Sustainable Fishery and Alternative Livelihoods Development Officer
Ms Margarita Kulakova, Educational and Interactive Salmon Exhibit Expert
Mr Vadim Zholudev, Executive Director, Community Environmental Foundation
Dr Vsevolod Leman, Head of Working Group on Salmonid Biodiversity
Ms Elena Andreeva, Administrative Assistant
Ms Galina Semenova, Project Accountant
Mr Nikoly Afimov, Information Technology Assistant
Mr Evgeny Muzurov, past Project Manager

Russian Association of Indigenous People of the North (RAIPON)

Mr Dmitry V Berezhkov, Chair of Executive Council
Ms Anastasia Chukhman, Deputy Director of Ethno-ecological Information Centre
Ms Nina Zaparovska

Ministry of Industry and Investments, Kamchatka Krai

Ms Oksana Gerasimova, Minister

Ministry of Natural Resources, Kamchatka Krai

Yuri A Garashenko, Minister

Ministry of Education and Science, Kamchatka Krai

Viktor L Tyumentsev, Minister

Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky School No.7

Three teachers and eight students

Agency for Tourism of Kamchatka Krai

Ms Tamara Tutushkina, Chief

Ministry of Fisheries, Kamchatka Krai

Mr Vladimir Galitsin, Minister

Northeastern Basin Administration for Fisheries and Conservation of Aquatic Biological Resources (Sevvostrybvod)

Mr Dmitri Zaitsev, Chief

Kamchatka Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography (KamchatNIRO)

Dr Sergei Korostelev, Director

Dr Vsevolod Leman, Head of Salmon Biology Research

Malki Salmon Hatchery

Ms Ludmila Sakharovskaya, Director

Ms Tatyana Volkova, Chief Expert

Wild Fish and Biodiversity Foundation

Mr Vyacheslav Zyvagintsev, Director

Dr Evgeny Lobkhov, Deputy Director for Science

Kolh River Zakaznik

Mr Dmitri Ryzhov, Director

All Russia Environment Protection Society

Ms Tamara Kurinova, Chair of Kamchatka Krai Branch

Kamchatka Technical University

Prof Nina Klochkova, Deputy Rector for Research

Ustkamchatriba (UKR) Fishing Company

Mr Andrei Kopylov, Director General

WWF-Russia Kamchatka/Bering Sea Ecoregional Office

Dr Lada Lekai, Director

Mr Anatoly Dekshstein, Marine Programme Coordinator

**Kamchatka Branch Pacific Institute of Geography,
Far-Eastern Department of the Russian Academy of Sciences**

Dr Aleksey Tokranov, Deputy Director

League of Independent Experts

Ms Elena Nenasheva

Wild Salmon Centre

Mr Guido Rahr, Executive Director

ANNEX 4 MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO MTE

RECOMMENDATIONS	PROJECT RESPONSE (update in red)	EVALUATORS' COMMENTS
STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION		
<p>1. The services of the Steering Committee as a body with representation of nearly all interested parties will be critical in the coming months if the project is going to be a "success". It would be very beneficial if the SC meetings were both a mechanism for reporting project activity and an opportunity for strategic thinking, transparency and guidance regarding general project direction relevant to achievement of project objectives.</p>	<p>This will be done in February 2007. A stakeholder retreat will be organized to prepare for this SC meeting. See Project Management and Implementation Section for more detail, page 12.</p>	
<p>Consideration should be given to holding a special SC meeting in the near future that is focused upon identifying strategic needs for the remaining project period. This meeting should be well planned and organized. This should be a multiple day, substantial decision-making event that includes a: (1) Thorough reporting and discussion of project activity to date; (2) Identification and discussion of project needs/issues, and (3) Determination and agreement regarding the "way forward".</p>	<p>Salmon MTE report was received in November 2006, the results of the evaluation were presented and discussed at the 5th Steering Committee in February 2007. "The results of Mid-Term Evaluation Report of the Project and future trends for 2007 and before Phase I completion (including Project Evaluation Indicators analysis)"- Vladimir A. Pischelev, Deputy Project National Director</p>	<p>Although accepted, this recommendation was not carried out as proposed by the MTE. For example, it is not clear from the PIU Update, whether the proposed retreat prior to the PSC Meeting was held. On the other hand it needs to be noted that the MTE went into far too much detail in its recommendations.</p>
<p>This should include presentation and discussion of a clear, detailed strategic workplan for project completion. During these SC meetings, there should be candid and informed discussions regarding budget matters, including allocations to date and remaining financing.</p>	<p>A stakeholder retreat will be organized in late Nov 2006 to do these things prior to the SC meeting.</p>	
<p>The project should consider (1) Inviting the consultant responsible for drafting the Phase II proposal to participate; and (2) Hiring a third party facilitator to assist with meeting preparation, guidance and reporting.</p>	<p>The preparation of all the documents for the SC and the discussion was held during December 2006 and January 2007 (meetings in Moscow, P-K, e-mail). The work was conducted with J. Griffin - Adaptive Management Advisor. He took part in all the preparatory work and in the work of the SC.</p>	
<p>2. In the long-term, the project would likely benefit from the development of a LSG to provide a more regular sounding board for project activity. The LSG might include membership from stakeholders such as tourism operators, wildlife biologists, ecotourism organizations, national and international NGO's, indigenous groups, hatcheries, Government agencies, and commercial fishery operators (particularly those located in project sites.)</p>	<p>The will consider organizing working groups related to the project's work and to geographic areas like the Kol PA. For example, the project could use a Working group on improving fishery management. There could also be local stakeholder working groups for Kol, for Utholok-Kvachina and In addition to the thematic working groups for science, and indigenous people. The project will focus much more on bringing the stakeholders together to discuss and work together. Regularly meetings on all the aspects of Project activity with the stakeholders were held. (list of meetings, seminars and conferences). Biodiversity and</p>	<p>The MTE had in mind a formal body which would have provided an avenue for meaningful participation by local stakeholders in project management activities. The Project did not set up this body but it claims to have provided other opportunities for participation.</p>

indigenous peoples Working groups had regular meetings
 Регулярно собиралась рабочая группа проекта по делам коренного населения (всего проведено 7 заседаний, с реализацией принятых решений).

3. The project may benefit if representatives of each government agency responsible for salmonid management in Kamchatka would come together on a regular basis to meet as a group with the project implementation team to discuss project activity. This would greatly facilitate strategic planning and information dissemination.

The key stakeholders such as Rybvod, Rosseslhoznadzor, NIRO, Rosprirodnadzor are all members of the Project Steering Committee. In order to strengthen their involvement in project implementation we are planning to increase the role of the SC in decision making process. I.e. the SC meetings will be organized in such a way as to encouraged the participants to actively participate in discussions rather than just approve the reports.

Another opportunity will be to have meetings with key Kamchatka stakeholders between the regular meetings of the Steering Committee in order to discuss interim results. Specially organized meetings with key Kamchatka stakeholders between the regular meetings of the Steering Committee were not conducted (one of the reasons is the changes in the structure of federal fishery authorities and replacement of regional administrations in Kamchatka and Koriakia due to which the Project was constantly in the process of establishing partnerships with new heads and newly created bodies). Working meetings with the members of the SC were held regularly.

In effect, this recommendation has not been carried out. And while it is true that the key stakeholders are all members of the PSC, when they meet as PSC they have other agendas

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

4. It is critical that UNDP/GEF on both the regional and national level allocate significant time in the coming months to make certain the project implementation unit receives enhanced support and guidance to complete the many outstanding tasks. This should include budgeting for more site visits.

This is being done. More support is being allocated by the CO, the Regional Coordinator, and the Adaptive Management Advisor.

Taking into account the distance between the UNDP CO and the project and the cost of travel, the Evaluators believe that supervision provided has been adequate, and this has been confirmed by the PIU members

5. The project would benefit greatly if the details of yearly plans were extended, particularly in terms of achievement of specific project indicators. In addition, it is strongly recommended that in the future the yearly workplans show how all project activities will be completed prior to project close.

This is being done as described above.

Done

6. To facilitate understanding between the project and co-financing partners, it may be useful to conclude a brief, formal MOU that clearly details expectations and re-visit this MOU periodically during project implementation.

An MoU will be finalized between the Project/UNDP and WSC in the Fall of 2006. The Draft is being discussed since August 2006.

It would seem that the MoU with WSC was never finalized but one with the WF&BF was signed

RESEARCH AND DECISION-MAKING

7. Further review the strategic purposes of existing research activities and develop a strategy/policy to embed science and decision-making. For instance, sponsor regular round-table or presentations bringing together researchers, policy makers and other stakeholders as an opportunity for researchers to publicly present and discuss their findings. This would be a useful practice to institutionalize even if current results are “pre-mature” due to the incompatible time requirements of research and project outputs.

- Dr. Lehman, with the full participation and input of the whole research working group, will step back and assess what the working group has accomplished. What new insights and knowledge have been generated by the project’s work (including MGU and Flathead Biological Station) and also ask and answer the question: “What questions remain to be asked and answered in our quest to understand river ecosystems and better inform diversity oriented salmon fishery management?” The group will also consider how its results be communicated more effectively.

- The Lehman team’s research is being integrated into NIRO. We are not communicating how this is being done, however. A summary of this will be drafted. Research results from the Kol, however, have yet to be integrated into NIRO’s work.

- Thematic Round tables for the research working group and other stakeholders will be organized starting from November where the project’s research results will be presented, discussed, and scientific recommendations formulated specifically describing/recommending more biodiversity friendly, ecosystem-friendly salmonid fishery management practice.

- The working group will also present the results at the Biodiversity Conservation Conference, which will be organized in Kamchatka in November 2006 .

This is a very important recommendation since research does not produce conservation until it is applied by policy-makers and managers. It would seem that rather than tie up the results of Project research with policy makers and managers, it has been tied up with other research activities. The recommendation has not really been implemented.

Yes, the Biodiversity Conservation Conference was held in November 26-27, 2006. All the other things were fulfilled by the Biodiversity working group. It should be mentioned that Lemman (biodiversity expert, WG leader) includes Project plans in the plans of the work of VNIRO and KamchatNIRO laboratories working for the state system of Kamchatka salmon fishery management and salmonid monitoring. The work of the laboratories is indissolubly related to the partnership with state fishery bodies. In this regard the policies and directions are initiated and financed by the Project.

8. Generate list of baseline parameters that are or will be generated by the project to serve as “indicators” of project success and identify how research activity will deliver these indicators.

- The project team has gone through the indicators with the director of the research working group during the week of July 24-31 2006 and clarified and modified indicators based upon what indicators our field research is able to generate.

The PIU response has missed the point of this recommendation

9. Create an informal mechanism for the five major management agencies and the project research teams to meet together regularly (once or twice a year) to discuss initiatives and outcomes. For instance, providing an introduction to the project sponsored GIS.

- The mechanism exists already through the research working group. It needs to be utilized more frequently and effectively. Semi-annual meetings will be organized.

The was no real possibility to gather together all 5 major management agencies to discuss Project activity. Separate working meetings were held regularly and the outcomes are provided. Meetings for meetings may not be useful. They are useful when they are productive, no matter what format is used for them.

Bilateral meetings between the Project and its stakeholders, individually, are useful; but not as useful as a round table meeting involving all key partners where they can hear what each other is saying and work out synergies and collaboration. The recommendation has not been carried out

The first will be devoted to presentation of the project sponsored GIS database on biodiversity and discussion of possible ways

<p>10. Upgrade GIS to newest version of Arcview/info with applications;</p> <p>11. Review law/policy framework to identify opportunities for incorporating results of research and monitoring program in fisheries management. The links within and outside of the project between information generated by the scientists regarding the system management requirements and policy makers is particularly important in light of the changes in the new legislation. It would be very useful if the project were to facilitate this process.</p>	<p>of integrating this database into the work of those agencies.</p> <p>This is not needed, as the software is up-to-date.</p> <p>This will be the primary focus of the remainder of the project period. The first step was made in August 2006, when the project submitted recommendations to Sevostrybvod on improvement of sport fishery regulations of Kamchatka based upon information and insights it has generated from its field sites.</p>	<p>Recommendation not required</p> <p>The Project appears to have carried this out successfully</p>
HATCHERY MANAGEMENT		
<p>12. It would likely be very beneficial if the hatchery were to consider clipping the adipose fin of fish prior to release.</p>	<p>This is a technical recommendation, which will be considered by the appropriate experts.</p>	<p>The Evaluators were advised that a different form of tagging (otolith marking) was being investigated.</p>
<p>13. The king salmon in the Bolshaya are considered to be under grave threat. It might be interesting to explore options with the hatchery and other stakeholders to work cooperatively to assist with simultaneously conserving the wild spawning grounds and wild stock gene pool.</p>	<p>This is will be discussed during the round table on improving hatcheries practices in Kamchatka, which will happen in November 2006</p>	<p>We are not aware of the outcome from this recommendation which was a bit vague</p>
<p>14. The hatchery staff would be very interested to have an opportunity to learn best management and practices/principles from other hatchery experiences globally. Again, the project does have a budget to provide support for this sort of activity, including bringing in international experts in hatchery/biodiversity management to help identify a sound, long-term strategy for hatchery management on the Bolshaya that may be replicated in other parts of Kamchatka.</p>	<p>- A long-term strategy and recommendations are being developed. - It is also planned to bring international participants at the round table on improving hatcheries practices in Kamchatka, which will happen in November 2006 - We consider the opportunity of organizing a study tour for hatchery officials to US/Canada in 2006/2007</p>	<p>No update has been provided to ascertain what has been carried out</p>
<p>15. The proposed recommendations for hatchery management improvement developed with project support are based primarily upon the Alaskan models. It may be useful to consider additional models/tools as management alternatives for Kamchatka's system.</p>	<p>These recommendations are being based not only on Alaskan models, but also other parts of Russia, Canada, mainland US, and Japan experiences (good and bad).</p>	<p>No comment</p>
LAW AND POLICY		
<p>16. <i>Implementation Support:</i> The project may consider providing greater technical assistance to the implementation of the relatively new fisheries act.</p>	<p>The project will consider this – in fact, what the project is doing overall – seeking to make salmonid fishery management practices more biodiversity friendly – is helping implement the relatively new fisheries act. What the project team will do now is to consider with legal authorities and policy specialists how specifically the project can contribute best practices and new insights into the development of clear policies to implement the new fisheries act.</p>	<p>No update provided on this vague recommendation</p>
<p>Gaps may exist that warrant a more thorough investigation, including specifically how "best-available science" and species conservation issues are integrated into the legal structure. In particular, if the "species monitoring program" established by the</p>	<p>Absolutely – the project's field work and field research has been building up to the point where the scientific working group can begin to discuss among themselves and offer recommendations regarding what specific ecosystem</p>	<p>The response does not seem to fit the recommendation. There also seems to be reliance on Phase Two</p>

project is somehow directly linked - legally - with the determination of quotas and other fisheries management issues to somehow improve long-term issues such as by-catch. Finally, with passage of the federal law, all regional legislation became invalid. This may necessitate a review of regional legislation.

health and biodiversity conservation measures could be/should be incorporated into salmonid fishery management. This will be top priority in the last year of this first phase and in Phase II.

Yes, in terms of the contracts on improvement of salmon fishery management (Model salmon harvesting management plan for the Kol River Zakaznik – VNIRO, “Development of Pacific Salmon Multi-Species Fishery Strategy Based on Differentiated Approach to Determination of Pacific Salmon Population Groupings in the West Kamchatka Region (E.A. Shevliakov, V.G. Davidov). Report // Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky: UNDP/GEF “Project Conservation and Sustainable Use of Wild Salmonid Biological Diversity in Kamchatka’s Peninsula”, KamchatNIRO, 2006. – 54 p.)

17. Sport Fishing Policy: Development of a strategy/policy paper to guide the development of sport fishing as a tangible tool for mainstreaming conservation within the private sector and providing increased anti-poaching vigilance on river systems. This would include working to identify legal mechanisms to describe exclusivity of access, equitable mechanisms for decision making, methods to insure quality control, and many other factors. Other tools such as “catch-and-release”, seasons, and slot management could be considered. Community management of sport fisheries is an intriguing and feasible concept, particularly for indigenous groups. Particular attention should be paid to balancing the desires/demands of international destination anglers, local sport anglers, and subsistence anglers to make certain products and opportunities exist for each of these sectors. There are international best practice experiences that could benefit Kamchatka.

18. Detailed Salmon Listing and Habitat Requirements: Regulations allowing for the listing of salmon stocks in particular rivers and/or stretches of river. This should involve complimenting listing regimes with requirements for identifying and implementing management actions, including designation and conservation of habitat.

19. Detailed Protected Area Definitions and Conditions: The concept of a salmonid protected area is new and complex. The project is in a very good position to help the Government of Russia and other stakeholders to learn from the current

Kamchatka regional law on fisheries is being revised and the project will facilitate the local legislature’s consideration of new, biodiversity - friendly fishery policies at the regional level.

The project is already doing this in terms of developing guidelines for sport fishing --- for catch and release fishing being developed jointly with Rybvod. As mentioned above the project submitted recommendations to Sevostrybvod on improvement of sport fishery regulations of Kamchatka This is also an idea that the project will explore for phase II as it may possibly emphasize mainstreaming into the private sector more in its next phase.

Once again, unfortunate reliance on Phase Two
No update provided

An interesting recommendation being considered by the project’s policy experts and fish management stakeholders. The preliminary response is that these regulations already exist – the Kamchatka Red Book already allows this.

According to the Project experts the existing system of regulation (if it is followed) provides the salmon biodiversity conservation

Absolutely – the establishment of the Kol-Kekhta PA and the work being done to establish a U-K PA are definitely being viewed as an opportunity for applying creative management tools. On point of clarification – the law has not recognized

The response is not entirely clear on whether the recommendation has been acted upon

No update provided on what has really been done

experience and build a strong basis for replication, particularly in the short-term for the four additional protected areas that the project is dedicated to creating. Create a track record for success. Should be easier now that the law has been passed recognizing the four areas. Should be considered as an opportunity for applying creative management tools.

20. Embed Science with Decision-Making: As noted, there is a significant need to more closely match quota and other management tools with the health/status of the species based upon rigorous study, recognizing the integral role salmonids play in the greater diversity of Kamchatka. This might include working with stakeholders to more carefully detail roles/responsibilities regarding implementation of the Act and subsequent regulations. More attention could be given to permitting requirements and making the management system more responsive.

21. Commercial Management Strategy: Detail a clear policy or strategy describing exactly how diversity principles will be incorporated into commercial harvest management systems.

22. Community Development Quota: Create a CBNRM policy for creation of community development quota describing the parameters of allocation and use.

23. Trust Fund: Create fundamental principles for trust fund development and management.

24. Participatory Decision-Making Regimes: Work to generate principles/policies for improving greater public participation in salmonid management decision-making.

25. International Best Practices: There are many very good templates and experiences to borrow from out there. It would be quite useful in nearly all of this work to benefit from someone else's experiences.

four PA. Only the Kol has been established under this project yet.

Again, this is one of the main thrusts of the project addressed above under the first recommendation in this section.

Top priority for the remaining period of time. Again – discussed above under the first recommendation.

The project is working on this policy to improve local communities' understanding of quotas.
 "Community development concept for coastal communities of the Western Kamchatka" is worked out ,
 "The collection of normative documents and legislation regulating participation of local communities in river systems management and protection, practical recommendations and normative documents for Community development concept" is done.
 The Concept was discussed at the meetings of the WG and in the regional associations. Suggestions were collected and analyzed. Then the workshop on the Concept paper on community development was held. It raised an extensive discussion among the representatives of the authorities and communities. Now RAIPON is working on forwarding the Concept.

This has already been done in collaboration with the PA project and the details are being discussed with key stakeholders.

The project in cooperation with WSC is developing a concept for establishing Community Management Advisory Council for PA on Kol river. This will become a model for further replication on Utkholok PA. Yes, it was created in 2008

The team of national experts is reading about and applying international best practices. The Project is planning to bring international expertise to develop Community Management Advisory Council for PA on Kol river. In addition, the project has brought in an expert from Alaska on the Community Development

No further comment

No update provided on whether this has been carried out and no firm example given

The Concept is not a result. But at least RAIPON is working on it – could there be an update on progress?

An update would be interesting

More details would be very interesting

Once again, the concept is not a result - has it been applied in the case of the Kol?

Quota Program there and plans to organize a round table discussion among Russian and foreign experts on biodiversity friendly hatchery management.

“Community development concept for coastal communities of the Western Kamchatka” is worked out on the basis of the similar Concept realized in Alaska and suggestions of

N. Cohen - ADVISOR ON FISHERY-BASED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN KAMCHATKA.

SPORT FISHING

26. *Sport Fishing Strategy/Policy*: Support for the development of a sustainable sport fishing industry for both local and international anglers should be a significant focus of this project. This might be greatly enhanced by facilitating the development of a comprehensive sport fishing policy or strategy as described in the law and policy section. The goal should be to create an environment that supports the development of a sustainable sport fishing industry. Effort should include detailing long-range policies for sport fishing vision, fishery and river management, stream access and permitting/licensing issues, integration with the automated licensing system, destination marketing, guide certification/training, management planning, tendering and other policy related issues in order to create a more sustainable environment for business development. It is strongly recommended that this activity benefit from the involvement of international professionals who clearly understand what is involved in development of sustainable sport fishing industries.

27. *Model Operation*: Facilitate the development of model sport fishing operation on one or several of the pilot rivers based upon the outcome of the policy/strategy exercise. There are very many interesting opportunities here, including linking the protected area status with innovative sport fishery management. For instance, the Bolshaya could have stretches designated for catch/release and slot fishing, commercial/non-commercial, etc. applying a montage of management tools in order to secure long-term integrity of the river system. Another opportunity may be working with indigenous communities to designate rivers or stretches of river for their development of a sustainable sport-fishing product.

28. *Training Program*: Facilitate/sponsor the creation of a fly-fishing guide-training program to create more professionalism/interest in the industry.

Although, the sport fishing component of the Project during Phase I was mainly dependant on parallel initiatives of WSC on Sopochnaya river and launch of UNDP/UNF Sport Fishing Project (both of those never became a reality) the Project engaged significant efforts for the development of diversity friendly sport fishing in Kamchatka. In partnership with KamchatNIRO the project has made assessment of existing practices and provide recommendations on improvement of sport fishing management to Rybvod. Based on the assessment of sport fishing potential of project sites, it is planned to develop by the end of Phase I a strategic plan of sport fishing development on Bolshaya river. This work will most probably require international expertise.

Strategic plan of sport fishing development on Bolshaya river is presented in the Project publication “Recreational and Sport Fishing of Kamchatka: modern condition, problems and the ways of their solution, development perspectives”. I. Shatilo, V. Leman. The materials of the book and research held in terms of the Project contracts on sport fishing made the basis for the direction included in the Kamchatka development plan.

Again, this is something that the project will consider doing in Phase II. See also paragraph above.

Since 2005 the Project supports development of fly-fishing in Kamchatka. In partnership with local enthusiasts and Moscow specialists there were organized 2 fly-fishing seminars for local anglers. In order to

Once again, a report is not a result. But at least it has influenced the Kamchatka Development Plan, and that is a good result

Unfortunate reliance on Phase Two.

Recommendation carried out

provide sustainability for those initiatives in August 2006 there was created Kamchatka Sport Fishing Development Center, which will become a facility for further Kamchatka based training. Advocacy and awareness raising events have complemented successful implementation of those initiatives.

ECONOMICS

29. Review and revise as necessary the macro-economic analysis.
 30. Conduct a micro-economic review/analysis of the Kamchatka salmon industry to inform the community development, sport fishing, anti-poaching, quota setting, and other project activities related to management of the fishery. The purpose of this review should be in part to determine: The contributions made by commercial, poaching, sport, and subsistence fishing to the local economy; and, economic instruments required (permits, fines, alternative livelihoods) in order to serve as an incentive to promote behavioral changes.

Same as below.

The project will bring in a environmental economist with a macro perspective to review the economic analysis done to date and to develop a total economic value assessment of salmon and their ecosystems for the Kamchatkan economy. **yes, serious research was done in the direction. The results are summarized and presented in the books: "Economic scheme of salmon fisheries in Kamchatka" "Kamchatka salmon industry: modern condition and economic prospects of its development". The books are widely discussed, positive responses from specialists are received**

Books have been produced and have been well received – now they need to be applied

POACHING AND OVER-HARVEST

31. Continue to push forward with development of model enforcement activities on the project rivers, including establishing a clear nexus between supply of equipment and alleviation of impacts.
 32. Greater enforcement of transport points such as helicopters. Nearly all commercial salmon roe is transported via helicopter to the airport in P-K for export out of Kamchatka.
 33. Improved licensing systems for sport and commercial fishing operations. This is linked to the supplied database.
 34. Creating a consumer awareness campaign particularly in Moscow. This worked quite well with black caviar and could be replicated for salmon, including the labeling of legal salmon products.
 35. Better comparison of numbers between fish caught in nets with numbers of fish processed. This will be particularly important now that the number of on-shore processing plants has grown tremendously.

Have been discussing poaching enforcement with Rosselhoznadzor and how to strengthen this now with the new institutional arrangements.

Too difficult to enforce – to control – as helicopters can stop anywhere and off-load illicit cargo before landing at the official heliport. One possibility is to create a system of informers. They are working on this – linking the legal records of companies to the process of awarding new quotas and licenses so there are consequences. The project's education and awareness programs do target poaching. To do this right, this activity alone would be a large single project.

The whole system of fishery management is changing. Federal authorities will be changing fishery management in the coming year. The Project will provide support and expertise as necessary. **Some suggestions presented in "The Regional concept for reduction of salmon poaching in Kamchatsky Krai" (e.g. harvest and escapement patterns) according to the Federal Fishery Agency are included in new documents regulating salmon fishery. Special research on comparison of numbers between fish caught in nets with numbers of fish processed and on the number of on-shore processing plants was not carried out as in was not in call for in the Project Document.**

Poaching is a problem bigger than the project

36. Implement mechanisms to legitimize "poaching" of salmon roe while placing production control in more localized hands, i.e., communities.

Government is considering long-term leases on rivers. There are some other legal changes in the works related to providing incentives for sustainable

No update

37. Expand the very successful river keepers program to other river systems.	harvest and disincentives for poaching. We are planning to expand the river keeper program on Kol river PA and Utkholok river when circumstances allow. Yes, river keepers program was first realized in the Sopichnaya river then expand to the Kol river.	Recommendation implemented
38. Continue community-based natural resource management schemes as incentives for community enforcement, vigilance, and responsible use.	Consideration of the CDQ program the project is exploring is ongoing. Yes, Done, mentioned above	CDQ is not CBNRM
POACHING OF NON-COMMERCIAL SPECIES		
39. Expand river keepers program to other project sites	See above.	Done
40. Continue support for development of "sound" sport fishing activities.	See above.	Done
41. Implement model programs for the reduction of "by-catch".	Kol river PA is designed to become a model site for pilot programs related to better management and harvest of wild salmon stocks. The development of such programs is scheduled for 2007. "Development of Pacific Salmon Multi-Species Fishery Strategy Based on Differentiated Approach to Determination of Pacific Salmon Population Groupings in the West Kamchatka Region (E.A. Shevliakov, V.G. Davidov). Report // Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky: UNDP/GEF "Project Conservation and Sustainable Use of Wild Salmonid Biological Diversity in Kamchatka's Peninsula", KamchatNIRO, 2006. – 54 p.) was done, no practical realization yet.	The recommendation was for <u>implementation</u> not a strategy or a publication
COMMERCIAL HARVEST		
42. Apply science/research programs to create models for more precise quota management, especially on the Kol and Bolshaya rivers, that could eventually be replicated in other regions. According to some parties, this is already occurring informally. These models should be used to create management quotas based upon ecosystem conservation rather than simple production targets.	This is addressed under the first comment of the Research and Decision making section. As stated earlier, the federal fishery agency is considering shifting fishery management practices towards the Alaska model, which focuses more on type of equipment used and strictly controlling the timing of fishing activity rather than quotas.	No update
43. Link the new enforcement database/communication system to the quota management system to more closely track the amount of legal/illegal take.	This is being done – the project is linking the new enforcement data system with the fishery management system.	Done
44. Provide technical support to the government related to leasing of fishing concession and integration of conservation principles.	The project is looking into bringing experience from other regions of Russia to help Rybvod analyze new river leasing program. New salmon fishery regulations (2008) are based on the principle of long-term allocation of fishing area for a designated user chosen by tender. This will provide the the long-term perspective of salmon conservation.	Done
45. Develop programs for monitoring processing plant production.	This doesn't make sense with new fishery management approach being phased in.	OK
46. Continue assisting KNIRO to develop river-based assessments.	This will continue as project research fieldwork progresses on the Kol, the U-K, and the branch of the Bolshaya.	No update
47. Initiate "on-the-ground" activities in the four pilot sites that clearly demonstrate commercial fishing methods that are both profitable and diversity supportive. Review and widely disseminate results to responsible	The project will focus on the Kol to do this, with further possible replication on other sites. See also Poaching of Non-Commercial Species section.	No update

government agencies, commercial operators, and other stakeholders. This might require identifying and securing international technical assistance capable of providing specific recommendations based upon international best practices.

PROTECTED AREA ESTABLISHMENT AND MANAGEMENT

48. *Lessons Learned:* The project should carefully reflect upon lessons learned during this process. What steps were necessary to achieve the goal? What was positive and negative about this process? One purpose of this formal exercise should be to inform the development process of the remaining three protected areas to be authorized.

Will incorporate lessons from the Kol process into the process now underway to have the Utholok-Kvachina (U-K) designated a PA. Will form a working group of key stakeholders to coordinate work on the U-K PA. In fact, an MoU will be developed with each partner organization on all outstanding issues.

The recommendation asks for lessons to be documented – the PIU reports on partnerships

The lessons were learned. Together with the Wild fish foundation a joint program was worked out and the agreement was made. Partnership is conducted through regularly working meetings where all the activities were coordinated. The work is going on in a rather productive way.

49. *Management Planning:* The project will want to work to facilitate the development and formalization of specific management conditions and strategies for the protected area, including securing and training of staff. As noted in the law and policy section, the words “protected areas” mean different things to all interests. This particular protected area includes commercial fishing, research, sport fishing, indigenous use, poaching, and a newly constructed pipeline and access road. All of these are complicating factors to be considered when designing the ultimate management plan.

Management planning will be a major focus of the 2nd phase, as indicated in the project brief. Once designated, the management plan, the “software” of the new PA will be of the utmost importance and the project will seek to develop models of these new kind of fishery PA in this regard in Phase II.

OK, recommendation acted upon

Management-plan for the Kol river zakaznik was worked out by the project and approved in the established procedure.

50. *Strategy for Additional Protected Areas:* The project document commit to the project to designation of an additional three protected areas: Bolshaya Basin, Sopochnaya River, and U-K. If the project is to achieve this goal, it might be very useful for a clear strategy to be detailed and approved by the Project Steering Committee. This should include reference to stakeholder analysis and the development of creative zoning designations to accommodate a variety of uses, including reference to the project’s piloting of innovating conservation approaches such as sustained livelihoods, hatchery management, and improved commercial fishing methods. These pilot sites were each selected as being representative of various salmonid conservation issues. Likewise, their protected area designation should creatively reflect the variety of issues.

A detailed strategy for the U-K will be reviewed and approved at the next SC meeting in Jan-Feb 2007. The project will not achieve the Bolshaya PA or the Sopochnaya PA. The Bolshaya was always anticipated as being a simple spawning area protected (see original logical framework indicators). Due to the changes in the fishery management institutional structure, this appears unlikely to happen before the end of phase I. The Sopochnaya River is already located in “Tskhanom” – a traditional use area designated by the Koryak Okrug. Because of this fact, and because the Sopochnaya fwas always envisioned as being a community-managed, multiple-use site that would be rooted in the sport fishing work the project envisioned doing there. Unfortunately, this work failed to materialize when WSC reorganized their programs in 2002 and eliminated their sport fishing program in Kamchatka. This eliminated the main funder and partner for this activity. An unforeseen problem, to be sure.

No update

MITIGATION OF HABITAT DEGRADATION

51. Secure firm commitments from government and other stakeholders to

There is a reaction to the report. KamchatGazprom reacted and is changing

Recommendation accepted and acted upon

implement mitigation plans/needs identified in the impact assessment. This could include model mitigation in the project sites and particularly linkages to requirements related to newly created protected areas and 'study' areas.

fish passage structures. The project will also continue to push them to make strategic improvements, which open up the most and best habitat to salmon migration – habitat which is now blocked by poor fish passage work. **7 streams restored, engineering projects for reconstruction of 6 bridges based on the recommendations worked out by the Project, KamchatNIRO, Sevvostrybvod are prepared. In connection with the resumption of the pipeline construction all the Project materials concerning repair work, environmental mitigation, monitoring programs are transferred to Gasprom-investvostok-company, now responsible for pipeline construction. Special project of pipeline construction is applied to the territory of the Kol river zakaznik. The demands and the regulations of salmon biodiversity and habitat conservation are made more severe.**

52. Identify and prioritize pending habitat degradation activities (i.e., hard rock mining) and consider mechanisms for utilizing baseline scientific knowledge developed through the project to legally inform mitigation requirements.

Will produce a manual and guidelines for companies and agencies who supervise these activities. Will there be training to help them use this manual? **Yes, Practical guide on salmon fishery impact assessment during project preparations of exploration, research and mining of mineral deposits in basins of Kamchatka and Koryak spawning rivers is ready for publication. (publication is planned for March-April)**

Recommendation accepted and acted upon

EDUCATION AND PUBLIC AWARENESS

53. Secure funding for a "Salmon Bus" to provide transport for participating students to both field study areas and the salmon interpretative center.

This is proceeding as a joint program with Sevostroybvod.

No update

54. Provide digital video equipment to enable students to make their own teaching documentaries.

On the plan. **Biology class-rooms in some schools are equipped to work on the elective course "Kamchatka salmon"**

Recommendation was a bit vague

55. Support replication of this program in other areas of Kamchatka.

On the plan. **The elective course is taught in 19 schools. In 41 local schools components of the curriculum are presented through regional component. In other schools the curriculum is presented through other forms (circles, field-camp, festival, biology weeks)**

Recommendation accepted and acted upon

56. Place the Kamchatka teachers in contact with similar school based salmonid and stream conservation programs.

Done. Already organized for 4 teachers to go to the U.S. – project pays for two specialists and WSC pays for 2 teachers.

Recommendation accepted and acted upon

57. Generate an on-going summer program for students, including stream and spawning monitoring programs.

Being done. The first step was made in September 2006 with a special in-the-field training session for school teachers.

Recommendation accepted and acted upon

58. Provide additional sets of laboratory and monitoring equipment for the teachers/clubs.

If there is budget for this and it is the priority need, then it will be done. **It was done in terms of summer field camps and festivals "Salmon keepers" the participants of which were provided by laboratory and monitoring equipment**

Recommendation accepted and acted upon

59. Create linkages between the project's on-going research and conservation efforts and the school programs, including sponsoring discussions between school children and experts and providing opportunities for select students to participate as interns in on-going research and monitoring activities.

This is being done. Had 1 seminar last year and there will be two this year (2006). Will add 10 more schools that will be adopting teaching programs.

No update

60. Continue pursuing innovative public

This is being done.

Recommendation

awareness initiatives such as supporting indigenous salmon festivals, replication of indigenous information centers, and financial support for conservation media.

accepted and acted upon

61. Expand public awareness initiatives such as the fly fishing festival and licensing procedures to more strategically target and inform local sport fishing enthusiasts.

This is being done. See Sport Fishing section.

Recommendation accepted and acted upon

62. Continue and expand linkages between salmonid conservation and general tourism initiatives in Kamchatka.

This is being done in part through the Green Tour fundraising program, which has been launched in partnership with UNDP PA Project in summer 2006.

Not exactly what was recommended

Community Development and Alternative Livelihoods

63. Replicate the river keepers program in other project areas. This appears to be a very cost-effective conservation mechanism.

See Poaching and Over-Harvest Section above

Recommendation accepted and acted upon

64. Improve incorporation of indigenous knowledge in long-term management of river systems. This should include continued support and expansion of lessons learned through the innovative indigenous knowledge program and building support amongst traditional community leaders for sustainable management objectives.

The Project TEK conservation programs are supposed to have some tangible results in programs oriented on eco-tourism development. The project team will also consider opportunity of developing educational programs for secondary schools in indigenous villages during Phase II.

The recommendation is about TEK being introduced into management; not ecotourism

65. Support innovative, community-driven mechanisms for Community-Based Management such as the "Community Development Quota".

Done, mentioned above

Recommendation accepted and acted upon

An indigenous quota currently exists in Kamchatka. Essentially what is required to create a CBNRM program is to more carefully define the terms of allocation and use. This will require generating support and consensus from both the Government and indigenous communities. The advice of the retained consultant is correct in that the first step should be to work with indigenous communities to determine a policy or strategy that clearly details the potential program parameters. The project should provide an international facilitator to assist project staff with this process.

The Federal Rybvod is developing a draft law on coastal fisheries. It needs input from the project on the CDQ idea. The project will analyze how this can fit within the emerging fishery management conditions and prepare recommendations for doing this. Done, mentioned above

The project should possibly look beyond the example of Alaska. There are literally hundreds of CBNRM models that could possibly be adapted to more closely match the specific requirements of Kamchatka. Nearly all of these models follow similar patterns with the development of a Community Based Organization that serves as a "Representative and Accountable Legal Entity" responsible for managing the community's resource rights on behalf of its members. The CBO then works to generate revenue from the resource and redistribute this benefit in ways that create clear linkages between the existence of the benefit and

The point made in the recommendation has been missed

sustainable use or conservation. The natural resource use may be consumptive and/or non-consumptive.

Although in the long-term, the target communities may include indigenous and non-indigenous communities, the project may next wish to capitalize on the existing framework the “indigenous quota” provides and work with indigenous communities to select a site within the project’s four watersheds of concern to pilot an experimental approach. This effort may be closely linked with the designation and management planning of the site as a “protected area.”

66. Activate the micro-credit fund in project sites with clear protocols for disbursement linked to salmonid conservation. Explore possibilities of linking micro-credit with CBNRM initiatives;

67. Facilitate linkages between reindeer herders in Kamchatka and similar programs in Buryatia, Scandinavia. Identify niche markets for reindeer meat and other products, i.e., tourist camps, hotels, restaurants and butcher shops;

68. Continue working with the network of indigenous people’s organizations to generate a strong constituency for conservation of salmonid diversity and alternative livelihoods.

This will be considered as the project analyses the emerging fishery management conditions. Preparatory work was to a considerable extent done. Practical work was not carried out as it was planned for Stage 2 of the Project.

Another victim of the cancellation of Phase Two

The project will try to leverage CIDA co-funding in Bolshayresk district. The project can cover the transaction costs, it may be able to leverage CIDA co-funding. The analysis of Entrepreneurs’ requirements in loan funds was done. 3 tribes obtained micro-credits – they are “Nul’ten”, “Rodnik” (Ust-Bolsheretsk), “Kavral”.

The program on micro-credits was supposed to be financed by CIDA. Last year CIDA stopped this work.

The project is developing a program, which seeks to help local indigenous groups re-establish their reindeer based livelihoods. Due to insufficient financial resources for alternative livelihoods development in Phase I, the project team will schedule implementation of this program for Phase II.

Recommendation accepted and acted upon to the extent possible

Another victim of Phase Two cancellation

This of course is being done. The working group will continue to meet and actively participate in decision making process giving advice and support to project initiatives.

Recommendation accepted and acted upon

PROJECT FINANCING

69. Provide technical assistance for the development of sound trust fund management protocols, including fund raising and allocation. Unless the charter, by-laws and other documents describing the workings of this body are very clear and precise, there will almost certainly be significant conflict and competition. This may be addressed adequately in the draft operations manual. The fund’s legal documents must be drafted clearly in order to secure the faith of potential donors. If the documents are perceived as in conflict or otherwise unwieldy, potential donors will be hesitant to contribute.

70. Clarify Trust Fund goals and work plan for both the dollar and ruble accounts, including realistic time frames for making operational. According to statements made within the Project Document, the international or “dollar account” Trust Fund is to become operational during Phase II. However, indicators for Phase I state that the

The big first step is already done – that of developing the overall structure of the international/Russian fund. And the Russian foundation – Kamchatka Biodiversity Conservation Foundation – is now established. The next steps are the next recommendation. The work on Trust fund development was to a great degree provided by the UNDP/GEF Kamchatka PA Project. Some tasks are fulfilled - Statutory documents for all management bodies of Kamchatka Biodiversity Conservation Fund developed. Russia based body of Conservation Fund registered. Structure and bylaws of international body developed. Donation box at PK airport installed. Russian Salmon Fund registered by a partnership of Russian NGOs supported by the Wild Salmon Centre, MSU and others. <http://russiansalmon.ru/> This step is being pursued now in the last year of Phase I. Intensive discussions are being held with Wild Salmon Center on co-funding, and fund structure.

This wrong interpretation of the Project document - According to statements made within the Project Document, the international or “dollar account” Trust Fund is to become operational during Phase II. Capitalization of the Fund from

Recommendation accepted and acted upon

The actual recommendation acted upon, see above

Trust Fund will be fully operational during Phase I with nearly US\$ 1.5 million secured.

71. Identify types of activities that will require long-term funding support from the Trust Fund and the amounts of revenue needed.

the GEF funds/project is not envisaged as plans for the 2d project phase do not materialize

This too will be developed as PA management and improved fishery management practices are refined during this last year of Phase I.

Mentioned above

Update unclear

Project Management and Implementation

72 Expand Role of Steering

Committee: The services of the Steering Committee as a body with representation of nearly all interested parties will be critical in the coming months if the project is going to be a "success". It would be very beneficial if the Steering Committee meetings were both a mechanism for reporting project activity as well as an opportunity for more in-depth strategic thinking and guidance regarding general project direction relevant to achievement of project objectives. These are clearly ideals reflected in the Project Document's TOR's. The objective should be to strengthen the capacity of the Steering Committee to provide support to the PMU.

73 Review Project Achievements in Light of "Lessons Learned" and Create Long-Range Workplan: The project would generally benefit if the details of yearly plans were extended, particularly in terms of achievement of specific project indicators. To date, the project has created three workplans (2004, 2005, and 2006). Each year, these show substantial improvement in terms of detail and logical organization. However, they would be strengthened significantly and flow more smoothly into M&E requirements if they were organized by output and indicator showing how each activity is specifically focused. In addition, it is strongly recommended that in the future the yearly workplans be closely aligned with a more strategic long-term or project duration plan, showing how all project activities will be completed prior to project close.

The project has 2 working groups – Indigenous Peoples Working Group and the Science Working Group.

Distribute recommendations from mid term evaluation in Russian. Seek comments from SC members ahead of the next SC meeting in January.

The project team plans to use the SC more strategically. Develop 5-10 main questions/issues to present to the SC and ask for their support – to get part of their support. **The questions/issues presented at every of the last 3 SCs were presented there just because they demanded crucial decisions made by the SC members. The project deals with very important so-called "salmon problem" and it always gave rise to much discussion.**

We will prepare a workplan based upon the recommendations of this evaluation and a strategic re-evaluation of the project's work during a special stakeholder retreat. The workplan will be linked to the indicators.

The workplans for 2007, 2008 were linked to the indicators.

The brief of the PSC could have been improved. The recommendation not fully understood

Recommendation accepted and acted upon

There are many improved responses being considered to address evolving conservation needs. The SC along with the PMU may wish to revisit the results framework and associated indicators in light of this review to create a very detailed, time-constrained workplan to strategically guide and support the transition from preparation to fuller implementation.

As noted in the main report, consideration should be given to

As stated earlier, a strategic planning retreat will be organized in the Fall of 2006 to refine the project's strategic vision for the remainder of the project and to prepare for the project's next SC meeting.

There was no a strategic planning retreat in the Fall of 2006 to refine the project's strategic vision. All these questions were prepared and considered at project's next SC meeting, in February 1, 2007. (the reason is explained above)

Action on the recommendation would have been beneficial

holding a special SC meeting in the near future that is focused upon identifying gaps and strategic needs. This will be very important to informing final evaluation of Phase I and setting the stage for development of Phase II.

Prior to gathering the SC, this activity might commence with a working retreat with the project staff and key stakeholders in P-K to further clarify bottlenecks, propose harmonized approaches, and a clear strategy for resolution.

74 Formalize Local Stakeholder Groups: In the long-term, the project would likely benefit from the development of a LSG to provide a more regular sounding board for project activity. The LSG might include membership from stakeholders such as tourism operators, wildlife biologists, ecotourism organizations, national and international NGO's, indigenous groups, hatcheries, Government agencies, and commercial fishery operators (particularly those located in project sites.)

Consideration should be given to expanding participation to parties concerned with greater ecosystem conservation issues, reflecting the important role salmonids play in this system.

75 Establish Informal Mechanisms for Kamchatka Level Agency Information Exchange: The project may benefit if representatives of each government agency responsible for salmonid management in Kamchatka would come together on a regular basis to meet as a group with the project implementation team to discuss project activity. This would greatly facilitate strategic planning and information dissemination.

The project team will consider organizing working groups related to the project's work and to geographic areas like the Kol PA.

For example, the project could use a Working group on improving fishery management. There could also be local stakeholder working groups for Kol, for Utholok-Kvachina and In addition to the thematic working groups for science, and indigenous people.

The project will focus much more on bringing the stakeholders together to discuss and work together.

Such structures were created in Sobolevo and Tigil districts – Ecocentre Council in Sobolevo (2008) and Ecocentre Council in Tigil (since 2007). The Project supported only those activities or ideas which were initiated by local people as the most important and actual for them. In such cases there are all the reasons to suppose that the activities would be sustainable and effective as they are supposed to solve the most burning problems for the local population. The WG and Councils for 2 Project Areas described in the PD were not organized on the reason of their practical unviability though the basis for them was built, the representatives were chosen, the working regulations for the councils were worked out.

The key stakeholders such as Rybvod, Rosseslhoznadzor, NIRO, Rosprirodnadzor are all members of the Project Steering Committee. In order to strengthen their involvement in project implementation we are planning to increase the role of the SC in decision making process. I.e. the SC meetings will be organized in such a way as to encouraged the participants to actively participate in discussions rather than just approve the reports. The members of Project SC are very active and always participate in the discussions – as it was mentioned, the problems are burning. (remember T.G. Kurinova-no report without her question or commentary which nearly always arise discussions – E. Andreeva)

Another opportunity will be to have meetings with key Kamchatka stakeholders between the regular meetings of the Steering Committee in order to discuss interim results.

Non-official meetings for discussion and solving of practical questions are always held by business people in Russia, without any prompt from international experts – that's the way of doing things. The project effectiveness should be evaluated by the practical results and not by the amount of official and non-official meeting

The recommendation was not really implemented and may have been misunderstood. What was proposed was not for the benefit of the community, but for the benefit of the PA

The recommendation seems to be duplicating the PSC

which, I assure you, we had a lot. (V.A. Pischelev)

76 Develop an MOU for Project Partners: To facilitate understanding between the project and co-financing partners, it may be useful to conclude a brief, formal MOU describing expectations, communication, information sharing and other important “partnership” details. This would be particularly useful to enhance the relationship between the project, the Wild Salmon Center, and key Government agencies. As a co-funding mechanism, it is surprising that creation of such an MOU is not a standard practice for all GEF projects.

This is being done for WSC and the project.

This could also be relevant when formalizing relationships with WWF Salmon Conservation Project.

The agreements were made with WWF and fixed in the Minutes about joint activities in 2007 (the plans were realized – the trip of fishery managers to the USA, conference on the Concept of indigenous communities development, conference on the anti-poaching strategy, Salmon fishery management workshop etc.). The coordination was fruitful and well organized also thanks to personal contacts with A.Dekshtein, L.Lekai and before them K. Zgurovskiy and L. Williams. The coordination with Wild Biodiversity Foundation should be mentioned also (mentioned above – the formal basis led to practical cooperation) The agreement of cooperation was signed with Sevvostrybvod, with Kamchatka Educational Ministry and the Teachers’ Training Institute

This recommendation is a repetition of Rec 2 above

The project will report quarterly on its stakeholder coordination efforts. Quarterly reports were sent regularly to all the stakeholders. In 2007 they were sent out every 2 months.

77 Retain Additional Staff, including Short-Term Technical Assistance: If the project is going to successfully achieve its objectives, strong consideration should be given to adding additional support staff and increasing expenditures on technical assistance to stimulate more rapid achievement of project objectives based upon lessons learned to date.

As the new programs will be launched the project will bring more local and international technical assistance. It was done in the sphere of Project results presentation in Mass Media. A specialist was hired who professionally fulfilled the task. Before that no additional support staff, only consultants when the need arises

The recommendation is very vague

78 Extend Project Period: In view of current budget reserves, the preponderance of outstanding project tasks, the cost-effectiveness of maintaining current full-time project staff and an already equipped project office and the seasonality of project implementation (most project activity occurs during the short summer months), consideration may be given to extending the period of Phase I for an additional year to 2008.

We will consider this question as we finalize work planning, assess what was done and what needs.

79 Begin Planning for Phase II: This project was designed to be funded under a second phase. Work should commence in the near-term to begin setting the stage to secure funds in order to minimize the probability of having a hiatus in project activity between funding periods.

This is being done although not before strategic planning is completed for the remainder of the project.

This recommendation has been overtaken by events, namely the cancellation of Phase Two

80 Allocate Time for Site Visits: It is critical that UNDP/GEF on both the regional and national level allocate

The project is doing this. UNDP is allocating enhanced support from Moscow and the regional office in Bratislava.

This recommendation has been overtaken by events, namely the cancellation of Phase Two

This is more than one recommendation. The first has been accepted,

significant time in the coming months to make certain the project implementation unit receives enhanced support and guidance to complete the many outstanding tasks. This should include budgeting for additional site visits. For instance, due to early spring scheduling, the mid-term evaluation did not include an opportunity to physically visit pilot sites to review “on-the-ground” activities. Although not debilitating to the final assessment, future supplemental project evaluations and/or final project evaluation should certainly include field site visits. These visits should include opportunities to hold discussions with residents – particularly commercial fishing operators, “poachers”, anti-poaching field staff, field researchers, sports anglers, and indigenous communities.

81 Expand Time Allocated for Monitoring and Evaluation: As noted, the time required for this evaluation mission was woefully under estimated. If future M&E missions are to be meaningful and comprehensive, it must be recognized that this is a complex project requiring significant time/energy to fairly evaluate and provide thoughtful recommendations for strategic improvements. Future M&E missions may benefit from holding a participatory workshop with representation from all project stakeholder groups, especially those represented in the Steering Committee.

Acknowledged. This will be done for future M&E missions.

the second was not acted upon

Recommendation accepted and acted upon

ANNEX 5 PROJECT PUBLICATIONS AND JOINT PUBLICATIONS

A. Loshkareva. GIS: theory, general information, electronic atlas and “Conseravation and Sustainable Use of Wild Salmonid Biodiversity in Russia’s Kamchatka peninsula” data base user’s guide.

I. Shatilo, V. Leman. Recreational and Sport Fishing of Kamchatka: modern condition, problems and the ways of their solution, development perspectives.

Pavlov D.S., Savvaitova K.A., Kuzishchin K.V., Gruzdeva M.A., Stanford J.A. The Status and Monitoring of the Salmonid Biodiversity and Their Environment on Kamchatka (on the territory of the “River Kol” protected area).

Traditional Knowledge and its Value for Biodiversity Conservation. Under the editorship of Y. Korchagin

V. Sharakhmatova. Methodic Recommendations on TEK use.

Y. Korchagin, V. Sharakhmatov. Traditional Knowledge as Cultural Heritage of Indigenous Peoples of Kamchatka.

A. Volkov, Elena Maximenko. Regional elective course “Kamchatka Salmon”.

S. Maximov, V. Leman. Regional Concept for Reduction of Salmon Poaching in Kamchatsky Krai. “Aboriginal tourism. Kamchatka” (guide)

N. Moraleva, E.Ledovskikh etc. Aboriginal tourism. Kamchatka. (Methodic recommendations)

V. Leman, E. Esin. Illustrated Guide on Kamchatka Salmon (Atlas on Salmonid Diversity)

S. Bobylev, P.V. Kasyanov, S. Solovyov, A. Stezenko “Kamchatka salmon industry: modern condition and economic prospects of its development”,

M. Ksenofontov, I.Goldenberg. Economic scheme of salmon fisheries in Kamchatka”

I. Zhuravleva, V. Sharakhmatova, Y.Yakel Concept Paper on Development of Indigenous Peoples of the North Living in Remote Coastal Regions of Western Kamchatka.

“Kol River protected area” informational poster