

Expanded Constituency Workshop: Case Questions on Project Implementation Reports

Project 1: Decentralized Rural Electrification

Implementing Agency: World Bank

Section 1: Project Status

1. What is the original closing date? Is there a revised closing date? If so, what is that date?
2. Is there a planned mid-term review date? Has a mid-term review already taken place, if so when?

Section 2: Development Objectives

1. What is the objective of the project? What is the global environmental objective? What is the difference?
2. What are the ratings for the PDO (Project Development Objective), GEO (Global Environment Objective), and Implementation Progress (IP)?

Section 3: Implementation Status Overview

3. How many households have received electrification through the project?
4. For the GEF DO, why has the rating from last year been downgraded?

Section 4: Project Development Indicators

Select one indicator from the matrix and identify the baseline, current status, and end target.

Project 2: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Territorial Planning Policies and Practices

Implementing Agency: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Section 1: Project Status

3. What is the revised closing date of the project?
4. How many site visits were conducted during the reporting period?

Section 2: Development Objectives

Describe the objective indicator from the matrix and identify the baseline, current status, and end target.

Section 3: Ratings of Development Objectives

Identify the different actors who provide feedback on DO ratings. Find the feedback and rating from the GEF Operational Focal Point

Section 4: Implementation Progress Rating

Identify the different actors who provide feedback on IP ratings. Find the feedback and rating from the GEF Operational Focal Point.

Based on the feedback by the different actors, have there been any implementation issues the project has had to deal with (delays, identification of flawed assumptions, risk factors that have materialized, etc.)?

Implementation Status & Results
Country A
Rural Electrification Phase I Project of the Rural Electrification (APL) Program (P075531)

Operation Name: Rural Electrification Phase I Project of the Rural Electrification (APL) Program (P075531)

Project Stage: Implementation

Seq.No: 6

Status: ARCHIVED

Archive Date:

Country: Country A

Approval FY: 2006

Product Line: IBRD/IDA

Region: REGION A

Lending Instrument: Adaptable Program Loan

Implementing Agency(ies): Country A Electric Company (CEC), Ministry of Energy and Mines

Key Dates

Board Approval Date 27-Apr-2006

Original Closing Date 31-Mar-2010

Planned Mid Term Review Date

Last Archived ISR Date 13-Apr-2011

Effectiveness Date 30-Aug-2006

Revised Closing Date 31-Mar-2012

Actual Mid Term Review Date

Project Development Objectives

Rural Electrification Phase I Project of the Rural Electrification (APL) Program (P075531)

Project Development Objective (from Project Appraisal Document)

The objective of REP I Project are to: (i) increase access to electricity of rural households in villages of targeted provinces; and (ii) improve financial performance of the power sector.

Has the Project Development Objective been changed since Board Approval of the Program?

Yes

No

Rural Electrification Phase I Project of the Rural Electrification (APL) Program (P080054)

Global Environmental Objective (from Project Appraisal Document)

Global environmental objectives: (i) substantial adoption of off-grid renewable energy in Government's rural electrification program; and (ii) increased efficiency of energy supply by CEC and consumption by customers, resulting in greenhouse gas emission reductions as increased hydropower exports substitute for thermal power production in Country B.

Has the Global Environmental Objective been changed since Board Approval of the Program?

Yes

No

Component(s)

Component Name Component Cost

CEC Component 42.19

MEM Component 8.69

Overall Ratings

	Previous Rating	Current Rating
Progress towards achievement of PDO	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Progress towards achievement of GEO	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Overall Implementation Progress (IP)	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

Implementation Status Overview

The original activities are substantially completed and have allowed for electrification of about 65,706 households and 671 villages, exceeding the revised target of 64,000 households in 640 villages. However, procurement of the off-grid electrification activities financed through AusAID's additional financing is behind schedule to meet the March 31, 2012 closing date and will require close monitoring. Nevertheless, the key outcome indicator on number of households connected will be surpassed due to AusAID's additional financing and the highly satisfactory progress of the Power to the Poor (P2P) scale up program. Regarding the objective of improving financial performance of the power sector, Country A Electric Company (CEC) has implemented the Financial Sustainability Action Plan, but government and irrigation arrears need to be cleared and tariffs need to be raised to keep CEC on a firm financial footing.

GEF DO: The objective of substantial adoption of off-grid renewable energy in the rural electrification program has been met as the market share of off-grid renewable households has reached 21% (through the installation of solar home systems) compared to the target of 19%. Although not expected to dip below the target, this current 27% value will likely decrease somewhat by the end of the project as the number of households electrified on-grid will likely increase at a faster pace than off-grid through the P2P program. The overall rating is downgraded to satisfactory because increased awareness and adoption of energy efficient technologies and practices by government agencies and other CEC customers stands only at 76% (compared to a target of 100%) for the public sector. While the residential target of 20% has been surpassed (46%) and the target of 33% for commercial customers has been surpassed (66%), the shortcoming on behalf of the public sector is considerable due to the public sector's larger share.

Locations

Country
 First Administrative Division
 Location
 Planned
 Actual

Results

Project Development Objective Indicators

Indicator Name	Core	Unit of Measure		Baseline	Current	End Target
Number of HH and village electrified		Text	Value	About 428,000 of households (HH) electrification in 2005	An additional 65,706 HH and 671 villages have been electrified	An additional 64,000 HH and 640 villages electrified
			Date	01-Jun-2006	31-May-2011	31-Mar-2012
			Comments		On grid: 51,625 HH in 570 villages. Off-grid: 14,081 HH by SHS; 230 villages in 17 provinces	Original target of 42,000 HH and 250 villages was increased with AusAID additional financing (8000 HH on-grid plus 5000 off-grid) and to correct the error in the number of on-grid villages (540 in the intermediate indicator) and correct the omission of the off-grid target values (9000 HH in 200 villages).
Implementation status of the Power Sector Financial Sustainability Action Plan		Text	Value	Tariff adjustment initiated in July 2005 CEC system loss of 22% Government Arrears of 113 billion Local Currency (LC)	Overall implementation of Action Plan for Financial Sustainability of the Power Sector has been broadly on track. See details below.	Satisfactory implementation of Sustainability Action Plan: tariff adjustment, CEC system loss below 17%, DSM & EE CEC Cell established; Settlement of Government arrears
			Date	01-Jun-2006	31-May-2011	31-Mar-2012
			Comments		1) Tariff reform: new average tariff of 673 LC/Kwh (USD 0.084) to be ratified by the MEM; start date of July 2011 delayed due to concerns about inflation. 2) 11.44% system losses (down from 18.85% in 2009) 3) DSM & EE Cell is established 4) Committee for	

					settlement of arrears is operational and MOF has been paying as per the schedule, but due to insufficient budget allocated by MOF to settle annual consumption, the total arrears remains at LC 84,821 billion.	
Global Environmental Objective Indicators						
"Market share" of off-grid renewable HHS under REP I				Baseline 8% "Market share" of off-grid renewable HHS during SPRE 01-Jun-2006	21% 31-May-2011 14,081 off grid / 65,706 off and on grid (including P2P) = 21%.	19% of newly-electrified HHS have SHS/VH 31-Mar-2012
Measurable increase in awareness and adoption of energy efficiency technologies and practices by Government agencies and other CEC customers				A complete lack of awareness by CEC customers 01-Jun-2006	76% public sector, 46% residential, 66% commercial and industrial 30-Nov-2008 As reported in DSM/EE Phase 1 - Baseline on EE Awareness Report (by IIEC) in Nov 2008; New survey to be done before end of project	100% central Government agencies, 20% of domestic & 33% of commercial customers aware of energy efficiency 31-Mar-2012
Intermediate Results Indicators						
Establishment of RE Master Plan and Database				Initial version of RE Database developed 31-Dec-2005	Completed 31-Dec-2010	Initial RE Masterplan and RE Database developed 31-Mar-2012
Financial Performance				2004 financial performance indicators	DSCR = 1.69 times; SFR = 35%; 31-May-2011 Based on CEC's FY10 unaudited accounts	debt service coverage ratio (DSCR)>1.5 times; self financing ratio (SFR)>30%; accounts receivable (AR) <2 months 31-Mar-2012
Establishment of DSM cell and implementation of pilot DSM/energy efficiency & awareness building programs				No DSM cell; no program to build efficiency or awareness	Over 50 energy audits conducted; 4 pilot EE programs implemented	Energy audit and other pilot programs implemented 31-Mar-2012

					30-Nov-2010	
Development of a sector financing strategy and pilot projects		Text	Value	Recommendations made by consultants on sector financing strategy	Completed	Sector financing strategy developed and legal documents for concessioning small-hydro projects to IPPs prepared
			Date	31-Dec-2005	31-May-2011	31-Mar-2012
			Comments			
Grid extension: Incremental number of villages and HHs electrified		Text	Value	about 428,000 HHs in about 35% of villages	51,625 HHs in 570 villages	Revised target: 50,000 HH in 540 villages
			Date	01-Jun-2006	31-Jul-2011	31-Mar-2012
			Comments		from CEC's Semiannual Progress Report (Aug 2011)	Original target was to add 42,000 HHs in 540 villages in the 7 central provinces; targeted number of HHs was revised upward with the AusAID additional financing (8000 HH under P2P)
CEC system losses		Text	Value	About 22% in 2005	11.44	below 17%
			Date	01-Jun-2006	31-May-2011	31-Mar-2012
			Comments		target exceeded	
Off-grid: Incremental number of villages and HHs HHs electrified		Text	Value	6,000 HH in 7 provinces; only 150 out of the 6,000 HHs not solar home systems (SHS)	14,081 HHs by SHS in 230 villages in 17 provinces	Add 14,000 HHs over 200 villages in 17 provinces
			Date	01-Jun-2006	31-May-2011	12-Mar-2012
			Comments	Indicator name should have also mentioned "village hydro share in HHs electrified through off-grid"		The original end of project target was 10,000 HH over 200 villages in 17 provinces, including 1,000 (10%) HHs through VH. This was increased to 14,000 with the AusAID additional financing.
Establishment and operation of a Rural Electrification Fund		Text	Value	REF Decree to be issued by the Prime Minister's Office	Established and operational	REF established and operational
			Date	31-Dec-2005	01-Sep-2010	31-Mar-2012
			Comments			
Rate of return on revalued assets of CEC		Percentage	Value	0.00	1.00	4.00
			Date	31-Dec-2005	31-May-2011	31-Mar-2012
			Comments		Based on FY10 unaudited figures.	
Development of alternative delivery models		Text	Value	Only one model for solar home system exists	New PPP model for village hydro developed	Alternative delivery models developed
			Date	31-Dec-2005	31-May-2011	31-Mar-2012

			Comments	needs diversified models for other off-grid technologies, e. g. micro hydro	IFC, as transaction advisor to MEM, has developed model bid documents for microhydro projects on a public-private partnership basis	
Implementation of the Action Plan for DOE Organizational Strengthening		Text	Value	Development of the Action Plan was under way	Fully Implemented	Action Plan developed and agreed with the Bank fully implemented
			Date	31-Dec-2005	01-Sep-2010	31-Mar-2012
			Comments		Various training programs have been completed.	

Data on Financial Performance (as of 27-Jul-2011)

Financial Agreement(s) Key Dates

Project	Loan No.	Status	Approval Date	Signing Date	Effectiveness Date	Closing Date
P075531	IDA-H2180	Effective	27-Apr-2006	02-Jun-2006	30-Aug-2006	31-Mar-2012
P080054	TF-56700	Effective	02-Jun-2006	02-Jun-2006	30-Aug-2006	31-Mar-2012
P075531	TF-96084	Effective	01-Oct-2010	01-Oct-2010	14-Oct-2010	31-Mar-2012

Disbursements (in Millions)

Project	Loan No.	Status	Currency	Original	Revised	Cancelled	Disbursed	Undisbursed	% Disbursed
P075531	IDA-H2180	Effective	USD	10.00	10.00	0.00	9.51	1.14	95.00
P080054	TF-56700	Effective	USD	3.75	3.75	0.00	3.75	0.00	100.00
P075531	TF-96084	Effective	USD	9.42	9.42	0.00	6.02	3.40	64.00

Disbursement Graph

Key Decisions Regarding Implementation

Procurement of off-grid activities should be accelerated in order to ensure completion by the March 31, 2012 closing date.

Restructuring History

Level two Approved on 07-Feb-2011

Related Projects

P080054-Rural Electrification Phase I Project of the Rural Electrification (APL) Program, P119715-Country A: AUSAID Grant Additional Financing of the Rural Electrification Phase I

Project 2: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Territorial Planning Policies and Practices

Implementing Agency: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Section 1: Project Status

3. What is the revised closing date of the project?
4. How many site visits were conducted during the reporting period?

Section 2: Development Objectives

Describe the objective indicator from the matrix and identify the baseline, current status, and end target.

Section 3: Ratings of Development Objectives

Identify the different actors who provide feedback on DO ratings. Find the feedback and rating from the GEF Operational Focal Point

Section 4: Implementation Progress Rating

Identify the different actors who provide feedback on IP ratings. Find the feedback and rating from the GEF Operational Focal Point.

Based on the feedback by the different actors, have there been any implementation issues the project has had to deal with (delays, identification of flawed assumptions, risk factors that have materialized, etc.)?



2011 Annual Project Review (APR)

Project Implementation Review (PIR) OF UNDP Supported GEF Financed Projects

Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Territorial Planning Policies and Practices

Focal Area	
Lead RTA	xxx
Lead Country(ies)	
Revised Planned Closing Date	1-Mar-2013

Project Summary

The project objective is to mainstream biodiversity conservation priorities into Country A's territorial planning policies and practices. The project will remove systemic, regulatory and knowledge barriers to mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into territorial planning. The objective will be achieved through two outcomes: i) Enabling regulatory, policy and institutional framework for land-use planning that reflects biodiversity considerations outside protected areas, and ii) Tested models for development and enforcement of biodiversity-compatible land-use plans at the district levels. The immediate global biodiversity benefits include enhanced ecosystem integrity outside PAs in 10 administrative districts (approximately 2 million hectares). In the long-term, taking into account the sought replication effect, the project will ensure the long-term integrity of fragile ecosystems over 36% of the country.

RTA'S GENERAL COMMENTS

The globally significant biodiversity of the country is to some extent secured by the national protected area system, which covers 7.9% of national territory. But the conservation of biodiversity also

depends on fragmented habitats outside protected areas (PAs). In fact, the largest part of the country's natural ecosystems is located outside PAs. These modified landscapes are characterized by rich floral and faunal diversity. Today, about 30% of species included in the National Red Data Book is present in man-modified landscapes. More than half of them in fact prefer such habitats or can be found only in these territories. Amongst the most important types of man-transformed territories which play a significant role for the conservation of the diversity of fauna species are various man-made fish ponds and water reservoirs that are analogous to natural water reservoirs in the most productive eutrophic stage; open drained areas of wetlands, earlier drained shrub-covered plains and floodplains; unique mature artificial forest stands, old landscape parks analogous to natural forests but frequently more diverse in the composition and structure of the vegetation cover and other ecological characteristics used as habitats for original and rich faunal complexes; agro-ecological zones of peculiar vast territories with traditional land cultivation technologies and other economic activities.

Threats: Changes in local land use patterns for agriculture, forestry, fisheries, and hunting are the principal direct drivers of biodiversity loss outside PAs

Long-term solution and barriers to its achievement: The long-term vision foresees the inclusion of biodiversity concerns in land-use policies and management practices in the country. Such a sustainable planning structure should be based on a highly dispersed distribution of territories where natural ecosystems, united into an integrated regional system through natural migration tracks, would prevail." The main barriers to realizing this vision can be clustered as follows: (a) systemic regulatory barrier; and (b) knowledge barrier.

UNDP CO GENERAL COMMENTS

-Comments related to the UNDP Gender Marker

48 women (governmental and local authorities, scientists, land use planning specialists, mass media and NGO representatives) participated in the project seminars and field activities.

-Highlight any significant results not addressed in the DO and IP sections

N/A

- List the dates of site visits to project this reporting period

19 May 2011 xxx district

PROGRESS TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES						
Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2009	Level at 30 June 2010	Level at 30 June 2011
Objective: To mainstream biodiversity conservation priorities into Country A's territorial planning policies and practices	Land area for which integrated land-use plans that deliver biodiversity benefits outside PAs are developed and under implementation	0 ha	Approximately 2 million ha (10 districts)			0 ha. Integrated biodiversity compatible territorial plans are developed for Korelichi and Volozhin districts (approximately 0.3 million ha). The plans are under the approval by the local executive committees. Two integrated plans for Rossony and Ivacevchy districts (total area of 0.97 million ha) will be finalized by the end 2011.
			Additional 7.4 million hectares have commenced replication			N/A this reporting period
Component 1. Enabling regulatory, policy and institutional framework for land-use planning that	Number of sectoral regulations and methodological guidelines that facilitate the incorporation of biodiversity	0	8			2 (i). 3 action plans for conservation of wild fauna species in the Red Book of Country A - the Aquatic Warbler, Greater Spotted Eagle and Great Snipe – were actualized and 5 new action

<p>reflects biodiversity considerations outside protected areas</p>	<p>conservation requirements into planning and management of land use outside protected areas (to be tracked in more detail through the SO 2 Tracking Tool)</p>						<p>plans for conservation of wild fauna– Bittern, Roller, Magpie diver – and flora - Matricary grapefern, and Fen orchid - species in the Red Book of Country A were developed.</p> <p>(ii). Requirements on protection of the wild fauna and flora included in the Red Book of Country A, their habitats and places of growth, for further inclusion into species maintenance standards to land and/or water users outside specially protected natural areas, and for inclusion into forest - and land management projects and schemes were prepared. The documents were presented at the Environmental Public Coordinating Council and posted on the web-sites of the Project, Ministry for Natural Resources and Environmental protection of Country A, and</p>
---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

						Environmental non-governmental network for broad public discussion.
	Number of government staff trained in collection of biodiversity information and integration of this into the development and implementation of land use plans	0	At least 30 officers			0 (the first training seminar planned for the second half of 2011)
(Note: A more detailed tracking of capacity development impacts at the systemic, institutional and individual levels will be based on the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard)						
Component 2. Tested models for development and enforcement of biodiversity-compatible land-use plans	Species maintenance standards covering vulnerable/threatened biotopes and species	Approximately 10-20 species maintenance standards	1,000 species maintenance standards			167 species maintenance standards for protection of 81 animal and 61 plant species identified on the territory of X and Y districts were developed

at the district levels					
	Increase in land area outside protected areas where threats to vulnerable/ threatened biotopes from economic activities are controlled	0 ha	Sustainable land uses (logging, hay-making, pasture management, fishing, hunting, recreation) demonstrated in following key biotopes:		3 demonstrational projects for sustainable hunting and fishing are under development and will be finalized by the end 2011
			· Mires: 12,000 ha;		n/a
			· Floodplain meadows: 8,000 ha;		n/a
			· Lakes: 5,000 ha;		n/a
			· Forests of high natural value such as floodplain wet deciduous forests: 20,000 ha		n/a

RATING OF PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE

<u>National Project Manager/Coordinator</u>	
Overall 2010 Rating (from 10 PIR)	
2011 Rating	S – Satisfactory
Comments	<p>Most of the objective variable indicators have been progressing during this reporting period. From the start of the project implementation, integrated territorial plans that accommodate biodiversity concerns are developed for 2 districts with an overall area of 0.3 million hectares (Y and X districts). Two more plans for D and E districts will be completely finalized till the end of 2011 (0.49 million hectares). Additionally, biological and landscape diversity inventory for 2 districts and preparation of a territorial plan for one district on the territory of 0.48 million hectares has been initiated. As the result of biodiversity inventory, 167 species maintenance standards covering vulnerable/threatened species to be included into territorial plans were prepared.</p> <p>In the framework of improvement of national legislation/regulation related to environment and natural resource management to support biodiversity conservation outside protected areas, 3 action plans for conservation of wild fauna species in the Red Book of Country A - the Aquatic Warbler, Greater Spotted Eagle and Great Snipe – were actualized and 5 new action plans for conservation of wild fauna– Bittern, Roller, Magpie diver – and flora - Matricary grapefern, and Fen orchid - species in the Red Book of Country A were developed.</p> <p>Methodological recommendations on minimal standards to be observed by different economic activities to maintain the integrity of key biotopes/ habitats are listed in the prepared Requirements on protection of the wild fauna and flora included in the Red Book of Country A, their habitats and places of growth, for further inclusion into species maintenance standards to land and/or water users outside specially protected natural areas, and for inclusion into forest and land management projects and schemes . Both documents were presented at the Environmental Public Coordinating Council and posted on the web-sites of the Project, Ministry for Natural Resources and Environmental protection of</p>

	<p>Country A, and environmental non-governmental network for broad public discussion. Activities on elaboration of common guidelines and approaches to conservation and sustainable use of biotopes of national and international significance are under way and will be finalized till the end of 2011, which served as scientific basis of initiation of the process of accession of Country A to Bern Convention.</p> <p>The major project risk that may affect its impact is associated with delays in preparation of local land use territorial plans by the State Committee on Property of the Republic of Country A as the main stakeholder. This risk was discussed and minimized by the joint meeting of the Country Office staff with the Head of the State Committee on Property of the Republic of Country A. Appropriate Memorandum on observing the initially agreed schedule for preparation of integrated regional territorial plans was signed. Another major risk relates to still low buy-in of the project strategy by key government actors/ institutions. But this risk is being minimized by active participation of the main stakeholders in the project’s capacity building activities, as well as involvement in field-level demonstrations. Four seminars on preparation of territorial plans that encompass biological and landscape diversity concerns and one field-level demonstration were held for representatives of central and local governmental and scientific institutions, as well as environmental non-governmental associations and the media.</p>
<u>GEF Operational Focal Point</u>	
Overall 2010 Rating (from 10 PIR)	
2011 Rating	S – Satisfactory
Comments	<p>During the project implementation business relationships between project staff and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (MNREP) were established.</p> <p>MNREP is involved in the discussion of the project draft annual work plans, acceptance of work, approves terms of reference works under the project. However, it concerns matters within the competence of the MNREP. Matters within the competence of the Ministry of Forestry and the State Committee on Property are not coordinated with MNREP. It should be noted that the reports</p>

	submitted for consideration meet the quality requirements. The project should be involved in the application of the reports' recommendations in practice.
<u>Project Implementing Partner</u>	
Overall 2010 Rating (from 10 PIR)	
2011 Rating	
Comments	
<u>UNDP Country Office</u>	
Overall 2010 Rating (from 10 PIR)	
2011 Rating	S – Satisfactory
Comments	<p>The project focuses its activities on the territories outside the natural protected areas. In the reporting period the project gained momentum implementing the planned activities towards meeting the established targets. Biodiversity inventories have been completed for two districts, Korelichy and Volozhin. Based on the inventories' results, land use plans for the above mentioned Country Aian districts developed (covering 0.3 mln ha) with biodiversity concerns integrated into these plans. The plans are pending approval of the respective local and regional Country Aian authorities.</p> <p>It should be underlined, however, that at the beginning, the project suffered delay with conducting biodiversity inventories on the target territories. Explanation with respect to the reasons caused the delay are presented in the IP Rating Section in more detail. Because of the delay with biodiversity inventories, subsequent development of land use plans for the target districts has been postponed. In 2011, the project has overcome the problems, and the work on inventory and land use plan development intensified resulting in completion of 2 land use plans for the districts of X and Y. Biodiversity inventory for 5 districts has started, along with the development of 3 new land use plans, which are expected to be finalized within next reporting period.</p> <p>Efforts have been put into further enhancing the national legal and regulatory framework dealing with biodiversity conservation. With</p>

	<p>project assistance, 8 national action plans for conservation of wild fauna and flora species were formulated (3 – updated, and 5 newly developed). Additionally, a regulatory document containing requirements for protection of the Red Book wild fauna and flora outside Country A in natural protected areas was drafted and circulated for comments. The project started developing species maintenance standards. First 167 standards have been developed for two Country A districts.</p> <p>To reduce threats to vulnerable/ threatened biotopes from economic activities, 3 pilot projects aiming at demonstrating benefits of sustainable hunting and fishing have been started. First results are expected by the end of 2011.</p> <p>Summing up all the above, it can be concluded that the project makes sufficient progress towards meeting the established targets and objectives.</p>
<u>UNDP Regional Technical Advisor:</u>	
Overall 2010 Rating (from 10 PIR)	
2011 Rating	S – Satisfactory
Comments	<p>The project is reporting for the first time, being in operation only for about 16 months. The project’s overall effectiveness is assessed “satisfactory”, as the project gained momentum for implementing the planned activities towards meeting the established targets.</p> <p>The project has drafted, although with some delay, land use plans for the districts of Korelichy and Volozhin of 0.3 mln ha, integrating results of the completed biodiversity inventories and associated biodiversity concerns. The plans are pending approval of the respective local and regional Country Aian authorities. The project has already initiated biodiversity inventories for another 5 districts, along with the development of 3 new land use plans, which are expected to be finalized within next reporting period.</p> <p>Under Outcome 1, the project has invested considerable efforts</p>

	<p>into enhancing the national legal and regulatory framework dealing with biodiversity conservation. In particular, the project assisted with the update of three and development of five national action plans for conservation of wild fauna and flora species. It also devised and circulated for comments a regulatory document containing requirements for protection of the Red Book wild fauna and flora outside Country A in natural protected areas was drafted and circulated for comments.</p> <p>Under Outcome 2, the project has developed the first 167 standards for two Country A in districts for further inclusion to territorial plans. Three pilot projects aiming at demonstrating benefits of sustainable hunting and fishing have been started with initial results to be generated by end of 2011. The project has positive values for indicator species outside protected areas for the districts of X and Y. Population trends in another 3 districts will be available in 2011, and remaining five - in 2012.</p> <p>The project team seems to well navigating the project despite the emerging risks. Although none of the risks recorded as critical, the project devised comprehensive approaches to mitigating major two risks that can potentially put on hold its implementation. As such, the project has signed MoU with the State Committee on Property of the Republic of Country A on observing the schedule for preparation of local land use territorial plans. The still low buy-in of the project strategy by key government institutions has been mitigated by engaging the targeted agencies in capacity building activities and on-site demonstrations. The project should continue to monitor the risks to ensure expedient implementation and achievement of project objectives in the next reporting period.</p>
--	---

PROGRESS IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Outcome 1 – Key Outputs this Reporting Period:

3 action plans for conservation of wild fauna species in the Red Book of Country A - the Aquatic Warbler, Greater Spotted Eagle and Great Snipe – were actualized and 5 new action plans for conservation of wild fauna– Bittern, Roller, Magpie diver – and flora - Matricary grapefern, and Fen orchid - species in the Red Book of Country A were developed

Outcome 2 – Key Outputs this Reporting Period:

Integrated territorial plans that accommodate biodiversity concerns are developed for 2 districts (X

and Y)

167 species maintenance standards for rare species habitats and biotopes were prepared

23 types of rare and threatened biotopes of European significance were found and described in X and Y districts

Requirements on protection of found species listed in Red Data Book of Country A are integrated in the Y forestry management plan

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING

<u>National Project Manager/Coordinator</u>	
Overall 2010 Rating (from 10 PIR)	
2011 Rating	S – Satisfactory
Comments	<p>The project has closed some gaps in implementation emerged in 2010 due to the project late startup. Although the project was approved in November 2009, the actual implementation has not started until March 2010.</p> <p>Inception workshop was organized and held within first two months of project start up, with the participation of representatives of governmental agencies, UNDP, Institutes of the National Academy of Science and Universities, administrative districts where the project is to be implemented, NGOs, numerous mass media and the project team.</p> <p>The project implementation unit was formed according to the UNDP procedure, to include a Project Manager, Administrative Assistant, Chief Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management Expert and Chief Expert on Land Use Planning. The project office was established and duly equipped. General management was provided to ensure that the project produces the results specified in the project document, to the required standard of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost what ensured 96% of financial delivery in 2010. Effective partnership between UNDP Country Office, MNREP (national implementing partner), Ministry of Forestry and other stakeholders to effectively achieve project goals and objectives was organized on a regular basis. Three Project Steering Committee</p>

	<p>meetings were organized and held during reporting period. There were five monitoring visits of the staff to project sites in X, Y, D and E districts done.</p> <p>The new-hired in June 2011 PR-specialist took responsibilities for specific communication and KM activities to make the project more visible for authorities, specialists and general public on local, regional, national and international stage. This lifted the communication burden from the Project Manager and Administrative and Financial Assistant and allowed them to focus more on project administrative and financial issues.</p> <p>Integrated territorial plans that accommodate biodiversity concerns are for the first time ever for Country A developed for 2 districts which means that selection of the location and the area of urbanized development, agriculture, forestry, guarantees a normal functioning of ecosystems and their components and the conservation of historically established conditions of evolution of genetic resources.</p> <p>Developed proposals for the legal regulation of protection and sustainable use of threatened biotopes of international and national value formed the basis of draft of national legislative Act on biotopes protection and served as scientific background of initiation of the process of accession of Country A to Bern Convention</p> <p>Demonstration projects on sustainable hunting and fishing practices initially planned for 2012-2013 have already been initiated to have enough time for corrective measures and improvements, if any.</p> <p>Project resources are spent in strict adherence to the project budget, work plans and project document. Some delay in project start resulted in reduction of indicated in the Project Document budget for the first year of the project (2010) by 18% which was compensated in the budget of the second year (2011).</p>
<u>GEF Operational Focal Point</u>	
Overall 2010 Rating (from 10 PIR)	
2011 Rating	S – Satisfactory

Comments	Following recommendations of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection to strengthen the information activities of the project, a specialist in public relations was hired by the project. The project has been active in this area since then. The project is active in organizing information events, seminars and conferences. This work should continue. The Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection is interested in the project's work as specified by the project annual work plan. In this regard, it is necessary not to delay the preparation of terms of references and selection of experts.
<u>Project Implementing Partner</u>	
Overall 2010 Rating (from 10 PIR)	
2011 Rating	
Comments	
<u>UNDP Country Office</u>	
Overall 2010 Rating (from 10 PIR)	
2011 Rating	S – Satisfactory
Comments	The quality and effectiveness of project implementation for the reporting period can be considered satisfactory noting though some delays with conducting biodiversity inventory in the target districts. Results of the inventory should provide a basis for integration of biodiversity concerns into the land use plans for the districts. The delay is attributed to the issues related to the peculiarities of scientific services market in Country A. This market is weak with mainly big national scientific institutions having expert capacity to conduct appropriate quality studies in the field of biodiversity. Despite project's efforts, a tender for services aiming at conducting biodiversity inventory in the target districts failed with only one bidder –a state owned scientific institute – submitting its offer. It should be noted that this institute meets the tender requirements having necessary expert capacity. Based on a thorough analysis of the Country A market, it was decided to engage the institute for performing the inventories using the NEX modality. The respective

	<p>procedures had been followed, and the institute started its work resulting in the inventory completed for two target districts.</p> <p>Apart from the above mentioned delays, the project is meeting the set targets (see the DO and DO Rating Sections). Project’s annual work plans were prepared timely and updated regularly. The majority of the activities were implemented in accordance with the approved ADWP in a timely fashion, in line with the approved budget. The 2010 delivery target has been met.</p> <p>The project team operated quite efficiently, and an appropriate quality management was provided. The project management team showed adequate professional knowledge and skills been able to plan and implement project activities with sufficient quality of the results. Two national specialists: (i) on Biodiversity Conservation, and (ii) on Land Use Planning have been hired to provide required level of expertise. Based on the previous positive experience, a dedicated communication specialist was included into the project team to ensure effective communication, along with meeting the respective GEF and UNDP visibility requirements.</p> <p>The project enjoyed full support from the key national stakeholders at the national and local levels with the Ministry of Environment showing strong ownership of the project implementation process, along with the project results. The project Board, which includes stakeholders representing Governmental agencies, scientific institutions and NGOs, met regularly providing guidance to project implementation and ensuring national ownership over the project results.</p>
<p><u>UNDP Regional Technical Advisor:</u></p>	
<p>Overall 2010 Rating (from 10 PIR)</p>	
<p>2011 Rating</p>	<p>S – Satisfactory</p>
<p>Comments</p>	<p>The project’s overall efficiency in the reporting period is assessed as “satisfactory”.</p> <p>The project is on track with preparing all workplans, budgets and documents. Despite some initial delays, all the outputs and activities</p>

	<p>are progressing well and on time.</p> <p>The project registered an outstanding delivery of over 90% of its annual budget and is progressing well and without any problems in disbursements and procurement with the support from the very dedicated team at the CO.</p> <p>The project team is completed and fully operational composed of National Project Manager, Project Assistant, Chief Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management Expert, and Chief Expert on Land Use Planning. Based on the previous positive experience, a dedicated communication specialist was included into the project team to ensure effective communication, along with meeting the respective GEF and UNDP visibility requirements.</p> <p>The National Project Director was appointed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection. The project enjoyed full support from the key national stakeholders at the national and local levels with the Ministry of Environment showing strong ownership of the project implementation process, along with the project results. The project Board, which includes stakeholders representing Governmental agencies, scientific institutions and NGOs, met regularly providing guidance to project implementation and ensuring national ownership over the project results.</p> <p>The project team organized the inception workshop within the first two months of project startup, with an excellent attendance by representatives of governmental agencies, Institutes of the National Academy of Science and Universities, targeted administrative districts, NGOs, numerous mass media. During the reporting period, three National Project Steering Committees were held in September 2010, followed by February and June, 2011.</p> <p>None of the risks are critical risks, but the project closely monitors two risks on (i) possible non-compliance of the State Committee on Property with the initially agreed schedule on development of land use plans for the targeted districts, and (ii) low government stakeholder buy-in of the project objective. Along with the risk update status though, the project team should diligently record its mitigation measures in the UNDP ERBM system.</p>
--	--

Finance

DISBURSEMENT OF GEF GRANT FUNDS

How much of the total GEF grant as noted in Project Document plus any project preparation grant has been spent so far?

Estimated cumulative total disbursement as of 30 June 2011	341940
Add any comments on GEF Grant Funds	na

Communications and KM

Tell the Story of Your Project and What has been Achieved this Reporting Period

The main project result in this reporting period is the preparation of land-use plans for X and Y districts. The total area of the districts covers 301,050 hectares. As a result of land-use plans implementation, the efficiency of using and conservation of this area will increase and land-use structure and administrative division improve. The land use plans encompass 60,000 residents of the two districts. As such, implementation of land-use plans will optimize their economical activity and improve ecological, recreation, hygiene and sanitary conditions. Also, 81 fauna and flora species listed in Red Book of Country A were found in Y district, resulting in the issuance of maintenance standards for 79 species. Similarly, 61 fauna and flora species listed in Red Book of Country A were found in X district, and the project prepared maintenance standards for 88 species. Twenty three rare and threatened biotopes were found and described for the first time in Country A. This became the scientific foundation for Country A's accession to The Bern Convention. In the regulatory area, the project developed a number of baseline documents for biodiversity conservation. These documents include `Requirements for conservation of rare and protected species by land-users` and national action plans for conservation of 8 fauna and flora species listed in the Red Book of Country A.

Adaptive Management this Reporting Period

Adaptive management in project realization contains such components as: (1) increasing stakeholders' personal loyalty to biodiversity conservation; (2) experience exchange with representatives of regional nature protection and land management inspections; (3) prompt reaction to changes in the external environment that can affect project implementation.

On point 1, complex informational and educational activities are emphasized. The target audience of the activities is government authorities, land-users and local habitants. Only if all these groups support the project it will be implemented effectively. This is why special attention is paid to: (i) mass media and experts involvement at all stages of project implementation (workshops for specialists, theoretical and practical conferences, etc.); (ii) mass media and experts coverage of key project

achievements (development of normative documents and land-use plans); (iii) PR-activities with participation of government authorities, land-users and mass media. Thus, project changes stakeholders attitude to biodiversity conservation not only on formal level but creates conditions for their personal loyalty.

On point 2, a) experience of land-use plans preparation was shared with representatives of 8 regional nature protection and land management inspections (a workshop on territorial plans of an administrative area conducive to biological and landscape diversity as a basis for land use optimization); b) expert knowledge of 30 representatives of regional nature protection and land management inspections was raised in sphere of protection of fauna and flora species listed in the Red Book of Country A (a workshop 'State and problems of conservation and rational use of aurochs in Country A').

On point 3, exact compliance with the schedule of works is one of the key conditions of project efficiency. That is why when the State Property Committee of the Republic of Country A, due to objective reasons, changed the schedule of preparation of Bobruisk district land-use plan, the situation demanded prompt reaction. The solution in this case was that the inventory of Bobruisk district biodiversity has been progressing as per the schedule of works while the development of land-use plans was transferred by the State Property Committee for 2012. To mitigate this risk for the project's subsequent work, a joint meeting of the Country Office staff with the Head of the State Committee on Property of the Republic of Country A was organized. A Memorandum on observing the initially agreed schedule for integrated regional territorial plans was signed.

Lessons Learned

Regional authorities of some project districts do not realize economic and social benefits of such integrated plans. Field visits of the project manager and experts to project districts and participation of regional authorities of the targeted districts in the seminars on adoption of territorial plans for the regions where such plans have been already finalized can help to solve the problem.

IC contract (waver) instead of Contractual Services-Companies for small-scale volume of work is more preferential as well as budget and time-saving.

The methods of adaptive management, elaborated by the project:

- keeping constant contacts with all involved parties, a flexible schedule for work adaptation;
- knowledge and experience exchange with another UNDP/GEF projects;
- mass media and experts involvement and coverage at all stages of project implementation as instrument of public control.

PARTNERSHIPS

Civil Society Organisations/NGOs

The project collaborated with the Public Coordinating Council and the Green Network (a society of environmental NGOs of Country A) to widely publicise and obtain feedback/comments on draft Requirements on protection of rare and threatened species of wild fauna and flora which habitats are handed under the protection to land and/or water users, and newly developed or updated National Action Plans (NAPs) for rare and threatened species of wild fauna and flora.

Indigenous Peoples

N/A

Private Sector

The project has engaged from the very beginning the private sector actors of the regions targeted for integral territorial planning. Two ecotourism projects have started for Volozhin and Ivacevichi districts. This enables to create a sustainable source of income for local budgets and work places for local people.

Other Partners

In close cooperation with the UNDP/GEF project "Catalyzing sustainability of the wetland protected area system in Country A through increased management efficiency and realigned land use practices" two workshops "Territorial plans of an administrative area as a basis for land use optimization with regard to the interests of biological and landscape diversity" for representatives of regional nature protection and land management inspections were held.

GENDER

Has a gender or social needs assessment been carried out?	No
Does this project specifically target women or girls as key stakeholders?	No

Please discuss any of the points above further or provide any other information on the project's work on gender equality

48 women (governmental and local authorities, scientists, land use planning specialists, mass media and NGO representatives) participated in the project seminars and field activities.