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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGDN</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGTC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGMS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>World Conservation Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKH</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICIMOD</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>Integrated Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYM</td>
<td>International Year of the Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRD</td>
<td>Mountain Research Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>Medium-Sized Projects (GEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTW</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>PES</td>
<td>Payments for Environmental Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIA</td>
<td>Project Implement Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP</td>
<td>Project Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE</td>
<td>Regional Office for Europe (UNEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBSTTA</td>
<td>Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (CBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVE</td>
<td>Television Trust for the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMD</td>
<td>Sustainable Mountain Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMI</td>
<td>The Mountain Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Scientific, Cultural and Educational Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNU</td>
<td>United Nations University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCRC</td>
<td>World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>World Wide Fund for Nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive Summary

2.1 The overall objective of the project on barriers and best practice in integrated and adaptive management of mountain resources was to assist developing countries to promote and enhance the protection and sustainable development of the mountains and their resources globally, as a contribution to the International Year of the Mountains (IYM), the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) and the Bishkek World Mountain Summit (BGMS). Through collaboration among Global Environment Facility (GEF) implementing agencies and other partners, this medium-sized project (MSP) aimed to identify best practice in GEF and non-GEF projects dealing with biodiversity, climate change and international waters in the context of integrated management of mountain ecosystems. This project was a major GEF contribution of the GEF to the International Year of the Mountains (IYM), the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) and BGMS, the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit in the year 2002.

4.2 The specific objectives of the project were:

(a) To integrate available information on the status of mountain ecosystems through the Mountain Watch process and support the publication of the Mountain Atlas as a tool for decision making in sustainable mountain development;

(b) To identify the steps needed to accelerate implementation and provide the experiences and lessons as the GEF contribution to the Bishkek Mountain Platform for dissemination at global events such as World Summit on Sustainable Development and the Bishkek World Mountain Summit (BGMS), 2002;

(c) To explore opportunities for building private-public partnerships on the upland-lowland nexus and promoting fair economic valuation of upland ecological services.

5.1 The total project had a total outlay of US$2,099,000, of which US$1,999,000 represented the investments under co-financing. Of the GEF contribution, 34 percent, 22 percent and 44 percent respectively were budgeted for the three major project outcomes: (a) environmental asset management, (b) mountain stakeholders, consultation, coordination arrangements, and (c) the Bishkek Mountain Platform and Best Practice Guidelines and the Mountain Watch and the Mountain Atlas.

6.1 The Project Manager for this GEF medium-sized project (MSP) was based in the UNEP, Regional Office for Europe (ROE), Geneva. He worked under the technical supervision of the Director, UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC), Cambridge (UK, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and the Regional Director, UNEP-ROE, Geneva, with additional reporting obligations to the Coordinator, Division for GEF Coordination, Nairobi. The fund management was under direction from Geneva with limited input from Nairobi and Cambridge. The direct fund management from Geneva and the multiplicity of coordination arrangements were not effective and allowed the Project Manager to operate without any stringent administrative or financial controls.

5. The Evaluation and Oversight (EOU) Unit, UNEP, jointly entrusted the task of an in-depth evaluation of this GEF-MSP (GEF) project to the two consultants. This task was initiated on 4th September, 2003 with an initial four-weeks desk-study at Dehradun followed by a participatory on-site evaluation undertaken at UNEP-ROE, Geneva and UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Cambridge from 5th to 16th October, 2003. The total period of engagement of the consultants was 11 days each. Although not many formal interviews with stakeholders were not conducted, efforts were made to browse the web sites of organizations associated with this project and hold consultations with concerned individuals through email.
6. The project has facilitated the launching of the Water and Mountain Initiative (WAMI), a multi-stakeholder forum in partnership with UNEP and the World Economic Forum (WEF) that is likely to improve the private sector participation in the maintenance of watersheds and in putting priorities on water management. In the forefront of economic development based on the concept of “Payments for Environmental Services” (PES), independent of this, the World Economic Forum WEF has also been working towards fostering public—private sector partnerships in environmental management.

10.7. Some of the preparatory consultations for the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit, including the preparation of ten thematic papers, were supported from the project funds. However, it has been observed, however, that a number of activities for expenses in organizing the BGMS summit (e.g., paying for a national coordinator in Kyrgyzstan to organize the summit, paying for advertisements of the summit, which was not agreed upon, have not been paid for from this GEF medium-sized project-MSP). A procedure which was never agreed upon. It seems that some of the other sources of funding—funding did not materialize and the GEF funds were used to fund for the core part of the costs of the summit. For instance, the GEF budget was used to pay for the following:

- An executive secretary to the Kyrgyzstan National Committee in preparation for the summit;
- The presentation on legal aspects of international agreement on mountains;
- Overall preparation of BGMS—the summit—logistics, technical support and summit documentation.

8. None of this was included in the GEF-MSP/GEF medium-sized project budget and should have come from other sources of financing, as is noted in the GEF-MSP/GEF project document. The fund management officer in Nairobi questioned the propriety of these payments as they were not in accordance with the GEF-MSP/GEF project document. The task manager and the fund management officer, UNEP-ROE, have given no explanation for this diversion of GEF-MSPGEF medium-sized project funds away from the project’s mandated activities. The Hanoi, Bangkok, Bishkek Global Mountain Summit has, however, initiated new trends of global cooperation in both political and economic areas and was able to evolve and achieve consensus on the following three important agendas:

(a) The Bishkek Mountain Platform;
(b) The Global Partnerships on Sustainable Development of Mountain Areas; and
(c) The Central Asian Mountain Charter covering the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Republic of Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and the Republic of Uzbekistan.

8. One of the important outputs of the GEF-MSP project, was the publication of ten thematic papers, which were prepared by globally-recognized experts after extensive consultations to elicit constructive criticism and suggestions for improvement and to incorporate useful case studies from regions across the globe. The ten thematic papers include 128 case studies, which were identified by experts as the best practice case studies. These papers are followed wide coverage of best practice case studies in the following regions: Asia-Pacific (50), Africa (17), Latin America (32), Europe (18), and North America (19). These papers are the best available synthesis up to date of the complete range of sustainable mountain development issues, challenges and opportunities which are of immense value to decision and policy makers. A gestation period would be required for the before-mentioned ten best of good management practices are translated into actions in other regions of the world. The successful adoption of such good management practices were translates into actions in other regions of the world.

10. Nevertheless, the United Nations University’s publication of these papers made a peer-reviewed edited volume entitled: "Key..."
0. Has made them even more worthwhile.

14. The Bishkek Mountain Platform (BMP) – the outcome and the key product of the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit – provides a framework for the stakeholders to contribute to sustainable development in the world’s mountain regions. The BMP Bishkek Mountain Platform incorporates the lessons learnt from the series of thematic papers funded from this GEF-MSPGEF medium-sized project and various resolutions and declarations on different aspects of sustainable mountain developments made during the International Year of the Mountains (IYM). It includes commitments from mountain states among other things, for protecting mountain ecosystems, reducing poverty and ensuring food security in mountain areas. The BMP Bishkek Mountain Platform includes actions to be undertaken at the international, regional and national level including development of integrated policies, charters and conventions between states sharing mountain areas. The BMP Bishkek Mountain Platform provides guidance on sustainable Mountain Development: Development (SMD) to governments, agencies and other agencies to improve the livelihoods of mountain people, enhance protection of mountain ecosystems and promote use of mountain resources more wisely. Commitments in the form of agreements, charters and conventions are the necessary first step for bringing about real change on the ground although global experience suggests that some of these commitments work and some do not.

11.10. The Bishkek Mountain Platform (BMP) – the outcome and the key product of the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit – provides a framework for the stakeholders to contribute to sustainable development in the world’s mountain regions. The BMP Bishkek Mountain Platform incorporates the lessons learnt from the series of thematic papers funded from this GEF-MSPGEF medium-sized project and various resolutions and declarations on different aspects of sustainable mountain developments made during the International Year of the Mountains (IYM). It includes commitments from mountain states among other things, for protecting mountain ecosystems, reducing poverty and ensuring food security in mountain areas. The BMP Bishkek Mountain Platform includes actions to be undertaken at the international, regional and national level including development of integrated policies, charters and conventions between states sharing mountain areas. The BMP Bishkek Mountain Platform provides guidance on sustainable Mountain Development: Development (SMD) to governments, agencies and other agencies to improve the livelihoods of mountain people, enhance protection of mountain ecosystems and promote use of mountain resources more wisely. Commitments in the form of agreements, charters and conventions are the necessary first step for bringing about real change on the ground although global experience suggests that some of these commitments work and some do not.

11.11. The UNEP-WCMC/CMS, World Conservation Monitoring Centre and the UNEP Mountain Programme in collaboration with GEF, UNEP regional offices, UNEP, Global Resource Information Database (GRID) centres and a number of other partners produced the Mountain Watch Report as part of this GEF-MSPGEF medium-sized project. The Mountain Watch Report attempts to provide the first map-based overview of environmental change in the mountain regions and its implications for sustainable development. It presents new global maps to illustrate selected values of mountain ecosystems and the pressures that are causing environmental change. The Mountain Watch Report is an output of consistently good quality with wide thematic coverage but lacks in the technical details of the methodology and process used in assessing the status of mountain ecosystems. It is also deficient in providing good examples of map-based assessments in guiding decision-making. In the absence of the ‘mountain atlas’ (which could not be produced because the requisite funds could not be raised through co-financing), the Mountain Watch Report – in its present form cannot contribute more in raising awareness rather than in contributing making substantively useful contributions in to decision-making for integrated mountain development.

11.12. The activities undertaken by the ICIMOD International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, Nepal under this GEF-MSPGEF medium-sized project pertaining to development of the mountain geographical information system (GIS) portal – the mountain atlas and the Mountain Watch as complementary activities to their ongoing Mountain Environment and Natural Resources Information System (MENRIS) programme in the Hindu-Kush Himalayan (HKH) region, have made a substantial contribution both in terms of advancing technology and in improving the way in which geographical information is managed, enhanced, accessed and leveraged for sustainable development in the Hindu-Kush Himalayan (HKH) region.

11.13. From its inception, stakeholder participation was the cornerstone of this GEF-MSPGEF project; its thematic scope. There was, however, a preponderance of male technocrats and academicians over women and grass-roots representatives in the various national and international consultations organized during the IYM International Year of the Mountains and the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit. The country ownership of the project has remained limited to the Republic of Kyrgyzstan and the Carpathian countries.

14. The project was conceived as an attempt to draw from the strengths of multiple partners and agencies to ensure adequate and timely planning and efficient coordination of the project. In practice, this arrangement did not work effectively and as a result the supervisors were not updated on project activities being implemented on the ground by the Project Manager.
15. Under this GEF medium-sized project - MSP, a major share of the Subcontract component has gone to the UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre, for which it signed two Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs). There has been an expenditure of US$30,317 over the agreed amount in the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for the project - on "Support to the UNEP’s Mountain Programme" which, according to UNEP-WCMC, happened in "good faith", acting upon the instructions of the Project Manager, with the approval of the Fund and Management Information System (IMIS) at the UNEP offices in Geneva. Some of the problems relating to the GEF-MSP project, reallocation and regulation of expenditure were a consequence of inadequately negotiated Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) and Subcontracts that had been inadequately negotiated in the first place. Inadequate financial planning led to a lack of clear distinction between what was GEF-financed and what was co-financed. This resulted in the project funding of some non-GEF activities from this project. The Project Manager and the Fund Management Officer, UNEP-ROE, did not employ proper checks and balances and failed to organize timely consultations with supervisors to deal with this situation.

16. The Monitoring and Evaluation System (MES) for this GEF-MSP project as laid out in the project document was not implemented, leading to avoidable coordination problems towards the end of the project. The Project Manager did not submit the Quarterly Status Reports on time and these too were consistently short of the substantive information required to evaluate the success of different milestones and activities towards the end of the project. They also lacked documentary evidence of on-ground project activities and outcomes achieved, making it difficult for the supervisors to monitor the status of the project with respect to outcomes expected and those accomplished. The non-submission of Mission Reports by the Project Manager further constrained the monitoring of the project’s progress.

There was practically no formal monitoring and evaluation process in place from the inception phase of the project. This GEF-MSP project had an agreed 24-month period for implementation as stated in the project document, but the project funds were so rapidly spent that it became necessary for the GEF to go in for a premature termination of the project. This had to be enforced at the time when the first annual project implementation review was scheduled to start.

17. The ratings for the success of the project implementation on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the highest and 5 being the lowest are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of objectives and planned results</td>
<td>4 (Satisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of outputs and activities</td>
<td>4 (Satisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>4 (Satisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>4 (Satisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>5 (Unsatisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ participation</td>
<td>3 (Good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country ownership</td>
<td>4 (Satisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation approach</td>
<td>5 (Unsatisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial planning and management</td>
<td>5 (Unsatisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replicability</td>
<td>5 (Unsatisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>5 (Unsatisfactory)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Based on individual ratings for each of the criteria listed above, one "good", five "satisfactory" and five "unsatisfactory" ratings were assigned. Overall, the Project project has been assigned the "satisfactory" rating.
Main Report

1.I. Project Identifiers

19. The following are the project identifiers:

14.1(a) Title: Barriers and Best Practices in Integrated Management of Mountain Ecosystems;

14.2(b) Implementing Agency: Global Environment Facility (GEF), United Nations Environment Programme;

14.3(c) Focal Area: Multi-focal with relevance to Biodiversity and International Waters.

2.II. Project Rationale and Objectives

20. The overall rationale of the project was to assist developing countries in promoting and enhancing the protection and sustainable development of the mountains and their resources globally, as a contribution to the International Year of the Mountains (IYM), World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) and Bishkek Global Mountain Summit (BGMS). Through collaboration among GEF Implementing Agencies and other partners, this Medium-sized Project (MSP) aimed to identify best practices in GEF and non-GEF projects dealing with biodiversity, climate change and international waters in the context of integrated management of mountain ecosystems. This project was designed and implemented as a major GEF contribution to the IYM and the WSSD in 2002.

21. The specific objectives of the project were:

(a) To integrate available information on the status of mountain ecosystems through the Mountain Watch process and support the publication of the Mountain Atlas as a tool for decision making in Sustainable Mountain Development (SMD);

(b) To identify the steps needed to accelerate the implementation and provide the experiences and lessons as the GEF contribution to the Bishkek Mountain Platform (BMP) for dissemination at global events such as the WSSD and the BGMS in 2002;

(c) To explore opportunities for building private-public partnerships on the upland-lowland nexus and promoting fair economic valuation of upland ecological surfaces.

3.III. Project Budget (in United States dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP (in kind)</td>
<td>122,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Kyrgyzstan (in kind)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss Development Corporation (cash)</td>
<td>166,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aga Khan Development Network (cash)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO (cash directly to the Government of Kyrgyzstan)</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Italy (cash)</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.IV. Major Project Outcomes and Relative GEF Contribution

22. The major project outcomes, associated investments and relative percentages of GEF contributions are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Project Outcomes</th>
<th>GEF Contribution (US$)</th>
<th>Relative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Environmental Asset Management and Stakeholders' Consultations</td>
<td>300,950</td>
<td>34 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Bishkek Mountain Platform</td>
<td>197,950</td>
<td>22 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Best Practice Guidelines, Mountain Watch and Mountain Atlas</td>
<td>401,100</td>
<td>44 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Annexure I provides details of the activities and outputs planned to achieve major project outcomes listed as A, B and C above.

5.V. Task Background

24. According to UNEP procedure, several types of evaluation are conducted based on the agency, timing and scope of the evaluation. An in-depth or independent evaluation examines a project in its entirety, covering both process and impact evaluation. It looks at the achievements of the project against the stated objectives, the cost effectiveness and the efficiency of delivery of outputs as well as impacts. Thus these evaluations measure performance against the planned activities and assess outcomes and their contributions to a better-managed environment. Information for this type of evaluation is gathered both from primary and secondary sources. Moreover, all projects that have a budget of US$ 500,000 and above are subjected to an in-depth or independent evaluation. Based on the requirements of the in-depth evaluation of this GEF-MSPGEF project, the consultants were assigned the task of project evaluation by the Chief of the Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi. The evaluation was conducted during the period 4th September - 26th October 2003 (with 11 days assigned to each consultant spread over 8 weeks). The consultants' Terms of Reference (ToR) of the consultants for this evaluation are given in Annexure II.

6.VI. Evaluation Methodologies and Approach

25. As per the Terms of Reference provided by the Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP, Nairobi, a period of 11 days spread over 8 weeks was agreed upon for this evaluation. Of this, nearly 6 weeks were utilized in the desk study and electronic consultations at Dehradun and two weeks were used in discussions and consultations with key project personnel at two project implementation sites – UNEP – Regional Office for Europe (ROE), Geneva and UNEP – World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) at Cambridge – and in preparation of the evaluation report. During the 6 -week period of the desk study, we first reviewed the GEF guidance manual for project evaluation, Project Document for this GEF-MSPGEF project, quarterly progress reports and relevant project correspondence made available to us by UNEP, Nairobi.
This helped us develop an understanding of the project and the issues to be addressed through this evaluation. In addition, an extensive review was made of the project documentation. The list of documents that were reviewed by us is given in Annexure III. We also visited websites and internet portals hosting project-related information and viewed some of video presentations of the project activities.

26. Based on the above, we developed a matrix of project activities covering identified outputs and outcomes, status of their implementation, and evaluation of the key outputs using the indicators adopted from the UNEP manual to our terms of reference. This matrix was used as a framework for this evaluation.

27. A participatory approach was adopted for this evaluation and as a part of the evaluation process, discussions were held with key project personnel in the UNEP offices in Geneva and Cambridge and other stakeholders to ascertain the degree of attainment of project objectives and outcomes, to assess replicability and sustainability issues, and to identify project benefits and constraints. Websites of organizations associated with the project were browsed and email consultations were made with a range of stakeholders. The list of consulted for the project evaluation is given in Annexure IV.

7. VII. Reviews and Evaluation of the Project Activities and Outcomes

28. Sections 7.1A through 7.3, B and C provide the review of the three major project outcomes and the associated activities.

7.1A. Environmental Management and Stakeholders’ Consultation

29. One of the important contributions expected from this GEF medium-sized project was the achievement of cooperative environmental asset management in mountain regions along with the establishment of alliances between the public and private stakeholders in the maintenance of the mountain ecosystems for the management of the watershed resources for economic development. Some discussions on this aspect have taken place but no action has so far materialized. The project was expected to promote inter-institutional cooperation in environmental stewardship by sharing responsibility and accountability for the sustainability of essential local and downstream products and services such as fresh water supplies, irrigation inputs, hydropower, biodiversity, conservation and tourism. The assessment of the various activities and outputs identified under this sub-component of the project is given below.

7.1.1. Launch of the Water and Mountain Initiative

30. Facilitating the launch of the Water and Mountain Initiative (WAMI), a multi-stakeholder forum in partnership with UNEP and World Economic Forum (WEF), is a positive effort in fostering private sector participation in the maintenance of watersheds and putting water management at the forefront of economic development. This initiative is an outcome of the report from the special panel on mountain commons organized by the World Economic Forum in Davos and earlier referred to as the private-public partnership “Caring for the Mountain Commons”. Based on the consensus evolved among the participating stakeholders, the key roles and responsibilities of the Water and Mountain Initiative were:

(a) To serve as an incubator for private-public partnership that addresses the importance of watershed management for the environment and the need for wise use of water resources in business production cycles;
7.1.33 Establishment of a Mountain-Mountain Commons

3.3 The World Economic Forum (WEF) organized several regional meetings on building public-private partnerships as part of its own programme, independent of this GEF-MSP/GEF medium-sized project. Of these, the European Summit held in Salzburg, Austria, in September 2002 resulted in high level extensive brainstorming on strategies to protect the common resources such as mountain ecosystems and water. The African Economic Summit held in June 2003 in Durban, South Africa, focused on risks associated with the deterioration of water sources. The WEF World Economic Forum meeting at Jordan focused on fresh water access, trans-border water sharing and integrated management of water resources. These meetings led to a consensus on UNEP’s role in developing strategies for disaster prevention in vulnerable regions, sustainable mountain management, restoration of degraded watersheds, identification of links between mountains and fresh water and developing legal instruments to enhance lowland-upland stakeholder partnership. These meetings were instrumental in steering discussions on topics relevant to positively shaping the current and future strategies for building partnerships for upland-lowland cooperation. It is evident from the above that these activities have contributed significantly and positively by the WEF World Economic Forum and that the present GEF-MSP/GEF project has only provided some catalytic action.

(b) To contribute to better understanding of the benefits of payments for Environmental-Environmental services (PES) and

(c) To establish and promote best practices in the management of watersheds and implementation of the concept of payments for environmental services (PES). It is pertinent to mention that, independent of this project, the World Economic Forum (WEF) has been working on the public-private partnership on mountain management and is keen to secure a new MSP-medium-sized project on the payments for environmental services approach.

31. The Water and Mountain Initiative, which has been drawn support from as many as 18 companies, specifically includes in its membership represented by Swiss Re, Alcan, Brugger Consulting and NET Partners (a European company), and many other enthusiastic non-business partners represented by, among others, GEF, the Aga Khan Trust for Culture, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the World Bank, the World Conservation Union (IUCN), the Schwab Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship, and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) International. This initiative has the potential of becoming a stable platform for promoting best practices in mountain resource management if a new GEF-MSP/GEF medium-sized project can be leveraged.

32. We have observed some evidence of the promotion of traditional practices in the management of watersheds, through innovative rain-water harvesting and piped water systems providing access to drinking water, like the one evolved by the Director, Barefoot College, Tilonia, India, with support from a Switzerland-based industrial company. Although this initiative is not categorically the output of this GEF-MSP/GEF project, it is concluded as an output with no relationship with this project. A fact confirmed in writing by the Director of Barefoot College, Tilonia, it still merits recognition, as it is a well-conceived initiative nurtured by a non-governmental agency in response to the recommendations of the World Economic Forum Summit held in Davos on the promotion of Ecological Service Payments (PES) and on the payments for environmental services approach.

33. The Water and Mountain Initiative, which has presently drawn support of as many as 18 companies, specifically includes in its membership represented by Swiss Re, Alcan, Brugger Consulting and NET Partners (a European company), and many other enthusiastic non-business partners represented by, among others, GEF, the Aga Khan Trust for Culture, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the World Bank, the World Conservation Union (IUCN), the Schwab Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship, and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) International.
34. A trust fund called the ‘Water Initiative Trust Fund’ was to be established by World Economic Forum with initial commitments to promote activities in Europe and Asia. Although some of the partners (Alcan, Plastec, Umgeni Water, Murray & Roberts) had indicated their willingness to contribute to this trust fund, no concrete action has taken place. An evaluation of the impacts that this initiative would have made in terms of significant positive contributions to or outcome of improving the mountain environment cannot be therefore done. It is important to mention that this trust fund was to have been capitalized from non-GEF sources and since this project has come to an end, it is evident that this objective has not been fully achieved.

7.1.44. Establishment of a Mountain Stakeholder Association

35. This well-conceived activity has not made any major headway under this GEF-MSP project. It could have been effective in promoting and piloting local, sub-regional and trans-boundary stakeholder associations for the overall sustainability of linkages between the local and the regional levels in mountain areas, but not made any major headway under this GEF-MSP. The special pilot association in Kyrgyzstan called the ‘Mountain Village Association’ is the only association to have been established during the lifetime of this project. For the replicability of this initiative in other regions of the world, commitments of funding support for such associations will be needed which may not be easy given the critical state of global resources.

14.1.15. Linkages with the Convention on Biological Diversity

36. It was envisaged in the Project Document that the outcomes of this GEF-MSP project would be integrated into the mountain biodiversity theme, which had been included as one of the three themes for in-depth consideration at the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity, held in Bratislava, Slovakia, in 1998. The proposed programme of work on mountain biological diversity was discussed at the eighth meeting of the Convention’s Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) held in Montreal from 10th to 14th March 2003. We have observed that the outcomes of this GEF-MSP project presently do not find a place in the proposed programme of work developed by the SBSTTA.

14.1.6. United Nations General Assembly Resolution on the International Year of the Mountains

37. On 20 December 2002, at its fifth-seventh session, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution 57/245 on the culmination of the UN International Year on the Mountains.
20th December 2002 as A/RES/57/245 in its 57th session. Among other things, the resolution
inter-alia endorses the Bishkek Mountain Platform, the outcome document of the Bishkek
Global Mountain Summit and agrees on actions at 11 points relating to sustainable mountain
development.

7.2B. The Bishkek Mountain Summit/Bishkek Global Mountain Summit (BGMS)

38. The final event of the International Year on the Mountains was the Global Mountain
Summit held in Bishkek from 28th-1 November 2002, at which 1,553 participants from 82 countries
included 30 official governmental delegations, representatives from 59 international organizations,
particularly among them FAO, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), UNEP, UNDP, the United Nations Educational, Scientific
and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ)
and international financial organizations such as the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank,
and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, etc.; international governmental organizations like Mountain Forum, the World Association of Mountain People, the Aga Khan
Development Network, Earth 3000; and many others participated.

39. Although the organization of the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit was not the part of
the present GEF-MSPGEF project, a large number of preparatory consultations, meetings and
workshops were held globally, which were partially, or fully supported by GEF-MSPGEF project
funds. At these gatherings, consensus was arrived at for the future discussions and adoption
during the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit. These consultations led to the refinement of the
Bishkek Global Mountain Summit agenda and programme and to the discussions being
moving forward. These consultations also led to the inclusion of the issues of gender, economic incentives and legal instruments for sustainable mountain development being
incorporated in the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit agenda. The Bishkek Global
Mountain Summit has initiated new trends of global cooperation in both political and economic areas
although sustainable financing mechanisms have not been secured. The Bishkek Global
Mountain Summit has been able to evolve and achieve consensus on the following three important
undertakings:

- (i) Bishkek Mountain Platform;
- (ii) Global Partnership on Sustainable Development of Mountain; and
- (iii) Central Asian Mountain Charter covering the Republic of Kazakhstan, the
Kyrgyzstan Republic, Republic of Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and the Republic of
Uzbekistan.

7.2.4. Thematic Papers

40. One of the important components of this GEF-MSPGEF project was the publication of ten
thematic papers for the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit after discussions and extensive e-
consultations to elicit constructive criticism and suggestions for further improvement and incorporation
of relevant best practice case studies from regions across the globe. A generic template for the
presentation of thematic papers was developed covering:

- a broad definition of the issues, (a)
- State of knowledge, (b)
- Best practice examples, (c)
- Linkages with other themes and processes and (d)
- Key actions were developed.

41. The International Advisory Board, in collaboration with UNEP, identified the topics and the
lead authors, who were all globally recognized experts. The Director, Centre for Mountain Studies &
President of the Mountain Forum, who was identified as the editor of the thematic papers,
developed template Reference templates and the timeline for the preparation of the thematic papers.
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7.2.22. Value Addition

The ten thematic papers include 128 case studies. The regional coverage of case studies is Asia-Pacific (50), Africa (17), Latin America (32), Europe (18), and North America (19). Some case studies cover more than one region. The number of case studies by region is 138, exceeding the total number of case studies of 128. The draft thematic papers were subjected to the global e-consultation process organized by the Mountain Forum for over a two-and-a-half-month period during which 63 comments were received. Independent of the e-consultation, the thematic papers were also peer reviewed by experts from different organizations across the globe.

42. Based on the comments received during e-consultations and the peer review comments, the lead authors prepared final versions of the papers that were subsequently hosted on the website of the Mountain Forum. These papers provide examples of best practices and were collated, edited, and developed into a comprehensive publication. The academic value of these thematic papers and the case studies in disseminating knowledge, technical know-how, and lessons learnt from many parts of the world have been summarized in the present evaluation.

43. We strongly feel that the high quality knowledge output of this GEF-MSPGEF medium-sized project would subsequently assist the developing countries to develop and implement best practices that promote and enhance the protection and sustainable development of mountains and their resources globally. Some gestation period would however be required for the translation of good management practices into actions in other regions of the world. The pace of dissemination of knowledge about the various best practice case studies and the level of national commitments to translate the learning into best practices on the ground would ultimately determine the level of success in the implementation of good practices.

44. A matrix of the key actions derived from the thematic papers and the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit to be implemented at the global, regional, sub-regional and national levels covering investment, governance and capacity building is an important outcome of this GEF-MSPGEF project. We have reviewed this matrix and feel that it provides a comprehensive framework for sustainable mountain development. It must also be stated that the GEF-MSPGEF project was a global project, and translation of the thematic papers should have also been done into other languages too and not just confined to translation into the Russian language. The outcomes of the GEF-MSPGEF project were a review of more specific contributions of GEF and non-GEF funded project activities in development and good management practices. This review has not taken place.

7.2.23. Value Addition of Thematic Papers

45. As part of the United Nations University’s (UNU) mandate to serve as a platform for dialogue and bridge between scholars, practitioners and policy makers, an effort is currently under way to publish the thematic papers as an edited volume under the title Key Issues for the World’s Mountain Regions. The two independent peer reviewers of the thematic papers have considered these papers to be of immense value to an international audience and they addressing new governance issues such as environmental services agreements, local and linked sustainability and re-orientation of education and research to promote sustainable development in mountain systems. They have recommended the publication of these thematic papers as the UNU’s publications subject to appropriate editorial modifications and the inclusion of a new, brief introductory chapter by the editors.

46. We feel that the subsequent publication of the thematic papers that are the key outputs of this GEF-MSPGEF project subsequently by UNU would be a very valuable add-on-extra outcome of this project. The dissemination of information about the wide spectrum of mountain issues, practices and interventions through this publication would immensely benefit the cause of the mountains, for which the GEF-MSPGEF project deserves considerable credit. Director,
Centre for Mountain Studies, Perth College, UHI Millennium Institute, who is one of the key persons responsible for major editing of the papers, and the Senior Academic Programme Officer, Environment and Sustainable Development, United Nations University, Tokyo, Japan, who is responsible for their publication, have confirmed that the United Nations University will publish the thematic papers edited under the title “Key issues for the World’s Mountain Regions”. This book, which is expected to be available by during the year 2004, will be useful for academicians, students, and policy-makers concerned with mountain regions. This is a topic of increasing global concern, particularly since the inclusion of a chapter on mountains in Agenda 21 and the process leading to the declaration and implementation of the International Year of Mountains, 2002. The fund support for the book is being generated by the United Nations University through many of its partners who will receive complimentary copies of the books for dissemination through the networks of the project partners, and other stakeholders, in order to reach scholars, policy makers and non-governmental organizations, particularly in developing countries. This would increase the visibility of the project and enhance the overall dissemination of the project output.

7.2.3 The Bishkek Mountain Platform

The Bishkek Mountain Platform (BMP) was the outcome and the key product of the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit. It provides a framework for the stakeholders to contribute to sustainable development in the world’s mountain regions. The Bishkek Mountain Platform incorporates the lessons learnt from the series of thematic papers funded under the GEF-MSP medium-sized project and the salient features of various resolutions and declarations on different aspects of sustainable mountain development made during the International Year of the Mountains. It includes commitments from mountain states, among other things, inter alia, for protecting mountain ecosystems, reducing poverty and ensuring food security in mountain areas.

The Bishkek Mountain Platform includes actions to be undertaken at the international, regional and national level including the development of integrated policies, charters and conventions between states sharing mountain areas. The BMP provides guidance for Sustainable Mountain Development (SMD) to governments and other non-governmental agencies, for example on how to improve the livelihoods of mountain people, protect mountain ecosystems and use resources more wisely. Thus, the Bishkek Mountain Platform meets this GEF-MSP project objective of providing a forum for enhanced coordination and expanded consultations on issues relating to sustainable mountain development. The BMP can be accessed through several web sites, particularly http://mountain.unep.ch, and is thus available to policy makers and practitioners for developing mountain related policy instruments and legislations. The Bishkek Mountain Platform does not need large funds to maintain it – the UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre can maintain it on its web-portal under its Mountain Programme. Presently, only the Republic of Kyrgyzstan has benefited from the guidance in developing mountain-related legislation.
7.3.3 Best Practice Guidelines, Mountain Watch and Mountain Atlas

7.3.3.1 Case Study Publication in the Special Issue of Mountain Research Development

One of the anticipated project outcomes of this GEF-MSPGEF project was the publication of guidelines and a select set of case studies of best practices in a Special Issue of Mountain Research Development (MRD) in 2003. Mountain Research Development (MRD) is a peer-reviewed quarterly journal that publishes articles from authors from many disciplines associated with mountain environments, resource development and human welfare. Apart from two sections in Mountain Research Development (MRD) namely “Development and Research” and “Mountain Platform”, “Mountain Notes”, “Mountain Media”, and “Mountain Views” regularly publish information on events, activities, statements and views in these sections. As per the publication policy of the Mountain Research Development (MRD), it is only previously unpublished articles are accepted for publication, including those not uploaded on the Internet can only be accepted for publication. Through our inquiry with Mountain Research Development (MRD) editorial office, we have learnt that there is no practice of publishing ‘Special Issue’ issues of MRD the journal, sponsored by an organization or dedicated to the results of a specific project. Thus it was not appropriate to propose the publication of a Special Issue of Mountain Research Development (MRD) as one of the project outcomes, as it would have allowed this. The MRD has published the Bishkek Mountain Platform BMP (Volume 23, No. 1, February 2003, page 88) and has also published information on the key outcomes of the International Year of the Mountains and the United Nations Resolutions on the International Year of the Mountains (2003) in the same issue. Similarly, information on Sustainable Mountain Development, Mountain Forum Council meetings and the African Node of the Mountain Forum has been published in MRD the journal (Volume 20, No. 1, February 2000, pages 92–97). We have noted with concern the erroneous reporting made by the Project Manager in his document “MSP Outputs and Supporting Documentation”, in which, in response to the request for a copy of the Special Issue of Mountain Research Development (MRD) in 2003 showing the guidelines and the case studies of best practices, he has referred to page 86 of the above issue of MRD the journal. The Project Manager has thus sought to convey the impression that a Special Issue of Mountain Research Development (MRD) exists whereas, the truth is that it neither exists nor can exist according to the publication policy of MRD.

7.3.2.2 Mountain Watch

The UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) and the UNEP mountain programme, in collaboration with GEF, UNEP regional offices, UNEP-GRID centres and a number of other partners, have produced the Mountain Watch Report as part of this GEF-MSPGEF project. The Mountain Watch Report attempts to provide the first map-based overview of environmental change in the mountain regions and its implications for sustainable development. It presents new global maps to illustrate selected values of mountain ecosystems and many of the pressures that are causing environmental change. In addition to the above, Mountain Watch Report also attempts to provide a systematic assessment of mountain ecosystems, using a geographical information system (GIS) analysis of global data, presented as a visual, map-based overview of the following:
7.3.44. Interactive Internet Internet Mountain Watch Portal

Mountain Atlas

Photographs, satellite models, terrain models, text and tables. Using spatial analyses of geographical information systems (GIS) data to assess values and pressures in mountain ecosystems and where possible enhancing these broader perspectives by use of fine-scale local information, the Mountain Watch and the mountain atlas were planned to make a substantive contribution to integrated mountain development and to provide an invaluable information resource for mountain specialists, planners and policy-makers and the concerned public. However, GEF funds could not be used to finance the production of an atlas and funds through co-financing could not be raised, however, this activity could not be implemented under this GEF-MSPGEF project, although UNEP-WCMC had relevant basic datasets, adequate technical skills and the experience of having produced such atlases in the recent past. As the attempts to raise approximately US$ 250,000 for research, spatial analyses, writing, networking, mapping and production work for this atlas by the Project Manager and UNEP-WCMC were not successful, this valuable output for sharing information for integrated mountain management could not be produced.

7.3.44. Interactive Internet Internet Mountain Watch Portal

The UNEP-WCMC developed an interactive Mountain Watch Portal for the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit that could have been accessible on-line at the site globalmountainsummit.org for the BGMS. A wide range of information was provided and maintained on this portal until the launch of the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit. After the BGMS summit, this portal was not maintained to provide any online access to information relevant to mountain States. The information can now be accessed only through the site mountains.unep.net. The portal, however, still includes the thematic papers and other useful information that was generated during the BGMS and other relevant information such as the Mountain Watch Report and the mountain atlas. The portal provides interactive use of all the maps contained in the Mountain Watch Portal through the link: www.unep-wcmc.org/maps/mountains. This feature of the portal is very useful as it allows the users to effectively explore the data sets and to manipulate the various thematic map layers.

55. Using the software Web Trends, which provides statistics on the trends in use of a web site or web portal, the UNEP-WCMC staff have generated the statistics of the Internet Internet Mountain Watch Portal for the year 2002. According to the Web Trends report for the period 1-31 January 2002 and 1-31 December 2002 there were 32,494 hits on this portal averaging about 89 hits per day. Users from 104 countries visited this portal and on an average each visitor spent 16.56 minutes browsing this portal.
7.3.55. International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development–Hindu Kush Himalayan region

56. Under this GEF-MSPGEF project, three activities were sub-contracted to the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, ICIMOD, Kathmandu, namely, the mountain geographical information system (GIS) portal, the mountain atlas and Mountain Watch Report for the Hindu-Kush Himalayan (HKH) region. All of these were continuing activities of the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) under the Mountain Environment and Natural Resources Information System (MENRIS) programme and the support provided through the GEF-MSPGEF project was complementary to these already existing ongoing activities. A mountain geographical information system (GIS) portal was developed by ICIMOD and deployed to serve geographical information system (GIS) resources addressing sustainable mountain development issues in the Hindu Kush Himalayan (HKH) region and can be accessed at www.icimod-gis.net.np. The portal serves as a virtual platform for sharing data and information and offers a one-stop experience for geographical data needs in the region. The mountain atlas, which ICIMOD has forged a partnership with the University of Eastern Kentucky, United States of America, is in the final stage of production after several revisions and an external review.

57. Under Mountain Watch, the ICIMOD International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development has compiled various geographical information system (GIS) datasets at 1:1 million scale of the Hindu Kush Himalayan (HKH) region on a 1:1,000,000 scale that include base maps, district or province maps, geological, drainage maps, eco-region, relief, elevation, major habitat, land use, and land cover, infrastructure, settlement and watershed maps. Our review of the ICIMOD International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development outputs suggest that these are contributing significantly to the extensive geographical information system (GIS) network development in the Hindu Kush Himalayan region.

8.VIII. Other Project Activities

58. On relating the project outcomes identified in the Project Document with our Terms of Reference for this evaluation, we have observed that for some of the outcomes practically no information or, in some cases, inadequate documentation was made available by the Project Manager. This placed some constraints upon our evaluation of these outcomes. The following are our comments with respect to these specific outputs:

- Mitigation plans were to be developed and provided to the regional partnerships for mountain action as part of this project. There is however, no evidence of such mitigation plans having been prepared.

- We understand that three regional workshops were held in Latin America, Africa and Asian regions to identify best practices for the sustainable development of mountain regions. We cannot comment upon the outcomes and the impact of these workshops in the absence of the workshop recommendations and information on their implementation status. We have only been able to see only the workshop programme and the list of participants and but there seem to be no workshop reports or recommendations. Despite several requests for the documents, the Project Manager could not make these documents available.

- The series of four video tapes of the Earth Report 6 produced by TVE for the International Year of the Mountains 2002 and broadcasted by BBC under the titles Summit to the Sea: Part I and II (26 minutes duration each), Summit to the Sea: Special edition (44 minutes duration) and The Angle on Hunger (26 minutes duration) were reviewed. The precise objective of producing these video tapes as discerned from the project documentation was to disseminate the available information on the status of current threats and challenges to mountain ecosystems and to direct the world community’s attention towards the urgent need to evolve-evolving strategies and share sharing best
practices for their protection and management through the events organized during the Year of the Mountains. From our review of these video tapes it is evident that the four video tapes provide quick snap shots of the threats and challenges faced by the different mountain ecosystems of the world, more specifically, the Mount Kilimanjaro, the Andes and the Alps. The range of threats cover impacts of global warming, mineral exploration, oil pipeline routing, water resource projects, mountain farming, soil erosion, decline in productivity and diversity of plant species and increasing challenges posed by harsh climate and the fragility of these mountain ecosystems, for in relation to sustainable living of the mountain communities. There is considerable overlap in issues highlighted for the perception of threats through coverage of the same issues in different mountain ecosystems, using the same video footage in more than one videotapes. Since these video tapes were broadcasted and re-broadcasted by the BBC in all the time zones and during weekends, they must have contributed to raising awareness about integrated mountain management issues.

As regards the ‘Sustainable Mountain Development (SMD) guidelines’, it is apparent from the project documentation that they are not available as a stand-alone document. However, guidance on sustainable mountain development is available, however, in the Bishkek Mountain Platform and is also featured in the Mountain Research Development (Vol. 23, No. 1, February 2003, pp. 86–89), which can be made use of in integrated planning and management of mountain ecosystems.

9. IX. National Comprehensive Development Framework

Based on the documents reviewed, it has been found little evidence of the sustainable mountain development guidelines having been integrated into the National Comprehensive Development Framework framework of mountain states. The Project Manager stated in his correspondence that a Comprehensive Development Framework framework for Kyrgyzstan had been prepared and was being revised to fully integrate provisions of the law and the Bishkek Mountain Platform as the basis for sustainable mountain development in Kyrgyzstan. As this activity is still ongoing, its evaluation cannot be done. Further countries other than Kyrgyzstan are not pursuing this activity. On the basis of this it is evident that several of the project activities were not dealt with by the Project Manager or were poorly implemented.

10. X. Role of United Nations Agencies and other International Organizations

Our review suggests that the GEF-MSP project was a global project as it brought together a large number of UN agencies, among them, UNEP, FAO, UNDP, UNESCO, UNDP, United Nations University and IUCN, as well as such agencies as the World Bank, WIWE, World Summit on Sustainable Development, The Mountain Institute, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, ACDP, Asian Development Bank and ICIMOD, International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, etc., and was able to evolve consensus over a large number of issues and processes culminating in an agreement and ownership of the Bishkek Mountain Platform. We have observed the involvement of the above agencies in the GEF-MSP project as collaborators, partners and implementers of various project activities. Of particular importance are the International Advisory Board (IAB) of the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit and President of Kyrgyzstan’s Council of Patrons of the IYM International Year of the Mountains, of which many of the above agencies were members.

There is however no evidence of the formal meetings of the Inter-agency Group on Mountains, which the FAO was to convene during 2001-2003. Neither is there any evidence what steps the Project Manager took to ensure proper coordination, with the FAO. These meetings would have helped in rapidly building consensus amongst various international agencies and organizations associated with the activities of this project. Other than this, we believe
that a very positive and important role was played by all United Nations agencies and other international organizations in the successful planning and conduct of project activities.

11.XI. Overall Assessment of the Project

62. Sections 11.1A–through 11.7E provide an overall assessment of the Project as per the format given in the ToR terms of reference.

11.1A. Sustainability of Environmental Benefits and Capacity Building

63. Under this GEF-MSPGEF project, a number of activities, implemented which resulted in several environmental benefits, some of which are sustainable. The project has increased the accessibility, quantity and quality of information on mountains and mountain people and has also increased public awareness of the importance of mountains to the earth’s fundamental life-sustaining systems. It is expected that increased awareness will lead to better understanding of environmental needs and will benefit decision making on key environmental issues.

64. Through the International Partnership for Sustainable Development in Mountain Regions, the project has strengthened and expanded the alliance of organizations that are committed to the mountains through the International Partnership for Sustainable Development in Mountain Regions although sustainable financing mechanisms are not in place. At the same time, however, actions at the country level – which are essential to implement national strategies for sustainable mountain development, to enact enabling policies and legislation, and to develop compensation mechanisms for environmental services and goods provided by mountain ecosystems – remain still continuous to be weak. Many mountain countries do not have the appropriate institutional environments and the critical financial resources to invest in sustainable mountain development.

Education, training, capacity building, technology development, and transfer and investments are still required to make the environmental benefits accrued through this project truly sustainable. Thus sustainability of the project activities is not ensured beyond the project period.

11.2B. Level of Stakeholder Participation

65. This project was designed as a multi-stakeholder project from its inception. During the implementation phase a number of stakeholders were involved in the process as active partners. It is pertinent to mention that during the numerous and wide-ranging consultations and meetings organized across the globe prior to the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit, a very large number of numerous country and regional civil society representatives and practitioners provided valuable inputs that helped to refine the agenda as well as the outcomes of the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit. Most of the major groups dealing with the mountains were represented on the International Advisory Board (IAB) for the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit, among them IUCN, WWF, Mountain Forum, ICIMOD, International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, Mountain Institute, Association of Mountain People, and International Mountains Society. In addition, regional partners were engaged in Africa, Asia and Latin America (Africa Mountain Association, African Mountain Forum, InfoAndina, IUCN Asia, National Centre for the Development of Mountain Regions in Kyrgyzstan, etc.).

66. Furthermore, as per the Project Manager, the GEF-MSPGEF project support for participation at the first International Year of the Mountains meetings during 2002 and at other major national and international preparatory consultations for the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit was provided in the ratio of 60:40 between the developed and developing countries.

Preponderance or preponderance of male scientists and academicians over women and grass-roots representatives was an evident feature in these consultations. The representation of all major groups at the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit ensured a consensus for adoption of the Bishkek Mountain Platform that finally became globally accepted as the framework for Sustainable Mountain Development in the XXI-twenty-first century and was referenced in the UN United Nations General Assembly resolution as such.
14.1C. Country Ownership of the Project

67. The GEF-MSGF medium-sized project was designed with the Republic of Kyrgyzstan as the hub of the project activities especially because the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit was organized there. Due to dynamic leadership and the personal involvement of the President of Kyrgyzstan as the Chairman of the International Advisory Board for the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit, and the Council of Patrons of the 2003 International Year of the Mountains, Kyrgyzstan had total ownership of the project. Although various other mountain countries were involved in organizing regional consultations and meetings and actively contributed to the success of the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit, their level of ownership of the project cannot be fully ascertained. By according to the Framework Convention on the Protection and Sustainable Development of the Carpathians, countries like Czech Republic, Republics of Hungary and Slovak, Governments of Romania and Ukraine and the Council of Ministers of Serbia and Montenegro have demonstrated their commitment to pursuing a comprehensive policy for the protection and sustainable development of the Carpathians with a view to improving the quality of life, strengthening local economies and communities and promoting the conservation of natural values and cultural heritage.

14.2D. Project Management

68. The Project Manager for this GEF-MSGF project was based in UNEP-ROE, Geneva. He worked under technical supervision of the Director, UNEP-WCMC and Regional Director, UNEP-ROE, Geneva. The fund management was under direction from Geneva with limited input from Nairobi and Cambridge. The project was conceived as a way of drawing on the strengths of multiple partners and agencies from the beginning to ensure adequate and timely planning and efficient coordination of the project. Our review suggests that appropriate and adequate coordination of all the project activities was not always visible and several reasons can now be assigned to this. One of them is the “duality of supervision” as indicated above. Thus by agreeing to this multiple supervision, coordination and management arrangement for this project, the project management team had set up a difficult task for itself right from its inception. In practice, this arrangement did not work effectively as a result of which the supervisors were often not updated about project activities being implemented on the ground by the Project Manager. The multiplicity of coordination arrangements allowed the Project Manager to operate without any stringent administrative and financial control and supervision.

69. Although clear timelines were set for project implementation, the Project Manager failed to adhere to them. Our review of the project correspondence indicates that despite the fact that the first quarterly progress report became due on 30 September 2002, this was not made available to DGEF until 6 April 2003. Subsequent to this, the DGEF started requesting repeated reminders through e-mails to the Project Manager for about the quarterly reports that were long overdue and which were required to ascertain project implementation status but these were repeatedly ignored. This was followed by the visit of the Fund fund management was under direction from Geneva with limited input from Nairobi and Cambridge. The project was conceived as a way of drawing on the strengths of multiple partners and agencies from the beginning to ensure adequate and timely planning and efficient coordination of the project. Our review suggests that appropriate and adequate coordination of all the project activities was not always visible and several reasons can now be assigned to this. One of them is the “duality of supervision” as indicated above. Thus by agreeing to this multiple supervision, coordination and management arrangement for this project, the project management team had set up a difficult task for itself right from its inception. In practice, this arrangement did not work effectively as a result of which the supervisors were often not updated about project activities being implemented on the ground by the Project Manager. The multiplicity of coordination arrangements allowed the Project Manager to operate without any stringent administrative and financial control and supervision.

70. We have observed that two projects, Bishkek Global Mountain Summit and GEF medium-sized project, with overlapping activities were being concurrently implemented.
concurrently. The GEF-MSP medium-sized project was to feed into the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit. It is evident that the Project Manager of this GEF-MSPGEF project used some funds to supplement the funding needed for logistical and administrative support to the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit. This was improper and it was the responsibility of the Project Manager and the Fund Management Officer of UNEP-ROE, Geneva, to prevent the above situation. As some of the activities were common to both the above projects, it became difficult for us to assign credits to individual projects for the outcome generated and also to ascertain their impacts as far as this evaluation is concerned.

71. We observed that the record keeping and reporting on project activities by the office of the Project Manager was grossly inadequate. Although folders on almost all project activities existed in the Project Manager’s office, the documents inside them were not complete and unchanged. The information on the project activities was scattered in electronic form and in paper formats in various places. Copies of email correspondence were also not properly indexed in the project folders. All this indicates improper office management. Under such circumstances, copies of communication made between DGEF and the Project Manager that were made available to us by UNEP, Nairobi proved to be very useful.

72. According to the Project Document, the UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) was designated as the Project Implementing Agency and was required to carry out the Project Implementation Plan (PIP). However, during our discussions with the Director of UNEP-WCMC, it was mentioned by Director, UNEP-WCMC, that UNEP-ROE, Geneva, and not UNEP-WCMC, World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) was the implementing agency. Because of this ambiguity prevailing in the project documentation, the project implementation review (PIR) for this GEF-MSPGEF project was not done.

73. A review of the Project Implementation Plan (PIP) as developed as a part of the Project Document, indicated that timelines were provided for various project activities to be completed within the 24-month project period. Despite this, nearly all project activities were not completed within 12–15 months of the project period. In the last paragraph of the project implementation plan, 24-month time lines are indicated but no activities are to be accomplished during this time-frame are shown against these time-lines. We have also learnt that, barring a few activities that were to be accomplished in the period up to December 2003, most of the activities already stand completed despite the delayed start of the project. This indicates that the project implementation plan was not well conceived. This situation was further compounded by the project manager’s rapid spending of the project funds in the Project Manager’s activities, including those that were not present to be funded from this GEF-MSPGEF project. Thus project funds were spent nearly one year in advance of its completion, forcing the DGEF to initiate a premature termination of this GEF-MSPGEF project even though there are still several pending unfinished activities and outputs that were to be accomplished. Had the project funds been spent in a prudent manner, these funds would have still been there to pursue some of the neglected activities and ensure the continuation of the project until the envisaged time period.

11SE Financial Planning and Management

74. The GEF-MSPGEF medium-sized project was approved with a total cost of US$2,099,000, which included US$390,000 as GEF Trust Fund and US$1,199,100 as fund support through co-financing. The 24-month project began in May 2002 and was scheduled to be completed in April 2004. However on 30th May, 2003 a major revision in project planning and budget was approved by Chief, Budget and Financial Management Service, UNEP, Nairobi. Although the total project cost including the GEF Trust Fund and co-financing amounts remained the same after this budget revision, the budget allocation for 2004 amounting to US$105,981 was cancelled and reallocated to the year 2003. No reason for this revision was recorded in the project action sheet. This meant that no project activities would go beyond 2003. This in effect meant advancing the completion date for project activities by four months. Some additional activities were also scheduled for the year 2003 during this revision such as...
Review of the Budget Performance by the Object Codes

We have reviewed the budget performance by Object Codes for the period January 2003 to August 2003 provided by the Fund Programme Management Office in Geneva. All account sheets have been updated and posted in October 2003. In the United Nations Integrated Management Information System, the period up to August 2003 only ( Annex VI). A review of the Object Codes (Annex VI) indicates that under the Object Code 3301 – “Regional meeting – Consultation on Mountain Ecosystems”, a disbursement of $3,879.41 has been made, which exceeds the approved allocation of $2,500.00. The Fund Programme Management Office in Geneva explained that salary payment adjustment in case of the former and leave salary payment adjustment in case of the latter was the reason for disbursement of the above amounts. Similarly, under the Object Code 3301 – “Regional meeting – Consultation on Mountain Watch and Best Practices”, a sum of $5,379.41 has been disbursed, representing an over-allocation of $3,879.41 against an allocation of $2,500.00. The Director of UNEP-ROE in Geneva stated that this over-expenditure lies within the established 20% flexibility rule. Furthermore, under the Object Code 1301 – “Administrative Support Personnel”, a disbursement of $105,000 by $1,783.70. This disbursement is authorized by the Chief, Programme Coordination and Management Unit. The review of the project correspondence indicated that Director, UNEP-WCMC – World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Cambridge and DGEF, Nairobi, were not involved in the project revision indicating improper coordination of project activities.

We have reviewed the final project report.
A sum of US$17,221 was disbursed under Object Code 3101—‘Training by Mountain Forum for developing country participants’. Despite our request, the Project Manager, UNEP-ROE in Geneva provided no details. There is no documentary evidence of this training having been conducted as the information on who attended the training, who organized it, when and where, and what benefits accrued from the training is completely lacking. We are therefore unable to comment on the ‘Training component’ amount of US$3101 of the budget. On the other hand, activities under Object Code 3302, 3303 and 3304—‘Regional Consultation on the Mountain Watch and Best-practices’ were reasonably well organized and led to the success of the ‘Bishkek Global Mountain Summit’ and other related project activities.

Under this GEF-MSPGEF project, as per the two memorandums of understanding executed for two separate tasks, a major share of the sub-Horizontal-Contract component was accounted to the UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre-WCMC. These included:

(a) Memorandum of understanding for the Project ‘Support to the Programme ‘Preparation and Organization of the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit’’ (Project No. GF/2740-02-4410-22-1) dated 15.11. November 2002 for US$180,000, and

(b) Memorandum of understanding for the Project ‘Support to the Programme ‘Mountain-Mountain Programme programme’’ (Project No. CP/5023-01-03-2102 and GF/2740-02-4410-2260) dated 30.5. May 2003 for US$158,209.

We have reviewed the Final Project Statement budget of the two memorandums, indicating amount of allocation, expenditure and balance for the two memorandums of understanding signed by UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre-WCMC.

It is evident that the bulk of funds for the second memorandum of understanding were outsourced by UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre-WCMC to third parties, with US$113,440 going to national consultants and US$23,062 going for the training component. Under the second memorandum of understanding dated 30.5. May 2003, against the allocated sum of US$158,209, UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre-WCMC incurred an expenditure of US$118,526, representing an excess of US$30,317. The UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre-WCMC requested for reimbursement of this amount, which, in its view, according to them, had been incurred in ‘good faith’, through acting with the approval of the Project Manager and the Fund-Management. However, the UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre-WCMC project staff, national consultants and expenditure on exhibitions and presentations under the training component for which the UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre-WCMC received expenditures for services from the Project Manager, UNEP-ROE, Geneva, the memorandum of understanding was revised to cover these costs. Indeed, a draft memorandum of understanding was also prepared, but this was never signed. However, relying on ‘good faith’ and oral verbal instructions—in financial transactions is indicative of inappropriate financial planning.

The first memorandum of understanding dated 15.11. November 2002 was fully managed in Cambridge by the UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre-WCMC and was completed within budget. Under its first memorandum of understanding for US$180,000, UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre-WCMC charged US$30,000 for ‘Preliminary preparation under Object Code 3304—‘Regional Consultation on the Mountain Watch and Best practices’’ and meeting the costs of office premises. Since the budget line of the approved memorandum of
understanding MoU, included this expenditure under this heading, along with other payments that were due to UNEP-WCMC. World Conservation Monitoring Centre-WCMC under the two memorandum of understanding MoUs have been released by UNEP, Nairobi after protracted negotiations and delay. These payments are exclusive of the over-spent amount of $30,317, which is now being referred to as the outstanding amount by the UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre-WCMC for this project, and for which they have sought reimbursement. However, UNEP-DGEF has reimbursed UNEP-WCMC for the amount agreed to in the original memorandum of understanding.

82. According to the updated budget details provided by Fund Programme Management Officer, UNEP-ROE, Geneva on 7th October 2003, an amount of $154,357.00 was allotted to UNEP, Geneva for this project for the year 2003. Out of this, disbursements have been made for $145,358.12 for expenditure incurred and an amount of $6367.30 has been kept as obligated expenditure under the project, leaving a balance of only $2,631.58 in the project account. Thus from a financial standpoint the project almost come to an end. During our discussions with Fund Programme Management Officer, UNEP-ROE, Geneva, he stated that from the administrative or financial angle there are no problems on the part of UNEP, Geneva due to any unresolved issues. This is however not true. There are many queries that have been raised by the Fund Programme Management Officer, UNEP, Nairobi, about the propriety of payments made for non-GEF activities and that have not been reimbursed to UNEP. As a result, these have remained unanswered by the Fund Programme Management Officer, UNEP-ROE, Geneva, and the Project Manager, UNEP, Nairobi.

83. A new and fully computerized system, the Integrated Management Information System (Integrated Management Information System) has been put in place to provide on-line and up-to-date information on administrative and financial matters in the United Nations offices in Geneva and Nairobi. Discussions with concerned personnel revealed that, while this system is fully operational in UNEP, Nairobi, there are technical issues to be dealt with in UNEP, Geneva, in order to harmonize the IMIS system at these UNEP offices. This situation is leading to delays and other associated management problems as on-line transactions between UNEP, Geneva and Nairobi offices are not fully operational. It was also observed that the nomenclature system of the Object Code and the Expenditure Code in the Integrated Management Information System is inappropriate, at least in the context of this project account management. For example, the Object Code 1110 relates to "Salary of Project Coordinator" whereas under the Integrated Management Information System it is stated as "Payment expenses to experts". Similarly, the Object Code 1601 pertains to "Official travel of Project Coordinator" whereas under the Integrated Management Information System it is stated as "Mission Costs (UNDP)-Consultants (UNFPA)". These mis-classified Object Codes and the Expenditure Codes are causing avoidable confusion in the true representation of budgeted activities in the GEF-MSP project budget activities and the allocated amounts and need immediate rectification.

84. We have also seen the "Expenditure Obligation Analysis Analysis analysis at the Object Code of Expenditure Level-levels for the period April-June 2003 prepared by the Fund Management Programme Management Officer, UNEP, Nairobi, in which several remarks have been made regarding the propriety of some of the disbursements and on which clarifications or responses were to be provided by the Project Manager, UNEP-ROE, Geneva, but these are still pending.
12.7G. Replicability of the Project

85. It is observed that the project has made a valuable contribution towards raising awareness amongst high-level policy planners, administrators and other mountain stakeholders. The interest and direct support provided by the President of Kyrgyzstan as President of the International Advisory Board (IAB) has been a major factor responsible for the success of the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit. There is already a suggestion to host the second Bishkek Global Mountain Summit, which should be held in the year 2005 and this must be followed up by UNEP in partnership with other stakeholders. It is pertinent to mention here that the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit was a roaring success and resulted in tangible and durable benefits for the fragile mountains and their hardy people; it should not remain a one-off event that was conducted during the 2004 International Year of the Mountains, and despite its roaring success and resulting tangible and durable benefits for the fragile mountains and their hardy people, they need to be replicated in other important mountain regions of the world. In the absence of any sustainable financing mechanisms in place, the replicability of the project activities beyond the project period may not be possible.

86. There is also a need to develop and implement the second GEF medium-sized project so that the consensus that emerged over the strategies for sustainable development of mountain ecosystems, participation and involvement of mountain communities in decisions that affect them can find expression in the form of on-the-ground actions. The conceptualization of a second GEF-MSP medium-sized project should however be conceptualized with utmost care to avoid the pitfalls that occurred in the present project. In MSP, planning in vain has to be avoided and ineffective management on the part of the Project Manager has been a major factor responsible for the success of the WSSD World Summit on Sustainable Development in September 2002 for mountain ecosystems across the globe. It is observed that the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) process envisaged in the project document and related to its actual implementation. Sufficient evidence of non-compliance of M&E with the monitoring and evaluation process laid down in the project document can be gathered from the contents of email correspondence between the Division of GEF Coordination Unit, Nairobi and the Project Manager from April 2003 onwards. In these emails, the former has raised serious concerns about the manner in which some of the project activities have been implemented and on the lack of documentary evidence on the process adopted and outcomes achieved. In our view this undesirable situation has arisen due to the neglect in implementing the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) process right from the inception of the project. It is important to mention here that the project document contains a clearly defined section on the monitoring, monitoring and evaluation Plan Plan in which it has been stated that monitoring and evaluation (M&E) would be carried out by the International Advisory Body (IAB) for the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit and the GEF IAB Monitoring and Evaluation Unit and also by setting up a Monitoring and Steering group. The second GEF-MSP medium-sized project, in its concept note, mentions the need to raise awareness amongst high-level policy planners, administrators and other mountain stakeholders. The interest and direct support provided by the President of Kyrgyzstan as President of the International Advisory Board (IAB) has been a major factor responsible for the success of the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit. There is already a suggestion to host the second Bishkek Global Mountain Summit, which should be held in the year 2005 and this must be followed up by UNEP in partnership with other stakeholders. It is pertinent to mention here that the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit was a roaring success and resulted in tangible and durable benefits for the fragile mountains and their hardy people; it should not remain a one-off event that was conducted during the 2004 International Year of the Mountains, and despite its roaring success and resulting tangible and durable benefits for the fragile mountains and their hardy people, they need to be replicated in other important mountain regions of the world. In the absence of any sustainable financing mechanisms in place, the replicability of the project activities beyond the project period may not be possible.

12.8H. Monitoring and Evaluation

87. We have reviewed the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) process as laid down in the project document and related to its actual implementation. Sufficient evidence of non-compliance of M&E with the monitoring and evaluation process envisaged in the project document can be gathered from the contents of email correspondence between the Division of GEF Coordination Unit, Nairobi and the Project Manager from April 2003 onwards. In these emails, the former has raised serious concerns about the manner in which some of the project activities have been implemented and on the lack of documentary evidence on the process adopted and outcomes achieved. In our view this undesirable situation has arisen due to the neglect in implementing the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) process right from the inception of the project. It is important to mention here that the project document contains a clearly defined section on the monitoring, monitoring and evaluation Plan Plan in which it has been stated that monitoring and evaluation (M&E) would be carried out by the International Advisory Body (IAB) for the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit and the GEF IAB Monitoring and Evaluation Unit and also by setting up a Monitoring and Steering group. The second GEF-MSP medium-sized project, in its concept note, mentions the need to raise awareness amongst high-level policy planners, administrators and other mountain stakeholders. The interest and direct support provided by the President of Kyrgyzstan as President of the International Advisory Board (IAB) has been a major factor responsible for the success of the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit. There is already a suggestion to host the second Bishkek Global Mountain Summit, which should be held in the year 2005 and this must be followed up by UNEP in partnership with other stakeholders. It is pertinent to mention here that the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit was a roaring success and resulted in tangible and durable benefits for the fragile mountains and their hardy people; it should not remain a one-off event that was conducted during the 2004 International Year of the Mountains, and despite its roaring success and resulting tangible and durable benefits for the fragile mountains and their hardy people, they need to be replicated in other important mountain regions of the world. In the absence of any sustainable financing mechanisms in place, the replicability of the project activities beyond the project period may not be possible.
funds were spent.

With a visit to Geneva but by the time this mission took place in July 2003, the majority of the six months behind schedule, DGEF, started sending repeated reminders and then followed it up that the project was being managed properly. When it was noticed that the reports were noticed to be reports but since this was an internally executed MSP project, there was an impression in the DGEF. That the project funds in full or in part have been used in full or in part in implementation of the reported activities reported upon;.

It is stated that normally DGEF normally sends repeated reminders for about the progress of the project. The Project Manager also did not take the necessary action to plan and organize the Midterm Term Review (MTW) and the Midterm Term Workshop-workshop (MTW). It is therefore obvious that had all the M&E monitoring and evaluation processes worked effectively, the activities and outputs envisaged in this GEF-MSPGEF project could have been better monitored during the implementation phase.

90. The following are the generic comments on these reports:

i.(a) All reports are very cursorily written with little attention to details and lack supporting evidence.

ii.(b) At many places there is a mismatch between the reporting period and the activities reported upon.

ii.(c) No clear indication has been provided as to whether GEF-MSPGEF medium-sized project funds in full or in part have been used in full or in part in implementation of the reported activities.

iii.(d) The grossly delayed submission of the quarterly reports to DGEF and their sketchy coverage of project activities have in fact defeated their very purpose of their use for monitoring and evaluation of the GEF-MSPGEF project in a meaningful way.

91. It is stated that normally, DGEF normally, sends repeated reminders for about the progress reports but since this was an internally executed MSP project, there was an impression in the DGEF that the project was being managed properly. When it was noticed that the reports were noticed to be six months behind schedule, DGEF started sending repeated reminders and then followed it up with a visit to Geneva but by the time this mission took place in July 2003, the management of the funds were spent.
92. Our review of the project quarterly reports indicate that these are weak and claim to have generated outputs for which there is no evidence. DGEF also sent repeated queries and comments because of the inadequate information contained on some of the outputs in the quarterly reports, but continued to receive unsubstantiated information about project outputs. Finally there was a visit of the DGEF mission to Geneva to review the project implementation and thereafter an independent evaluation of the project was called for.

93. It was also learnt that many mission reports are due from the Project Manager, which indicates inadequate project management and especially the Monitoring and Evaluation System management. In view of the above, we conclude that the Monitoring and Evaluation System was not used as an effective management tool of the project. By the time the DGEF started actively monitoring and evaluating the project activities, many of them were over but not to the satisfaction of the DGEF.
**12.XII.** Overall Project Rating

94. As per the format provided in the Table of Terms of Reference and on the basis of an in-depth review of the project discussed in Chapters VII–through to XI, the success of the project implementation has been rated below on the scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being the highest rating and 5 being the lowest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of objectives and planned results</td>
<td>4 (Satisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of outputs and activities</td>
<td>4 (Satisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>4 (Satisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>4 (Satisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>5 (Unsatisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ participation</td>
<td>3 (Good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country ownership</td>
<td>4 (Satisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation approach</td>
<td>5 Unsatisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial planning and management</td>
<td>5 (Unsatisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replicability</td>
<td>5 (Unsatisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>5 (Unsatisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating</td>
<td>4 (Satisfactory)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95. Based on individual ratings for each of the criteria listed above, one ‘Good’, five ‘Unsatisfactory’, and five ‘Satisfactory’ ratings were assigned. An overall rating of ‘Satisfactory’ has been assigned to the project.

**13.XIII.** Lessons Learned

**13.1.** E-consultations

96. The e-consultation process used during the preparation of ten thematic papers was instrumental in eliciting constructive criticism and incorporating as many as 128 case studies from mountain regions across the globe. This process ensured the development of a high-quality knowledge product.

97. E-consultation is a cost-effective way of ensuring multi-stakeholder networking and dialogues needed to identify innovative and sustainable collaborative activities and foster evolving consensus for action at the local, national, regional and global scales.

**13.2.** Project Design

98. The project design of this GEF-MSPGEF project could have been better conceived. For example, the Mountain Watch Report paper and the Mountain Atlas should have been planned as integrated products in order to make a substantive contribution to integrated mountain development. A feasibility assessment of the project outcomes such as the Mountain Atlas should have been done in advance. The Mountain Atlas could have been produced only if funds through co-financing were available, which ultimately never materialized. Thus for the Mountain Atlas, funds should have been earmarked from the GEF-MSPGEF project and not from co-financing. The editorial policy of Mountain Research and Development Journal does not allow publication of material that has been put on the internet. Since the thematic papers were intended to be put on the internet right from the beginning, their subsequent publication in the Journal was never a possibility.

99. There was no clear-cut distinction between some of the activities funded from this GEF-MSPGEF project and some funded through co-financing. This created difficulties in
discerning the impact of some of the activities. For example, the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit was not funded from this GEF-MSP II project but the wide array of regional consultations, workshops and meetings, which were critical to the success of the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit, were funded through the GEF-MSP II project. It would have been better had the co-funding option been used for funding distinct but discrete activities.

- The financial planning for the project was weak and the financial management process was non-transparent and complicated as it involved multiple agencies geographically separated from each other. The multiplicity of coordination arrangements was not effective and allowed the Project Manager to operate without any stringent financial controls. The financial management also suffered due to improper functioning of IIMS (Integrated Information Management System) at UNEP, Geneva.

- Some of the MoUs (Memorandum of Understanding) and contracts under this GEF-MSP II project were inadequately negotiated and led to weak budget and expenditure control. This allowed the Project Manager and the Fund Manager to operate without any stringent financial controls. The financial planning for the project was weak and the financial management process was non-transparent and complicated. The Fund Manager also suffered due to improper functioning of IIMS (Integrated Information Management System) at UNEP, Geneva, to book payments for non-GEF activities also under this GEF-MSP II project.

13.3C Coordination and Management

- The multiple project supervision, coordination and management arrangements agreed upon for this project did not provide the necessary operational efficiency to deliver the project outcomes. These arrangements led to inadequate supervision of the Project Manager, who further compounded the situation by not submitting quarterly progress reports in time and also not submitting reports on the several missions that he undertook. Further, inadequate project and project documentation on the part of the Project Manager made it even more difficult for the supervisors to monitor on-ground activities.

- Although the GEF-MSP II project by design was a global project, its ownership remained limited to the Republic of Kyrgyzstan and Carpathian countries.

- Efficient and effective project management by the Project Manager recruited at a P-5/L- post should have ensured better project outcomes, but this did not happen.

13.4D Monitoring and Evaluation

- The well-laid down Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) process for this project in the project document was never followed, which ultimately led to a premature termination of the project with several outcomes partially achieved and some not achieved at all. The Project Manager should have made vigorous efforts to ensure compliance in consultation with the project supervisors.

- The monitoring and evaluation process envisaged for this medium-sized project was not faulty but there were significant lapses in its implementation.

14. Recommendations

**Recommendation 1: S. GEF-MSP II Second GEF medium-sized project**

- Efforts should be made to develop and implement the GEF-MSP II second GEF medium-sized project so that the consensus that emerged over the strategies for sustainable development of mountain ecosystems, participation and involvement of mountain communities in decisions that affect them can find expression in the form of on-the-ground action.

- The project concept for the second GEF medium-sized project should however be visualized conceptualized with utmost care to avoid the pitfalls that occurred in the present GEF-MSP II medium-sized project due to inadequate and ineffective project planning and management.
Recommendation 2: Synergy of actions

14.2
Linkages between the Bishkek Mountain Platform (BMP), the key product of the Bishkek Global Summit, and the Global Partnership on Sustainable Development of Mountain Areas should be established with the proposed mountain biodiversity work programme of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA). This would promote synergy of actions for improving the planning and management for sustainable development of the mountain regions.

Recommendation 3: Water and mountain initiative

14.3
The role and responsibilities of the World Economic Forum’s “Water and Mountain Initiative” as incubator for private-public partnership should be expanded to demonstrate cooperative engagement between upstream and downstream landowners, based on the concept of “Payment for Environmental Services” (PES).

Recommendation 4: Expanding the Mountain Watch process

14.4
The Mountain Watch process should be expanded to take the global assessment process to a regional or national level to enhance effective decision-making on complex mountain issues. Assessments of mountain problems and issues should also be linked with climate change. Converging the Mountain Watch and the Mountain Atlas process on the pattern adopted by UNEP Global Environment Outlook should be possible. Generating interest among donors to fund this activity would make this feasible.

Recommendation 5: Maintaining the Mountain Watch portal

14.5
Regular updates and maintenance of the interactive Internet Mountain Watch portal should be carried out by UNEP-WCMC under its Alpine Environment Programme. The methodological details of spatial data analysis currently lacking in the Mountain Watch Report should be added to its electronic version on the Mountain Watch Portal.

Recommendation 6: Comprehensive policy and framework

14.6
Efforts should be made to evolve consensus on the lines of the Alpine and Carpathian Conventions for other mountain regions of the world in order to develop a comprehensive policy and framework for sustainable mountain development.

Recommendation 7: The Integrated Management Information System

14.7
The problems with the integrated management information system (IMIS) at UNEP, Geneva, should be immediately addressed. Reclassification of the Object Codes and Objects of Expenditures in the IMIS system is required.

Recommendation 8: Rigorous planning and project management

14.8
There is need for rigorous planning of various memorandums of understanding, contracts and subcontracts to be executed in a project in order to eliminate or minimize any ambiguity over subsequent payments released for activities covered under these documents. The project and the process documentation of all the project activities should be properly done in the office of the project manager. The implementation of the monitoring and evaluation system should be rigorously monitored by the project management team. The process of recruiting project managers needs to be reviewed by UNEP and should among other things include stringent reference checks.
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Annexure

Details of activities under GEF-MSPthe GEF medium-sized project on "Barriers and Best best Practices-practices in the Integrated-integrated Management-management of Mountain-mountain Ecosystems;ecosystems" to achieve major project outcomes.

Planned Activities-activities to Achieve-achieve Outcomes

A. Activities to contribute to Environmental-Environmental Asset-asset Management-management and Stakeholder-stakeholder Consultations-consultations: Outcome A

1. To prepare a presentation and publish a report for a special panel on Mountain Commons during the World Economic Forum in Davos on private-public partnership "Caring for the Mountain Commons";

2. To conduct special meetings with representatives from the private sector on building private-public partnerships on the upland-lowland nexus and promotion of ecological service payments;

3. To conduct face-to-face consultations as part of the meetings of the Inter-agency Group on Mountains (IAGM, includes more than 50 representatives from developing countries, non-governmental organizations, governments, multi-national and national development agencies, private sector and specialized institutions), the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit preparatory process, national and regional consultations, and during the World Summit on Sustainable Development and the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit meetings;

4. To support participation from developing countries for all major national and international IYM International Year of the Mountains consultations for detailed discussions and interviews with the practitioners of development and conservation in mountains, dwellers in mountain communities, representatives of local administrations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community-based organizations, and field visits to remote mountain areas in all continents, to ensure a bottom-up approach to problem definition and problem solving;

5. To produce a report on the problems and their solutions on building private-public partnerships on the upland-lowland nexus and promoting fair economic valuation of upland ecological services, and establishment of mountain stakeholders associations to be combined with the Mountain Atlas (or as a separate publication).

B. Activities to contribute to the Bishkek Mountain Platform: Outcome B

1. To prepare TOR terms of reference for ten thematic papers for the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit and to organize the preparation of papers;

2. To conduct e-consultations through the Mountain Forum electronic network on draft thematic papers in order to elicit constructive criticism, suggestions for improvement, and relevant case studies;

3. To review the thematic papers through the regional meetings of the "High Summit" process, which will include the preparation of regional assessments and their discussion, leading to proposals for improving the application of the papers at a regional scale;

4. To ensure finalization of the thematic papers based on inputs from the e-consultations, the "High Summit" process, and other sources;

5. To prepare a synthesis of the thematic papers as an input to the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit (draft Bishkek Mountain Platform) and the World Summit on Sustainable Development;

6. To facilitate the participation of key individuals designated by the African, Asia/Pacific, Central European and Central and South American "High Summit" regional meetings in the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit, thus ensuring their ownership of the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit outputs;
C. Activities to contribute to *Best-Practice Guidelines* and **Mountain Atlas** and Mountain Watch: Outcome C

- **1.** To carry out a desk-study, including a database and critical assessment of integrated management of mountain ecosystems (IMME) projects implemented between 1991 and 2001 by GEF and its partners (FAO, ICIMOD International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, TMI The Mountain Institute; IUCN, WWF, GTZ, ADB Asian Development Bank and other major international and bilateral agencies);

- **2.** To carry out a consultation process involving Mountain Forum e-consultations, regional workshops, and regional offices of FAO, and to solicit case studies of barriers and best practices in IMME;

- **3.** To undertake a planning workshop to be held at UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre WCMC in early 2002 for the purposes of identifying key data sets, key partners, and approaches for the **Mountain Atlas** and Mountain Watch;

- **4.** To compile key spatial data sets on the status and trends in the condition of mountain ecosystems and selected pressures;

- **5.** To prepare a preliminary integrated assessment of the condition of mountain ecosystems, and the vulnerability of these ecosystems to selected pressures; and to publish a report describing the assessment undertaken through a process of dialogue with key partners;

- **6.** To make special presentations and displays at the World Summit on Sustainable Development WSSD;

- **7.** To hold a side event at the Bishkek Summit at which the draft guidelines and Mountain Watch report will be circulated;

- **8.** To produce a mountain internet portal in support of the Bishkek Mountain Summit;

- **9.** To develop an application providing access to information relevant to mountain ecosystems;

- **10.** To publish the final guidelines and a selected set of case studies of best practices in Mountain Research and Development;

- **11.** To organise three regional workshops, to be held in Latin America, Africa and Central and South-east Asia, to identify best practices for the sustainable development of mountain areas in each region;

- **12.** To produce a **Mountain Atlas** with reports of the condition of mountain ecosystems based on the results of the extensive consultations held, including an assessment on the vulnerability of different areas to selected pressures, and an evaluation of the implications for sustainable development of the human populations in each region;

- **13.** To identify the implications of the condition of mountain ecosystems for policy development and implementation, with a specific focus on how adverse environmental impacts can be mitigated in practice; this will include reference to specific case studies identified at the regional workshops.
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TERMS OF REFERENCE

Under the guidance of the Chief of Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) and in close cooperation with the Director, UNEP, World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) in Cambridge and the Task Manager, MSP Medium-sized Projects in the Division of GEF Coordination, Global Environment Facility (GEF) in Nairobi, Kenya, the evaluator shall undertake a detailed review and evaluation of the project, “Barriers and Best Practices in Integrated Management of Mountain Ecosystems.” The evaluation shall be conducted by a consultant in consultation with the EOU and the Evaluation and Oversight Unit during the period between 1st September 2003 and 12th October 2003 (10.5 days spread over 6 weeks).

1.1 Background

This project was launched during the International Year of Mountains when the United Nations General Assembly endorsed the proposal of the Government of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan to organize the year 2002 as the International Year of Mountains (IYM). It invited FAO to serve as the lead agency in collaboration with governments, UNEP, UNDP, UNESCO and other relevant organizations of the United Nations system and non-governmental organizations. To celebrate the International Year of the Mountains, the Government of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan hosted the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit (BGMS) from 28th October to 1st November, 2002 where participants could present achievements and agree on concrete actions to ensure sustainable development and management of mountain regions in the 21st century. The Government of Kyrgyzstan, the Swiss Development Corporation, the Aga Khan Development Network, and several other donors were to finance the preparatory process for the BGMS.

GEF financing was sought for an additional element of the BGMS, which would provide an analysis of the practices and barriers in integrated management of mountain ecosystems thus assisting in the transformation of the summit discussions into action to manage mountain ecosystems sustainably.

1.1.1 Legislative Mandate

The project builds on the role played by UNEP in assisting in the organization of the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit as an effort of the United Nations to celebrate the International Year of Mountains. It also is in line with UNEP’s comparative advantage of UNEP lies in the analysis and dissemination of best practices on various topics of importance.

1.2 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation shall be conducted as an in-depth evaluation. The objective of the evaluation is to establish project impact— and review and evaluate the implementation of planned project activities, outputs and outcomes against actual results. Guidelines on performance indicators are provided in the UNEP project manual on the GEF Project Implementation Review.

The findings of the evaluation will be based on:

(a) Desk review of the project document, outputs, monitoring reports (such as the quarterly reports, mission reports and the GEF annual Project Implementation Review).
review reports), and relevant correspondence. Of particular importance will be an analysis of the added value of this GEF financed initiative over and above what was to be done as part of the regular operations for the International Year of Mountains by the Government of Kyrgyzstan and the relevant partner agencies;

(b) Review of specific products including datasets, surveys, publications and materials, reports of training courses and workshops highlighting the level of quality of stakeholder consultations, presentations, technical information and strategies, and the results these outputs have had in achieving the objectives of the project;

(c) Interviews with the Director, UNEP-ROE, the Director, UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre, the Director, UNEP DGEF, the Task Manager of this project at ROE, the programme officer responsible for medium-sized projects at DGEF, the relevant fund officers at DGEF and ROE, and other relevant staff of ROE and WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre;

(d) Interviews with relevant stakeholders involved including government representatives, local communities, non-governmental organizations, the private sector and UN agencies whose actions are said to have influenced, or to have been influenced, by this project.

The evaluator should develop a participatory evaluation methodology to carry out this exercise.

2.2 Terms of reference

The evaluator shall:

1. Establish to what extent the project’s objectives were met and planned results attained, taking into account the indicators listed in the project document (project document annexed) and the extent to which project activities are completed and outputs attained, particularly focusing on the quality and utility of the following project outputs in improving management of mountain ecosystems which is the overall objective of this project:

- Outputs from regional, national and global consultations that were provided to Bishkek Summit
- The Pilot Mountain Watch
- The Mountain Atlas
- Ten thematic issue papers that were to be prepared and discussed through e-consultations.
- Results of lessons learned incorporated in Bishkek Mountain Platform
- Sustainable Mountain Development guidelines
- National Comprehensive Development Frameworks / Development Planning Programmes showing how SMG guidelines were integrated into these frameworks;
- Video copy of the special “Mountain Week” on BBC World in the end of October/November 2002;
- input that was integrated into the special session of UN General Assembly at the end of International Year of the Mountains;
- The Special panel at the World Economic Forum (WEF) in Davos 2003 and special events at Regional / National WEF World Economic Forum meetings;
- Establishment of a public-private partnership for Mountain Commons with a potential Mountain Commons Trust Fund, with funding secured from non-GEF sources;
- Establishment of a Mountain Stakeholder association piloted in Eurasia and launched during Bishkek Summit;
- Overview of mountain environments and guidelines for best practices;
Evidence of the role of GEF, FAO, IUCN, WWF, World Bank, UNDP, UNESCO, United Nations University and other partners in the Mountain Watch Portal;
Outcomes of the three regional workshops held in Latin America, Africa and Asian regions to identify best practices for the sustainable development of mountain regions, and to develop information resources provided by the project;
Basins and best practice portal/database on sustainable development of mountain ecosystems;
Web site of the mountains portal showing the spatial data sets, the integration of data sets, the best practice information on mountain management, the monitoring of hits to the site;
Special issue of ‘Mountain Research and Development’ in 2003 showing the guidelines and set of case studies of best practices.
Mitigation plans developed and provided to the regional partnerships for mountain actions.

2. The evaluator shall assess the various aspects of the project as follows:
   - Evaluate the sustainability of the environmental benefits achieved through this project including the sustenance of capacity built and the utility of the project’s outputs in improving management of mountains;
   - Evaluate the level of stakeholder participation. Attention should be paid to the type and level of participation by various stakeholders at different stages of project implementation, with particular attention to the criteria used for selecting stakeholders who were supported financially from this project.
   - Examine the country ownership of the project during project design and implementation. Attention should be paid to the relevance of project and impact on national development and environmental agendas, regional and international agreements, and recipient country commitment, not limited to Kyrgyzstan, the host of the Bishkek Summit.
   - Review from the point of adaptive project management the effectiveness of the institutional structure, financial planning including the level of co-financing both cash and in-kind, the staffing, administrative arrangements and operational mechanisms at the project level, particularly the functioning of the project management and steering committees;
   - Assess the replicability of the project taking into account arrangements and steps taken in this respect.
   - Review the monitoring and evaluation system as an effective management tool of the project. Attention should be paid to the identification of baselines and indicators, quality of backstopping, quality assurance, and control of deliverables.
   - Identify lessons learned.
   - Provide recommendations to UNEP and its executing partners regarding future actions to follow up this project.

3. Evaluation report format and procedures

The evaluation report shall be a detailed report, written in English, of no more than 20 pages exclusive of the executive summary, the lessons learned, and the findings and recommendations and include:

- Executive summary (no more than 3 pages)
- Separate section on lessons learned
- Separate section on findings and recommendations
- All annexes should be typed.

The success of project implementation will be rated on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the highest rating and 5 being the lowest. The following items should be considered for rating purposes:

- Attainment of objectives and planned results
• Attainment of outputs and activities
• Cost-effectiveness
• Impact
• Sustainability
• Stakeholders participation
• Country ownership
• Implementation approach
• Financial planning
• Replicability
• Monitoring and evaluation

Each of the items should be rated separately and then an overall rating given. The following rating system is to be applied:

1 = Excellent (90% - 100% achievement)
2 = Very Good (75% - 89%)
3 = Good (60% - 74%)
4 = Satisfactory (50% - 59%)
5 = Unsatisfactory (49% and below)

In accordance with UNEP/GEF policy, all GEF projects are evaluated by an independent evaluator contracted by the Evaluation and Oversight Unit, and not associated with the implementation of the project. The evaluator should have the following qualifications: (i) Basic expertise on the subject matter, (ii) Experience with projects of a global nature, and (iii) Project evaluation.

4. Outputs of the evaluation

The final report shall be written in English and submitted in electronic form in MS Word Format by 10th October 2003, and should be addressed as follows:

Mr. Mr. Segbedzi Norgbey, Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit
UNEP, P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel.: (254-20) 623387
Fax: (254-20) 623158
Email: segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org

With a copy to:

Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaf, Director
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254-20-624166
Fax: +254-20-624041/4042
Email: ahmed.djoghlaf@unep.org

Mr. Fritz Schlingemann
Director, ROE,
Email: frits.schlingemann@unep.ch

Mr. Mark Collins
Director, UNEP-WCMC: World Conservation Monitoring Centre
Email: info@unep-wcmc.org
The evaluation report will be printed in hard copy and published on the Evaluation and Oversight Unit’s web-site www.unep.org/eou.

5. Evaluation

The contract will begin on 1st September 2003 – 12th October 2003 (10.5 days spread over 6 weeks). The consultant will submit a first draft to Evaluation and Oversight Unit on 29th September 2003. A first draft version will be forwarded to the Directors, ROE, DGEF and World Conservation Monitoring Centre WCMC for initial comment. Comments on the final draft report will be sent to the consultant after a maximum of two weeks. After incorporating the comments, the consultant will submit the final report.

The evaluator will travel to Geneva, Cambridge and possibly Kyrgyzstan if deemed necessary by the consultant following his or her findings in Geneva and Cambridge, to interview the Task Manager of the project and relevant staff of ROE and WCMC. Telephone interviews will be conducted with DGEF. The consultant will carry out written or telephone interviews of stakeholders who have been said to have influenced or have been influenced by this project.

6. Schedule of Payment

The evaluator will receive an initial payment of 40% of the total amount to be made upon assessment of satisfactory progress by submitting the draft report. Final payment of 60% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual SSAs. The travel will be prepared separately and will be inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses.

In case, the evaluator cannot provide the products in accordance with the terms of reference, the timeframe agreed, or his products are substandard, the payment to the evaluator could be withheld, until such a time the products are modified to meet UNEP standards. In case the evaluator fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP, the product prepared by the evaluator may not constitute the evaluation report.

12th August 2003
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List of documentation perused

2. Quarterly progress reports
   a. Quarterly progress report (1 July – 30 September 2002)
   b. Quarterly progress report (1 October – 31 December 2002)
   c. Quarterly progress report (1 January – 31 March 2003)
   d. Quarterly progress report (1 April – 30 June, 2003)
4. Compilation of Mountain Forum E-Consultations on Thematic Papers for the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit, (11th February – 28th April, 2002) containing the following thematic papers:
   i. Conflicts and peace in mountain areas (draft paper C2) authored by: Frederick Starr.
   ii. Mountain tourism and the conservation and maintenance of biological and cultural diversity (draft paper B3) authored by: Wendy Brewer, Linda and Nikhat Sattar.
   iii. Sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation (draft paper B2) authored by: Steve Rasmussen and Safdar Parvez.
   iv. Mountain infrastructure: access, communications, energy (draft paper D1) authored by: Thomas Kohler.
   v. Institutions for democratic and decentralized sustainable mountain development (draft paper C1) authored by: Jane Pratt.
   vii. The challenges of mountain environments: Water, natural resources, hazards, desertification and the implications of climate change (draft paper E1) authored by: Mylvakanam Iyngararasan, Li Tianchi and Surendra Shrestha.
   viii. Legal, economic, and compensation mechanisms in support of sustainable mountain development (draft paper B1) authored by: Maritta Koch-Weser and Walter Kahlenborn.
   ix. Prospective International Agreements for Mountain Regions (draft paper A1) authored by: Dr. Wolfgang Burhenne.
   x. National policies and institutions for sustainable mountain development (draft paper A2) authored by: Douglas McGuire.
5. Reviews of “Key Issues for the World’s Mountain Regions” (Two in number).
7. Revised version of "Key Issues for World’s Mountain Regions" to be published by the United Nations University.

10. **Mountain Watch:**
   - Flyer on World Atlas on Mountain Evaluation, Prepared by UNEP.
   - UN General Assembly Draft Resolution on the International Year of Mountains.

11. **Environmental Change and Sustainable Development in Mountain-areas, UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre WCMC, 2002.**

12. Mountain Watch:
   - Flyer on World Atlas on Mountain Evaluation, Prepared by UNEP.

13. **UN General Assembly Draft Resolution on the International Year of Mountains.**

14. **Switzerland and the International Year of Freshwater 2003: The Involvement of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation.**


16. **Summary Report and Main Outcome of Meeting of Interested Stakeholders of Water and Mountain Initiative (WAMI)/World Economic Forum Water Initiative, Geneva, Switzerland 23rd April – April 2003.**

17. **Briefing Note on Mountain Commons Stewardship Side Event, 2002 World Economic Forum and WSSD World Summit on Sustainable Development Prep-com – UN Delegates.**


19. **Framework Convention on the Protection and Sustainable Development of Carpathians.**

20. **Stories from – Panapress about Bishkek summit.**

21. **Press Release on Global Warming Triggers Glacial Lakes Flood Threat – Himalayan Mountain Lakes at High Risk of Bursting their Banks with Devastating Consequences for People and Property; New Comes in International Year of the Mountains and on the Eve of Important Climate Change Meeting; United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).**

22. **UNEP Information Note – UNEP and the International Year of the Mountains.**

23. **Status of the European Mountain Initiative – United Nations Environment Programme and International Year of Mountains.**

24. **Conclusions and Recommendations of International Meeting and Roundtables on “Sharing the Experience Mountain Sustainable Development in the Carpathians and in the Alps”: UNEP/ROE EURAC – Bolzano/Bozen.**


26. **African Mountains High Summit Conference Report.**

27. **Alpine Convention – Conservation and Sustainable Management in the Alps.**

28. **Bishkek Global Mountain Summit – A Look into the Future.**

29. **GF/2740-02-4410-22-1 as per Memorandum of Understanding for “Supporting the preparation and organization of the International Conference “Bishkek Global Mountain Summit”.**

30. **Beyond the International Year of Mountains: A Preliminary Assessment by the FAO, the United Nations Lead Agency for Food Security and Nutrition International Year of the Mountains 2002.**


33. **From High Summit to Johannesburg… and on to Bishkek! – International Year of the Mountains, 2002.**

34. **Beyond the International Year of Mountains: A Preliminary Assessment by the FAO, the United Nations Lead Agency for Food Security and Nutrition International Year of the Mountains 2002.**

35. **Beyond the International Year of Mountains: A Preliminary Assessment by the FAO, the United Nations Lead Agency for Food Security and Nutrition International Year of the Mountains 2002.**

36. **Multimedia Encyclopedia – Mountains of Kyrgyzstan.**

### Video Tapes
- Earth Report 6 – Summit to the Sea Part 1 (Duration 26 minutes).
- Earth Report 6 – Summit to the Sea Part 2 (Duration 26 minutes).
- Earth Report 6 – The Angle on Hunger (Duration 26 minutes).
Earth Report 6 – Summit to the Sea, Special Edition (Duration 44 minutes).

Website sites
- http://www.globalmountainsummit.org
- http://www.stort.unep-wcmc.org/imaps/mountains
- http://www.mountains.unep.net

Budget Details

Revised project budget provided by Fund Programme Management Officer, UNEP, ROE, Geneva.

Budget performance by object codes for the period January to August 2003 provided by Fund Programme Management Officer, UNEP, ROE, Geneva.

Final expenditure report of UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre WCMC submitted for budget lines under project nos. CP/5023-01-03-2102 and GF/2740-02-4410-2206 as per MOU dated 29/04/03 for “Support of Mountain Programme”.

Project expenditure report of UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre WCMC for budget line under Project No.
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1. Mr. Frits Schlingemann
   Director and Regional Representative, UNEP, Regional Office for Europe
   15, Chemin des Anemones
   CH-1219 Chatelaine
   Geneva, Switzerland
   Tel.: +41 22 917 82 67
   Fax: +41 22 797 90 24/67
   Email: frits.schlingemann@unep.ch

2. Mr. Andrei Iatsenia
   Senior Programme Officer, Mountain Programme Coordinator
   UNEP, Regional Office for Europe
   15 Chemin des Anemones
   1219 Chatelaine, Geneva
   Switzerland
   Tel.: +41 22 917 82 73
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   Email: Iatsenia@unep.ch

3. Mr. Mikhail S. Evteev
   Administrative and Fund Management Officer,
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   Switzerland
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   Fax: +41 22 797 34 42
   Email: evteevm@unep.ch

4. Mr. Jurg Gerber
   Vice President Environment,
   Alcan technology &and Management Ltd.
   Am Bahnhof
   CH-8177 Neiderglatt
   Switzerland
   Tel.: +41 1 852 21 22
   Fax: +41 1 850 53 89
   Email: juerg.gerber@alcan.com

5. Mr. Mark Collins
   Director, UNEP, World Conservation Monitoring Centre
   219 Huntingdon Road
   Cambridge CB3 0DR, UK, United Kingdom
   Tel.: +44 1223 277314
   Fax: +44 1223 277136
   Email: mark.collins@unep-wcmc.org

6. Mr. Timothy Johnson
   Director of Programmes, UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre
   219 Huntingdon Road
   Cambridge CB3 0DR, UK, United Kingdom
   Tel.: +44 1223 277314
   Fax: +44 1223 277136
   Email: tim.johnson@unep-wcmc.org

7. Ms. Lera Miles
   Senior Programme Officer, Forest, Dryland and Fresh Water Programme
   UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre
   219 Huntingdon Road
   Cambridge CB3 0DR, UK, United Kingdom
   Tel.: +44 1223 277314
   Fax: +44 1223 277136
   Email: lera.miles@unep-wcmc.org

8. Mr. Phillip Fox
   Head of Electronics Communications Services,
   UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre
   219 Huntingdon Road
   Cambridge CB3 0DR, UK, United Kingdom
   Tel.: +44 1223 277314
   Fax: +44 1223 277136
   Email: phillip.fox@unep-wcmc.org

9. Mr. Simon Blyth
   GIS Geographical Information System Technical Officer,
   UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre
   219 Huntingdon Road
   Cambridge CB3 0DR, UK, United Kingdom
   Tel.: +44 1223 277314
   Fax: +44 1223 277136
   Email: simon.blyth@unep-wcmc.org

10. Ms. Helen Gray
    Project Administrator
    UNEP-WCMC World Conservation Monitoring Centre
    219 Huntingdon Road
    Cambridge CB3 0DR, UK, United Kingdom
    Email: helen.gray@unep-wcmc.org

11. Ms. Sheila Aggarwal-Khan
    UNEP DGEE
    The Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination (DGEE)
    P.O.Box 36552
Nairobi, Kenya.

Tel.: (254)(20) 624041
Fax: (254) (20) 624042;
Email: Sheila.Aggarwal-Khan@unep.org

12. Mr. David Duthie
UNEP/GEF Biodiversity Enabling Activities
PO Box 30552
Gigiri
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254-20-623717 (Please note new city code)
Mobile: +254-722-786743
Fax: +254-20-624268
Email: david.duthie@unep.org

13. Ms. Sandeep Bhambra
UNEP
The Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination (DGEF)
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi, Kenya.
Tel.: (254)(2) 623347
Fax: (254) (2) 624041;
Email: Sandeep.Bhambra@unep.org

14. Dr. Anna Tengberg
Land Degradation Unit
UNEP, Division of GEF Coordination
P.O. Box 30552, Nairobi, Kenya
Tel. 254-20-624147
Fax. 254-20-624617
Email: Anna.Tengberg@unep.org

15. Ms. Rita Janssen
Account Manager
Allen Press, Inc.
810 E. 10th Street Lawrence,
KS, USA 66044.
Tel: 785-843-1234—Ext. 115
Fax: 785-843-1244—
mailto:rijanssen@allenpress.com
http://www.allenpress.com

16. Dr. Christoph Imboden
Begli 222A
CH-7477 Filisur
Switzerland
Tel.: +41 81 420 4200
Fax: +41 81 420 4201
Mobile: +41 78 878 0101
ch.imboden@bluewin.ch

17. Dr. J. Gabriel Campbell
Director General
International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD)
Kathmandu, Nepal
Tel.: (977 1) 5525 313, or 5525 318 (direct)
Fax: (977 1) 5524 509, or 5536 747
Email: gcampbell@icimod.org.np

18. Dr. Basanta Shrestha,
Head, Mountain Environment Information Systems,
International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD)
P.O. Box 3226, Kathmandu, Nepal
Tel.: (977 1) 5525 313, or 5525 318 (direct)
Fax: (977 1) 5524 509, or 5536 747
Email: bshrestha@icimod.org.np

19. Dr. Eklavya Sharma
International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD)
P.O. Box 3226, Kathmandu, Nepal
Tel.: (977 1) 5525 313
Fax: (977 1) 5524 509, or 5536 747
Email: esharma@icimod.org.np

20. Dr. Martin Price
Director, Centre for Mountain Studies
Perth College
UHI Millennium Institute
Crief Road
Perth PH1 2NX, UK
Tel.: +44 (0) 1738-877217
Fax: +44 (0) 1738-877018
Email: Martin.Price@perth.uhi.ac.uk

21. Dr. Libor Jansky,
Senior Academic Programme Officer
Environment and Sustainable Development
United Nations University
Tokyo, Japan
Tel.: +81-3-3499-2811
Fax: +81-3-3406-7347
Email: Jansky@hq.unu.edu

22. Dr. Bruno Messerli
CDE, University of Berne, Switzerland, and Chief Coordinator,
UNU Global Mountain Partnership Programme
Email: bmesserli@bluewin.ch

23. Dr. Jack D. Ives
Senior Adviser, UNU Environment and Sustainable Development Programme
Email: JackIves@pigeon.carleton.ca
## Thematic papers and their relevance to GEF-MSP objectives and evidence of best practices and their application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the thematic paper</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of theme to GEF medium-sized project-MSP objectives and evidence of best practices</th>
<th>Evidence of application or potential application in future.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts and peace in mountain areas</td>
<td>Frederick Starr</td>
<td>The paper has drawn many elements that are common to conflicts in mountains and also provides some prescriptions for remedial actions. The case studies and examples identified to supplementing the learning... in the above paper are relevant for conflict resolution... The establishment of friendship a biosphere reserve of trans-boundary nature is an example of good practice. This case study also shares ideas that have gone into the design of this reserve and the success in promoting work with local farmers.</td>
<td>Learning and examples have global relevance and application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain tourism and the conservation and maintenance of biological and cultural diversity</td>
<td>Wendy Brewer Lama, Nikhat Sattar</td>
<td>The paper discusses relationship between mountain tourism and objectives of mountain development and conservation. A series of variables that should be taken into consideration about how to generate mountain tourism alternatives are documented... The paper draws focus on community management of resources, policy level commitment to mountain tourism management, integrated approaches for mountain development, reinvestment of tourism revenues in conservation, benefit sharing, conservation contracts with community, partnership etc. Best practice examples of successful tourism in mountain areas that have been successful in conserving biological and cultural diversity are also presented.</td>
<td>Examples are illustrated from very diverse countries – Pakistan, India, Nepal, Canada, China, Alaska, Australia, Kyrgyzstan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation</td>
<td>Stephen F. Rasmussen and Safdar Parvez</td>
<td>The paper presents an assessment of poverty and livelihood issues pertaining to mountain communities. It has drawn inferences from global experience and thus has global context. The paper provides comparisons of global averages of socio-economic variables like GDP, mortality rates, life expectancy and adult literacy. The authors' argument that economic growth in the rest of the country is important for mountain areas to grow is an important take home message for most mountain countries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain infrastructure: access, communications, energy</td>
<td>Thomas Kohler</td>
<td>The paper convincingly argues that access, communication and energy are vital issues for sustainable mountain development, discusses principles for best practices and uses country examples to illustrate application of the various principles.</td>
<td>A range of case studies and examples supplement this paper and provide examples of good practices of promoting eco-friendly and adaptive technology. Design and implementation of passive solar buildings in mountain areas of Laddakh in India, development of 'Green Road' concept in Nepal and the 'Green' building concept in Colorado are good examples of application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions for democratic and decentralized sustainable mountain development</td>
<td>Jane Pratt</td>
<td>The paper highlights the fact that extent of isolation and self-sufficiency of mountain communities determine the appropriateness of institutional arrangements for sustainable mountain development initiatives. An important take home message based on examples discussed is that partnerships whether between upstream and</td>
<td>Lessons are applicable globally. The paper has underlined the urgency of development of supportive institutions for welfare of mountain community, resources and environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of the thematic paper</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Relevance of theme to GEF medium-sized project-MSP objectives and evidence of best practices</td>
<td>Evidence of application or potential application in future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of education, science and culture for sustainable mountain development</td>
<td>Bruno Messerli and Edwin Bernbaum</td>
<td>The importance of education and scientific approaches are recognized as critical for reducing the isolation of mountain communities and for managing the mountains ecosystems. Means of promoting traditional and formal knowledge are discussed and information about a host of institutions, organizations and global programme dedicated to promoting local and regional knowledge of protection and conservation of mountains is shared.</td>
<td>Paper encourages the advancement in learning through networking for global benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The challenges of mountain environments: Water, natural resources, hazards, desertification and the implications of climate change</td>
<td>Mylvakanam Iyngararasan, Li Tianchi and Surendra Shrestha</td>
<td>The paper analysis the climate change and implications on mountain environment. It also highlights the possible steps for monitoring glacial lake outburst flood, mitigation and early warning systems. The case study on rehabilitation and agriculture production in ridged field in Peru is an example that demonstrates how the participatory development of appropriate technology helped peasant communities develop sustainable agriculture in arid areas.</td>
<td>Use of appropriate technology for sustainable mountain development already being practiced in Peru can be very helpful in developing framework for sustainable agricultural systems for many other mountain regions of the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal, economic, and compensation mechanisms in support of sustainable mountain development</td>
<td>Maritta Koch-Weser and Walter Kahlenborn</td>
<td>The paper introduces the concept of economic evaluation of Environmental Services and the use of Payment of Environmental Services (PES) as an instrument for water management for better co-operation among upland-lowland farmers.</td>
<td>Case studies represent diverse mountain regions of the world where PES Payments for Environmental Services is already picking up fast as an instrument for watershed management and some of them actually represent models in conflict resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective International Agreements for Mountain Regions</td>
<td>Dr. Wolfgang Burhenne</td>
<td>In absence of any legally binding global agreements that cover concerns related to mountain regions that otherwise vary in legal, political, economic and socio cultural situations, the paper provides a useful guidance on issues to be considered in designation of new rules, agreements to be framed for implementation in national, international and trans boundary areas</td>
<td>Examples of several agreements (Vienna and Alpine convention) are quoted for their pros and cons to be considered in any new initiatives of framing rules and agreement for protection of environment. The paper provides comprehensive information on principles and ground rules that are to be elaborated in addressing specific commitments and obligations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National policies and institutions for sustainable mountain development</td>
<td>Douglas McGuire</td>
<td>Provides the awareness of the need to create policies and institution at the national level that meet the specific needs of mountain region and contribute in decisive manner for the implementation of this objective.</td>
<td>Shares examples of policies created or those to be implemented in several countries including Austria, France, Georgia, Poland, Morocco, Nepal, Japan, and Bulgaria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexure Annex – VI

Budget Performance by object codes for the period January, 2003 to August 2003 provided by the Fund Programme Management Officer, UNEP, ROE, Geneva

**DUTY STATION:** GENV  
**FUND TYPE:** 4  Technical Co-operation  
**FUND: CPL NAME:** Counterpart Contributions in Support of the Environment Fund Activities  
**BUDGET SECTION:** PROGRAMME: 2655 ORG UNIT: 2666 PROJECT ID: P135 BIS SUBPROGRAMME:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS/CODES</th>
<th>OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>ALLOTMENT</th>
<th>ENCUMBRANCE</th>
<th>OBLIGATION</th>
<th>DISBURSEMENTS</th>
<th>AMOUNT ALLOT</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>441 Other Fund Source - Project Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110 Experts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,988.47</td>
<td>5,988.47</td>
<td>46,011.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210 OPAS experts - UNDP National professional staff - UNFPA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3302 In-service training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50,200.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50,200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBJECT CLASS 441:** 65,000.00 2,700.00 0.00 5,988.47 5,988.47 59,011.53  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>AMOUNT ALLOT</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Fund Source - Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3302 In-service training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50,200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBJECT CLASS 443:** 50,200.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 50,200.00  

**PROJECT ID TOTAL:** 115,200.00 2,700.00 0.00 5,988.47 5,988.47 109,211.53  

**BUDGET SECTION:** PROGRAMME: 2655 ORG UNIT: 2666 PROJECT ID: P135 BIS SUBPROGRAMME:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>AMOUNT ALLOT</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Fund Source - Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3302 In-service training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50,200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORG UNIT TOTAL:** 115,200.00 2,700.000.00 5,988,475,988,47100,211.53  

**BUDGET SECTION:** PROGRAMME: 2655 ORG UNIT: 2666 PROJECT ID: P135 BIS SUBPROGRAMME:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>AMOUNT ALLOT</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Fund Source - Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3302 In-service training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50,200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAMME TOTAL:** 115,200.00 2,700.000.00 5,988,475,988,47100,211.53  

**BUDGET SECTION:** PROGRAMME: 2655 ORG UNIT: 2666 PROJECT ID: P135 BIS SUBPROGRAMME:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>AMOUNT ALLOT</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Fund Source - Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3302 In-service training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50,200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS CODES</th>
<th>OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>ALLOTMENT</th>
<th>ENCUMBRANCE</th>
<th>OBLIGATION</th>
<th>DISBURSEMENTS</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>ALLOT</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET SECTION TOTAL:</td>
<td>411,200.00</td>
<td>2,700.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,988.47</td>
<td>5,988.47</td>
<td>109,211.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUDGET SECTION: PROGRAMME: 2655
ORG UNIT: 2666
PROJECT ID: P135
BUDGET SECTION: PROGRAMME: 2655
ORG UNIT: 2666
PROJECT ID: P149

FUND NAME: UNEP Project Accounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>PRE-COMMITTED</th>
<th>UNCOMMITTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FUND TOTAL: 115,200.00 2,700.00 0.00 5,988.47 5,988.47 109,211.53

BUDGET SECTION: PROGRAMME: 2655
ORG UNIT: 2666
PROJECT ID: P149

CLASS CODES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>PRE-COMMITTED</th>
<th>UNCOMMITTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

OBJECT CLASS 441:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>PRE-COMMITTED</th>
<th>UNCOMMITTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

OBJECT CLASS 443:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>PRE-COMMITTED</th>
<th>UNCOMMITTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

OBJECT CLASS 445:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>PRE-COMMITTED</th>
<th>UNCOMMITTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

PROJECT ID TOTAL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>PRE-COMMITTED</th>
<th>UNCOMMITTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

BUDGET SECTION: PROGRAMME: 2655
ORG UNIT: 2666
PROJECT ID: P149

CLASS CODES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>PRE-COMMITTED</th>
<th>UNCOMMITTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

54
ORG UNIT TOTAL: | 154,357.00 | 0.00 | 6,367.30 | 145,358.12 | 151,725.42 | 2,631.58

| BUDGET SECTION: PROGRAMME: 2655 | ORG UNIT: 2666 | PROJECT ID: P149 | BIS SUBPROGRAMME: |
| BUDGET SECTION TOTAL: | 154,357.00 | 0.00 | 6,367.30 | 145,358.12 | 151,725.42 | 2,631.58

| FUND TOTAL | 154,357.00 | 0.00 | 6,367.30 | 145,358.12 | 151,725.42 | 2,631.58

DUTY STATION: GENV
FUND TYPE: 4 Technical Co-operation
FUND: CPL
NAME: Counterpart Contributions in Support of the Environment Fund Activities

| PROJECT ID TOTAL: | 115,200.00 | 2,700.00 | 0.00 | 5,988.47 | 5,988.47 | 109,211.53

| PROJECT CLASS 441: Other Fund Source - Project Personnel |
| 441 | 52,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,988.47 | 5,988.47 | 46,011.53 |
| 5110 Experts /10 | 6,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6,000.00 |
| 3120 Administrative Support Personnel /20 | 5,000.00 | 2,700.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,000.00 |
| 1601 Mission Costs(UNDP) - Consultants(UNFPA) /1 | 65,000.00 | 2,700.00 | 0.00 | 5,988.47 | 5,988.47 | 59,011.53 |

<p>| PROJECT CLASS 443: Other Fund Source - Operating Expenses |
| 443 | 50,200.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 50,200.00 |
| 3302 In-service training /2 | 50,200.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 50,200.00 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT CLASS</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>ALLOTMENT</th>
<th>ENCUMBRANCE</th>
<th>OBLIGATION</th>
<th>DISBURSEMENTS</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>Other Fund Source - Project Personnel</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135,688.74</td>
<td>-10,988.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110</td>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>105,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>106,783.37</td>
<td>106,783.37</td>
<td>-1,783.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301</td>
<td>Administrative Support Personnel</td>
<td>10,300.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19,440.93</td>
<td>19,440.93</td>
<td>-9,140.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>Mission Costs(UNDP) - Consultants(UNFPA)</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,332.00</td>
<td>7,132.44</td>
<td>9,464.44</td>
<td>535.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Other Fund Source - Operating Expenses</td>
<td>125,300.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,332.00</td>
<td>133,356.74</td>
<td>135,688.74</td>
<td>-10,988.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECT PRE- COMMITTED</td>
<td>UNCOMMITTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS/CODES OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE</td>
<td>ALLOTMENT</td>
<td>ENCUMBRANCE</td>
<td>OBLIGATION</td>
<td>DISBURSEMENTS</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>ALLOT BALANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ID TOTAL</td>
<td>154,357.00</td>
<td>6,367.30</td>
<td>145,358.12</td>
<td>151,725.42</td>
<td>2,631.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>