



# United Nations Environment Programme

برنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة • 联合国环境规划署

PROGRAMME DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT • PROGRAMA DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA EL MEDIO AMBIENTE

ПРОГРАММА ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ ПО ОКРУЖАЮЩЕЙ СРЕДЕ

---

## Mid-Term Evaluation of the UNEP/GEF project 'Strengthening the Network of Training Centers for Protected Area Management Through Demonstration of a Tested Approach'

(GF/3010-05-04)

Paul Grigoriev

Evaluation and Oversight Unit  
June 2007

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>A. Introduction and Background</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>B. Background</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>C. Scope, Objective, Methods and Constraints of the</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Scope</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Objectives</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Methods</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Project Review Criteria</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Evaluation Constraints</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>D. Project Performance and Impact</b> .....	<b>10</b>
(i) <b>Attainment of objectives and planned results</b> .....	<b>10</b>
(ii) <b>Achievement of outputs and activities</b> .....	<b>12</b>
(iii) <b>Cost effectiveness</b> .....	<b>13</b>
(iv) <b>Financial planning and control</b> .....	<b>14</b>
(v) <b>Impact</b> .....	<b>14</b>
(vi) <b>Sustainability</b> .....	<b>14</b>
(vii) <b>Stakeholder participation / public awareness</b> .....	<b>15</b>
(viii) <b>Country ownership /driveness</b> .....	<b>15</b>
(ix) <b>Implementation approach</b> .....	<b>15</b>
(x) <b>Replicability</b> .....	<b>16</b>
(xi) <b>Monitoring and evaluation systems</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>E. Conclusions and Rating</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>F. Recommendations</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>G. Lessons Learned</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>Annex 1: Overall Ratings Table</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Annex 2: Risk Factor Table</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Annex 3: Project Achievements During 2005 – 2006</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>Annex 4: MTR Terms of Reference</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>Annex 5 : SP 1 Tracking Tool Sheets for Ten Protected Areas</b> .....	<b>62</b>

## **Executive Summary**

### **General**

The collapse of the Soviet Union has resulted in socio-economic conditions that led to negative repercussions on biodiversity and protected areas. In short, PAs and their biodiversity have come under increasing stresses and threats. This was accompanied by the severe weakening of PA management capacity through the erosion of skills among PA managers and staff..

This three-year medium-sized project is intended to address one element of this problem directly through the establishment of permanent and sustainable PA management training centers and programmes in four countries: Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus. It also promotes the strengthening and broadening of political and local support for PAs among decision makers and other stakeholders. It is being executed through the EcoCenter “Zapovedniks” based in Moscow, in conjunction with project implementation units in each of the other three countries.

### **Key Findings**

This project is very timely and important in the four countries where it is being implemented. It has also made very good progress in the implementation of its planned activities. Consequently, it is also making good progress towards achieving its objectives and should continue to be supported by GEF. Nevertheless, the project is constrained by several factors, the primary one being its lack of a clear single focus. The current project framework represents a mélange of initiatives, that while being very important in their own way, appear to have been grafted over the course of the project’s development phase onto the main project objectives, those being to improve the management capacity of PA staff through the establishment of training centers, programmes and the delivery of training, and the heightening of political support for PAs. This is a major constraint. Another very significant constraint, not only to the project and its management, but also to the undertaking of this mid-term review, is the confusion stemming from the lack of clarity concerning the project objectives, logical framework, indicators, and thus the absence of a proper framework for monitoring and evaluating the impact of the project *vis a vis* its expected objectives and outcomes. This is a problem that has plagued the project from the outset and while corrective actions have been undertaken, it remains a constraint as well as a concern moving forward unless it is conclusively and effectively addressed.

### **Recommendations**

It is strongly recommended that the project become more realistic in terms of its expectations, considering that it is a medium-sized project. The expectations of the project are too broad and optimistic for a medium-sized project, particularly so since it is being implemented in four countries. Consequently, it should be refocused strictly onto its original primary objectives, those being strengthening the management capacity of PA managers and staff through exposing them to training in best practices of PA management, and strengthening political and local support for PAs. Certain elements of the current project, such as expanding PA systems, the institution of payments for environmental services, and in particular, the establishment of environmental Trust Funds in all four countries, are really dubious in the context of this project and thus should be reconsidered. They simply are not realistic or achievable in the current context of the countries and in the framework of this medium-sized project. The advice is that they should be dropped

from the project. Likewise, there is an urgent need to revisit the logical framework for the project, to establish consistent, meaningful and measurable indicators in the process, and to prepare a comprehensive M&E plan with appropriate levels of funding and instituted procedures to implement it.

## **Acknowledgements**

The evaluator would like to thank Charlotte Stanton and Michael Spilsbury of UNEP in Nairobi for their patience and insightful and very useful comments and suggestions, Natalia Danilina and Svetlana Kopylova of the EcoCenter Zapovedniks in Moscow for the same and for organizing the review and providing much valuable information, and also all of the project staff met in Russia, Kazakhstan and Ukraine in the course of the review. Gratitude is extended to all those who looked after the logistics and to all participants in the discussions who freely gave of their time to provide valuable information. The contributions of all of the above have been invaluable and are greatly appreciated.

## **A. Introduction and Background**

### **Project Identifiers**

<b>Project Number:</b>	GF 3010-05- 04
<b>Project Name:</b>	Strengthening the Network of Training Centers for Protected Area Management Through Demonstration of a Tested Approach
<b>Duration:</b>	3 years
<b>Implementing Agency:</b>	UNEP
<b>Executing Agency:</b>	Zapovedniks Environmental Education Center
<b>Participating Countries:</b>	Russian Federation, Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan
<b>Eligibility:</b>	All countries participating in this project have ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity: Belarus - 9 Sept. 93; Kazakhstan – 6 Sept. 94; Ukraine - 7 Feb. 95; Russian Federation – 5 Apr. 95.
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Biodiversity
<b>GEF Operational Program:</b>	OP 1,2,3,4
<b>GEF Strategic Priority:</b>	1 – Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems
<b>Project Costs (\$US):</b>	
<b>GEF Total Project:</b>	975,000
<b>Co-financing:</b>	
Governments:	940,500
NGOs:	427,500
<b>PDF</b>	
GEF PDF A:	25,000

**Full Project Cost:**

**2,368,000**

**B. Background**

Biodiversity and protected areas in Northern Eurasian countries are confronted by numerous pressures and problems. These include intensive natural resource use, large-scale clearing of forest, mining, industrial pollution, poaching, lack of political and public support, lack of adequate skills to manage protected areas (PAs) and lack of understanding of the importance of PAs. These pressures have been exacerbated by harsh socio-economic conditions, particularly in rural areas, following the collapse of the Soviet Union. Communities living in or near PAs have been forced to rely more heavily on natural resources for survival, and to use these resources more intensely, and often irresponsibly, frequently because alternative resources do not exist. In these conditions, it is difficult for elected politicians to impose restrictions on resource use in PAs. Furthermore, the economic situation has caused a once well-run system for educating and informing the public of the values of PAs to suffer from a lack of resources. This has also affected the training of staff for the region's network of protected areas. Managers and rangers often do not possess the necessary knowledge and skills to effectively manage PAs and undertake biodiversity conservation efforts. Additionally, previous communication links among PAs of different countries were destroyed. There are insufficient opportunities to share lessons and experience from best practices in PA management.

The region's new political and economic conditions also create points of friction between local populations and PAs. It is, therefore, important for elected authorities and representatives of institutions involved in natural resources use to understand the role of PAs in protecting biodiversity and their potential for economic development or the improvement of livelihoods. Currently, these people are not aware of the importance of PAs in biodiversity conservation, sustaining livelihoods or even for economic development.

Nevertheless, Northern Eurasia's PA network continues to play a vital role in the conservation of biodiversity. For example, the PA network of these countries provides protection for a large number of rare species, such as tigers, snow leopard, and aurochs. It also preserves remaining tracts of virgin forest, rare steppe ecosystems, and mountainous areas, such as the Tien Shian, the Caucasus, and Altai Ranges, which are particularly important biodiversity centers.

Given the foregoing, the project's stated primary Goal in the Project Document is 'to improve biodiversity conservation and rural livelihoods through better management of protected areas in Northern Eurasia. The project will do so by (1) seeking stronger political support for PAs in the region (awareness-raising, strengthening of the legal PA framework...) and (2) improve PA management through the use of modern management tools, including economic and financial tools benefiting both the environment and poor local communities living in or around PAs.'

The project's stated Objectives in the Project Document, are to:

1. Improve the management skills of PA managers and staff, especially in the field of PA management plan preparation, the use of economic tools such as economic valuation of ecosystem services, payment for ecosystem services and in the field of conservation finance mechanisms.
2. Seek stronger political support for PAs in the region through better awareness of the importance of PAs for both local communities and political decision makers.

These Objectives are to be achieved through the following Outcomes:

- § PA managers and staff much better trained to improve PA sustainability;
- § Public authorities who are aware of the importance of PES schemes;
- § One PA will have or be close to having an environmental fund established to improve its long-term financial management;
- § A stronger and more efficient support from local and national authorities for PAs;
- § A better understanding amongst local communities and authorities of the importance of biodiversity conservation and PAs;
- § PA managers and local authorities who are informed on existing economic practices of PAs.

The project is comprised of nineteen Activities (subsequently expanded to 28 and later to 30):

1. Establishment of an Advisory Group at the start of the project. The Advisory Group is comprised of representatives from the EcoCenter “Zapovedniks”, UNEP, the CBD Secretariat, the GEF Secretariat and one expert from each participating country.
2. Meetings of the working group (two per year).
3. Identification and assessment of existing PA related initiatives. Accumulation and assessment of world and Russian best practices in training PA managers.
4. Development of the packages of training programs and methodological materials, and their dissemination.
5. Forming and training teams of trainers in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan. Establishing and equipping Training Centers (TCs) for PA managers in the 4 countries.
6. Development of business/operational plans for TCs to ensure their financial sustainability.
7. Creation of a Strategy for improving management effectiveness of PAs through staff training and teaching of representatives of other sectors.
8. Regular training sessions for PA managers in each of the four TCs, including seminars on methods of training of local authorities.
9. Preparation of the Best Practice book “PA staff trainings in Northern Eurasia”
10. Analyzing foreign experience on implementing PES schemes. Discussion at the Working Group meeting. Preparation and dissemination of the Recommendations on PES.
11. Training sessions, workshops, briefings for local authorities in PAs. Organization of study-visits of local authorities to the nearest PA.
12. Presentations of the training programs to government agencies responsible for PAs.
13. Development of projects on PR campaigns with local communities by trained PA managers. Preparation and implementation of PR-campaigns with local communities in PA involved in the training program.
14. Preparation and dissemination to PAs of methodological materials on PR and interaction between PAs and local communities, of the lessons learned from the implemented projects.
15. Development and implementation of the pilot projects on participatory management in PAs. PR-activities related to these projects.
16. Selection of model PA for establishing an environmental fund (EF). Development of EF Concept, definition of mission, objectives, strategic priorities.
17. Meetings, negotiations, briefings with EF potential donors and governmental authorities.
18. Incorporation of the EF.
19. Accumulation and analysis of the existing economic/financial incentives for good practices in Northern Eurasian PAs. Preparation and dissemination of brochures/booklets on “Economic/financial incentives for good practices in Northern Eurasia PAs”.

The project duration is 36 months from June 2005 to June 2008. The project was approved in June 2005 and implementation commenced in July 2005.

The total project budget is US\$ 2,368,000 with US\$ 975,000 being funded by the GEF Trust Fund, with US\$ 940,500 in co-funding from Governments (cash and in-kind), and US\$ 427,500 from NGOs. GEF's contribution to the PDF-A was US\$ 25,000.

## **C. Scope, Objective, Methods and Constraints of the Review**

### **Scope**

The scope of the review was guided by the "Global Environment Facility Guidelines for Implementing Agencies to Conduct Terminal Evaluations, May 2003". Thus, this mid-term review is intended to provide valuable information half way through the project's implementation in order to improve its effectiveness and impact, and also a base for the project's terminal evaluation.

### **Objective**

The objective of this mid-term review (MTR) was to assess operational aspects, such as project management and the implementation of activities, and also the extent of progress made to date towards the realization of the project's stated objectives. The review was to assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results, as well as to identify any corrective actions needed for the project to achieve maximum impact. The review's findings are to feed back into project management processes through specific actionable recommendations and 'lessons learned' to date.

More specifically, the review was to:

- assess the relevance of the project's design *vis-à-vis* the practical conditions encountered during project execution;
- assess the appropriateness of the execution means *vis-à-vis* the project objectives;
- assess the quality and relevance of project outputs to date;
- explore the significance of any outcomes and impacts to date and the likelihood of achieving future impact with respect to the project's stated objectives; and,
- review the project monitoring tools, and specifically whether these are appropriate and are being used appropriately for project monitoring purposes.

### **Methods**

The findings of the review are based on the following:

1. A review of documents including:
  - (a) Prepared project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNEP and GEF annual Project Implementation Review reports) and relevant correspondence.
  - (b) Review all knowledge products including the project website and provided reports produced with GEF financial support.
  - (c) Notes and minutes from the Steering Committee, Advisory Group, and all other meetings funded with GEF support.
2. Consultation with project staff and key stakeholder groups, political leaders targeted for awareness raising, protected area managers targeted for capacity building, and local communities and business targeted for awareness raising.

3. Interviews with project management (such as National Coordinators, representatives of the Executing Agency).

### **Project Review Criteria**

The success of the project's implementation to date was to be reviewed, assessed and rated with respect to the eleven criteria below. The review parameters are summarized below while a more detailed explanation of the criteria is to be found in the MTR Terms of Reference provided in Annex 4.

1. Attainment of objectives and planned results
  - Effectiveness: progress to date towards achieving the stated project objectives (by activities).
  - Efficiency: Assessment of outcomes achieved in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times.
2. Achievement of outputs and activities
  - Proposed and designed training programmes and any possible improvements for their implementation.
  - Extent to which scientific and technical information and knowledge have been incorporated within, and have influenced the execution of project activities.
3. Cost-effectiveness
  - Cost-effectiveness of the project activities funded by GEF and whether these activities are likely to achieve the goals and objectives within the planned time and budget.
  - Contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project has leveraged additional resources.
4. Financial Planning and Control
  - Strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning.
  - Co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing (in co-operation with the IA and EA).
  - Due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
5. Impact
  - Immediate impact of the project.
  - Potential longer-term impacts of the project's interventions.
6. Sustainability
  - Financial. To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project outcomes/benefits once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market trends that support the project's objectives)?
  - Socio-political.
  - Institutional framework and governance.
  - Ecological (if applicable).



7. Stakeholder participation / public awareness

- Identification and engagement of stakeholders.
- Degree and effectiveness of collaboration/interactions between the various project partners.
- Degree and effectiveness of public awareness activities and publications.

8. Country ownership / drivenness

- Country ownership and level of commitment.

9. Implementation approach

- Adherence to project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document and effectiveness of any required adaptations.
- Supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP/DGEF.
- Administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints in implementation.
- Use of the logical framework as a management tool and M&E for adaptive management.
- Risk assessment.

10. Replicability

- Replication potential and any initiatives undertaken in that regard.

11. Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

- M&E design.
- M&E plan implementation.
- Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.
- GEF Biodiversity Tracking Tool usage.

**Evaluation Constraints**

One constraint pertains to the time allocated for conducting the review in the field, which was twelve days. Since four countries are participating in the project and considerable distances are involved, not much time could be spent in each country. At the beginning of the review it was decided, in consultation with project management, that it would be feasible to visit only three of the countries and Belarus was not visited by the evaluator. Nevertheless, information on the project's progress in Belarus was derived from printed documents and conversations with knowledgeable people, including the Project Manager and Project Director.

Perhaps the most significant constraint faced, however, was the absence of a single consistent project logical framework that could actually be used as intended, that being the base for the assessment of progress in the realization of project objectives and outcomes, or in other words, the project's actual impact to date. This point is underlined by the fact that the project objectives, outcomes, outputs, activities and indicators for monitoring and evaluation have appeared in four document sources over the course of the project's conceptualization and implementation to date (original project document set, PIR set, Project Steering Committee May 2006 set, Annex 5 of

mid-term review TOR set). This created a very confusing base for undertaking the assessment of progress and resulted in considerable time having to be devoted to sorting out this confusing situation. However, this also represents the recognition of deficiencies in earlier logframes and an attempt to make improvements. Indeed, the Project Performance Rubric logframe included in an Annex in the MTR's Terms of Reference is consistent with the revised project logframe from May 2006 at least as far as project Objectives are concerned. Project Outcomes still differ though. While it would have been appropriate to use the indicators provided in the Project Performance Rubric (since the revised logframe refers to the M&E framework for tracking tools and targets), this proved to be impossible since the indicators provided are end of project targets, and also since the number of outcomes is different in these two sources.

## **D. Project Performance and Impact**

### **(i) Attainment of objectives and planned results**

The monitoring of the project, not to mention its evaluation, is greatly complicated by the fact that over time 4 sets of objectives, outcomes, outputs and indicators for monitoring and evaluation have been produced (project document set, revised logframe from May 2006, PIR set, Annex 5 of MTR TOR set). The initial and the revised logframes are also of no great utility for either project monitoring or evaluation because of weakness in the indicators. Considerable time was spent on discussing the logframe and on working to improve it so that it can be better used for its intended purpose.

The assessment of progress towards achieving the project Objectives and Outcomes is first of all premised on the existence of consistent and clearly defined Objectives and Outcomes. Regrettably, this is not the case and this complicates the assessment and undoubtedly the project's implementation as well since the focus is not as clear as it should be, and may be shifting over time. While this is a reflection of efforts to improve the project, it does not assist in the project's evaluation. For example, in the Project Document, the Objectives are: 1) Improve the management skills of PA managers and staff (especially in management planning and use of economic tools and conservation finance mechanisms) and 2) Seek stronger political support for PAs in the region through better awareness of the importance of PAs for local communities and political decision makers. In the revised project log frame of May 2006, the Objectives are: 1) Improve PA management in four countries and 2) Seek stronger political support for PAs in the region. In the Project Performance Rubric (Annex 5 of the MTR TOR), the Objectives are: 1) Seek stronger political support for PAs in the region through better awareness of the importance of PAs and a better legal framework for their protection and 2) Improve management of PAs through the use of conservation finance and economic tools benefiting both the environment and poor local communities. In the PIR document, the Objectives are identical to the ones in the revised project logframe from May 2006.

The inconsistencies are even more apparent in the expected Outcomes. In the Project Document, the Outcomes are: 1) PA managers and staff are much better trained to improve PA sustainability; 2) Public authorities are aware of the importance of PES schemes; 3) One PA will have or be close to having an environment fund established to improve long term financial management; and 4) Stronger and more efficient support from local and national authorities for PAs. In the 2006 PIR the Outcomes are: 1) PAs demonstrating increased management efficiency; and 2) PAs benefiting from stronger support from local, regional and national authorities. These two objectives are consistent with the ones in the revised project logframe from May 2006. In the Project Performance Rubric (Annex 5 of the MTR TOR), the Outcomes are: 1) Stronger and more

efficient political support from local authorities for PA; 2) Better understanding amongst local communities and authorities of the importance of and support for PA; 3) Existing more supportive legal framework for PA leading to a more secure future; 4) Local communities, NGOs, PA managers, PA staff and local authorities much better prepared to improve financial sustainability of PA and implementing the newly acquired skills with broad support; 5) Authorities and communities are implementing a PES scheme in each region and benefiting both users and providers of services. Public authorities are aware of the importance and feasibility of this mechanism; and 6) One PA will have (or be close to having) an environment fund to improve its long-term financial management.

It follows, therefore, that on account of the inconsistencies among the objectives and expected outcomes, there is also a lack of consistency in the indicators that are to be used for assessing progress. The “achievement” indicators provided in the log frame of the project document were to be used together with any additional monitoring tools including the GEF Biodiversity Tracking Tools<sup>1</sup>. However, the indicators presented in the project document are essentially process indicators rather than impact indicators. For example, financial and activity progress reports are not indicators of the effectiveness of a project in realizing its objectives and outcomes but rather just means of verification of budgetary expenditures and the undertaking of activities.

It is recognized by the project management team that the original logframe found in the project document is not really a logframe. It is also acknowledged that further revisions represent attempts to improve the situation. However, it is the evaluator’s opinion that the latest version of the logframe is still deficient if it is to be used as the basis for project M&E. A new logframe must be developed as soon as possible. It should clearly articulate the following: the project goal; the project objectives; the expected project outcomes; for each outcome the required outputs and for each output a set of necessary activities. Two – three SMART impact indicators (as opposed to process indicators) need to be agreed upon for each outcome. For each outcome, the baseline should be established (or backcasted in this case to the start of the project), mid-point targets defined, end of project targets defined, sources of verification established, means of verification defined, and assumptions and risks articulated. While some of this work has been attempted, it still needs to be completed and agreed upon and forwarded to the entire project team, along with clear instructions on how the indicators will be monitored and reported upon.

The SP 1 Tracking Tool is also not appropriate for tracking the impact of such a project since the project is not directly focused on increasing management effectiveness in one or two individual protected areas but on establishing mechanisms to increase capacity to do so in PA systems in four countries over a longer time than the lifespan of the project. The Tracking Tool has five out of thirty questions of relevance to this project (#14 – staff training; #20 – education and awareness programme; #21 – state and commercial neighbours; # 23- local community input and #29 – community economic benefits). The numbers used for tracking changes in these parameters will not be particularly convincing of actual changes. Nevertheless, the completed forms for ten PAs in the four project countries are presented in Annex 5. Russia and Kazakhstan have three PAs each, and Ukraine and Belarus two each. It must be remembered that this is a MSP with a three-year timeline and expecting measurable positive changes in globally significant biodiversity or a notable reduction in threats in four countries’ PA systems with 189 national level PAs on account of this project is not appropriate or realistic. This raises the relevance of demanding adherence to the SP 1 Tracking Tool requirement for a project like this one and underlines the need for the development of a new set of indicators and guidelines for their use in strictly capacity building projects such as this one. Traditional indicators dealing with the impact of a

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://gefweb.org/projects/Focal\\_Areas/bio/bio\\_tracking\\_tools.html](http://gefweb.org/projects/Focal_Areas/bio/bio_tracking_tools.html).

project on biodiversity or reduction of threat are not appropriate for a strictly capacity building project. Also, much parallel related activity is going on in the countries that cannot be directly or strictly attributed to the project (e.g. imminent establishment of a biodiversity conservation Trust Fund in Kazakhstan, legal reforms in countries, budget increases for PAs in Kazakhstan, increase in the funding level of the national EcoFund in Ukraine over the past year).

In spite of the above, strictly judging by the activities that were undertaken during the first part of the project, it is possible to state that there has been definite progress towards the realization of the project's "generally understood" objectives of improving PA management capacity through the provision of training to staff and managers; the garnering of greater support for PAs; involving local communities and providing opportunities for them to benefit from PAs in sustainable ways; and disseminating project information and experiences to others. Training centers have been established in four countries, needs were assessed, training material prepared, trainers trained, many training seminars conducted, round tables and workshops held with representatives of various sectors, support for legislative changes provided, work with local communities initiated, micro-credit funds established at Bolshaya Kokshaga and Baikalskiy zapovedniks in Russia, an informative project website established, numerous guidelines, newsletters, and publications produced and disseminated etc. More information on these and other accomplishments to date are available in the PIR, in Annex 3 of this report, in Progress Reports submitted to UNEP, and on the project website ([www.wildnet.ru](http://www.wildnet.ru)).

## **(ii) Achievement of outputs and activities**

Like there was inconsistency among Objectives and Outcomes, this is also the case for Outputs and Activities. In the Project Document the Outputs are: 1) Training for PA managers and staff on new modern environmental and PA management tools implemented and well attended; 2) Foreign experience on implementing PES schemes analysed. Recommendations on PES implementation prepared and disseminated to federal and national PA of the region; 3) At least one environmental fund established (or close to be established) during the project; 4) A targeted training/briefing campaign for political authorities organized and fully implemented; 5) A strong public relations and awareness raising campaign with local communities and stakeholders efficiently implemented and broadly supported by the media; and 6) Economic/financial incentives for good practices in Northern Eurasia PA analysed, published, disseminated. In the revised project logframe of May 2006, the Outputs are: 1) PA managers' skills and expertise increased; 2) Best practices on PA management available to PA staff in Northern Eurasian countries; 3) PA managers using their skills and new mechanisms in their work; 4) Increased awareness of politicians at different levels on the value of PAs; and 5) Legislative support for PA increased. These Outputs are consistent with the ones in the PIR documentation. In the Project Performance Rubric included in the MTR Terms of Reference, the Outputs are more similar to the earlier ones presented in the Project Document, being: 1) Targeted training/briefings for local authorities implemented; 2) Public relations campaign with local communities and stakeholders implemented; 3) Analysis of PA legal framework and proposed improvement to authorities. Legal/economic/financial incentives for good practices implemented; 4) Training for PA managers implemented; 5) One pilot activity on PES developed in each region; and 6) At least one environmental fund established (or well under way) under the project.

The number of activities has also increased over time from the initial 19 in the Project Document to 28 in the PIR Project Performance Rubric and to 30 in the revised project logframe of May 2006,. This, however, is understandable and is more a reflection of the adaptations of the project to take advantage of changed circumstances and opportunities as they arise.

The inconsistencies described present a serious constraint to evaluating progress in the project's reaching of its anticipated objectives and outcomes because they are not fixed. This is further complicated by the general lack of indicators that may be used to track the achievement of objectives and outcomes. The Project Document has no indicators for Objectives, Outcomes or Outputs whatsoever. There are only indicators for the originally planned nineteen activities. These will certainly indicate what activities have been performed but will certainly not show the impact of the project. They are only useful for reporting on activities undertaken. The indicators featured in the PIR and in the Project Performance Rubric (in MTR Terms of Reference) are also not only divergent but practically not useful at all for assessing project impact.

To illustrate the point, in the PIR, for Objective 1 – improve protected area management in four countries – the indicators are SP 1 Tracking Tool scores and “dynamics of financing of PA systems in the four countries”. In the Project Performance Rubric, the objective is somewhat different to begin with being – improve management of PA through the use of conservation finance and economic tools benefiting both the environment and poor local communities – the indicators are naturally different. These are: number and impact of new financial instruments used before the end of the project, and number of people officially benefiting from PA or buffer zone ecosystem before the end of the project. So, what exactly is being assessed or evaluated?

Impact indicators are primarily to be used at the Outcome level. Disregarding the inconsistencies among proposed outcomes in the various documents, it is worth examining some of the ones proposed to date to illustrate another point. “Relations between PAs and local communities are improved” and “Politicians at national, regional and local levels are more supportive to PAs”. These would be very difficult to actually measure but would also not provide much directly obvious information on the impact of the project. This is a difficulty not only with this project's use of indicators but is a problematic area in many projects. However, it needs to be addressed and improvements need to be made during the revisions of the project logical framework, which are inescapable for the project.

Nevertheless, while assessment of progress in realizing objectives and outcomes could not be done strictly objectively, and intuition and interpretation had to be utilized to a greater degree than may be desirable, it is clear that a great number of activities have been undertaken effectively over the project's first part. These are well tracked and documented in all of the project's offices. Annex 3 provides an overview of the activities. Further listings of activities performed and their status are available in the PIR report, on the project website, and in Biannual Progress Reports submitted to UNEP. It should be noted that the project team is very clear on the logic and rationale for the activities that are being undertaken but for an external evaluator their link to the outputs and outcomes and objectives is not always readily apparent. This is primarily because of the problems discussed above concerning the inconsistencies in the logframe and thus lack of a clear understanding of what activity fits in where and how it supports the attainment of a particular output, outcome and objective.

What this underscores is that while it is fine to operate at the activities level, it is fundamentally important to ensure that the activities do not become the primary focus of effort. The outcomes and objectives must be clearly articulated to all and be the drivers of all activities to ensure that the latter's undertaking realizes the higher order expectations of the project.

### **(iii) Cost effectiveness**

This project is proving to be cost-effective for several reasons. First, this is due to its attraction of co-financing to levels greater than anticipated, even at the outset. This leveraging of additional resources in the form of co-financing makes the project cost-effective from the GEF perspective.

Secondly, the work to date has been accomplished with the expenditure of less than one third of allotted funds (approximately 20% of planned co-financing and 25% of GEF funds, at least as of several months ago). Further updating is required but there is no doubt that the volume of work conducted to date in four countries over close to two years approximately a total of US\$ 500,000 represents one of the more cost-effective interventions than is usually seen. The project's cost-effectiveness is further enhanced because the information, knowledge and skills that it generates and disseminates broadly is an investment in information. This is a "soft" resource that may and will be transposed elsewhere at essentially little cost.

**(iv) Financial planning and control**

Although there have been some difficulties in the past (an initial delay in commencing the project in Kazakhstan due to changes in local project registration requirements, a previous disbursement problem in Ukraine which has now been effectively resolved by project management and relevant parties), all necessary planning and control processes have been instituted and are functioning properly.

For an outsider, financial aspects are somewhat challenging to assess since budgetary years have changed through the project from summer to summer to calendar year as the basis for reporting and then the amount spent was zeroed out. The budget presentation could and should be made somewhat more understandable. On the basis of examined budgetary and financial reports, an impression was created that it is somewhat disjointed. Nevertheless, it is clearly thorough and up to standards. A previous audit indicated that there are no problems in terms of financial controls and management. What would assist is a rolling table of expenditures from the start which presents planned versus actual expenditures, both from the GEF funds and co-financing by outcomes. More specifics on this are provided in the recommendations section.

**(v) Impact**

The real impacts of the project will only be realized years after its completion. To measure impact, proper indicators will also have to be developed. For now, however, it can be stated that the project has already had obvious positive effects in the four countries, either directly or indirectly. These range from improved skills, knowledge and performance of PA staff in their jobs, to heightened awareness of PA values among the general public, communities near PAs, the private sector, and decision-makers. The project has instituted a requirement for managers of PA staff who attended training sessions to report on the impact of the training on their job performance. The project management team is compiling these responses from PA managers and they clearly indicate the impact that the training sessions have had on improved performance in the field. Improvements have been noticed in ecological surveys and inventories, educational programmes for visitors, PA administration and other areas of work. Micro-credit funds established through the project have also resulted in positive economic results for local people where they exist. Relations between local communities and PAs, such as in the case of Ugra National Park which was visited during the review, have also showed signs of improvement. The development and passage of new legislation has also benefited from the project. The exposure of political figures and representatives of the private sector to PAs and biodiversity conservation themes has also resulted in changed outlooks towards PAs among them. While indicators and numbers would be more convincing, it is clear, based on documented evidence and personal observation, that the project is having numerous positive impacts already.

#### **(vi) Sustainability**

The project shows strong indications of its future financial, socio-political, and institutional sustainability. In terms of financial sustainability, the project is incorporating the training centers and programmes into existing governmental PA structures and processes. In this regard, the project is serving as a driver and catalyst. Once these centres are established on the base of PAs, training programmes are developed, trainers and staff are trained, then this represents a resource that will not require much if any additional input in order to be sustainable. Micro-credit funds are established on the principle of sustainability of credits and operate on this basis. Regarding socio-political sustainability, there are no concerns since what the project is offering and delivering is perfectly in line with governmental obligations in the countries to begin with. Concerning institutional sustainability, one issue identified (in Ukraine and Belarus) was the need for training centers to actually become officially recognized licensed bodies for raising qualifications of attendees in order to receive funds from the government. In Russia, the new Forest Code and Water Code clearly place emphasis on the promotion of resource exploitation for national economic strengthening. However, PAs are still being established at the same time and so the potential effect of this is uncertain but not likely to affect the project's impact. Also in Russia, a new law is being considered that will preclude the generation of income by PAs and its retention by federal authorities, such as PAs. Overall, however, socio-political and institutional factors and potential constraints are not considered to be of any greater concern for this project than for any other. Ecological sustainability is being enhanced through this project's varied interventions, most notably in the longer term than the project itself.

#### **(vii) Stakeholder participation / public awareness**

This project is highly inclusive of all stakeholders and is raising public awareness of PAs and biodiversity conservation is one of its principal objectives. The mechanisms put in place to involve stakeholders are varied but are all effective. These include the project Steering Committee itself, and the project website for the dissemination of information and contact with stakeholders. Project staff often travel to project sites to conduct meetings and hold discussions with stakeholders. Public hearings are employed to bring together stakeholders and soliciting their views and input on pertinent topics. They are also very active in maintaining contact with political figures in the four countries at national, regional and local levels..

In terms of raising public awareness, the numerous roundtables and workshops and public events held, and the documentation, programmes, publications and means of education that have been produced to date provides clear indication of the efforts of the project to raise awareness.

#### **(viii) Country ownership/drivenness**

While the project is supported by the governments of all four countries, the level of commitment displayed varies. It would be safe to say that the highest level at present is in Kazakhstan. In this country, there also is a high degree of cooperation and collaboration among related projects, including GEF projects. This collaboration has in fact been formalized through an agreement among the project managers. For example, Kazakhstan has strongly indicated that it will operationalize a national Trust Fund for biodiversity conservation this year through an UNDP/GEF project using oil and gas revenues to capitalize the fund in lieu of taxes. There is also strong government support for such a fund in Kazakhstan, something that is lacking in the other three countries. The legislative base in Russia, Ukraine and Belarus is inappropriate for a functioning environmental or Trust Fund now. In Ukraine, government support for the project is also evident in willingness to assist in the establishment and operation of a training center. While,

the project is receiving continued support in Russia and Belarus, the sense of its recognized importance and thus priority is not as readily evident.

**(ix) Implementation approach**

The project is being implemented according to agreed upon processes. The established reporting to UNEP and consultation mechanisms among project management staff, stakeholders, and the Steering Committee are working effectively. The project's management is committed and shows adaptability to changing circumstances in the operational context. There appears to be good communication among all project managers in the four countries and between the Task Manager in UNEP and the Project Manager and Project Director in Moscow at the EcoCentre Zapovedniks. The only issues concerning the implementation approach have to do with the original and unfortunately evolving project design. A thorough threats/root causes/barriers analysis should have been undertaken at the outset of the project's conceptualization and PDF A. Since this was not done, there is just a very general and much too broad description of the situation confronting biodiversity and PAs in the region without keying on education and the lack of capacity as being the sole key barrier that this project will address. As a result, over time, the project came to include other foci like PES, Trust Fund establishment, and local economic stimulation. This in turn detracted from the work that could have been done on the initial project thrust – strengthening management capacity of PA staff and building up the constituency of PA supporters. Since the logframe still requires further improvement, an opportunity exists to rectify this. Without a proper M&E system with impact reporting implemented, some concern remains that reporting will continue to be good but may not be reporting on what is actually of importance to measuring the impact of the project.

**(x) Replicability**

This project has already established a solid foundation of experience, training mechanisms and materials and tools that have proven effective in four countries in training PA staff and other stakeholders. The materials and training packages produced possess great transferability potential to other countries and regions. While the potential for the dissemination of information and experiences from this project is very high, there does not yet exist a formalized plan for replicating lessons learned. This does not mean, however, that replication will not occur. This only means that it would be advisable to generate a formal replication plan to further enhance the project's impact and coverage. Since the project establishes a cadre of trainers, along with training materials and tested and refined approaches to training, the replication potential is very high. What is required is way of ensuring that further replication of project elements does in fact occur. A replication plan should be prepared.

**(xi) Monitoring and evaluation systems**

This project element demonstrates the greatest weakness. The fundamental reason for this is that the M&E system was not designed properly when the project was developed. The project still lacks a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. While a rudimentary M&E “plan” has been prepared in the form of a simple framework to monitor the project's progress towards achieving its objectives and outcomes, it is still not proper. The indicators included in it are not really impact indicators but mostly process indicators, such as “dynamics of financing of PA systems in the 4 countries” and “changes or new policies and regulations that reflect project interventions”. Changes in policies or in budgets may be observed but their impact on the ground will remain unknown. While the PIR does present



findings on the objective and outcomes levels, and does provide a baseline as well mid-term and end of project targets, the indicators used are again process indicators such the number of products produced, number of people trained and the number of amendments to laws prepared. The SP 1 Tracking Tool is also proposed as an indicator but for reasons mentioned, it is also not very appropriate for this project, with the possible exception of five management issues out of thirty.

In this regard, the project fails to meet the minimum requirements for project design of M&E and the application of a Project M&E plan. The project, however, does track project implementation at the activities level very thoroughly. This is done through budgetary controls instituted and the compilation and constant updating of the status of activities and regular reporting to UNEP. However, the concern is that while this information is useful, it will fail to answer the important question concerning the impact of the project. That information will have to be inferred. Once a proper M&E Plan is developed for the remainder of the project, its implementation must be properly resourced and also monitored.

## **E. Conclusions and Rating**

Despite the challenges described above, the project is making steady progress towards the achievement of its objectives. Numerous activities have been successfully undertaken and the project's management has resolved many of the initial difficulties confronted. It is a project that is filling an extremely important niche in PA management and biodiversity conservation. What is truly remarkable, is how much has already been accomplished during its first stage leading up to the MTR, considering that it operates in four countries, and especially since it is just a MSP.

However, it is critically important for the identified problems to be resolved as quickly as possible so that they do not constrain the implementation of the project going forward. In particular, the logical framework needs to be redone along with the sorting out of the inconsistencies among objectives, outcomes, activities. Also, the indicators need further attention as part of the revision of the logical framework.

The overall rating of the project is **satisfactory**.

## **F. Recommendations**

This review was undertaken to assess progress to date, to determine difficulties, to assess the likelihood of positive project impacts over the longer term, and to identify areas for improvement to increase the likelihood of generating sustainable project impacts. The following recommendations are based on this assessment of the project to date with a view towards its improvement over the remaining timeframe.

- The project's scope is too broad. It was not framed properly at the outset in the project document and now it is too broad and unrealistically ambitious and needs to be framed properly. The project has to be refocused and streamlined for the remainder of its timeline. The focus should be strictly on building up management capacity in PAs through the training centres and the provision of training, and expanding the constituency of PA support among political decision makers at all levels, the local population and the private sector. This is a PA capacity building project and not a project to set up Trust

- Funds and PES schemes in 4 countries. Several full size projects would not be able to do this and this is just a MSP that is half-way through its implementation. The Project Steering Committee should take a decision on this proposal at its next meeting and should document the decision and the associated justification behind it.
- Existing inconsistencies among objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities need to be resolved. This will go a long way towards relieving some confusion or anxiety about priorities and the focus of the project for its remaining duration. This should also be done at the next project SC meeting, and delegated to be acted upon as soon as possible. In conjunction with the new agreed upon set of outcomes, new indicators have to be developed and agreed upon. These should be SMART and should be at the outcome level. Only 2-3 indicators should be prepared per outcome. Once prepared and agreed upon, all key project partners in the four countries should be made thoroughly aware of them and the expected methods for collecting information and reporting on them. A new logical framework needs to be developed and agreed upon by the project Steering Committee. This should be done as soon as possible and no longer than six weeks after the Steering Committee meeting. Considerable time was devoted to starting this during the evaluation and the Project Manager has subsequently spent more time on this.
  - A proper M&E plan does not exist for the project. This should have been completed and approved before project commencement but this is understandable given the confusion and changes in the logframe, indicators etc. over time. Nevertheless, a comprehensive M&E plan must be developed on the basis of the logframe indicators and properly resourced and implemented. The focus should be on the impact of the project on improving PA management and thus biodiversity conservation, and on the impact on growth of political and institutional support of PAs. The focus of monitoring and reporting should be on outcomes as opposed to activities. Detailed reporting on individual activities, as has been done to date, is time consuming and takes valuable time away from maximizing the project's impact. This should be done by project staff once the new logframe and indicators are agreed upon but definitely no longer than 2 months following the next PSC meeting. Evidence of use of the logframe and performance indicators should be evident in project reporting.
  - A new approach to tracking the impact of strictly capacity building projects should be developed due to the limitations inherent in the use of the SP1 Tracking Tool for projects of this nature. This should be addressed by GEF and any recommendations or resulting directives distributed widely.
  - The establishment of environmental funds should be excluded from the project for its remaining duration because this is unrealistic for the context, with the exception of Kazakhstan where indications are good that there will be a fund established. It should be noted that the establishment of the fund in Kazakhstan is being undertaken through a concurrent GEF/UNDP Wetlands Conservation project that has budgeted for this major initiative. This project is collaborating with the GEF/UND project in this regard. With the likely exception of Kazakhstan, institutional and legal issues and the absence of realistic capitalization prospects present very serious barriers to the realization of Environmental Funds in the other three project countries. The legislative base in Russia, Ukraine and Belarus is inappropriate for a functioning environmental or Trust Fund now – but Kazakhstan is likely to go ahead with the establishment of one this year though with help from oil and gas funds in lieu of taxes being used to capitalize the fund. There is also strong government support for such a fund in Kazakhstan, something that is lacking in

the other three countries. Operationalizing such funds is also very complex and is far beyond the scope of a medium-sized GEF project, even if a fund's establishment was being pursued in only one country, let alone four. Thus, it is recommended that no more effort be devoted to this element of the project. In Kazakhstan, the fund will likely be operationalized even in the absence of this project's further input.

- Further work on PES schemes is also not advised since seeing any progress on the ground in the next year is doubtful. The pursuit of PES is a premature idea in the context of all of the countries, where, for example, it is often very difficult to have illegal activities prosecuted and fines collected. Moreover, the new Forest Code and Water Code in Russia clearly place emphasis on the promotion of resource exploitation for national economic strengthening. Also in Russia, a new law is being considered that will preclude the generation of income by PAs and its retention by federal authorities, such as PAs. The Steering Committee meeting should consider this and the minutes of the meeting should reflect the basis for the decision taken.
- A unified and cumulative table of budgetary disbursements – from the start of the project to the present and also showing forecasted expenditures, including GEF and C-F columns - should be instituted. While present means of financial tracking and reporting are perfectly adequate, it would be useful to have a unified table illustrating the financial status of the project in a single snapshot. Such a table would present planned versus disbursed amounts by outcomes, outputs and activities, and whether these sums were GEF funds or co-financing. Such a table would not replace but rather supplement existing financial and co-financing reports that are submitted to UNEP. By providing a single overview, such a table will make future assessments of financial elements of the project considerably simpler and quicker. This task should be assigned to the financial officer of the project in Moscow and should commence within two months of the next project Steering Committee meeting.
- While cash co-financing levels from July 1 2005 to December 31 2006 have exceeded original expectations by nearly US\$ 100,000, and project management is to be commended for this, the in-kind contributions are lagging behind terribly. Of the total expected in-kind contribution of US\$ 680,000, only US\$ 59,000 was received as of December 31, 2006. This situation needs to be addressed by the project Steering Committee at its next meeting and a course of action decided upon to rectify it since this represents nearly 50% of the total anticipated co-financing level.
- A replication plan should be written for the transfer and replication of the project's lessons in other locations in the four project countries, in Northern Eurasia and beyond. The plan should indicate what is to be replicated, the methods to be used, the resources required, and means for feedback on the experiences. This should be endorsed by the Steering Committee at its next meeting and delegated to the Project Manager. The plan should be prepared and approved within three months of the project's planned completion.
- It would be equally worthwhile for the project to look after the other half of the equation – one half is better trained people in PAs but the other half is to develop national minimum standards for hiring people in the first place, and then to upgrade their knowledge and skill sets through training sessions. Each position in PAs needs a description and statement of qualifications and their acceptance by the respective

governments as minimum standards that have to be met in order to be considered for employment in a PA. It appears that the government is moving in this direction already. The Project Director should follow up on this and determine whether this is an initiative in which the experience derived from the project may be of assistance. This should be acted upon within three months of the next project Steering Committee meeting.

- The project has accomplished a great amount of positive work over the first half of its anticipated timeline. In fact, what has been accomplished to date is rather remarkable, especially considering that is a MSP operating in four countries. Its managers and the project teams in the four participating countries have exhibited very strong commitment, flexibility and resourcefulness in overcoming the challenges that were built into the project through the deficiencies in its original design, as well as externalities as was the case in Kazakhstan. With the acceptance and implementation of the above recommendations, there is every reason to expect that the project will achieve its primary objectives. For this reason, it should continue to receive GEF support.

## **G. Lessons Learned**

- As was already underlined in the PIR, many of the difficulties encountered by the project in its early implementation, as well as its MTR, stemmed from the initial project design. The project proposal and subsequently the project document were authored by several people over a period of four years. Thus, the project came to represent an amalgam of different initiatives and priorities, as well as adjustments to evolving requirements. The lesson here is that the project document must be clear to all parties from the beginning so that anyone reading it understands the project scope, the intended intervention and performance measures, and then project implementation, as well as evaluation, may follow smoothly on the basis of the original project design.
- There is a great need at project inception for all personnel involved with a project to have a clear understanding and consensus on the logframe as the basis for the project M&E plan and for reporting and evaluation of the project. SMART indicators at the Objective and outcome levels should avoid indicators ‘shifting’ during the project.
- A project training workshop at the inception of a multi-country project is essential to provide clear guidance as to expectations. In the absence of a clear understanding of expectations, processes and even terminology, much time and resources will be wasted, and levels of frustration increased. The emphasis is on conducting an interactive workshop as opposed to a project committee meeting, to reach a common understanding on the project approach, management processes and terminology.

## ANNEX 1: OVERALL RATINGS TABLE

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
<b>Attainment of objectives and planned results (overall rating)</b> Sub criteria (below)	As discussed in the text, due to the inherent inconsistencies in the objectives and planned outcomes, as well as indicators to be used in assessing progress in achieving objectives, the evaluation is more qualitative than quantitative. Also, the attainment of objectives and planned results will be better assessed at the project's completion. On the basis of available information and interpretation of results to date, it can be said that the project is satisfactorily moving towards the realization of its objectives but in the absence of useful indicators, this cannot be quantitatively assessed as of now.	S
Effectiveness (project objectives)	As above	S
Effectiveness (expected outcomes)	As above	S
Relevance	The project's planned outcomes are consistent with the OP 1.	HS
Efficiency	The project is very efficient in the use of available resources, the mobilization of personnel and partners, and the realization of numerous activities. Project management also has and continues to demonstrate adaptability to evolving challenges and changing circumstances which also contributes to its efficiency.	HS
<b>Achievement of outputs and activities</b>	Numerous activities have been implemented and outputs are being progressively realized. However, in the absence of a useful and practical logframe, the question remains concerning the relationship among all of the activities and outputs, and the desired overall outcomes and objectives.	S
<b>Cost-effectiveness</b>	The project is impressively maximizing its reach and impact through the attraction of co-financing and the use of partnerships in all countries. There is much being accomplished for the expenditures.	HS
<b>Impact</b>	The actual overall project impact will only be realized years after project completion. In the meantime, it is clear	S

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
	that the project is laying a strong foundation to ensure that its impact will be felt in all four countries for many years following its completion.	
<b>Sustainability (overall rating)</b> Sub criteria (below)	Overall, the sustainability potential of project's impact is considered to be high.	S
Financial	Financial sustainability is very realistic due to the incorporation of the centres into existing structures and authorities.	S
Socio Political	Work with politicians and decision makers is being undertaken and this will assist in the sustainability of the project's impact in the long term.	MS
Institutional framework and governance	Project impact will always be dependent upon governance in each country and work is being targeted in this direction for that reason.	S
Ecological	The project is geared towards the enhancement of ecological sustainability in PAs	S
<b>Stakeholders participation</b>	The project is extremely participatory and inclusive of all stakeholders in all four countries.	HS
<b>Country ownership</b>	Ownership degree varies among the countries, with Kazakhstan exhibiting the strongest support and commitment at present.	MS
<b>Implementation approach</b>	The project is being implemented without any significant constraints or difficulties. Perhaps the only suggestion is to focus more on reporting at the outcome level as opposed to the activity level, once the logical framework and indicators are revised.	S
<b>Financial planning</b>	Financial systems and reporting appear to be in order although a little complicated to follow due to changes during the project's first stage.	S
<b>Replicability</b>	The project is developing and testing mechanisms for upgrading PA management capacity. All approaches used and lessons learned from the project in four countries under different circumstances will find a range of applications in other locations. A replication plan should be prepared, properly resourced and implemented.	S
<b>M&amp;E (overall rating)</b> Sub criteria (below)	Project M&E has not been implemented properly since the project's inception for a number of reasons. This is an issue that is fundamentally important and should	U

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
	receive immediate attention	
M&E Design	Since the logframe is the basis for M&E of a project, and since the current logframe has undergone past revisions and the present indicators exhibit deficiencies, this is a serious constraint to the M&E of the project.	U
M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)	M&E appears to largely consist of reporting on progress on activities. There is no obvious and adopted M&E plan as such. The plan should be prepared as soon as possible	U
Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities	Budgeting for M&E should be done on the basis of the to be prepared M&E plan.	U
<b>Overall Rating</b>	Once the project is refocused and current deficiencies effectively addressed, it is likely that it may be rated as highly satisfactory by its terminal evaluation.	<b>S</b>

The following rating system should be applied: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Moderately Satisfactory, Moderately Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory, and Highly Unsatisfactory.

## ANNEX 2: Risk Factor Table

INTERNAL RISK Project management										
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	NOTES
<b>Management structure</b>	Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood	Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others	Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems	X						The responsibilities are clear and understood by everybody, the team is trained to work together
<b>Governance structure</b>	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs	Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate	Members lack commitment (seldom meet) and therefore the Committee/body does not fulfil its function	X						The SC meetings are regular, the suggestions made were useful and were taken into account by project team; next SC meeting in July 2007 will review project at its mid-point and will likely result in project adjustments to improve its overall impact.
<b>Internal communications</b>	Fluid and cordial	Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good	Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment / factions	X						Team members communicate regularly with the Project Manager and among themselves through formal and informal mechanisms.
<b>Work flow</b>	Project progressing according to work plan	Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall implementation	Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation		X					Adjustments/adaptations are made occasionally, but the bulk of the work plan is adhered to.
<b>Co-financing</b>	Co-financing is secured and	Is secured but payments are	A substantial part of pledged	X		X			X	While the project already attracted more cash co-



	payments are received on time	slow and bureaucratic	co-financing may not materialize							financing that was supposed initially for the first year period, and more is expected, the in-kind contributions are falling far short of anticipated levels. This is a serious issue that requires immediate resolution by the SC.
<b>Budget</b>	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget		X					Project has spent less funds that was supposed for the reporting period. Some reallocations between budgets lines are necessary.
<b>Financial management</b>	Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for	Financial reporting slow or deficient	Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds	X						Audit was conducted and showed that financial management is transparent and correct
<b>Reporting</b>	Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues	Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues	Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting		X					Some small delay in technical reporting due to revisions to the logframe and work plan that took time. Reporting is thorough and proper and accomplishes what is expected. Since the logframe still requires further improvement, and a proper M&E system with reporting implemented, some concern remains that reporting will continue to be good but may not be reporting on what is actually of importance - measuring the impact of the project.
<b>Stakeholder involvement</b>	Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners	Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners	Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from	X						This project is very inclusive of stakeholders. Stakeholder analyses were done, and all major stakeholders participate in the project.

			partners or other stakeholders						
<b>External communications</b>	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted	Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstandings concerning objectives and activities evident	X					All major stakeholders are aware of the project and its objectives and are participating in the activities. Project news are regularly up-dated. The project website is very useful for updating on progress.
<b>Short term/long term balance</b>	Project is meeting short term needs and results within a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability	Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term	Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected	X					Considerable attention is being paid to sustainability and replicability issues, and to the dissemination of best practices. This is evidenced, for example, through the preparation of Business Plans for TCs in Russia and Belarus, and this will be done for the other two countries as well.
<b>Science and technological issues</b>	Project based on sound science and well established technologies	Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks	Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties	X					Training programmes are based on the best globally accepted scientific methods in this sphere.
<b>Political influences</b>	Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven	Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated	Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives		X				Since the PAs operate within governmental structures, and the success of the TCs is of importance, political influences are inescapable. However, they do not interfere with the realization of project objectives.
<b>Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary</b>									

**EXTERNAL RISK**

<b>Risk Factor</b>	<b>Indicator of Low Risk</b>	<b>Indicator of Medium Risk</b>	<b>Indicator of High Risk</b>	Low	Medium	Substantial	Not Substantial	To be Determined	<b>NOTES</b>
<b>Political stability</b>	Political context is stable and safe	Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation	Very disruptive and volatile		X				Political conditions may always change but changes that may undermine the project are considered unlikely.
<b>Environmental conditions</b>	Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors	Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes	Project area has very harsh environmental conditions				X		This is a capacity building project that is not restricted to a single project area.
<b>Social, cultural and economic factors</b>	There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results	Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation but mitigation strategies have been developed	Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers	X					There are no real or predictable issues that may affect project results.
<b>Capacity issues</b>	Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners	Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity	Capacity is very low at all levels and partners require constant support and technical assistance		X				This project is specifically being undertaken to improve management capacity.
<b>Others, please specify</b>									

### ANNEX 3: PROJECT ACHIEVEMENTS DURING 2005 - 2006

The project has accomplished the following during the first 18 months of implementation.

#### ***1) Capacity building for PA staff:***

(more than 250 people have been involved)

- § International best practices of training PA managers were collected and analyzed; PA management training needs for Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan were identified and assessed.
- § Country-specific training strategies for PA staff were developed.
- § 4 Training Centers for PA managers were created (1 in each country).
- § Teams of trainers for each Training Center were formed and trained.
- § 12 training programs and 6 training modules were developed and tested.
- § 150 PA managers from 4 countries were trained on the following topics:
  - Training-for-Trainers and national project managers “Organization of Work of Training Centers for PA Managers”, Russia, 15 participants;
  - Training-for-Trainers on Environmental Education and Eco-tourism at PAs, Russia, 16 participants;
  - Training-for-Trainers “Organization of Ranger Service Work”, Russia, 16 participants;
  - 2 training sessions on “Environmental education and work with local communities at national parks and zapovedniks of Ukraine”, 29 participants;
  - Training for Chief Rangers of PAs, Kazakhstan, 22 participants;
  - Training for Rangers, Belarus, 14 participants;
  - International seminar on development of PA management plans (Belarus-Kazakhstan-Russia), 25 participants;
  - Seminar “Scientific research and monitoring in PAs”, Kazakhstan, 26 participants;
  - Training “Using GIS in PA Management”, Belarus, 18 participants;
  - Seminar “Eco-tourism development and implementation of sustainable livelihood programs in PAs”, Russia, 18 participants;
  - Seminar “Interaction between PAs and private companies”, Russia, 18 participants.

Also the following activities were conducted:

- Round-table meetings on PR, fundraising for PAs etc., Russia
- 2 exchange visits between Belarus and Russian PA staff;
- Study-visit on eco-tourism development and implementation of sustainable livelihood programs for Russian PA managers and local authorities, Austria, 8 participants;
- Project staff and experts took part as trainers in numerous training sessions and seminars on different aspects of PA management.

#### ***2) Dissemination of best practices of PA management:***

- § The following books from the IUCN/WCPA Best Practice series were translated into Russian, published and disseminated to about 190 PAs in the 4 project countries:
  - “Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas: Guidelines for Planning and Management” by Paul F.J. Eagles, Stephen F. McCool and Christopher D. Haynes;
  - “Speaking Common Language. The uses and performance of the IUCN System of Management Categories for Protected Areas” by Kevin Bishop, Nigel Dudley, Adrian Phillips and Sue Stolton
- § Published book “Protected Area Seminary” (*how to conduct training at PAs for various stakeholders*) by N.Danilina, V.Sinitsyna and V.Yasvin.
- § Guidelines “Payments for Ecosystem Services: methodology and international experience of implementation in PAs” was compiled and prepared in Russian by S. Kopylova and disseminated as an electronic publication.

- § Article “New paradigm for PAs: active visitor management” by David Sheppard was translated into Russian and disseminated via the project website.
- § The book “Protection of fauna in Ukraine” was prepared and published in Ukraine.
- § The book “Environmental ethics and PA management” was published and disseminated in Ukraine.
- § The popular booklet “Territories of Nature. PA system in Russia and the Strategy of its Development” by E.Bukvarjova, N.Danilina and V.Dezhkin was published and disseminated.
- § The website [www.wildnet.ru](http://www.wildnet.ru) was created and is being updated regularly with all publications of project partners and other editions of EcoCenter “Zapovedniks”.
- § 18 issues of "Protected Islands" monthly newspaper were produced and disseminated.

### **3) PA managers using their skills and new mechanisms in their work:**

#### ***a) Implementation of new training skills by PA staff through making trainings at their PA:***

- § Trainings for rangers conducted in 11 PAs of 4 countries (more than 100 people trained in Russia alone).
- § Training of PA scientific staff on new methods of scientific research and monitoring was conducted in 7 PAs in Kazakhstan (more than 120 people trained).
- § Training sessions on environmental education and interaction between PAs and local communities were held in 15 PAs (more than 130 people participated in Russian trainings only).

#### ***b) PA managers implement pilot projects demonstrating new skills at their PA:***

- § Micro-crediting funds were established and are functioning on the base of “Bolshaya Kokshaga” and Baikalsky zapovedniks. The funds have already attracted more than 1.1mln rubles (about US\$ 40 000) of private and public money and receive a lot of support from local authorities. The funds are used to develop environmentally-oriented small businesses in the sustainable development zones of these 2 biosphere reserves.
- § The program of eco-tourism development in Kabansky region within Baikalsky biosphere reserve was developed and submitted for approval to local authorities and other stakeholders.
- § The potential and perspectives of eco-tourism development and implementation of sustainable livelihood programs within and around PAs were analyzed in 5 regions of Russia.
- § The proposals for “Regional policy on tourism development in Astrakhan region” to develop eco-tourism on the base of Astrakhansky zapovednik was prepared and submitted. Pilot eco-tours and student field courses were conducted at the zapovednik together with tourist companies.
- § The project "National parks and cultural museums as a potential for regional development" was implemented in Kenozersky NP, Russia. The model of cooperation between national parks and cultural sites in order to protect cultural heritage at PAs and natural heritage at the cultural sites was developed and is being tested.
- § The pilot project on the establishment of a National Park Development Council is being implemented in “Ugra” NP, Russia.
- § The first Regional Training Center for PAs in Russia was officially opened in the Khakassia Republic. The Center was initiated by EcoCenter “Zapovednik” (GEF/UNEP project) and founded by Khakasskiy zapovednik, Russian Ministry of Natural Resources and the Foundation “Strana zapovednaya”.
- § The “Concepts of Visitor centers creation” and “Strategies of eco-tourism development” were prepared for Korgalzhinsky and Alakolsky zapovedniks and the future biosphere reserve “Ak-Zhailyk” in Kazakhstan.
- § The Working Group to edit the new “Guidelines on scientific research and monitoring in PAs – *Letopis prirodi*” was created and is working in Kazakhstan.
- § The Management plan for Korgalzhinsky zapovednik was developed in Kazakhstan.

- § Management plans for Alakolsky and Naurzumsky zapovedniks in Kazakhstan and for Berezinsky zapovednik in Belarus are being developed now.
- § The package of documents to create a new biosphere reserve “Ak-Zhailyk” in Kazakhstan was prepared and submitted for approval to the Government.
- § The GIS for Berezinsky zapovednik in Belarus is being developed.
- § Assistance was provided to more than 10 youth environmental NGOs supporting PAs in Ukraine.

**c) *Training local communities and business on interaction with PAs:***

(more than 600 participants were trained in total):

- § The following seminars were conducted for representatives of businesses/authorities/local communities on interaction with PAs:
  - 4 seminars on tourism development, planning guest-houses, economic methods of biodiversity conservation and establishing micro-crediting funds for local communities around PAs at “Bolshaya Kokshaga” zapovednik (Republic of Mari El, Russia).
  - 2 seminars on tourism development and implementation of sustainable livelihood programs at PAs for authorities, businesses and local population, Baikalsky zapovednik (Republik of Buryatia, Russia).
  - Seminar for managers of tourist companies “Ecotourism – cooperation between PAs and tourism business in Astrakhan region” in Astrakhansky zapovednik, Russia.
  - 2 workshops "National parks and cultural museums as a potential for regional development" for cultural sites, municipal authorities and business, Kenozero NP, Russia.
  - 3 seminars for farmers on the development of green tourism and establishing of local PA in Ukraine.
  - Summer school for young public rangers “Organization of anti-poaching campaigns at PAs”, “Svyatie gori” NP, Ukraine.
  - 2 workshops for public rangers, Ukraine.
  - Master class for environmental journalists, Ukraine
- § Work is being done to establish a permanent platform for interaction between PAs and business in Russia. The following activities have been already conducted:
  - 4 round table meetings “at the Green Hall” between business and PAs to discuss possible co-operative projects, Moscow, Russia.
  - 3 ecological actions - team-building for private companies’ staff at PAs of Moscow and the Moscow region.
  - The seminar «Protected areas: definition, legislation and possibilities of interaction between protected areas and oil-and-gas companies» for representatives of the TNK-BP oil company, Moscow, Russia.

**d) *Establishment of Environmental Fund for PAs in Russia:***

- Project staff participated in the Round-table on the preparation of the new federal law "On charity and trust funds" with participation of representatives of Public House of Russian Federation (national authorities, NGO and big business) in the Russian Academy of Science.
- Negotiations with the Russian Ministry of Natural Resources on Environmental Fund creation are being conducted.
- Meetings with potential donors from big business companies are being conducted.
- A Feasibility Study for EF creation in Russia was prepared according to the results of all meetings and negotiations.

**Progress in Implementation of Outcome 1. PAs demonstrating increased management efficiency.**

- § Staff of approximately 115 PAs of the 4 countries was trained in environmental education and interaction with local communities.
- § Pilot projects on strengthening environmental education and local community involvement are being implemented in about 30 PAs of the 4 countries.
- § Scientists of 44 PAs of the 4 countries were trained on how to integrate their research into PA management.
- § At 10 PAs of 3 countries work on improving the procedures of scientific research and monitoring is being done.
- § Rangers of about 40 PAs were trained on different aspects of organization of their work.
- § Ranger services' work is being improved at 11 PAs of the 4 countries.
- § About 60 PAs of 3 countries were trained in alternative conservation finance mechanisms.
- § At 19 PAs of the 4 countries some work is being done on increasing financial sustainability.

**4) Increased awareness of national, regional and local politicians of the value of PAs:**

(more than 400 representatives of state and local authorities from 4 countries took part in the meetings)

- § The following meetings were conducted with representatives of authorities of different levels:
  - All-Russian conference “Past, present and future of the federal system of PAs in Russia” under the *aegis* of the Russian Ministry of Natural Resources, 174 participants.
  - Public hearings with national and local authorities to discuss the expansion of Kaniv zapovednik, Ukraine.
  - Round-table “Interaction between PAs, local and regional authorities and business” Khakassia Republic, Russia. 35 participants.
  - Series of training sessions for inspectors of State Service of Protection of Fauna and Flora, Presidential Administration of Belarus Republic at Berezinsky zapovednik, Belarus, 60 participants.
  - Round-table with national and local authorities in support for Berezinsky zapovednik, Belarus. 16 participants.
  - Presentations on PA values made at the following events:
    - at Public Hearings in Vladimir “Protected areas of Vladimir region: perspectives of development of PA network”, Russia; about 30 participants.
    - at the Regional Meeting of Public House of Russian Federation at Tula;
    - at the Workshop “Regional PAs in Russia: possibilities for development”, “Volga-Ahtuba floodplain” nature park, Volgograd region, Russia; 22 participants.
  - A number of press-conferences and public hearings were conducted.

**7) Legislative support for PAs increased:**

- § The “Russian Strategy of federal PA system management till 2015” was developed for the Russian Ministry of Natural Resources with the following attachments:
  - The draft of Regulations of MNR proposal to the Government of RF on establishing national parks.
  - The draft of Regulations of MNR proposal to the Government of RF on establishing state nature federal reserves.
  - The draft of Regulations of MNR proposal to the Government of RF on establishing nature parks.
  - Action plan for implementing the “Russian Strategy of federal PA system management till 2015”

All documents were approved by the Russian Ministry of Natural Resources and are being submitted to the Russian Government.

- § Official presentation of the Strategy was conducted, and a popular booklet was published.
- § The "Ukraine State Program of PA management till 2020" developed and submitted for approval to the Ukraine Government.
- § Amendments to 2 national laws that significantly strengthen the PA system were developed in Ukraine and submitted to the Government.
- § Amendments to Kazakhstan's National Law "On Protected Areas" were prepared and the new law was officially approved by the Government in July, 2006. The text of the new law was disseminated to all PAs in the country at seminars, through the project web-site, and the official web-site of PAs of Kazakhstan.
- § The "Program of development of PA system in Kazakhstan for 2007 – 2009" was prepared and officially approved by the Kazakhstan Government on October 13, 2006.
- § 13 new PAs of the local level (nature reserves and nature monuments) were created and 3 existing PAs were expanded in Ukraine.
- § Documents to create a nature reserve of local level were prepared and submitted for approval to the local government in Borisov region, Belarus.

**Progress in Implementation of Outcome 2. Seek stronger political support for PAs in the region.**

- § More than 400 politicians of different levels improved their knowledge of PA systems.
- § 29 direct expressions of support for PAs followed the project activities in the 4 countries.
- § National strategies on PA management were prepared and submitted for approval in Russia and Ukraine, and already approved in Kazakhstan.
- § Regional PA networks expanded in Ukraine (16 new or expanded PA), and are being expanded in Belarus and Kazakhstan.
- § Amendments to the Kazakhstan National Law "On Protected Areas" were prepared and officially approved, and 2 amendments are being approved in Ukraine.



## ANNEX 4: MTR TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Mid-Term Review of the UNEP GEF project “Strengthening the Network of Training Centers for Protected Area Management through Demonstration of a Tested Approach” GF/3010-05-04

#### 1. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

##### Project rationale

Intensive natural resource use, large-scale clearing of forest, mining, industrial pollution, poaching, lack of political and public support, lack of adequate skills to manage protected areas (PA) and lack of understanding of the importance of PA are amongst the main factors that contribute to the loss of biodiversity in the countries of Northern Eurasia. In addition to these factors, the collapse of the Soviet Union led to a decline in the socio-economic climate of these nations, particularly in rural areas. The difficulties of post-Soviet socio-economic conditions have forced local populations to rely more heavily on natural resources as a means for survival, and to use these resources more intensely, and often irresponsibly, simply because alternative resources do not exist. Furthermore, the economic situation has caused a once well-run system for educating and informing the public to suffer from a lack of resources. This has also affected staff training for the region’s network of protected areas. In these conditions, it is difficult for elected politicians to impose restrictions on the use (over-use or unsustainable use) of economic benefits arising from PA.

Northern Eurasia’s PA network currently plays a vital role in biodiversity conservation. For example, the PA network of these countries provides protection for a large number of rare species of animals, such as tigers, taiga, snow leopard, and aurochs. It also preserves remaining tracts of virgin forest, rare steppe ecosystems, and mountainous areas, such as the Tien Shan, Caucasus, and Altai Ranges, which are particularly important biodiversity centers.

The traditional Soviet system of protecting territories through prohibitive measures not only does not work under the region’s new political conditions, but also creates points of friction between local populations and protected areas. Managers and rangers do not possess the necessary knowledge and skills to organize biodiversity conservation efforts under the region’s new political conditions. Additionally, communicative links between PAs of different countries were destroyed. There are not enough opportunities to share lessons and experience from best practice of PA management.

It is important for political elected authorities and representatives of institutions involved in natural resources use to understand the role protected natural areas play in protecting biodiversity and their potential for economic development or improvement of livelihoods. Currently, these people are not aware of the importance of PA for both biodiversity conservation and livelihoods or even for economic development.

The primary goal of the project was stated as *‘to improve biodiversity conservation and rural livelihoods through a better management of protected areas in Northern Eurasia The project will do so by (1) seeking stronger political support for PA in the region (awareness raising, strengthening of the legal PA framework...) and (2) improve PA management through the use*

*of modern management tools, including economic and financial tools benefiting both the environment and poor local communities living in or around PA. Before starting activities, the project will assess the effectiveness of all other related activities and projects in the region and identify gaps to fill and opportunities to use.'*

The main objectives were stated as:

1. Improve the management skills of PA managers and staff, especially in the field of PA management plan, use of economic tools such as economic valuation of ecosystem services, payment for ecosystem services and in the field of conservation finance mechanisms. Participatory approaches will be another key subject for training through the “learning by doing” methodology.

2. Seek stronger political support for PA in the region through a better awareness of the importance of PA for both local communities and political decision makers. This will be done through public relation work, briefing, work with schools and the press, publications, support to local environment NGOs etc.

These objectives were expected to achieve the following outcomes:

- § PA managers and staff much better trained to improve PA sustainability;
- § Public authorities who are aware of the importance of PES schemes;
- § One PA will have or be close to having an environmental fund established to improve long-term financial management;
- § A stronger and more efficient support from local and national authorities for PA;
- § A better understanding amongst local communities and authorities of the importance of biodiversity conservation and PA;
- § PA managers and local authorities who are informed on existing economic practices of PA.

### **Relevance to GEF Programmes**

The project is relevant to GEF Operational Programmes 1 – 4 and GEF Strategic Priority 1, Catalyzing Sustainability of PA and 2, generation and dissemination of best practices. UNEP has a primary role in the GEF in catalysing the development of scientific and technical analysis and in advancing environmental management in GEF-financed activities. UNEP also provides guidance on relating the GEF-financed activities to global, regional and national environmental assessments, policy frameworks and plans, and to international environmental agreements. This project will therefore be linked to UNEP’s activities including its existing work on monitoring the state of the environment and analysing global environmental trends through its Global Environmental Outlook (GEO).

### **Executing Arrangements**

The Working Group manages and coordinates the project. It is responsible for integrating substantive information and materials, preparation of reports, expenditure of funds, and relations with partners. The Working Group consists of 10 experts from all participating countries.

Project Director (presently at Zapovedniks Centers, Moscow, Russia) will provide overall guidance and direction to project implementation, and will chair the Working Group. The

Project Director convenes the meetings of the Working Group twice annually.

The Project Manager within the Zapovedniks Center (Russia) handles the day-to-day implementation of the project under the agreed program of work, and the leadership of the project director.

The Web Site Administrator, within the Zapovedniks Center manages the regional Web Site.

Education Coordinators – managers of Training Center within Kazakhstan Committee of Forestry, Fishing and Hunting, Beresinsky Zapovednik in Belarus, Ukraine State Protected Areas Service, Russian Zapovedniks Center are responsible for; the implementation of their part of the project activities under the agreed program of work, create, implement, and test training seminars in their countries, conduct workshops and other activities.

The Working Group is advised by the Advisory Group that consists of 12 individuals: the National GEF Focal Points from participating countries, representative PA Agencies, members of Steering Committee of WCPA, the Director of EPAP Project/chair of WCPA, the leader of WCPA Task Force on PA management effectiveness, UNEP GEF, and the representative of the Technical Board the European TOPAS Project. Advice is sought from other experts as needed. The Working Group should constantly communicate with members of AG via e-mail to get advice, comments for all activities and results. There are meetings of Advisory Group (AG) at least twice during the project implementation.

The Zapovedniks Center handles Project accounting and financial reporting and provide office facilities for the Project Director, Project manager and Education Coordinator for Russia. Beresinsky Zapovednik (Belarus), Kazakhstan Committee for Forestry, Hunting and Fishing and Ukraine State Protected Areas Service with cooperation with Kiev ECC will provide office facilities for the Education Coordinators for their countries and will work as subcontractors with Zapovedniks Center.

The Working group is responsible for the design of the implementation of the all-working programs and for preparing the reports and published materials of the Project. The Working Group ensures adequate coordination and integration of information and materials among the Education Coordinators in the participating countries.

A project steering committee will be composed of representatives of each participating country and selected independent high level experts

### **Project Activities**

The project duration is 36 months from June 2005 to June 2008.

The project had a total of nineteen activities:

20. An Advisory Group will be established at the start of the project. The Advisory Group will comprise representatives from EcoCenter “Zapovedniks”, UNEP, the CBD Secretariat, the GEF Secretariat and one expert from each participating country.
21. The meetings of the working group (two per year)
22. Identification and assessment of existing PA related initiatives. Accumulation and assessment of world and Russian Best practices in training PA managers.

23. Development of the packages of training programs and methodological materials, dissemination.
24. Forming and training teams of trainers in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan. Establishing and equipping Training Centers for PA managers in the 4 countries.
25. Development of business/operational plans for TC to gain financial sustainability.
26. Creation of the Strategy of improving management effectiveness of PA through staff training and teaching off representatives of other sectors.
27. Regular training sessions for PA managers in each of the four TC, including seminars on methods of training of local authorities.
28. Preparation of the Best Practice book “PA staff trainings in Northern Eurasia”
29. Analyzing foreign experience on implementing PES schemes. Discussion at the Working Group meeting. Preparation and dissemination of the Recommendations on PES.
30. Trainings, workshops, briefings for local authorities in PA. Organization of study-visits of local authorities to the nearest PA.
31. Presentations of the training programs to government agencies responsible for PA
32. Development of projects on PR campaigns with local communities by trained PA managers. Preparation and implementation of PR-campaigns with local communities in PA involved in the training program.
33. Preparation and dissemination to PA of methodological materials on PR and interaction between PA and local communities, of the lessons learned from the implemented projects.
34. Development and implementation of the pilot projects on PA participatory management in PA. PR-activities related to these projects.
35. Selection of model PA for establishing environmental fund (EF). Development of EF Conception, definition of mission, objectives, strategic priorities.
36. Meetings, negotiations, briefings with EF potential donors and governmental authorities.
37. Incorporation of the EF.
38. Accumulation and analysis of the existing economic/financial incentives for good practices at Northern Eurasia PA. Preparation and dissemination of brochures/booklets on “Economic/financial incentives for good practices at Northern Eurasia PA”.

### **Budget**

The total budget was US\$ 2.368.000 with US\$975,000 funded by the GEF Trust Fund and co-funding from Governments (in cash & kind) US\$ 940,500, and NGOs US\$427,500. GEF’s contribution to the PDF-A was US\$ 25,000.

## TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE REVIEW

### **2. Objective and Scope of the Review**

The objective of this mid-term review (MTR) is to assess operational aspects, such as project management and implementation of activities and also the level of progress towards the objectives. The review will assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. **It will focus on identifying corrective actions needed for the project to achieve maximum impact. Review findings will feed back into project management processes through specific recommendations and 'lessons learned' to date.**

The review will:

- assess the relevance of the project design vis-à-vis the practical conditions encountered during project execution;
- assess the appropriateness of the execution means vis-à-vis the project objectives;
- assess the quality and relevance of any project outputs to date
- explore the significance of any outcomes and impacts to date and the likelihood of achieving future impact with respect to the project's stated objectives
- review the project monitoring tools, whether these are appropriate and are being used appropriately for project monitoring purposes.
- 

### **3. Methods**

This Mid Term Review will be conducted as an in-depth review using a participatory approach whereby the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, key representatives of the executing agencies and other relevant staff are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the review. The consultant will liaise with the UNEP/EOU and the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager on any logistic and/or methodological issues to properly conduct the review in as independent a way as possible, given the circumstances and resources offered.

A draft report will be prepared and circulated to UNEP - DGEF Task Manager, key representatives of the executing agencies, and the UNEP / EOU. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP - EOU for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary revisions.

The findings of the review will be based on the following:

4. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
  - (a) The project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNEP and GEF annual Project Implementation Review reports) and relevant correspondence.
  - (b) Review all knowledge products including the project website and all reports produced with GEF financial support.
  - (c) Notes and minutes from the Steering Committee, Advisory Group, and all other meetings funded with GEF support.
5. Consultation with project staff and key stakeholder groups, especially political leaders targeted for awareness raising, protected area managers targeted for capacity building, and local communities and business targeted for awareness raising.

6. Interviews with project management (such as National Coordinators, the Executing Agency, etc.).
7. Interviews and telephone interviews with other stakeholders. As appropriate, these interviews could be combined with an email questionnaire.
8. The Consultant could also seek additional information and opinions from representatives of donor agencies providing co-funding and other organisations by e-mail or through telephone communication.

***The consultant will attend the project Steering Committee Meeting in early 2007 to present the Mid Term Review findings and help advise on necessary corrective actions.***

#### **4. Project Review Criteria**

**The success of project implementation shall be reviewed, assessed and rated with respect to the eleven aspects defined below:**<sup>2</sup>

##### **12. Attainment of objectives and planned results:**

The review should assess progress made towards achieving the project's major relevant objectives. The "achievement" indicators provided in the log frame of the project document should be used together with any additional monitoring tools including the GEF Biodiversity Tracking Tools<sup>3</sup>.

- Effectiveness: Evaluate progress to date towards achieving the stated project objectives (by activities), taking into account the "achievement indicators" in the project logframe / project document. Comment on the progress made to date.
- Efficiency: Include an assessment of *outcomes* achieved to date in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Is the project cost-effective? How does the cost-time vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Has the project implementation been delayed? Is it on track?

##### **13. Achievement of outputs and activities:**

Assessment of the project's success to date in producing each of the programmed activities and outputs, both in quantity and quality as well as usefulness and timeliness, in the framework of the review scope as defined in para1. Is the project on track?

- The mid term review will assess the proposed and designed training programmes and suggest any possible improvements for their implementation.
- Determine the extent to which scientific and technical information and knowledge have been incorporated within, and have influenced the execution of, the project activities.

##### **14. Cost-effectiveness:**

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

---

<sup>2</sup> However, the views and comments expressed by the evaluator need not be restricted to these items.

<sup>3</sup> [http://gefweb.org/projects/Focal\\_Areas/bio/bio\\_tracking\\_tools.html](http://gefweb.org/projects/Focal_Areas/bio/bio_tracking_tools.html). The evaluator should comment on the relevance of these tracking tools to the overall approach adopted by the project.

- Assess the cost-effectiveness of the activities of the project funded by GEF and whether these activities are likely to achieve the goals and objectives within the planned time and budget. How do the costs compare to the costs of similar projects in similar contexts?
- Assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project leveraged additional resources.

### 15. Financial Planning and Control

Review of financial planning requires assessment of the quality and effectiveness of financial planning and control of financial resources throughout the project's lifetime. The review should include assessment of actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), the status of co-financing secured against that anticipated and patterns of co-financed expenditure by activity. The review should assess whether the use of project funds is commensurate with the attainment of physical progress, efficacy and the timeliness of procurement and disbursement activities. The review should also assess the executing agency's use of GEF funds specifically for project activities as opposed to work conducted with their regular budgetary support.

The review should:

- Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables.
- Present the major findings from financial audits if any have been conducted.
- Identify and verify the sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing (in co-operation with the IA and EA).
- Assess whether the project has applied appropriate standards of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
- The review should also include a breakdown of actual expenditures of GEF and co-financed funds for the project to date <sup>4</sup>

### 16. Impact:

Impacts (long term effects) stemming from project interventions can take time to be fully realised. Some effects, however, can be realised as a part of the implementation process. The review will:

- Evaluate the immediate impact of the project on the countries selected;
- As far as possible, also assess the **potential longer-term impacts** of the project's interventions, considering that the review is taking place at the mid term and that longer term impact is expected to be seen in a few years time. **Frame recommendations to enhance future project impact in this context.** Which will be the major 'channels' and required actions for longer term impact? The review should formulate recommendations that outline possible approaches and necessary actions to facilitate the terminal evaluation and an impact assessment study in a few years time.

---

<sup>4</sup> To be prepared in consultation with the relevant UNON/DGEF Fund Management Officer of the project.

## 17. Sustainability:

Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, e.g. stronger institutional capacities or better informed decision-making. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes. The evaluation should ascertain to what extent follow-up work has been initiated and how project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced over time. In this case, sustainability will be linked to the continued use and influence of scientific models and scientific findings, produced by the project.

Four aspects of sustainability should be addressed: financial, socio-political, institutional frameworks and governance, and ecological (if applicable) The following questions provide guidance on the assessment of these aspects:

- Financial resources. To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project outcomes/benefits once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market trends that support the project's objectives)? Was the project successful in identifying and leveraging co-financing?
- Socio-political: To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on socio-political factors? What is the likelihood that the level of stakeholder ownership will allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- Institutional framework and governance. To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? While responding to these questions consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how are in place.
- Ecological. Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The TE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project.

As far as possible, also assess the potential longer-term impacts considering that the evaluation is taking place upon completion of the project and that longer term impact is expected to be seen in a few years time. Frame any recommendations to enhance future project impact in this context. Which will be the major 'channels' for longer term impact from the project at the national



and international scales? The evaluation should formulate recommendations that outline possible approaches and necessary actions to facilitate an impact assessment study in a few years time.

#### **18. Stakeholder participation / public awareness:**

This consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF- financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project. The review will specifically:

- Assess the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism was successful, and identify its strengths and weaknesses.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of collaboration/interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of all public awareness activities and publications that were undertaken during the course of implementation of the project. Have all publications funded with GEF support been technically and scientifically vetted before publication and accredited to UNEP and GEF?

#### **19. Country ownership / drivenness:**

This is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements. The review will:

- Assess the level of country ownership. Specifically, the evaluator should assess the countries’ level of commitment.

#### **20. Implementation approach:**

This includes an analysis of the project’s management framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management. The review will assess the efficiency of project organisation and management with respect to its size and composition, organisational structure, personnel management and policy, the qualifications of local staff and consultants. Specifically the review will:

- Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been followed. In particular, assess the role of the various committees established and whether the project document was clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation, whether the project was executed according to the plan and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project to facilitate its implementation.
- Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management and the supervision of project activities / project execution arrangements at all levels.
- Assess the effectiveness of supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP/DGEF.

- Identify administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project.
- Assess whether the logical framework was used during implementation as a management tool and whether feedback from M&E activities more broadly was used for adaptive management.
- The evaluator will examine risk assessments included in the annual Project Implementation Review (PIR) and will complete the risk factor table attached in Annex 5. Any major variances between the PIR risk assessment and the consultant's risk assessment will be presented and discussed.

## 21. Replicability:

- Assess whether the project, and in particular the training tools developed, have potential to be replicated, either in terms of expansion, extension or replication in other countries and/or regions and whether any steps have been taken by the project to do so and the relevance and feasibility of these steps.

## 22. Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- **M&E design.** Did the project have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives? The review will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E and the application of the Project M&E plan (Minimum requirements are specified in Annex 4). The evaluation shall include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART<sup>5</sup> indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.
- **M&E plan implementation.** Was an M&E system in place and did it facilitate tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period. Were Annual project reports complete, accurate and with well justified ratings? Was the information provided by the M&E system used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs. Did the Projects have an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure? Has the project completed the GEF Biodiversity Tracking Tools in accordance with requirements? (i.e. (i) at project inception, (ii) at mid term.
- **Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.** Were adequate budget provisions made for M&E made and were such resources made available in a timely fashion during implementation? GEF projects must budget adequately for execution of the M&E plan, and provide adequate resources for during implementation of the M&E plan.

---

<sup>5</sup> SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely.

The review will consider the effectiveness of the M&E system (in defining performance indicators and collecting and analysing monitoring data on project progress) and follow-up on primary stakeholders' reactions to project activities. Is the project using 'results-based' management approaches?

- The review shall include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The review shall comment on how the monitoring mechanisms have been employed throughout the project's lifetime, whether this allowed for tracking of progress towards project objectives and how the project responded to the challenges identified through these mechanisms. The tools used might include a baseline, clear and practical indicators and data analysis systems, or studies to assess results that were planned and carried out at specific times in the project.

The *ratings will be presented in the form of a table*. Each of the eleven categories should be rated separately with **brief justifications** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The following rating system is to be applied:

HS	= Highly Satisfactory	MU	= Moderately Unsatisfactory
S	= Satisfactory	U	= Unsatisfactory
MS	= Moderately Satisfactory	HU	= Highly Unsatisfactory

In addition, the evaluator should prepare a draft 'performance table' for the project. This table should specify, for each of the main objectives and outcomes in the project logical framework, levels of performance (and their means of assessment) for each of the six performance categories above (HS to HU). This performance table will be discussed and finalised during the Mid Term Steering Committee Meeting and will be used as a rubric for assessing project performance in the Terminal Evaluation of the project. An example is shown in Annex 5.

When possible, the consultant will provide recommendations for improvement of project performance in each of the eleven categories above, so that the project could incorporate the recommendations for the improvement of the project performance for the remaining duration of the project.

##### **5. Review report format**

The report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain; the purpose of the review, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible and include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate clear managerial responses.

Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. The review report shall be written in English, be of no more than 40 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

- i) An **executive summary** (no more than 3 pages) providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the review;
- ii) **Introduction and background** giving a brief overview of the project, for example, the objective and status of activities;
- iii) **Scope, objective and methods** presenting the purpose of the review, the assessment criteria used and questions to be addressed;
- iv) **Project Performance and Impact** providing factual evidence relevant to the questions asked by the reviewer and interpretations of such evidence;
- v) **Conclusions and rating** of project implementation success giving the reviewer's concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given criteria and standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to questions about whether the project is considered good or bad, and whether the results are considered positive or negative;
- vi) **Recommendations** suggesting actionable proposals regarding improvements that can benefit the project in its remaining lifespan. The evaluator shall make clear recommendations that primarily aim to enhance the likelihood of project impacts. Recommendations should always be specific in terms of who would do what and provide a suggested timeframe;
- vii) **Lessons learned** presenting general conclusions from the standpoint of the design and implementation of the project, based on established good and bad practices. Lessons must have the potential for wider application and use, and the wider context in which lessons may be applied should be specified;
- viii) **Annexes** include a breakdown of actual expenditures against activities and the current status and expenditure relating to co-financing for the project. This information will be prepared in consultation with the relevant DGEF and UNON Fund Management Officers of the project (table attached in Annex 2 Co-financing and leveraged resources); terms of reference, list of interviewees, and so on.

The scope of the review is guided by the “Global Environment Facility Guidelines for Implementing Agencies to conduct Terminal Evaluations, May 2003”<sup>6</sup> to evaluate the activities supported by GEF through this project. As such, a comprehensive mid term review, will provide valuable information and useful experience for the project in advance of the terminal evaluation of the project.

The draft and final reports will be assessed for quality as set out in Annex 3. Review comments on the draft report will be shared with the consultant.

Examples of UNEP GEF Evaluation Reports are available at [www.unep.org/eou](http://www.unep.org/eou)

## **6. Submission of Final Mid Term Review Reports.**

The final report shall be submitted in electronic form in MS Word format and should be sent to the following persons:

Segbedzi Norgbey, Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit  
 UNEP, P.O. Box 30552  
 Nairobi, Kenya  
 Tel.: (254-20) 624181  
 Fax: (254-20) 623158  
 Email: [segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org](mailto:segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org)

---

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.gefweb.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/MEPTools/IA\\_Guidelines\\_for\\_TE.pdf](http://www.gefweb.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/MEPTools/IA_Guidelines_for_TE.pdf)

**With a copy to:**

Olivier Deleuze, Officer-in-Charge  
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination  
P.O. Box 30552  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: + 254-20-624166

*Fax: + 254-20-624041/4042*

Email: [olivier.deleuze@unep.org](mailto:olivier.deleuze@unep.org)

Anna Tengberg  
UNEP/GEF acting SPO Biodiversity  
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)  
Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF)  
PO Box 30552  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: 254 20 7624147  
Fax: 254 20 7624041/2  
Email: [anna.tengberg@unep.org](mailto:anna.tengberg@unep.org)

Alain Lambert  
SCN Quadra 2 - Bloco A  
Ed. Corporate Financial Center, 11 andar  
70712-901 Brasilia DF

Charlotte Stanton  
UNEP/DGEF Task Manager  
Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination (DGEF)  
United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP)  
P.O. Box 30552 Nairobi, Kenya

The final review report will be considered as an 'internal document' with the circulation of the report to be determined by DGEF management.

**7. Resources and schedule of the review**

This review will be undertaken by an international evaluator contracted by the Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP. The contract for the evaluator will begin on 1 February 2007 and end on 19 April 2007 (25 days spread over 11 weeks study). The evaluator will submit a draft report in 16 March 2007 to UNEP/EOU, the UNEP/DGEF task manager, and key representatives of the executing agencies. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP / EOU for collation and the consultant will be advised of any factual errors to be corrected. Comments to the final draft report will be sent to the consultant by 23 March 2007 after which, the consultant will submit the final report no later than 19 April 2007.

The evaluator will after an initial telephone briefing with EOU and UNEP/GEF, travel and meet with project staff at the beginning of the review. In accordance with UNEP/GEF policy, all GEF projects are evaluated by independent evaluators contracted as consultants by the EOU. The evaluators should have the following qualifications:

The evaluator should not have been associated with the design and implementation of the project. The evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation and

Oversight Unit, UNEP. The evaluator should be an international expert in pollution control, coastal management or marine policy and have experience with project evaluation. Knowledge of UNEP programmes and GEF activities is desirable. Fluency in oral and written Russian, and oral and written English is required.

#### **8. Schedule Of Payment**

The consultant shall select one of the following two contract options:

##### **Lump-Sum Option**

The evaluator will receive an initial payment of 30% of the total amount due upon signature of the contract. A further 30% will be paid upon submission of the draft report. A final payment of 40% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual Special Service Agreement (SSA) of the evaluator and is inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses.

##### **Fee-only Option**

The evaluator will receive an initial payment of 40% of the total amount due upon signature of the contract. Final payment of 60% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual SSAs of the evaluator and is NOT inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses. Ticket and DSA will be paid separately by UNEP.

#### **9. Proviso**

In case, the evaluator cannot provide the products in accordance with the TORs, the timeframe agreed, or his products are substandard, the payment to the evaluator could be withheld, until such a time the products are modified to meet UNEP's standard. In case the evaluator fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP, the product prepared by the evaluator may not constitute the Mid Term Review report.

## Annex 1. Ratings Tables Required in the Mid Term Review Report

### OVERALL RATINGS TABLE

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
<b>Attainment of objectives and planned results (overall rating)</b>		
<b>Sub criteria (below)</b>		
Effectiveness (project objectives)		
Effectiveness (expected outcomes)		
Relevance		
Efficiency		
<b>Achievement of outputs and activities</b>		
<b>Cost-effectiveness</b>		
<b>Impact</b>		
<b>Sustainability (overall rating)</b>		
<b>Sub criteria (below)</b>		
Financial		
Socio Political		
Institutional framework and governance		
Ecological		
<b>Stakeholders participation</b>		
<b>Country ownership</b>		
<b>Implementation approach</b>		
<b>Financial planning</b>		
<b>Replicability</b>		
<b>M&amp;E (overall rating)</b>		
<b>Sub criteria (below)</b>		
M&E Design		
M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)		
Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities		
<b>Overall Rating</b>		

The following rating system should be applied: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Moderately Satisfactory, Moderately Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory, and Highly Unsatisfactory. (see rating system to be applied to the ‘sustainability’ sub-criteria below)

### **RATING OF OUTCOMES**

Outcomes are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs. Outputs are the products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention; they may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes and objectives. The terminal evaluation will make an assessment of the extent to which the project’s major relevant objectives<sup>7</sup> were effectively and efficiently achieved or are expected to be achieved and their relevance. The ratings on the outcomes of the project will be assessed using the following criteria:

- A. **Relevance:** In retrospect, were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies?
- B. **Effectiveness:** Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?
- C. **Efficiency:** Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed?

### **RATING OF IMPACT**

Impacts are positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. For the GEF, environmental impacts are the main focus. Comments should provide information on the likelihood of achieving the impacts specified in the project document.

### **RATINGS OF PROJECT M&E**

Monitoring is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, its design, implementation and results. Project evaluation may involve the definition of appropriate standards, the examination of performance against those standards, and an assessment of actual and expected results.

The ratings on the quality of the project M&E systems will be assessed using the following criteria:

- a. Whether an appropriate M&E system for the project was put in place (including capacity and resources to implement it) and whether this allowed for tracking of progress towards projects objectives. The tools used might have included a base line, clear and practical indicators and data analysis systems, or that studies to assess results were planned and carried out at specific times in the project.
- b. Whether the M&E system was used effectively for project management.

### **RATINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY**

- A. Sustainability will be understood as the probability of continued long-term outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The Terminal evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the

---

<sup>7</sup> The intended physical, financial, institutional, social, environmental, or other development results to which a project or program is expected to contribute.



persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, i.e. stronger institutional capacities, legal frameworks, socio-economic incentives /or public awareness. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes. See section F under 'Project evaluation criteria'.

Rating system for sustainability sub-criteria

Highly Likely = 6, Likely = 5, Moderately Likely = 4, Moderately Unlikely = 3, Unlikely = 2, Highly Unlikely = 1, and not applicable = 0

## Annex 2. Co-financing and Leveraged Resources

Co-financing (basic data to be supplied to the consultant for verification)

Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other* (mill US\$)		Total (mill US\$)		Total Disbursement (mill US\$)	
	Plann ed	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planne d	Actual	Plann ed	Actual	Planned	Actual
- Grants										
- Loans/Concessio nal (compared to market rate)										
- Credits										
- Equity investments										
- In-kind support										
- Other (*)										
-										
-										
-										
-										
-										
Totals										

\* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

### *Leveraged Resources*

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

## Annex 3

### Review of the Draft Report

Draft reports submitted to UNEP EOU are shared with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The DGEF staff and senior Executing Agency staff provide comments on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. UNEP EOU collates the review comments and provides them to the evaluators for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report. General comments on the draft report with respect to compliance with these TOR, are shared with the reviewer.

### Quality Assessment of the Evaluation Report

All UNEP GEF Mid Term Reports are subject to quality assessments by UNEP EOU. These apply GEF Office of Evaluation quality assessment and are used as a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluator.

The quality of the draft evaluation report is assessed and rated against the following criteria:

<b>GEF Report Quality Criteria</b>	<b>UNEP EOU Assessment notes</b>	<b>Rating</b>
A. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable?		
B. Was the report consistent and the evidence complete and convincing and were the ratings substantiated when used?		
C. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes?		
D. Were the lessons and recommendations supported by the evidence presented?		
E. Did the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?		
F. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of the project M&E system and its use for project management?		
<b>UNEP EOU additional Report Quality Criteria</b>	<b>UNEP EOU Assessment</b>	<b>Rating</b>
G. Quality of the lessons: Were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
H. Quality of the recommendations: Did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can they be implemented?		
I. Was the report well written? (clear English language and grammar)		
J. Did the report structure follow EOU		

guidelines, were all requested Annexes included?		
K. Were all evaluation aspects specified in the TORs adequately addressed?		
L. Was the report delivered in a timely manner		

**GEF Quality of the MTE report = 0.3\*(A + B) + 0.1\*(C+D+E+F)**  
**EOU assessment of MTE report = 0.3\*(G + H) + 0.1\*(I+J+K+L)**  
**Combined quality Rating = (2\* 'GEF EO' rating + EOU rating)/3**  
 The Totals are rounded and converted to the scale of HS to HU

Rating system for quality of terminal evaluation reports

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.

## **Annex 4 GEF Minimum requirements for M&E**

### **Minimum Requirement 1: Project Design of M&E<sup>8</sup>**

All projects must include a concrete and fully budgeted monitoring and evaluation plan by the time of Work Program entry (full-sized projects) or CEO approval (medium-sized projects). This plan must contain at a minimum:

- § SMART (see below) indicators for project implementation, or, if no indicators are identified, an alternative plan for monitoring that will deliver reliable and valid information to management
- § SMART indicators for results (outcomes and, if applicable, impacts), and, where appropriate, corporate-level indicators
- § A project baseline, with:
  - a description of the problem to address
  - indicator data
  - or, if major baseline indicators are not identified, an alternative plan for addressing this within one year of implementation
- § An M&E Plan with identification of reviews and evaluations which will be undertaken, such as mid-term reviews or evaluations of activities
- § An organizational setup and budgets for monitoring and evaluation.

---

8

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

## ***Minimum Requirement 2: Application of Project M&E***

- § Project monitoring and supervision will include implementation of the M&E plan, comprising:
- § Use of SMART indicators for implementation (or provision of a reasonable explanation if not used)
- § Use of SMART indicators for results (or provision of a reasonable explanation if not used)
- § Fully established baseline for the project and data compiled to review progress
- § Evaluations are undertaken as planned
- § Operational organizational setup for M&E and budgets spent as planned.

**SMART INDICATORS** GEF projects and programs should monitor using relevant performance indicators. The monitoring system should be "SMART":

1. **Specific:** The system captures the essence of the desired result by clearly and directly relating to achieving an objective, and only that objective.
2. **Measurable:** The monitoring system and its indicators are unambiguously specified so that all parties agree on what the system covers and there are practical ways to measure the indicators and results.
3. **Achievable and Attributable:** The system identifies what changes are anticipated as a result of the intervention and whether the result(s) are realistic. Attribution requires that changes in the targeted developmental issue can be linked to the intervention.
4. **Relevant and Realistic:** The system establishes levels of performance that are likely to be achieved in a practical manner, and that reflect the expectations of stakeholders.
5. **Time-bound, Timely, Trackable, and Targeted:** The system allows progress to be tracked in a cost-effective manner at desired frequency for a set period, with clear identification of the particular stakeholder group to be impacted by the project or program.

## Annex 5 – Project Performance Rubric

LOGFRAME	Intervention Logic	Objectively verifiable Indicators	Source of verification	Risk assessment
Goal	Improved biodiversity conservation and livelihoods through a better management of PA in Northern Eurasia.	At least 20% of selected PA with a good management plan and a more sustainable financial future made possible through the use of new conservation finance mechanisms.		
Project objectives	<p>1. Seek a stronger political support for PA in the region through a better awareness of the importance of PA and a better legal framework for their protection.</p> <p>2. Improve management of PA through the use of conservation finance and economic tools benefiting both the environment and poor local communities.</p>	<p>- Number, type and quality of political interventions in support of PA (local, regional, national) before the end of the project.</p> <p>- Number and impact of new financial instruments used before the end of the project.</p> <p>- Number of people officially benefiting from PA or buffer zone ecosystem before the end of the project.</p>	<p>Parliament, municipal Council documents, newspaper clips, project reports.</p> <p>Extensive participatory survey in the region.</p> <p>Reports from development institutions, trade unions and people's organisations.</p>	<p>Lack of support from local authorities, other priorities,</p> <p>Political instability and conflicts.</p> <p>Conflict of interest.</p>

<p>Project outcomes</p>	<p>1.1. Stronger and more efficient political support from local authorities for PA.</p> <p>1.2. Better understanding amongst local communities and authorities of the importance of and support for PA</p> <p>1.3. Existing more supportive legal framework for PA leading to a more secure future.</p> <p>2.1. Local communities, NGOs, PA managers, PA staff and local authorities much better prepared to improve financial sustainability of PA and implementing the newly acquired skills with broad support.</p> <p>2.2. Authorities and communities are implementing a PES scheme in each region and benefiting both users and providers of services. Public authorities are aware of the importance and feasibility of this mechanism.</p> <p>2.3. One PA will have (or be close to having) an environment fund to improve its long term financial management.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 50% of the PA of the region benefiting from strong political support before the end of the project.</li> <li>- Clear expression of support for PA from at least 50% of the communities living in or around PA in the region, before the end of the project.</li> <li>- 20% of the PA benefiting from a stronger and implemented legal framework.</li> <li>- At least 50% of the PA implementing at least 2 new conservation finance mechanisms before the end of the project.</li> <li>- At least one PES project implemented in each region before the end</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Paper clips, project reports, official legal documents</li> <li>- Paper clips, project reports, survey, trade unions/association reports.</li> <li>- Publications of legal documents.</li> <li>- List of PA and instruments used. Project reports, PA annual reports.</li> <li>- PES project documents and reports.</li> <li>- EF reports and by-laws. Relevant legal documents.</li> </ul>	<p>Difficulties for cross border collaboration.</p> <p>Difficulties in communication across such a wide region.</p> <p>Lack of adequate material for training in local language.</p> <p>Difficulties to send no English speaking PA managers abroad for training and exchanges.</p> <p>Job instability for newly trained people.</p>
-------------------------	---	--	--	--



		<p>of the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least one Environmental Fund established or well underway before the end of the project.</li> </ul>		
Project outputs	<p>1. 1.1. Targeted training/briefings for local authorities implemented.</p> <p>1.2.1. Public relations campaign with local communities and stakeholders implemented.</p> <p>1.3.1. Analysis of PA legal framework and proposed improvement to authorities.</p> <p>Legal/economic/financial incentives for good practices implemented.</p> <p>2.1.1. Training for PA managers implemented</p> <p>2.2.1. One pilot activity on Payment for Environmental Services (PES) developed in each region.</p> <p>2.3.1. At least one environmental fund established (or well under way), under the project.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number and quality of the authorities met before project year 2.</li> <li>- Quantity and type of briefing and communication material produced and used during year 1 and at end of project.</li> <li>- Number and type of legal documents produced and adopted by relevant institutions before end of project.</li> <li>- Number and type of training provided and number of participants after project year 2 and at end of project.</li> <li>- Type, place and time of PES project developed.</li> <li>- Type, place</li> </ul>		<p>Lack of political support from local authorities.</p> <p>Conflict of interest. Lack of confidence/trust with project proponents.</p> <p>Un-clarity of the legal framework in place.</p> <p>Political instability.</p>

		and time of environmental fund developed.		
Project activities	For output 1.1. For output 1.2. For output 1.3. For output 2.1. For output 2.2. For output 2.3.	<b>COST</b>		

## ANNEX 6 RISK FACTOR TABLE

*Evaluators will use this table to summarize risks identified in the **Project Document** and reflect also **any new risks** identified in the course of the evaluation in regard to project implementation. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk as relevant.*

INTERNAL RISK Project management										
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	NOTES
<b>Management structure</b>	Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood	Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others	Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems							
<b>Governance structure</b>	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs	Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate	Members lack commitment (seldom meet) and therefore the Committee/body does not fulfil its function							
<b>Internal communications</b>	Fluid and cordial	Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good	Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment / factions							
<b>Work flow</b>	Project progressing according to work plan	Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall implementation	Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation							
<b>Co-financing</b>	Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time	Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic	A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize							
<b>Budget</b>	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget							
<b>Financial management</b>	Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for	Financial reporting slow or deficient	Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds							
<b>Reporting</b>	Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner	Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or	Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of							

	and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues	lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues	project reporting								
<b>Stakeholder involvement</b>	Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners	Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners	Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders								
<b>External communications</b>	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted	Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstandings concerning objectives and activities evident								
<b>Short term/long term balance</b>	Project is meeting short term needs and results within a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability	Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term	Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected								
<b>Science and technological issues</b>	Project based on sound science and well established technologies	Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks	Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties								
<b>Political influences</b>	Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven	Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated	Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives								
<b>Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary</b>											

**EXTERNAL RISK**

<b>Risk Factor</b>	<b>Indicator of Low Risk</b>	<b>Indicator of Medium Risk</b>	<b>Indicator of High Risk</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Substantial</b>	<b>Not Assessed</b>	<b>To be determined</b>	<b>NOTES</b>
<b>Political stability</b>	Political context is stable and safe	Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation	Very disruptive and volatile						
<b>Environmental conditions</b>	Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors	Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes	Project area has very harsh environmental conditions						
<b>Social, cultural and economic factors</b>	There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results	Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation but mitigation strategies have been developed	Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers						
<b>Capacity issues</b>	Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners	Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity	Capacity is very low at all levels and partners require constant support and technical assistance						
<b>Others, please specify</b>									

## ANNEX 5: SP 1 TRACKING TOOL SHEETS FOR TEN PROTECTED AREAS

### Reporting Progress in Protected Areas: Data Sheet

Name of protected area	Alakolsky zapovednik	
Location of protected area (country, ecoregion, and if possible map reference)	Republic of Kazakhstan, Alakol-Sasykkol lake system (WWF Eco-Region PA0806 Emin Valey Steppe), N 46-48° latitude and E 80-82° longitude	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed on 5 May, 1994 by Taldykorgan district administration for top land area and projecting	Gazetted by the government of Kazakhstan at 21 April, 1998
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Republic of Kazakhstan state ownership	
Management Authority	Committee of Forestry and Game Management of Republic of Kazakhstan	
Size of protected area (ha)	19,773	
Number of staff	Permanent 30	Temporary 9
Annual budget (US\$)	197,440 (43,830 – salary, 153,610 – technical service and transaction costs)	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	IUCN management category I b	
Reasons for designation	The Reserve was established for ornithological and wetland Conservation, protection of important and unique nesting places of colonial water birds: gulls (relict, pallass', yellow-legged and black-headed), terns (caspien,, gull-billed, white-winged, common and little), Dalmatian and White Pelican, spoonbill, cormorant, great egret, Grey heron, Night Heron, sandpipers, ducks and others.	
Brief details of GEF funded project or projects in PA	GEF/UNEP project "Strengthening the network of Training Centers for PA managers as a demonstration o a tested approach", 2005-2008	
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	GEF Wetlands Project UNDP Kazakhstan GEF small grant project on the protection of the Relict Gull (Larus relictus) in the reserve.	
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	Conservation of typical and unique ecosystems, biodiversity and genetic fund of plant and animal life in it's natural habitat.	
Objective 2	Research and monitoring of natural resources	
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		

Threat 1	Fires. This is a serious threat, which leads to destruction of invertebrates, muskrat burrows and waterfowl nests. Fires do also kill directly water birds and mammals.
Threat 2	Poaching on wild animals such as wild boar, roe deer and waterfowl. This problem is not only restricted to the reserve's territory.
List top two critical management activities	
Activity 1	Nature Protection
Activity 2	Scientific research and monitoring of wildlife.

**Name/s of assessor (including people consulted):** Iralina A., Kerteshev T., Vagapov R., Dieterich T., Tursunbayev V., Omarbekova A.

**Contact details (email etc.):**

**Date assessment carried out (Day/Month/Year):** 23.10.2005

\* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
The protected area is not gazetted	0	Gazetted by the government of Kazakhstan at 21 April, 1998	
The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	Due to difficult economical situation of the local communities around the protected area after the collapse of the Soviet Union, poaching is not controlled effectively. Corruption of reserve staff and pressure on natural resources remain high.	With providing alternative livelihood and thus an additional income to the communities the pressure on natural resources is expected to be eased. step to this – to train the reserve staff sustainable livelihood programs
Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively	2		
Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	Staff permanent: 30, temporary: 9	To increase staff numbers and to raise qualifications of the existing staff.
There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of	1		
The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some	2		
The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and Regulations	3		
No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	Due the missing of a modern management plan and difficulties in allocation of finances for all needed activities of the protected area some objectives can not be achieved.	A management plan for the protected area will be worked out.
The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these Objectives	1		
The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0		



Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1	The protected area does only cover about 3% of the whole lake system. Constrains concerning the integrity of the ecosystem protection are obvious.	It is planned to enlarge the strict protection of the PA to about 15% of the lake system till 2010.
Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2		
Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	The reserve lacks modern informational panels to demarcate the boundary	To train staff on this and to create informational panels at all entrance to the reserve
The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2		
The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		
There is no management plan for the protected area	0		
A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1		
There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
No regular work plan exists	0		To adapt the annual plans according to new management plan
A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		
A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0		

Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		
Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2	Due to the lack of sufficient scientific staff and not educated rangers at the reserve scientific surveys are not carried out to an extent needed.	Parallel training is for reserves' science and rangers
Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0		
There is some ad hoc survey and research work	1	see above	With installing a modern management plan research can be orientated more in an applied sense for PA management
There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		
Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		
There are no staff	0		
Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2	Staff is poorly trained and the scientific department is too small.	Staff training will be provided and the numbers will be enlarged.
Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0		
Problems with personnel management	1	Personnel is narrowly specialized on very	Staff training will diversify the abilities

Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives			
Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		
Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
Staff are untrained	0		
Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		A training program for PA staff will be developed and implemented.
Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
There is no budget for the protected area	0		
The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1	The budget for the PA has been growing in the past years constantly, but is still not at an level to implement all management needs	To increase budget, mainly from transfer from the government
The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		
The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0		
There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		To search for new sources of funds
There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0		
Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1	The budget is not closely correlated to the management needs.	This questions will be regulated in the future management plan in detail.
Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		
Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		

Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
There are little or no equipment and facilities	0	Scientific equipment is poor and boats to ranger the lakes are not existing.	To purchase scientific equipment and boats.
There are some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		
There are equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
There are adequate equipment and facilities	3		
There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0		
There is some ad <i>hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
There is no education and awareness programme	0	There are existing actions like the Marsh for Parks, but no awareness program at schools, adult population or visitors of the reserve is provided.	To develop environmental education program, to train staff on environmental education, to establish a modern visitor center.
There is a limited and ad <i>hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0	As during Soviet times PA have been installed without community participation there are still no mechanisms developed to get local communities involved in the PA management.	A forum will be established making it possible to take all interests of local stakeholders into account and address sustainable use of nature resources step – to educate the reserve staff on these issues.
There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		

Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	Indigenous and traditional peoples do not live in or around the PA.	
Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	As during Soviet times PA have been installed without community participation there are still no mechanisms developed to get local communities involved in the PA management.	To strengthen relations with local communities. Within the process of implementing the management plan for the PA these questions will be addressed
Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
There are no visitor facilities and services	0	The visitor center has not been updated for more than a decade and does not meet modern requirements to lead visitors.	To build the new visitor center according to the current demands. To construct facilities for tourists (hotels, tourist buses etc.) to purchase equipment
Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		
Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		

Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0		
There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1	In the strict PA only very limited tourism is possible. The tourist potential for the PA and for the region is not used so far.	A community based eco-tourism project will be put up for the region and closely linked to the PA.. First step – to develop a conception for the eco-tourism development for the reserve
There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	This is regulated by the national law of Kazakhstan	To lobby the changes in this law
The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0		
Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		
Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2		
Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		
Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0		
Protection systems (patrolling, omission and etc.) are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1		
Protection systems (patrolling, omission and etc.) are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2	Poaching is still the major threat for the reserve.	To improve efficiency of rangers' work through trainings, purchase of equipment and integrating innovative approaches to this work
Protection systems (patrolling, omission and etc.) are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated	3		

Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	It's a strict nature reserve that doesn't allow any economic activities on its territory	To create biosphere reserve using the reserve area as a core. In this biosphere reserve to develop sustainable livelihood programs within the area
The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated	3		
There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0		
There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		To integrate monitoring program into management plan for the reserve
A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		

**41.3**

## Reporting Progress on Protected Areas: Data Sheet Korgalzhin 2004

Name of protected area	Korgalzhinsky zapovednik		
Location of protected area (country, ecoregion, and if possible map reference)	Republic Kazakhstan, Tengis-Korgalzhyn Lake System (WWF eco region PA 0810 Kazakh Steppe) , N 50°42 - 50°10 latitude and E 68°39 - 69°42 longitude		
Date of establishment (make a distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed at 19. May, 1958 by the Soviet Ministries enactment 390 on the suggestion of Kaz. Soviet Union Republic	Gazetted by the Soviet Ministries enactment of Kaz Soviet Union Republic №124 of 16 April, 1968.	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	the Republic of Kazakhstan – state ownership		
Management Authority	Forestry and Game Management Committee of the Republic of Kazakhstan		
Size of protected area (ha)	259,771		
Number of staff	Permanent 51	Temporary 10	
Annual budget (US\$)	44,698 (36,638 – salary, 5,129 - technical service and accounting operations, 2,931- revenue earned)		
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar Convention list, etc)	IUCN Category I A Ramsar Site: Korgalzhyn Nature Reserve on the list of international important wetlands under category “A” and has the international status of a Ramsar site. Korgalzhyn Nature Reserve is proposed for World Heritage (not yet approved by UNESCO).		
Reasons for designation	Protection of unique lake system; conservation of Tengiz-Korgalzhyn lake’s biodiversity, primarily ornithological fauna		
Brief details of the GEF funded project or projects on PA	GEF/UNEP project “Strengthening the network of Training Centers for PA managers as a demonstration of a tested approach”, 2005-2008		
Brief details of other relevant projects on PA	GEF Wetlands Project UNDP Kazakhstan KAZ/00/G37/A/1G/99: Integrated conservation of priority globally significant migratory bird wetland habitat: A Project on the protection of the Sociable Lapwing ( <i>Chettusia gregaria</i> ) by ACBK, RSPB. The German Society of Nature Conservation is supporting the bird monitoring program in the PA.		
List, two primary objectives of the protected area			
Objective 1	Protection of Nature Reserve territory (including water areas) with a focus on biodiversity conservation		
Objective 2	Conducting scientific research and monitoring, working out and introduction of scientific methods of natural ecosystems’ conservation		



List, two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)	
Threat 1	Control of the water regime on the lakes is crucial to minimize the impacting on the habitat of waterfowl and other birds.
Threat 2	Fires. Spring fires are dangerous on the reeds' lakes, having caused big damage to wild animal and birds, first of all to their young. As big colonies of rare nesting birds are situated in the reed beds fire control in spring is crucial to guarantee successful breeding.
List two most important activities in management	
Activity 1	Nature protection
Activity 2	Scientific research and monitoring

**Name/s of assessor(s) (including people consulted):** A. Iralina, T.Kerteshev, R.Vagapov, T.Dieterich,

O.Koshkina, A.Omarbekova

**Contact details (email etc.):** [alia.iralina@rambler.ru](mailto:alia.iralina@rambler.ru)

**Date assessment carried out (Day/Month/Year):** 01.08.2005

\* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0	Decree # 124 of the Ministry Council of Kazakh SSR on April 16, 1968	
Does the protected area have legal status?	The government has approved the necessity of the protected area to be gazetted but the process has not begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is not completed	2		
<i>Context</i>	The protected area has been legally gazetted (in case of private Nature reserve, PA is owned by a Trust Fund, etc)	3		
2. Control on Protected Area	There are no mechanisms for controlling the inappropriate land use and activities on the protected area	0	Due to difficult economical situation of the local communities around the protected area after the collapse of the Soviet Union, poaching is not controlled effectively. Corruption of reserve staff and pressure on natural resources remain high.	To provide alternative livelihood programs to the local communities to divert them from poaching. To strengthen the ranger service of the reserve.
Is there a control on illegal land use and any illegal activities (e.g. poaching)	There are mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities on the protected area but there are major problems in their effective implementation	1		
	There are mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities on the protected area but there are some problems in their effective implementing	2		
<i>Context</i>	There are mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities on the protected area, which are effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement	The staff has no effective capacity/resources to observe the rules and regulations of the protected area	0	Staff permanent: 51, temporary: 10 – too little people to manage such a big area. The level of staff qualification is also very low.	To increase staff numbers and to train people
Is the staff able to adequately observe the rules and regulations of the protected area?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to observe the rules and regulations of the protected (e.g. lack of skills, no budget for patrol)	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Context</i>	The staff have sufficient capacity/resources to observe the rules and regulations of the PA but some demerits have still place	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to observe the rules and regulation of the PA	3		
4. Protected area objectives	No clear and approved objectives for the protected area	0		
Have the objectives been agreed?	The objectives of protected area have been approved, but the management is abnormal to these Objectives	1		
<i>Planning</i>	The objectives of the protected area have been approved, but only partly implemented	2	Due the missing of a modern management plan and difficulties in allocation of finances for all needed activities of the protected area some objectives can not be achieved.	A management plan for the protected area should be worked out and finances allocated for the reserve by the state organs should be enlarged.
	The objectives of protected area has been approved and the PA's management is implemented according to them	3		
5. Protected Area's design	Inadequacies in design mean the impossibility to achieve the main management goals for PA	0		
Is it necessary to broaden the protected area for meeting its objectives?	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of main goals are constrained to some extent	1		
	Inadequacies in design are not significantly constraining the achievement of main goals, but the design could be improved	2	The protected area is so far not including valuable virgin steppe territory adjacent to the lakes. In addition the productive landscape around the reserve is not managed in respect to the reserves needs.	It is planned to enlarge the nature reserve, to include valuable virgin steppe territory west of lake Tenigz. It is also planned to include the management of the productive landscape into the reserves under the principles of the man and biosphere program.

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Planning</i>	Nature Reserve design features are contributing to achieve the main goals of PA	3		
6. Protected Area's Boundaries	The boundaries of PA are not certain to the management authority or locals/neighbor land users	0	The informational panels are very bad or don't exist	To train PA staff and to build new informational panels and put them where needed
Are the boundaries certain and demarcated?	The boundaries of PA are certain to the management authority, but not to locals/neighbour land users	1		
<i>Context</i>	The boundaries of PA are certain to the management authority and locals/neighbour land users but not appropriately demarcated	2		
	The boundaries of PA are certain to the management authority and locals/neighbour land users and appropriately demarcated	3		
7. Management Plan	There is no Management Plan for the PA	0	There is no Management Plan	The Management Plan should be developed. For this PA staff should be trained on management planning.
Is there a Management	A management plan has been or is developed but not being implemented	1		
Plan and is it being implemented?	There is the approved management plan but partly implemented because of limited financing or other problems	2		
<i>Planning</i>	There is an approved management plan and has being implemented	3		
Additional points	The planning process allows for key stakeholders to influence on the management plan	+1		
	There is an prescribed schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
<i>Planning</i>	The results of monitoring, researches and evaluation are routinely incorporated into Planning process	+1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
8. Regular Work Plan  Is there an annual Work Plan?  <i>Planning/Outputs</i>	No regular work plan exists	0		
	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and activities are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not implemented	2		
	A regular work plan exists, activities are monitored against the plan's targets and most of or all prescribed activities are implemented	3		
9. Resources Inventory  Do you have sufficient information to manage the area?  <i>Context</i>	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0		
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work has not been implemented	2	Due to the lack of sufficient scientific staff and not educated rangers at the reserve scientific surveys are not carried out to an extent needed.	Parallel training is for reserves' scientists and rangers to install a monitoring program. To strengthen scientific monitoring at the reserve
	Information concerning the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being updated	3		
10. Researches  Is there a program on management-orientated survey and research work?	There is no survey or research works taking place on the protected area	0		
	There is some ad hoc survey and research works	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2	see above	With installing a modern management plan research can be orientated more in an applied sense for PA management.

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a comprehensive, integrated program of survey and research works relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resources Management	Requirements for active management of key ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		
Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)?	Requirements for active management of key ecosystems, species and cultural values are certain but not being introduced	1		
	Requirements for active management of key ecosystems, species and cultural values have been partly assessed	2		
<i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of key ecosystems, species and cultural values have been substantially or fully assessed	3		
12. Staff	There are no staff	0		
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	Staff number is inadequate to run the main management activities	1		
	Staff number is below optimum level to run main management activities	2	Staff is poorly trained and the scientific department too small.	Staff training will be provided and the staff numbers will be enlarged.
<i>Inputs</i>	Staff number is adequate to run the management needs of PA	3		
13. Personnel management	Problems with personnel management constrain to achieve the major management objectives	0		
Are the personnel managed well enough?	Problems with personnel management partially constrain to achieve major management objectives	1	Personnel is narrowly specialized on very few tasks.	Staff training will diversify the abilities of the staff members i.e. rangers will be trained to guide tourists and contribute to the species monitoring in addition to their ranger work.
<i>Process</i>	Personnel management is adequate to achieve the major management objectives but could be improved	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
	Personnel management is excellent and contributes to achieve the major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training	Staff is untrained	0		Training programs for various categories of PA staff will be developed and implemented.
Is the staff trained appropriately?	Level of staff training and skills is low than requested for PA	1		
<i>Inputs/Process</i>	Level of staff training and skills is adequate, but could be improved in further to fully achieve the management objectives	2		
	Level of staff training and skills fully satisfies the the management current and future needs of PA	3		
15. Current budget	There is no budget for the protected area	0		The PA budget is expected to grow in the future years.
Is the current budget sufficient? <i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and seriously constraints the capacity to manage	1	The budget for the PA has been growing in the past years constantly, but is still not at a level to implement all management needs.	
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be improved in further to fully achieve effective management	2		
	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Budget Security	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management completely depends on external or annual funding	0		
Is the budget secure?	The secure budget is minor and the protected area could not adequately function without external financing	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a secure core budget for the protected area, but funds for innovations and initiatives are engaged from external financing	2		To find new sources of funds for all innovations
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a long-term basis	3		
17. Budget Management	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines the effectiveness	0	The budget is not closely correlated to the management needs.	This questions will be regulated in the future management plan in detail.
Is the budget managed to meet the critical management needs?	Budget management is poor and constrains the effectiveness	1		
	Budget management is adequate, but could be improved	2		
	Budget management is excellent and effective	3		
18. Equipment	There are little or no equipment and facilities	0	Scientific equipment is poor and boats to patrol the lakes are not existing.	Scientific equipment and boats should be purchased and reserve staff educated to use them.
Are there necessary equipment and facilities?	There are some equipment and facilities but these are fully inadequate	1		
	There are equipment and facilities, but still some main shortages constraining the management	2		
	There are adequate equipment and facilities	3		
<i>Process</i>				
19. Equipment Maintenance	Maintenance of equipment and facilities is not provided	0	Lack of funds	To find new sources of funding
Is equipment adequately maintained?	Maintenance of equipment and facilities is provided on an occasional basis	1		
	Maintenance of equipment and facilities is provided, but not sufficiently	2		
	Maintenance of equipment and facilities are provided at requested level	3		
<i>Process</i>				



Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
20. Education and awareness Program	There is no education and awareness program	0		
Is there a educational program?	There is a limited and ad <i>hoc</i> education and awareness program, but not integral planning for this	1	There are existing actions like the March for Parks, but no awareness program at schools or for visitors of the reserve is provided.	An ecological awareness program for local schools and visitors to the reserve should be developed together with the establishment of a modern visitor center. Staff should be trained on modern approaches to environmental education.
<i>Process</i>	There is a planned education and awareness program but there are still serious shortages	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness program fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. Neighbour State and commercial institutions	There is no contact between Nature reserve administration and neighbour state and private land users	0		
Is there co-operation with land users on adjacent sites?	There is limited contact between Nature Reserve administration and neighbour state or private land users	1	As during Soviet times PA have been installed without community participation there are still no mechanisms developed to get local communities involved in the PA management.	To plan and conduct activities to involve communities into participatory management of the reserve (workshops, trainings, discussions etc.).
<i>Process</i>	There is regular contact between Nature Reserve administration and neighbour state or private land users, but on low level cooperation basis	2		
	There is regular contact between Nature Reserve administration and state and private land users, cooperation on Management Issues	3		
22. Indigenous population (locals)	Indigenous population (locals) have no possibility to make decisions on management of the protected area	0	Indigenous and traditional peoples do not live in or around the PA.	
May the locals, resident or regularly using the PA, contribute	Locals have some possibility to contribute into decision making on management of PA, but can not directly be involved in final decisions	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
	Locals directly contribute to decision making on management of the PA	2		
	Locals directly participate in decision making on management of the PA	3		
23. Local communities	Local communities have no possibility to contribute in decision making on management of the protected area	0	See comments to point 21.	See point 21. Within the process of implementing the management plan for the PA this questions should be addressed.
Do the local Communities, resident Within or near the protected Area, contribute to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have some possibility to contribute in decision making on management of the PA, but can not directly be involved in <u>final decisions</u>	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions on management of PA	2		
	Local communities directly participate in decision making on management of PA	3		
Additional points	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area administration	+1		
<i>Outputs</i>	Programs to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services	0		
	Visitor facilities and services are not satisfied	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) developed enough?  <i>Outputs</i>	Visitor facilities and services are satisfied the current level for visits but could be improved	2	The visitor center has not been updated for more than a decade and does not meet modern requirements. There is no program of visitor facilities development.	The visitor center should be updated. The program of visitor facilities development should be made and become an important part of management plan
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent and satisfied the current level for visits	3		
	25. Commercial tourism	There is little or no contact between PA's administration and tour operators, using the PA		
Do the commercial tour operators contribute to the protected area management?  <i>Process</i>	There is contact between PA's administration and tour operators but this is largely related to administrative or regulatory matters	1	In the strict PA only very limited tourism is possible. The tourist potential for the PA and for the region is not used so far.	A community based eco-tourism program should be put up for the region and closely linked to the PA.
	There is limited co-operation between PA's administration and tour operators to enhance visitor experiences and to maintain the protected area values	2		
	There is constant co-operation between PA's administration and tour operators to enhance visitor experiences, to protect the values and to resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?  <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0		
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Conditions	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural	0		

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Next steps</b>
Assessment	values are being severely degraded			
Is the protected area managed according to its objectives?	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2		
<i>Outcomes</i>	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programs for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		
28. Access assessment	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective by controlling access or use of the PA in accordance with designated objectives	0		

Is access/resource use sufficiently controlled?  <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems are only partially effective By controlling access or use of the PA in accordance with designated objectives	1	The ranger service is not very effective.	To improve efficiency of ranger service work.
	Protection systems are relatively effective by controlling access or use of the PA in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or completely effective by controlling access or use of the PA in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment  Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities?  <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has reduced the potential for economic development of the local communities	0		With developing a series of alternative livelihood forms, it is expected that the benefits from the PA to the region will increase. But the raising awareness campaign for staff and local population is necessary.
	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There are some economic benefits to local communities from the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There are significant economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation  Is there an evaluation of management effectiveness?  <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is no monitoring and evaluation on the protected area	0	As the scientific staff is not sufficient many data are not analyzed and no mechanisms developed how to connect monitoring with management needs.	This questions will be addressed in the management plan of the PA.
	There is some occasional monitoring and evaluation, but no integral strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an approved monitoring and evaluation system, but their results are not systematically used for management	2		
	There is an effective monitoring and evaluation system, which is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>47.5</b>	85	

## Reporting Progress on Protected Areas: Data Sheet Korgalzhin 2004

Name of protected area	Zapovednik "Aksu-Zhabagly"	
Location of protected area (country, ecoregion, and if possible map reference)	Republic Kazakhstan, Tyan Shan mountains	
Date of establishment (make a distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed	Gazetted - 14.07.1926
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	the Republic of Kazakhstan – state ownership	
Management Authority	Forestry and Game Management Committee of the Republic of Kazakhstan	
Size of protected area (ha)	85754	
Number of staff	Permanent 50	Temporary 17
Annual budget (US\$)	210 690	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar Convention list, etc)	IUCN Category I B	
Reasons for designation	Conservation of mountain ecosystems and biodiversity	
Brief details of the GEF funded project or projects on PA	GEF/UNEP project "Strengthening the network of Training Centers for PA managers as a demonstration o a tested approach", 2005-2008	
Brief details of other relevant projects on PA	The transboundary Central Asian GEF-project "Conservation of the biodiversity in Western Tyan-Shan".	
List, two primary objectives of the protected area		
Objective 1	Conservation of mountain ecosystems and biodiversity	
Objective 2	Scientific research and monitoring of natural processes	
List, two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		

Threat 1	Poaching
Threat 2	Illegal and uncontrolled tourism
List two most important activities in management	
Activity 1	Nature protection
Activity 2	Scientific research and monitoring

**Name/s of assessor(s) (including people consulted):** A. Iralina, N. Danilina, T.Kerteshev, E. Shukurov

**Contact details (email etc.):** [alia.iralina@rambler.ru](mailto:alia.iralina@rambler.ru)

**Date assessment carried out (Day/Month/Year):** 20.08.2005

\* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0	Decree on creation of the reserve from July, 14, 1926	
Does the protected area have legal status?	The government has approved the necessity of the protected area to be gazetted but the process has not begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is not completed	2		
<i>Context</i>	The protected area has been legally gazetted (in case of private Nature reserve, PA is owned by a Trust Fund, etc)	3		
2. Control on Protected Area	There are no mechanisms for controlling the inappropriate land use and activities on the protected area	0	Some poaching exists due to the lack of professional skills of ordinary rangers.	To improve efficiency of the ranger service work.
Is there a control on illegal land use and any illegal activities (e.g. poaching)	There are mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities on the protected area but there are major problems in their effective implementation	1		
<i>Context</i>	There are mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities on the protected area but there are some problems in their effective implementing	2		
	There are mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities on the protected area, which are effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement	The staff has no effective capacity/resources to observe the rules and regulations of the protected area	0		
Is the staff able to adequately observe the rules and regulations of the protected area?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to observe the rules and regulations of the protected (e.g. lack of skills, no budget for patrol)	1		



Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Context</i>	The staff have sufficient capacity/resources to observe the rules and regulations of the PA but some demerits have still place	2	The staff numbers are not enough to manage such a big area	To increase staff numbers
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to observe the rules and regulation of the PA	3		
4. Protected area objectives	No clear and approved objectives for the protected area	0		
Have the objectives been agreed?	The objectives of protected area have been approved, but the management is abnormal to these Objectives	1		
<i>Planning</i>	The objectives of the protected area have been approved, but only partly implemented	2		
	The objectives of protected area has been approved and the PA's management is implemented according to them	3		
5. Protected Area's design	Inadequacies in design mean the impossibility to achieve the main management goals for PA	0	The area is rather small, the reserve is divided into 2 clusters, there is no buffer zone	To expand the reserve area, to create buffer zone
Is it necessary to broaden the protected area for meeting its objectives?	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of main goals are constrained to some extent	1		
	Inadequacies in design are not significantly constraining the achievement of main goals, but the design could be improved	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Planning</i>	Nature Reserve design features are contributing to achieve the main goals of PA	3		
6. Protected Area's Boundaries	The boundaries of PA are not certain to the management authority or locals/neighbor land users	0		There is a need to create new informational panels, modern ones
Are the boundaries certain and demarcated?	The boundaries of PA are certain to the management authority, but not to locals/neighbour land users	1		
<i>Context</i>	The boundaries of PA are certain to the management authority and locals/neighbour land users but not appropriately demarcated	2		
	The boundaries of PA are certain to the management authority and locals/neighbour land users and appropriately demarcated	3		
7. Management Plan	There is no Management Plan for the PA	0		
Is there a Management Plan and is it being implemented?	A management plan has been or is developed but not being implemented	1		
	There is the approved management plan but partly implemented because of limited financing or other problems	2		
<i>Planning</i>	There is an approved management plan and has being implemented	3		
Additional points	The planning process allows for key stakeholders to influence on the management plan	+1		
	There is an prescribed schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
<i>Planning</i>	The results of monitoring, researches and evaluation are routinely incorporated into Planning process	+1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
8. Regular Work Plan  Is there an annual Work Plan?  <i>Planning/Outputs</i>	No regular work plan exists	0	Monitoring of the results is not perfect	To make regular work plans in accordance with management plan of the reserve, to improve monitoring system
	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and activities are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not implemented	2		
	A regular work plan exists, activities are monitored against the plan's targets and most of or all prescribed activities are implemented	3		
9. Resources Inventory  Do you have sufficient information to manage the area?  <i>Context</i>	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0	The reserve exists since 1926 and has strong scientific department, the long-term monitoring is a part of its scientific work	To continue the research and monitoring
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work has not being implemented	2		
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and has being updated	3		
10. Researches  Is there a program on management-orientated survey and research work?	There is no survey or research works taking place on the protected area	0	The research has traditionally being oriented to "pure science" more than to management needs	To train scientific staff and to change the focus of research through developing new program of scientific work and putting it into accordance with management plan
	There is some ad hoc survey and research works	1		
	There is considerable survey and research works but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a comprehensive, integrated program of survey and research works relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resources Management	Requirements for active management of key ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0	There are developed systems of fire control, forest management etc.	
Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)?	Requirements for active management of key ecosystems, species and cultural values are certain but not being introduced	1		
	Requirements for active management of key ecosystems, species and cultural values have been partly assessed	2		
<i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of key ecosystems, species and cultural values have been substantially or fully assessed	3		
12. Staff	There are no staff	0	The staff number is very low.	To increase staff number significantly.
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	Staff number is inadequate to run the main management activities	1		
	Staff number is below optimum level to run main management activities	2		
<i>Inputs</i>	Staff number is adequate to run the management needs of PA	3		
13. Personnel management	Problems with personnel management constrain to achieve the major management objectives	0	Personnel are narrowly specialized on very few tasks.	Staff training should diversify the abilities of the staff members i.e. rangers will be trained to guide tourists and contribute to the species monitoring in addition to their ranger work.
Are the personnel managed well enough?	Problems with personnel management partially constrain to achieve major management objectives	1		
	Personnel management is adequate to achieve the major management objectives but could be improved	2		
<i>Process</i>				

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
	Personnel management is excellent and contributes to achieve the major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training	Staff is untrained	0		
Is the staff trained appropriately?	Level of staff training and skills is low than requested for PA	1	From 29 rangers only 5 have appropriate level of qualification; no scientific staff has scientific degree	To train staff from all departments, To make training courses for other PA staff at the base of the reserve
<i>Inputs/Process</i>	Level of staff training and skills is adequate, but could be improved in further to fully achieve the management objectives	2		
	Level of staff training and skills fully satisfies the the management current and future needs of PA	3		
15. Current budget	There is no budget for the protected area	0	There is a lack of funds for equipment, infrastructure, staff and other items	To apply for increase of state funding, to attract funds from other sources (international projects, grants, eco-tourism etc.)
Is the current budget sufficient?	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and seriously constraints the capacity to manage	1		
<i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is acceptable, but could be improved in further to fully achieve effective management	2		
	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Budget Security	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management completely depends on external or annual funding	0		
Is the budget secure?	The secure budget is minor and the protected area could not adequately function without external financing	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a secure core budget for the protected area, but funds for innovations and initiatives are engaged from external financing	2		To find new sources of funds for all innovations
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a long-term basis	3		
17. Budget Management	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines the effectiveness	0		To train top management on this.
Is the budget managed to meet the critical management needs?	Budget management is poor and constrains the effectiveness	1		
	Budget management is adequate, but could be improved	2		
	Budget management is excellent and effective	3		
18. Equipment	There are little or no equipment and facilities	0	Some equipment is lacking	To purchase the necessary equipment
Are there necessary equipment and facilities?	There are some equipment and facilities but these are fully inadequate	1		
	There are equipment and facilities, but still some main shortages constraining the management	2		
	There are adequate equipment and facilities	3		
<i>Process</i>				
19. Equipment Maintenance	Maintenance of equipment and facilities is not provided	0		
Is equipment adequately maintained?	Maintenance of equipment and facilities is provide on occasional basis	1		
	Maintenance of equipment and facilities is provided, but not sufficiently	2		
<i>Process</i>	Maintenance of equipment and facilities are provided at requested level	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
20. Education and awareness Program	There is no education and awareness program	0		
Is there a educational program?	There is a limited and ad <i>hoc</i> education and awareness program, but not integral planning for this	1	Very limited work with children, nothing more	To develop environmental education program, to train staff on modern methods of work with adult population, tourists etc.
<i>Process</i>	There is a planned education and awareness program but there are still serious shortages	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness program fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. Neighbour State and commercial institutions	There is no contact between Nature reserve administration and neighbour state and private land users	0		
Is there co-operation with land users on adjacent sites?	There is limited contact between Nature Reserve administration and neighbour state or private land users	1	As during Soviet times PA have been installed without community participation there are still no mechanisms developed to get local communities involved in the PA management.	To plan and conduct activities to involve communities into participatory management of the reserve (workshops, trainings, discussions etc.).
<i>Process</i>	There is regular contact between Nature Reserve administration and neighbour state or private land users, but on low level cooperation basis	2		
	There is regular contact between Nature Reserve administration and state and private land users, cooperation on Management Issues	3		
22. Indigenous population (locals)	Indigenous population (locals) have no possibility to make decisions on management of the protected area	0	Indigenous and traditional peoples do not live in or around the PA.	
May the locals, resident or regularly using the PA, contribute	Locals have some possibility to contribute into decision making on management of PA , but can not directly be involved in final decisions	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
	Locals directly contribute to decision making on management of the PA	2		
	Locals directly participate in decision making on management of the PA	3		
23. Local communities	Local communities have no possibility to contribute in decision making on management of the protected area	0	See comments to point 21.	See point 21. Within the process of implementing the management plan for the PA this questions should be addressed.
Do the local Communities, resident Within or near the protected Area, contribute to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have some possibility to contribute in decision making on management of the PA, but can not directly be involved in final decisions	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions on management of PA	2		
	Local communities directly participate in decision making on management of PA	3		
Additional points	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area administration	+1		
<i>Outputs</i>	Programs to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services	0		
	Visitor facilities and services are not satisfied	1		



Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) developed enough?  <i>Outputs</i>	Visitor facilities and services are satisfied the current level for visits but could be improved	2	Very good modern visitor center was built not long ago in the framework of GEF Tyan Shan project	It's very important to disseminate this excellent experience to other PA of the country through seminars and exchange visits
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent and satisfied the current level for visits	3		
	25. Commercial tourism	There is little or no contact between PA's administration and tour operators, using the PA		
Do the commercial tour operators contribute to the protected area management?  <i>Process</i>	There is contact between PA's administration and tour operators but this is largely related to administrative or regulatory matters	1		
	There is limited co-operation between PA's administration and tour operators to enhance visitor experiences and to maintain the protected area values	2		
	There is constant co-operation between PA's administration and tour operators to enhance visitor experiences, to protect the values and to resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	This is regulated by the national law of Kazakhstan Republic	To improve legislation at the national level
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Next steps</b>
<i>Outputs</i>	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Conditions Assessment	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0		
Is the protected area managed according to its objectives?	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2		
<i>Outcomes</i>	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programs for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		

Is access/resource use sufficiently controlled?  <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems are only partially effective By controlling access or use of the PA in accordance with designated objectives	1	The ranger service is not very effective.	To improve efficiency of ranger service work.
	Protection systems are relatively effective by controlling access or use of the PA in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or completely effective by controlling access or use of the PA in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment  Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities?  <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has reduced the potential for economic development of the local communities	0		To train staff on innovative methods of work with local communities
	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There are some economic benefits to local communities from the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There are significant economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation  Is there an evaluation of management effectiveness?  <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is no monitoring and evaluation on the protected area	0	As the scientific staff is not sufficient many data are not analyzed and no mechanisms developed how to connect monitoring with management needs.	These questions will be addressed in the management plan of the PA.
	There is some occasional monitoring and evaluation, but no integral strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an approved monitoring and evaluation system, but their results are not systematically used for management	2		
	There is an effective monitoring and evaluation system, which is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>57.9</b>	99	

### Reporting Progress in Protected Areas: Data Sheet

Name of protected area	Astrakhansky state biosphere reserve	
Location of protected area (country, ecoregion, and if possible map reference)	Astrakhan region, South of European Russia	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed	Gazetted – 11.04.1919
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Federal property	
Management Authority	Federal Service for Control in Nature Using, Russian Ministry of Natural Resources	
Size of protected area (ha)	67 917	
Number of staff	Permanent	Temporary
Annual budget (US\$)		
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Part of "Volga Delta" Ramsar site , IUCN category 1, UNESCO biosphere reserve, is now submitted for inclusion into World Heritage list	
Reasons for designation	Conservation of unique natural ecosystems and landscapes (the decision of Scientific Council of Astrakhan state university)	
Brief details of GEF funded project or projects in PA	GEF/UNEP project "Strengthening the network of Training Centers for PA managers as a demonstration o a tested approach", 2005-2008	
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	GEF/UNDP project "Conservation of the Lower Volga delta" will start in 2006	
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	Protection of the ecosystems and biodiversity	
Objective 2	Scientific research and monitoring	
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Poaching and uncontrolled and very rapid tourism developmenet in the Volga river delta	
Threat 2	Inadequate financial support from the federal government	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Protection (ranger service)	
Activity 2	Public awareness and environmental education	

**Name/s of assessor (including people consulted):** Aleksey Knizhnikov, Natalia Mech, deputy director on environmental education and eco-tourism, Galina Zamyatina, deputy director on ranger service, Aleksander Gorbunov, deputy director on science

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

**Contact details (email etc.):** nvmekh@mail.ru

**Date assessment carried out**

**(Day/Month/Year):** 25.08.2005

\* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves	
Does the protected area have legal status?	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
<i>Context</i>	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3	The Statute of the reserve from 1919 and its later editions	
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	The deficiencies in federal PA legislation complicate the implementation of these mechanisms	The reserve staff will actively participate in the preparation of the State Strategy of PA management. The other measures on improving PA legislation are necessary
Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching)	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
controlled?	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
<i>Context</i>	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> What happens if people are arrested?	
Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
<i>Context</i>	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and Regulations	3		
4. Protected area objectives	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	There is very limited financial resources, there is no management plan to control the implementation of PA objectives	Train staff on management planning
Have objectives been agreed?	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these Objectives	1		
<i>Planning</i>	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> does the protected area contain different management zones and are these well maintained?	To start work with authorities on enlarging the reserve area
Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives?	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1		
	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2	There is a need to enlarge the reserve to include there the whole area of Ramsar Volga delta site yes	
<i>Planning</i>	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area?	
Is the boundary known and demarcated?	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
<i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		The informational panels can be improved
7. Management plan	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	No management plan	To train staff on management planning, to initiate the work on preparation of management planning
Is there a management plan and is it being implemented?	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
<i>Planning</i>	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
Additional points	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1		
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
<i>Planning</i>				
8. Regular work plan	No regular work plan exists	0	It's part of official reporting to the Ministry	To develop the program for monitoring of the results
Is there an annual work plan?	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		
<i>Planning/Outputs</i>	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0		
Do you have enough information to manage the area?	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		



Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Context</i>	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2	The scientific department is strong and scientific monitoring is being conducted since 1950-s. Not enough staff and equipment (= funds) to do all necessary surveys	To search for grants to be able to make the more expensive necessary surveys
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	The scientific department is strong and scientific monitoring is being conducted since 1950-s. Not enough staff and equipment (= funds) to do all necessary surveys	To identify priorities of the work of scientific department and to direct research more to the needs of management
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?	There is some ad hoc survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resource management	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0	All resource management programs exist since long ago and are implemented	
Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)?	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
<i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
12. Staff numbers  Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?  <i>Inputs</i>	There are no staff	0	Not enough staff in environmental education department, eco-tourism and ranger service	To increase staff numbers
	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
13. Personnel management  Are the staff managed well enough?  <i>Process</i>	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0		
	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		
	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training  Is there enough training for staff?  <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff are untrained	0	Staff need to improve their professional skills.	To provide trainings on environmental education, eco-tourism, sustainable livelihood programs, ranger work
	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current	There is no budget for the protected area	0		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

budget					
	Is the current budget sufficient?	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1	The funds are enough only to maintain existing facilities and pay very small salaries	To attract additional funds through different fundraising activities and eco-tourism development
		The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		
<i>Inputs</i>		The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget		There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0		
Is the budget secure?		There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
<i>Inputs</i>		There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2	See the comment above	
		There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget		Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0		
Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?		Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
		Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		To train top management on budget management and other economic issues
<i>Process</i>		Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment		There are little or no equipment and facilities	0		
Are there adequate equipment and		There are some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1	The lack of funds makes strong limitations to this work	To search for additional funds

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

facilities?	There are equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
<i>Process</i>	There are adequate equipment and facilities	3		
19. Maintenance of equipment	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0		
Is equipment adequately maintained?	There is some ad <i>hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1	The equipment is maintained rarely when there are some funds for this	To search for additional funds
<i>Process</i>	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme	There is no education and awareness programme	0		
Is there a planned education programme?	There is a limited and ad <i>hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1	The gaps remain in awareness raising work with adult local population, authorities, business (especially, tourist companies). No detailed awareness raising program.	To plan work with these categories, to integrate innovative methods into environmental education work. To develop detailed awareness raising program.
<i>Process</i>	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0		
Is there co-operation with adjacent land users?	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2	The reserve works with local communities on fire prevention, planting forests, environmental education work. The co-operation with local and regional authorities should be more active and fruitful, the contacts with business remain very rare and episodic.	To strengthen co-operation with authorities and especially tourist business through collaborative projects, workshops, discussions etc.

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

<i>Process</i>	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		
Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1	No indigenous people within the reserve area	
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities  Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	The reserve regime was traditionally perceived as “no people” zone, it’s still the same	To change this perception through trainings for top management, to develop program of work with local communities
	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points  <i>Outputs</i>	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: Do visitors</i>	

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough?  <i>Outputs</i>			Visitor center is under construction. There are 12 itineraries for tourists but they are not well equipped and are good only for children, not for eco-tourists with bigger demands	To improve facilities to satisfy eco-tourists. To finish works on construction of the visitor center.
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial tourism	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	Possible issue for comment: examples of contributions	
Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management?  <i>Process</i>	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1	The contacts exist only with a small amount of local tourist companies	To find new partners, especially at the regional, national and international levels and develop co-operation with them. To start with workshops for tourist companies
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?  <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	There is no adequate regulation to collect fees in PA of Russia	To improve the federal legislation for PA
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Condition assessment Is the protected area being	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded		<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> It is important to provide details of the biodiversity, ecological or cultural values being affected	
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

<i>Outcomes</i>	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2	Some values suffer from poaching, illegal fishing and uncontrolled tourism	
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		
28. Access assessment	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	
Is access/resource use sufficiently controlled?  <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1	The protection system exists since long ago, it has proven its effectiveness	The the
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> how does national or regional development impact on the protected area?	To esp sur
Is the protected area providing	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1	The reserve does nothing to help local communities to gain any economic benefits from its existence	
economic benefits to local communities?	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
<i>Outcomes</i>	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	The monitoring activities don't have systematic character	To prc
Are management activities monitored against performance?	There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
<i>Planning/Process</i>	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>46.5</b>		

### Reporting Progress in Protected Areas: Data Sheet

Name of protected area	Baikalsky zapovednik		
Location of protected area (country, ecoregion, and if possible map reference)	Baikal lake region, Eastern Siberia		
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed	Gazetted	- 1969



Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Federal property	
Management Authority	Federal Service for Control in Nature Using, Russian Ministry of Natural Resources	
Size of protected area (ha)	<b>165724</b>	
Number of staff	Permanent <b>88</b>	Temporary <b>10</b>
Annual budget (US\$)	130 000	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	WH site, IUCN category 1, UNESCO biosphere reserve	
Reasons for designation	Conservation of unique natural ecosystems and landscapes	
Brief details of GEF funded project or projects in PA	GEF/UNEP project "Strengthening the network of Training Centers for PA managers as a demonstration of a tested approach", 2005-2008	
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	WWF Small grant Programm, 7 000 US \$ (2005)	
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	Protection of the ecosystem of the Baikal lake	
Objective 2	Environmental Education and Public awareness	
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Air pollution	
Threat 2	Inadequate financial support from the federal government	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Protection (ranger service)	
Activity 2	Public awareness	

**Name/s of assessor (including people consulted):** Dr. Valery Novikov,, Dr. Mikail Brynskih, Natalia Danilina, Vasily Sutula, director

**Contact details (email etc.):**  bairn@burnet.ru

**Date assessment carried out**

**(Day/Month/Year):**  20.07.2005

\* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps	
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves		
Does the protected area have legal status?	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1			
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2			
<i>Context</i>	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3			The Statute of the reserve
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0			
Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled?	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1			
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2			
<i>Context</i>	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3			
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> What happens if people are arrested?		
Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1			
<i>Context</i>	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2			The staff doesn't have necessary level of qualification (especially, rangers and foresters)
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and Regulations	3			
				Needs for training of inspectors (rangers) and foresters	

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
4. Protected area objectives  Have objectives been agreed?  <i>Planning</i>	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	There is very limited financial recourses	The managers of the reserve will take part in the preparation of the State Strategy for PA management. They will be trained in fundraising and management planning
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these Objectives	1		
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
5. Protected area design  Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives?  <i>Planning</i>	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> does the protected area contain different management zones and are these well maintained?  yes	
	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1		
	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2		
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation  Is the boundary known and demarcated?  <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area?	The informational panels can be improved
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
7. Management plan	There is no management plan for the protected area	0		
Is there a management plan and is it being implemented?  <i>Planning</i>	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1	Yes, not enough funding and not enough skills to implement it	To train staff in fundraising, management planning (including implementation and monitoring), other PA management issues
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
	Additional points	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan		
<i>Planning</i>	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
	8. Regular work plan	No regular work plan exists	0	
Is there an annual work plan?  <i>Planning/Outputs</i>	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		To make this plan more in correspondance with the reserve management plan
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		
	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
	9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area		
Do you have enough information to manage the area?	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Context</i>	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2	The scientific department is strong and scientific monitoring is being conducted for many years already. Not enough staff and equipment to do all necessary surveys	To identify priorities of the work of scientific department and to direct research more to the needs of management
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	The scientific department is strong and scientific monitoring is being conducted for many years already. Not enough staff and equipment to do all necessary surveys	To identify priorities of the work of scientific department and to direct research more to the needs of management
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?  <i>Inputs</i>	There is some ad hoc survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resource management	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		To improve the work of ranger service and forestries
Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)?  <i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
12. Staff numbers  Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?  <i>Inputs</i>	There are no staff	0	Not enough staff in environmental education department, eco-tourism and ranger service	To increase staff numbers
	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
13. Personnel management  Are the staff managed well enough?  <i>Process</i>	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0		
	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		
	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training  Is there enough training for staff?  <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff are untrained	0	Staff need to improve their professional skills.	To provide trainings on environmental education, eco-tourism, sustainable livelihood programs, fundraising, micro-crediting and other economic mechanisms, ranger work
	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current	There is no budget for the protected area	0		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

budget	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1	The funds are enough only to maintain existing facilities and pay very small salaries	To attract additional funds through different fundraising activities and eco-tourism development
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		
<i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0	See the comment above	
Is the budget secure?	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0		To train top management on budget management and other economic issues
Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		
<i>Process</i>	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment	There are little or no equipment and facilities	0		
Are there adequate equipment and	There are some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

facilities?	There are equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2	No funds	To search for funds to buy additional equipment
<i>Process</i>	There are adequate equipment and facilities	3		
19. Maintenance of equipment	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0		
Is equipment adequately maintained?	There is some ad <i>hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
<i>Process</i>	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme	There is no education and awareness programme	0	The gaps remain in awareness raising work with adult local population, authorities	To plan work with these categories, to integrate innovative methods into environmental education work
Is there a planned education programme?	There is a limited and ad <i>hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
<i>Process</i>	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0	The work with local and regional authorities should be more active and fruitful, the contacts with business remain very rare and episodic	To strengthen co-operation with authorities and business
Is there co-operation with adjacent land users?	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
<i>Process</i>	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		



Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

22. Indigenous people	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		
-----------------------	--	---	--	--

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1	No indigenous people within the reserve area	
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	The local people can have some input only on limited number of decisions but all principal issues are adressed only by the reserve staff, without their participation	To involve local population into reserve management, to develop and implement programs of co-operation, to develop and conduct special trainings for local community and for reserve's staff, common workshops and discussions
Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points  <i>Outputs</i>	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: Do visitors</i>	It's planned to build new facilities, f.ex.ethnografic village etc.
Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough?	Visitor facilities and services are Inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
<i>Outputs</i>	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial	There is little or no contact between	0	Possible issue for comment: examples	

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

tourism	managers and tourism operators using the protected area		of contributions	
Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management?  <i>Process</i>	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1	The contacts exist only with a small amount of local tourist companies	To find new partners, especially at the national and international levels and develop co-operation with them
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?  <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	There is no adequate regulation to collect fees in PA of Russia	To improve the federal legislation for PA
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Condition assessment Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives?  <i>Outcomes</i>	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded		<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> It is important to provide details of the biodiversity, ecological or cultural values being affected	To work with polluting enterprises through awareness campaigns and at the federal level
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2		
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
Additional points  <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		
28. Access assessment	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	
Is access/resource use sufficiently controlled?  <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1		The the
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment  Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities?  <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> how does national or regional development impact on the protected area?  The regime of strict nature reserve has never permitted to provide any benefits to the local people. No the reserve is starting to develop sustainable livelihood programs at its buffer zone – but they don't have enough knowledge and skills for that	To live in t dis prc
	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation  Are management activities monitored against performance?  <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	The monitoring activities don't have systematic character	To prc
	There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>55.8</b>		

**Reporting Progress in Protected Areas: Data Sheet**

Name of protected area	Kenozero National Park		
Location of protected area (country, ecoregion, and if possible map reference)	Russia, Archangelsk Region (Russian North West)		
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed	Gazetted - 1991	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Federal property, 7700 ha – private and other public property under the authority of National park		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Management Authority	Federal Service for Control in Nature Using, Russian Ministry of Natural Resources	
Size of protected area (ha)	139663	
Number of staff	Permanent 135	Temporary 15
Annual budget (US\$)	265 000	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	IUCN category 5, UNESCO biosphere reserve	
Reasons for designation	Conservation of unique natural and cultural landscapes	
Brief details of GEF funded project or projects in PA	GEF/UNEP project "Strengthening the network of Training Centers for PA managers as a demonstration of a tested approach", 2005-2008	
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	Norway-Russian Project for Cultural Landscapes conservation	
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	Protection of the natural and cultural landscapes	
Objective 2	Environmental Education and Public awareness	
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Poverty of local community	
Threat 2	Inadequate financial support from the national government	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Communication, education and public awareness	
Activity 2	Management of natural resources	

**Name/s of assessor (including people consulted):** Dr. Valery Novikov, Natalia Daniina, Nadejda Podoplekina, deputy director on environmental education and eco-tourism

**Contact details (email etc.):** [kenkadr@atnet.ru](mailto:kenkadr@atnet.ru)

**Date assessment carried out**

**(Day/Month/Year):** 25.07.2005

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves  The Statute of National park from 1991.	
Does the protected area have legal status?	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
<i>Context</i>	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	The methods are also written in the Statute of National park	
Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled?	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
<i>Context</i>	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> What happens if people are arrested?  Not enough trained staff	There is a need for training of rangers and foresters
Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
<i>Context</i>	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and Regulations	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
4. Protected area objectives  Have objectives been agreed?  <i>Planning</i>	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0		
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these Objectives	1		
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
5. Protected area design  Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives?  <i>Planning</i>	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> does the protected area contain different management zones and are these well maintained?	
	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1		
	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2		
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation  Is the boundary known and demarcated?  <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area?	
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
7. Management plan	There is no management plan for the protected area	0		
Is there a management plan and is it being implemented?	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1	Lack of funding is the main problem. The other is the lack of skills of the national park staff to implement management plan	To train staff, to attract new sources of funds
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
	<i>Planning</i>			
Additional points	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1		
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
<i>Planning</i>				
8. Regular work plan	No regular work plan exists	0		
Is there an annual work plan?	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1	They are not completed due to the lack of funds and management skills among the park staff	To train staff, to attract new sources of funds
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		
	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
<i>Planning/Outputs</i>				
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0		
Do you have enough information to manage the area?	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		



Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Context</i>	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2	The scientific department of the park is relatively young, very small and with not so much experience. The department also lacks staff.	To attract outside scientists to do monitoring and inventory on some species and ecosystems. To train specialists from scientific department, to increase number of this staff.
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	The scientific department of the park is relatively young, very small and with not so much experience. The department also lacks staff.	To attract outside scientists to do monitoring and inventory on some species and ecosystems. To train specialists from scientific department, to increase number of this staff.
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?	There is some ad hoc survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resource management	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0	Major gaps are related to the lack of funding and skills on specific activities management	To train staff (especially, rangers) and to attract additional funding for this
Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)?	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
<i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
12. Staff numbers	There are no staff	0		
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1	Yes. Park needs to increase the staff numbers, especially in the environmental education and scientific departments	See at the left
<i>Inputs</i>	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
13. Personnel management	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0	The top management is rather sophisticated in personnel management	It could be improved by providing additional trainings for top management staff
Are the staff managed well enough?	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		
<i>Process</i>	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training	Staff are untrained	0	Staff need to improve the professional skills, especially on environmental education (work with adult local population), eco-tourism, sustainable livelihood programs, micro-crediting funds at PA, trainings for rangers etc.	To provide necessary trainings (see at the left)
Is there enough training for staff?	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
<i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
	Staff training and skills are in tune with the	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

	management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs			
15. Current budget	There is no budget for the protected area	0		
Is the current budget sufficient?	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1	The significant lack of funding represents the major problem for overall management of the park	To attract the additional sources of funds from all possible sources
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		
<i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0		
Is the budget secure?	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2	The core budget is provided by the Ministry, but it's enough only to maintain the existing equipment and to pay the staff the minimum salary	To search for the outside financing more actively.
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0		
Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2	The financial managers are rather sophisticated	Best practice materials (international and national) would be useful to integrate new approaches to this management
<i>Process</i>	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

18. Equipment	There are little or no equipment and facilities	0	Due to the Norwegian project, most of the necessary equipment has been purchased.	There are still the gaps to be filled.
Are there adequate equipment and facilities?	There are some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		
	There are equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
Process	There are adequate equipment and facilities	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
19. Maintenance of equipment  Is equipment adequately maintained?  <i>Process</i>	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0		
	There is some ad <i>hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme  Is there a planned education programme?  <i>Process</i>	There is no education and awareness programme	0	The park staff has significant experience in this work, but there are significant gaps like efficient methods of work with adult local population, raising awareness on cultural values of the park, co-operation with other educational organizations etc.	There is an urgent need to fulfill these gaps and expand the park's work with different categories of population
	There is a limited and ad <i>hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours  Is there co-operation with adjacent land users?  <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighboring official or corporate land users	0	There are no planned programs of co-operation with different stakeholder categories	To develop these programs of co-operation and conduct activities to strengthen interaction with local communities and business
	There is limited contact between managers and neighboring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighboring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighboring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

22. Indigenous people	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	No indigenous people within the park area	
-----------------------	--	---	---	--

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	The local people can have some input only on limited number of decisions but all principal issues are adressed only by the park staff, without their participation	To involve local population into park management, to develop and implement programs of co-operation, to develop and conduct special trainings for local community and for park's staff, common workshops and discussions
Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
<i>Outputs</i>	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: Do visitors</i>	If the level of visitation grows (and it's planned that it will), the new facilities will be needed
Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough?	Visitor facilities and services are Inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
<i>Outputs</i>	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

25. Commercial tourism	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	Possible issue for comment: examples of contributions	
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Next steps</b>
Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management?  <i>Process</i>	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1		It's important to find new tour operators and to diversify the park product
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?  <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	There is no adequate regulation to collect fees in PA of Russia	To improve the federal legislation for PA
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Condition assessment Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives?        <i>Outcomes</i>	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1	Some cultural value (landscapes, monuments) are severely degraded and the park has no funds for restoration	To search for additional funds (i.e. in the Ministry of Culture) to restore these values, to strengthen interaction with organizations of culture
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded			
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2		
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		



Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1	The programs were developed in the framework of Norwegian project	To search funds for implementation of these programs
28. Access assessment	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments		
Is access/resource use sufficiently controlled?  <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1		The the	
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2			
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3			
29. Economic benefit assessment	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> how does national or regional development impact on the protected area?	To trai poq fun sus	
Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities?  <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1			
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2			The park has some successful experience of initiating traditional folks and production of souvenirs by local population - it's the main source of income at the local level
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3			
30. Monitoring and evaluation	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	The monitoring activities don't have systematic character	To pro	
Are management activities monitored against performance?	There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1			
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2			
<i>Planning/Process</i>	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3			
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>57.9</b>			

### Reporting Progress in Protected Areas: Data Sheet

Name of protected area	Kaniv nature zapovednik		
Location of protected area (country, ecoregion, and if possible map reference)	Ukraine, Cherkassy region, Kaniv district		
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed	Gazetted - 1923	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Property of T. Shevchenko Kyiv national university, 100 % state property		
Management Authority	T. Shevchenko Kyiv national university		
Size of protected area (ha)	2027 ha + 1354 ha buffer zone		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Number of staff	Permanent 72	Temporary 6
Annual budget (US\$)	120 000	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	1A IUCN category	
Reasons for designation	Conservation of unique natural ecosystems and landscapes	
Brief details of GEF funded project or projects in PA	GEF/UNEP project "Strengthening the network of Training Centers for PA managers as a demonstration of a tested approach", 2005-2008	
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	ISAR project "Biosphere reserve – perspective for Prydniprovja" with the aim to expand the reserve area, 2005-2006	
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	Nature conservation	
Objective 2	Scientific monitoring	
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Small area of the reserve that is not enough for normal conservation of viable populations of mammals	
Threat 2	Conflicts with local community (30 000 people in Kaniv, 7 neighboring villages)	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Protection (ranger service)	
Activity 2	Scientific research + student field practices of the university	

Name/s of assessor (including people consulted): Podobaylo Anatoliy (consultations – Chorniy Mikola, director, Petrichenko Oleg, deputy director on protection, Shevchik Vasil, senior researcher, Polishko Oleksander, chief of the museum of nature)

Contact details (email

tc.): kpz@ck.ukrtel.net

Date assessment carried out

(Day/Month/Year): 30.01.2007

\* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves  Acts on land ownership of Kyiv national university № 7-47 from 2001, Statute of Kaniv zapovednik from 26.04.2005	Everything OK
Does the protected area have legal status?	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
<i>Context</i>	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	Налажены контакты с местными властями, прошли общественные слушания.	To raise efficiency of work of PA ranger service To increase interaction between zapovednik and law enforcement authorities
Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching)	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
controlled?	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
<i>Context</i>	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> What happens if people are arrested?	To train staff, especially ranger service on law enforcement issues
Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
<i>Context</i>	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and Regulations	3		
4. Protected area objectives	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0		
Have objectives been agreed?	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these Objectives	1		
<i>Planning</i>	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3	Objectives are written in the Statute of the reserve. The management is directed to meet these objectives – it's approved by the Scientific Council of Kyiv national university	Everything OK
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> does the protected area contain different management zones and are these well maintained?	
Does the protected area need enlarging,	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1	There is a need to enlarge zapovednik and to establish biosphere reserve with the core in actual zapovednik (to add buffer zone and sustainable land use zone through including the lands of Kaniv municipality). Now the staff is working to solve this problem.	To continue work with authorities of all levels to expand the reserve. To apply for biosphere status for the reserve.
corridors etc to meet its objectives?	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2		
<i>Planning</i>	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area?	

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Is the boundary known and demarcated?  <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1	The boundary is described in the Acts on land use, is known by both the management authority and local residents as the reserve exists since 1923. But the number and quality of demarcation signs is not satisfactory – and this causes the problems with tourists.	To create new demarcation signs (information panels etc.) and to train PA staff on modern requirements to zapovednik information infrastructure
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Next steps</b>
7. Management plan	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	There is some plan of activities similar to those that zapovedniks used in the soviet time. But no appropriate management plan.	To train people (director, first) on PA management planning. To start preparing the management plan for the future Kaniv biosphere reserve.
Is there a management plan and is it being implemented?  <i>Planning</i>	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
Additional points  <i>Planning</i>	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1		
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
8. Regular work plan	No regular work plan exists	0		
Is there an annual	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

work plan?	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2	Information taken from annual reports of zapovednik to Scientific Council of Kyiv national university	To improve the work plan according to the new management plan as soon as it's developed
<i>Planning/Outputs</i>	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0		
Do you have enough information to manage the area?	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		
Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Context</i>	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2	Chronicles of nature exist from 1968 where all information from scientific monitoring is noted. There is a lack of information on invertebrates, mushrooms and algae and also there is a need in additional survey on cultural values of the reserve	To carry out more scientific studies on the topics mentioned. To train scientific staff on the need to study cultural values along with the natural ones.
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	Rich traditions of scientific research, but not directed towards decision of concrete management objectives of the reserve (too theoretical research)	To train scientific staff on how to make their research more close to PA management practical needs. To adopt the research programs correspondingly.
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?	There is some ad hoc survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

11. Resource management	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		
Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)?	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1	The management of water resources is not adequate as the river Dnieper is not included in the area of nature reserve. Hydrological regime of Kaniv reservoir basin makes problems to coastal ecosystems management. Fire, forest and species management is adequate, there are some problems with invasive species.	To expand the reserve area, including the river Dnieper inside. To make scientific research on the ways to improve resource management.
<i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Next steps</b>
12. Staff numbers	There are no staff	0		
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1	There is a lack of staff in ranger service, only 1 person in environmental education department, enough staff in management department.	To increase the number of staff in the departments mentioned. To achieve this – firstly, to train the PA director and to persuade him that this is necessary
<i>Inputs</i>	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
13. Personnel management	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0		
Are the staff managed well enough?	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		



Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

<i>Process</i>	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2	Прошел обучение начальник службы охраны и провел тренинги для персонала	
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training Is there enough training for staff?	Staff are untrained	0	2 сотрудника прошли курсы в экоцентре «Заповедники».	
<i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current budget	There is no budget for the protected area	0		To search for new sources of funds for the zapovednik (potential variants – eco-tourism, beekeeping in the surrounding areas etc.). To start this work first step is to train the director and economists of zapovednik on fundraising and conservation finance issues.
Is the current budget sufficient?	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

<p>The available budget is acceptable, but</p> <p>could be further improved to fully achieve effective management</p>	<p><b>2</b></p>	<p>Появились поступления от использования общежития. Главбух ездила по обмену опытом в Асканию-Нову. Директор принимает участие в подготовке малых грантов.</p>	
---	-----------------	---	--

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0		
Is the budget secure?	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2	The budget for salary and main management issues is secure (but little), but no money for innovations, new initiatives is not secure at all and varies much from year to year.	Again, to search for new sources of funds for zapovednik innovative programs.
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0		
Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1	The budget is mostly spent to maintenance of material and technical basis, but not to the conservation management	To attract new funds by diversifying the budget sources
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		
<i>Process</i>	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment	There are little or no equipment and facilities	0		
Are there adequate equipment and facilities?	There are some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1,5	В бюджете Университета запланирована реконструкция столовой.	To attract new funds for reparation of museum of nature and for purchase of equipment. To work with University authorities to receive money for these issues from them.
	There are equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Process</i>	There are adequate equipment and facilities	3		
19. Maintenance of equipment	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0		
Is equipment adequately maintained?	There is some ad <i>hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1	Only the equipment that is so old that can't be used at all is being maintained.	The same as above
<i>Process</i>	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme	There is no education and awareness programme	0		
Is there a planned education programme?	There is a limited and ad <i>hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1,5	The environmental education program is being prepared after the training at EcoCenter "Zapovedniks". The plan of reconstruction and renovation of the visitor center has been made. The work with children improved, new environmental education materials are being used. The work with adult population started.	There is more need to train PA staff on environmental education, especially on the work with adult population, PR, communities involvement, eco-tourism etc. The staff of Env.Education Department should be increased to carry this work.
<i>Process</i>	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0		
Is there co-operation with adjacent land users?	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2	Регулярные контакты с сельсоветами, гослесхозом, Музеем Шевченко, Каневрыбой.	Still more need to train staff (starting from the director) on interaction with business and authorities. Another option – to train

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

<i>Process</i>	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	Local community = indigenous people. Please, refer to the next question.	
Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	No participation of local communities in decisions on PA management.	To train PA staff on modern methods of interaction with local communities, sustainable livelihoods programs (in the buffer zone and within the planned biosphere reserve), participation management of PA etc. To make awareness raising campaigns with local communities
Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1	-	

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

<i>Outputs</i>	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1	No such programs	
24. Visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> Do visitors	To train director on the benefits they can obtain from developing sustainable tourism within future biosphere reserve (in current zapovednik it can't be a priority). To search for funding to make new facilities and to improve the existing ones. To start earning money from the existing facilities.
Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough?	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1,5	There is a student hostel, student café, nature museum and few ecological trails without infrastructure. All facilities are very poor and simple, some urgently need repairation.	
<i>Outputs</i>	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2	КПЗ включен в турпрограмму «Золотой венок Киевщины и Черкащины»	
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial tourism	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0		If zapovednik receives biosphere status, there will be a need to develop commercial tourism. Now it's time to start training people on this.
Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management?	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1	Есть контакты с турфирмами, которые возят детей в музей природы, но заповеднику от этого нет доходов.	
<i>Process</i>	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism,	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

<p>finest) are applied, do they help protected area management?</p> <p><i>Outputs</i></p>	<p>The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs</p>	1	<p>There are accommodation fees but they go to the budget of Kyiv university. Most of the fines collected go to the national government.</p>	<p>To search for the ways to earn extra money which will go straight to zapovednik budget</p>
	<p>The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area</p>	2		
	<p>There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas</p>	3		
<p>27. Condition assessment Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives?</p> <p><i>Outcomes</i></p>	<p>Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded</p>		<p><i>Possible issue for comment:</i> It is important to provide details of the biodiversity, ecological or cultural values being affected</p>	<p>To improve management, first, through expanding the reserve size, making scientific research more practical, improving the work of ranger service, integratin new approaches to management of numerous cultural values.</p>
	<p>Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded</p>	1		
	<p>Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted</p>	2		
	<p>Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact</p>	3		
<p>Additional points</p> <p><i>Outputs</i></p>	<p>There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone</p>	+1		
<p>28. Access assessment</p>	<p>Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives</p>	0		

### Reporting Progress in Protected Areas: Data Sheet

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	
Is access/resource use sufficiently controlled?  <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1	Fish poaching and gathering of mushrooms by local population are serious problems. Source of information – interview with deputy director on protection.	To
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> how does national or regional development impact on the protected area? Подготовлены проекты по развитию сельского туризма в окрестностях заповедника. Ведутся переговоры с инвесторами по строительству яхт на водохранилище.	To prc za Im loc
Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities?	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
<i>Outcomes</i>	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	There are annual work planning with report to Scientific Council of the university and to National PA service. But there is no M&E strategy	To mc
Are management activities monitored against performance?	There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
<i>Planning/Process</i>	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>36.2</b>		

Name of protected area	Zakaznik "Leliakivskiy"		
Location of protected area (country, ecoregion, and if possible map reference)	Ukraine, Poltava region, Pyriatyn district		
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed 2003	Gazetted - 2005	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Municipal property 100%		



Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Management Authority	Sasenovsky municipal council	
Size of protected area (ha)	379,9	
Number of staff	Permanent 0	Temporary 1
Annual budget (US\$)	0	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	4 IUCN category	
Reasons for designation	Conservation of wetland natural ecosystems	
Brief details of GEF funded project or projects in PA	GEF/UNEP project "Strengthening the network of Training Centers for PA managers as a demonstration of a tested approach", 2005-2008	
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	ISAR project "Create your own nature reserve", 2003 with the aim to establish the reserve ISAR project "PAs of Poltava region»	
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	Nature conservation	
Objective 2	Sustainable development of local communities	
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Small area of the reserve that is not enough for normal conservation of viable populations of mammals	
Threat 2	Poaching, absence of the reserve staff	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Sustainable management of natural resources	
Activity 2	Recreation and scientific monitoring	

Name/s of assessor (including people consulted): Podobaylo Anatoliy (consultations – Milemko Volodimir, head of local environmental service)

Contact details (email tc.): [podob@biocc.univ.kiev.ua](mailto:podob@biocc.univ.kiev.ua)

Date assessment carried out

(Day/Month/Year): 30.09.2005

\* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<p><i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves</p> <p>There is official decision on gazetting the protected area from March 2005. The Statute of the reserve is being prepared now as well as the decision on expansion of the reserve area.</p>	To finalize the Statute of the reserve and officially approve the expansion of the reserve.
Does the protected area have legal status?	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
Context	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	<p>There are only very common mechanisms written in the National Law on Protected Areas. The Statute of the reserve is not yet prepared.</p>	To finalize the Statute of the reserve and officially approve it.
Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching)	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
controlled?	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
Context	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	There is still no staff in the reserve	To establish public environmental inspection to enforce PA legislation in the reserve

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
<i>Context</i>	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and Regulations	3		
	4. Protected area objectives	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	
Have objectives been agreed?	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these Objectives	1	The objectives are written in the scientific rationale of the reserve, but not yet managed according to these objectives	To inform all land owners and local population about the objectives of the reserve and to start implementing them
<i>Planning</i>	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> does the protected area contain different management zones and are these well maintained?  There is a need to enlarge the reserve to establish the national park with the core in actual reserve (to add buffer zone and sustainable land use zone).	To continue work with authorities of all levels to expand the reserve. To apply for national park status for the reserve for the authorities of all levels.
Does the protected area need enlarging,	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1		
corridors etc to meet its objectives?	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

<i>Planning</i>	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	The boundary is not known as the reserve has just been created. There is only 1 informational panel at the entrance to the reserve.	To create new demarcation signs (information panels etc.)
Is the boundary known and demarcated?	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
<i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		
7. Management plan	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	There is no management plan.	To start preparing the management plan for the future Udaiskiy National Park.
Is there a management plan and is it being implemented?	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
<i>Planning</i>	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
Additional points	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1		
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

<i>Planning</i>	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
8. Regular work plan	No regular work plan exists	0	No plans, only some plans of scientific monitoring at the reserve exist	To prepare the work plan for this or the following year
Is there an annual work plan?	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		
	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
<i>Planning/Outputs</i>				
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0		
Do you have enough information to manage the area?	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1	There is the list of species and critical habitats and values	There is a need in conducting more detailed surveys
<i>Context</i>	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2		
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	There is no research programs, only some ad hoc studies, very rare and limited	To start research, to develop the program of it
Is there a programme of	There is some ad hoc survey and research work	1		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

<i>Inputs</i>	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resource management	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0	There are only irregular anti-poaching campaigns, and regular water management	To apply for the national park status to the reserve, to start management of other resources
Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)?	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
	<i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed		
12. Staff numbers	There are no staff	0	The nature reserves of Ukraine have no staff. Their protection must be the responsibility of local municipality and local environmental service.	To establish and train the public environmental ranger service for the reserve. The next step – to create the national park.
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
	<i>Inputs</i>	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site		
13. Personnel management	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0	Not appropriate as there is no staff	

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Are the staff managed well enough?	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		
<i>Process</i>	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training	Staff are untrained	0	There is no staff	It's necessary to train public environmental ranger service staff
Is there enough training for staff?	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
	<i>Inputs/Process</i> Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current budget	There is no budget for the protected area	0	There is no budget for the reserve. It was created using funds from the grants.	To create national park with the budget - the first step for it – to approve the Ukraine State Strategy of PA management in the Council of Ministers of Ukraine
Is the current budget sufficient?	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0	Not appropriate as there is no budget at all	
Is the budget secure?	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0	Not appropriate as there is no budget at all	
Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness			
<i>Process</i>	Budget management is adequate but could be improved			
	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness			
18. Equipment	There are little or no equipment and facilities	0	There is no equipment	To purchase equipment
Are there adequate equipment and facilities?	There are some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		
	There are equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
	There are adequate equipment and facilities	3		
<i>Process</i>				
19. Maintenance of equipment	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0	Not appropriate as there is no equipment	



Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Is equipment adequately maintained?  <i>Process</i>	There is some ad <i>hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities			
	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance			
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained			
20. Education and awareness programme  Is there a planned education programme?  <i>Process</i>	There is no education and awareness programme	0	No program and no work in this direction	To conduct trainings for local and regional public rangers, these rangers should start work with local population after
	There is a limited and ad <i>hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users?  <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0	Very limited communication with local municipality – only when there is a need to solve some conflict. Some co-operation is now starting the field of expansion of the reserve.	to train local and regional authorities (through public hearings, discussions, meetings, round-tables) on the ways of co-operation with zakaznik and how they can benefit from it
	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	Local community = indigenous people. Please, refer to the next question.	

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	Local communities initiated the changes in the reserve Statute in its part related to sport hunting and fishing.	To train local authority on modern methods of interaction with local communities, sustainable livelihoods programs, participation management of PA etc. To make awareness raising campaigns with local communities
Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
<i>Outputs</i>	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	No visitor facilities at all	There is a good potential to develop green tourism at the reserve. There is a need to train farmers of the region on green tourism.
Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough?	Visitor facilities and services are Inappropriate for current levels of visitation or			
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved			

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

<i>Outputs</i>	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation			
25. Commercial tourism	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	No contact with tour operators, tourism is not considered a priority for PA management	Now it's time to start training people to develop commercial agricultural tourism, to start co-operation with tour operators.
Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management?  <i>Process</i>	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1		
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?  <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	No fees are collected	It'll be only possible if the reserve receives the status of national park.
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Condition assessment Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives?	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded			
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

<i>Outcomes</i>	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2	Most of the flood plain ecosystems are not degraded, but all meadow ecosystems are of anthropogenic origin.	To improve management of meadow ecosystems. To expand the reserve to include cultural values.
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
<i>Additional points</i> <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		
28. Access assessment	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	
Is access/resource use sufficiently controlled?  <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1	Only construction, irrigation, melioration etc. are limited.	
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	The reserve regime is not very strict, so there is no damage to local community income, but no benefits either	To aut prc will Imj loc
Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities?	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
<i>Outcomes</i>	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	No monitoring activities	To act
Are management activities monitored against performance?	There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
<i>Planning/Process</i>	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>12</b>		

**Reporting Progress in Protected Areas: Data Sheet**

Name of protected area	National park "Braslavskie ozera" (Braslav lakes)		
Location of protected area (country, ecoregion, and if possible map reference)	Belarus, 211970, Vitebsk region, Braslav district		
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed 1993	Gazetted 1995	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	100 % state property (national level)		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Management Authority	Presidential Administration of Belarus Republic		
Size of protected area (ha)	69100		
Number of staff	Permanent	650	Temporary -
Annual budget (US\$)	1.5 mln		
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	No, IUCN category 5		
Reasons for designation	Conservation of natural ecosystems of Braslav lakes and eco-tourism development		
Brief details of GEF funded project or projects in PA	GEF/UNEP project "Strengthening the network of Training Centers for PA managers as a demonstration of a tested approach", 2005-2008		
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	Participated in the GEF project "Biodiversity conservation of "Bielovejskaya pusha" National park"		
List the two primary protected area objectives			
Objective 1	Conservation of natural forest and lakes ecosystems of the region		
Objective 2	Eco-tourism and environmental education		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)			
Threat 1	Using the park area and buffer zone for development (not conservation) purposes		
Threat 2	Increasing anthropogenic pressure on the ecosystems within the park area		
List top two critical management activities			
Activity 1	Protection of landscapes and biodiversity		
Activity 2	Development of sustainable eco-tourism		

Name/s of assessor (including people consulted):    Ivkovich Valeriy (project national coordinator in Belarus)

Contact details (email tc.):    valery.ivkovich@tut.by

Date assessment carried out

(Day/Month/Year):    09.09.2005

\* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves	
Does the protected area have legal status?	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
<i>Context</i>	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3	The Statute of NP from 1995	
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	The ranger service and protection system exist, but are not efficient. The illegal hunting, fishing and lodging are not well controlled.	To train staff, to increase efficiency of ranger service work, to make awareness campaign, to conduct systematic work with different land users and local communities
Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching)	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
controlled?	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
<i>Context</i>	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Context	Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1	The rangers and other staff of the park are not experienced and well trained, the conflicts with local population are often, the park is relatively new structure in the region – all this often causes problems in enforcing PA legislation	To train rangers and top management on law issues and on methods of work with local population
		The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
		The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and Regulations	3		
Planning	4. Protected area objectives	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	The objectives are written in the law “On protected areas” and in the Statute of the reserve. But the main objective on nature conservation is often ignored to the sake of eco-tourism development	To improve efficiency of work of ranger service and of scientific department of the park, to train top management on general conservation issues
	Have objectives been agreed?	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these Objectives	1		
		The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
		The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0			



Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives?  <i>Planning</i>	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1	There are different land users within the park territory that makes PA management very difficult and causes numerous conflicts	To decrease the number of land uses within the park area, to make the structure of PA more simple and the functional zones – bigger and less in number
	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2		
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation  Is the boundary known and demarcated?  <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area?	To train park staff on making informational panels, to create these signs and to equip all entrances with them.
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

7. Management plan	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	There is no management and no funds to develop it	To develop management plan for the park. First steps to this – to train staff on management planning and to lobby the national law on obligatory management planning for all national parks
Is there a management plan and is it being implemented?	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
<i>Planning</i>	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
Additional points	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1		
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
<i>Planning</i>				
8. Regular work plan	No regular work plan exists	0		As soon as management plan is prepared, the annual work plans should be integrated and monitored according to it
Is there an annual work plan?	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2	The plan exists and is approved by the Presidential Administration. Some activities are not completed, most of them are not systematic, some of them – don't correspond to the regime of the national park at all	
<i>Planning/Outputs</i>	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Do you have enough information to manage the area?	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1	The park exists since 1995 only and the information is not yet sufficient. The process of resource inventarization is complicated by the lack of staff and funds for this job	To hire scientists from other organizations to do this work. To search for additional funding for scientific research (in the state budget and in other sources)
<i>Context</i>	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2		
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0		
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?	There is some ad hoc survey and research work	1	The scientific department is very small. The research is not a priority for the park. Some ad hoc work is being done by outside experts	To attract more outside scientists to work in the park. To develop program of scientific research and to direct it to fulfil management objectives of the park.
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
<i>Inputs</i>				
11. Resource management	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)?	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2	There are fire control system, forest and water management systems, but they are not perfect, especially the water one. The poaching and illegal fishing in lakes exists and it's a serious problems	To integrate new methods and approaches to resource management systems. To strengthen the protection system.
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		
<i>Process</i>				
12. Staff numbers	There are no staff	0		
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2	The number of staff is sufficient, even too many people in some departments. But, at the same time, there is a lack of personnel in scientific department, environmental education	To move personnel from some departments to the others
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
<i>Inputs</i>				
13. Personnel management	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

<p>Are the staff managed well enough?</p> <p><i>Process</i></p>	<p>Problems with personnel management</p> <p>partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The staff distribution between departments is not optimal for the national park (see above). The conflicts and problems exist.</p>	<p>To train director and deputy directors on stagg management and conflict solving, to modify the staff structure of the park (only possible at the level of Presidential Administration)</p>
	<p>Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved</p>	<p>2</p>		
	<p>Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives</p>	<p>3</p>		
<p>14. Staff training Is there enough</p> <p>training for staff?</p> <p><i>Inputs/Process</i></p>	<p>Staff are untrained</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>No trainings and raising qualification courses have ever been conducted with the park personnel. The special skills are very low, most of the people don't have special education, most of them came to work in the park from organizations with completely different tasks</p>	<p>There is ugent need in trainings for all staff from all departments of the park, starting from top management</p>
	<p>Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area</p>	<p>1</p>		
	<p>Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management</p>	<p>2</p>		
	<p>Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs</p>	<p>3</p>		
<p>15. Current budget</p>	<p>There is no budget for the protected area</p>	<p>0</p>		
	<p>The available budget is inadequate for basic</p>	<p>1</p>		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Is the current budget sufficient?	management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage The available budget is acceptable, but  could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2	There is lack of funds for several types of park's activities (see comment below) but overall budget is adequate	To change the budget structure, to search for additional funds for several activities
<i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0		
Is the budget secure?	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2	The core budget is being spent to management of resources and to maintenance of tourism facilities. But staff trainings, purchase of modern equipment, scientific research are completely reliant on outside funding	To search for the additional funding for innovative initiatives
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0		
Is the budget managed to	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1	See comment above. The lack of professional management skills of the staff, including PA director, economic and financial staff also makes budget management not efficient	To train PA staff, especially on management and financial issues. To modify budget structure to give more funds to nature conservation, science and environmental education activities.
meet critical management needs?	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

<i>Process</i>	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment	There are little or no equipment and facilities	0	Major equipment and facilities exist. Tourism facilities are in good condition and well maintained. But other facilities not directly related to tourism and equipment for research are inadequate, old and in not enough numbers	To purchase necessary equipment and to build / restore facilities that need it
Are there adequate equipment and	There are some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		
facilities?	There are equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
<i>Process</i>	There are adequate equipment and facilities	3		
19. Maintenance of equipment	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0	Only old equipment and facilities are maintained due to the lack of funds	To apply for additional funding for reparation of buildings to the state budget, to search for additional sources of funds, especially for equipment
Is equipment adequately maintained?	There is some ad <i>hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
<i>Process</i>	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme	There is no education and awareness programme	0	There is no environmental education department. No work besides very rare lectures in schools and ad hoc campaigns are done in this field	To develop program of work, to train staff of eco-tourism department on the need for environmental education and its methods, to conduct awareness raising campaigns

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Is there a planned education programme?  <i>Process</i>	There is a limited and ad <i>hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users?  <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0	The contacts are limited due to the lack of knowledge on how and why to do it among the park staff	To train staff on modern methods of interaction with neighbours and conflict resolution, to develop plan of work in this direction
	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	See the point 23 for this	
Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		



Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

23. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		
Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1	Local authorities, representatives of local and regional business and communities participate in some discussions on national park management, but not in all of them	To strengthen relations with local population through development of systematic program of participatory management of the park. First step – to train top management that this is necessary and how to do it
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
<i>Outputs</i>	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services	0		
Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough?	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1	The park has very good hotels, tourist bases for different income categories, tourist equipment. The number of facilities for low income tourist can be increased	
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
<i>Outputs</i>	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial	There is little or no contact between	0		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

tourism	managers and tourism operators using the protected area			
Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management?	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1	The contacts exist but they are mostly ad hoc, there are few long-term commercial partners and advertising of park product and its image could be much better	To pay more attention to the work with commercial tourist companies, to develop the long-term program of this work, to attract new partners from the capital and international tour operators, to diversify tour product of the park, especially the number of itineraries for scientific and cognitive tourism
Process	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0		To diversify tourism product to gain more profit from it. To direct these funds to further development of eco-tourism and work with people.
Outputs	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3	The fees go to the park, but their amount is not sufficient and doesn't constitute important source of funding for the park (compared to state funding it's almost nothing). These fees don't go to further development of eco-tourism and work with people, but to resource management and numerous auxiliary activities of the park.	
27. Condition assessment	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded			

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:  
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives?	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1	The park management of the area and resources is not yet appropriate to the national park regime - the hunting, fishing and cutting forests still exist within the park's territory. It causes degradation of some ecosystems, particularly of aquatic ones.	To stop the activities that are not appropriate to the park status (first step – to train top management that this must be done). To strengthen nature conservation activities of the park.
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2		
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		
28. Access assessment	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	
Is access/resource use sufficiently controlled?  <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1	The ranger service exists and works, but the staff has no special skills and the work is not effective. The access to the park is not at all limited, the control system is not good, at many entrances there is no guard at all.	To sys infr ent nur
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	The park is one of the main economic agents in Braslav region. It provides working places and some possibilities of additional income from tourists	To inc from live proc tou
Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities?	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
<i>Outcomes</i>	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	The parks regularly reports to the Presidential Administration, but no systematic internal monitoring of the results achieved is not being done	To inte
Are management activities monitored	There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
against performance?	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
<i>Planning/Process</i>	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>42.4</b>		

### Reporting Progress in Protected Areas: Data Sheet

Name of protected area	Berezinsky biosphere zapovednik (biosphere reserve)		
Location of protected area (country, ecoregion, and if possible map reference)	Belarus, Vitebsk region, Lepel district		
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed	1924	Gazetted - 31.01.1925
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	100 % state property (national level)		
Management Authority	Presidential Administration of Belarus Republic		
Size of protected area (ha)	85 000		
Number of staff	Permanent	Temporary	
Annual budget (US\$)	1 000 000		
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	1A IUCN category, biosphere reserve, biogenetic reserve, Diploma of Council of Europe		
Reasons for designation	Conservation of natural ecosystems, flora and fauna		
Brief details of GEF funded project or projects in PA	GEF/UNEP project "Strengthening the network of Training Centers for PA managers as a demonstration o a tested approach", 2005-2008		
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	Participated in the GEF project "Biodiversity conservation of "Bielovejskaya pusha' National park"		
List the two primary protected area objectives			
Objective 1	Conservation of natural forest and marshes ecosystems of the southern taiga and their dynamics		
Objective 2	Scientific research and environmental education		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)			
Threat 1	Changes in hydrological regime of Berezina river and its tributaries		
Threat 2	Increasing anthropogenic pressure at the adjacent lands		
List top two critical management activities			
Activity 1	Protection of landscapes and biodiversity		
Activity 2	Scientific monitoring		

**Name/s of assessor (including people consulted):** \_\_\_Kashtalian Aleksander (consultations – Hmaro Vikentiy (director), Ivkovich Valeriy (deputy director on scientific research), Zimnickiy Vadim (chief of ranger service) \_\_\_\_\_

**Contact details (email tc.):** BBSR@VITEBSK.UNIBEL.BY

**Date assessment carried out**

(Day/Month/Year): 06.09.2005

\* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves	
Does the protected area have legal status?	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
<i>Context</i>	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3	The Statute of the reserve from 1925	
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	PA ranger service is rather efficient – the protection system is well planed, the work is being done on a systematic basis, the control of access to the reserve area and to illegal activities exists The main problems – the lack of skills and education of rangers	The protection system will rest the same. It's necessary to concentrate on improving qualifications of rangers of the reserve
Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching)	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
controlled?	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
<i>Context</i>	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0		

Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1	The rangers are not well trained and the staff rotation in ranger service is very big. This causes problems in law enforcement.	To train rangers on law issues. To introduce measures to stimulate them to work more efficiently. To increase the efficiency of ranger service work.
<i>Context</i>	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and Regulations	3		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Next steps</b>
4. Protected area objectives	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	The objectives are written in the law “On protected areas” and in the Statute of the reserve. The management is directed to fulfil the objectives. There are some violations of the reserve regime (hunting, cutting trees), but not too much	To stop all activities that don't correspond to the reserve objectives and protection regime.
Have objectives been agreed?	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these Objectives	1		
<i>Planning</i>	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0		



Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives?  <i>Planning</i>	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1	The design satisfies the major functions of the reserve. But, according to the national law "On protected areas" the reserve doesn't have zonation that causes considerable problems of management	To develop and implement management plan for the biosphere reserve (according to the international legislation on biosphere reserves). In this plan - to divide zapovednik area into zones with different management regimes
	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2		
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation  Is the boundary known and demarcated?  <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area?	
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		

7. Management plan	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	There is no management and no funds to develop it	To develop management plan for the reserve. First step to this – to study the existing national and international experience on management planning, to train staff on it.
Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? <i>Planning</i>	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
Additional points <i>Planning</i>	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1		
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
8. Regular work plan	No regular work plan exists	0	The plan exists and is approved by the Presidential Administration. Some activities are not completed, some are not systematic and well monitored	As soon as management plan is prepared, the annual work plans should be integrated and monitored according to it
Is there an annual work plan?	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		
<i>Planning/Outputs</i>	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0		

Do you have enough information to manage the area?	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		
<i>Context</i>	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2,5	The information on habitats and species is gathered since 1960-s (Letopis prirody, annual scientific reports and results of scientific monitoring).	To improve this work it's planned to create GIS and electronic version of "Letopis prirody" (nature chronicles) for the reserve
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	The scientific research is very strong and long-term monitoring of natural processes is being done, but it's not directed to the needs of management (science for science only)	To modify the plan of scientific work to direct it to practical things. To train scientific staff of the reserve on possibilities of practical use of the results of their research in management
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?	There is some ad hoc survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
	<i>Inputs</i> There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resource management	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		

Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)?	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1	There is rather effective fire control system, forest management system etc.	Innovative methods still can be integrated there
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		
<i>Process</i>				
12. Staff numbers	There are no staff	0	The number of staff is below the demand in eco-tourism department, no staff in environmental education	To move some people from some axiliary services of the reserve to work with people
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
<i>Inputs</i>	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
13. Personnel management	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0	There are conflicts between the personnel, not always managed well. It's partly due to the fact that PA directors are being changed almost every year	To train the new director of the reserve and deputy directors on staff management and conflict resolution
Are the staff managed well enough?	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		

<i>Process</i>	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training Is there enough	Staff are untrained	0	Staff of the reserve has never participated in any trainings. Most of rangers have no special education and no skills to do their job. The work with visitors and local population is mostly done by staff from scientific department who have no skills of this work. No people have knowledge on management planning and other economic tools of PA management.	To train staff on all the topics mentioned, to organize exchange visits and study-tours to other reserves, to provide guidelines and methodological materials
training for staff?	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
<i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current budget	There is no budget for the protected area	0	The budget is enough for basic management and scientific research, but it's not adequate for staff training, equipment, work with population and visitors	To search for additional funding (mostly from international projects and sustainable eco-tourism as all other activities are prohibited by the reserve regime)
Is the current budget sufficient?	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0	See the comment above	To search for the additional funding for innovative initiatives
Is the budget secure?	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0	The lack of professional management skills of the staff, including PA director, economic and financial staff, and very big rotation of top management staff causes problems with budget management	To train PA staff, especially on management and financial issues
Is the budget managed to	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
meet critical management needs?	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		
<i>Process</i>	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment	There are little or no equipment and facilities	0		
Are there adequate equipment and	There are some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		

facilities?	There are equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2,5	Major equipment and facilities exist and are in good condition. The training center of the reserve that is under construction now needs additional equipment. The ranger service also needs new equipment.	To purchase necessary equipment
<i>Process</i>	There are adequate equipment and facilities	3		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Next steps</b>
19. Maintenance of equipment	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0		
Is equipment adequately maintained?	There is some ad <i>hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1	Only old equipment and facilities are maintained due to the lack of money	To apply for additional funding for the national authorities and to search for other sources of funding for these purposes
<i>Process</i>	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme	There is no education and awareness programme	0		
Is there a planned education programme?	There is a limited and ad <i>hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1	There is no environmental education department in the reserve. The education work is limited to the ad hoc lectures in schools. No work is being done with adult population, there is no systematic awareness program	To train reserve staff on environmental education methods. To develop program of this work and to start implementing it. To conduct awareness raising campaigns. To create the separate department of env.education within the existing department of eco-tourism.
<i>Process</i>	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0		

neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users?	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1	Very little contacts due to contradictions between the final aims of reserve and its neighbors – conservation versus economic development. This is a position of reserve staff. The PA managers are very conservative and don't want to communicate much with other stakeholders – prefer to be as far from them as possible	To raise awareness of all neighbors on the existence of the reserve, its functions and value. To make PR campaigns for the reserve. To invite neighboring organizations to participate in the reserve events.
<i>Process</i>	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		
Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	The state is the only land owner and land user at this area. All management decisions are taken by PA staff itself. Local people don't participate in these decisions.	It's planned to include more local people into the staff of the PA.. It's also necessary to involve local people into all activities of the reserve and particularly to the preparation of the future management plan of the reserve
Do local communities resident or near	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		



	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
<i>Outputs</i>	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services	0		
Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough?	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2	The reserve has good hotel (just after restauration), several tourist bases with good facilities. But the number of available facilities is not sufficient and the number of services is rather small	To improve this but only within the limits of reserve regime of protection
<i>Outputs</i>	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial tourism	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Next steps</b>

Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management?  <i>Process</i>	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1	The reserve works with several commercial tour operators, but their number and types of tour product are very limited due to the strict regime of protection of the reserve.	It's planned to develop new tourist products and itineraries, maybe with new commercial companies but these products must satisfy the rules of the reserve
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?  <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	Some fees from tourism go to the reserve itself but the share in the reserve budget is very small	To raise portion of fees going to the reserve and the total amount of fees collected from tourism through diversification of tourist product (within the limitations of the reserve regime)
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
27. Condition assessment Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives?  <i>Outcomes</i>	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3	The reserve exists since 1925 and protection system is managed according to its objectives	To strengthen the existing gaps in the protection system
	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded			
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2		
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are			

	predominantly intact	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		
28. Access assessment	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0		



Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Is access/resource use sufficiently controlled?  <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1	The law "On Protected Areas" and the Statute of the reserve strictly prohibit the access or use of the reserve not in accordance with its objectives. The protection system exists since 1925 and is rather effective in controlling this	
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment  Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities?  <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	The reserve is the main economic agent in the area, giving working places to local people (most of the local residents are the staff of the reserve). But besides working places it doesn't provide any benefits to communities.	To integrate more local residents into the staff of the reserve, increase communication with local population, involve them in planning for PA and into participation in all activities of the reserve. To study possibilities of providing benefits for local people and to train zapovednik top managers on these issues.
	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation Are management activities monitored  against performance?	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	The reserve regularly reports to the Presidential Administration and to the Ministry of Nature Protection, but no systematic internal monitoring of the results achieved is being done	To develop monitoring plan and to integrate it into the reserve management plan
	There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2 <sup>197</sup>		



