

**United Nations Development Programme
Global Environment Facility
Ministry of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation**

**DEMONSTRATING SUSTAINABLE CONSERVATION OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY IN
FOUR PROTECTED AREAS OF RUSSIA'S KAMCHATKA OBLAST, PHASE 1
RUS/01/G31 (00014615)**

**MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT
(According to UNDP this is a final evaluation of phase 1 and also a mid term
evaluation of the 2 phase project.)**

David Vousden

Galina Fet

June 2004

Acknowledgements

Acronyms

1. Executive Summary

2. Evaluation Process (Purpose and methodology)

3. Project Background and Landscape

Threats and Root Causes – Justification for project
Objectives
Outputs and Activities
Project Management
Stakeholders and Beneficiaries
GEF Context
End-Of-Project Expected Landscape

4. Findings and Evaluation

Project Delivery

- Outputs and Activities
- Threats and Root Causes – Effective Resolution
- Global and National Benefits
- Stakeholder Participation and Public Involvement
- Capacity Building
- Policy and Legislative Reform and Improvement
- Replicability
- Risks and Sustainability

Project Management and Implementation

- Project Design and Planning
- Project Management
- Project Execution and Implementation
- Country ownership/Drivenness
- Workplan and Budget (including cost effectiveness)
- Monitoring and Evaluation

Overall Project Impact

- Objective Achievements
- Constraints

5. Conclusions of Evaluation of Phase One

6. Recommendations for Further GEF Support

7. Lessons and Best Practices for GEF Biodiversity Projects of a Similar Nature

Annexes

ToR

Itinerary

Lists of Persons/Agencies/Bodies interviewed

List of Documents Reviewed

Questionnaire used as guidelines for interviews

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Evaluators would like to thank all of the Kamchatka UNDP/GEF Project Team, including the Working Groups, and especially the Project Manager for his assistance and hard work in making this Evaluation successful within a very short time-frame. Also within Kamchatka we would wish to thank the Director of the Nature Parks for his frank and open opinions, the staff and scientists of the Biosphere Reserve and Pacific Geography Institute, and the local NGO representatives (particularly those from the League of Independent Experts who have been closely involved with this Project since its infancy).

In Bystrinsky specifically we are grateful for the transparent and detailed input from the local administration, and for the opportunity to meet with local recipients of grants and loans. We wish to express our gratitude also to the staff of the SME and Micro-Credits Office for their time and patient explanation of the process involved in reviewing, selecting and distributing funding assistance.

We wish to extend our appreciation to certain project partners for their input to this Evaluation process, specifically CIDA and IUCN who were particularly helpful in sharing their opinions and concerns with the Evaluation Team.

We thank also the very professional UNDP GEF and Environmental staff from the UNDP Country Office in Moscow, and to the Resident Representative of UNDP for the Russian Federation for his time and input.

Finally, we wish to express our appreciation for the input from the National Project Director and Deputy Head of the Department of Nature Protected Areas and Biodiversity Conservation within the Ministry of Natural Resources in Moscow, and his staff. Their continued commitment to this project in the face of significant administrative upheavals is a beacon of hope for political sustainability.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BCC	Biodiversity Conservation Centre, NGO, Moscow
BNP	Bystrinsky Nature Park
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBF	Counterpart Business Fund, Khabarovsk
CCF	Country Cooperation Framework (UNDP)
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
ESRI	Environmental Systems Research Institute
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
GOR	Government of the Russian Federation
ISAR	Initiative for Social Action and Renewal in Eurasia
IUCN	World Conservation Union
KamchatNIRO	Kamchatka Scientific Fisheries Research Institute
KamchatRybvod	Kamchatka State Fisheries Management Agency
KBPIG RAN	Kamchatka Branch of Pacific Institute of Geography, Russian Academy of Sciences, Petropavlovsk
KIENR	Kamchatka Institute of Ecology and Natural Resources
KLIE	Kamchatka League of Independent Experts, NGO, Petropavlovsk
KNPD	Kamchatka Nature Parks Directorate
KOA	Kamchatka Oblast (Regional) Administration
KSBR	Kronotsky State Biosphere Reserve (Zapovednik)
KSCNP	Kamchatka State Committee for Nature Protection
KHMA	Kamchatka Hunting Management Agency
KPACF	Kamchatka Protected Areas Conservation Fund
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MNR	Ministry of Natural Resources
MOORE	Gordon & Betty Moore Foundation
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NNP	Nalychevo Nature Park
NRC	Natural Resources Committee (Kamchatka and Koryaksky Autonomous Okrug)
NTFP	Non-timber Forest Products
PA	Protected Area

PDF-B	Project Development Facility, Block B (GEF)
PERC	Pacific Environment & Resources Center
SCEP	State Committee for Environmental Protection - Russian Federation
SMESF	Small and Medium Enterprise Support Fund
SKSS	South Kamchatka State Sanctuary (<i>Zakaznik</i>)
TEK	Traditional Environmental Knowledge
TESERA	Tesera Sytems Inc., Sustainable Resource Planning, Analysis and Management Srvices
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
WB	The World Bank
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society
WHS	World Heritage Site
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The UNDP GEF-supported Project on Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biological Diversity in Four Protected Areas of Russia's Kamchatka Oblast is now nearing completion of its first phase which has a lifetime of 24 months. Within this short phase-one lifetime, this Project has demonstrated significant successes and achievements.

In the Evaluation, each Project Output has been reviewed separately. The review of each Output is summarised initially by identifying the original LogFrame Indicators from the Project Document, and then by discussing the Measurable Achievements for each Indicator. A Semi Quantitative Assessment technique then follows which has been applied to each Project Output in order to assess the level of achievement within each activity. Clarification of the adopted SQA score is then given for each Output/Activity. A General Discussion is then given on each Output which provides more elaborate detail, discussing feedback from stakeholders as well as identifying areas of concern or poor delivery. Using the Semi-Quantitative Assessment technique which provides values (between 1-5) for GEF Project Criteria and for the Project Outputs and Delivery, the Evaluators find the project to have achieved a an overall SQA figure of **3.54** which is equivalent to **'Impressive Delivery'**. Table 1 below gives the status of delivery for each project output as assessed against the measurable indicators given in the LogFrame. Table 2 below presents the overall SQA achievement scores for each project objective. These two tables provide a clear overview of the 'benchmarks' that were identified within the Project Document, and the level of achievement within these 'benchmarks'.

Evaluation Results are summarised below under **Project Outputs, Project Delivery and Project Management & Implementation.**

PROJECT OUTPUTS

Strengthening of the Protected Areas System has been realised through the development of management and operational plans, the creation and/or strengthening of field-offices, guard posts and ranger patrol stations, and through increased staffing levels. Efforts are under way to finalise the assessment of tourism development feasibility, and much has been done to address pollution issues within the Parks. Staffing levels are still somewhat inadequate and both the Project and Implementing Agency are working hard to resolve this issues at both the regional and federal level.

Biodiversity Information and Management has been significantly improved through capture and compilation of historic and current data sets and information, and the development of a standardised database format. Key data gaps are currently being defined with a view to providing guidance for future research requirements to support policy decisions.

The development of **Sustainable Financing Mechanisms** has proved to be one of the more significant challenges to this Project. So far there has been no capitalisation of such mechanisms as yet. The reasons for this are analysed in the discussion of that Output in the main text. Response from donors has been poor and it is probable that greater emphasis is now needed in trying to attract funding from other sources. The Project is therefore realigning its focus in this area toward private sector interests and will be looking at new, innovative approaches to such financing measures. On the positive side, the project has developed strong partnerships in support of sustainability of Objectives. The document discusses the various reasons why the project decided not to start capitalisation of the Trust Fund until there was a clearer picture of the levels of further

funding under phases two and three. The document also lists the mitigating circumstances which surround the apparent shortfalls under this particular Output (Lack of support from regional administration, unexpected restructuring of responsibilities at the federal Ministerial level, impracticable separation of the Trust Funds for this Project and for the Salmonid Conservation project)

Good foundations have been set in place with respect to **Strengthening the Legal, Regulatory and Policy Base**. The various policies, legislation and regulations pertinent to biodiversity conservation and PAs have been identified and comprehensively reviewed. Some recommendations have been proposed at the regional level. The Project now needs to consolidate this effort to ensure that a clearly defined and formal list of amendments and reforms to policy and legislation (as required to meet the Project Objectives) is finalised in time to provide a road-map for the next phase of the Project, which will be placing its emphasis on actual reform implementation.

The Project has undoubtedly delivered **Heightened Biodiversity Awareness and Advocacy**. Media, schools and communities now understand the relationships between the Parks, biodiversity and resource conservation, and the sustainability of their quality of life (and their general livelihoods). The communities have noted real actions to support their role in the Parks rather than just words. Awareness programmes are active but ‘branding’ could be improved to strengthen the linkages between activities related to community improvements and the objectives of the Project.

Improvements in the development of **Alternative Livelihoods and Community-Based Conservation** have been highly impressive and very successful. The small and medium sized funding and micro-credit loans have made a significant difference within the communities and, for the most part, the community sees these improvements as being closely associated with the Project. There is still a need to engage the communities more directly into the management process for the Parks, even if this is initially only at the more fundamental level of parks maintenance and overseeing tourism. Furthermore, there is a need to link the improvements in livelihoods to improvements in biodiversity conservation through a more focused and measurable set of indicators than currently exist.

PROJECT DELIVERY

In general, Project Delivery has been high with exceptionally good stakeholder participation and public involvement, significant capacity building, a high level of project output replicability, and strong opportunities for both global and national benefits.

The evaluation identifies some concerns in relation to **Threats and Root Causes**. The first focuses on on-going and planned mining activities near or within Bystrinsky Nature park which are still a serious concern among stakeholders. Management plans for the Park are attempting to address this concern. The second focuses on the increased emphasis on resource exploitation and consequent reduction in priority toward sustainable management that has resulted from significant administrative changes at the federal level. The Evaluation recommendations address this concern. The third concern is poaching. Subsistence level poaching is being addressed by the project through its activities related to Alternative Livelihoods. Organised poaching by the privileged rich is not being addressed by the project at present and it is difficult to see how this could be done except at the federal level. Again, recommendations to focus some project activities at the federal level would help to address this concern. Any further project phase should have a more specific and targetable list of root causes.

With respect to **Global and National Benefits**, domestic protected area capabilities have been enhanced along with an increase in transferable knowledge and lessons. Globally, the project is meeting its objectives. In both cases, sustainability will be the overarching factor toward success or failure.

Stakeholder Participation and **Public Involvement** have been exemplary both throughout project design and implementation. The project has consequently fostered high levels of support among all stakeholders. Some minor concerns are elucidated within the text. In particular, the project has achieved notable success within the Bystrinsky Nature Park where biodiversity conservation and community issues and concerns most overlap. Local administration in this area is highly supportive of the project as are the local population who see enormous benefits available to them in the long-term from the presence of the Park and through sustainable management of its natural resources and biodiversity.

Capacity Building has been achieved through institutional strengthening within both Nature Parks through physical improvements as well as human resource development. The Evaluation identifies some areas of weakness which could be improved, including training of project staff and better training of senior Parks management. The project intends to identify further training needs for any next phase.

Policy and Legislative Reform and Improvement has made some progress. Such reforms and changes are difficult within the new Russian economic and political context. The Evaluation has made some recommendations to improve and advance this process.

Replicability of project achievements and lessons would be valuable, especially within the Russian Federations Protected Areas system. The successes made within the Alternative livelihoods output as well as the development of an effective and compatible database are clear examples.

Risks and Sustainability are a concern although the evaluators were impressed with the ability of the project management team to respond to new risks and threats to sustainability. Much will depend on the design of any next phase as this first phase has only had some 20 months to run and it is difficult to assess the strength of the foundation developed so far. The text discusses a number of possibilities for strengthening his area, particularly by taking a more federal approach in any next phase.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT & IMPLEMENTATION

The overall **Project Design** and its **Planning** is well thought out for the most part. This is reflected in the high level of achievement in an implementation period of only 20 months. The development of strong partnerships and the transparent stakeholder consultations have played a major role in good project design leading to these achievements. The Evaluation identifies some criticisms which would provided valuable lessons for future project development (and are captured as such in both the Recommendations and Lessons and Best Practices section of the report). These include the need for a more simplified use of terminology within the Project Document, the use of more standard terminology as adopted by GEF Implementing Agencies, a more realistic timescale for achievements under each Output and Activity and taking into account the limited funding made available, and the need for more specific and measurable indicators (although these became difficult to apply under the phased approach in any case).

All of the stakeholders were very supportive and complementary toward the **Project Management** team. The 4 Working Groups that were developed to address relevant project Outputs had a good strategy for achieving their objectives. Overall, the Project Management showed a dynamic and logical approach to keeping project delivery as high as possible under fairly difficult budget limitations and time constraints.

Project Execution and Implementation has also demonstrated a high level of successful interaction and mutual support between the Project Team in Kamchatka, the Implementing Agency in Moscow and the various other Project partners. Communication channels are effective and assistance and advice appears to have been timely and professional.

At the federal level, **Country Ownership** appears to have been strong with much support from the office of the National Project Director. The Evaluation identifies new challenges arising as a result of significant changes in Ministerial responsibility. The Evaluation provides recommendations which could be instrumental in addressing these changes and in further strengthening Country Ownership.

The **Workplan and Budget** have been followed accurately. Some early difficulties arose from attempts to stick to the workplan without any proactive amendment where necessary. This was overcome by interventions at the Steering Committee level. One of the greatest concerns identified by the evaluators was the severe reduction in budget at the approval stage for this project, with little or no consequent reduction in expected Outputs or Activities. This further reflects on the abilities of the Project Team to be able to deliver under such constraints of both time and budget.

Monitoring and Evaluation requirements were incorporated into the Project Document and have been successfully followed. Some problems were encountered in the early days of implementation but these were overcome through consultation with the Implementing Agency and the Steering Committee. The evaluators reviewed the Project Implementation Review of June 2003 and found it to be an accurate reflection of project status and concerns at that time.

As an overall assessment therefore, Project Implementation has demonstrated good initial project design and planning, and an excellent level of project management. Overall project execution and implementation has also been of a high standard, including effective monitoring and evaluation.

There are still some concerns regarding the initial and significant reduction in Project budget and the phasing of the project but these are expected to be resolved through the design of the next phase. Some risk and sustainability issues remain, but this is hardly surprising for a project that has been evaluated after only 20 months of implementation. Project phasing has made it difficult to provide more specific measures of success or to identify any improvements to biodiversity conservation. This is because phase one (the subject of this current evaluation) was designed to provide baseline information on both biodiversity and socio-economic status while phases two and three address the development and implementation of monitoring procedures. This is a weakness in project design. The need to develop a proper baseline for indicators that would allow for more realistic measurement of achievement has been noted and is included in the recommendations. In the absence of such a baseline and relevant indicators the evaluation has had to rely on personal observation and feedback from stakeholders. The summary of Lessons and Best Practices captured through this evaluation clearly identifies the need for GEF Project Documents to use realistic and sequential indicators which can be numerically measured wherever possible. This should be a clear objective of the next phase. It is understandable that the success of a project in its early stages may need to be measured using Process Indicators. However, as soon as possible the LogFrame should

provide Stress Reduction and Environmental Stress indicators as measurable verification of success. In the absence of such measurable indicators any Evaluation must inevitably be subjective.

TABLE 1: STATUS OF OUTPUT DELIVERY AS PER MEASURABLE INDICATORS

OUTPUT	MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT DOCUMENT (LOGFRAME)	STATUS OF DELIVERY
Strengthening of the Protected Areas System	Management Plans prepared/approved for each Protected Area	COMPLETED
	Annual Operational Plans prepared and on record	COMPLETED
	Staff requirements identified and additional (GEF) staff hired	Identified - not hired
	PA Directorates established for Nature Parks	COMPLETED
	Essential equipment and supplies procured and infrastructure established	COMPLETED
	Tourism feasibility study completed and tourism development opportunities assessed	Expected by Project end
	Recreational carrying capacity of each PA determined	Expected by Project end
Biodiversity Information and Management	Existing biodiversity information for each PA is collated and standardized	Expected by Project end
	Meta-database is produced	COMPLETED
	Data needs are defined	Expected by Project end
	Required key biodiversity assessments are defined	Expected by Project end
	Traditional environmental knowledge appraised and means of integration into decision-making defined	Expected by Project end
Sustainable Financing Mechanisms	25% additional staff salaries absorbed by KOA and NRC	NO
	User fees established and implemented	No Mechanism
	KPACF designed and operational with 1 st stage of co-funding secured	NO
Strengthening the Legal, Regulatory and Policy Base	Biodiversity Policy Analysis completed and report available on file	COMPLETED
	Inadequacies and weaknesses in legislation and regulations identified and on file	COMPLETED
Heightened Biodiversity Awareness and Advocacy	Public Awareness communications strategy developed	COMPLETED
	Awareness Programme developed	COMPLETED
	Awareness Materials prepared and disseminated	COMPLETED
Alternative Livelihoods and Community-Based Conservation	Ecotourism feasibility assessed and defined through study	Expected by Project End
	NTFP harvest limits established for Protected Areas	Expected by Project End
	NTFP Management Plans prepared	Expected by Project End
	SME financing facility and Community Small Grants Programme developed	COMPLETED
	Traditional economic pursuits identified and defined	COMPLETED
	Economic feasibility of traditional pursuits appraised	Partial - Good Appraisal

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

The overall findings of this Evaluation are that this Project has made significant achievements toward the conservation and management of important global biodiversity; toward strengthening the administrative and management capacity within the 4 selected protected areas; toward increasing stakeholder biodiversity conservation awareness, commitment and participation in PA management; and toward promoting alternative livelihoods for local communities thereby enabling biodiversity conservation. Project Management has shown itself to be well capable of reacting to challenges, and has demonstrated a motivation and determination that bodes well for further activities toward achieving the project's objectives. The Evaluation therefore feels that the Project has set an excellent foundation (both at the regional and federal level) for the development of effective protected areas management, and that this foundation is more than strong enough for GEF to build a further phase of support and assistance with which to consolidate its efforts and investment so far.

The Evaluation recommends that the present phase be extended until the end of 2004 in order to complete some critical outstanding activities, that a further GEF phase be developed and submitted for approval, and that this further phase be granted sufficient funding to effectively complete the project objectives. The Evaluation also recommends that this next phase should be focussed on providing a model demonstration for the Russian Federation of how regional and federal protected areas systems can be properly managed and sustained under the newly re-structured government responsibilities and policies.

The detailed Recommendations of the Evaluation are divided into policy issues and specifics as follows:

PRIMARY RECOMMENDATIONS (POLICY)

- Extension of Phase One of the Project to the end of 2004 (already recommended by the Steering Committee).
- Funding for the Project should be returned to the \$7 million level (as originally identified) to achieve the Project's Objectives within the Project lifetime.
- Development of a formal strategy and workplan for identification of Sustainable Financing Mechanisms, which should then be adopted by the Steering Committee **before** the end of Phase One.
- Ensure that a final set of recommendations for strengthening the legal, regulatory and policy base are presented to the authorities **before** the end of Phase One, and used as a road-map for legal and policy reform under the next phase.
- In its next phase, the Project should demonstrate how both the regional and federal PAs can be sustainable managed and supported within the newly re-structured ministerial responsibilities and policies providing a transferable model for national replication, and to this effect should include a federal-level component within Moscow.
- The Project needs a long-term monitoring programme for biodiversity status, pollution and other threats both within and outside the PA system.
- A High-Profile Mission to Kamchatka should be arranged in coordination between UNDP and the Federal Government in order to raise the overall profile of the Project
- Phase Two of the Project should develop Councils for Co-Management of the PAs.

SECONDARY RECOMMENDATIONS (SPECIFICS):

- The Project needs to review the Threats and Root Causes to capture new concerns and to re-prioritise old issues.

- Before the end of Phase One, the Project needs to establish the baseline for impact indicators which can be effectively measured as accurate verification/justification of component and output success.
- The staffing problems within the PAs need urgent attention and resolution.
- There is a need to develop a Centre of Excellence for Training in Wilderness and Parks Management in Kamchatka.
- Further capacity building needs to be agreed in open consultation with relevant stakeholders.
- The Project should seek to help the indigenous people and the communities as a whole to resolve their concerns regarding hunting, fishing and land-rights.
- The successes of the SME and micro-credit experience in Esso now need to be transferred to other communities, and to start encouraging alternative livelihoods in other PAs.

The Evaluators have also provided a list of lessons pertinent to future GEF Project Development (Lessons and Best Practices for GEF Biodiversity Projects of a Similar Nature).

TABLE 2: OVERALL SEMI-QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR PROJECT ACHIEVEMENTS

PROJECT COMPONENT OR OBJECTIVE	ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE SUCCESS OF COMPONENT OR OBJECTIVE																				RATING
	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95	100	
PROJECT DELIVERY																					1-5
OUTPUTS & ACTIVITIES																					3.75
THREATS & ROOT CAUSES - RESOLUTION																					3.25
GLOBAL & NATIONAL BENEFITS																					3.5
STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION & PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT																					4.25
CAPACITY BUILDING																					3.5
POLICY & LEGISLATIVE REFORMS																					3.75
REPLICABILITY																					3.5
RISKS & SUSTAINABILITY																					3
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION																					
PROJECT DESIGN & PLANNING																					4
PROJECT MANAGEMENT																					4.25
PROJECT EXECUTION & IMPLEMENTATION																					3.75
COUNTRY OWNERSHIP																					3
WORKPLAN & BUDGET																					2.5
MONITORING & EVALUATION																					3.5
OVERALL PROJECT ACHIEVEMENT & IMPACT																					3.54

2. EVALUATION PROCESS (PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY)

The purpose of a GEF Independent Evaluation is to enable the direct stakeholders to the project (the National Government Executing Body, the Implementing Agency, and GEF) to review the progress of the project at a pertinent stage in the project lifecycle, and to reappraise the objectives and likely outputs from the project. In facilitating this review it is important that these direct stakeholders are given as much input and feedback from a broad spectrum of all project stakeholders and beneficiaries related to the project objectives.

The evaluation attempts to determine, as systematically and objectively as possible, the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project. The evaluation will assess the achievements of the project against its objectives, including a re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and of the project design. It will also identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the objectives. While a thorough review of the past is in itself very important in order to explain or justify project trends and/or amendments, such an in-depth evaluation is ultimately an important tool for providing detailed recommendations with regard to the current project and its outputs, and for capturing best practices and lessons which can be used to structure and drive future project development.

This Evaluation is particularly critical in its timing in view of the fact that this project has initially been divided into three phases of implementation. In order to proceed with next phase it is a pre-requisite that an evaluation of phase one is undertaken. A primary responsibility of this phase-one evaluation is therefore to assess the sustainability of the project (objectives, management, financing, etc) into the next phase. A further responsibility is to provide guidance on any realignment of the project's activities and objectives in order to achieve a sustainable final outcome. In this respect, the current evaluation places its emphasis on results and delivery, making particular use of measurable indicators as defined by the Logical Framework within the signed Project Document.

Further details regarding the Monitoring and Evaluation requirements of UNDP/GEF and the Objectives and Purpose of this Evaluation can be found under the Terms of Reference for the Phase 1 Evaluation (Annex 1).

In looking at the achievements of any Project, it is necessary to review the Workplan, and the Logical Framework tables listing Outputs against Measurable Indicators. This often requires some level of rating or quantitative scoring. To this effect, the Evaluators have used a **Semi-Quantitative Assessment** approach which aims to assess the actual achievements of the project up to the time of the Evaluation against the anticipated achievements defined in the Workplans. These Workplans are not designed to be an evaluation tool so much as a sequential guideline of events necessary to complete the project outputs.

This SQA approach assigns a scale of achievement for each output (based on the expected delivery and the success criteria for measuring that delivery) This provides a useful and quite accurate guideline to see which components are keeping up with the work plan and which have fallen behind, and in what activities they have fallen behind. The point to remember in this exercise is the fundamental requirement of the Evaluation, which is to provide guidance and improvement to the project implementation process to assist it in achieving its objectives successfully and sustainably.

In making this assessment the Evaluator has to make a judgement of the percentage of achievement per activity against the original work plan. To smooth-out the subjective nature of this approach, this is then converted to a scale from 1-5 whereby:

- 0 – 1.1 = Almost no delivery – Project sustainability severely in jeopardy. The Project stands a strong chance of failing in its objectives.
- 1.1-2.0 = Some effective delivery but generally poor and well behind schedule – unsustainable at present. Drastic measures needed to secure objectives.
- 2.1-3.0 = Borderline – Some notable achievements but needs greater delivery to be sustainable. Project certainly salvageable and can still be successful.
- 3.1-4.0 = Good to Impressive Delivery – Some activities may be behind, most are on or ahead of schedule. Project stands every chance of meeting its objectives and is expected to succeed but would benefit from some improvements and a review of priorities.
- 4.1-5.0 = Excellent Delivery – All outputs keeping pace with or ahead of the work plan. At present rate of delivery and achievement, project will be successful and sustainable.

The SQA achievements for each of the Outputs are presented in tabular form in that section of the Evaluation report (**Findings and Evaluation – Project Delivery, Outputs and Activities**) below.

Section 5 (**Conclusions of Evaluation of Phase One**) of this report presents the SQA scores for the overall objectives and components of the Project as defined both in the Logical Framework and Workplan, as well as by the GEF criteria for Projects and discusses their implications. This includes a an extrapolated composite score for the Project Outputs and Activities.

Table 1 in the Executive Summary (above) shows the semi-quantitative assessment of achievements for each of the GEF Project objectives and criteria. The value of this process is that it clearly highlights the activities which, for various reasons have fallen behind or are experiencing difficulty in delivery, and allows the Evaluators to make suggestions and recommendations for improvement.

This evaluation was conducted during the April 2004. Two Evaluators were contracted for this process. The Evaluators conducted interviews and collected observations both in Kamchatka and Moscow. This included a field-trip within Kamchatka to the Bystrinsky Nature Park and surrounds specifically to assess community feedback to development of

the Park infrastructure and to assess the stakeholder perception of the recently-introduced financial mechanisms for supporting alternative livelihoods. Further follow-up consultations were carried out for several weeks following the field visits in order to qualify any concerns and to fine-tune the Evaluation .

3. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND LANDSCAPE

3.1. BACKGROUND

The Kamchatka peninsula is one of the world's last remaining extensive natural areas still offering an opportunity to conserve outstanding globally significant biodiversity values. This 1,500 kilometre-long peninsula is included in WWF's Global 200 list of the world's most important ecoregions. Kamchatka's six protected territories are included in United Nations World Heritage List (UNESCO). Historically, Kamchatka's biodiversity was protected by its remoteness, rugged landscape, and later by its strategic military importance. Recent years of economic reform and societal upheaval have created a worsening situation for biodiversity within the region. The area has become increasingly more accessible, while local populations are experiencing economic hardships, and protected area budgets have been sharply reduced. This has resulted in significant and increasing threats to Kamchatka's biodiversity and existing protected areas (PAs). In a business-as-usual "baseline" scenario, the PAs' biodiversity will face growing cumulative threats from organized poaching, uncontrolled access and unmanaged uses of the PAs, including recreation, and resource exploitation by local populations beyond sustainable levels, thereby significantly diminishing their global benefits.

In spite of the economic hardships and numerous competing priorities, federal and regional level government administrations, the resident research community and locally-active NGOs have demonstrated a continued commitment to supporting the PAs. Nevertheless, despite this effort, there has been a widening gap between the existing limited baseline management capacity, and the actual requirements to effectively address the growing biodiversity conservation challenges in the protected areas.

3.2. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The current project aims to help secure the global benefits of conserving biological diversity in all protected areas in the Kamchatka Oblast by demonstrating replicable, sustainable approaches to biodiversity conservation in four existing representative protected areas. GEF resources will be used in a first phase to: strengthen the protected areas' administrative and management capacity; enable the development of a more rational and supportive PA legal foundation; increase stakeholder biodiversity conservation awareness, commitment and participation in PA management; enable biodiversity conservation; promoting alternative livelihood pursuits for local communities; increase efficiencies by improving collaboration between federally and regionally administered protected areas and among responsible authorities; and leverage co-funding support to ensure the attainment and sustainability of project results. It is

intended thereby to address the primary threats to biodiversity within the protected areas, along with their root causes.

3.3. THREATS AND ROOT CAUSES – JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PROJECT

The Project Threats Analysis list the following Threats which were acting as barriers to sustainable conservation of biodiversity within the 4 protected areas that fall within the project's system boundary:

- Poaching of wildlife (bear, snow sheep, reindeer, marine mammals, salmon)
- Natural Resources exploration in shared watersheds
- Unsustainable harvesting of Non-Timber Forest Products and other natural resources
- Uncontrolled access to Protected Areas resulting in harmful impacts (loss of vegetative cover, trampling, erosion, fire-risk, etc)
- Pollution (terrestrial and aquatic) by both resident communities and visitors (solid and liquid waste, hydrocarbons, thermal discharges, abandoned equipment, etc)
- General habitat degradation and disturbance of wildlife populations

These Threats can be related to the following primary Root Causes:

- Overwhelming subsistence needs and economic enticements
- Lack of alternative livelihoods and incomes
- Inadequate enforcement capacity
- Legislative deficiencies
- Poor Protected Areas management capacity
- Lack of awareness of biodiversity value and importance
- Absence of effective biological or resource harvesting data to direct policy and decision-making
- Absence of monitoring of activities and changes in biological communities/ecosystems
- Absence of management plans for natural resource harvesting and exploitation
- Absence of community involvement or support for Protected Areas

Further detail regarding the harmful impacts created by these threats and explanation of the root causes can be found in Annex IV of the Project Document – Threats Analysis.

3.4. OUTPUTS

Based on the identified threats and their associated root causes, the project defined the following Outputs aimed at strengthening the ability for sustainable conservation of biological diversity within the 4 protected areas. These Outputs and their associated Activities will be addressed and their delivery and impact assessed through the evaluation process.

- Output 1: Strengthening Protected Areas Management**
- Output 2: Improved Biodiversity Information and its Management**
- Output 3: Sustainable Financing Mechanisms**
- Output 4: Strengthened Legal, Regulatory and Policy Base**
- Output 5: Heightened Biodiversity Awareness and Advocacy**
- Output 6: Alternative Livelihoods and Community-Based Conservation**

3.5. PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

The Project is being implemented by UNDP and executed through the Ministry of Natural Resources in Moscow. UNDP has a group of GEF Project Staff established within Kamchatka including a Project Manager. The project is overseen by a Project Steering Committee and there are several technical support groups that are answerable to the Steering Committee through the Project Manager. These include four Working Groups dealing with the following issues that relate to the project Outputs:

1. Strengthening PA management capacity
2. Alternative Livelihoods
3. Raising Conservation Awareness and Advocacy
4. Establishing Sustainable Financial Mechanisms

3.6. BENEFICIARIES AND STAKEHOLDERS

The sustainable conservation of biodiversity values of the four project sites is intended to provide benefits that are significant globally, nationally and locally. Global benefits of the project include the securing of long-term protection for species, habitats, and communities that are currently stressed and are increasingly threatened by numerous factors. Domestic benefits accruing from the project include the enhancement and distribution of protected area management capabilities, the establishment of a sound financial footing to ensure the protected areas' sustainability, and the accumulation of transferable knowledge and skills to other contexts. The PA administrations and staff are expected to benefit from exposure to new management approaches, improvements in the information base, enhanced capacity to effectively manage the PAs, upgraded skill sets through training opportunities, and improved relations with local communities and users. Locally, through the provision of alternative livelihood options to the resident population, the project is expected to enhance local support for conservation, and to stimulate the development of self-reliance and sustainable economic use of the areas' biodiversity resources. The project intends to provide these communities with the knowledge and mechanisms to adapt their use of the PAs that optimises their economic and social welfare while sustainably conserving their biodiversity values. In addition, secondary beneficiaries, including NGOs and other government agencies and partners in project delivery are expected to benefit from their own capacity building.

Considerable stakeholder input was solicited during both the project development and implementation stages (see **Findings and Evaluation** below).

At the regional level (within Kamchatka), stakeholders and beneficiaries from project delivery include:

- Regional government administration
- Communities associated with the Parks (especially Bystrinsky and Nalychevo Nature Park)
- Indigenous peoples within and adjacent to the Parks
- Scientific community and institutions of higher learning
- Schools and Colleges
- Local and regional NGOs
- Regional tourism operators
- Indigenous communities
- General public

At the national level (within the Russian Federation), stakeholders and beneficiaries from project delivery include:

- Ministry of Natural Resources
- Other government agencies benefiting from Parks incomes or from sustainable management of natural resources (forestry, fisheries, etc)
- Scientific community and institutions of higher learning
- National NGO groups
- National tourism operators
- Other protected areas systems throughout the Federation
- Other communities and indigenous peoples associated with protected areas throughout the Federation (who stand to gain from best lessons and practices)

At the global level, stakeholders and beneficiaries from project delivery include:

- All countries of the world with an interest or objective to conserve and manage globally-significant biodiversity
- Other protected areas systems throughout the world which can benefit from lessons and best practices
- Other communities and indigenous peoples associated with other global protected areas who can benefit from demonstrations of alternative livelihoods and closer cooperation with PA systems

3.7. GEF CONTEXT

The significance of Kamchatka's biological diversity is not measured so much by the number of different species, but more by the presence of numerous rare and unique species, species assemblages and ecosystem processes, including volcanic and geothermal ones (there are 40 geysers and 200 thermals in the Geyser Valley and five thermal fields in Uzon volcano caldera). Also, a great number of endemic species and subspecies of plants and animals inhabit the peninsula. For example, 10% of

Kamchatka's 1,168 plants are endemic. 11 out of 766 vascular plants of Kronotsky Reserve are included in a Russian Red Book. 12 mammals of Kamchatka are included in the Red Book: sea lion, sea otter, insular harbour seal, polar bear and 8 species of cetaceans. 35 species of Red Book birds were found there, many of them find their nesting and breeding grounds in PAs (up to 2000 pairs of colonial birds nest in Kronotsky). Archaeological remnants and ancient settlements were found in the south. As a result of its island-like environment, there is a continuing process of diversification among the peninsula's endemic species and subspecies.

The Kamchatka Oblast's network of protected areas currently consists of: 2 Strict Nature Reserves (federal zapovedniks), 17 special purpose reserves or refuges (zakazniks) of either federal or Oblast significance, 4 Nature Parks (Oblast level), 1 Nature Park (local level), and 83 Nature Monuments and other sites designated for their unique features. These PAs, selected on the basis of various ecological characteristics, biodiversity values and their uniqueness, comprise 27.4% of Kamchatka's territory. It is the intent of the Kamchatka Oblast Administration to ultimately designate approximately 31% of the peninsula under various protected area designations. One implication of this is that since the network of PAs is nearly complete, the long-term conservation of Kamchatka's biodiversity is predicated upon the effectiveness of the existing PAs in conserving their biodiversity. The criteria for selecting the 4 protected areas, which constitute the system boundary for this project, are explained in the Project Document under **Project Context**.

The Russian Federation meets the eligibility criteria of the GEF instrument under paragraph 9(b) and the project was considered to be eligible by GEF under Operational Programme 4 – Mountain Ecosystems. In particular, the project meets GEF criteria by being country driven; securing global biodiversity benefits; involving multiple stakeholders in its implementation; securing co-financing to achieve the sustainable development baseline; and, incorporating measures for ensuring long-term institutional and financial sustainability. The project also meets CBD objectives by fulfilling the requirements contained in the Convention's Articles 6 (General Measures for Conservation and Sustainable Use), 7 (Identification and Monitoring), 8 (In-situ Conservation), 10 (Sustainable Use of Components of Biological Diversity), 11 (Incentive Measures), 12 (Research and Training), 13 (Education and Awareness) and 17 (Exchange of Information). The Project Document defines other eligibilities and linkages relevant to GEF resource use (see **Strategy for use of UNDP/GEF Resources**).

3.8. END-OF-PROJECT EXPECTED LANDSCAPE

The expected end-of-project situation is defined in the Project Document as the following:

‘The four protected areas’ management will be strengthened, and they will serve as models of approaches to sustainable biodiversity conservation in different socio-economic and institutional contexts. Measurable indicators, that are presented in Annex III, will show that the long-term conservation of their biodiversity values has been assured through the elimination of the threats

confronting them, and clearly evident improvements in their management. Poaching and natural resource over-exploitation will have been significantly reduced, and the provision of alternative sources of livelihood for local communities will have negated the exploitation pressure from these populations. The recreational potential of the areas will have been realized through planned and well-managed tourism and visitation, activities that will also contribute to increasing the areas' self-financing capability. The protected areas will enjoy strong support from local communities, decision-makers at all levels and the general public, and will serve as anchors for the continuing elevation of biodiversity awareness and recognition of the need to safeguard biodiversity values among future generations in Kamchatka and visitors alike'.

However, this would be the overall end-of-project landscape. Specific indicators are given in Annex III (Logical Framework) which will demonstrate the achievements of phase one currently under evaluation, along with an overall set of ratings for specific project deliveries (e.g. Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives (the extent to which the project's environmental and development objectives were achieved); Implementation Approach; Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement; Sustainability; and Monitoring & Evaluation.

4. FINDINGS AND EVALUATION

4.1. PROJECT DELIVERY

4.1.1 Overall Objective

The overall objective of the project is to strengthen the protected areas' administrative and management capacity; enable the development of a more rational and supportive PA legal foundation; increase stakeholder biodiversity conservation awareness, commitment and participation in PA management; enable biodiversity conservation promoting alternative livelihood pursuits for local communities; increase efficiencies by improving collaboration between federally and regionally administered protected areas and among responsible authorities; and leverage co-funding support to ensure the attainment and sustainability of project results

There is strong evidence to support the fact that the project is achieving its overall aim to strengthen the protected areas administrative and management capacity. However, this now needs to be reviewed in the light of significant changes taking place within the overall structure of regional and federal government in relation to the administrative responsibilities for both natural resource exploitation and management, and both federal and regional protected areas.

The following section looks in greater detail at the actual level of delivery and achievements for each Project Output.

4.1.2 Outputs and Activities

Output 1: Strengthening Protected Areas Management

LogFrame Indicators:

- Management Plans prepared/approved for each Protected Area
- Annual Operational Plans prepared and on record
- Staff requirements identified and additional (GEF) staff hired
- PA Directorates established for Nature Parks
- Essential equipment and supplies procured and infrastructure established
- Tourism feasibility study completed and tourism development opportunities assessed
- Recreational carrying capacity of each PA determined

Measurable Achievements:

All of the Protected Areas Management Plans were developed by the end of 2003 and are under implementation. Similarly, all of the annual Operational Plans for all 4 PAs have been completed as required, and have been implemented. The staff requirements for the 4 protected areas are covered in the Management Plans. However, although the project has provided some staff as agreed in the Project Document it is of significant concern that the government administration has not met its agreed commitments to staffing levels. This raises some doubt regarding the sustainability of PA management and efficiency in the long-term although it is understood that the Project Management is actively working to resolve this issue with assistance from the Implementing Agency and with federal support. Protected Areas Directorates have now been established for the Nature Parks and these are represented by an overall Director, a Deputy Director for each Nature Park and an underlying management system for the Parks. Much of the essential equipment to manage and maintain the Parks has been procured and distributed and a Parks infrastructure has been established. However, the efficiency and long-term sustainability of the equipment usage and maintenance, as well as the effective use of the new infrastructure is in question as a result of the lack of trained staff and their inadequate powers. It is hoped that this would be addressed in the next project phase also. A tourism feasibility study is planned and under implementation, and is expected to be completed on time (July-August 2004). This feasibility study will also address the recreational carrying capacity for each PA as required under Activity 1.2.

Semi-Quantitative Analysis of Output Delivery

OUTPUT 1	START MONTH	COMPLETION MONTH	%ge Delivery
Activity 1.1 – Prepare and Implement Operational Plans (All 4 Pas)	Oct-02	Aug-04	100
Activity 1.2 – Define recreational carrying capacity	Oct-02	Jul-04	100

Activity 1.3 – Procure Field and Office Equipment	Oct-02	Jun-03	100
Activity 1.4 – Prepare and Begin to Implement PA Management Plans	Nov-02	Jul-04	80
Activity 1.5 – Define PA Personnel Requirements and Staffing	Nov-02	Nov-03	100
Activity 1.6 – Establish Facilities for Nature Parks Directorates	Nov-02	Mar-04	100
Activity 1.7 – Assess and Control Water Pollution	Nov-02	Jul-04	60
Activity 1.8 – Provide Training for PA Staff	Jan-03	Jul-04	90
Activity 1.9 – Establish Ranger Patrol Stations	Jan-03	Aug-04	100
Activity 1.10 – Clean up polluted sites	Jan-03	Dec-03	80
Activity 1.11 – Establish and Staff Nature Park Directorates	Feb-03	Apr-04	75
Activity 1.12 – Define tourism development feasibility	Jul-03	Jul-04	100
N.B. Percentages in red assume that Activity will be completed on time as assured by Project Management Team			Total for Output
			90.4

Clarifications to SQA: Although much has been achieved in respect of Park Management and Operational Plans, this needs to be balanced against the inadequate level of staff capacity compared to project expectations. However, this is not a direct fault of the efforts of the Project itself which has made significant steps in the establishment and staffing of the Nature Parks Directorates. Hence a reasonable score of 75% has been given for delivery under Activity 1.11. Furthermore, although PA Management Plans have been prepared and are under implementation for each area, these are not supported by adequate law enforcement. Their effective implementation is therefore questionable which clarifies the reduced score for Activity 1.4 (80%). Project Management has identified that training (under Activity 1.8) has been good but that there are further needs. Some effective clean-up of polluted sites associated with the Parks has been undertaken but there is now insufficient funding to complete this activity (1.10), which is reflected in the score of 80%. The report from Activity 1.2 is in its draft form and is expected to be complete before the end of this phase of the project. Less progress seems to have been made in activity 1.7. A progress report has been submitted by KamchatNIRO on the status of water pollution within the PAs, but no evidence of results or conclusions were available. Although the completion date for this activity is not until June 2004, KamchatNIRO have already requested an extension until September 2004. However, there is more than enough descriptive and analytical data already available with which to draw effective conclusions and to present a report finishing sampling of the missing field data in summer. The Evaluators can only conclude that it is unlikely that such a report and its associated data will be forthcoming before the end of the project. This is reflected in the score of 60% achievement for activity 1.7.

General Discussion

The Director of the Nature Parks is quite emphatic that, without the presence and activities of the GEF project and its partners the Parks at Bystrinsky and Nalychevo would be in a poor shape with little management and very limited

resources/infrastructure. GEF input has been particularly important and critical in the Bystrinsky Nature Park, which was little more than a 'paper' park prior to the implementation of the project. This park now has communications systems, guard posts, and a central Parks Office in Ezzo. The GEF funding has helped to raise the profile of the parks both within the communities and at a political level. Other parks currently outside of the project exist only on paper and have no real function.

The Deputy-Director of Kronotsky in a presentation to the Steering Committee made note of some of the concerns within the Zapovednik. **A. Personnel:** One negative concern within the Zapovednik is staff efficiency and capacity. The low pay and the remote, dangerous nature of the work do not attract high calibre, young, professional staff. On the positive side however, he notes that GEF funding assistance has helped to keep experienced personnel on-board. Pay levels need to be raised for Inspectors and for scientific staff and the concerns about insurance need to be resolved (i.e. PA staff are risking their lives for very poor remuneration). The cuts in Federal funding made it impossible to conduct patrolling and scientific monitoring without additional field supplements and equipment. **B. Sustainable Communications and Transport:** The main form of transport into and around Kronotsky is by helicopter which is extremely expensive (>\$1,000 per hour). The development of cheaper and more reliable aviation needs to be addressed. This needs support from both the regional and federal level. Some consideration should be given to sea transportation using small boats and pneumatic vehicles (the latter would have less impact on the tundra). Heavy trucks are destroying the habitats and are not a reasonable form of transport in this highly protected area. Currently, some of the radio communications are obsolete and life-threatening. **C. Infrastructure:** This is still unsatisfactory. More funding is needed, along with reliable contractors with a working material base. There is also a need for better onsite facilities for scientists, especially to assist in developing PA database and in conducting field monitoring programs. **D. Ecological Education:** There needs to be more effort put into sensitising the mass media and such education should start early in schools. **E.** The tourism issue needs to be resolved. There is good potential for tourism but this needs legislative support, planning and investment. **F.** A reserve fund is needed to address emergencies within the PAs. Currently there is no such funding. He recommends that the Project should establish such an emergency response reserve fund of between \$10-15,000 for the PAs.

At the community level there has been a significant change in attitudes as local people have seen action turned into words with a real presence and delivery from the GEF project. The community sees that the parks are actually working. Prior to the implementation of the project there was considerable negotiations (during the development phase) and a lot of consultation at the local level. However, this was seen at the time to be 'all talk but no action' in the eyes of the community. Now that they see real activities the support is growing. This has been reflected in community-led involvement in voluntary park clean-ups (with Project initiation, and provision of equipment such as gloves, bags, etc). Some 22 km of trails have been cleaned and a number of old buildings demolished and removed. The Project also negotiated an important agreement with a former military station within Kronotsky Reserve to clean up stored hydrocarbons.

Nalychevo Park has seen direct community involvement from adjacent communities but also from people in Petropavlovsk, the primary city in the Oblast. Bystrinsky Park and its surrounds supports 8 different indigenous groups which have not always traditionally seen eye-to-eye on matters, but the project has helped to bring these different groups together. In Bystrinsky, priority should be given to establishing a co-management Committee that will include local representatives, regional and park administrators, project coordinators, media, business and industry representatives for information exchange and collaborative decision-making.

The provision of equipment through the project has, according to the Director of Nature Parks, made a big difference to management and inspection. The provision of snow mobiles has been a particular breakthrough in allowing Inspectors to patrol the Parks and to intercept poachers. Much of the poaching is undertaken by the new rich classes and they usually have excellent equipment. This equipment procurement for the parks has allowed more control over poachers (although the issue of the lack of powers of arrest among Inspectors is still a constraint). The construction of check-points and control towers for the Inspectors has also made a difference (although there are still insufficient Inspectors, and they have inadequate powers). The Director feels that the presence of the Inspectors has definitely reduced the level of poaching. He also praises the development of effective management plans for the 2 Parks. In the much larger territory of Kronotsky Zapovednik, the establishment of several year-round ranger stations (cordons) is urgently needed especially in such sensitive areas as Uzon and the northern boundary. The majority of existing ranger stations are in such a state of disrepair that they can not be utilised anymore. One such cordon (Unana) was built with GEF Project support. A reduction in funding to the Zapovedniks does not allow for timely replacement or repairs of essential equipment and firearms (two-thirds of the latter are from the 1940s and 1950s and are dangerous to use). Inspectors in the federal reserves do have legal rights similar to police in terms of stopping violators and issuing the fines, and in bearing arms. Working conditions and their salaries are at a very low level. Management plans for federally administered reserves include the ranger's reports on the types of violation, access to the territories and fines collected. The number of Violation Protocols issued in Kronotsky has reduced drastically from 100 in 2001 to 16 in 2002 due to the new law which reduced the violation fee itself, making it impossible and unprofitable to collect it. Only two hunting violations were registered during this period due to the lack of sufficient patrolling equipment.

Training has been comprehensive (in some cases the PA staff feel it has been too much!). Training has been conducted both within the PAs (e.g. South Kamchatsky – Coordinating wildlife and visitors. General training on how to use the existing laws against poachers) and at the desk-top (Seminars on legal problems and policing) as well as study tours to existing managed parks in Canada. Several sessions were conducted by a Russian lawyer who conducted legal seminars for inspectors and staff of PAs. He also produced on a volunteer basis a compilation of the Russian law on Nature Protection in a format that could be useful in the field.

Suggestions from the Project Team for additional training include organisation of eco-tourism, training of inspectors (roles and functions). Also there needs to be special training initiatives for the Federal Parks but there is currently insufficient money to cover this. Some Federal Park personnel have volunteered to undertake training within the Kamchatka landscape during their vacation time. Following the successful visit of Parks staff to Canada, the Project is attempting to develop more permanent relationships and to implement a more formal Partnership Programme. One initiative that the Project has proposed is the creation of a Special Training Centre within Kamchatka to train the trainers. This could be developed into a world Centre of Excellence in Wilderness Park Management and could become self-sustainable by providing a commercial service. Such a Centre could also train guides from tourism companies and provide certification which could then become a requirement for tourist operations.

One significant constraint to management of the parks is the lack of personnel. The Project has supplied equipment and built infrastructure to support the parks but there are insufficient staff to man the guard posts and to undertake patrols. This reflects the current failure in commitment from government administration. The Project had defined the number of personnel needed for PAs and had also defined sources for financing (both available and potential). The government had agreed to fund certain positions but this has never happened. At the regional level this is a direct decision on the part of the regional administration not to fulfil its formally-agreed commitments to the project. At the federal level there is a freeze on growth of parks personnel which can only be resolved after government re-structuring has been completed. This re-structuring process is underway at the present moment (March-April 2004) and is expected to be complete within the next few months.

The opinion of the Project Team is that there are sufficient personnel to support the federal protected areas, but that the constraints are financial in that salaries are very poor and this is reflected in the fact that it is often difficult to get personnel of sufficiently adequate capability and calibre to do the work effectively. This is even more apparent when considering the relatively dangerous and isolated nature of the work in Kronotsky and South Kamchatsky. There is a strong emphasis from all of the Project Team that these staffing problems need to be resolved early in the next phase. The number of inspectors and scientists is still much less than it was in the 1980s. The demand for high quality technical personnel for supporting data collection and monitoring will be crucial for the next Phase of the project and should be addressed at the beginning of the Phase 2. GEF's contribution to supporting staff during the first phase of the project is well-recognised. In the federal PAs, additional funds were provided by the Project to allow parks personnel to undertake extra field-work (food, equipment, etc). In Bystrinsky and Nalychevo regional Nature Parks, the project has supported extra staffing levels but still not enough money to support the 2 full-time staff and 6 part-time positions. The problem arising now is that the project has delivered good equipment in both quality and quantity but there is no the staff to make effective use of this equipment. Despite commitments from the local administration to support extra staff, this is not forthcoming. The excuse given is that these commitments were made by a previous administration and not the current one. The various management plans for the 4 PAs identify required staffing

levels. This would seem to be an important issue which should be addressed urgently during the next phase of the project.

Despite inadequate support from the regional administration, the two Nature Parks have developed significantly with regard to their management capacity (largely as a result of good top-level management supported by funding from GEF and partners such as WWF and CIDA). Both have Parks Offices, and Visitor's Centres are under construction. Both have Directors, staff (although not necessarily sufficient), adequate equipment, and good cooperation and relations with the community. However, there is a strong concern that there is insufficient management capacity within the Bystrinsky NP, which hampers efficiency of the project activities and delivery in this area. Other concerns relating to Bystrinsky NP include staff turnover over the last 2 years, and the general lack of staff experienced in Park's management. The project appears to have been trying to address these issues, and has something of a certain medium-term strategy for this specific park. However, these issues and their resolution should be seen as a challenge for the project in the immediate future.

Control stations (guard-posts) have been constructed and better communications have been installed. Currently there are a total of 12 staff for the two Nature Parks but their actual requirement is considerably more (see below). Another 50% were to have been provided by government according to the agreements signed within the Project Document. However, it should be noted that funding from the federal level has increased (as a result of the presence of the project) to an additional 5 million rubles more than the previous year. The number of Parks visitors has grown and Park income has therefore also grown. (>R.700,000 in 2003).

The actual Staffing levels and their funding for each PA are as follows:

<u>Nalychevo:</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>
Gov't Funded	8	8
GEF Funded	1	1
Total	9	9

To function effectively Nalychevo needs a staff of 20 persons.

<u>Bystrinsky:</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>
Gov't Funded	1	2
GEF Funded	2	2
Total	3	4

To function effectively Bystrinsky needs a staff of 14 persons.

Cost to Government for Nature Parks Staff for 2003 was \$45,000 and for 2004 was \$51,500.

Cost to GEF for Nature Parks Staff for 2003 was \$13,000 and for 2004 was also \$13,000.

Federal Protected Areas:

Kronotsky Strict Biosphere Reserve (Zapovednik) also includes the South Kamchatsky State Sanctuary as a structural sub-division of one administrative entity. Therefore both PAs have a single set of staff and single financing sources.

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>
Total Staff (all Gov't funded)	63	62
No. of above = Inspectors	32	32

To function effectively, the Biosphere Reserve needs 104 staff (including 62 inspectors)

Cost to Government for Federal Reserve for 2003 was \$98,350 and for 2004 was \$122,000

Cost to GEF in field bonuses (for staff to operate in remote conditions) for 2003 was \$10,000 and for 2004 was also \$10,000.

From the above figures it would certainly seem that Bystrinsky Nature Park is quite seriously understaffed and this needs to be resolved fairly quickly if the Park is to develop a sustainable management scenario.

The old laws applying to Zapovedniks such as Kronotsky prohibited tourism from their protected areas. However, under the new order that has restructured this as a Biosphere Reserve it is possible to zone the protected area to allow some tourism to take place. If the laws change then Kronotsky is all ready to adopt this zoned Biosphere Reserve structure within the existing Biosphere Reserve.

One area of concern is the apparent lack of coordination still between the regional and the federal PAs. There is currently little evidence of any integrated or coordinated management. However, this could change after the government has finished its restructuring and should probably be a focus or component within the next phase of the project.

The Project Working Group addressing this Output and Output 2 has been actively working with several groups of experts in developing the databases and in assembling a catalogue of required research. They have also developed some recommendations for improving legislation related to the Parks and have approved contracts for evaluating the capture of profits from the PAs. The Working group has a special contact person in the Duma which they can deal with on policy and legislative matters and they have cooperated with the local administration in developing laws on ecotourism and in developing sanctions for regulators/inspectors. Discussions with Working Group One have highlighted a need to extend the deadline for phase one by 6 months in order to meet the workplan requirements and to achieve satisfactory delivery of the Activities.

However, they also see the need to begin work on some of the second phase activities in parallel with completion of the first phase. Working Group One feel that the priorities for the next phase in relation to Strengthening Protected Areas Management should include better training and equipment for development of an accurate database (including GIS), more emphasis on review and amendment of legislation, a more rational and sustainable strategy for effective staffing and financing of staff, continued efforts in developing public awareness and coordinating activities with the regional socio-economic development plan.

IUCN, as a project partner, is active in Working Group One and one of their priorities is the development of ecotourism within the PAs. An analysis of the tourism market has shown some interesting trends. All tourism companies in Kamchatka offer the Valley of the Geysers (within the Kronotsky Zapovednik) as a tourism destination but none of them mention the presence of the PA, so this cannot really be considered to be ecotourism as the tourists are given no information about ecology or the presence of the PA. This may be an issue of sensitivity as, under Federal Law, tourists are prohibited from entry to a Zapovednik. However, the same absence of information occurs with official tours to Nalychevo Park where tourism is both permitted and encouraged. IUCN considers there to be a lot of potential for ecotourism but it is difficult to realise as there is so little experience and understanding of how ecotourism operates throughout the rest of the world. Existing or absent legislation represents another complicated problem for ecotourism. IUCN has developed an ecotourism guidance booklet and has participated in seminars to explain ecotourism and to raise its profile within the communities. They are now developing an ecotourism strategy for each PA. In Bystrinsky Park they are using a questionnaire to raise the profile of ecotourism and to explain its aims and potential to the local population. So far there has been a positive reaction to the concept.

Analysis of pollution levels within the Parks (using ichthyofauna, zoobenthos, etc) demonstrates that pollution levels are generally not high and that the ecosystem generally cleans up any short-term, low-level pollution incidents. There are no major industries within the PAs. However, there are some specific point-sources of pollution that need to be addressed, and there is clearly a need to develop a monitoring programme to ensure that any pollution threats are identified before they can cause a serious impact, and there is a need for formal legislation to support this and to support effective Environmental Impact Assessments on any proposed new constructions or enterprises that might create harmful pollution impacts. Hydrocarbon water pollution would also now seem to be a cause for concern as a threat to biodiversity within the federal reserves. Furthermore, toxic agricultural waste, thermal pollution, and raw sewage are an issue for the Nalychevo Park watershed and parts of Bystrinsky Park also. The Working Group has produced a report which suggests steps which could be taken to avoid or mitigate any future pollution incidents.

Data is available with KamchatNIRO on the status of water pollution within the PAs. Some of this historical information dates back many decades and includes observations and studies on the biology and physiology of hydrobionts including salmonid species. Initial observations and interim reports from KamchatNIRO also identify possible threats.

Sampling water stations were established in 2 PAs where the physical characteristics of the water levels, as well as chemical analyses were recorded. Results were compared to the maximum allowable concentrations, and to the levels at unpolluted sites. This activity was granted an extension in order to finish water sampling in the tourist areas of the parks during the summer season. The low SQA score reflects the inadequate planning of seasonal sampling. Sampling at Nalychevo and Kronotsky is planned for the field season of 2004. Major water pollution sources in Kronotsky include sewage from the tourist complex in the Geyser Valley and tons of hydrocarbons from abandoned geological and military installations (including poorly contained hydrocarbons which are contaminating the soil).

KamchatNIRO documentation notes that water contamination creates a threat for vulnerable species such as Stellar sea lions and other marine mammals. Populations of a number of marine mammal species have experienced a drastic decline since 2002. Examples of potential threats include the Kronotsky lighthouse, which uses 10 tons of diesel fuel a year and is located near the breeding grounds of several species of sea mammals. It has been recommended that refuelling should be conducted in the presence of Inspectors in the future, and should include bioremediation measures in event of emergency spills. In addition, there is a high risk of contamination from former military sites and associated fuel containers (including thousands of fuel drums in Kozlov peninsular and Kronotsky Zapovednik). Dismantling of such sites (including the seismological station at Tip Olga), are a concern if not supervised properly and if insufficient attention is given to the possible harmful effects from leakage of contaminants.

The interim KamchatNIRO report discusses South Kamchatsky Zakaznik and, in particular, Kurilsky lake which does not freeze over in the winter and supports the largest Asian population of “nerka” salmonid (6 million). The water purity in this lake depends on the absence of spills from boat fuelling. It has been recommended that all fuel storage should be moved away from the shore zone completely. The report also notes in its discussions that there are no roads or industries inside Bystrinsky Park, but it does not mention in its conclusions the planned road construction, nearby gold-mining, use of pesticides and a proposed toxic waste landfill, all of which represent very real threats to the watershed and the Park.

The report also discusses the possible effects of the waste thermal outflow and raw sewage in Esso on salmonid reproduction, and suggests diverting these discharges into abandoned mines. In two settlements (Esso and Anavgai) raw sewage is discharged into the river. Bioremediation measures have been proposed for the park areas. Sampling station locations are shown on the topographic maps and their exact coordinates are listed in the tables. The use of remote sensing technology and multispectral satellite imagery is suggested for detection of the major water pollution events and monitoring on the regional scale. The report would benefit from the inclusion of maps showing the PA boundaries and buffer zones, contours defining major pollution sources, the location of threats (as defined in report), roads, industrial sites, construction areas, tourist camping areas, boat and helicopter fuelling areas, tourist routes, fish spawning areas, agricultural

waste sites, and thermal pollution areas. Furthermore, no potentially serious threats to biodiversity are mentioned in report's conclusions. Better maps, improved verbal interpretation of results produced in analytical tables, suggestions for further monitoring and a better seasonal sampling plan would greatly improve the report. Valuable recommendations on priority issues have been made in the report including introducing bioremediation, building bridges over the rivers and streams essential for salmonid survival and reproduction within the park areas, and assist in resolving issues with pesticide waste near Nalychevo Park. The interim report also does not mention the presence of important Red Book species such as Steller Sea Lion - *Eumetopius jubatus* and seals - *Phoca* spp. There has been a drastic decline in these species which may be attributable to coastal water pollution.

The overall Output delivery has been very high and much has been achieved toward strengthening the management of the 4 protected areas.

Output 2: Improved Biodiversity Information and its Management

LogFrame Indicators:

- Existing biodiversity information for each PA is collated and standardized
- Meta-database is produced
- Data needs are defined
- Required key biodiversity assessments are defined
- Traditional environmental knowledge appraised and means of integration into decision-making defined

Measurable Achievements:

Biodiversity information is currently being collated and converted from paper to electronic format. This format has been standardised to ensure A. compatibility throughout the system used within the Russian Federation and B. to ensure that it is compatible and comparable with other standardised global systems. This process is expected to be complete now by the end of 2004. An effective meta-database has already been developed and is currently being expanded and updated. It will not be possible to define the data gaps until sufficient information has been compiled in electronic form into the biological database and the meta-database. This process can be considered to be well underway. The first priority is to finalise the biodiversity data. This will be followed by completion of input of the socio-economic data. The appraisal and compilation of Traditional Environmental Knowledge is an on-going process that includes coordination between the project and a number of other agencies. Development of future key research needs will follow (and priorities are well known) , but will probably continue into the next Project phase in view of the enormity of the work involved in electronic standardisation of the databases. Biodiversity mapping is underway but has started late. A catalogue of research needs should be available for the research community and NGOs by the expected Workplan delivery date (June 2004).

Semi-Quantitative Analysis of Output Delivery

OUTPUT 2	START MONTH	COMPLETION MONTH	%ge Delivery
Activity 2.1 – Develop standardized biodiversity database format for all four PAs	Oct-02	Jun-03	90
Activity 2.2 – Appraise and compile TEK in BNP and among users of KSBR, SKSS and NNP	Oct-02	Feb-04	60
Activity 2.3 – Develop common meta-database for each PA	Dec-02	Oct-03	90
Activity 2.4 – Define key data gaps and other data deficiencies	Feb-03	Jun-03	75
Activity 2.5 – Compile existing biodiversity information for each PA using above format	Jul-03	Jul-04	80
Activity 2.6 – Prepare key research needs plans for each PA	Jul-03	Sep-03	100
Activity 2.7 – Conduct PA biodiversity mapping	Jul-03	Apr-04	60
Activity 2.8– Produce and distribute research needs catalogue to research and NGO community	Sep-03	Jun-04	100
N.B. Percentages in red assume that Activity will be completed on time as assured by Project Management Team			Total for Output
			81.9

Clarifications to SQA: This Output has been somewhat delayed as a result of the underestimation of the amount of work involved in compiling and collating enormous quantities of paper-based data and re-formatting said data into electronic form. Furthermore, the new standardised format must not only comply with the formats usually employed within the Russian Federation, but must also be compatible with global formats. The compatibility between Federation format and global format has proved to be extremely tricky and required development of new techniques and algorithms. Consequently, the standardised databases are already well-developed but will take some additional 6 months to complete based on the original workplan. The high scores reflect the enormous amount of work and effort that have gone into achieving a very complex standardisation process and to overcoming methodological difficulties. The slightly lower score (60%) on biodiversity mapping reflects the absence of a basic, preliminary map of the key species, endangered populations and environmental threats for each PA, though the digital map base and textual information is presented in reports in abundance. Such representation should be considered as a priority for completion under Phase 1. Management plans contain comprehensive information on endangered and protected species, their distribution and habitats, threats to biodiversity, species lists, etc and fulfill the requirement for Activity 2.6. The definition of key data and research gaps, and the consequent identification of research needs are inevitably similarly delayed as they follow on as a logical ‘next-step’. However, overall the evidence is strong that a research needs catalogue will be ready as per Workplan which will include the priorities and strategies for research.

General Discussion

The contract for the portion of this Output dealing with the development of databases has been given to the Institute for Ecology and Nature Management (under the Academy of Sciences). Although this is not a Government Agency it does receive federal funding. The Institute is cooperating closely with a Canadian company, TESERA, which specialises in database development and standardisation (they are responsible for the databases used by the Canadian National Parks). This cooperation is being made possible through CIDA co-funding to the project. This activity is also being assisted by a federal expert on Russian ecological databases (Alexander Martynov). A report produced by TESERA shows significant progress within this output, as well as firm plans to develop the databases further with on-going support from TESERA.

An expert team has been created for each PA to take the information in its paper form and to convert it into a digital database in a standardised format. Considerable time and expertise has gone into the design of a standardised format that will not only be compatible with the Russian Federation system of databases but will also be directly comparable with standard global database systems. Up until this point these two different database systems were poorly compatible. The Working Group that has been guiding this process consider that the conversion of a significant volume of data from paper format to digital format, and the design of a new model format that fits both the Russian standard model and the international model are two major outputs from the Project which will be of enormous value to scientists and decision-makers in the future. The Working group considers any gaps in data to be consistent throughout Kamchatka (with regard to biodiversity) and not just pertinent to the PAs. The main gaps reflect the fact that the ecosystems and biological communities have not been systematised as yet, and that the current methodology is very different to the rest of the world's system, for identifying ecosystems. Although not originally a requirement under the project, the databases are being designed to fit into an overall GIS system.

A full bibliographic review, gaps in biodiversity data, and instructions for a database compilation were identified and developed by scientists from the Kamchatka Branch of the Pacific Institute of Geography, Russian Academy of Sciences (KBPIG RAN). The final sets of information from numerous data sources on species abundance and distribution (from collections, monitoring sites, publications, archive materials, etc) will include thousands of entries. For example, there are about 4500 bibliographic references including 700 publications on Kronotsky Zapovednik.

However ownership of unpublished data could cause long-term problems for this set of activities. Many scientists from Institutes and working within the Reserves have expressed a concern about authorship of the database, and have expressed reluctance in sharing of unpublished data. Publishing scientific data was provided with some federal support, private sources, funding from foundations and KLIE NGO. Recently catalogues of vertebrates, plants, bibliographic references, Biodiversity Conferences Proceedings were published with this support. Several publications are still waiting for support (for example, "Atlas of Ichthyofauna", "Red Book of Kamchatka", descriptive materials on

ecosystems, lists of species). The process of entering information into databases will require at least 4 qualified technical personnel knowledgeable in biodiversity and computerised databases, and a dedicated Internet line (which is currently not available for this task). Members of the KBPIG RAN team were closely collaborating with local NGO (KLIE) on the issues of public participation, training, information sharing, and publications. KLIE has several years of support from PERC, MOORE and the Rockefeller Brothers foundations. They provide information and public support on some controversial issues of ecological expertise, environmental assessments, ecological violations, and legal disputes regarding biodiversity, conservation and democracy. They are conducting mapping projects in collaboration with PERC and WWF.

To ensure sustainable development of the scientific research more attention needs to be paid to obtaining external sources of funding through grants, collaborative studies, and student exchange programmes that will attract the young generation to nature conservation. Training in networking and grant writing could be beneficial for the scientific staff and could be provided by a local NGO.

Management Plans would be more effective if they included some preliminary pilot spatial biodiversity and threats presentations. They lack visual information on the locations of the ranger stations, scientific research monitoring stations and routes, zoning, access roads, neighbouring settlements, etc., (although these are often described in detail in the text). This sort of refinement should not wait until the entire database system is completed. Preliminary spatial mapping is essential for planning and management and could be based on expert knowledge, even at an early stage. To assist in such development of spatial mapping, contour maps of the PAs and surrounding areas could be distributed to the PA staff and collaborating institutions (regional, local, national), together with a one-page legend with the key words for locations or contours. They would then be asked to outline the major categories of critical biodiversity items and threats in the areas of their expertise.

Major biodiversity “hotspots” should be outlined by specialists, experts, rangers, etc. on a management plan map (spawning, nesting grounds, rare species habitats, ranges of critical species, migratory bird roosting and feeding areas, locations of unique hot springs or geological phenomena), especially, for Kronotsky Zapovednik where there are a significant number of tourist routes but no preliminary spatial information on ranger stations, biodiversity sensitive spots, rare and unique ecosystems, etc. Mitigation and restoration areas (anthropogenic, fire restoration, industrial, former military sites) as well as the monitoring sites should also be included.

Such a preliminary map could then be updated and refined later. The initial information would, however, help significantly in planning and managing scientific and protection activities. It should serve as a base for developing and approving tourist routes so as to avoid sensitive areas and vulnerable species or ecosystems. It would help to justify the number of rangers, and to define their patrol routes based on the locations of the major threat zones (pollution sources, access roads, frequent poaching sites, tourist

campgrounds, etc.). Some areas may require seasonal reinforcement and the spatial mapping would greatly assist in defining these.

This preliminary biodiversity and threats spatial assessment could still be accomplished during the Phase One and would enhance the participation of a broad range of specialists in the development of the Management Plans. It may reduce existing tensions between business and science and contribute to co-management approaches before the implementing process begins. It could also be done on a regional scale for the areas adjacent to the Parks, or for those areas important for the Park's biodiversity as corridors or barriers for species migration (for example, rivers, gold mining roads, land-use around the parks, timber practices in the buffer zones, etc.).

There are already excellent and detailed descriptions of "biodiversity locations" and other sensitive areas within the Management Plans, as well as descriptions of the major threats. This information should be converted into the format of a preliminary chart for inclusion in the Management Plans. There is a professional digital map of Kamchatka developed with the use of the satellite imagery as a map base (the rivers, roads, boundaries, mountains, settlements, etc.) with easily identifiable features for contour-based preliminary mapping of biodiversity, threats, ranger stations, monitoring sites, walking routes. This digital map could serve as a basis upon which to represent biodiversity information and its major threats. This digital consolidation of information from paper maps and geo-referencing field work was undertaken by NGOs supported by PERC, the Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI), the Institute of Geography and a private foundation. They provided NGOs with computers, internet, training and licensed software support. Currently NGO members are in the process of mapping biodiversity "hot spots" at the regional level for the WWF project. They will be potential collaborators on the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Database component of the GEF Project with Biodiversity Conservation Centre (BCC) The contract for this GIS work was currently (April 15, 2003) awarded to an NGO to provide a digital map-references biodiversity database.

UNESCO is providing further co-funding to assist with the collection and compilation of traditional environmental knowledge (TEK). This assistance is of value but, to some extent, has also required the project to work to the time-scale set by the co-funders and other partners. For example, currently IUCN, UNDP and UNESCO are all working on the compilation of TEK within the Bystrinsky Nature Park. There is a need for closer coordination between these agencies to ensure better capture and sharing of information. WWF has been collaborating with Park Directorates in a number of educational programs including videocassette production on the park nature trails and education centre activities.

Evidence from the evaluation strongly suggests that the workplan was over-optimistic or at least underestimated the amount of work required by a considerable team of experts in order to successfully compile and standardise the data. However, there are assurances from the Project team that many of the activities will be finalised by mid-2004, and that

all activities can be completed by the end of 2004. Prioritising key research needs for the Phase II will help to manage the enormous volume of data.

In general, this Output has produced very valuable results and clearly demonstrates an enormous amount of effort in rationalising and delivering useful databases for future monitoring and decision-making purposes.

Output 3: Sustainable Financing Mechanisms

LogFrame Indicators:

- 25% additional staff salaries absorbed by KOA and NRC
- User fees established and implemented
- KPACF designed and operational with 1st stage of co-funding secured

Measurable Achievements:

No absorption of staff salaries (at any percentage) by Kamchatka Oblast Administration or by the Natural Resources Committee. The potential for user fees has been assessed and a strategy defined, but a mechanism has not been formally established and the collection of user fees has not been implemented. The Kamchatka Protected Areas Conservation Fund is still being negotiated and is not yet operational, nor has any co-funding been secured as yet. The reasons for this are identified below under the **SQA Clarification** and under the **General Discussion**.

Semi-Quantitative Analysis of Output Delivery

OUTPUT 3	START MONTH	COMPLETION MONTH	%ge Delivery
Activity 3.1 – Continue partnership development	Aug-02	Jun-03	85
Activity 3.2 –Design and establishment of KPACF	Sep-02	Feb-03	50
Activity 3.3 – KPACF capitalization	Feb-03	Jul-03	10
Activity 3.4 – Determine complementary funding sources	Oct-02	Jul-04	25
Activity 3.5 – Assess KPACF after Phase I	May-04	Jun-04	100
		Total for Output	54.0

N.B. Percentages in red assume that Activity will be completed on time as assured by Project Management Team

Clarifications to SQA: Partnership development has been good throughout the project so far and is expected to continue. As a consequence of this, several co-funding initiatives have been developed and expanded which directly support the aims and objectives of this project. The design and establishment of the KPACF may be behind schedule but there are some good reasons and the end-product should be more sustainable and effective as a result of time-consuming renegotiations. Capitalisation of the Fund has been poor, probably as a result of too much emphasis on donors (many of which are already contributing in one way or another) and not enough attempts to engage the private sector.

Consequently there has been little success in determining the complementary funding sources for the Fund. However, it is clear that careful assessment and consideration has already been given to the KPACF, and that some clear decisions will be made regarding its registration and implementation after sensible and detailed consultation and before the end of phase one. Emphasis is now being placed on seeking financial support from the private sector.

General Discussion

The absorption of the staff salaries by the local administration has failed to materialise so far although the Project has been, and continues to lobby hard for this necessary sustainability requirement. In principal, the lack of support from the regional administration has created a substantial risk for sustainability within this Output and within the project as a whole. This concern is shared by the project team and at the Federal level as well. Changes in local administration are expected by the end of 2004 as a result of forthcoming elections, and this includes changes in the budget process and allocation. Every effort will be made to engage and sensitise the new administrative policy-makers into the significance and importance of this project. It is further understood that staff levels for federal protected areas (which includes 2 of the 4 PAs within the project) have been frozen, at least until the Ministry concerned has finalised a re-structuring process. Again, the Project intends to address this concern through some re-focusing of objectives to provide additional effort targeted at the federal level rather than just concentrating on the regional administration and related policies.

The intended establishment of user fees has also not been achieved so far. However, consultations have taken place regarding how best to improve income from the PAs. The Director of the Nature Parks has been lobbying to get user fees adopted by the local Duma but this does need a substantial change in law and will require stronger support from the local administration than has been the case to date. It appears that it is not the concept of the user fees which has created problems but more the definition of where these user fees would go. There has been resistance by the local administration toward the specific use of such fees for the Nature Parks and their management, (as they would wish to see the fees absorbed within the central revenues of local administration, while the Project would wish to see such fees absorbed into the Trust Fund, once it has been established). However, as with the discussion regarding staff salaries in the previous paragraph, it is hoped that the Project (with support from the federal level administration) will be able to address this concern more successfully when the new regional administration is established toward the end of 2004.

This output also identifies the need to create The Kamchatka Protected Areas Conservation Fund. Donors were originally contacted to identify some sources of co-funding for the Trust Fund but this was met with very little positive response and this approach will need re-thinking. Also, in the early stages of developing the structure and legislation of this Trust fund it was realised that it would be more cost-effective and politically appropriate to combine it with the proposed Trust Fund for the parallel GEF Salmonid Conservation Project rather than to attempt to develop two similar Trust Funds.

This has required some re-negotiation and the intended plan now is to develop an Umbrella Trust Fund for Biodiversity Conservation within Kamchatka. The UN Foundation has also expressed an interest in a joint Trust Fund rather than individual Funds.

The concept of Trust Funds within the Russian Federation is almost anathema at present due to bad experiences and failures in attempts to set up similar mechanisms within the 1990's. Traditional donors are very reticent about involvement in such Trust Funds within the Federation. It would seem more logical now to attempt to engage the private sector into supporting a single environmentally-focussed Trust Fund for Kamchatka. Also, the original plan was to develop a sinking Trust fund which would be drained over a period of 7-10 years. Now the project recognises the need for an Endowment component to be built into the Trust Fund. It is also hoped that additional revenues from PAs can be incorporated into the Trust Fund as well as revenues from Russian Institutes and the private sector.

The concerns relating to this component extend beyond the actual project implementation and also focus on a larger concern regarding GEF's commitment to the project. The original project submission identified the need for GEF funding of \$7 million in order to successfully support the identified activities and the workplan. Of this figure, \$1.5 million was to be GEF's contribution to the Trust Fund once other contributions had been identified. After consideration by GEF the entire project budget was cut to \$4.25 million. Discussions with the Implementing Agency regarding this decision and its implications lead the Evaluators to the logical assumption that the GEF contribution to the Trust Fund would be equally reduced to around \$850,000. This reduction considerably weakens the Trust Fund and also sends a less-than positive message to intended funding bodies and supporters.

Based on these concerns the Project decided not to start capitalisation of the Trust Fund until it became clearer as to what GEF funding would actually be available for the 2nd and 3rd phase. Also the capitalisation of the Salmonid Project's Trust Fund is expected to occur within the 4th year of that project which would be in 2008. The PA Project expects to have the necessary legal charters for the Fund finalised by the end of July 2004 along with the appropriate operational plans and mechanisms. They also plan to capture some preliminary commitments of co-funding by the end of phase one. The Project now needs to make some serious decisions regarding when to register its Trust Fund based on the above concerns.

On the surface it would seem that this Output has achieved a rather poor measure of success. Generally the delivery has been low and more priority could have been given to this Output. However, there are some mitigating circumstances which should be considered.

- Lack of support from the regional administration could not have been predicted (although such political sustainability is always an issue and a risk in any GEF project). During the project development stage (and under a different

administration) support was very strong. It is hoped that a new administration can be sensitised quickly and that some priority can be allocated to the project, hopefully with support and guidance from the federal level. This particular constraint has created problems with staff sustainability as well as user fee mechanisms.

- Restructuring of responsibilities at the federal Ministerial level could also not have been predicted. However, GEF projects, by nature, need to be dynamic and should be able to embrace such political trends and changes within their objectives. One function of an Evaluation is to identify such political realignments and to capture their needs in future project aims and activities. Although freezes in staff levels for federal PAs may be a short-term constraint, the end potential for more effective GEF support raised by the restructuring process may prove be more beneficial to project sustainability in the long-term.
- The concept of Trust Funds for the two projects should have been combined into one Fund during the project development phase. This is now being given serious consideration by the Implementing Agency and the respective project management.

One suggestion put forward by the Project Team was that potential partners in a Kamchatka trust Fund should be invited to Bystrinsky to see for themselves how successful the SME and Micro-Credit Funding component has been within the project.

Clearly there is an urgent need to resolve concerns of sustainability under this Project Output, and this should be done in some measure before the closure of phase one through the adoption of a clearly defined strategy and workplan toward rationalisation and capitalisation of the Trust Fund.

Output 4: Strengthened Legal, Regulatory and Policy Base

LogFrame Indicators:

- Biodiversity Policy Analysis completed and report available on file
- Inadequacies and weaknesses in legislation and regulations identified and on file

Measurable Achievements:

Policies, legislation and regulations have been assessed from the biodiversity perspective and reports have been produced. These reports highlight inadequacies in legislation and regulations. Recommendations arising from these reports address the promotion of tourism development and the potential for revenue retention from protected areas, as well as providing responses to illegal activities within protected areas.

Semi-Quantitative Analysis of Output Delivery

OUTPUT 4	START MONTH	COMPLETION MONTH	%ge Delivery
----------	-------------	------------------	--------------

Activity 4.1 - Assess policies from biodiversity conservation perspective	Oct-02	Jun-03	100
Activity 4.2 - Assess legislation and regulations from biodiversity conservation perspective	Oct-02	Jan-03	100
Activity 4.3 - Legislative changes to promote tourism development	Oct-02	Feb-03	65
Activity 4.4 - Provide for greater PA revenue retention	Oct-02	Mar-03	65
Activity 4.5 - Legislative and regulatory strengthening to combat illegal activities	Oct-02	May-04	45
Total for Output			75.0

Clarifications to SQA: A full assessment of policy, legislation and regulations in relation to biodiversity conservation has been undertaken, although many of the specific legislative changes have not been finalised on paper due to disagreements with, or lack of support, from regional administration. For example, the processes for revenue retention may be clear, but the support and agreements on adoption of such processes is not. Similarly, the mechanisms for strengthening the combat of illegal activities such as poaching are proving to be elusive although the necessity and focus is clear. The perception among stakeholders is that this is primarily due to the lack of powers available to Parks Inspectors and the supposed complexity involved in resolving this situation and making such powers available. Nonetheless, the project has achieved primarily what it set out to do under this Output for this project phase with respect to legislative assessment and review.

General Discussion

Three contracts have been awarded to identify gaps and inadequacies in legislations and regulations, 1. Looking specifically at both federal and regional legislation, 2. Checking the regulations which apply to Environment and Industry, and 3. Identifying existing legislation pertinent to improvements in income from PAs and reviewing possible changes. The goal of these contracts was to identify weaknesses in legislation and policy relating to biodiversity and to make recommendations for improvements. One report produced by the Business Academy recommends the need to make the parks more profitable. The reports arising from the contracts further include recommendations on what needs changing within the legislation with respect to biodiversity conservation, parks management and development, and institutional responsibilities. Recommendations are aimed principally at the regional level but some include suggestion for the federal legislature. An expert who is a specialist on federal law and working on implementing changes in the federal law is serving as a consultant to the project. A recommendation has been sent to Moscow to ask for such a specialist to work on changes and improvements in legislation for Protected Areas. There is presently a timely opportunity for the project to work with the federal administration as the federal administration is currently constructing new laws pertinent to natural resources and protected areas.

The Director of the Nature Parks has made some recommendations regarding user fees for the Parks and is currently trying to get the relevant law discussed in the local Duma.

At the moment there is no legislation that relates to people paying for use of park facilities.

The Project Lawyer and Manager have been regular participants at the meetings of Councils and committees responsible for development of regulatory norms. They regularly introduced recommendations developed by the Project legal consultants regarding PAs. In the newly adopted “Law on Tourism in Kamchatka Region” (February, 2004), some of the projects recommendation were taken into consideration.

Due to support from the local scientists, NGOs, administration, international organizations and even tourist companies themselves, the active development of overnight trekking tourism in Kronotsky Zapovednik is no longer supported or advised. Tourism in Kronotsky eventually (probably within the next 2 years or earlier) is going to be limited to one day eco-tours (3-6 hours) to Geyser Valley and Uzon; the rest of the trail network will be available only for scientific or educational groups on special request. The trade-off agreed upon is to increase the visitor’s numbers up to the carrying capacity (3000-4000 a year) on the existing two well -developed routes, and to provide the same level of support to Zapovednik (approximately 50 helicopter flights hours a year: patrolling, cargo, research, emergency). There were 2766 visitors in 2003. Any increase in visitor numbers should be supported by an effective monitoring programme and should ensure that the rules of ecotourism are adopted by tourist companies (with sufficient information provided on the importance of the World Heritage Site and special visiting rules applied, e.g. no cooking and dishwashing, no trash-burning, no collections; “silence month” rules are honoured, mandatory presence of Inspectors during the tours, etc.). Additional revenues for the Zapovednik could come from the sales of brochures, books, video CDs, souvenirs and World Heritage items at the tourist sites.

The adoption and implementation of recommendations for legislative changes at the local administrative level has started to bring results due to the collective efforts of several organizations working for the Project. The Project has addressed the local legislative body with recommendations and suggestions many times and, even in spite of the complications created by government restructuring, has managed to implement some of their suggestions in two laws. Some of the proposed amendments and proposals for changes in PAs were approved by the local Council of People’s Deputies (local legislative body) and sent to the Governor for approval. It demonstrates that UNDP-GEF Project has made significant efforts at the local administrative level in promoting their recommendations (Phase I indicator). The relevant new legal decree mentions the Project and proposes solutions to the problems. Recommendations include: PAs concept development, cadastre, regional approach to PAs, advice to create regional administrative body for PAs, advise to resolve inconsistencies and discrepancies between local and federal law, provide government support in management and protection of PAs, support and stimulate the small business development (tourism and recreation) in the Parks, provide financing and law enforcement, and to work out amendments to administrative code of Kamchatka Region (including legal charges for ecological violations and establish legal bodies to issue Violation Protocols).

One of the problems constraining progress within Output 4 is the re-structuring of the government Ministry responsibilities, and the consequent lack of responsible position or body regarding parks and protected areas regulations. Currently ecological conservation and natural resource exploitation and management all sit within the same Office but the general perception is that ecological conservation now has a much lower priority both regionally and probably at the federal level also. There are a number of complications which have arisen as a consequence of the 2001 restructuring which led to dissolution of the State Committee for Ecology and adsorption of its responsibilities within the Ministry of Natural Resources. Federal funding to support regional administration is fairly rigid and guided by complex regulations. One of the consequences of these regulations is that the creation of a new position and associated salary at the regional level (e.g., A person responsible for parks enforcement) would result in an equivalent loss of funding from the federal government to the regional administration. The outcome of this is that the regional administration for protected areas is now little more than a small office within the Department of Natural Resources in Petropavlovsk. A further concern is the proposal by the regional administration that the parks should each be run autonomously without an overarching administrative body. This creates concerns from the Projects point-of-view as it would enhance the problem of sustainability and effective management. It would also require a much larger personnel force (one complete set for each park) and greater demands on budgets and equipment.

At the federal level (Zakaznik and Zapovednik) there are no real problems with the legislation (which has been in existence for many years), only with the funding to support the management and enforcement needs.

In discussions with the National Project Director and Deputy Head of Department of Nature Protected Areas and Biodiversity Conservation it was noted that although the Nature Parks are run at the regional level, the legislation for the Nature Parks is defined at the federal level. The National Project Director also pointed out that there is an existing legal mechanism at the regional level that could resolve the Parks Inspector's lack of powers. There is also a way to resolve this at the federal level as well.

Under this Output legislative reviews and reports have been delivered in time and are very comprehensive. A lot of recommendations and suggestions have been submitted to the pertinent legal authorities and policy makers in the appropriate manner. These submitted reports outline many inconsistencies, gaps and inadequacies in the federal and local legislation, and provide detailed lists of recommendations for adoption or consideration including reviews of the international regulations on biodiversity. The reports have been undertaken and completed by respected and high ranking professionals from Kamchatka and Moscow. These professionals themselves actively participate in the legislative process. Further concerns relating to **Policy and Legislative Reform** are discussed in the section below which discusses the Project's achievements at this level and considers how this need can best be addressed by future Project activities.

Output 5: Heightened Biodiversity Awareness and Advocacy

LogFrame Indicators:

- Public Awareness communications strategy developed
- Awareness Programme developed
- Awareness Materials prepared and disseminated

Measurable Achievements:

Effective strategies have been developed and implemented within the Project for public awareness communications. Although a formal awareness programme may not exist on paper with an associated budget and workplan, a logical awareness strategy does exist and is effective. Significant and comprehensive awareness materials have been developed and disseminated using various forms of media and distribution mechanisms.

Semi-Quantitative Analysis of Output Delivery

OUTPUT 5	START MONTH	COMPLETION MONTH	%ge Delivery
Activity 5.1 - Preparation/compilation of educational materials	Oct-02	May-03	100
Activity 5.2 - Delivery of biodiversity conservation awareness programmes to PA communities and users of adjacent lands	Oct-02	Mar-04	100
Activity 5.3 - Awareness raising among media	Oct-02	Jul-04	90
Activity 5.4 - Development of communications strategy for raising biodiversity awareness	Nov-02	Mar-03	60
Activity 5.5 - Preparation of conservation curriculum for schools	Nov-02	Jul-03	80
Activity 5.6 - Awareness raising for decision-makers on biodiversity conservation needs of PAs	Nov-02	Mar-04	70
Activity 5.7 - Development of awareness programme for each PA	Dec-02	Aug-03	70
Activity 5.8 - Design of interpretive/education facilities for each PA	Jan-03	Apr-04	70
		Total for Output	80.0

Clarifications to SQA: The preparation, compilation and distribution of awareness materials have been impressive. Awareness raising within the media has also been good although some delivery at the federal level could have helped promote the importance of the project nationally. There is no specific evidence of development of a formal communications strategy within the project as such but clearly a logical and sequential approach has been followed. Although formal conservation curricula have not been adopted, recommendations have been developed and it is almost certainly more realistic to promote such educational awareness through informal and extra-curricula activities. To this extent the Project has shown a dynamic response to a potential constraint. Awareness raising for decision-makers at the policy level has not been so successful

(although significant efforts have been made) but this may be a factor of personalities and the higher priority given by the new administration to resource exploitation rather than sustainable management and conservation. Nevertheless, there is a need to improve this activity and federal support may prove to be one channel that could be better exploited. The development of awareness programmes and educational facilities for the two Nature Parks has been exceptionally well addressed. This activity has not extended to the federal parks but good reasons are given and this probably reflects another dynamic decision by the Project to deviate somewhat from the intended workplan where unseen constraints have come to play. The Project has also developed an effective website early in the implementation phase (www.unkam.ru).

General Discussion

Undoubtedly, the project has made a very significant contribution to heightening awareness and advocacy. Educational materials and grants have been provided to schools and community libraries. These activities have received significant co-funding and support from CIDA and IUCN. According to the Project Management, people have been hired from the communities to work in the visitor's centres and 4 people (2 from the Kronotsky Zapovednik and 2 from the South Kamchatsky Zakaznik) have been trained in Moscow at the Eco-centre. The media have become closely involved at the local level. The Team Leader for this project Output is a media person (ex-TV Director) who understands the needs and requirements of the media. Twice monthly Radio and TV broadcasts on matters relating to biodiversity and the PAs are commonplace and local newspapers have regular articles on the Parks. Radio broadcasts are often more important due to the absence of TV in many smaller communities, and the project recognises this and gives radio a high priority. Eleven issues of the newsletter "Zapovednaya territoria" have been published since August 2003. Fifteen authors from Bystrinsky Park area participated in these issues. Their targeted distribution has risen from 300 to 1000 copies with support from local administration and collaboration with the UNDP-GEF Salmonid Conservation project. This newsletter is displayed on the Project website. The Bystrinsky regional newspaper "Novaya Zhizn" ("New Life") has dedicated many of its reports to Project awareness in the region. Its supplemental bulletin - "Aidit" has been published in a local language for more than 10 years. "Kamchatka Aborigen" is another regional newspaper where indigenous grant recipients from Anavgai have been sharing their experience. The electronic journal "Sodruzhestvo" is published with the Project support, and the Project Internet site hosts and updates other news items.

It should be noted however that most of the awareness activities are fairly general and have been targeting mainly 'beyond' the actual PAs and their roles, There is a need here for the awareness strategy to have a more focused direction both for the Parks and for environmental education.

Furthermore, raising awareness at the level of the local administration and sensitising the policy makers has been more difficult and has taken much time and effort. Slowly the senior regional administration has come to support the project's objectives, but there is a constant challenge created by changes in the administration that tends to create

continuous complications for the project. During the project development phase a lot of effort went into sensitising the local administration and support was high in the early days of the project. The one positive effect resulting from changes in the administration is that the policy people who have been made more aware and sensitive to the needs of the project tend to move on and up to more senior posts in Moscow.

The NGO community is strongly supportive of the project and its objectives and have a very positive opinion of achievements. The Project has provided some financial support for NGO field-work which, although fairly small in terms of actual funding has been gratefully received by the NGO community and has allowed them to support themselves during field-trips. This has built an enhanced and very positive relationship between the Project and the NGOs.

The indigenous peoples have taken time to accept the aims of the project and their initial concerns focussed on land rights and being able to carry out their traditional activities of hunting and fishing in the presence of strengthened PAs. However, the Nature Parks particularly have shown a very successful involvement of the community and have been developed in a sensitive way, addressing the community needs and assisting in alternative livelihood development and encouraging commercial enterprise that take pressures off biodiversity and help to sustainably manage natural resources. This has been noted by adjacent communities and by indigenous groups and other communities who would now wish to participate in the project's objectives as they see very real benefits to be gained at the community level.

The project has issued a contract to develop a mechanism for including ecological knowledge and biodiversity information into the teaching curricula, even within mathematics and chemistry. This has resulted in a detailed report and the recommendations from this report are already being implemented informally within schools, and particularly into extra-curricula activities. However, to formally change educational curricula would require detailed and complex amendments at the federal level. This is probably unnecessary as dynamic changes can be made more easily in the mind-set of the teaching community without the need to impose such requirements through formal curricula amendments. Consequently, the project prefers to use extra-curricula methods and more informal agreements with schools whereby teachers understand the value of biodiversity and incorporate it into the formal teaching requirements. However, there is no doubt that the project would have produced stronger impact if the proposed measures/recommendations could feasibly have been more systemic and better planned and presented. Due consideration should be given to a possible compromise between a more informal approach and a more formal adoption of such an approach, along with a more systematic and uniform strategy. Schools are also developing field-trips and summer camps that focus on traditional land-use and traditional environmental knowledge. The Parks are also providing such educational facilities.

The project has undoubtedly concentrated its efforts on the Bystrinsky Nature Park and its associated communities. There has been a greater need here than in Nalychevo Nature

Park as the latter has already had a history of development and community interaction. Also communities such as Esso exist directly within the Bystrinsky Nature Park and the two have a fundamental and dynamic effect on each other. Before the GEF project was implemented there were no activities going on within Bystrinsky in support of biodiversity conservation and the Park was simple a paper designation. Now the entire community supports the Park.

Public awareness and advocacy for the federal parks (Kronotsky and South Kamchatsky) has not been a priority of phase one of the project. There are no visitor's centres (South Kamchatsky has no access roads and Kronotsky is a Zapovednik which does not, in theory, allow tourism but only educational or scientific visitors) and there are very few communities within these federal parks (although there are some on the coast within the South Kamchatsky PA). The Project intends to address the needs of these two areas under phase two which will be more realistic as the federal parks system and its mother Ministry will have been re-structured and the Project will then be aware of what activities will be and will not be allowed within Zakazniks and Zapovedniks.

The function of Working Group Three focuses on this Output. The Group consider the whole concept of ecology in the Parks to be particularly linked to the indigenous peoples, and feel that ecological education within Kamchatka is critically important. A lot of effort is going into educating children on the purpose and function of the Kronotsky Zapovednik, and a biodiversity and Parks manual has been developed for Bystrinsky as well as an ecological education programme. These initiatives in education and awareness are now starting to capture lessons and develop best practices and a more systematic approach. The Working Group feels that the next focus of attention should be on the mass media. The Parks already have a newsletter, which is popular, and they already contribute to TV and radio programmes through the Project. Information on biodiversity and the parks is published in all the regional newspapers.

A public agreement on biodiversity conservation was signed in November 2003 between the local Duma, the heads of the PAs, the indigenous peoples, youth, and the media. The Project will also use International Biodiversity Day (22nd May) to implement public hearings and educational events related to biodiversity in Kamchatka and the function of the PAs.

The project has also assisted in the development of the regional museum and provided a consultant to evaluate the museum facilities, capacity and requirements in relation to biodiversity. The consultant found the staff to be extremely enthusiastic, and found the museum to have a very positive role as an ecological education centre and a social centre. During the evaluation of the museum and its social role it became clear, that poaching is considered to be a basic requirement for subsistence among many communities where there is little money and no employment. This poaching takes place close to or within the PAs. According to the consultant and the Working Group, one of the museum's roles will be to convince people of the sustainable value of biodiversity and the need for careful management through the functions of the Parks. The museum hopes to teach people to value their own roots and to foster support for nature conservation. The museum can also

provide a window to those areas which are legally out-of-bounds such as the Zapovedniks. Educational departments provide extracurricular activities for young school children related to museums. The museums role should also be one of outreach, to schools and communities which cannot easily visit the museum. The museum can explain to groups such as tourist companies how they can make use of museum displays and resources to demonstrate the value of the Parks.

Overall, the Project has clearly taken significant steps in a relatively short time toward heightening awareness and providing a platform of advocacy in support of the PAs and their objectives.

Output 6: Alternative Livelihoods and Community-Based Conservation

LogFrame Indicators:

- Ecotourism feasibility assessed and defined through study
- NTFP harvest limits established for Protected Areas
- NTFP Management Plans prepared
- SME financing facility and Community Small Grants Programme developed
- Traditional economic pursuits identified and defined
- Economic feasibility of traditional pursuits appraised

Measurable Achievements:

An ecotourism feasibility assessment/definition study is currently underway and should be completed by August 2004. Surveys of NTFPs have been undertaken and are still in progress, but some management plans have already been developed including recommendations on zoning. The Small and Medium Enterprises financing facility and the Small Grants Programme are fully developed and very successful. Traditional economic pursuits have been identified and the economic feasibility of some of these pursuits has been appraised, particularly in relation to the SME and Small Grants Programme (including Reindeer breeding and the sustainable use of NTFPs)

Semi-Quantitative Analysis of Output Delivery

OUTPUT 6	START MONTH	COMPLETION MONTH	%ge Delivery
Activity 6.1 - Community outreach programme development	Oct-02	Aug-03	100
Activity 6.2 - Assessment of NTFP and natural resource use in PAs	Oct-02	Jun-03	85
Activity 6.3 - Developing community sensitivity to tourism	Nov-02	Oct-03	80
Activity 6.4 - Training in SME start-ups and in grant proposal writing	Nov-02	May-04	100

Activity 6.5 - Increasing community involvement in PA management	Jan-03	Apr-04	50
Activity 6.6 - SME Rural Development Fund establishment	Jan-03	Sep-03	100
Activity 6.7 - Community Small Grants Facility	Jan-03	Sep-03	100
Activity 6.8 - Tourism and visitor behaviour codes	Mar-03	Apr-03	70
Activity 6.9 - Tourism promotion	Apr-03	Jul-04	60
Activity 6.10 - NTFP Management Plans	Jul-03	Dec-03	60
Total for Output			80.5

Clarifications to SQA: The assessment of natural resource usage and NTFPs is well underway but not yet completed. This is also true with regard to the sensitivity of communities to sustainable tourism. Community involvement in the PAs needs to be more carefully considered and discussed with both regional and federal administrators. In the meantime, good progress is being made at the maintenance level and further training of local community guides would be beneficial. Generally, there has been significant progress in developing strategies and mechanisms for guidance on tourism development and codes of behaviour although further progress is essential. The NTFP management plans are under development and it is hoped that these can be completed before the end of phase one of the Project.

General Discussion

Studies on ecotourism are currently under preparation but will probably not be fully completed by the end of phase one. Two assessments of Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs) have been undertaken (1 by IUCN and 1 by a local expert in Bystrinsky). These assessments have identified resource type and distribution, collection and treatment methods (particularly using traditional knowledge and preparation techniques). Based on these assessments, recommendations have been developed which provide guidelines on zoning and methodologies for NTFP extraction.

The privatisation of land for the communities, the zoning of land for non-timber forest product gathering, and the processing of non-timber products are all important issues in considering alternative livelihoods within the Nature Parks and have been well-studied in both Bystrinsky and Nalychevo. As partners in the Project, IUCN have undertaken a social survey which aims to evaluate the use of NTFPs and to analyse how they can be sustainably used and managed within the PAs. The intent would be to develop zoning and controls over quantities and areas of harvesting, marketing procedures, and training of people. One project which has been supported through the small grants component is the collection, processing and marketing of herbal teas. The Project has also assisted in developing a handicraft school to train people in traditional alternative livelihoods. This handicraft school has processed some 80 people, mostly from the Elizovo area. The school teaches wood-carving, joinery and clay sculpture.

Community sensitivity to tourism (particularly ecotourism) is being developed through the Project and communities are being given assistance to develop more appropriate tourist facilities as well as generally identifying alternative livelihoods which should ease the pressure on biodiversity. Ecotourism is a very important component of the work of Working Group Two. IUCN is helping the working group to develop the legal regulations and guidelines for ecotourism. They are encouraging and receiving lots of support and input from the local people. In cooperation with its partner agency, CIDA, the project has made substantial progress in the creation and implementation of funding and grants for alternative livelihood development.

The SME fund has been extremely successful in their delivery within Bystrinsky. The development of this fund was supported by experts from the Eurasia Foundation. The Counterpart Business Fund experience from Khabarovsk (where there has been considerable Russian experience in such funds) was used to help develop the micro-credit component of this Output also. Two experts from the Eurasia Foundation visited Bystrinsky to evaluate social conditions. Public hearings and consultations were carried out and all stakeholders were invited to participate in developing the procedures and mechanisms for the SME fund. Documentation was presented to the Project Steering Committee for approval, and the fund was duly registered and officially opened. Three local people with knowledge of local financial conditions were hired and sent for training at the Counterpart Business Fund. Considerable training has already been given in Small and Medium Sized Enterprise (SME) development and in grant proposal writing. Two fund demonstration meetings have been held so far for grant proposals and the third is underway as the Evaluation takes place. The 1st meeting attracted 170 people and the second attracted 50 people. Following these, the Project received applications for funding (20 in the first set of applications and 17 in the second). The highest priority within these funding request has been toward private businesses with civil society second. Half of all the applicants are women and one-third are indigenous people. It is noticeable that the application documentation for the second set of applications is of a higher quality than the first as every party goes through a learning exercise. One of the overall impacts of the funding programme has been a substantial increase in awareness regarding the Parks and biodiversity. The local communities can see that the grants are helping the social and economic situation and improving people's livelihoods. The community can see that its local people who are working in the Fund Office and that local people are gaining assistance and help.

So far the grants awarded under the SME programme include a total of R.280,000 in the first application (88% business and 12% civil society enterprises), and R162,000 (93% business and 7% civil society enterprises). Examples include setting up a herbal tea collection, drying and marketing enterprise; development of improved community library facilities (including internet); development of an information centre to improve the local social situation; a school ecological project in Bystrinsky Park; and a school grant to develop handicrafts.

Therefore, a number of SME grant proposals have already been reviewed and grants have been disbursed. The Evaluators were able to review the process and to meet some of the

grant recipients during their field-visit to Bystrinsky (see below). The disbursement and use of the grant money is carefully monitored to ensure that it is used as proposed. The SME and Micro-Credit Programme has a well-established and functional office in Bystrinsky adjacent to the Parks Administration Office, thereby ensuring local community perception of the connection and linkage between the two activities.

The Evaluators visited the SME and Micro-Credit Fund Office adjacent to the Nature Park Offices. This was very well set-up and well staffed. The building was renovated using CIDA (Project co-funding partner) money. The staff consists of a Director of the Fund, an SME Grant Specialist and a Credit Fund Specialist. UNDP arranges for their salaries to be paid using CIDA funding. The Office has been running since August 2003.

Within the SME grant process there have been two rounds of grant applications so far and 4 grants were issued for each set of applications. Examples include a school carpentry workshop, development of processing for herbal teas, a hairdressing salon, Ethnic clothes and shoe repairs, a Koryak people's exhibition in the local museum, and youth club interactions to clean up forest guided paths and viewing points, etc (See some further details below).

An Advisory Committee within the community and working for the Fund Office defines whether an activity is more suited to an SME grant or a micro-credit loan. They have a clear set of criteria to guide them both in this process and in their discussions and selection of successful grant applications. The priorities and criteria were established with assistance from the Eurasia Foundation and the CIDA-funded consultant. The Advisory Committee represents the lowest decision-making level in this process. It is made up primarily of representatives of the local population who are elected at a public meeting. Their advice then goes to an Expert Committee of independent and sub-contracted experts from fields related to the grant applications. These experts are selected for each round of applications. The Fund Office administration does not have any direct influence on this selection process but they may advise of the development priorities. One concern that the Fund Office has is that the transfer of funds from Petropavlovsk to the Office in Esso is time-consuming and costs them 4% in charges. The Project covers the cost of one person who is in the Project Working Group for Alternative Livelihoods and Community-Based Conservation (Head of the Financial Sustainability Mechanism) and further funds from GEF have been used to cover costs of travel and communications. The Office stated that it would welcome a Gaps Analysis of pertinent livelihoods to help identify where the funds should be targeted.

The Micro-Credit programme has developed more slowly, probably as a reflection of initial uncertainty and suspicion regarding its function. However, 7 loans have now been disbursed and more effort is now going into explaining the fund (also local people are now seeing it in action and seeing real results and improvements). So far 7 credit applications have been approved for between R30,000 and R150,000. These include:

1. A cafeteria and food shop with an 8 month loan of R100,000

2. A tourist service and hotel, and money for a carpentry workshop with a 6 month loan of R30,000
3. Additional stocks for a market shop with a 3 month loan of R100,000
4. Another store and restaurant with a 3 month loan of R70,000
5. Construction materials and welding equipment to build greenhouses to grow and sell vegetables over 8 months for R50,000
6. A catering service (renovation of premises and purchase of furniture) over 5 months for R40,000
7. Transport service and renovation of hotel rooms over 12 months for R150,000

Plus the Office has 3 new credit applications on file for developing retail sales, catering and a hotel renovation and upgrade. All of the above 7 credits have been re-paid (the Fund Office and the recipient negotiate over repayment time) and the Credit Fund is now becoming very popular with previous borrowers keen to apply for another credit loan now they have met their repayment targets. As Kamchatka and Bystrinsky approach a new tourism season and the snow melts they expect to receive many more applications. The Office is also pro-active within the community. If they see the potential for a credit loan they will approach the potential candidate and recommend that they apply.

The Project hired a long-term consultant who has worked in the community for many weeks to explain the purpose and mechanics of both the SME fund and the Micro-Credit programme and to help people with applications. This has assisted enormously with public awareness and has also raised the profile of the programme through the media. The consultant's opinion of the SME and Micro-Credit Programme is that everything is now running smoothly after some delays and obstacles. There are always challenges in introducing such funding facilities in a remote community like Esso with a fairly small population. But the consultant feels that the system functions well now under confident and efficient local staff with a well-functioning office provided by the Project. One weakness is probably in the performance monitoring of the funds but this could be improved fairly easily and should be addressed certainly in the next phase (as it is important to demonstrate transparency in all of the funding activities). The consultant also feels that the funds may be being managed over-cautiously and that a greater risk tolerance could be accepted in view of the successes so far. There should be more flexibility in applying policies and selection criteria. The documentation requirements, which are currently very rigorous, could be safely relaxed a little, although the consultant feels that this is a positive criticism toward the current mechanism, which has ensured correct funding procedures and avoided any suggestion of unfairness. The consultant recommends that there should be **(a)** a greater local role in decision-making for the grants and credit loans, **(b)** a larger emphasis on character and capacity versus collateral, **(c)** improvements in transparency (more information available on how the application and selection system works), **(d)** minor changes to banking approaches which would improve service, and **(e)** an increased emphasis and effort toward group-lending. Generally speaking the consultant has been very impressed with the speed and efficiency with which the grants and loans system has been established. There has been a tremendous effort made by the staff of the Funding Office to meet with people in the market-place and work-place to inform them of the opportunities. One challenge in dealing with

indigenous people is their need for training on use of computers to fill in forms and prepare reports. It is a possibility that the documentation could be altered to allow for manual applications. Generally, the staff in the Funding Office are very happy with the level of support from the Project and their assistance with guidance and information. Comparison with conditions for credit from other banks versus the GEF conditions show the latter to be much more favourable.

The overall funding exercises have raised the entire credibility of the Project and the Parks with the local people. It has also helped the communities legally by registering their businesses and generally improved the socio-economics of the region. Discussions with the local administration highlight the fact that local people now see this funding source as a very real alternative to the otherwise essential dependence on natural resource exploitation. Project partners working with the project also see a significant development toward lowering this dependence on natural resources. Consequently it is making a major contribution toward addressing the root causes to biodiversity threats and sustainability of the Parks. Unfortunately, it is difficult to measure this accurately as the Project Design, the Workplan and the reduced Budget allocation did not make allowances for the need to monitor measurable indicators to this effect within the first phase. Monitoring of socio-economic and biodiversity indicators are activities which were identified for the following phases. However, if process indicators had been properly included in the Project Design then these would now demonstrate a measurable level of success as far as the development of alternative livelihoods and the reduction in stress and threats to biodiversity are concerned. The project team feel strongly now that the overall grants and loans approach should now be extended beyond Bystrinsky.

Whilst visiting Esso in Bystrinsky, the Evaluators were shown some of the enterprises that the Project had supported under its alternative livelihood assistance initiative and through the SME grants and micro-credit loans. The local school had received funds to build a workshop and for equipment for wood-working. This not only allows the school to train children with a useful skill but has also allowed the work-shop to undertake a number of carpentry exercises around the town to improve the community.

The Evaluators also met with a man who used to be a fisherman and hunter but who received a grant to develop his own carpentry business. Currently he has a small hotel which does guided trips in the summer (horse-back and rafting) and he now concentrates on carpentry in the winter. He now wants to receive credit to invest in winter tourism including guided trips through the forest on sled and on horseback. His main winter occupation previously used to be fur-trapping.

Another SME grant was given to a school ecological group for extra-curricula activities. They reviewed the wildlife and ecology of Nalychevo and are doing the same for Bystrinsky. They have collected information on flora and fauna as part of their project and have won a WWF Living Planet award. Children from 12-16 also take part in weekend field-trips and are trained in tracking, climbing and ecotourism.

A community library within Bystrinsky region also received a grant for equipment to develop a community information centre (computers, printers, etc). This has proved essential for the social unity of the village and they have developed a good working relationship with the Nature Park Information Centre. Children and adults can use the Internet to browse on specific subjects. The Evaluators were able to meet several grant and credit recipients whilst visiting this information centre and to hear their experiences. Most reaction to the Project and the funding initiatives were very positive. One strong complaint which was not aimed at the Project but was presented to the project as an issue for resolution was the concern felt by the indigenous people regarding the privatisation process and the loss of their traditional hunting grounds. After the early 1990s the land was re-distributed and the indigenous communities were no longer legally allowed to access their traditional areas. The Project pointed out that they have had some discussions with lawyers on the matter and that they can arrange for the lawyers to visit the communities to discuss their problems. The community itself also noted that the certification process for businesses is now \$1000 which is an enormous fee for a small enterprise. They would also welcome a review of what sort of businesses could best be developed in harmony with the Park, and what lessons exist from other parts of the Federation or examples from the rest of the world with regard to such alternative livelihoods. It was stated that many of the indigenous people are still cautious about the intentions of the Project and how this would relate to their needs and desires to keep their traditional hunting and fishing rights. Although many of them have houses in the towns and villages, they still prefer to live in the forest whenever possible.

So, clearly the indigenous peoples in particular are very concerned about land ownership within their communities. The indigenous people do not have any formal documents for land ownership. Traditional livelihoods among these indigenous communities include reindeer herding and breeding. Funded enterprises are currently under consideration to promote and assist in reindeer breeding ventures. 40% people in the PAs are indigenous and half of these wish to continue or expand their interest in reindeer (including a significant number of the younger generation). The other half are primarily fishers or hunters. It is hoped that a reindeer breeding school may be set up (through the University) by the end of 2004.

One short-coming noted by the Evaluators was a lack of Project branding. There could have been clearer indications in buildings and near equipment as to where the funds had come from (The Project) and what the purpose was behind the funds (Alternative livelihoods to protect and conserve biodiversity while improving the quality of life for the local community). There were no obvious indications of this anywhere.

Attempts to increase community involvement in the management of the PAs is on-going. Input has been provided by Canadian experts and Russian experience from the Altai and Koryak region has been captured by the project. However, it is difficult to promote the concept of community involvement in parks management in Russia in view of the country's long-standing history of centralised governmental management with no role for communities. This is enforced even more in Kamchatka where the regional administration has traditionally had complete oversight of the Nature Parks. The Project

is addressing this slowly by encouraging community involvement in maintenance rather than administrative matters at this stage. In this respect there has been successes already in Nalychevo Nature Park. This community involvement in management is closely linked with the problems of land ownership as discussed above. Both of the Nature Parks have offered to set up Councils for Co-Management with the communities. This will require consultation and round-table meetings to review the ideas and suggestions of all stakeholders. Some specialist input would help during workshops. It would also seem sensible to try and incorporate this Co-Management Council approach with the GEF Salmonid Project. Regulations to allow such co-management would need to be drafted and adopted. Such co-management approaches would definitely help with the sustainability of the PAs. The GEF project is already assisting in encouraging and promoting this approach.

Visitor behaviour codes have been established for each Nature Park. The project is now preparing new codes according to new federal rules and is working with a Moscow expert at the federal level. Several activities are underway which promote tourism. Guides have been developed through the Project which target high-level tourism and advice on how to develop opportunistic and pragmatic tourist ventures (800 copies). A website is planned (**Explore Kamchatka**) which will be updated annually. This is being supported by new co-funding from the Alaskan Tourism Company which has been leveraged through the project. ATC has assisted with information, translation and editing. This website is sustainable and will be self-financing.

In general therefore, this Output has been extremely successful, not only in establishing the SME and Credit fund approaches, but in addressing the linkages between these activities and the reduction in threats to biodiversity within the PAs. Almost all of the people involved in enterprises that have received loans or grants would have been relying much more heavily on exploitation of natural resources and biodiversity within the PA. If proper Process Indicators had been built into the project design and monitoring strategy then these would no doubt have shown a high level of measurable achievement. The success of this Alternative Livelihoods development approach has made a significant contribution therefore to community-led conservation within Bystrinsky Park.

OVERALL SQA PERCENTAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF ALL OUTPUTS AND ACTIVITIES = 77%

4.1.3 Threats and Root Causes – How are they being addressed?

The original set of Threats and Root Causes outlined in the Project Document identified most of the primary concerns and presented a logical foundation upon which justification for the Project Outputs and Activities could be developed.

Of the identified Threats, poaching and uncontrolled access (with risks from trampling, erosion and fire) remain primary concerns but are being addressed (at least in principle – see clarification below) through the Project. Unsustainable management/harvesting of

natural resources, although less of an immediate threat, is also being resolved through the project and in the long-term.

With respect to the Root Causes, subsistence needs and economic problems are being addressed successfully with every expectation of sustainable solutions becoming a permanent fixture. This is also true regarding lack of alternative livelihoods. Awareness is heightened and this has created unprecedented support for the Parks. Information capture and management regarding biodiversity distribution and value has also now become a high priority. Despite a lack of traditional understanding, community involvement is slowly evolving.

However, three concerns arise both from reviewing the Project Document and in discussion of the status of current Threats and Root Causes. The first (1) focuses on a potential Threat that appears to have been overlooked, the other concerns (2 and 3) relate to more recently developed Root Causes associated with administrative and governmental changes and restructuring.

1. Consultations with stakeholders during the project development phase clearly highlighted concerns regarding proposed mining activities adjacent to Bystrinsky Nature Park. However, these were not discussed at all in the actual Project Document, and the absence of any mention of this threat was a concern raised by the STAP Reviewer. The response to this STAP Review concern was as follows:

Any potential threats to Bystrinsky Nature Park associated with the Aginskoye gold deposit were considered and discussed extensively with many stakeholders during project preparation. In the end, consensus was reached that the deposit does not pose a threat to the park. Nevertheless, this issue is to receive further attention during the management planning exercise to be undertaken during the project's first stage. Likewise, the development and implementation of the park's monitoring programme will take this issue into account.

Currently there are two mines in the planning stages. A nickel mine is planned some 3 km outside of the Bystrinsky Park boundary. Initial stages will require removal of large quantities of soil. This mine will use an old road that runs adjacent to the Park boundary. A gold mining enterprise is also planning to build a gold-mining plant at the top of the watershed but also outside of the Park. The concern here is that any outflow of soil and detritus and any chemicals used would impact on the Park through the watershed.

There is clearly still considerable concern among stakeholders and within the community regarding this potential threat. The road that runs to the copper and nickel plant runs through Bystrinsky Park but there has been no concerns raised regarding the problems associated with this road construction (both in respect of direct habitat destruction and improved access for poachers and illegal visitors). Furthermore, although harmful chemicals (mercury and cyanide) are not being used at present, this is because these processes are not yet in place. Such chemicals almost certainly will be used unless their use is prevented. The concern is that mining and its associated development is going

ahead without open public discussion and public input and that the project is not assisting to ensure that there is such stakeholder involvement. The perception among stakeholders and the community is that the Project has ignored this threat and has shown no concern. It appears that the mining industry may have been undertaking a more successful public relations campaign than the Park or the GEF Project. Furthermore, there is a clear perception that the regional administration for Kamchatka is much more supportive of resource exploitation such as mining, than it is of long-term sustainable resource management and biodiversity conservation as represented by the Park and the GEF Project. NGO groups directly involved in the Bystrinsky Nature Park believe that public awareness has arrived too late on this issue and that there is some resentment in the community that the mining aspects were presented and accepted as a critical economic development before they realised the value from conservation and sustainable resource management. They are most concerned that the Project is ignoring this potential threat.

The formal response to the STAP Reviewer's concerns notes that..

..this issue is to receive further attention during the management planning exercise to be undertaken during the project's first stage.

The management plan for the Bystrinsky Nature Park identifies the mining issue as one of the first threats to the existence of the Park. The entire Park sits over one of Kamchatka's largest gold mining areas. Already the borders of the Park were altered during the designation stage to exclude two major deposits of gold to the detriment of the aims of the Park and the need to conserve biodiversity. The management plan identifies the fact that the presence of the Park is no guarantee against commercial intrusion in the future. Although providing no specific solution to this problem, the management plan does propose zonation measures which would effectively prohibit such commercial activities throughout most of the Park area. It also identifies the need for the designation of a protected (buffer) zone along the border of the Nature Park, primarily to address the concerns of economic activities adjacent to the Park boundary. To this effect, the management plan recommends specific studies to identify the threats and to designate buffer zone widths and location, as well as allowed and prohibited activities.

2. The second issue has arisen as a concern during the project implementation phase and is probably a cause behind the third issue (below) as both of these issues relate to changes in administrative policies. Clearly there has been a change in policy at both the regional and federal level since the project development phase, and this has resulted in a reduced emphasis on sustainable management of biodiversity and other natural resources, along with an increased emphasis on resource exploitation.

Where there used to be a State and a Regional Committee on Ecology, this has now been downgraded to a section within a relatively new Ministry of Natural Resources. This Ministry's primary mandate is the exploitation and economic development of natural resources. This effectively means that ecology, environment and conservation of natural resources now takes a very low priority within a Ministry which seeks to develop short-term economic gain from these same resources. This effectively undermines the role of

Protected Areas at both the regional and federal level and this is reflected as a reduced level of commitment and support, particularly at the regional level. One obvious aspect of this change in priorities which now threatens the sustainability of project outputs is the failure of the government to meet its commitments to staffing levels within the PA system in Kamchatka.

3. Poaching is still a primary day-to-day threat to the objectives of the Project, to the sustainability of the PAs and to biodiversity conservation as a whole in Kamchatka. Poaching within PAs is a fairly universal problem and will never be entirely eradicated from any Park system. Two distinct types of poaching are obvious within Kamchatka.

The first is subsistence poaching by locals with low income and limited employment opportunities. This type of poaching provides food for local families and necessary income from the sale of poached resources. It is also probably more easily monitored and controllable, and more effectively addressed through education, awareness and alternative livelihood approaches (as is already being demonstrated successfully in Bystrinsky Nature Park)

The second type of poaching in Kamchatka involves big money and top quality equipment (snow-mobiles and helicopters). This is particularly the case in Nalychevo Nature Park and probably in South Kamchatsky Zakaznik also. Groups of poachers are known to hunt protected species from helicopters and this has been associated with tourist packages, with apparently little effort on the part of local government to prevent or ban such activities. This high-level poaching is the privilege of the rich and excludes the local population (whose level of poaching tends to focus on salmon and salmon caviar). There is little in the way of current regional legislation or actual prosecution to prevent these activities. Until 2001, Inspectors had rights through the State Committee on Ecology. Inspectors could prosecute any illegal activities and issue fines. After 2001, the number of Inspectors was reduced from 80 to 6 and their responsibilities were no longer dealt with at the federal level but at the level of the Oblast administration. It is now the responsibility of the Regional Governor to decide which are the administrative bodies and designated persons to undertake such formal inspection duties. Currently no-one has responsibility for prosecution or imposition of fines. Inspectors can only monitor and advise people not to undertake illegal activities. Until the Governor issues a law or amends legislation to define responsibility of Inspectors and to identify who is responsible for enforcement (and what their powers are) then there is no effective enforcement of PA rules and no anti-poaching capability. This has major consequences for Output 4 of the Project, and for the current sustainability of the Project's primary objectives.

It is notable that the Project Document for Phase One was also unspecific and somewhat incomplete in its identification of Root Causes. For example, it identifies 'Lack of Awareness of Biodiversity Value' and 'Absence of Monitoring' as root causes. Whereas they are certainly causes of threats, they are not the root cause. Making people more aware of the value of biodiversity may not necessarily remove the threat from poaching, etc. Neither would the sudden introduction of monitoring specifically remove any threat.

This lack of specificity can be explained within the context of the original phase one Project Document as it may indeed be that these root causes were not specific and could not be easily identified. Furthermore, the requirements of GEF have altered somewhat in the 5 years since the Threats and Root Causes assessment was undertaken. However, after two years of project implementation, these Root Causes should now be fairly clear and this should be reflected in the Project Document for the second phase.

To summarise this section:

- Most of the Threats and Root Causes identified in the project development phase and therefore in the Project Document are being addressed at some level, some very successfully
- The project is not adequately addressing stakeholder concerns regarding a pre-existing threat to one of the nature Parks i.e. mining and commercial/economic threats to the parks, particularly Bystrinsky
- Significant changes in policy regarding natural resource exploitation versus sustainable conservation represents a new and very pertinent risk to project sustainability, and a new threat to the protected areas and their biodiversity
- Inadequate capacity, ineffective legislation and/or indifference to the need to combat poaching represents another significant threat to the protected areas and their biodiversity
- The Project Document for the second phase should have a much more specific list of Root Causes for the Project to address

SQA PERCENTAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVE = 65%

4.1.4 Global and National Benefits

The Project Document identifies the benefits as follows:

Global: The securing of long-term protection for species, habitats, and communities that are currently stressed and are increasingly threatened by numerous factors.

Domestic: Include the enhancement and distribution of protected area management capabilities, the establishment of a sound financial footing to ensure the protected areas' sustainability, and the accumulation of transferable knowledge and skills to other contexts.

Specific: The PA administrations and staff will benefit from exposure to new management approaches, improvements in the information base, enhanced capacity to effectively manage the PAs, upgraded skill sets through training opportunities, and improved relations with local communities and users. Locally, through the provision of alternative livelihood options to the resident population, the project will enhance local support for conservation, and will stimulate the development of self-reliance and sustainable economic use of the areas' biodiversity resources. The project will provide these communities with the knowledge and mechanisms to adapt their use of the PAs that

optimises their economic and social welfare while sustainably conserving their biodiversity values. In addition, secondary beneficiaries, including NGOs and other government agencies and partners in project delivery, will benefit from their own capacity building.

In the context of the global benefits, it is fair to say that the project is meeting its objectives, although the sustainability of the outputs and the long-term protection of biodiversity are still very much in the balance and dependent on the overall sustainability of the Project and beyond.

Domestically, protected areas capabilities have definitely been enhanced and there is an accumulation of knowledge and lessons which could be transferable to other PA situations within the country. However, this has to be seen in the context of recent and significant changes within the structure of the administration, and the reallocation of the responsible Ministry which have not place Protected Areas in a secure position. The establishment of a sound financial footing is still questionable in the light of the poor financial support given to the project by the regional administration, along with the delays in establishing the Trust Fund.

At the specific level, there is no doubt that the project has delivered significant benefits. In particular, the activities undertaken to address alternative livelihoods and to reduce the negative impacts on biodiversity resulting from over-exploitation have made a significant difference and provide a rare concrete demonstration of mitigation of threats through the remediation of root causes. But these activities still need to be secured through some form of sustainability and formal adoption of processes and long-term plans.

SQA PERCENTAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVE = 70%

4.1.5 Stakeholder Participation and Public Involvement

This project was designed through extensive consultations and the direct participation and input of all stakeholders over a nine month PDF B development period. The project development process directly involved the federal government at the national and regional levels, relevant branches of the regional Administration, non-governmental organizations, representatives of communities and indigenous peoples' organizations, academics, the research community, the mass media, and the public at large. Over 600 individuals took part in the project development process. Three meetings of the Steering Committee were held during the project development phase which involved representatives of the federal Government, the Kamchatka Oblast Administration, Kamchatkan NGOs, indigenous peoples' representatives and UNDP. A further three well-attended stakeholder meetings were conducted in Kamchatka. The administration and staff of the two federal PAs were directly involved throughout the project development process, as were representatives of the federal Forest Service, that now has also been absorbed by the MNR. The process also involved the Kamchatka Oblast Administration, including the Governor of Kamchatka Oblast and two vice-governors. All segments of the Administration, and the Kamchatka Nature Parks Directorate, the

Hunting Management Agency, the fisheries management agency (KamchatRybvod), and the academic and research community participated in and provided input into the project's development. Kamchatka based NGOs also took an active part and made valuable contributions to the project design.

The project development process was particularly sensitive to the views and aspirations of local communities and indigenous people. Specialized expertise was hired during project development to assess the conditions and needs of local communities. To this end, the project development team also visited and had extensive discussions with community and indigenous peoples' organizations' representatives in all of the directly affected communities - Milkovo, Esso and Anavgai. In these consultations, it was particularly important to not only solicit the population's direct input but also to convey the implications of the project to their daily activities, both opportunities and potential changes to the norm. As a result, the project is widely supported by local communities and indigenous people.

The PDF B process likewise directly involved teams of regional experts in fulfilling the information gathering and analysis requirements. The information provided by the teams included that on: biodiversity status and threats; social and economic characteristics; legal and regulatory regime; indigenous people; environmental awareness and advocacy; and, alternative livelihoods.

The project development process similarly brought together numerous other parties by providing a unifying and coherent framework for their particular mutually supporting initiatives. These parties include: UNESCO, WWF, CIDA, NSF and the University of Alaska, and WCS. Extensive consultations with these partners have resulted in mutual understanding and the development of a partnership in project design and delivery.

As a result of the extensive consultations undertaken and the direct participation of all stakeholders throughout the project development process, the project has attained high levels of support among all stakeholders. The objectives and implications of the project are clearly understood by all. The project brief was endorsed by the federal government and by the Kamchatka Oblast Administration.

The Evaluators were able to attend a Project Steering Committee Meeting while in Petropavlovsk, which provided them with an excellent opportunity to meet with a selection of stakeholders and representatives of beneficiary groups.

Discussion with the principal NGO representatives as well as the presentations given by same at the Steering Committee attended by the Evaluators demonstrates strong support from the NGO community toward both this Project and the GEF sister-project on Salmonid Conservation within Kamchatka. The NGOs noted that the early stages of the GEF PA Project was not easy as it was necessary to identify first what the legal status of each PA was, and then to formulate management plans which were sympathetic and relevant to each PA. The NGO representatives noted that it took a long time for the communities to recognise and understand the aims and objectives of the GEF Project. But

now they can confirm that public awareness and support for the PAs is much stronger as a result of the presence and outputs of the GEF Project, and there has been a major and positive change in the public perception of what is happening in the parks. The NGOs were directly involved in the early stages of public awareness and attempting to explain to the communities what was to happen and how this could be advantageous to them in the long run. Perceptions changed and support flourished once the communities saw positive activities on-the-ground.

Some concerns expressed by the NGO representatives at the Steering Committee meeting attended by the Evaluation Team included **A.** Transparency of Tendering - they feel this could be improved and has caused lack of credibility in the past which results in unbalanced participation, **B.** Entry into Zapovedniks – they are concerned that the purpose of the Zapovedniks is to exclude access and that the threats within Kronotsky are growing as this requirement has been unofficially (and illegally) relaxed. They feel that this is a result of an informal uniform approach to all PAs within Kamchatka, **C.** Mineral development adjacent to Bystrinsky Park and associated infrastructure within the Park. This is considered to be more of a threat by the NGOs than it is by the Park administration and the NGO community would like to see stronger concern and involvement on the part of the Project, with some specific activities included in the next phase to monitor and guide on this issue. **D.** Need for area counts of key species such as brown bear and snow sheep, so as to assess populations and monitor their dynamics **E.** PA Enforcement - involvement of all experts in development of anti-poaching strategies and a concerted effort to resolve the issue of the lack of powers invested in the Inspectors. There is also a need for better PA boundary definition with signs and guidance.

There were also concerns expressed by the NGOs regarding some of the level of training of Parks staff. In particular, mention was made of the Bystrinsky Nature Park and the need for either better training or better qualified senior administrative personnel. The NGOs are disappointed about how little control the Project exercised over staff selection. They consider this problem to be universal across the PAs. Further priorities for the next phase should include: **A.** Qualifications of PA personnel should be reviewed, standardised and resolved. The management plans are good but the personnel are not qualified or experienced enough to undertake the management. They also feel that NGOs should have been allowed more input to Management Plan development, **B.** The project needs to clarify that it is the Project that has a finite lifetime, and that people and the PA system will need to work independently after the GEF project funding finishes. The Project tends to give the impression that all the activities will close down once the Project is finished, **C.** Not enough attention has been paid to assessing and locating threats in first phase. Information on threats were collected but not analysed or shared. They are particularly concerned about changes to borders of Bystrinsky Park to exclude mining areas and the fact that the Project is undertaking no activities in relation to monitoring this potentially serious impact, and is perceived to be ignoring it, **D.** there is a need for more efforts and better materials for real ecological education.

The overall opinion formally stated by the NGO representatives at the meeting was one of strong support. They see the Project as having great potential for developing ecological interest and supportive organisations within Kamchatka. They feel the various experts (both local and international) have done a creditable job and that the management plans for the PAs are very good.

The indigenous peoples representative at the Steering Committee meeting thanked UNDP/GEF for their positive efforts in bringing the indigenous people on-board in the project and its objectives. Their suggestions included **A**. A need now to coordinate all related Projects, initiatives and organisation within Kamchatka, possible through the GEF Project in the next phase, **B**. They would wish to see the newly-elected president of the Indigenous People's Committee included as a formal member of the Steering Committee. The latter suggestion was voted on and agreed at the end of the Steering Committee meeting. During the field-trip to Bystrinsky, the local Museum Director made the point that all of the Project Objectives were linked in some way to the problems or well-being of the indigenous peoples and that these same people were now expressing a great interest on the Project. Whereas they had been suspicious initially, he felt that they now had no doubts that the Project was beneficial to their way-of-life and their needs. Their principal concerns, as previously expressed, are the maintenance of their traditional way-of-life including ownership and/or access to lands for hunting and fishing. They ask that GEF consider the possibility of providing them with funded assistance to seek legal help to solve these problems of land ownership and rights in relation to biodiversity management and their stakeholder interest in the protected areas.

It is important to note that the nature of the indigenous peoples and their relationship to the community is very different in Russia (especially Kamchatka) than is the case with other Far North Indigenous people who effectively represent the entire community. In Kamchatka, the indigenous people make up a part of the community and are fairly well integrated into it. This has certain consequences within the Project context inasmuch as the Project should not necessarily try to deal with and relate to the indigenous people in isolation from the rest of the community they are all one and the same and it would be retrogressive of the Project to create an artificial split where none currently exists. This was a particular concern raised by the CIDA representatives based on their considerable experience of dealing with indigenous peoples and Far North communities. Their concern is to ensure that there are equal opportunities rather than targeting the indigenous component of the communities for preferential treatment as this could easily create resentment within the rest of the community.

A federal representative of the Ministry of Natural Resources spoke at the Steering Committee meeting on behalf of the National Director (who was unable to attend the Steering Committee due to the imminent restructuring of the Ministry). The National Director wished to make it clear to the meeting that MNR was very impressed with the tremendous progress made by the Project in a relatively short time. He was particularly impressed with the progress on the database which had been significant despite the fact that many experts felt it could not be done (especially in view of the incompatibilities

between the Russian standard methods and international standards, which have now been resolved).

The local representative of the Ministry of Natural Resources also addressed the Project Steering Committee Meeting. The representative noted that the Project Staff had shown themselves to be very efficient and dedicated and the Ministry had noted their growing professionalism through the life of the Project so far. The MNR priorities now were **A.** that the funding for contracts should only be given after the contractees and proposals had passed an ecological expertise review, otherwise this was a violation of ecological regulations, **B.** The same problem concerned MNR with respect to the grants (e.g. the grant for the herbal tea enterprise was given but without any expert assessment. All such funding should be carried out in accordance with the law, **C.** The proposed development of ecotourism in the PAs should also go to expert review and an MNR specialist needed to be involved in order to ensure success. The MNR representative also noted that although the PA Management Plans did not need to go through an ecological expertise review, any zoning requirements suggested within the plans would need such a formal review. The Director of the Nature Parks noted that all such management plans had been sent to the Ministry for expert review but no response had been forthcoming as yet.

One important outcome of the Steering Committee meeting attended by the Evaluation team was a formal agreement by the Committee to request an extension of phase one of the project until the end of 2004 in order to complete the workplan and activities.

During their field-visit to Bystrinsky, the Evaluation Team were able to talk directly with the local head of administration. He noted that the Project has opened up local people's minds to the importance of nature and biodiversity in the Bystrinsky Park and its surrounds. In particular, they see now that they can make a living by other means that do not threaten biodiversity or damage the natural environment. He felt that the grant and credit programme had made a big difference, as had the construction of the new Parks administration Office. This has given the Nature Park a real presence and entity in the region where before many people were unaware of its existence. Now the Park is fully integrated into any development decision-making process or policies, as the Park constitutes two-thirds of the administrative area of Bystrinsky. The administration considers education to be a priority in the region and is pleased with the contribution made by the Project. He noted that poaching is one of the greatest problems threatening the Park. He felt that the contribution of the Project, through the alternative livelihoods programme (grants and credits) was making a difference here. He gave one example of a woman who has set up a well-respected hair-dressing business with the assistance of the Project. Her husband, an ex-poacher, helps her with the business and now considers it beneath his dignity to go illegal hunting and fishing. There are other similar examples. He also quoted the Project assistance which was given to developing the herbal tea and wood-products business through assistance to purchase a dryer. This contribution helps the whole village (not just the small group of entrepreneurs) as they can all get access to the dryer for a small fee. So despite the fact that the grants and loans are small, they have made a big difference to people's lifestyles and removed their narrow dependency on the natural resources. He stated that one of the most important impacts of the Project was that

words had been turned into real actions by GEF, UNDP and their partners. He is certain that the incidence of subsistence poaching has fallen as a direct result of the Project's alternative livelihood initiatives.

One of the Bystrinsky administration's suggestions was that the Parks Inspectors should combine their patrols with the local Fisheries Inspectors which have more concrete powers (fines and penalties, seizure and confiscation). The local police also fall under the jurisdiction of the Bystrinsky administration and they could assist by sending policemen with the patrols.

In discussions regarding the continued extraction of timber from the Bystrinsky region (including the Nature Park), the Head of the Administration noted that although nowhere near as much timber was being removed as was licensed for removal (about 15% only), it was an extremely wasteful process as only the best part of the logs were used. He suggested setting up a wood-processing plant to use more of the wood and the chippings and dust to reduce the waste. He also felt that the jobs created by this would help to reduce the incidence of poaching. On discussing a more sustainable approach to logging and possible better management of extraction forest, he agreed that they would welcome any assistance from experts in this field that the Project might be able to arrange and support. He also understood the problems associated with the existing and proposed mining issues. He agreed that it would also be good for the Project to assist in advising on these problems and to act as an intermediary and a broker to try and resolve the mining issues, possibly through the development of a 5-10 year extraction plan. However, he advised that the project should discuss this with the Deputy Director of Natural Resources for the Kamchatka Oblast and possibly also with KamGold.

In general, the Bystrinsky administration was very pleased with the achievements of the Project. They would like to see the credit programme extended and improved. They like the SME grant system as it is run by local people but they are less keen on the credit loan system as it is managed from Petropavlovsk and is therefore less transparent and accountable to the local situation.

As a further concern, the Head of the Bystrinsky Administration noted that sewage treatment and disposal was a problem within Esso and its surrounds, which impacted the Park and especially its rivers and water table. 100% of sewage at present is treated through the septic tank process. Less than 50% of these are pumped out and taken to a liquid land-fill site. The rest simply leach out into the water table, and then into rivers. The land-fill has no lining however so the contents also leach out and find their way into the natural water system. The entire area has a Protected Water Area Status where any enterprise or development that threatens the quality of the water in the water table is prohibited but nothing is being done to clean up the sewage situation. 1.7 million rubles have been spent on designing a waste-handling system based on bio-composting but it would take another 40-60 million rubles to build it and there is no such money for construction. If there were any possibility for GEF to help to leverage such funds then this would be an enormous contribution to the community and to protection of the local biodiversity.

CIDA is a major partner and co-funder to this project and frequently works closely or through IUCN. In 2000, IUCN started on the Non-Forest Timber Products project and CIDA provided the funding for this. IUCN was familiar with the practical applications of NTFP management but didn't have as much knowledge or experience on the financial aspects. Consequently, CIDA, in cooperation with and support to the GEF initiative, set up the SME and Credit Funds. This was also a good opportunity to use Canada's experience in this field of work.

CIDA's main interest and focus has always been (1) community involvement, alternative livelihoods and support to aboriginal population of the North; and (2) the management capacity of the PAs (staffing levels, increased revenues, sustainable mechanisms, etc). CIDA's priority within the Far East of Russia is economic development. IUCN's focus is on public involvement, protected areas management and NTFPs. GEF's focus has always been more strictly toward environmental issues (e.g. how to better equip rangers and inspectors to address threats to biodiversity?). UNDP has always been very keen on incorporating the Parks Canada model and capturing lessons and best practices from it. Initially there has been a perception that the partnership between all of these agencies (IUCN, CIDA, UNDP, GEF) was a little strained as some of the partners were already well-established and had already achieved good results and won public trust, other new partners had a different vision and different ideas about local capacity. So these different ideas and approaches needed to be resolved. However, the overall opinion now seems to be that the partnerships are beginning to work well, and any early frictions and differences of opinion have mostly disappeared. The representatives from CIDA felt that the idea of using the Project to provide direct assistance to the PA system throughout the Federation (by demonstration in Kamchatka how the PAs would work within the newly re-structured government) was a good approach.

SQA PERCENTAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVE = 85%

4.1.6 Capacity Building

Although capacity building is identified as a project deliverable, one area that the Project Team in Kamchatka felt was weak was training and developing the capacity of the Project Team to manage a GEF Project with all the complexities inherent in reporting, procurement procedures, contracting, etc. This should be an initial implementation activity which follows an inception workshop. This is also referred to below under **Workplan and Budget**. However, in defence of the UNDP CO it should be noted that after the launch of the project, the Country Office organized one-week training for the project staff (4 staff members) in Moscow on UNDP procedures, followed by individual missions by the working group leaders. The Project Manager also took part in CIDA RBMS training. Furthermore, UNDP did respond to concerns raised by the Project Team regarding interpretation of the Project Document by arranging a mission early in the Implementation phase for the Project Development Expert to visit Petropavlovsk to meet with the project team and provide explanations on the UNDP/GEF work plan and project document. Following this a series of concrete instructions/guidelines on administrative

issues were provided to the project team in written form. It maybe that a more formal arrangement could have been made after project approval, but pre-implementation, to undertake such training and interpretive exercises. This has been a common concern in many GEF projects in the past.

Also, members of the Project Team often had experience in specific skills without an overall understanding of the Objectives. So, a particular Working Group member or leader might be well-versed in financing or alternative livelihoods but have a very limited knowledge of protected areas and biodiversity, or how to work with indigenous people. There was no budget allocated or time given in the workplan for training the Project Team members themselves in the overall Objectives. Just 2-3 days every 6 months would have been sufficient to raise the overall awareness of the specialists.

Otherwise, there have been significant steps taken toward capacity building within the short lifetime of the project so far. Institutional strengthening has clearly made a difference within both Nature Parks with respect to both physical developments (offices and buildings) and human resource developments (increased staff and staff capability). Training has been fairly intensive although a more rational strategy and workplan for training in the next phase may prove valuable. Some more specific training in Senior-level Parks Management would also be valuable and necessary in the next phase. Equipment procurement and distribution has also made a significant difference to the ability of Parks personnel to carry out there responsibilities.

The Project intends to go through a formal consultation process with the PAs to identify any further capacity building and equipment needs for a next phase.

SQA PERCENTAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVE = 70%

4.1.7 Policy and Legislative Reform and Improvement

The output dealing with legislative and policy strengthening is where reforms would logically be addressed. By the end of phase one, this output of the Project was expected to have:

- conducted an assessment of current policies in relation to biodiversity
- reviewed the legislative and regulatory basis of biodiversity conservation in the PAs
- assessed the legislation appertaining to tourism development
- assessed opportunities for revenue generation from the PAs in the context of policy and legal issues
- assessed the legislative needs for strengthening the response to poaching and other threats
- developed a set of recommendations (including proposed amendments) to all of the above

The reviews of the relevant legislation and policies have been undertaken and assessments of needs conducted. Conclusions and recommendations have been forwarded to the relevant local authorities and there has been some feedback (although not all of it has been positive) However, according to the project Document, the first phase of the project was to have initiated implementation of the above changes after the first 6 months. Clearly this has not taken place but this should be seen in the context of the very limited time period within which phase one has operated (24 months) and it would be unreasonably optimistic to expect the project to have achieved any sort of implementation of policy and legal changes within this time (although clearly some significant efforts have been initiated to this effect).

Making changes to legislation within the Russian Federation is a complex, sensitive and time-consuming process, and is very difficult even at the level of the State Duma. This situation has not been helped by the re-structuring of the Ministries and the reallocation of responsibilities. Now that the project has delivered the required reviews, proposed amendments and recommendations, the next phase would then need to work closely at the federal and regional level to remove any policy and legislative barriers to effective PA management.

In order to make any effective improvements to strengthening the legal, regulatory and policy base for PAs it will almost certainly be essential to work more closely at the federal level. Legal reforms can be evolved and developed here through the relevant Ministry, and those applicable to the regional level can then be transmitted to the local Duma which would work closely with the Project in Kamchatka. It would therefore now seem to be both logical and sensible that the project should develop a Moscow-based component, ideally within and working closely with the relevant government department and Ministry which deals with PAs. There is strong evidence that what the Russian PA system needs (and what a revised Project could help to deliver in its next phase) is a clear demonstration of how the federal and regional PAs management can be re-structured and evolve under the newly reconstructed Ministry, and the development of best lessons and practices that could be replicated in other PA scenarios throughout the Federation.

The primary concern of the Evaluators must be the real credibility for legislative amendment and policy reform within the next phase of the project in light of the foundation set in the early stages (with due consideration given to the constraints identified above). It is important to impress on those developing and adopting any new phase for the Project the absolute and essential requirement to resolve the issues within this Output in coordination with the restructuring process of the government and the new policies and priorities on PAs as they become adopted.

In summary, the project has built a good foundation in the first phase upon which to base recommendations and reforms in policy and legislation in support of the overall Project Objectives.

SQA PERCENTAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVE = 75%

4.1.8 Replicability

Many of the successful activities undertaken through this Project are undoubtedly transferable to other PA situations, both within the Russian Federation and beyond. In particular, the lessons learned from the Alternative Livelihoods and Community-Based Conservation output can be of enormous value elsewhere, particularly in Russia and in Central Asia. The development of an effective database system which is compatible with both the Russian system and the International system is a considerable breakthrough and will help to unite scientists within and outside of the Federation, as well as providing a very valuable foundation for monitoring and policy improvements.

There is now an outstanding opportunity to use the Kamchatka experience (both present and future) as a model which could be replicated throughout the Russian Federation PA system. This system is going through a painful transition at present and needs all the help that can be given to rationalise and strengthen PA management and sustainability throughout the country. With the head-start that has been given to the Kamchatka PAs and the close linkages between the federal and the regionally protected areas, there is a strong case for channelling the efforts of this Project and all its stakeholders toward such a formal national demonstration in the greater interests of managing and conserving biodiversity within protected areas throughout the Russian Federation.

SQA PERCENTAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVE = 70%

4.1.9 Risks and Sustainability

It is difficult to address sustainability as an overall concept for the project as a whole. Clearly some aspects of the Project are more likely to be sustainable, and others are at risk. The PA Management Plans provide a good foundation for sustainability. But then there is the question of what happens to the equipment provided by the GEF project (which has proved to be very useful) and who will maintain or replace it as it malfunctions. At the moment the whole sustainability of the Russian PA system is at stake as policy is realigned and administrative procedures and institutions are restructured. Training and capacity building has every potential to be sustainable but needs a training centre or similar programme of on-going strengthening and reinforcement. The Project has worked hard to leverage further funding, particularly from the government. This resulted in an additional R800,000 being allocated from the Federal Reserve toward South Kamchatka Zakaznik last year, along with a commitment by the Duma to provide the same additional funding every year for the Zakaznik. However, for sustainability to be effective and lasting (politically as well as financial) there needs to be still further improvements in awareness.

The Project has delivered good results at the community level on awareness. It now needs to concentrate more effort at sensitising the policy-makers at the regional and particularly at the federal level. To this end it also needs to make greater use of media at the federal level. The Project profile needs raising at the federal level (which will then make it a higher priority at the regional level). One way of raising the profile in the eyes of federal

policy-makers and senior persons in Ministries would be for UNDP and GEF to show a strong presence, possibly through visits from senior level personnel, both from UN and from the GEF Secretariat.

So political sustainability is a slow process and comes in steps. But it could be strengthened if there is a perception of the importance of the project not only at the national level but also at the global level. The concept of formal realignment of the Project through the next phase as a national demonstration, and closer coordination at the federal level in Moscow, would go a long way to strengthening this profile.

Probably of much greater concern is the financial sustainability. The failure to achieve many of the concrete objectives under Output 3 (implementation of user fees, capitalisation of the KPACF, etc) presents a substantial risk to the project sustainability. In the Project's defence is that fact that the Output may have been overly optimistic within the first 24 months. However, the actual SQA score for the Output is somewhat inflated by the high level of good partnership (which may bode well for future funding although many of the potential close partners are already donors to the project), and by the activity for assessing the KPACF which is effectively being undertaken by the current Evaluation to some extent. The Evaluators would strongly urge that a full assessment is necessary and should be carried out BEFORE the end of phase one of the Project in order to identify pragmatic next-steps. Certainly, at this stage in the project the Evaluation would have to identify a fairly low SQA score as a reality of the status of sustainability and the potential political risks, which nevertheless the Evaluators would hope can be addressed and resolved in any further project phase.

One aspect of the Project which has convinced the Evaluators to keep the SQA at a reasonable level (despite the obvious constraints and concerns highlighted above) is the impressively pro-active response of the Project and the Management Team to challenges that might threaten the project and present a risk, or a concern to sustainability. From this point-of-view, concerns for project sustainability and risks within the actual project lifetime are low.

SQA PERCENTAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVE = 60%

4.2. PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

4.2.1 **Project Design and Planning**

The overall Project design is well put together, effective and logical, as is reflected in the amount that has been achieved in a very small period of time. The strong partnerships developed before and during the project have reaped benefits, especially in the area of alternative livelihoods and community support/awareness. Furthermore, the early and continued involvement of a multitude of broad spectrum stakeholders has also paid dividends, with a strong element of support for the project from all sectors. It is particularly gratifying to see this level of support carried through to the more formal Project discussions and reviews such as the Steering Committee meetings, where a

noticeably keen and numerous presence of NGOs and interested individuals not only attended as observers, but were able to contribute, criticise and praise as they felt necessary.

Some criticisms of the actual design and planning are worth capturing for future consideration both within this Project and for the development of future GEF projects.

The Project Team had some difficulty understanding the language and terminology of GEF as presented in the Project Document, particularly the Logical Framework and the Workplan. As a consequence some of the Document text had to be re-defined and explained in the early stages of the Project. This is not uncommon for a GEF Project and raises the question of “for whom is the Document written”? Clearly, this ‘GEF-Speak’ language is well known and well understood by the Implementing Agencies and by GEF but it consistently creates confusion and embarrassment at the level of the government reviewers and decision-makers as well as for the executing agencies and the people on the ground who have to carry out the Project activities. The Evaluators feel that some effort should be put into translating and simplifying GEF and UN terminology at the drafting stage. So frequently the end-product of this complicated terminology is that those reading it are both perplexed and at the same time too embarrassed to comment, while those writing it all-too-often have an unclear grasp or understanding of its meaning themselves.

The Project certainly does appear to have been somewhat optimistic in its intended achievements within the available time-scale, and within the available funding. Again, this is not unusual for a GEF project and is often driven by GEF’s need (and demand) to demonstrate actual delivery and sustainability where, in fact, the reality is unrealistic. For example, Output 1 is not an unreasonable logical foundation for following phases. It develops the Management and Operational Plans for the PAs, defines the personnel, equipment and facilities required to effect such Plans, and provides training. This in itself would be an excellent and very intensive set of deliveries. However, this can only be achieved with sufficient funds and with sufficient expertise. If we then look at the additional activities under this Output (recreational carrying capacity, assess and control water pollution, establish ranger patrol stations, clean up polluted sites, define tourism development feasibility) then the Output becomes cumbersome and overly-optimistic. Most of the additional activities could have been better defined and managed under a separate output or project component. Similar observations can be made for Output 2 which attempts to achieve an enormous delivery of plans, reports and mapping from a diverse and uncoordinated (and certainly incomplete) set of data. Output 6 is massively optimistic within the time-scales available and it is a laudable achievement worthy of considerable praise that the Project Team has managed to delivery so effectively under this Output, often well ahead of schedule.

The Project has done its best to accommodate the burden of activities required in such a short time, mainly by contracting work out to reputable and experienced individuals or bodies. However, this then raises the concerns regarding the funding level within the project to support such sub-contracts.

The Evaluators understand that the original project was submitted to GEF with a requested budget of \$7 million based on the needs identified within the Project Document and on the carefully assessed estimates for achieving each activity. It is further understood that the Project was then revised, at the request of GEF, into three phases and that GEF also cut the budget to \$4.25 million (nearly a 40% loss of funding). Not only would the actual phasing of the Project incurred additional overall costs (logistics, evaluation, monitoring, additional document preparation, etc) but it is understood that the severe reduction in the budget was never reflected in a parallel reduction in activities. In other words, the Project was expected to deliver the same level of quantity of output and outcomes despite the fact that its budget had been nearly halved. The fault here clearly lies with the funding agency, although the Evaluators understand that they were overarching reasons linked to GEF's own funding problems, and that this was probably a 'best-fit' reaction in order to save the project under budget constraints that were causing many projects to be shelved as a result of lack of funds. This scenario also speaks volumes about the determination and dynamic response of the Project Team and the stakeholders in Kamchatka to achieve what they have on what must be seen as a grossly inadequate budget. It must be the hope of all involved parties that this unreasonable situation will be rectified in any further phases of the Project, and sufficient funding will be injected to deliver those activities that have therefore understandably fallen short in phase one.

One aspect of Project Design relating to the Project Document itself which should be given consideration in future Project documents is the use of standard terminology throughout. The Document Text itself refers to Immediate Objectives and then Activities. The Logical Framework refers to Outputs (which equate to the Immediate Objectives in the main Document text), and the Workplan refers to Outputs and Tasks. Not only does this create an element of confusion but is also not consistent with GEF terminology. The standard approach within a GEF project is to have an Overall Objective(s). Then the project is broken down into Project Components (e.g. **Strengthening Parks** or **Legislative Reform**), each Component has a set of Outputs which are the intended improvements or realignments (e.g. **Establishment of Nature Park Directorates** or **Revision of Laws and Regulations**), then these are broken down into precise Activities (e.g. **Develop Construction Plans for Parks Office** or **Review Existing Laws and Regulations on Nature Parks**). For each **Output** there should be an **Outcome** or **Outcomes** which effectively reflects the measurable indications of success for the Output that will go into the LogFrame (e.g. Output = **Strengthening Parks**, Outcome = **New Nature Parks Offices Constructed and Fully Staffed**). An Output therefore is an intention while an Outcome is an actual physical result. The Outcomes can be transferred effectively as Indicators to the LogFrame and wherever possible, given measurable values to ease any evaluation process (e.g., 75% of PAs have a full staff complement by 20th month of Project Implementation).

One other concern that the Evaluators would wish to raise is that of the indicators used in the LogFrame. Nearly all of the indicators within the Project Document LogFrame are Process indicators. To some extent this is not too surprising as the indicator system was

specifically set up to try and capture improvements where there may be no hard numerical data (i.e. As in the early stages of a Project where Process indicators are often the only available verification of success). However, the PIR has identified some more specific indicators of impact which could be numerically measured (e.g. ‘Areas of contiguous habitat have not decreased’) and these should be developed further as specific numerical impact indicators under the next phase. Process indicators tend to identify improvements in the actual administrative and policy process in support of Project objectives (e.g. developing and adopting laws) while impact indicators tend to be divided into Stress Reduction Indicators (e.g. More poaching patrols recorded on a weekly basis, and more fines imposed on illegal hunting) and Environmental Stress Indicators (e.g. increases in populations of threatened species previously targeted by poachers). A higher priority in relation to indicators must be the need to establish a baseline for quantitative impact indicators before the completion of Phase One. During Project Development, GEF now expects to see the baseline quantified during the PDF-B phase. It can be expected that GEF would be very critical if these are not available after 2 years of GEF support.

Certainly, a primary concern of the Evaluators under this aspect of Project Design and Planning is the severe reduction in the proposed budget versus the allocated budget which has undoubtedly impacted on the effectiveness of project delivery, and must be viewed by the Evaluators as a constraint to the delivery of the Project Objectives. However, it should be recognised that this was not primarily the fault of the Project designers, and the Evaluators recognise a high quality of Project Design within this project.. Consequently the constraints that these budget concerns have imposed on the project have been reflected in the SQA score below under Workplan and Budget rather than detract from a well-designed and planned project.

SQA PERCENTAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVE = 80%

4.2.2 Project Management

All stakeholders were highly supportive of the Project Management Team, and this was particularly the case with regard to the co-funding partners.

The Project has four Working Groups dealing with the following issues that relate to the project Outputs:

5. Strengthening PA management capacity
6. Alternative Livelihoods
7. Raising Conservation Awareness and Advocacy
8. Establishing Sustainable Financial Mechanisms

Each of the Working Groups has developed a good strategy for achieving their objectives and is working closely with stakeholders and communities. The status and achievement of their work is discussed above (**Project Delivery – Outputs and Activities**) under the relevant Output headings.

The Project Management has made efforts to develop close links with the regional offices for the Ministry of Natural Resources in Petropavlovsk. The Project and the Ministry have undertaken activities together in biodiversity and protected areas awareness and education. They have also undertaken joint planning exercises for the Zapovednik and Zakaznik. The Project has also worked with the local administration to encourage discussions and public hearings relating to existing and proposed mining, especially in the Bystrinsky area. The regional administration has a sub-department within its Ministry offices which deals with the Parks and the relationship between this department and the Project is professional and effective. Problems relating to the project's Objectives versus the regional policy on resource use and management tend to be more prevalent at the higher level of regional government.

At the federal level there have been many changes as a result of government restructuring (which are inevitably reflected at the regional level also) and the situation for Protected Areas through the Federation is both unstable and vulnerable at present. There are hopes that some stability will return with the current restructuring process, which will hopefully place a sympathetic and professional person in overall charge of the Protected Areas.

One area of concern is the structure of the Project Management team and the lack of any direct support to the Project Manager in the day-to-day management of the Project. The absence of a Deputy means that the Project Manager is having to deal with the high volume of bureaucracy and reporting prevalent in the project rather than concentrating on issues of sustainability such as stakeholder input within specific project components, resolving the issues of PA staff and government commitments, etc. The Project Manager could undertake a more valuable role with regard to diplomatic functions and negotiation if there were a Deputy position. This was foreseen and addressed in the later implemented GEF Salmonid project. It would also help to reduce a sustainability risk in that should the current Project Manager decide to leave the Project for whatever reason then there would be an element of continuity and memory.

In the final analysis, the Evaluation Team has to be impressed with the level of efficient and professional management given by the Project Team under difficult conditions and requiring a dynamic and pro-active attitude in order to keep project delivery as high as possible.

SQA PERCENTAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVE = 85%

4.2.3 Project Execution and Implementation

The relationship between the UNDP staff at the main UNDP Country Office in Moscow and the Project Team (some 9 time zones away) in Petropavlovsk appears to be very effective and strong with plenty of support given by the UNDP Country Office. The Kamchatka Project Team members were particularly impressed by the efforts made by UNDP Moscow staff to attend the 6-monthly Steering Committee meetings. It was noted that this support ran right up to the level of the Resident Representative in UNDP Moscow. Channels of communication are effective (even given the time difference) and

responses to requests for assistance or advice are timely and professional. This is particularly noteworthy in view of the very limited human resources available for environmental issues within UNDP Moscow, and the large portfolio of projects which they have to deal with (including the GEF portfolio) across such a large geographical territory. From this point-of-view UNDP's support of the project is to be commended. However, UNDP itself would benefit from adopting a higher priority to environmental projects reflected in more human and financial resources in an enormous geographical area like Russia with such a wealth of wilderness and important biodiversity, but with so many new threats arising with the pressure for economic development.

SQA PERCENTAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVE = 75%

4.2.4 Country Ownership

At the federal level, the project has received strong support from the office of the National Project Director who is also Deputy Head of Department of Nature Protected Areas and Biodiversity Conservation, Ministry of Natural Resources. This has been forthcoming despite the reduced nature of this department (which now has only 3 staff) and the down-grading of protected areas as a priority within the federal government. It is of significant concern to this Project that re-structuring of the government has resulted in the liquidation of the State Committee for Ecology and the placement of the responsibility for Protected Areas within a small department which is subordinate to a much larger Ministry which has a mandate to undertake resource use and exploitation. The fact that this restructuring has taken place during the project lifetime has created a considerable challenge to the long-term sustainability of the Project Objectives. However, strong efforts are being made by the Project to address this challenge, and this Evaluation is attempting to support those efforts through its recommendations.

This policy change resulting in the reduced significance of protected areas and biodiversity conservation and management versus resource extraction and exploitation is reflected in the fact that the administration has failed to fulfil its formal commitment (as per the signed Project Document) to take on responsibility of the PA staff in Kamchatka. Without fulfilment of government commitments to the Project, it is difficult to see how the Project Objectives can achieve sustainability.

However, discussions with both the Project Team and with the National Project Director have raised some hopes within the Evaluation Team as to a future course of action which may help to address the profile of the Project at the regional and federal level, and may strengthen the importance of achieving sustainability, as well as strengthening the country ownership and support for the project. These will be discussed in the **Conclusions** and **Recommendations**. Therefore, in the final analysis at the level of this current Evaluation it has to be said that Country Commitment has not been as high as expected or desired. Although there are certain highly committed individuals, especially at the federal level, the overall national policy on natural resources and PAs presents a high risk to the Project at present, and there is a strong perception within the Project that the lack of political support at the regional level has hindered progress in PA

strengthening and effective legislative reform, as well as the mitigation and resolution of certain threats to the parks and biodiversity as a whole.

SQA PERCENTAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVE = 55%

4.2.5 Workplan and Budget (including cost-effectiveness)

The Project seems to have followed the original Workplan fairly accurately and consistently (taking into account some delays in actual delivery as highlighted under the relevant sections above), although the Project Team did draw attention to the fact that the early days of project implementation were difficult mainly as a result of lack of understanding and intention behind some of the obscure UN/GEF terminology used. In order to rectify this problem, the consultant responsible for design of the Project Document spent some time with the various Working Groups explaining the intent and translating the terminology.

Originally the Project Team tried to follow every step in the plan precisely which caused difficulties as some of the steps experienced inevitable delays and the workplan fell out of sequence. It was explained during the first Steering Committee that changes could be made as long as they were justified. On this basis, some minor but helpful amendments were made regarding timing of deliveries as well as logistics. The Project Team noted that a proper Inception Meeting along with training on GEF procedures (procurement, contracting, reporting, etc) should ideally have been programmed into the workplan as a first activity. This would have been valuable and would have streamlined the process of project delivery in the early days. They would have valued an opportunity to speak with someone with GEF experience in Project Management. In fairness to UNDP, they did respond to this need very quickly but this should be captured as a lesson for future GEF projects.

In assessing the accuracy of the original budget, the Project Team noted that some activities ran over budget and some fell below the estimated budget (which would seem to be fairly consistent with all budget estimates). Budget revisions were made during the final stages of preparation of the budget document and the consultant preparing the document consulted with the relevant persons over every budget line. One problem which was raised was the significant increase in salary levels between the finalisation and approval of the Project Document and its associated budget, and the present day realities of salary payments. Another major problem with salaries was created when taxes (which run at 50%) were not added to the budget. Consequently there was significantly less money available to hire people than was intended.

There have been no real problems with the disbursement process although the Project Team felt that too many signatures were necessary from UNDP and that this could delay disbursement by up to 2 weeks. However, in the Evaluator's opinion this is actually a very fast disbursement process compared with other projects. Although the aforementioned training would have been very valuable at the beginning of the project,

the Project Team feel that they are now well experienced in handling budgetary matters and that no significant changes would need to be made for a further phase of the project.

Probably the greatest concern to the Evaluators has been the severe reduction in the proposed budget versus the allocated budget which has impacted on the effectiveness of project delivery and has only been counteracted by the dedication and dynamic abilities of the Project Team. This has been discussed already under Project Design and Planning.

SQA PERCENTAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVE = 50%

4.2.6 Monitoring and Evaluation

The standard monitoring requirements for a GEF project were incorporated into the Project Document and its implementation. UNDP, as the implementing agency, requires quarterly reports on progress, budgeting along with an annual Project Implementation Review.

One problem raised by the Project Team was the need to do separate Annual reports for both GEF and CIDA. This, in itself, is unavoidable as both Agencies have their own reporting formats and monitoring/evaluation requirements. However, it would have reduced the amount of work for the Project Team if the Reporting dates could have coincided as much of the information required was the same. Regrettably, the two Agencies were working with a different 'end-of-year' deadline. This effectively required the Project Team to produce two very similar Annual Reports at different times of the year. However, although the Project Management raised this as a concern, the Evaluators understand that both UNDP and CIDA recognised this constraint early in the project and negotiated successfully to streamline the reporting process.

In the first phase, the Steering Committee has met every 6 months. This has been good for ensuring that the Project has remained on track, and to address the problems that have arisen in the early stages. However, in the Project Team's opinion it would now be more reasonable for the Committee to meet every year face-to-face with a possible email meeting in between. This was proposed to the meeting of the Steering Committee in April 2004 in the presence of the Evaluation team and was adopted. Generally, the Steering Committees have been very effective in discussing issues and in resolving any problems. Despite meeting every 6 months, a high frequency for the average GEF project, these Committee meetings have been attended in almost every case by the National Project Director and senior representative from the Ministry of Natural Resources, as well as by a senior person from CIDA and by the regional Vice-Governor. The Committee Meetings have also had good stakeholder representation, and this participation by stakeholders as observers has been encouraged. Non-Committee members such as NGO representatives and other interested stakeholders are seen to be very active in the Committee meetings and are encouraged to ask questions and to raise points of concern. It should be recognised that this change in practice from 6-monthly meetings to annual meetings may not be initially feasible during the transition between phase one and the next phase, which will require a lot of overview and policy guidance.

So far, the monitoring process has not identified any day-to-day areas of concern within the Project that have needed to be acted on. Stakeholder input to both project Development and Implementation has been good and this participation also tends to act as an informal level of monitoring and evaluation of Project progress and achievement.

One request from the Project Team was that the quarterly reporting format and tables could be simplified, and they would value UNDP Moscow's assistance in this matter. The format was designed as part of the project but it is too time-consuming every 12 weeks and eats into the valuable time that the Project needs to spend on its outputs and deliveries. Again the Evaluators now understand that this has been resolved as CIDA has now agreed to semi-annual narrative reporting

In undertaking a Project Evaluation of this nature, it is necessary to review previous evaluation documents for accuracy and for follow-up. In particular, some attention must be given to the combined UNDP Annual Project Report (APR) and the UNDP/GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR) of June 2003.

A review of the PIR shows a well-formulated document that accurately highlights the concerns, risks, achievements and transferable lessons from the Project at the time. The PIR identifies certain issues and concerns that tend to parallel concerns which have come to light during the current Evaluation, thereby suggesting that the PIR was correct to raise these concerns and also that the concerns may not have been resolved as yet.

Within the overall Development Objective, the PIR defines one of the Indicators as being 'Areas of contiguous habitat have not decreased'. Under Actual Level Achieved the PIR notes that 'Areas of contiguous habitat have decreased due to two gold-mining operations in the area adjacent to the BNR (Bystrinsky Nature Reserve)'.

Further into the report, under Development Objective Assumptions and Risks, the PIR highlights 3 Medium risks as being 'PAs are not sacrificed to economic development', 'Political stability is maintained in the Oblast' and 'Government willing to make necessary adjustment to facilitate PA conservation effectiveness'. Undoubtedly these risks remain at least at the Medium level and have shown themselves to be far from resolvable to date.

On a specific level it is noted that under Immediate Objectives relating to the decrease in degraded sites 'to implement water pollution assessment contract was concluded with KamchatNIRO. The contract duration June-December 2003. The contractor started to work and at present field studies are carried out'. However, the Evaluators have identified that only interim reports have been produced and that certain very real threats have been overlooked in these. It is also not expected that the Project will receive a final report before the end of phase one. This is reflected in the discussion of the LogFrame achievements under **Project Delivery** (above).

Under the risks defined in the Immediate Objective Assumptions and Risk, the PIR highlights two High category risks as ‘Equitable cost-sharing arrangements can be negotiated’ and ‘Willingness and capability to maintain commitment not altered by external economics and political changes’. Again, these two risks remain at a High level. The Project has so far struggled to negotiate equitable cost-sharing arrangements in support of its sustainability. The maintenance of commitment has clearly altered due to economic and political changes with far more emphasis now on exploitation of natural resources rather than conservation, and with a significant change in the status of ecological responsibilities within the government structure.

In the Project’s favour is the resolution of one of the identified Challenges (see **Implementation Issues** within the PIR) i.e. ‘The low awareness and understanding by the local population...’, as well as a distinct improvement in the second Challenge i.e. ‘Low level of involvement of local and regional authorities’.

In summary then, the PIR has correctly identified the principal risks to the project as well as the challenges at the time of the report. The Project has done well to remove or reduce some of the concerns regarding the challenges but many of the risks still remain much as identified in the PIR, and would need to be targeted for action under a further project phase.

SQA PERCENTAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVE = 70%

4.3 OVERALL PROJECT IMPACT

One statement from the Fourth Quarterly Report made a strong impact on the Evaluators and defined concisely how the project has impacted on the community:

“Definitely, the main breakthrough is that the project is no longer perceived as a solitary ambition of an out-of-the-way small team sponsored by international donors just to pursue some hidden agenda. Instead, a solid understanding has finally come to those whom this project relates either by profession or by passion, that biodiversity conservation per se is the conservation of our harmonious living with the nature, which, in turn, could bring various benefits to everybody”

Undoubtedly, the Project has made a significant impact on strengthening the presence and functions of the PAs, in removal of root causes to threats to biodiversity, and in raising public awareness and stakeholder support for the Project objectives. The SQA score for the Overall Project Impact is extrapolated from the combined scores for the various Outputs and GEF Objectives/criteria, and is discussed below under **Conclusions of Evaluation of Phase One**.

4.3.1 Objective Achievements

The Project has definitely had a positive effect on thinking and policy. Admittedly this has not always reached the top, but this may be due as much to inflexible and intractable thinking at the decision-making level, aimed at a political ‘get-rich-quick’ policy, rather

than a shortfall on the part of the Project in its attempts at political level awareness. However, a Public Agreement on Biodiversity Conservation was signed by the local Duma in Kamchatka along with other stakeholders including the heads of the PAs, the indigenous peoples, youth, and the media.

Clearly there is a lot of support for the Project from the National Project Director who also represents the government department responsible for protected areas. However, the National Project Director was also keen to point out that he would not want to see the federal PAs given any less attention than the regional PAs and did not feel that the Nature Parks should be given all the priority. He stressed the urgency and importance of the need to conserve and protect biodiversity in both Kronotsky Zapovednik and South Kamchatsky Zakaznik. He also stressed he would welcome any future increase in cooperation and assistance between the Project and his Department at the federal level. He noted that the government re-structuring was now moving very fast and felt that it was now very important to demonstrate how the project could develop a model for the Russian PA system following this re-structuring process, and demonstrate how the federal and regional approach to PAs within the new Ministerial structure (where both PAs and resource exploitation are the responsibility of the same Ministry) could cooperate and be successful so that the model could be replicated in other PAs throughout the Federation.

Despite constraints highlighted in the Evaluation, the Project has made a valuable and high-impact contribution to delivering a strong foundation for further essential work toward the sustainable conservation of biological diversity in the four protected areas targeted within the Kamchatka Oblast.

4.3.2 Constraints

The Project Team felt that overall the Project is rather heavy in its detail and is trying to solve too many problems at once, and at too many levels. They feel that it may be too complicated to try and achieve all of the activities in such a short time, and that the communities and the government need more time to take on-board the Objectives of the Project. Furthermore, they feel that the project is under-staffed for the level of achievement, which is expected in so short a time, and with such limited funds. In this respect, too many contracts have been awarded for too many diverse activities. Again, the Project Team feel that a slower and more focussed approach would have allowed more time to select the correct people for the work and to react better to the delivery from each contract. However, this should not be seen as a criticism of the Project Team themselves who, in the estimation of the Evaluators, have made tremendous and generally very successful efforts to work within the unfortunate constraints placed on them, particularly by the funding restrictions.

There is evidence that initially the expectations of the local people were too high. They envisaged a huge pot of money would be coming their way and consequently put immense pressure on the Project to deliver these financial resources at the community level.

This also has to be seen within the context of the fairly recent changes in the political system in Russia. It is not many years ago that people and communities were used to centralised decision-making and financing, and to having all decisions made for them, and all activities paid for from central funds. This mentality and the memory of that system still remain to some extent, and the project has tended (to some extent) to re-create this level of dependency, while the beneficiaries may well have been more than happy to adopt such easy dependence. To this extent, the project has tended to create consumers rather than stakeholder partners. The Project needs to be both cautious and sensitive to this problem and to try and avoid encouraging this tendency. At the moment there is evidence in some cases that suggests the Project is doing all the work and the PAs and Government are sitting back and waiting for it to happen through the Project's efforts.

Also within this context of political change, the Project has faced enormous constraints and challenges resulting from government restructuring and changes in policy toward natural resources and the economics associated with those resources. Again, it is an accolade to all parties and stakeholders involved in the Project implementation and execution that the Project has survived, and has found ways to achieve successes despite these political upheavals and policy constraints. This is an area that will need very focused and committed attention in any further GEF project phase. This is all the more laudable when seen in the light of further impositions and constraints created by the reduced funding level allocated to the project.

5. CONCLUSIONS OF EVALUATION OF PHASE ONE

5.1.1 Project Delivery

The delivery within each Output varies considerably with Output 1 being the most successful. Protected Areas throughout Kamchatka have been strengthened by the presence of the Project, particularly the two Nature Parks. The weakness within this Output focuses on the inadequate staffing levels within the PAs (again, particularly the Nature Parks). This reflects the lack of commitment on the part of the government to deliver the staffing support agreed within the Project Document.

Output 2 has also delivered well, especially when considering the ambitious nature of the activities within the short timeframe of this phase one. A gaps analysis and a set of recommendations for future research to support policy decisions (ideally before the end of phase one) will be key to the long-term success of this Output.

Output 3 has been noticeably less successful on delivery. The development and capitalisation of the sustainable financing mechanisms for the project and the PAs have failed to materialise effectively as yet. A realigned focus toward the private sector may

prove to be more successful. This would need to be a high priority for any further phase of the Project.

Output 4 has delivered a good foundation for follow-up policy and legislative reform. There has been full assessment of existing legislation, although little by way of implementation of legislative or policy reforms. However, it would be unrealistic to expect much in the way of legislative reform within 20 months. Nevertheless, the implementation of these amendments and reforms in support of the PAs and project objectives would need to be a major priority under any further phase, and the Project must be absolutely certain that clear recommendations have been made be available to government before the end of the first phase.

Output 5 has produced a high rate of deliver and success, with all stakeholders providing positive feedback on the enhanced level of awareness at all levels, and with specialised educational programmes having been developed to target schools at the extra-curricula level. In particular, awareness within the Bystrinsky Community (which was relatively ignorant to the functions and presence of the park pre-Project) has been significantly raised and now fosters positive support from that same community toward the objectives of the Park.

Output 6 is a very definite success story, and is almost certainly responsible for the enhanced level of support within the Bystrinsky community as noted under Output 5. Community outreach has been exceptionally good, and the alternative livelihoods component of this Output has demonstrated a very real and effective approach to the mitigation of root social and economic causes that represent threats to biodiversity and Parks management. Direct community involvement in Parks management has proved difficult so far but could be resolved through a more pragmatic approach to community maintenance and monitoring programmes.

There is a need to combat outstanding and new threats (and their root causes) to PA management sustainability and biodiversity conservation. The Project needs to foster credibility by addressing the effects of mining and its infrastructure on Bystrinsky Nature Park. This need not be a conflict-based involvement, and discussions with local administration would seem to welcome the assistance of the Project to help define how the two needs (Natural resource usage, as well as conservation and sustainable management) could be developed and integrated in harmony. This is also true of timber extraction which, if properly managed, could also meet the needs of the logging interest as well as the forest management and conservation lobby. However, all this needs to be developed within the greater context of the restructuring of the Ministry and the reassignment of responsibilities (and accountabilities). The long-term and globally respected strict designation of Zapovednik still has a role to play in certain areas of Kamchatka where there is no room for compromise over critically endangered and unique (and globally important) biodiversity. At the same time, careful zoning of other areas could allow some economic and conservation interests to exist side-by-side where feasible. One continuing threat that will need to be urgently addressed is that of high-value poaching using superior equipment. The government needs to make a legal and

manpower commitment to eradicating this menace that will otherwise undoubtedly have serious effects on biodiversity, PA sustainability and therefore long-term commitment from donors (not to mention long-term damage to stakeholder interests and community rights).

Significant global and national benefits, as well as regional (in-country) benefits, have been demonstrated through the Project already, despite the short timescale. Sustainability will be the key to the success of this GEF requirement, particularly political sustainability from the point-of-view of developing a high profile role for PAs throughout the Russian Federation by demonstrating how PAs can be of value to the community while existing effectively within the policy dictates and demands of a new economic order.

Stakeholder participation and public involvement has been exemplary throughout both Project development and implementation. Rarely have the Evaluators seen such a model example of participation and stakeholder consultation at all levels within a GEF project. If anything, this participation and involvement of all parties will help to develop and cement the sustainability of the Project.

Capacity building has achieved much within the PAs but there is still much to be done to consolidate and build on this work for the long-term sustainability of Parks Management and for the effective development of human resources to carry out that management at all levels (maintenance, stewardship, inspection, and administration). Further GEF initiatives beyond phase one will need to develop a very pragmatic and well-defined strategy for further capacity development, including transparent consultation with the personnel concerned.

Policy and legislative reform are, to some extent, the backbone of this Project inasmuch as these reforms will provide the basis for political and financial sustainability of the PAs. A good foundation of review and assessment has been achieved by the project, and no doubt there are some fairly clear opinions regarding what realignments and reforms are needed. However, the concern must be whether there is yet any formal set of documents/reports from the Project which specifically advise regional administration (and to some extent federal also) on the necessary reforms, which are essential to support the Project's objectives. Any follow-on phase for this Project will need such formal guidelines as a road-map upon which to base implementation of reforms and amendments, and will also need to work much more closely at the federal level to raise the Project profile and to present the Kamchatka PA scenario as a model for development that can then guide the integration and policy for other PAs throughout the Federation.

There are some good lessons to be learned (both positive and negative) from the Project so far, and much of what has been achieved could already be replicated (e.g. success with alternative livelihoods and the linkage to effective awareness and support from the communities; challenges associated with attempts to develop a Trust Fund and how this could be avoided in future scenarios of this nature). But probably the greatest opportunity for replication lies in the future with the potential development of a national demonstration model within Kamchatka of PA management under the newly re-

structured Ministry, for transfer to other PA systems within the Federation. This potential for replication should be captured in the development of further GEF inputs to this project, and linked to the similar requirements identified under policy and legislative reforms.

Attempts to mitigate or overcome risks and sustainability, as a GEF requirement under phase one, has shown a limited performance, much of which has already been highlighted through concerns discussed above. However, this has to be seen in the context of over-expectation on the part of the Project as far as delivery in the first phase is concerned. In fact, the Project Team have reacted efficiently to the challenges created by the need for sustainability and the risks that have arisen during phase one and this is reflected in the achievements made within less than 2 years.

Much still needs to be done in order to capture sustainability and mitigate political and economic risks within the overall project. However, the concerns have been identified and may be addressed within future GEF inputs with careful design and efficient monitoring.

Overall, the Project Delivery has been very good. Most of the Outputs and GEF Project Requirements have demonstrated a ‘Good to Impressive Delivery’ on the SQA 1-5 scale (see **Tables 1 & 2** (Executive Summary) and **Section 2. Evaluation Process - Purpose and Methodology**, above) with a consolidated SQA score for Project Delivery of **3.56**.

5.1.2 Project Implementation

As with Project Delivery, Project Implementation has shown a good level of success and delivery. The overall Project Design and Planning is well-developed and logical, and has made good use of stakeholder input and participation at all stages. Regrettably, one of the major shortcomings here that reduces the delivery and impact of this aspect of the project has been the significant reduction in budget allocation which was not paralleled by a balanced reduction in Outputs and Activities. These Outputs and Activities were already very ambitious within the allocated time-frame, but became somewhat untenable when seen in the context of inadequate budget commitments. This has noticeably reduced the efficiency of the Project Design.

Project Management has been commendable. This is particularly true in light of the constraints and limitations raised by the ambitious expectations for project delivery, coupled with the significant reduction in available budget to achieve this same level of delivery. The fact that the Project has achieved what it has owes much to the standard of professionalism of the Project Team and their dedication and commitment to their work. This praise of the Project Team extends also to the dedication and commitment of the Working Groups, who have persevered in their responsibilities despite frustrating changes in policy and government structure. They have all been amply supported by the NGO community who have consistently reviewed and appraised project objectives and deliveries, and have thereby demonstrated a model example of participatory support to the Project.

Project Execution and Implementation has been equally impressive, and excellent working relations appear to have evolved between the Project staff in Kamchatka, and the UNDP Country Office support staff in Moscow. Again, this is a model example of Implementing Agency support to a GEF Project, especially in view of the time and geographical distances involved.

Unfortunately, Country Ownership receives a borderline assessment, primarily in view of policy changes and a failure on the part of the government to demonstrate political sustainability and commitment. It should be stressed here that this criticism does not apply to the specific Department within the government dealing with PAs. More specifically, it reflects the overall change in Ministerial and Federal policy regarding the strategic importance of PAs versus the need for economic development of Natural Resources as a short-term fix to the Russian Federation's economically depressed situation. Regrettably the priority has been given to short-term economic gain rather than recognising the long-term sustainable value of carefully managed and conserved natural resources and biodiversity.

The Workplan, in itself, is not a major concern and has generally been well developed, albeit a little ambitiously in its intended delivery over a 24 month period for phase one. Where the workplan fails is in the context of the massively reduced and inadequate Budget, a limitation not designed within the original project document, but apparently imposed by GEF itself. Disbursement has been effective and documentation follows the required procedures for transparency.

Monitoring and Evaluation has achieved a good measure of success, despite some minor problems which inevitably arise as a matter of procedural requirement by agencies (and are therefore more predominant where more than one partner agency is involved in a Project). The level of commitment to the Steering Committee meetings by all parties has been admirable. The requisite level of reporting, and evaluation of project delivery has been effectively met. However, some risks still remain and should be taken into consideration in the development of further GEF inputs, and should be clearly defined through measurable indicators in a LogFrame to ensure adequate monitoring of their removal or mitigation.

Finally, in respect of Project Implementation, the level of delivery and success has been most satisfactory with a consolidated SQA score of **3.5**, which, like **Project Delivery** (above) falls well within the SQA category of '**Good to Impressive**' as defined in the **Evaluation Process - Purpose and Methodology** (see **Table 2** – Executive Summary).

5.1.3 Overall Project Impact

The Semi-Quantitative Assessment score for Overall Project Impact is **3.54** (see **Table 2**). This is at the mid to high end of the 3.1 - 4 scale which denotes a 'Good to Impressive Delivery'. This translates as some Outputs and Activities being partly behind, but most are on or ahead of schedule and many are delivering extremely effectively and

successfully. It intimates that the Project stands every chance of meeting its objectives, and is expected to succeed within the overall, timescale, but would benefit from some improvements and a review of priorities. The Project can be seen to have an **Impressive Delivery** rate.

The project has undoubtedly made a significant impact both in strengthening the role of the PAs, and in raising the level of awareness and support for the PAs, and for sustainable biodiversity management and conservation as an overall goal. This should further impact positively at the global level in view of the biologically strategic importance of this region.

Admittedly, there have been some aspects of the first phase of this project which have been less than successful in their delivery. But there are defensible justifications for these shortfalls, and clear indications on how they might be addressed in any future GEF input to this Project.

The government restructuring, and the reallocation of responsibilities for PAs, although having created unexpected constraints during the phase one lifetime, are also timely in the sense that they provide an opportunistic vehicle for using the Kamchatka experience as a guiding model for the restructuring and reassessment of the PA system throughout the Federation.

With careful consideration and development, a further phase of the project can and should realistically focus on increased strengthening of PA management, a more concerted and determined effort (in coordination with and supported by the relevant federal authorities) to realign policy and reform legislation, along with integrated national and international efforts to resolve the long-term issue of political and financial sustainability for the 4 Kamchatka PAs as a transferable model for the rest of the Federation's PA system (where appropriate).

The Project has laid a solid foundation upon which GEF and its partners can build and achieve further strengthening of the PA system, not only in Kamchatka, but also hopefully throughout the Russian Federation. This solid foundation has initiated the strengthening of the PA system in Kamchatka through the development of Management and operational plans for the PAs, and through training, institutional strengthening and procurement of vital equipment. It has developed a standardised database supporting a wealth of information on biodiversity as well as related socio-economic data. It has made an impressive contribution to raising indigenous and community support and awareness, and to developing active and effective partnerships for conservation and management, and it has created the building blocks of a substantial alternative livelihoods programme which is effectively addressing root causes. In short, in less than 2 years this project has built the springboard for an impressive GEF intervention which shows every potential for making a significant global contribution to biodiversity management and conservation.

In reviewing the overall Project Impact therefore, this Evaluation finds the Project to have achieved a high level of success (particularly within the constraints both inherent

and evolved). Seen in the context of the newly-emergent social, political and economic nature of the Russian Federation, this is both impressive and laudable. Furthermore, in view of the relative inexperience of GEF biodiversity projects within the Russian Federation and the time that this project was conceived and taken through its development phase, and the initial reticence to work within this new and untried (and potentially unsustainable) environment, all parties and stakeholders to this Project should be praised for the level of achievement and participation, and should be encouraged to continue with this valuable contribution to global biodiversity conservation. There is an unprecedented opportunity here to directly influence and assist national biodiversity conservation and management policy and legislation as it is evolving, rather than trying to force GEF policy and requirements to fit within an existing national policy and legislative structure.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER GEF SUPPORT

The following text constitutes the Evaluators recommendations regarding any further input from GEF in relation to this project.

Firstly, the Evaluators would strongly recommend that this Project be extended to a further phase. Although some problems of sustainability and delivery have been evident, these are primarily due to the dynamic restructuring process currently underway within the Russian Federation's Ministries. During these difficult and vulnerable times for the future sustainability of the Russian PA system, it is even more vital that the GEF Project remains as a monitoring presence and a link between the policies orchestrated at the administrative (regional and federal level) and those whose concerns focus on long-term effective management and conservation of critically important global biodiversity within the Russian Federation

However, in the interests of commitment and support it is recommended that there be only one further phase, which would represent the combined phases two and three. Phasing the project may have advantages to GEF from the point-of-view of evaluating sustainability and commitment, but it does little to build an environment of trust and expectation with regard to long-term project delivery. Neither does it build trust within project personnel and PA staff regarding their security and job expectations, which inevitably has implications with regard to sustainability of the Project. GEF's inevitable concerns regarding project sustainability and delivery can be addressed through a Mid-Term Evaluation of the next phase. This still allows GEF to retain its control over funding in the event of any significant failure in delivery during this next phase, but avoids the perception on the part of the stakeholders of uncertainty and lack of commitment on the part of the donor, or the perception that there is no ultimate guarantee that the donor will stick with the project to the defined end. This also important in the context of the major partner/donor (CIDA) whose financing last until 2008. CIDA would almost certainly not feel comfortable in partnering GEF if the latter were to initiate another evaluation-based break in funding within a further two years (e.g. 2006/7).

Within the context of this proposal, the Evaluators wish to make the following recommendations. It should be noted that these are not necessarily in order of priority (which will vary in any case as a matter of personal opinion). However, they are separated into overarching policy decisions for the future of the project, and into more specific but equally significant requirements:

PRIMARY RECOMMENDATIONS (POLICY)

1. That GEF approve the extension of Phase One of this project to the end of 2004 as discussed and adopted by the Steering Committee Meeting (7th April 2003), with the understanding that **A.** this involves no further budget requirements or funding from GEF and **B.** This will allow time for completion of some outstanding activities and preparation for the next Phase (see **Recommendation 2 & 3** below).
2. That the funding for the project should be returned to the \$7 million level that was originally identified as being the required allocation to achieve the Project's Objectives. This should be reflected in the level of funding requested and allocated to the second phase of the project (\$5.5 million). With the addition of new components and the realignment of the Project as a demonstration model for the Federation (see recommendation below), this is the minimum level of funding acceptable to ensure any level of sustainability **WITHIN** the Project lifetime.
3. That Activities under [Output 3 – Sustainable Financing Mechanisms](#), be reviewed in detail by the Project Team (both in Kamchatka and Moscow), and that a formal strategy and workplan be developed to identify realistic steps forward in the creation of these mechanisms. This strategy should specifically address **A.** the structure and input to a combined Conservation Fund (incorporating **All** Biodiversity-related projects in Kamchatka), and **B.** Formal proposals on User Fees (collection and allocation). This document to be finalised and formally adopted by the Steering Committee **BEFORE** the end of Phase One, with a view to early implementation under Phase Two.
4. That Activities under [Output 4 – Strengthened Legal, Regulatory and Policy Base](#) be reviewed by the Project Team to ensure that a final set of recommendations are (have been) presented to the relevant federal and regional authorities **BEFORE** the end of Phase One, and that these recommendations should be used as a road-map for legal and policy reform under Phase Two upon its approval by government.
5. That the Project be re-packaged and realigned under the next Phase to present itself as a regional demonstration providing a transferable model for national replication. The emphasis of this next phase therefore would be to demonstrate how both the regional and federal PAs could be sustainably managed and supported within the newly re-structured ministerial responsibilities and policies. This will require a federal-level component focussing on legislation and policy,

- and on sensitisation and awareness within the ministries in Moscow. This component should also aim to develop better coordination and integration of activities between the federally-administered and the regionally-administered PAs. The long-term intent would be to produce a model within the new structure that could be applied to other PA scenarios throughout the Federation. This approach would also address the concerns expressed by MNR that they would not wish to see over-emphasis of Project activities on the regionally-administered PAs at the expense of support to the Federal PAs.
6. The next phase of the project should identify a specific component aimed at developing a long-term monitoring programme for biodiversity status, pollution and other threats both within and outside the PA system. This should be linked to the existing work on database development and expanded into a full GIS/mapping system, initially for the PAs and later extended beyond the PAs to the rest of Kamchatka. The primary focus of this programme should be the capture and dissemination of accurate data upon which to base policy-level decision-making. In order to better develop such a component, the existing [Output 2 – Improving Biodiversity Information and its Management](#), should complete its Gaps Analysis and conclude its report on key future research needs **BEFORE** the end of Phase One. In support of this initiative, Phase two should identify funding for improved training in monitoring and data collection and analyses, database development, and GIS-related mapping of the ecosystems. Wherever possible, community involvement in this programme should be identified and encouraged.
 7. The Evaluators would recommend that a High-Profile Mission to Kamchatka be arranged in coordination between UNDP and the Federal Government. This should aim to bring top-level management from UNDP, GEF, and other partner agencies (CIDA and IUCN) into Kamchatka for the inception of Phase Two. This Mission will raise the overall profile of the Project within the federal and regional context and should help to ensure a higher level of commitment within the government, as well as promoting the significance and importance of the biodiversity of the region and the achievements so far within the donor and implementing agencies.
 8. Phase Two of the project should continue to foster and encourage community support through the development of Councils for Co-Management of the PAs. This will allow community representatives to sit on a management board for the PAs and to take an active part in policy and decision-making.

SECONDARY RECOMMENDATIONS (SPECIFICS):

- i) The Second Phase needs to review the Threats and Root Causes to capture new concerns and to re-prioritise old issues. In this respect, Phase Two needs to include a component that provides monitoring and assistance to the mining issue, sustainable logging (including less wasteful processing of timber and timber-products), and gives a greater emphasis to addressing the issue of poaching, which

is still a major threat. If possible, some consideration should be given to assisting the Bystrinsky administration in resolving the issue of sewage leaching into the Parks environment. It may be possible for the GEF Project to leverage funding to this effect. Furthermore, in identifying Root Causes to Threats, the Project Document for the Second phase should provide a more specific and focused definition. The Project Document for Phase One identifies ‘Lack of Awareness of Biodiversity Value’ and ‘Absence of Monitoring’ as root causes. They are certainly causes of threats but they are not the root cause. These Root Causes should by now be reasonably clear and precise after two years of project implementation.

- ii) In addition, the Second Phase needs to include impact indicators (Stress Reduction Indicators and Environmental Stress Indicators), which can be numerical measured as accurate verification/justification of component and output success. In order for these to be credible, the project team needs to establish **(before the end of Phase One)** the baseline for the quantitative impacts indicators that would be used in the next phase.
- iii) The Second Phase of this project needs to resolve the staffing problems within the PAs. All of the PAs have insufficient staffing levels. Furthermore, the levels of pay for inspectors working in the more isolated PAs is insufficient to attract capable persons to what is dangerous work. Although this is an administrative responsibility of the government, it is also a serious constraint to addressing Threats and therefore needs to be identified within a specific Project Output. In a similar context, the powers of the Inspectors need to be resolved if poaching is to be successfully reduced. Currently these parks wardens have no powers of arrest.
- iv) The Second Phase should also develop a component aimed at the Development of a Centre of Excellence for Training in Wilderness and Parks Management in Kamchatka aimed at all levels of Parks staff, tourism representatives, field-guides, schools, the international scientific community. Wherever possible this Centre should aim to be self-sufficient by charging fees for its training and facilities. Such a Centre would not only enhance the profile of the Project and of Kamchatka’s (and the Federation’s) PAs, but would help the overall objectives of the project in seeking sustainable financing mechanism. However, it is also necessary to ensure that Kamchatka PAs enjoy the ownership over and benefit from this Centre both in terms of capacity building and revenue generation. Therefore, the issue of sustainability of the Centre and continuous demand for its services has to be considered as well.
- v) Further capacity building in the Second Phase needs to be agreed in open consultation with relevant stakeholders, and should focus on relevant training at all levels (including the Project Team); developing effective transport and supply lines to the more remote PAs (with an emphasis on reducing transportation impact on the environment); developing on-site facilities from which to base scientific monitoring and research groups, and for support to PA staff; developing zoning

within and adjacent to the PAs (including realistic buffer zones but also identifying zones for carefully monitored economic activities) and finalising and requirements for formal adoption/extension of boundaries.

- vi) The Project should seek to help the indigenous people and the communities as a whole to resolve their concerns regarding hunting, fishing and land-rights with a view to sustaining traditional livelihoods, and to help to foster support for the long-term sustainable management of target species and biodiversity as a whole. Such assistance would help to remove a significant source of friction between Parks administration and the community and would make an enormous contribution toward building community support and protection for the Parks.
- vii) The project now needs to extend the successes of the SME and micro-credit experience in Esso to other communities, and to start encouraging alternative livelihoods in other PAs within the project system boundary.

7. LESSONS AND BEST PRACTICES FOR GEF BIODIVERSITY PROJECTS OF A SIMILAR NATURE

Based on the findings of the Evaluation, the following list highlights some of the Lessons and Best Practices which could be transferred to other pertinent GEF projects.

- A. Community awareness and support can be seen to be dependent on real actions happening at the ground level rather than just words and presentations. The ‘buy-in’ from the Bystrinsky community happened when they saw real concrete changes taking place (e.g. a new Parks Office) and when they felt a real difference in their own lives (i.e. access to grants and loans to improve their livelihoods and thereby remove their dependence on resource exploitation).
- B. Targeting the actual root causes, although sometimes difficult for GEF within the restrictions of its funding criteria, can really make a difference. Unemployment, lack of access to and funds for development of businesses, the need for assistance in developing alternative livelihoods – these all constitute root-cause barriers to the removal of threats to biodiversity. This Project is demonstrating how successful it is to REALLY address the root causes rather than merely identifying them within a document.
- C. Indigenous peoples within the Russian Arctic and Far East are an integral part of a community. They do NOT represent the whole community as is the case in some parts of North America. In this context, community assistance and participation initiatives need to be sensitive about NOT focusing specifically on indigenous people to the exclusion of other non-indigenous community members for fear that this may create resentment and competition.

- D. GEF project design specialists should be sensitive to the potential confusion and embarrassment that can be created by using overly complex terminology within documents. Consideration should be given to the primary audience which, rather than being the GEF specialists (who already understand all of the GEF concepts and criteria requirements), should be aimed at government personnel.
- E. Inception training of staff (and those government personnel who are most likely to be involved in the project) is of tremendous value to the smooth implementation of a project.
- F. Where partnerships are involved in the actual implementation and execution of project components (as is the case with this project in the administrative partnership between UNDP and CIDA), efforts should be made to coordinate and integrate (where possible) requirements for reporting, monitoring and evaluation so as to reduce the demands on the Project Team. Wherever possible formal reporting requirements should be kept as simple and as standardised as possible.
- G. GEF MUST adopt more realistic time-frames and budgets for its Projects. This Lesson is consistently being identified in Project Evaluations but never seems to be acted upon. This inevitably creates negative reporting on delivery at the Evaluation stage which is frequently not the fault of the Project Team. Smaller and less ambitious components (and indeed projects) would tend toward more successful delivery and sustainability.
- H. GEF Project Documents must use realistic and sequential indicators which can be numerical measured wherever possible. It is understandable that the success of a project in its early stages may need to be measured using Process Indicators. However, as soon as possible the LogFrame should provide Stress Reduction and Environmental Stress indicators as measurable verification of success.
- I. The very valuable lessons and practices developed and demonstrated through the SME Fund and Credit Loans should be captured somewhere by UNDP/GEF in guidelines or documentation made available to GEF Project Developers as an example of alternative livelihood funding and encouragement.

TABLES

1. Overall Semi-Quantitative Assessment Results for Project Achievements

ANNEXES

1. ToR
2. Lists of Persons/Agencies/Bodies interviewed
3. List of Documents Reviewed
4. Questionnaire used as guidelines for interviews

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EVALUATION

Terms of Reference
for the
Phase I Mid-term Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF Project

**“Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biological Diversity in Four Protected Areas
of Russia’s Kamchatka Oblast. Phase 1.**

Annex 1: Outline of Mid-Term Evaluation Report

Executive summary

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

Introduction

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

The Project and its development context

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

Findings and Conclusions

- Project delivery
 - Progress of the project as a whole in achieving its stated objectives
 - Effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation
 - Stakeholder participation, partnerships
- Project implementation
 - Project oversight
 - Project execution
 - Project implementation
 - Project administration
 - Project planning
 - Monitoring and evaluation
 - Risk management
- Project finances
 - Financial planning
 - Budget procedure
 - Disbursements
 - Effectiveness of funding mechanism
 - Risks

Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

Lessons learned

- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Annexes

- TOR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results

Other relevant material

Annex 2. Logical Framework – Evaluation Indicators

Objectives	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p>Goal: To secure the global biodiversity benefits of the Kamchatka Peninsula's PAs</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number of PAs has not decreased 2. Effectiveness of PA system has been strengthened beyond 2008 	<p>Biodiversity surveys PA system review PA management effectiveness review</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ PAs represent Kamchatka's complement of global biodiversity values ◆ PAs are not sacrificed to economic development interests ◆ Support of existing PAs continues at baseline levels
<p>Purpose: To demonstrate approaches to sustainable conservation of biodiversity in four existing PAs</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No decrease in size of PAs 2. Areas of contiguous habitat have not decreased 3. Functional connectivity with adjacent lands is maintained 4. Threats have been eliminated or greatly reduced 5. Conflicts are resolved through multi-stakeholder participatory decision-making 6. Viable populations of threatened and rare species remain in the PAs 7. Representative indicator species maintained at viable population levels 	<p>Aerial photographs Aerial photographs Aerial photographs</p> <p>Monitoring programme results Nature of decision-making procedures employed Field surveys</p> <p>Field surveys</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Political stability is maintained in the Oblast ◆ Socio-economic conditions do not deteriorate further ◆ Governments willing to make necessary adjustments to facilitate PA conservation effectiveness ◆ Sustainable development baseline is maintained

<p>Output 1:</p> <p>PA management capacity is strengthened</p>	<p><u>Phase I</u></p> <p>Management Plans are prepared and approved for each protected area Staffing requirements identified and additional staff for incremental PA management functions hired</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA Directorates for Nature Parks established • Essential equipment, supplies and infrastructure procured • Tourism development opportunities are assessed • Recreational carrying capacities determined • Annual Operational Plans prepared <p><u>Phase II</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills and knowledge of PA staff increased • Poaching incidence is decreased • Fire control is improved • Degraded sites decreased in area • Stakeholders participate in PA decision-making • Users impacts controlled and managed <p>Phase III</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration among PAs strengthened • Second generation Management Plans prepared 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approved Management Plans ▪ Staff numbers and budgets ▪ Existence of Directorates ▪ Procurement records ▪ Tourism feasibility study has been conducted ▪ Study report ▪ Operational Plans on record ▪ Training and qualification levels ▪ Surveys and records ▪ % burned areas ; response times ▪ Change in area degraded ▪ Multi-stakeholder PA Management Advisory Committees functioning ▪ Monitoring reports ▪ PAs exchange information ▪ Revised and approved Management Plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Agreements on management can be reached among all stakeholders ◆ Qualified staff available ◆ Baseline support continues ◆ Equipment maintained in operational state ◆ Tourism development seen as a priority ◆ Targeted level of co-financing realized ◆ Enforcement effective ◆ New fires restricted through effective use of education ◆ New degradation restricted through better controls ◆ Councils representative of all interests ◆ Users' acceptance of behaviour restrictions ◆ Institutional adjustments provide for increased collaboration
-----------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>Output 2:</p> <p>Information on the PAs' biodiversity values and its uses is upgraded, and the information's use in decision-making management is improved</p>	<p><u>Phase I</u></p> <p>Existing biodiversity information for each PA is collated and standardized Meta-database is produced Data needs are defined Required key biodiversity assessments are defined Traditional environmental knowledge appraised and means of integration into decision-making defined</p> <p><u>Phase II</u></p> <p>Biodiversity assessments carried out Monitoring framework and procedures are developed Socio-economic assessments conducted</p> <p><u>Phase III</u></p> <p>Monitoring programmes implemented Reporting mechanisms to decision-makers at all levels functioning Biodiversity surveys continued as required</p>	<p>Information data bases</p> <p>Meta-database for each PA Data gathering plans formulated Research plan is produced</p> <p>Report on file</p> <p>Reports on surveys and research Monitoring program and protocols in place Reports on file</p> <p>State of PA monitoring reports Inclusion of PA biodiversity values in decision-making Data base updating continuous</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Information is readily available ◆ Stakeholders willing to share information ◆ Traditional environmental knowledge is retained in the communities ◆ Willingness to participate in assessments ◆ Targeted levels of co-financing realized
<p>Output 3:</p> <p>Sustainable financing mechanisms are developed to provide for recurrent and incremental PA operational costs</p>	<p><u>Phase I</u></p> <p>25% of additional staff salaries absorbed by KOA and NRC User fees instituted</p> <p>KPACF designed, first stage co-financing secured, and fund operational</p> <p><u>Phase II</u></p> <p>50% of additional staff salaries absorbed by KOA and NRC KPACF operational and second stage co-financing secured</p> <p>PAs retain increased portion of generated funds</p> <p><u>Phase III</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Third stage co-financing secured ● 90% of incremental staff salaries absorbed by KOA and NRC by project's completion <p>Incremental costs of PA management and operations provided for by KOA and NRC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revenue generation receipts from users ▪ Approval of Fund ▪ Budget analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fund capitalized from multiple sources ▪ PA budget analysis ▪ Budget analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Targeted level of co-financing realized ◆ Willingness and capacity to pay ◆ Fund mechanism legally acceptable ◆ Equitable cost-sharing arrangements can be negotiated ◆ Legislation modified to permit revenue retention ◆ Willingness and capability to maintain commitment not altered by external economic and political changes

<p>Output 4:</p> <p>Institutional adjustments remove barriers to effective PA management and biodiversity conservation</p>	<p><u>Phase I</u></p> <p>Biodiversity policy analysis undertaken Inadequacies in existing legislation and regulations defined</p> <p><u>Phase II</u></p> <p>PA biodiversity conservation objectives factored into all regional economic development plans and policies</p> <p>Legislation revised to support tourism development, alternative financing of PAs, stronger anti-poaching deterrent and inclusion of conservation curriculum in schools Strong effective anti-poaching legislation and its enforcement</p> <p><u>Phase III</u></p> <p>Development policies for adjacent lands support biodiversity conservation in PAs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Report on file ▪ Report on file ▪ Plans indicate biodiversity conservation concerns ▪ Policy constraints to biodiversity conservation removed ▪ Changes in legislation to support biodiversity conservation ▪ Stiffer penalties for poaching and higher incidence of convictions ▪ Policy review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Level of co-financing realized ◆ Biodiversity conservation remains a priority in regional development plans and policy development sensitive to biodiversity conservation ◆ Legislative reforms expedited ◆ Commitment to strict control of poaching
<p>Output 5:</p> <p>Biodiversity conservation awareness and advocacy of stakeholders is strengthened</p>	<p><u>Phase I</u></p> <p>PA communications strategy developed</p> <p>Awareness programme developed Awareness materials prepared</p> <p><u>Phase II</u></p> <p>Awareness programme implemented</p> <p>Evidence of increased publicity of PA biodiversity conservation issues</p> <p>Changes in perceptions and attitudes of visitors to PAs as well as staff</p> <p><u>Phase III</u></p> <p>Conservation curriculum in schools</p> <p>PA and NGO biodiversity specialists consulted on regional land use decisions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communications strategy ▪ Programme production ▪ Materials available ▪ Records of programme delivery ▪ Publications, media coverage reports ▪ Survey results ▪ Education curricula ▪ Involvement in decision-making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Agreement on awareness programme strategy ◆ Regional media supportive partners ◆ Education authorities accepting of curriculum revisions ◆ Targeted level of co-financing realized

<p>Output 6:</p> <p>Alternative livelihoods and enabling mechanisms for local populations are developed and local communities actively participate in PA conservation and operations</p>	<p><u>Phase I</u></p> <p>Ecotourism feasibility defined NTFP harvest limits established for PAs and NTFP management plans prepared SME financing facility and community small grants programme developed Traditional economic pursuits defined and their economic feasibility appraised</p> <p><u>Phase II</u></p> <p>Small-business development fund operating Community small grants programme initiated Tourism promotion activities started Number of tourists/visitors increases Involvement of local community members in PA operations Community based conservation officers recruited and trained Community conservation councils developed</p> <p>NTFP and other resource utilization in PAs sustainable</p> <p><u>Phase III</u></p> <p>PA decision-making involves communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ecotourism feasibility study ▪ PA specific documentation ▪ Organizational and procedural documentation ▪ Report on opportunities on file ▪ Fund records ▪ Programme disbursements ▪ Publications, programmes ▪ Visitor surveys ▪ Numbers employed directly or indirectly ▪ Staffing records • Community councils established ▪ Independent evaluation of monitoring results • Communities are partners in decision-making on PAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Consensus reached with communities on management strategies ◆ Limits defined with local communities ◆ Targeted levels of co-financing realized ◆ Financial mechanisms in place ◆ Favourable results of tourism feasibility study ◆ External factors do not constrain development of tourism as a viable economic alternative ◆ Availability of personnel ◆ Records maintained ◆ Incentives developed are effective in altering livelihoods to more sustainable forms ◆ Role of councils legitimized <i>vis a vis</i> PA administrations
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ANNEX 2: LIST OF PERSONS/AGENCIES INTERVIEWED

Date	Interviewee name	Organization/Position	Address	Topics discussed
April 6	Karmadonov, Yuri Germanovich	Project Manager, UNDP/GEF Project Administration	UNDP/GEF Project, Karl Marx Ave. 29/1, Room 400 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683031, Russia ph. 4152-90403, fax 4152-90824 e-mail: karmadonov@unkam.ru	Project activities review
April 6	Prosina, Svetlana Flyurovna	Leader, Working Group IV (Sustainable Financing Mechanisms), UNDP/GEF Project Administration	UNDP/GEF Project, Karl Marx Ave. 29/1, Room 207 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683031, Russia ph. 4152-90403, fax 4152-90824 e-mail: prosina@unkam.ru	Achievements and lessons of the Phase I small and medium business entrepreneurial activities support
April 6	Menshikov, Vitaliy Ivanovich	Director, Kamchatka Nature Parks Directorate http://www.kamchatksalmon.ru	Karl Marx Ave. 29/1 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683031, Russia Ph. 4152-90723	Nature Parks Directorate problems, needs and solutions
April 6	MEETING	UNDP/GEF Salmonid Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Project	Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683049, Russia ph. 4152-119095, fax 4152-220274 e-mail: info@kamchatkasalmon.ru	First year reporting: results and directions
April 7	4 th STEERING COMMITTEE LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	UNDP/GEF Project, Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biological Diversity in Four Protected Areas of Kamchatka	http://www.unkam.ru	Programme reports and presentations by programme coordinators and officers, working group leaders and experts, KOA administration, public groups, NGOs, representatives of indigenous groups and private foundations
April 7	Elena Armand	Programme Coordinator, Head of Environment Unit, UNDP Russian Country Office	Ostozhenka 28, 119034, Moscow, Russia, ph. (095) 787-21-02, e-mail: elena.armand@undp.org	Project achievements and goals
April 7	Steven Basadur	Programme Officer, Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) http://www.cdi-cida.ru	200 Promenade du Portage Gatineau, Québec K1A 0G4 Canada	CIDA support for private sector development, collaboration with the Project
April 7	Poletaeva, Alevtina Andreevna	Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Agency of MNR RF for Kamchatka Oblast	106, ulitsa Mishennaya Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky Kamchatka Oblast 683016 Russia ph. 4152-12-1098	Regional development and legislative issues related to Protected Areas, role of Kamchatka Oblast Administration in supporting the Project

April 7	Abikh, Andrey Borisovich	Executive Director, Kamchatka League of Independent Experts (KLIE) (NGO) website: http://klie.ru	56 Partizanskaya Str., P.B. 273 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683000, Russia, ph. 4152-120996, fax 4152-120747 e-mail: liga@klie.ru ;	NGO activities and public awareness
April 7	Romensky, Vladimir Semyonovich	Director, Ecological organization "Sotka" (NGO)	41 Pobedy Ave. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683023, Russia ph. 4152-254987 e-mail: sotka@mail.kamchatka.ru	Capabilities of NGO to conduct species surveys
April 7	Martha Madsen	Museum International Expert	684010 Kamchatskaya Oblast, Elizovo, Ryabikova St. 48 ph. 41531-21754 fax 716-52 E-mail: zapoved@elrus.kamchatka.su	Kronotsky Zapovednik Museum
April 8	Shmatkov, Nickolay Mikhailovich	Manager, Forest Programme, IUCN Website: www.iucn.ru	IUCN, 17 Marshal Vasilevsky Str., Moscow 123182, Russia ph. (7-095) 190 4655 (7077), fax (7-095) 490 5818 e-mail: shmatkov@iucn.ru	Non-Timber Product programme
April 8	Natalia V. Moraleva	Manager, Programme Deveopment, IUCN Website: www.iucn.ru	IUCN, 17 Marshal Vasilevsky Str., Moscow 123182, Russia ph. (7-095) 190 4655 (7077), fax (7-095) 490 5818 e-mail: nvm@iucn.ru	Eco-tourism development
April 8	Stishov, Mikhail Sergeevich	Deputy National Project Director, Ministry of Natural Resources, Russia Website: www.mnr.gov.ru	Ministry of Natural Resources, 4/6 B. Gruzinskaya St. Moscow 123995, Russia ph. (7-095)125-56-88 e-mail: stishov@wrangel.msk.ru	Ministry restructuring and PA management
April 8	Emmanuelle Tremblay	Programme Coordinator, Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) http://www.cdi-cida.ru	200 Promenade du Portage Gatineau, Québec K1A 0G4 Canada Tel: (819) 997-0490	CIDA prgrammes coordination with the Project
April 8	John Yuill	Project Expert, Whyte Reynolds International, Inc., Canada Website: http://www.whytereynolds.com	302 - 3105 33rd Street Vernon, British Columbia V1T 9P7 Canada ph. (250) 545-4445, fax: (250) 545-6447 e-mail: wri@nocdc.bc.ca	Mirocredits and small business financing
April 8	Ivan Ménard	Consultant	335, Avenue Laurier	Alternative livelihoods

			Québec, G1R 2K8, Canada tel./fax (418) 523-4399 e-mail: ivan.menard@sympatico.ca	
April 9	Loginov, Mikhail Nikolaevich	Bystrinsky local administration Head	Esso	Media involvement (radio broadcast initiative)
April 9	Logunov, Boris Alekseevich	Bystrinsky local administration Deputy Head of Educational Board		
April 9	Guseva, Irina Nikolayevna	SMESF Director		
April 9		Handicraft school		
April 9	Mr. And Ms. Merlin	Ethnic Itelmen crafters		
April 9		Esso secondary school		
April 9	Solodikova, Taisiya Gavrilovna	Member, Working Group on interaction of indigenous people of Kamchatke with UNDP GEF Project, Esso, Bystrinsky District, Kamchatka		
April 9		SMESF loaners		
April 9		SMESF grantees		
April 9		Anavgai community		

April 9	Nataly Olofinskaya	Programme Assistant, Head of Environment Unit, UNDP Russian Country Office	Ostozhenka 28, 119034, Moscow, Russia, ph. (095) 787-21-02, e-mail: elena.armand@undp.org	Programme coordination
April 9	Slugin, Alexander	Director, Bystrinsky Ethnographic Museum	Naberezhnaya, 14A Esso, Kamchatka, 684350 Russia ph. (41542) 21319, 21103 e-mail : essomus@mail.iks.ru	Museum exposition tour
April 9	Konstantin V. Chumakov	Project media expert	Esso, Bystrinsky District, Kamchatka ph. (41542) 21-110 e-mail : nitai@mail.iks.ru	Publishing media and archive materials, electronic journal, public participation in publications
April 9	Goveiny, Boris Romanovich	Newspaper Editor, Novaya Zhizn (New Life) and 'Aidit' Bulletin	1 Tereshkovoi St., Esso, Bystrinsky District, Kamchatka 684350	Bystrinsky regional newspaper
April 10	Karmadonov, Yuri Germanovich	Project Manager, UNDP/GEF Project Administration	UNDP/GEF Project, Karl Marx Ave. 29/1, Room 400 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683031, Russia ph. 4152-90403, fax 4152-90824 e-mail: karmadonov@unkam.ru	Project management issues
April 10	Vance Martin	President, WILD Foundation, USA website: www.wild.org	The WILD Foundation, PO Box 1380 Ojai CA USA 93024 tel 805-640-0390, fax 805-640- 0230 e-mail: vance@wild.org	Training programmes and collaborative opportunities
April 10	Cyril Kormos	Vice President, WILD Foundation, USA website: www.wild.org	The WILD Foundation, PO Box 1380 Ojai CA USA 93024 tel 805-640-0390, fax 805-640- 0230 e-mail: cyril@wild.org ;	Indigenous people and legal issues of biodiversity conservation
April 11	Peter Bekkerov	President, Union of Itelmen Families	34 Lenina Street, apt. 60, Elizovo, 684010 Ph. 41531-232-5 bekkerov@elizovo.kamchatka.ru	Ethnic Minority Group aspirations, traditional lifestyle
April 11	Labkovskaya, Natalia Alekseevna	Head, Foreign Economic Relations & International Protocol Department, Kamchatka Region Administration	1 Lenin Square Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683040 Russia ph. 4152-112092, fax 4152-112355 e-mail: kra@svyaz.kamchatka.su	International meetings and collaboration involving ethnic minorities

April 11	Snytkina, Larisa Ilyinichna	Project Consultatnt, Assistant Professor, Department of Philology, Kamchatka State Technical University	30 Zvezdnaya, Apt. 151 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683038 Russia ph. 4152-279085 e-mail: larisa@mail.iks.ru	Project bilingual terminology
April 12	Moiseev, Robert Savelievich	Director, Kamchatka Branch of Pacific Geography Institute of Far Eastern Department RAS	Partizanskaya Str., 6, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683000, Russia ph. 4152-123457 fax 4152-112454 e-mail: tok@mail.iks.ru	Database development and scientific reserch
April 12	Abikh, Andrey Borisovich	Executive Director, Kamchatka League of Independent Experts (KLIE) (NGO) website: http://klie.ru	56 Partizanskaya Str., P.B. 273 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683000, Russia ph. 4152-120996, fax 4152-120747 e-mail: liga@klie.ru ;	KLIE funding, participation in publishing, training, assessments and other activities
April 12	Chernyagina, Olga Andreevna	President, Kamchatka League of Independent Experts (KLIE) (NGO) website: http://klie.ru	56 Partizanskaya Str., P.B. 273 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683000, Russia ph. 4152-120996, fax 4152-120747 e-mail: liga@klie.ru ;	Participation in legislative process related to protected ares and regional species biodiversity conservation
April 12	Kirichenko, Vadim Yevgenyevich	GIS Development Specialist, Kamchatka League of Independent Experts (KLIE) (NGO) website: http://klie.ru	56 Partizanskaya Str., P.B. 273 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683000, Russia ph. 4152-120996, fax 4152-120747 e-mail: liga@klie.ru ;	Demonstration of a digital map base in ArcGIS for protected areas
April 12	Stepanitsky, Vsevolod Borisovich	National Project Director, Ministry of Natural Resources, Russia, Website: www.mnr.gov.ru	Ministry of Natural Resources, 4/6 B. Gruzinskaya St. Moscow 123995, Russia ph. (7-095) 1255688 e-mail: zapchin@glasnet.ru	Protected areas issues
April 13	Menshikov, Vitaliy Ivanovich	Director, Kamchatka Nature Parks Directorate http://www.kamchatksalmon.ru	Karl Marx Ave. 29/1 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683031, Russia Ph. 4152-90723	Tourism assessments in the Parks
April 13	Tokranov, Alexei Mikhailovich	Deputy Director, Kamchatka Branch of Pacific Geography Institute of Far Eastern Department RAS	Partizanskaya Str., 6, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683000, Russia ph. 4152-123457 fax 4152-112454 e-mail: tok@mail.iks.ru	Research and technical potential of the Institute

April 13	Ledovskikh, Elena Yurievna	President, Ecotourism Development Fund "Dersu Uzala", UNDP ecotourism expert	Moscow, Russia ph. (7-095) 190 4655 (7077), fax (7-095) 490 5818, e-mail: dersu@ecotours.ru elenik@deol.ru ; http://www.ecotours.ru	Ecotourism development
April 13	MEETING	Council of Peoples Deputies	Administration Building 1 Lenin Square Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683040 Russia	New Protected Areas Discussed
April 14	Elchaparov, Vladimir Gennadyevich	Lawyer, UNDP/GEF Project Administration and Kamchatka League of Independent Experts (KLIE) (NGO) website: http://klie.ru	UNDP/GEF Project, Karl Marx Ave. 29/1, Room 400 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683031, Russia ph. 4152-90403, fax 4152-90824 e-mail: elchaparov@unkam.ru & 56 Partizanskaya Str., P.B. 273 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683000, Russia, ph. 4152-120996, fax 4152-120747 e-mail: liga@klie.ru ;	Legal issues
April 14	Bychkov, Sergey Aleksandrovich	Media Expert, UNDP/GEF Project Administration	UNDP/GEF Project, Karl Marx Ave. 29/1, Room 401 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683031, Russia ph. 4152-53291 fax 4152-90824 e-mail: bychkov@unkam.ru	Media activities and publications
April 14	Stukalov, Alexei Ivanovich	Leader, Working Group I (Strengthening PA management capacity), UNDP/GEF Project Administration	UNDP/GEF Project, Karl Marx Ave. 29/1, Room 400 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683031, Russia ph. 4152-90403, fax 4152-90824 e-mail: stukalov@unkam.ru	Project management
April 14	Zaporotskaya, N.N.	Working Group 2, UNDP/GEF Project Administration	UNDP/GEF Project, Karl Marx Ave. 29/1, Room 400 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683031, Russia ph. 4152-90403, fax 4152-90824	Ethnic communities
April 14	Tutushkina, Tamara Ivanovna	Distinguished Ecologist of Russia	Karl Marx Ave. 29/1, Room 200 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683031, Russia	Educational Programmes

April 14	Komarov, Valery Victorovich	Director, Kronotsky State Biosphere Reserve	684010 Kamchatskaya Oblast, Elizovo, Ryabikova St. 48 ph. 41531-21754 fax 716-52 zapoved@elrus.kamchatka.su	Zapovednik's lack of federal funding, ecotours
April 14	Komarov, Victor Valerievich	Director, Kronotsky State Biosphere Reserve	684010 Kamchatskaya Oblast, Elizovo, Ryabikova St. 48 E-mail: zapoved@elrus.kamchatka.su	Needs for inspectors and new ranger stations
April 14	Markulev, Aleksej Mikhailovich	Educator, Kronotsky State Biosphere Reserve	684010 Kamchatskaya Oblast, Elizovo, Ryabikova St. 48 E-mail: zapoved@elrus.kamchatka.su	Elementary education class
April 14	Kuznetsova, Galina Mikhailovna	Curriculum development Specialist, Kronotsky State Biosphere Reserve	684010 Kamchatskaya Oblast, Elizovo, Ryabikova St. 48 E-mail: zapoved@elrus.kamchatka.su	Curriculum, museum
April 14	Khimchenk, Olga Ivanovna	Librarian, Kronotsky State Biosphere Reserve	684010 Kamchatskaya Oblast, Elizovo, Ryabikova St. 48 E-mail: zapoved@elrus.kamchatka.su	Library
April 14	Gold, Natalia Victorovna	Scientist, Kronotsky State Biosphere Reserve	684010 Kamchatskaya Oblast, Elizovo, Ryabikova St. 48 E-mail: zapoved@elrus.kamchatka.su	'Chronicals of Nature' and computer technology
April 16	Karpachevsky, Mikhail Lvovich	Biodiversity Conservation Centre (BCC) forest@biodiversity.ru website: http://cci.glasnet.ru/bcc	41, Vavilova Str., (App. 2) 117312 Moscow, Russia Tel: 7 095 124 5022 Tel/Fax: 7 095 124 7178 E-mail: tilia@glasnet.ru ,	Biodiversity mapping
April 16	Victor Nikoforov	WWF-Russian Programmes Coordinator	P.O. Box 55, 125319 Moscow, Russia Tel.: +7 095 727 0939; Fax.: +7 095 727 0938; email: vnikiforov@wwf.ru	Educational activities in the Parks, collaboration with the project
May	Korenev, Radmir Radmirovich	Nalychevo Nature Park Director	Karl Marx Ave. 29/1 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 683031, Russia Ph. 4152-90723	Territory protection, inspector's rights
May	Mosolov, Vladimir Ilych	Director, Kronotsky State Biosphere Reserve	684010 Kamchatskaya Oblast, Elizovo, Ryabikova St. 48	Research and monitoring programme in Zapovednik

			ph. 41531-21754 fax 716-52 zapoved@elrus.kamchatka.su	

ANNEX 3: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

UNDP GEF RF Ministry of Natural Resources – Project Document RUS/01/G31/A/1G/99 ‘Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biological Diversity in Four Protected Areas of Russia’s Kamchatka Oblast. Phase 1.

UNDP Annual Project Report (APR) & UNDP/GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR) 2003.

Terms of Reference for the Phase 1 Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF Project “Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biological Diversity in Four Protected Areas of Russia’s Kamchatka Oblast.

UNDP Mission Report - Trip to Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky. 11-17 September 2002

First Quarterly Report for the UNDP/GEF Project RUS/02/008. April 2003

Third Quarterly Report for the UNDP/GEF Project RUS/02/008. October 2003

Fourth Quarterly Report for the UNDP/GEF Project RUS/02/008. December 2003

Minutes of the First Steering Committee Meeting – 13th September 2002. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky.

Minutes of the Second Steering Committee Meeting - 3rd April 2003. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky.

Minutes of the Third Steering Committee Meeting – 25th August 2003. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky.

Federal Law on Environmental Protection No. 7-FZ of January 10, 2002.

Review on the legal issues done by external consultants for IUCN Development of Ecotourism in Kamchatka Protected Areas (PA) Interim Report, Moraleva N.V., 2003.

Summary Management Plan of Nature Park ‘Bistrinsky’. Directorate of Kamchatka Parks. UNDP GEF Project ‘Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biological Diversity in Four Protected Areas of Russia’s Kamchatka Peninsula, Biodiversity Conservation Centre. 2003.

Summary Management Plan of Nature Park ‘Nalischevo’. Directorate of Kamchatka Parks. UNDP GEF Project ‘Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biological Diversity in Four Protected Areas of Russia’s Kamchatka Peninsula, Biodiversity Conservation Centre. 2003.

Summary Management Plan of State Nature Zakaznik ‘Yuzhno-Kamchatsky’. Kronotsky State Nature Biosphere Zapovednik. UNDP GEF Project ‘Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biological Diversity in Four Protected Areas of Russia’s Kamchatka Peninsula, Biodiversity Conservation Centre. 2003.

Summary Management Plan of Kronotsky State Nature Biosphere Zapovednik. Kronotsky State Nature Biosphere Zapovednik. UNDP GEF Project ‘Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biological Diversity in Four Protected Areas of Russia’s Kamchatka Peninsula, Biodiversity Conservation Centre. 2003.

Progress Report KamchatNIRO. 30 September 2003 (Russian). Intermediate Informational Report on survey conducted on “Evaluation of Water Pollution and Factors Threatening Biodiversity”. Investigators: B.B. Vronsky (KamchatNIRO), V. N. Leman (Salmon Reproduction Section, VNIRO), A.V. Ulatov, etc.

Final Report KamchatNIRO, Draft of May 2004. ‘Evaluation of Water Pollution and Factors Threatening Biodiversity’. A.V. Ulatov, et al., (Russian), 60 p.20 October 2003 (Biodiversity Conservation Centre) – for UNDP / GEF Project. Analytical report on creating management plans for four Protected Natural Areas of Kamchatka Oblast. Compiled by: Grigoryan, A.R. (project director), Buivolov, Yu. A, & Dobrushin, Yu. V.

Final Report - International Perspectives on Protected Areas Management Planning in Kamchatka, Russian Federation. Contract Report GEF 2002-317-01. For Working Group 1 “Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biological Diversity in Four Protected Areas of Russia’s Kamchatka Oblast”. UNDP/GEF and the Kamchatka Parks Directorate. By Stephan Fuller, International Mountains Consultancy. September 2003.

Final Report for Review - Options for Public Participation in the Management of Protected Areas in Kamchatka. Contract Report 2003-347-02 for Working Group 1 “Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biological Diversity in Four Protected Areas of Russia’s Kamchatka Oblast”. UNDP/GEF and the Kamchatka Parks Directorate. By Stephan Fuller, International Mountains Consultancy. December 2003.

UNDP/GEF Project ‘Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biological Diversity in Four Protected Areas of Russia’s Kamchatka Oblast’. Small and Medium Enterprise Support Fund (SMESF) Strategic Plan Discussion Paper by John Yuill.

Legal and Economic Bases for Raising Revenues from Activities in Four Protected Areas in the Kamchatka Oblast: Applicability of International Experience with Conservation Financing. Prepared for the UNDP/GEF Project ‘Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biological Diversity in Four Protected Areas in Russia’s Kamchatka Oblast, Phase I. FINAL REPORT. Prepared by Jennifer Braswell, Environmental Attorney – Advisor.

Biodiversity Database Final Report. Prepared by: Tesera Systems Inc. for: A.I. Stukalov, V.G. Elchaparov. UNDP, 29/1 Karl Marx Ave, office 401, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky. Report KBPIG RAN. 10 January, 2004. ‘Defining Key Data Gaps and Other Data Deficiencies’, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, Moiseev R.S. et al., 91 p.

Feasibility Study for the Establishment of a Kamchatka Protected Areas Conservation Trust Fund. By Barry Spergel, Consultant to UNDP/GEF Kamchatka Protected Areas Project UNDP/GEF RUS/01/G31. August 12, 2003.

Concept Paper, Draft : ‘Kamchatka Conservation Trust Fund’, Barry Spergel, April 22, 2004.

Paul Webster. 2003 ‘Russia’s zapovedniks are some of the world’s most pristine wildernesses. For 70 years they were protected ruthlessly by the Soviet system, but recently they have fallen prey to Putin, the World Bank and ecotourists’. http://www.theecologist.org/archive_article.html

Report: ‘Evaluation on status and activities of the Museum of Kronotsky Biosphere Reserve’ (in Russian), Madsen, M., 2003. 4p.

Report: 'Information technologies: bridge from 19th to 21st century. Activities on biodiversity conservation and cooperation of the UNDP GEF Project with mass media in Bystrinsky District, Esso'. Bychkov, S., (in Russian), 2003, 4p.

Report of the leader of the UNDP GEF Public Awareness Working Team, Bychkov, S., (in Russian), 7 April 2004, 5p.

Final report of the media expert on local communities awareness and media interaction in Bystrinsky District for the period 10 September 2003 – 10 March 2004. Chumakov, K. V. 2004, (in Russian), Bystrinsky District, Esso, 10 March 2004.

Draft of final report: 'Ecotourism Feasibility Study of Ecotourism in Kamchatka Protected Areas'. Moraleva N.V., (in Russian), April, 2004.

PA Training seminar document: 'Instructions for the Personnel of Specially Protected Natural Areas: Principles of Legislation for Protected Areas, State Natural Parks and Zapovedniks'. Kreidlin M.V., Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 2004, 45 pp.

Final Report: 'Evaluation of Legislative Standards for Biodiversity Conservation'. Bryuzgina O. L., Serdolik Legal Firm, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 2003, 59 pp.

Final Report: 'Establishing Legislative and Economic Foundations for Profit-Making Activities of the Specially Protected Natural Areas'. Dvortsova E. N. and V. I. Dvortsov, Far Eastern Branch of the All-Russian Academy of International Trade. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 2004, 49 pp.

Final Report: 'Evaluation of Existing Legislation from Biodiversity Conservation Perspective'. Oborskaya N. R., Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, June 2003, 55 pp.

Final Report: 'On Introducing Legislative Foundations to Prevent Illegal Activities'. Ponomareva E. E., Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, May 2003, 22 pp.

Review of the Implementation of Suggestions and Recommendations on the Improvement of PA Legislation. Elchparov V. G. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 2004.

II OTHER RELEVANT MATERIALS AND REFERENCE SOURCES

1. Publications on UNDP/GEF Project activities

Anon., *The Pearl of the Far East*. In: Kamchatka Segodnya (Kamchatka Today) (newspaper, 8000 copies), 14 (56), 12 April 2004. (in Russian).

Bocharov, M. The Kamchatka ecological initiative will exist. *Zapovednaya territoriya (Protected Territory)*, 3(8), March 2004, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky. (in Russian).

Chumakov, K. V. 2004. Cooperation in the ecosystem management. *Zapovednaya territoriya (Protected Territory)*, 3(8), March 2004, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky. (in Russian); interview with A.B. Smetanin.

Anon., 2004. Opening of the office of the Fund of the Support of Small and Medium Business “Sodruzhestvo” took place February 9, 2004 in Bystrinsky District. In: *Zapovednaya Territoriya (Protected Territory)*, 2(7) (in Russian).

Anon., 2004. Results of the competition of the Fund of the Support of Small and Medium Business). In: *Zapovednaya Territoriya (Protected Territory)*, 3(8) (in Russian).

Bocharov, M. 2004. Kamchatka ecological initiative will exist! In: *Zapovednaya Territoriya (Protected Territory)*, 3(8) (in Russian).

Chumakov, K. 2004. Advice from the Keepers of Beauty. In: *Zapovednaya Territoriya (Protected Territory)*, 1(6) (in Russian). (on creation of the Council on Co-Management of the Bystrinsky Nature park).

Chumakov, K. 2004. Cooperation in ecosystem management. In: *Zapovednaya Territoriya (Protected Territory)*, 2(7) (in Russian). (interview with A.B. Smetanin, acting main forester of Bystrinsky Leskhoz; on conservation measures related to the ore deposits Aginskoye and Shanuch in Bystrinsky District).

Markulev, A. 2003. Museum in the Kronotsky Reserve opens its doors. In: *Zapovednaya Territoriya (Protected Territory)*, 1(1) (in Russian).

Moiseev, R. 2004. Are the “Greens” the main enemies of the country’s development? In: *Zapovednaya Territoriya (Protected Territory)*, 2(7) (in Russian).

Ponomareva, E. 2003. On some issues of fighting the poaching in the specially protected natural areas. In: *Zapovednaya Territoriya (Protected Territory)*, 1(1) (in Russian).

Sharakhmatova, V. 2004. Traditional fisheries and possibilities in salmonid conservation by indigenous peoples of Kamchatka. In: *Zapovednaya Territoriya (Protected Territory)*, 3(8) (in Russian).

Solodikova, T. 2003. The [Bystrinsky] Park is the hope and concern of the indigenous people. In: *Zapovednaya Territoriya (Protected Territory)*, 1(1) (in Russian).

Stepanitsky, V. 2004. Protected Areas are our national wealth -- but the society is not aware of it. In: *Zapovednaya Territoriya (Protected Territory)*, 3(8) (in Russian).

Tokranov, A. 2004. The Red Book of Kamchatka. In: *Zapovednaya Territoriya (Protected Territory)*, 2(7) (in Russian).

2. Educational Materials

Markulyov, A.M. & Kuznetsova, G.M. 2004. *Spring Bird Day (Birds of Kronotsky Biosphere Reserve). Guide for schools, 1-4 grades*. Museum of Kronotsky Biosphere Reserve, Elizovo (in Russian).

Nalychevo Natural Park (videotape). WWF Trail at Nalychevo Natural Park. Heritage Series. (in Russian). Nature Parks Directorate.

Tokranov, A.M.. 2004. On “scaleless beast” and other dwellers of Kamchatka’s waters. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, KamchatNIRO, 151 pp. (in Russian). A popular account of marine fauna of Kamchatka’s coastal waters.

3. Relevant Biodiversity Publications and Species Reviews

Lobkov, Ye. 1999. *Kamchatka. Sites of World Natural Heritage*. Moscow, LOGATA, 152 pp. (in Russian).

The Priority Territories of the Russian Far East for Biodiversity Conservation. 1999. Vladivostok, Friends of the Earth & IUCN, 199 pp. (in Russian).

Restructuring of the NR Ministry, (in Russian), April 15, 2004
http://www.mnr.gov.ru/files/part/4853_prikaz_345.doc

Shestakov A.S. Russian Federal Law on Biodiversity Conservation and Use. Analytic Review. Moscow, Geos Publishing and WWF, (in Russian), 2001, 408 pp.

Newell, J. 2004. The Russian Far East. A Reference Guide for Conservation and Development. 2nd Ed. Daniel & Daniel, McKinleyville, California, USA. 463 pp.

Zykov V., Chernyagina O. A. Developing the System of Protected Areas.
www.biodiversity.ru.

Artyukhin, Yu. B. & Gerasimov, Yu. N. (eds.). 2003. *The Biology and Conservation of the Birds of* Vol. 5. Moscow, BCC Press, 122 pp. (in Russian).

Artyukhin, Yu. B. & Gerasimov, Yu. N. (eds.). 2002. *The Biology and Conservation of the Birds of Kamchatka*. Vol. 4. Moscow, BCC Press, 120 pp. (in Russian).

Maiss, A.A. et al. (eds.). 2004. *The Sea of Hope. The Status of bioresources in the Russian portion of the Bering Sea: conservation issues and the public role*. Vladivostok, MOBO DVORC ISAR, Russky Ostrov, 110 pp. (in Russian).

Balykin, P.A. et al. (eds). 2002. *Materials of III scientific conference. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, November 27-28, 2002. KBPIG RAN; KLIE; KamchatNIRO, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 310 pp.*, (in Russian) Balykin, P.A. et al. (eds). 2003. *Conservation of biodiversity of Kamchatka and coastal waters). Proceedings of III scientific conference. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, November 27-28, 2002. KBPIG RAN; KLIE; KamchatNIRO, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 140 pp.* Selected proceedings (in Russian).

Moiseev, R. S. & Tokranov, A. M. 2000. *Catalog of Vertebrates of Kamchatka and Adjacent Waters*. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, Kamchatskiy Pechatnyi Dvor, 166 pp. (in Russian).

Scientific research in zapovedniks and national parks. Proceedings of the conference, Pushchino-na-Oke, 18-26 December 1999. WWF, Moscow, 1999 (in Russian).

Tokranov, A. The ode to dwarf pine. *Zapovednaya territoriya (Protected Territory)*, 3(8), March 2004, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky. (in Russian).

Viktorova, A. U. The nature of Kamchatka now has more protectors. *Zapovednaya territoriya (Protected Territory)*, 3(8), March 2004, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky. (in Russian).

Lobkov, Ye. G. (ed.). 2002. Animal and Plant Life of the Valley of Geysers. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, Kamchatsky Pechatny Dvor, 303 pp. (in Russian).

Maksimenkov, V.V. et al. (eds.). 2003. Conservation of Biodiversity of Kamchatka and coastal waters. Materials of IV Scientific Conference, November 18-19, 2003. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 319 pp. (in Russian).

Balykin, P.A. et al. (eds.). 2002. Conservation of Biodiversity of Kamchatka and coastal waters. Materials of IV Scientific Conference, November 27-28, 2002. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, 307 pp. (in Russian).

Neshatayeva, V.V. (ed.). 2002. Flora and vegetation of the Southern Kamchatka. Proceedings of the Kamchatka Institute of Ecology and Nature Management. Vol.2, pp. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, Kamchatsky Pechatny Dvor, 339 pp. (in Russian).

Proceedings of the Kamchatka Institute of Ecology and Nature Management. Vol.1, 2000, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, Kamchatsky Pechatny Dvor, 339 pp. (in Russian).

Proceedings of the Kamchatka Branch of the Pacific Institute of Geography. Vol. 4, 2003, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, Kamchatsky Pechatny Dvor, 325 pp. (in Russian).

Puzachenko, Yu. G. & Merzliakova, I. A. 2002. International cooperation in the area of biodiversity conservation and the issues of data harmonization. Moscow, Strakhovie Revyu, 67 pp. (in Russian).

Tokranov, A.M. (ed.). 1997. Publications of the Kamchatka Institute of Ecology and Nature Management 1987-1996 (bibliography). Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, Kamchatsky Pechatny Dvor, 103 pp. (in Russian).

Tokranov, A.M. (ed.). 2001. Publications of the Kamchatka Institute of Ecology and Nature Management 1997-2000 (bibliography, No. 2). Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, Kamchatsky Pechatny Dvor, 78 pp. (in Russian).

ANNEX 4: QUESTIONNAIRE USED AS GUIDELINE FOR INTERVIEWS

GEF TERMINAL EVALUATION – KAMCHATKA PROTECTED AREAS PHASE ONE

A. OVERALL OBJECTIVE

Demonstrating replicable, sustainable approaches to biodiversity conservation in four existing representative protected areas.

Has the Project achieved its primary aims under the first Phase to:

1. Strengthen the protected areas' administrative and management capacity?
2. Enable the development of a more rational and supportive PA legal foundation?
3. Increase stakeholder biodiversity conservation awareness, commitment and participation in PA management?
4. Enable biodiversity conservation promoting alternative livelihood pursuits for local communities?
5. Increase efficiencies by improving collaboration between federally and regionally administered protected areas and among responsible authorities?
6. Leverage co-funding support to ensure the attainment and sustainability of project results?

B. THREATS AND ROOT CAUSES

1. Has the project addressing all the primary Threats and Root Causes?
2. What happened to the threats identified by Gold Mining and Oil and Gas prospecting?

C. OUTPUT AND ACTIVITY – (INDICATORS FROM LOGFRAME)

Output 1: Strengthening Protected Areas Management

Management Plans prepared/approved for each Protected Area
Annual Operational Plans prepared and on record
Staff requirements identified and additional (GEF) staff hired
PA Directorates established for Nature Parks
Essential equipment and supplies procured and infrastructure established
Tourism feasibility study completed and tourism development opportunities assessed
Recreational carrying capacity of each PA determined

Output 2: Improved Biodiversity Information and its Management

Existing biodiversity information for each PA is collated and standardized
Meta-database is produced
Data needs are defined
Required key biodiversity assessments are defined
Traditional environmental knowledge appraised and means of integration into decision-making defined

Output 3: Sustainable Financing Mechanisms

25% additional staff salaries absorbed by KOA and NRC
User fees established and implemented

KPACF designed and operational with 1st stage of co-funding secured

Output 4: Strengthened Legal, Regulatory and Policy Base

Biodiversity Policy Analysis completed and report available on file
Inadequacies and weaknesses in legislation and regulations identified and on file

Output 5: Heightened Biodiversity Awareness and Advocacy

Public Awareness communications strategy developed
Awareness Programme developed
Awareness Materials prepared and disseminated

Output 6: Alternative Livelihoods and Community-Based Conservation

Ecotourism feasibility assessed and defined through study
NTFP harvest limits established for Protected Areas
NTFP Management Plans prepared
SME financing facility and Community Small Grants Programme developed
Traditional economic pursuits identified and defined
Economic feasibility of traditional pursuits appraised

D. GLOBAL AND NATIONAL BENEFITS

D.1. Operational Programme 4 – Mountain Ecosystems

Statement of OP 4 Objectives

1. Does the project address the aims and objectives of OP4 both in its design and in its implementation?

D.2. Conventions (Biodiversity)

Statements from Convention

1. Does the project address the requirements of the Biodiversity Convention?

D.3. National Priorities

1. Were the national priorities and their linkage to GEF's global aims clearly defined in the Project Document?
2. Is the project addressing the national priorities?

E. PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

1. Has the Executing Agency fulfilled its responsibilities effectively as per the ToR?
2. Has the Implementing Agency fulfilled its role as required?
3. Has the PIU functioned effectively in its management role?
4. Have the channels of communication between the PIU, the EA and the IA worked effectively and has response to requests for assistance etc been forthcoming and timely?
5. Has the Project Management networked effectively with other project stakeholders?

6. Are there any improvements which could be made to Project Management and Implementation for Phase 2?

F. WORKPLAN AND BUDGET

1. Has the project followed the workplan (taking into account any amendments made by the Steering Committee)?
2. Was the Workplan realistic in terms of delivery and timing?
3. Has the budget proved to be an accurate assessment of the project's financial needs?
4. Have there been any problems in disbursement?
5. Based on experiences from Phase 1 of this project are there any recommendations regarding workplan delivery and budget disbursement which would improve efficiency for Phase 2?

G. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

1. Were adequate monitoring and Evaluation procedures (Indicators, criteria for measuring performance, results, impacts, etc) built into the project design?
2. What standard UNDP M&E procedures were followed (Quarterly and Annual reports, site visits, representation at SteerCom?). (See P. 108 and discuss with Project Manager and UNDP)
3. Have these M&E procedures been followed and implemented?(reporting, PIR, Tripartite Review, MTE?)
4. Have any concerns or recommendations arising for the M&E process been acted on to improve project performance?
5. Have all stakeholders been transparently engaged in the M&E process (Steering Committee, PIR, MTE?) during project implementation?
6. How can M&E be improved for the next phase of the project?

H. STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

1. Were appropriate stakeholders involved in the Project Development?
2. Were adequate provisions/arrangements made within the original Project Document to allow for comprehensive and fair stakeholder involvement and input to the project?
3. Has stakeholder input and involvement been adequate? If not, why not?
4. Were any principal stakeholders not included in this process and how would this have affected the project's delivery and long-term success?
5. Have relevant stakeholders (e.g. NGOs, community groups, other Government Departments, etc) been involved directly in executing specific activities?
6. How can stakeholder participation be improved in the next phase of the project?

I. CAPACITY BUILDING

1. Did the Project Document accurately identify the required capacity building and institutional strengthening?
2. What institutional strengthening has been achieved/will be achieved?
3. What training has been/will be achieved?
4. Has the project provided any equipment and has this been used effectively?
5. Has any of the capacity building and institutional strengthening focused on NGOs or community groups? If yes, how effective has this been?
6. Has the project now identified additional capacity building and institutional strengthening which will be necessary for the second phase?

J. POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE REFORMS/IMPROVEMENTS

1. Were any policy reforms or legislative amendments identified as project requirements? If not, should they have been and has this affected project performance?
2. If policy reforms and legislative amendments were identified as project requirements, how effective has the project been (reference to workplan and logframe) at delivering these reforms and amendments?
3. Has the project now identified new reforms and amendments which will be necessary for the second phase?

K. REPLICABILITY

1. How replicable within Kamchatka and Russia are the lessons and practices developed through this project so far?
2. How replicable would they be in other Protected Areas projects throughout the world?

L. SUSTAINABILITY

1. Are the activities undertaken so far and their outcomes and deliverables sustainable in the long-term? Do Park User Fees and other sources of Revenue represent sufficient income to maintain an effective management structure?
2. Are the overall objectives of the project [STATE THEM] likely to be sustainable beyond the project lifetime and for the foreseeable future?
3. What would need to be done to improve the chances of such sustainability?

M. OVERALL IMPACT OF PROJECT

List positive and negative impacts and identify quality of results

1. Natural/Environment. What improvements or harm has the project had on the natural environment both within the 4 protected areas and outside?
2. Political: Has the project affected political thinking and policy. Is it seen as a good or a bad thing by local politicians?
3. Economic: Has the project had a positive or negative economic effect either within or outside of the project areas?
4. Social: Has the project created improvements or problems within associated or affected communities?

N. FEASIBLE IMPROVEMENTS TO PHASE ONE

1. Overall, what improvements could have been made to the Phase One project?

O. CREDIBILITY AND AIMS OF PHASE TWO

1. Based on achievements and lessons learned from Phase One, what should be the Aims and Objectives of Phase Two? (i.e. What are the next set of Priorities to address in relation to developing and/or maintaining the effectiveness and sustainability of both the existing Protected Areas and the need for further PAs within Kamchatka Oblast?)
2. Can these be realistically achieved based on what has been done in Phase One?

P. GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. Are the aims of the Protected Areas, and the development of tourism within those areas contradictory objectives?

2. How do the Communities view the presence and designation of Protected Areas (i.e. do they ignore the purpose of those PAs and concentrate on a day-to-day approach to their livelihood, or are they actively involved in their management?)
3. Has the presence of the PAs and the capacity building by the GEF project done anything to remove the threat from poaching, natural resource exploitation and increased human presence as a result of tourism?
4. Has the project provided for, or encouraged, any increase in the efficiency and presence of enforcement within the PAs?
5. Has the Project achieved any measure of success in integrating and coordinating the administration and management of the Federal Protected Areas (Kronotsky State Biosphere Reserve and South Kamchatka State Sanctuary) and the two Nature Parks (Bystrinsky and Nalychevo)?
6. Has the Project been effective at all in improving the information base within the PAs on which management and policy decisions, and legislative improvements can be based?
7. Has the Project been effective in raising public/stakeholder awareness regarding Park issues and concerns?
8. Has the Project assisted at all in developing Management Plans for any of the Parks?
9. Do the Project Objectives and Activities truly address the Threats and Root Causes within the Parks?

Q. ANY OTHER COMMENTS OR CONCERNS REGARDING EITHER THE EXISTING PROJECT OR A NEXT PHASE WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED IN PREVIOUS QUESTIONS?

LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS TO CONSULT

PROJECT

STEERING COMMITTEE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WORKING GROUPS

INTERNATIONAL

UNDP
CIDA
UNESCO
WCS
IUCN
WWF

NATIONAL/LOCAL

MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES
KAMCHATKA OBLAST ADMINISTRATION
KAMCHATNIRO
KAMCHATKA INSTITUTE OF ECOLOGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES
KAMCHATKA NATURE PARKS DIRECTORATE
KAMCHATKA STATE COMMITTEE FOR NATURE PROTECTION
NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE (Kamchatka and Koryaksky Autonomous Okrug)

Project Management for Salmonid Project
Local Communities within or associated with the Protected Areas System
Local Municipalities

