

# **ANNEXES**

## **TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**“Conservation-oriented management of forests and wetlands to  
achieve multiple benefits”**

**Republic of Belarus**

PIMS #5495, GEF ID 7993

GEF Focal Area: Ecosystems and Biodiversity  
BD-1 Program 1; LD-3 Program 4; CCM-2 Program 4; SFM-1; SFM-3

**UNDP/Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of  
Belarus (Ministry of Environment)**

Sabine Schmidt and Viktoryia Kalosha

## Annex 1 Evaluation Ratings Tables (from TE Guidance GEF/UNDP)

**Table 9. TE Rating Scales**

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance	Sustainability ratings:
<p>6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings</p> <p>5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings</p> <p>4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings</p> <p>3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings</p> <p>2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings</p> <p>1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment</p>	<p>4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability</p> <p>2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability</p> <p>1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability</p>

**Table 13. Monitoring & Evaluation Ratings Scale**

Rating	Description
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)	There were no short comings; quality of M&E design/implementation exceeded expectations
5 = Satisfactory (S)	There were minor shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation met expectations
4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	There were moderate shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation more or less met expectations
3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	There were significant shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation was somewhat lower than expected
2 = Unsatisfactory (U)	There were major shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation was substantially lower than expected
1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	There were severe shortcomings in M&E design/implementation
Unable to Assess (UA)	The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of M&E design/implementation.

## Annex 2 Documents and Online Sources Reviewed by the TE Team

Project Identification Report (PIF), 2014

Project Document PIMS 5495 “Conservation-oriented management of forests and wetlands to achieve multiple benefits”

Inception Report (PIMS 5495), March 2018

Annual Work Plans 201, 2018, 2020, 2021, 2022

Project Implementation Reviews (PIR), 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 draft

Mid Term Review Report, 2020

Issues Logs, 2018 – 2022

Lesson Learned Logs 2018 – 2022

Minutes of Meeting of Project Board Meetings, # 1 - 10

Wetlands Project Communication Strategy 2021

Risk Logs 2018 – 2022

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, Water management of Zvaniec mire, Belarus, Technical task force meeting 26-28 May, 2018. “Komarovo”, Divin village, Kobrin rajon, Belarus

Online Publications (UNDP Belarus website)

- Descendants of ancient tarpans help European bison to survive, **January 14, 2021**
- The economics of restored peatlands: why we invested in the rehabilitation of Zhada bog. - Ten million dollars a year is the cost of ecosystem services of Zhada bog in Belarus.
- How fire can help preserve biodiversity? March 1, 2021
- Black-alder forests can help restore Belarus’ peatlands and benefit the economy, March 19, 2021
- How Belarus uses degraded peatlands rewetting to conserve unique biodiversity of its bogs. May 22, 2021
- The economics of restored peatlands: why we invested in the rehabilitation of Zhada bog. January 29, 2021
- Why do we need to know about each of our peatlands? Alexander Kozulin, Scientific Coordinator, UNDP-GEF “Wetlands” project.

Other online sources:

- The story of one burn. An insider look at the controlled burning. Nature-based Solutions Insider Virtual tour of Nalibokski Reserve <https://заказник-налибоки.бел/360-naliboki/index.html>

## Annex 3      Individuals Met and Schedule of Interviews

#	Date	Time	Name	Participants	Role	Contacts
1	6/27/2022	17:00-18:00	Meeting with the UNDP-GEF project staff	Aliaksei Artiushevskiy, PM; Alexander Kozulin, scientific coordinator; Hanna Harbachova, Programme assistant Dzmity Mizhyhurski, Project Administrative & Finance Assistant		
2	6/28/2022	17:00-18:00	Meeting with UNDP Country office	Igar Tchoulba, PA Natalia Labaznova Hanna Harbachova, Programme assistant		phone. +375293334406
3	6/30/2022	10:00-11:00, 12:00-13:00	Meeting with the Institute of Experimental Botany	Alexander Sudnik, Candidate of Biological Sciences, Associate Professor Alexander Dmitrievich Pugachevsky - former director of the institute, was the director during the implementation of the project	NIM partner	phone: +375172241854, +375173530171 e-mail: monitoring@biobel.bas-net.by, asudnik@tut.by Sudnik +375293276703
4		11:00-12:00	Meeting with Ministry of Forestry	Alexander Kozorez, Head of the hunting department of the Ministry of forestry of the Republic of Belarus		phone +375296955841 s_kozorez@mail.ru Kazarez@ministry.mlh.by
5		16:00-17:00	Meeting with the Centre on Bioresources of the National Academy of Science (NAS)	Alexander Chaikovski , director Vasily Shakun, Head of the Laboratory of Population ecology of terrestrial vertebrates and management of bioresources Michail Maksimenkov, Researcher, Sector	NIM partner	Chaikovsky +375296806014 chaikovski@biobel.by zoology@biobel.by

				for International Cooperation and Maintenance of Environmental Conventions		
6	7/1/2022	10:00-11:00	Meeting with the Ministry of Environment	Alexander Korbut	National Project Director, Deputy Minister	phone +37544 709 75 30
7	7/12/2022	09:00-10:00	Meeting with the Centre on Animal Husbandry of the National Academy of Science (NAS)	Sergei Sidunov, Head of the laboratory of breeding and selection of beef cattle, candidate of agricultural Sci., Associate Professor tre on Animal Husbandry of the National Academy of Science (NAS)	NIM partner	tel. +375 29 183 69 37 Boks12@tut.by
8		10:00-11:00	Meeting with "Arzhanitsa", private enterprise	Vasily Brilenok	Director of small enterprise "Arzhanitsa"	arzhanitsa@tut.by
9		11:00-12:00	Meeting with representative of Forest Institute (Gomel)	Anton Potapenko	NIM partner	anto_ha86@mail.ru
10	7/14/2022	09:00-18:00	visit to the Naliboksky nature reserve	Vladimir Aliseyko	Director of Naliboksky reserve	phone +3751772 6-10-10
				Yuri Rudovich	Forester	
11	7/20/2022	09:00-18:00	visit to Sporovsky nature reserve	Vadim Prokopovich	Director of Sporovsky reserve	phone +375296505325
12				Aliona Sinilo	Tourism Specialist	
13				Ivan Kagin	Chairman of the Striginsky Village Council	
14				Valentina Karpuk, Ivan Karpuk	Representative of local agroecotourism / local community	
15	7/21/2022	10:00-12:00	visit to Sporovsky nature reserve	Vitaly Shkapich	Director of Zvanets natural reserve	phone +375 16 44-76-413
16				Ekaterina Kruk	Leading Specialist	

17	4/4/2022	09:30-10:30	Meeting with representative of agroecotouristic business near Naliboksky reserve	Vasily Shakun	Owner of the agroecotouristic center	phone +375447715979
18		11:00-12:00	Meeting with Director of Ecological centre in Turov school #2	Svetlana Nosko	Director of Turov school #2	phone +375292303150 school2turov@mail.ru
19	8/8/2022	10:00-11:00	Meeting with project manager	Aliaksei Artiushevskiy	PM	phone +375296771099 aliaksei.artsiusheuski@undp.org
20		12:00-13:00	Scientific coordinator of the project	Alexander Kozulin	Scientific coordinator of the project	phone +375296684713 kozulinav@yandex.ru

## Annex 4 Guiding Questions for Semi-structured Interviews

- What is your current role?
- Were you directly involved in project design, implementation or oversight? What was your role?
- How long have you been involved in the project?

National	Local	Community
<b>Relevance</b>		
To what extent does the project align with national priorities and contribute to key government programmes ?	How do the introduced practices (inside and outside PAs) support sustainable management of PAs, NRs and biodiversity conservation and habitat restoration and conservation	How do the introduced practices (inside and outside PAs) support local livelihoods, sustainable NR management and biodiversity conservation practices and awareness
Which government programs and other projects is the project contributing to/coordinated with?	Do the new practices fit with local planning objectives? What is different in terms of how you manage PAs, habitat, biodiversity now?	What is different in terms of how you local stakeholders manage/use resources, and improve livelihoods.
How have project outcomes helped the country align to/fulfill international obligations – Conventions?	To what extent did project design, meet the needs and interests of diverse stakeholders in your area?	
To what extent did project design meet the needs and interests of diverse stakeholders?	To what extent were lessons learnt and practices from other relevant project(s) built into the design of the project? (that are implemented by your organization or by others)	
To what extent were lessons learnt and practices from other relevant project(s) built into the design of the project? (that are implemented by your org or by others)	To what extent was the project concept and implementation arrangements developed in consultation with stakeholders?	Was the project concept and implementation arrangements developed in consultation with stakeholders? How was this done? Who was involved?
To what extent was the project concept and implementation arrangements developed in consultation with stakeholders? How were	How were different stakeholder involved?	

<p>different stakeholder involved?</p> <p>How are new legislation and regulations developed with project support implemented? Policy support for implementation?</p>	<p>How do new legislation and regulations developed with project support/change your organizations mandate and activities</p>	<p>How do new legislation and regulations developed with project support effect local level resource management/use and livelihoods?</p> <p>What are changes to livelihood/income on household level?</p>
Effectiveness		
<p>To what extent have project objectives been achieved? What do you consider the most important contributions the project has made? On policy level and on the ground?</p> <p>To what extent have new practices been operationalized, and mainstreamed in operations of relevant agencies?</p> <p>To what extent have new practices been adopted effectively – legally, public awareness, planning procedures, institutional framework, socio-economic, inter-agency coordination, community acceptance/benefits</p> <p>Does the legal and regulatory framework developed with project support enable the effective operationalizing of the new practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does it provide a suitable framework for peatland conservation?</li> </ul>	<p>To what extent have project objectives been reached? What do you consider the most important contributions the project has made in your area?</p> <p>To what extent do the new practices improve management of natural resources and biodiversity conservation?</p> <p>To what extent have new practices been adopted effectively – legally, public awareness, planning procedures, institutional framework, socio-economic, inter-agency coordination, community acceptance/benefits</p> <p>What changes have been made regarding institutions, inter-agency cooperation in land use/natural resources/biodiversity conservation?</p> <p>Does it change the way stakeholders and coordinate with each other?</p>	<p>What do you consider the most important contributions the project has made in your area?</p> <p>To what extent do the new practices improve management of natural resources and protection of habitat and species?</p> <p>How are the innovations applied by different agencies, private sector entities, communities?</p> <p>To what extent have new practices been adopted effectively – legally, public awareness, planning procedures, institutional framework, socio-economic, inter-agency coordination, community acceptance/benefits</p> <p>Has the project led to any changes in how institutions and other stakeholders coordinate?</p> <p>Have effective mechanisms been developed to coordinate natural resource planning and management (among different levels and stakeholders)</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Does it establish compliance monitoring and enforcement systems?</li> <li>○ Does it improve systemic capacities to manage peatlands/protect peatland habitat? (to plan, regulate, and enforce management prescriptions)</li> </ul> <p>What important changes have been made regarding institutions, inter-agency cooperation in land use/natural resources/biodiversity conservation, and cross-sectoral?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Does it change the way stakeholders coordinate with each other?</li> </ul> <p>Have effective mechanisms been developed to coordinate land use planning (among different levels and inter-agency) that mainstreams biodiversity conservation?</p> <p>Have capacities (human resources) been built on all levels to sustain new management, monitoring and conservation measures?</p> <p>Have new roles and responsibilities with regard to new management and monitoring practices been reflected in job descriptions and competency requirements?</p>	<p>Have effective mechanisms been developed to coordinate land use planning (among different levels and inter-agency) that mainstreams biodiversity conservation?</p> <p>Have capacities (human resources) been built on all levels to better manage habitats and biodiversity?</p> <p>What factors and/or innovations contributed to successful achievements and good project progress towards targets, in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•implementation arrangements</li> <li>•oversight</li> <li>•engaging experts</li> <li>•M&amp;E and adaptive management</li> <li>•planning approaches (preparing annual work plans), involving stakeholders</li> <li>•facilitating community participation</li> <li>•communicating project objectives and successes to public M&amp;E others</li> </ul> <p>What lessons learnt and best practices for effective implementation did the project generate?</p> <p>To what extent do risks and barriers remain to be overcome?</p>	<p>Have capacities (human resources) been built for sustainable land use/biodiversity conservation?</p> <p>Have new roles and responsibilities with regard to new PA and NR management approaches added to your job descriptions and or requirements?</p> <p>What is the role of the community? In terms of decision making / in terms of benefitting?</p> <p>What are the lessons learnt from the implementation of this project?</p> <p>What are some of key factors that led to the success of the project? How would you rate the importance of these factors (ranking)?</p>
---	--	--

<p>What lessons learnt and best practices for effective implementation did the project generate?</p> <p>To what extent do risks and barriers remain to achieve the project objective and generate Global Environmental Benefits?</p>		
<b>Efficiency (have not added)</b>		
<p>Was the project implementation cost-effective?</p> <p>Are financial management procedures and reports in line with government and UNDP/GEF procedures</p> <p>Is the project implementation approach efficient for delivering the planned project results?</p> <p>Project implementation on schedule? If not, has it impacted cost-effectiveness?</p> <p>Have co-financing contributions in cash and in-kind to project implementation been made?</p> <p>To what extent has the project leveraged additional resources?</p>	<p>Is the project implementation approach efficient for delivering the planned project results?</p> <p>Project implementation on schedule? If not, has it impacted cost-effectiveness?</p> <p>To what extent has the project leveraged additional resources?</p>	
<b>Sustainability</b>		
<p>Have all costs related to new practices been considered in budget planning at different levels/with relevant</p>	<p>How will implementation of practices continue once the project is over?</p>	<p>Will financial resources be available to sustain project/plans after the project ends?</p>

<p>stakeholders? Do budget plans (annual) consider costs for new practices? Will financial resources be available to sustain project results after end of GEF support?</p> <p>What measures are taken to attract other funding resources? Private sector, other donors?</p> <p>Is the government seeking follow-up support to sustain, further strengthen the innovations introduced and scale up to other sites , from other donors?</p> <p>Is the degree of ownership at all levels/among all stakeholders sufficient to maintain project results?</p> <p>Are all roles and responsibilities for implementation of new practices at all levels agreed, clarified with all stakeholders? Are they reflected in job and competency descriptions?</p> <p>Are M&amp;E and enforcement procedures strengthened, capacities built and resources available?</p> <p>Are indicators used by the project in line with stakeholder/government indicators? (were they in line from the onset or brought in line/incorporated at</p>	<p>Will financial resources be available to sustain project/plans after the project ends?</p> <p>Will financial resources be available to sustain project results after end of GEF support?</p> <p>Is there a good M&amp;E and oversight process in place for the new practices to continue?</p> <p>Is the degree of ownership at all levels/among all stakeholders sufficient to maintain project results?</p> <p>Have the new approaches, practices been introduced into the design of other projects/programs?</p> <p>Is the government seeking follow-up support to further operationalize and scale up innovations, from other donors?</p> <p>Are the roles and responsibilities for implementing practices 9and the law on conservation and sustainable use of peatlands at all levels clear? Do you feel these roles will continue after the project?</p> <p>What support or structures are needed for the innovations to continue and for scale up? (policy, resources, national support)</p> <p>Is there enough awareness about the innovations and the project?</p> <p>Are there any risks? Political, social, institutional,</p>	<p>Is there a good M&amp;E and oversight process in place for the new practices to continue?</p> <p>Is the degree of ownership at all levels/among all stakeholders sufficient to maintain project results?</p> <p>Have the new approaches and practices been introduced into the design of other projects/programs?</p> <p>Are the roles and responsibilities for implementing new practices at all levels clear? Do you feel these roles will continue after the project?</p> <p>What support or structures are needed for the innovations to continue and for scale up? (policy, resources, national support)</p> <p>Is there enough awareness about the innovations and the project?</p> <p>Are there any risks? Political, social, institutional, environmental that can stall the project?</p>
---	---	--

<p>project end)? (question to Project team )</p> <p>To what extent could sustainability of project achievements be linked to socio- political factors?</p> <p>Has the innovative approaches/practices been communicated widely in the public, in online, broadcast, print media? Has public awareness been built?</p> <p>Have exit strategies been developed on project level?</p> <p>What are the prospects of scaling up new approaches?</p> <p>Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project impacts and Global Environmental Benefits</p> <p>What are the key challenges in promoting and scaling up new practices?</p> <p>How can they be addressed? Most important measures to sustain project results?</p> <p>What are key risks ?</p>	<p>environmental that can stall sustained project impacts?</p> <p>What are the key challenges in promoting the innovations and sharing lessons learnt? How can they be addressed?</p>	
<b>Gender</b>		
<p>Was the project aligned with national policies and strategies on gender equality?</p>	<p>To what extent were mechanisms developed and applied for separate consultations with women?</p>	<p>Did the project make an effort to involve women? How? In what type of activities?</p> <p>Were women's organizations involved and supported in project activities?</p>

<p>To what extent were mechanisms developed and applied for separate consultations with women?</p> <p>To what extent did activities to promote income generation, livelihood strategies target women?</p> <p>To what extent were women's organizations involved and supported in project activities?</p> <p>Was project M&amp;E gender disaggregating?</p> <p>How were perspectives of women and men involved and affected by the project monitored and assessed?</p> <p>To what extent did the project encourage/facilitate the participation of women in all activities (planning, capacity building, income generation, access to resources, co-management)</p> <p>What real changes in gender equality did the project generate, pilot or contribute to?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to/control of resources</li> <li>• Access to information</li> <li>• Decision making power/influence</li> <li>• Division of labor, workload</li> <li>• Income generation</li> <li>• social status</li> </ul>	<p>To what extent was gender balance achieved/promoted in all project related activities, employment?</p> <p>Did the project make an effort to involve women? How? In what type of activities?</p> <p>Were women's organizations involved and supported in project activities?</p> <p>How were perspectives of women and men gathered?</p> <p>Were there any changes to women's lives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to/control of resources</li> <li>• Access to information</li> <li>• Decision making power/influence</li> <li>• Division of labor, workload</li> <li>• Income generation</li> <li>• social status</li> <li>• membership to organization</li> </ul> <p>Did women support activities for conservation?</p>	<p>How were perspectives of women and men gathered?</p> <p>Were there any changes to women's lives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to/control of resources</li> <li>• Access to information</li> <li>• Decision making power/influence</li> <li>• Division of labor, workload</li> <li>• Income generation</li> <li>• social status</li> <li>• membership to organization</li> </ul> <p>Did women support activities for conservation?</p>
--	--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• membership to organization</li> </ul> <p>To what extent did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?</p> <p>To what extent and in what ways did the project's gender results advance or contribute to the project's biodiversity outcomes?</p>		
<b>Impacts</b>		
<p>To what extent have key environmental stresses (three identified drivers of degradation) been reduced, or to what extent have enabling conditions for reduction of stresses been created by the project?</p> <p>To what extent did the project address environmental threats (three drivers of degradation)</p> <p>Did the project address limited know-how for long term, biodiversity conservation friendly environmental management</p> <p>What contributions have been made to capacities (awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, monitoring systems, womens' empowerment and participation in decision making).</p>	<p>What are the impacts on natural resource management, PA management, habitat conservation and restoration, biodiversity species conservation, and sustainable use for livelihood support?</p> <p>Did the project address weak national policy and capacity for work inside and outside PAs</p> <p>Did the project address limited know-how for long term, biodiversity conservation friendly natural resources/PA/habitat/species management?</p> <p>What kind of changes have taken place in terms of land use management? Do they provide better /sustainable land use management and conservation options? Are they applied?</p> <p>Did communities benefit? How? Livelihoods/capacity/empowerment?</p> <p>To what extent are local stakeholders aware of the new management practices, and of conservation values?</p>	<p>What are the impacts on natural resource management, PA management, habitat conservation and restoration, biodiversity species conservation, and sustainable use for livelihood support?</p> <p>Did communities benefit? How? Livelihoods/capacity/empowerment?</p> <p>To what extent are local stakeholders aware of the new practices, approaches, protection status, key biodiversity values and vulnerabilities?</p>

<p>Did the project generate any unintended impacts? (negative and positive)?</p> <p>What are the implications and scope?</p> <p>What are remaining barriers to sustain long term impacts?</p>	<p>Did the project generate any unintended impacts? (negative and positive)? What are the implications and scope?</p> <p>What are remaining barriers to sustain long term impacts?</p>	<p>Did the project generate any unintended impacts? (negative and positive)? What are the implications and scope?</p> <p>What are remaining barriers to sustain long term impacts?</p>
---	--	--

Annex 5 Evaluation Question Matrix			
<b>Relevance:</b> How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national level?			
Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
To what extent does the project support the objectives of the GEF Focal Area strategies and programs, namely for biodiversity, SLM and Climate Change Mitigation	Level of coherence with GEF strategies and outputs	Project documents GEF programmatic documents Stakeholders, project staff	Document review Interviews
To what extent does the project objective align with the priorities of local community members/land owners/users, farmers etc.?	Level of coherence between project objective and stated priorities of local stakeholders	Local stakeholders Document review of local development strategies, environmental policies, etc.	Local level interviews Desk review
To what extent does the project objective align with the development priorities of local governments in the project areas?	Level of coherence between project objective and stated priorities of local stakeholders	Local stakeholders Document review of local development strategies, environmental policies, etc.	Local level field visit interviews Desk review
To what extent does the project align with national priorities and contribute to key government programmes in biodiversity conservation, sustainable forest and land management, climate change mitigation	Level of coherence with ongoing development policies and needs. Level of fit with evolving institutional framework Level of integration with or influence on local economic/livelihood development	Project documents Project staff Local stakeholders in government and community/private sector Key national policy documents: <i>National Strategy and Action Plan on Biodiversity</i> <i>National Strategy for the Implementation of Ramsar Convention.</i> <i>Belarus' National Communications</i>	Desk reviews Stakeholder interviews Interviews with project staff



		<i>to UNFCCC</i> state program "Environmental protection and sustainable use of natural resources" for the period 2015-2019 State program "The Belarusian Forest", (2016-2020) Action Plan on Conservation and Management of Bison (2015 – 2019 others	
<p>To what extent do the innovative PA management practices developed by the project align with and is taken up by the government/MNREP's management approach?</p> <p>Does the new legislation namely the Law on the Protection and Sustainable Use of Peatlands) developed with project support promote government priorities in biodiversity conservation and habitat restoration</p>	<p>Level of implementation of new practices.</p> <p>Knowledge and skills in applying new practices.</p> <p>Policy support for new practices.</p> <p>Acceptance by all stakeholders and beneficiaries of new practices</p>	<p>PA administration staff</p> <p>MNREP officers</p> <p>Project reports</p>	<p>key informant interviews</p> <p>document reviews</p>
<p>To what extent was the project concept and implementation arrangements developed with in-depth stakeholder consultations at all levels and with active community participation?</p> <p>To what extent did project design, and namely the newly introduced PA management practices and other conservation measures, meet the needs and interests of diverse stakeholders?</p>	<p>Level of involvement of local and national stakeholders in project design and implementation (meetings, planning approaches, outreach, number of stakeholders/meetings, MoU etc., knowledge and awareness of stakeholders and beneficiaries of project design, implementation and benefits)</p>	<p>Project staff</p> <p>Local and national stakeholders</p> <p>Project documents</p>	<p>Phone interviews</p> <p>Interviews with project staff and consultants/experts</p> <p>Desk review</p>

To what extent were lessons learnt and practices from other relevant project(s) built into the design of the project?	scaling up of lessons/practices through the project	project documents project team UNDP CO staff staff of other donor agencies	Desk review Interviews with project, UNDP CO and other donor agencies Interviews with stakeholders
Does the project objective fit GEF strategic priorities?  (BD Objective 2: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors)	Level of coherence between project objective and GEF strategic priorities (including alignment of relevant focal area indicators)	GEF strategic priority documents for period when project was approved  Current GEF strategic priority documents	Desk review Interview with regional GEF advisors
Was the project in-line with UNDP priorities and strategies for Belarus?	Level of coherence between project objective and design with UNDAF, and UNDP Country Program and its Theory of Change SDGs	UNDAF  UNDP Country Program	Desk review Interviews with project and UNDP country office staff Interviews with national government agencies representatives
Does the project objective contribute to the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and other relevant international conventions (signed by Belarus)	Linkages between project objective and elements of the CBD, such as key articles and programs of work	CBD website National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan	Desk review national stakeholder interviews
<b>Effectiveness:</b> To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
To what extent have project objectives been reached?	Progress toward project indicator targets	Project documents M&E data Project staff Project stakeholders	Stakeholder interviews Document review

To what extent have newly introduced practices/mechanisms been adopted effectively – legally, public awareness, planning procedures, institutional framework, socio-economic, inter-agency coordination, community acceptance/benefits	Acceptance, knowledge of and support for newly introduced practices (details will be addressed under Results, Achievements towards targets)	Project documents M&E data Project staff Project stakeholders	Stakeholder interviews Document review
What factors and/or innovations contributed to successful achievements and good project progress towards targets, in terms of: implementation arrangements oversight engaging experts adaptive management planning approaches (preparing annual work plans), involving stakeholders facilitating community participation communicating project objectives and successes to public M&E others	Level of documentation of and preparation for project risks, assumptions and impact drivers	Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders	Stakeholder interviews Document review
What lessons learnt and best practices for effective implementation did the project generate?	Scaling up of practices, documentation of best practices	Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders	Stakeholder interviews project staff interviews Document review
To what extent do risks and barriers remain to achieve the project objective and generate Global Environmental Benefits? General overview. Details addressed under “sustainability”	Documented evaluation of risks, inclusion in planning documents, risk preparedness.	Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders	stakeholder interviews Document review

**Efficiency:** Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?

Was the project implementation cost-effective?	<p>Financial management procedures (aligned with UNDP, national norms)</p> <p>Actual/planned disbursement rate</p> <p>Project management costs compared to overall costs (%)</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Project team members</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Interviews with project team members</p>
Are financial management procedures and reports in line with government and UNDP/GEF procedures	<p>Cost of project inputs and outputs relative to norms and standards for donor projects in Belarus</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Project staff</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Interviews with project staff</p>
Is the project implementation approach efficient for delivering the planned project results?	<p>Adequacy of implementation structure and mechanisms for coordination and communication</p> <p>Planned and actual level of human resources available</p> <p>Extent and quality of engagement with relevant partners / partnerships</p> <p>Quality and adequacy of project monitoring mechanisms (oversight bodies' input, quality and timeliness of reporting, etc.)</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>National and local stakeholders</p> <p>Project staff</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Interviews with project staff</p> <p>Interviews with national and local stakeholders</p>

Project implementation on schedule? If not, has it impacted cost-effectiveness?	Project milestones in time Planned results affected by delays Required project adaptive management measures related to delays	Project documents Project staff	Desk review Interviews with project staff
Have co-financing contributions in cash and in-kind to project implementation been made?	Actual cash and in-kind co-financing compared to commitments as per ProDoc	Project documents Project staff	Desk review Interviews with project staff
To what extent has the project leveraged additional resources?	Amount of resources leveraged compared to project budget	Project documents Project staff	Desk review Interviews with project staff
<b>Sustainability:</b> To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Have all costs related to newly introduced mechanisms/practices been considered in budget planning at different levels/with relevant stakeholders?  Will financial resources be available to sustain project results after end of GEF support?	Financial requirements for maintenance of project benefits Level of expected financial resources available to support maintenance of project benefits Potential for additional financial resources to support maintenance of project benefits	Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders Planning procedures and documents	Field visit interviews Desk review Stakeholder interviews
Is the degree of ownership at all levels/among all stakeholders sufficient to maintain project results?  Are all roles and responsibilities for implementing practices/mechanisms at all levels agreed, clarified with all stakeholders?  Are they reflected in job and competency descriptions?	Level of initiative and engagement of relevant stakeholders in project activities and results	Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders	Field visit interviews Desk review Stakeholder interviews

Are the livelihood opportunities for local communities sufficient as incentives to sustain their active participation in implementing practices ? Are opportunities already realized?	Attitude of community members Evidence of improved household incomes Evidence of livelihood diversification/shift to sustainable, biodiversity friendly livelihood strategies	Project documents Local government records Community members, Beneficiaries	Desk review Interviews Site Visits to local communities, enterprises, households
Are M&E and enforcement procedures for the new practices and mechanisms strengthened, capacities built and resources available	Ongoing M&E and enforcement effective, records available, responsibilities clear, routine budget planning,	Project documents, Planning documents Stakeholders	Document reviews Interviews
Are indicators used by the project in line with stakeholder/government indicators? (were they in line from the onset or brought in line/incorporated at project end)?	Project supported results are reflected and maintained in local and central government M&E procedures and records.	Project documents	Desk reviews Stakeholder interviews
Do relevant stakeholders have the necessary technical capacity to ensure that project benefits are maintained?	Level of technical capacity of relevant stakeholders relative to level required to sustain project benefits	Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders	Stakeholder interviews Desk review
To what extent could sustainability of project achievements be linked to socio-political factors?	Existence of socio-political risks to project benefits	Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders	Stakeholder interviews Desk review
Have the new approaches, practices and mechanisms been communicated widely in the public, in online, broadcast, print media? Has public awareness been built?	Level/number of publications, media mentions. Evidence of public awareness/knowledge of project introduced innovations	Project documents/outputs. Project staff Local stakeholders	Stakeholder interviews Desk review
Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project impacts and Global Environmental Benefits?	Existence of environmental risks to project benefits	Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders	Stakeholder Interviews Desk review

<b>Gender Equality</b> Were equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women and men considered? Were the interests, needs and priorities of women and men taken into consideration in project design, implementation and M&E? Was project design and implementation gender responsive?			
Was the project aligned with national policies and strategies on gender equality?	coherence with national policies	Project documents Project staff stakeholders	Desk review stakeholder interviews Project staff interviews
Was the UNDP Gender Marker rating assigned to the project document realistic and backed by the findings of the gender analysis?	Gender analysis confirms/coherent with rating	Project doc/gender analysis	Desk review
To what extent were mechanisms developed and applied for separate consultations with women?	Number, type, scope of meetings/ events with women participants	Project documents Project staff Local stakeholders local women, womens organizations	Desk reviews Interviews with project staff Field visit interviews and focus group discussions
To what extent did activities to promote income generation, livelihood strategies target women?	Womens' participation in and benefits from income generation activities	Project documents Project staff Local stakeholders local women, womens organizations	Desk reviews Interviews with project staff Field visit interviews and focus group discussions
To what extent were women's organizations involved and supported in project activities?	Number of womens organizations involved in activities	Project documents Project staff Local stakeholders local women, womens organizations	Desk reviews Interviews with project staff Field visit interviews and focus group discussions
Was project M&E gender disaggregating?	Disaggregated information on gender (men and womens' participation in project activities)	Project M&E data Project M&E officer	Desk review Interviews with project staff
How were perspectives of women and men involved and affected by the project monitored and assessed?	Disaggregated information on gender (men and womens' participation in project activities)	Project M&E data Project M&E officer	Desk review Interviews with project staff

To what extent did the project encourage/facilitate the participation of women in all activities (planning, capacity building, income generation, access to resources)	Level of womens participation in activities, representation in planning/co-management committees, increased income for women	Project documents Project staff Local stakeholders local women, womens organizations	Desk reviews Interviews with project staff Field visit interviews and focus group discussions
To what extent was gender balance achieved/promoted in all project related activities, employment?	number of women/men participants and employees	Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders	desk reviews Interviews of project staff
What real changes in gender equality did the project generate, pilot or contribute to? Access to/control of resources Access to information Decision making power/influence Division of labor, workload Income generation social status membership to organizations	Changes in access to/control of resources, access to information, decision making power, influence, division of labor, workload, income generation, social status, membership in organizations, for women and men	Project documents, M&E Local government M&E Community Women/Womens'Organizations	Desk reviews Interviews with project staff Local stakeholder interviews, namely women and womens' organizations
To what extent did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?	Level of progress of gender action plan and gender indicators in results framework	Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders	Desk review, interviews, field visits
To what extend and in what ways did the project's gender results advance or contribute to the project's biodiversity outcomes?	Existence of logical linkages between gender results and project outcomes and impacts	Project documents Project staff Project stakeholders	Desk review, interviews, field visits



## Annex 6 Ethics Code of Conduct – Signed Forms

---

### **UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators**

#### **Evaluators/Consultants:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

#### **Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Evaluator: Sabine Schmidt

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): n.a.

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at \_\_\_Ulaanbaatar\_\_\_ (Place) on \_\_\_June 24, 2022\_\_\_ (Date)

Signature:



## UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

### Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Evaluator: Viktoryia Kalosha

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant):

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at Minsk, Belarus on 11 August 2022

Signature: 

## Annex 7 Project Results Framework

<p><b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcomes as defined in the 2016-2020 CPD for Belarus:</b> 3.1: Solutions developed at national and subnational levels for the sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste; <u>and</u> 3.2 Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions able to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation.</p>
<p><b>UNDP Strategic Plan:</b> Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded.</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</b> BD-1 Program 1; LD-3 Program 4; CCM-2 Program 4; SFM-1; SFM-3</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b>            BD-1 Program 1: Indicator 1.1: Funding gap for management of PA systems and globally significant protected areas, Indicator 1.2: Protected area management effectiveness score.            SFM-1: Indicator 1: Area of high conservation value forest identified and maintained            SFM-3: Indicator 5: Area of forest resources restored in the landscape, stratified by forest management actors            LD-3 Program 4: Indicator 3.2: Application of integrated natural resource management (INRM) practices in wider landscapes            CCM-2 Program 4 Indicator 4. Deployment of low GHG technologies and practices</p>

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target (by project end)	Source of verification	Risks																					
Project Objective: To introduce a conservation-centered and financially self-sufficient approach to management of forests and wetlands that harbor internationally important biodiversity and are important for climate and land integrity	<u>Biodiversity:</u> Funding gap for management of targeted globally significant PAs -- Nalibokski, Sporovsky, Zvanets, Mid-Pripyat (Pogost meadow), Turov Lug, and Olmany Mires  Protected area management effectiveness score -- METT applied at Nalibokski, Sporovsky, Zvanets, Mid-Pripyat (Pogost meadow), Turov Lug, Olmany Mires, Dikoe and Servech  <u>Sustainable Forest Management:</u> Area of high conservation value forest identified and maintained	Annual financing gap for optimal management scenario (operations): USD 135,506	Financing gap reduced by half	Annual project monitoring reports	The project is too ambitious for the amount of resources available																					
		<table><tr><th>PA</th><th>B/L METT</th><th>Target METT</th></tr><tr><td>Nalibokski</td><td>50</td><td>85</td></tr><tr><td>Zvanets</td><td>49</td><td>87</td></tr><tr><td>Sporovsky</td><td>53</td><td>87</td></tr><tr><td>Olmany</td><td>43</td><td>79</td></tr><tr><td>Servech</td><td>24</td><td>73</td></tr><tr><td>Turov</td><td>37</td><td>84</td></tr></table>	PA	B/L METT		Target METT	Nalibokski	50	85	Zvanets	49	87	Sporovsky	53	87	Olmany	43	79	Servech	24	73	Turov	37	84		Annual project monitoring reports
		PA	B/L METT	Target METT																						
		Nalibokski	50	85																						
Zvanets	49	87																								
Sporovsky	53	87																								
Olmany	43	79																								
Servech	24	73																								
Turov	37	84																								
50,000 ha	200,000 ha	Annual project monitoring reports																								

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target (by project end)	Source of verification	Risks
	<u>Land Degradation:</u> Application of INRM practices in wider landscapes <u>Climate Change Mitigation:</u> Area under low GHG management practices with monitoring of low GHG impact undertaken	0  0	12,456 ha (5 forested peatland pilots)  415,385 ha <sup>1</sup>	Annual project monitoring reports Annual project monitoring reports	
Outcome I: Improved financial sustainability and management effectiveness of protected forest and wetland biotopes harboring globally important biodiversity	Number of business organizations involved in sustainable habitat management at target PAs (Zvanets, Sporovsky, Mid-Pripyat, Turov Meadows) that is profitable for them	No business organizations involved in management of target PAs	At least one business organization profitably involved at each target PA	Reports of business organizations on their activities within PAs	Use of machinery during restoration and management of habitat might damage flora and fauna of wetlands (soil compaction, ditches formation, etc.)  Demand and price dynamics in wetland biomass (pellets) might influence
	Representation of women in sustainable use activities associated with business plans developed under Outcome 1	0%	50%	Reports of business organizations on their activities within PAs	
	Area of natural, highly productive foraging grounds within the living territory of the European bison's micro population in the Nalibokski Reserve (50,000 ha)	Not more than 100 ha	More than 300 ha	Implementation reports of the engineering project	
	Spatial distribution of bison throughout the micro population's living area	During late autumn and early spring bison feed mainly on adjacent agricultural lands	Bison forage in this area (mosaic meadows) during the most important period of the year (late autumn, early spring)	Data collected by monitoring studies throughout the year using camera traps, etc.	
	Area of open sedge mires where sustainable resource use and vegetation management is practiced	Sporovsky 500 ha Zvanets 100 ha	Sporovsky 3,000 ha Zvanets 4,500 ha	Reports on monitoring of vegetation	

<sup>1</sup> This includes: 150,000 ha of HCVF, 260,000 ha of forested peatlands, 1,025 ha of open peatland, 560 ha improved grassland management, 3,800 ha where biomass production replaces fossil fuels.



Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target (by project end)	Source of verification	Risks	
	Dynamics of water level throughout the year	Unstable water level (30-50 cm above or 30 cm below ground level) during May-July Water mineralization is from 300 to 450 mg/l	Optimal water level – 5-20 cm above ground level during May-July Water mineralization is from 150 to 300 mg/l	Reports on monitoring of water levels at pilot sites	project activities adversely	
	Population size of indicator species in Zvanets and Sporovsky Reserves	Sporovsky Reserve				Reports on monitoring of bird species' populations
		Species	B/L pop. size	Target		
		Aquatic warbler	500-700 males	900		
		Greater spotted eagle	1-2 pairs	4		
		Zvanets Reserve				
		Aquatic warbler	2,100-4,400 males	5,000		
		Greater spotted eagle	0-2 pairs	4		
		Curlew	0-4 pairs	15		
	Area of open, sustainably used meadows at Turov and Pogost Meadows	Turov Meadow 100 ha Pogost 0 ha	Turov Meadow 380 ha Pogost 150 ha	Results of monitoring of biotopes' ratio, vegetation		
	Population size of species during spring migration (Widgeon, Ruff, Black-tailed godwit)	Turov Meadow				Results of monitoring bird populations during migrations
		Species	B/L pop. size	Target		
		Widgeon	10,000-20,000	50,000		
		Ruff	10,000-30,000	40,000		
		Black-tailed godwit	3,000	10,000		
		Pogost Meadow				
		Widgeon	100	10,000		
		Ruff	0	10,000		
	Black-tailed godwit	0	500			
	Population size of nesting indicator bird species (Great snipe, Black-tailed godwit, Terek sandpiper, Redshank)	Turov Meadow				Results of monitoring bird populations during breeding
		Species	B/L pop. size	Target		
Great snipe		100 males	150			
Black-tailed godwit		30 pairs	80			
Terek sandpiper		5 pairs	20			
Redshank		120 pairs	200			
Pogost Meadow						
Great snipe		0 males	20			

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline		Target (by project end)		Source of verification	Risks
			Black-tailed godwit	0 pairs	5		
			Terek sandpiper	0 pairs	2		
			Redshank	2 pairs	10		
	Numbers of organized tourists in the PAs		PA	B/L tourist nos.		Target	Reports of PA Management Agencies on the tourism activity
			Nalibokski	250	2,500		
			Sporovsky	4,500	5,500		
			Turov Meadow	340	2,500		
Outcome II: Sustainable forest and wetland ecosystem management in buffer zones and economic landscapes adjacent to protected areas	Area of forest biotopes transferred to the protection category	3,000 ha of forest lands with rare biotopes are transferred into protection		150,000 ha of forest lands with rare biotopes are transferred into protection		Passports of biotopes' transfer into protection	Climate change leads to catastrophic impacts on high conservation value forests and peatlands
	Number of Forestries that envisage forestry management plans in line with sustainable use of protected biotopes	3 forestry enterprises		10 forestry enterprises		Forestry Management Plans	
	Number of employees of the Ministry of Forestry trained in the sustainable use of protected biotopes	Employees of the Ministry of Forestry do not have experience in sustainable use of rare biotopes needing special protection		At least 50 employees of the Ministry of Forestry trained		Training evaluations, workshop reports	
	Official policy and document on future use of forest hydro amelioration systems	Due to the lack of data for evaluation of the current state of forest hydro amelioration systems, there is no coordinated policy on their further use		Proposals on ways of further use of forest hydro ameliorative systems (260,000 ha) are developed and encapsulated in a Sectoral document of the Ministry of Forestry		Sectoral document titled "The Scheme of Distribution of Forest Hydro Amelioration Systems according to Their Use"	
	Outcome III: Increased experience and knowledge of innovative biotechnological measures for	Area of territory with associations of sedge mires	Dikoe 250 ha Servech 200 ha		Dikoe 1,250 ha Servech 570 ha		
	Population size of globally threatened species: Aquatic warbler,		Dikoe			Reports on monitoring of	
			Species	B/L pop. size	Target		

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline		Target (by project end)		Source of verification	Risks
eliminating the most significant threats to globally important species, and monitoring of their populations.	Greater spotted eagle, Curlew, Great snipe.		Aquatic warbler	150-200 males	250	bird populations	threatened species habitats, translocation, and artificial nests cannot be easily applied in Belarus
			Greater spotted eagle	4-5 pairs	4-5 <sup>2</sup>		
		Servech					
			Aquatic warbler	31-38 males	90		
			Curlew	0-2 pairs	3-4		
			Great snipe	21-30 males	30-40		
	Area of restored sedge fen mires	There is only one sedge fen mire in the Grodno Region - the "Svisloch" mire – with an area of 200 ha		Sedge fen mire Dokudovskoe with an area of 1,200 ha is restored (located in northwest Belarus); offers potential key habitats for globally threatened aquatic warbler, greater spotted eagle.		Report on implementation of the construction project on ecological rehabilitation of Dokudovskoe	
	Area of vegetation associations on restored mire	Sedge communities on the peatland Dokudovskoe (1,200 ha) occupy no more than 20 ha		Sedge communities on peatland Dokudovskoe occupy at least 700 ha		Data on monitoring of vegetation communities	
	Greenhouse gas emissions at following pilot sites: 12,456 ha of forest peatland; 1,025 ha of open peatlands	Carbon dioxide emissions are about 10-20 tons per ha per year		Carbon dioxide emissions are about 0 tons per ha per year		Data on monitoring of greenhouse gas emissions	
Number of genetically valuable bison transferred from different micro populations in Belarus and Poland to Nalibokski to increase diversity	0		5		Data from genetic research studies		
Number of genetic passports issued for the Nalibokski micro population of the European bison	0		8		Data from genetic research studies		
Population dynamics of the Aquatic warbler in the Zuvintas Reserve (Lithuania)	Population size of the aquatic warbler at the		Population size increases to at least 30 males (through translocation)		Reports on monitoring of		

<sup>2</sup> The objective is to stabilize the condition for this species. Without the project activities, the number of eagles will decline quickly.

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target (by project end)	Source of verification	Risks
		restored potential key habitat Zuvintas is 2-7 males	and further population growth is registered	bird species populations	
	Number of breeding pairs of greater spotted eagle in Olmany Mires	18-20 pairs	Stabilized at 20-25 pairs	Reports on monitoring of the population of greater spotted eagle in Olmany Mires	
	Breeding success	30%	40-50		
	Number of secure nesting sites	Lack of secure places for nesting	At least 20 artificial nests are established on plots where greater spotted eagles nest		
	Action plan on conservation of 13 invertebrates and 5 molluscs with EN and VU status based on scientific knowledge of size and distribution (including <i>Dolomedes plantarius</i> , <i>Dytiscus latissimus</i> , <i>Graphoderus bilineatus</i> , <i>Cerambyx cerdo</i> , <i>Lycaena helle</i> , <i>Lopinga achine</i> , <i>Euphydryas maturna</i> , <i>Phyllodesma ilicifolia</i> , <i>Unio crassus</i> , <i>Pseudanodonta complanata</i> )	Lack of data prevents actions for their effective protection	Collected data on the state of populations of these species leads to the development of an Action Plan on conservation of these poorly known species	Report on the state and distribution of species and on protection measures	



## Annex 8      **Audit Trail**

To the comments received on August 29/30 from the Terminal Evaluation of “Conservation-oriented management of forests and wetlands to achieve multiple benefits”, Republic of Belarus. UNDP Project PIMS # 5495.

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator’s name) and track change comment number (“#” column):

<b>Institution, Organization</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>Comment Location</b>	<b>Comment/Feedback on the draft TE Report</b>	<b>TE Team Response and Actions taken</b>
UNDP CO	1	Title page	Suggest to include a design of title page and to omit “Draft” so as to identify the document as the final Terminal Evaluation Report	DRAFT has been omitted, and a design added to the title page
UNDP CO	2	Table of Contents	Request to update ToC to reflect only necessary headings in correct order	ToC was updated entirely
PMU	3	Page 6, co-financing table. 5) total co-financing	Total co-financing amount was given as USD 23,432,542. Feedback suggests to correct to USD 28,884,780.	Accepted and changed to USD 28,884,780.
UNDP CO	4	Page 9, paragraph 1	Request to add PMU to acronyms list	PMU was added to acronyms list
UNDP CO	5	Page 11, Chapter on Main Findings	Comment: “Either in this part or where you feel more appropriate, please mention how the project addressed/considered (or not) the needs of vulnerable groups. As there were not specifically targeted activities, probably it’s worth mentioning some indirect events. It can also be a shortcoming of the project and recommendation for the future.”	Followed up with the addition of the following paragraphs at the end of the section: “Project design did not include specific activities and expected results to benefit vulnerable groups. The only aspect related to livelihood improvements in project design and reflected in the results framework is the profitable involvement of private enterprises in sustainable habitat management of two PAs. The evaluation team found no evidence that the project's activities had a direct impact on improving the situation of ordinary people in Belarus, including vulnerable groups. However, indirect benefits for local communities were found to be generated by project activities; these included an increase in the flow of customers for agro-

				ecotourism facilities near Nalibokski and Sprovsky nature reserves, and the popularization of the value of wild-growing types of berries for end-users of products on packages of OAO Arzhanitsa. These results did not explicitly affect vulnerable groups."
PMU	6	Page 11, paragraph 5, last line	"mowing and bush removal on over 800 ha of open sedge mire in Sporovsky and Zvanets reserves" was quoted as one of the key achievements under Outcome 1. Comment suggests to update value according to latest PIR (2022).	Accepted and changed to: "mowing and bush removal on over 11,000 ha of open sedge mire in Sporovsky and Zvanets reserves".
UNDP CO	7	Page 12, 1. line	Use correct spelling of COVID-19 throughout document	Throughout document, COVID-19 was used
UNDP CO	8	Page 12, end of paragraph 4	"agreement with over 104 forestries on the use of forest hydro ameliorative systems on 474,700 ha. ". Comment: "If we mean leshozy, there are only 99 of them. Pease check it"	A footnote was inserted to explain: " "including 99 forestries of the Ministry of Forestry, 2 educational and experimental forestries, 3 forestries under the Presidential Affairs Management Department".
PMU	9	Page 15, Recommendation A.1. in table.	Recommendation A.1. "With implementing partners who have not completed all activities according to agreements (namely JSC "Turovschina") – jointly review remaining activities according to Memorandum of Understanding, and plan for implementation. Conclude <u>binding</u> agreement. (also see E.1.) " was proposed to omit as remaining 2 months of project are not sufficient to implement recommendation.	Accepted, Recommendation A.1 was omitted.
UNDP CO	10	Page 16, Recommendations Summary Table	Comment: "From the regional colleagues we received the following suggestion: follow up on the second TE Recommendation to convene a round table meeting in order to explore how good practices can be scaled up esp. in the context of GEF 8 programming. Please incorporate it accordingly"	Followed-up: "convene a round table meeting in order to explore how good practices can be scaled up esp. in the context of GEF 8 programming." Was added as recommendation B.3.

PMU	11	Page 16, Recommendation D.2.	“Prepare funding proposals for in-depth feasibility studies including study tour/s to Poland (based on project consultant recommendations) on a) production of pellets from grassy biomass, b) production of biodegradable disposable tableware, c) export of biomass and the fattening of livestock. “ Comment: “It’s out of the someone’s specific influence due to the political situation”	The recommendation has been re-phrased to: “Develop more detailed proposals including business plans for the development of pellet production from plant biomass and biodegradable disposable tableware, taking into account relevant foreign experiences in this field.”
PMU	12	Page 23,	“By 2021, key achievements included (as per 2021 PIR): “. Comment asks about data from 2022 PIR.	Rejected. Under this chapter, “Milestones” are described (for MTR, and 2021). Achievements at EoP/2022, based in PIR 2022, are described in following chapters.
PMU	13	Page 31, end of paragraph 1.	Comment suggests to mention one more project preceding the wetlands project: “Conservation and sustainable management of peatlands in Belarus to minimize carbon emissions and help ecosystems to adapt to climate change”, 2014-2017 funded by EU	Accepted. Added: “and “Conservation and sustainable management of peatlands in Belarus to minimize carbon emissions and help ecosystems to adapt to climate change, 2014-2017 funded by EU”.
PMU	14	Page 35, last line	“Ministry of Energy (In-kind USD 200,000), “ was proposed to delete	Accepted. Deleted “Ministry of Energy (In-kind USD 200,000)”
PMU	15	Page 36, 2. Paragraph, 1. line	“Co-financing USD 21,170,337 (Government of Republic of Belarus)”- was proposed to check value.	Followed up and changed to: “Co-financing USD 26,141,706 (Government of Republic of Belarus)” based on latest co-financing data provided by PMU
PMU	16	Page 36, details on co-financing table	Comment suggested to replace the table with the most updated table provided by PMU	Followed up. Table was replaced, explanations for old table were deleted.
PMU	17	Page 74, paragraph 3	“mowing and bush removal on over 800 ha of open sedge mire in Sporovsky and Zvanets reserves.” Was quoted as a key achievement under Outcome 1. Comment asked to update value based on PIR 2022.	Followed up. Changed to: “mowing and bush removal on over 11,000 ha of open sedge mire in Sporovsky and Zvanets reserves.”
PMU	18	Page 76, first recommendation	Same as Recommendation A.1. above. “With implementing partners who have not completed all activities according to agreements (namely JSC “Turovschina”) – jointly review remaining activities according to Memorandum of Understanding, and plan for implementation. Conclude binding agreement.	Accepted. Recommendation omitted.

			Comment suggests to omit recommendation as remaining project time is not sufficient to follow up.	
UNDP CO	19	Page 43, Indicator 1, Assessment.	Comment: "Where the targets exceeded/are below the expected levels, please indicate by what percent in each case"	Followed up: throughout the table on achievements against targets, the over/underachievements of quantitative targets have been expressed in percentages.
UNDP CO	20	Page 54, Indicator 22 assessment	Comment: "Additional Comments" on "achievement of target delayed"	Responded with further elaboration: "Achievement of target delayed at Dikoe; activities (removing biomass) scheduled for September 2022 in protected area management plan are likely to achieve target. At Servech, target exceeded by 5 %."
UNDP CO	21	Page 56, Indicator 25 assessment	Comment on "Quantitative target partially achieved": "Additional comments"?	Followed up with further elaboration: "Quantitative target partially achieved. GHG emissions per ha have been reduced by 65 % (compared to baseline) after rewetting, and are anticipated to be reduced by 75 % after 20 years."
UNDP CO	22	Page 65, paragraph 1	Comment regarding gender outcomes: "Figures may be compared with data at p. 46."	Followed up by adding: "By 2020, representation of women in the project's target area management activities amounted to 47% (38 out of 81). Of the total number of experts hired by the project in 2020-2021, 54% were women (8 out of 15)."
UNDP CO	23	Page 65, paragraph 2	The draft report here had stated "At time of drafting this report, the final/updated GEF Core Indicators were not available yet". Comment: " can they be reviewed".	Response: this statement was erroneous; in fact the report quotes the updated (2022) values for 2022 in the next section. The lines "project beneficiaries, the total number of which (at MTR) was 3179, including 1083 female (34 %) and 2096 male. "At time of drafting this report, the final/updated GEF Core Indicators were not available yet." was deleted, and the relevant core indicator values for 2022 added: " <i>direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment</i> . Total number expected at CEO ER: N/A. Total number achieved at MTR: 54 female, 21 male. Total number achieved at TE:81 (38/43)"

## Annex 9: GEF Core Indicators at TE stage

PIMS 5495 Belarus

August, 2022

**Instructions:** Select all indicators relevant to the given project. Enter data for the present stage, not for future stages. Note that Core Indicator 11 is mandatory for all projects. For projects under development, integrate Core Indicators into the project Results Framework, ideally at the objective level.

### Core Indicator 1: Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (hectares)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
N/A	226,704	137,423	230,247

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all figures reported under the two sub-indicators (1.1 and 1.2) for that stage.

#### 1.1 Terrestrial protected areas newly created

Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all individual PAs reported in the next table, for that stage.

Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)

Add rows as needed.

Name of Protected Area	METT Score at CEO ER	METT Score at MTR	METT Score at TE

Add rows as needed; ensure all relevant PAs are listed in both this and the previous table. Note no METT score at PIF.

#### 1.2 Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness

Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
	226,534	137,423	230,247

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all individual PAs reported in the next table, for that stage.

Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
Nalibokski	93947	IV	N/A	86,892	86,892	86892
Zvanets	145850	IV	N/A	16,824	8,000	16824
Sporovski	93900	IV	N/A	19,384	19,384	19384
Olmany mire	900564	IV	N/A	94,219	20,000	104000
Servech	n/a	IV	N/A	9068	3,000	3000
Turov Meadow	147	VI	N/A	147	147	147
Для ПА Nalibokski, Zvanets, Sporovski, Olmany mire (проект Полесье, АПБ) разработаны и частично реализованы планы управления, что <b>improved management effectiveness</b> .						

Add rows as needed.

Name of Protected Area	METT Score at CEO ER	METT Score at MTR	METT Score at TE
Nalibokski	50; 85 (TE target)	73	87
Zvanets	49; 87 (TE target)	76	89
Sporovski	53; 87 (TE target)	76	89
Olmany mire	43; 79 (TE target)	60	78
Servech	24; 73 (TE target)	51	72
Turov Meadow	37; 84 (TE target)	70	88

Add rows as needed; ensure all relevant PAs are listed in both this and the previous table. Note no METT score at PIF.

#### Core Indicator 2: Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (hectares)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all figures reported under the two sub-indicators (2.1 and 2.2) for that stage.

#### 2.1 Marine protected areas newly created

Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all individual PAs reported in the next table, for that stage.

Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)

Add rows as needed.

Name of Protected Area	METT Score at CEO ER	METT Score at MTR	METT Score at TE

Add rows as needed; ensure all relevant PAs are listed in both this and the previous table. Note no METT score at PIF.

## 2.2 Marine protected areas under improved management effectiveness

Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all individual PAs reported in the next table, for that stage.

Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)

Add rows as needed.

Name of Protected Area	METT Score at CEO ER	METT Score at MTR	METT Score at TE

Add rows as needed; ensure all relevant PAs are listed in both this and the previous table. Note no METT score at PIF.

## Core Indicator 3: Area of land restored (hectares)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
		6,956 (6726 ha rewetted forested peatlands + 230 ha restored grasslands)	13,016 (12,456 ha of rewetted forest peatlands and 560 ha of restored grasslands)

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all figures reported under the four sub-indicators (3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4) for that stage.

### 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural lands restored

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)

### 3.2 Area of forest and forest land restored

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)

### 3.3 Area of natural grass and shrublands restored

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
	560 ha total: 380 ha - Turov meadow, 180 ha - Pogost meadow	230 ha total: Turov meadow - 180 ha + 50 ha - Pogost meadow	660 ha total: Turov meadow - 180 ha, Pogost meadow - 50 ha, meadows in Nalibokski PA – 430 ha.

### 3.4 Area of wetlands (including estuaries and mangroves) restored

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
	12,456 ha of rewetted forest peatlands	6,726 hectares of 4 rewetted forested peatlands: Berezovik, Verechskoye, Ostrovo, Dokudovskoye)	13,256 hectares of 6 rewetted peatlands: Berezovik (4567 ha), Verechskoye (759 ha), Ostrovo (847 ha), Dokudovskoye (757 ha), Zhada (4521 ha), Servech (1805 ha).

### Core Indicator 4: Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
N/A	410,00 (baseline LD PMAT Project Context, Forestry and CCM TT)	379,865	653,905

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all figures reported under the four sub-indicators (4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4) for that stage.

### 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (qualitative assessment, noncertified)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Qualitative description at PIF	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Qualitative description at CEO ER	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Qualitative description at MTR	Ha (achieved at TE)	Qualitative description at TE



--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Add rows as needed.

#### 4.2 Area of landscapes that meet national or international third-party certification and that incorporates biodiversity considerations

Ha (expected at PIF)	Type of Certification at PIF	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Type of Certification at CEO ER	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Type of Certification at MTR	Ha (achieved at TE)	Type of Certification at TE

Add rows as needed.

#### 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (expected at PIF)	Description of Management Practices at PIF	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Description of Management Practices at CEO ER	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Description of Management Practices at MTR	Ha (achieved at TE)	Description of Management Practices at TE
		150,000 (from CCM TT, LD PMAT Project Context)	forest area where management plans are revised to avoid deforestation and reduce dryland forest degradation	122,865	122,865 ha of rare biotopes have been identified on the territory of 33 forestries	179,205 ha of rare biotopes have been identified on the territory of 43 forestries	
		260,000 (from CCM TT, LD PMAT Project context)	peatland forest area where plans for management and wise use reduce peatland forest degradation	257,000	Proposals on ways of further use of forest hydro ameliorative systems on the area of 257,000 ha have been developed and agreed with the respective forestries	Proposals on ways of further use of forest hydro ameliorative systems on the area of 474,700 ha have been developed and agreed with the respective forestries and Ministry of forestry	

Add rows as needed.

#### 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value forest loss avoided

Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)

--	--	--	--

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all individual PAs reported in the next table, for that stage. Prepare and upload file that justifies the HCVF.

Name of HCVF	Ha (expected at PIF)	Counterfactual at PIF	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Counterfactual at CEO ER	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)

Add rows as needed.

\*\*\*Evidence required in Portal: "Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF"\*\*\*

#### Core Indicator 5: Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)

#### 5.1 Number of fisheries that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations

Number of fisheries (expected at PIF)	Number of fisheries (expected at CEO ER)	Number of fisheries (achieved at MTR)	Number of fisheries (achieved at TE)

Name of Fishery	Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Type of Certification at PIF	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Type of Certification at CEO ER	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Type of Certification at MTR	Total Ha (achieved at TE)	Type of Certification at TE

Add rows as needed.

#### 5.2 Number of Large Marine Ecosystems with reduced pollution and hypoxia

Number of LMEs (expected at PIF)	Number of LMEs (expected at CEO ER)	Number of LMEs (achieved at MTR)	Number of LMEs (achieved at TE)

Figure at a given stage must be the total count of the LMEs listed in the next table.

Name of LME	Type of Pollution (expected at PIF)	Extent of Pollution (expected at PIF)	Type of Pollution (expected at CEO ER)	Extent of Pollution (expected at CEO ER)	Type of Pollution (achieved at MTR)	Extent of Pollution (achieved at MTR)	Type of Pollution (achieved at TE)	Extent of Pollution (achieved at TE)

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Add rows as needed.

**Total area under improved management (in PIF and CEO ER Table F)**

Million Ha (expected at PIF)	Million Ha (expected at CEO ER)

Calculate the total by summing Core Indicators 1-5. Ensure that there is no double-counting.

**Core Indicator 6: Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent)**

GHG emission type	Metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> -eq (expected at PIF)	Metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> -eq (expected at CEO ER)	Metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> -eq (expected at MTR)	Metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> -eq (expected at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> -e (direct)			1,138,490	3,199,577
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> -e (indirect)			1,107,735	4,799,366

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all figures reported under the first two sub-indicators (6.1 and 6.2) for that stage.

**6.1 Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the sector of Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use**

GHG emission type	Ha (expected at PIF)	Metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> -eq (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> -eq (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (expected at MTR)	Metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> -eq (expected at MTR)	Ha (expected at TE)	Metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> -eq (expected at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> -e (direct)				3,199,577		1,138,490		
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> -e (indirect)				4,799,366		1,107,735		
Anticipated year	---	[2018-2100]	---	[2018-2100]	---	[2018-2100]	---	[2018-2100]
Duration of accounting	---	[1-30]	---	[1-30]	---	[1-30]	---	[1-30]

**6.2 Emissions avoided outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use)**

GHG emission type	Metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> -eq (expected at PIF)	Metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> -eq (expected at CEO ER)	Metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> -eq (expected at MTR)	Metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> -eq (expected at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> -e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> -e (indirect)				
Anticipated year	[2018-2100]	[2018-2100]	[2018-2100]	[2018-2100]
Duration of accounting	[1-20]	[1-20]	[1-20]	[1-20]

### 6.3 Energy saved (megajoules)

Total MJ (expected at PIF)	Total MJ (expected at CEO ER)	Total MJ (achieved at MTR)	Total MJ (achieved at TE)

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all figures reported in the next table, for that stage.

Type of Intervention	MJ (expected at PIF)	MJ (expected at CEO ER)	MJ (achieved at MTR)	MJ (achieved at TE)

Add rows as needed.

### 6.4 Increase in installed renewable energy capacity per technology (megawatts).

Type of Renewable Energy	Capacity (MW; expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW; expected at CEO ER)	Capacity (MW; achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW; achieved at TE)
[biomass, geothermal, ocean, small hydro, solar photovoltaic, solar thermal, wind power, and storage]				

Add rows as needed.

### Core Indicator 7: Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management

Number (expected at PIF)	Number (expected at CEO ER)	Number (achieved at MTR)	Number (achieved at TE)

--	--	--	--

Figure at a given stage must be the count of all water ecosystems reported under the four sub-indicators for that stage.

#### 7.1 Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program formulation and implementation

Shared Water Ecosystem (name)	Rating (entered at PIF)	Rating (entered at CEO ER)	Rating (entered at MTR)	Rating (entered at TE)
<i>[note that this is not a open field in the Portal, but a restricted drop-down list]</i>	1 = No TDA/SAP developed 2 = TDA finalized 3 = SAP ministerially endorsed 4 = SAP under implementation			

Add rows as needed, i.e. if more than one water ecosystem.

#### 7.2 Level of regional legal agreements and regional management institution(s) to support its implementation

Shared Water Ecosystem (name)	Rating (entered at PIF)	Rating (entered at CEO ER)	Rating (entered at MTR)	Rating (entered at TE)
<i>[note that this is not a open field in the Portal, but a restricted drop-down list]</i>	1 = No regional legal agreement, or neither institutional framework nor RMI in place 2 = Regional legal agreement under development 3 = Regional legal agreement signed and RMI in place 4 = Regional legal agreement ratified and RMI functional			

Add rows as needed, i.e. if more than one water ecosystem.

#### 7.3 Level of national/local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees

Shared Water Ecosystem (name)	Rating (entered at PIF)	Rating (entered at CEO ER)	Rating (entered at MTR)	Rating (entered at TE)
<i>[note that this is not a open field in the Portal, but a restricted drop-down list]</i>	1 = Neither national/local reforms nor IMCs 2 = National/local reforms in preparation, IMCs functional 3 = National/local reforms and IMCs in place 4 = National/local reforms/policies implemented, supported by IMCs			

Add rows as needed, i.e. if more than one water ecosystem.

#### 7.4 Level of engagement in IW:LEARN through participation and delivery of key products

Shared Water Ecosystem (name)	Rating (entered at PIF)	Rating (entered at CEO ER)	Rating (entered at MTR)	Rating (entered at TE)
-------------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------

<i>[note that this is not a open field in the Portal, but a restricted drop-down list]</i>	1 = No participation 2 = Website in line with IW:LEARN guidance active 3 = As above, plus strong participation in training/twinning events and production of at least one experience note and one results note 4 = As above, plus active participation of project staff and country representatives at International Waters conferences and the provision of spatial data and other data points via project website			
--	--	--	--	--

Add rows as needed, i.e. if more than one water ecosystem.

#### Core Indicator 8: Globally over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels (metric tons)

Metric tons marine capture fisheries (expected at PIF)	Metric tons marine capture fisheries (expected at CEO ER)	Metric tons marine capture fisheries (achieved at MTR)	Metric tons marine capture fisheries (achieved at TE)

Fishery Details <i>(source for the estimate of tonnage, and the initial justification for considering the fishery to be overexploited)</i>

#### Core Indicator 9: Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials, and products (metric tons of toxic chemicals reduced)

Total metric tons (expected at PIF)	Total metric tons (expected at CEO ER)	Total metric tons (achieved at MTR)	Total metric tons (achieved at TE)

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all figures reported under the first three sub-indicators (9.1, 9.2 and 9.3) for that stage.

#### 9.1 Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and POPs containing materials and products removed or disposed (POPs type)

POPs type	Metric tons (expected at PIF)	Metric tons (expected at CEO ER)	Metric tons (achieved at MTR)	Metric tons (achieved at TE)
-----------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------

<i>[one chemical per row; note that this is not a open field in the Portal, but a restricted drop-down list]</i>				
--	--	--	--	--

Add rows as needed.

## 9.2 Quantity of mercury reduced (metric tons)

Metric tons (expected at PIF)	Metric tons (expected at CEO ER)	Metric tons (achieved at MTR)	Metric tons (achieved at TE)

## 9.3 Hydrochlorofluorocarbons reduced/phased out (metric tons)

Metric tons (expected at PIF)	Metric tons (expected at CEO ER)	Metric tons (achieved at MTR)	Metric tons (achieved at TE)

## 9.4 Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste (use this sub-indicator if one or more of 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3 are filled in)

Number (expected at PIF)	Number (expected at CEO ER)	Number (achieved at MTR)	Number (achieved at TE)

## 9.5 Number of low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented, particularly in food production, manufacturing, and cities (use this sub-indicator if one or more of 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3 are filled in)

Number (expected at PIF)	Number (expected at CEO ER)	Number (achieved at MTR)	Number (achieved at TE)

## 9.6 Quantity of POPs/Mercury containing materials and products directly avoided

Metric tons (expected at PIF)	Metric tons (expected at CEO ER)	Metric tons (achieved at MTR)	Metric tons (achieved at TE)
-------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------

--	--	--	--

NEW sub-indicator now appearing in the Portal, but missing from the GEF's Core Indicator worksheet and Results Architecture. Unclear how this is different from the headline Core Indicator 9.

**Core Indicator 10: Reduction, avoidance of emissions of POPS to air from point and non-point sources (gTEQ)**

Grams of toxic equivalent (expected at PIF)	Grams of toxic equivalent (expected at CEO ER)	Grams of toxic equivalent (achieved at MTR)	Grams of toxic equivalent (achieved at TE)

**10.1 Number of countries with legislation and policies implemented to control emissions of POPs to air**

Number (expected at PIF)	Number (expected at CEO ER)	Number (achieved at MTR)	Number (achieved at TE)

**10.2 Number of emission control technologies/practices implemented**

Number (expected at PIF)	Number (expected at CEO ER)	Number (achieved at MTR)	Number (achieved at TE)

**Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment**

Total number (expected at PIF)	Total number (expected at CEO ER)	Total number (achieved at MTR)	Total number (achieved at TE)
N/A	N/A	54	81

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of female and male, as in the table below for that stage.

Gender	Number (expected at PIF)	Number (expected at CEO ER)	Number (achieved at MTR)	Number (achieved at TE)
Female	N/A	N/A	33	38
Male	N/A	N/A	21	43

This indicator is mandatory for all UNDP-GEF projects.



## Annex 10 – Photo Annex (Naliboksky and Sporovsky Reserves)



Naliboksky reserve, Tyakovo tract: feeders for European bison in the area cleared under the project



Naliboksky reserve, Tyakovo tract: feeders for European bison in the area cleared under the project





Naliboksky reserve, Tyakovo tract: observation tower built as part of the project



Naliboksky reserve, Tyakovo tract: reclamation canal - the border between the cleared (right) and uncleared (left) territory



Naliboksky reserve, Tyakovo tract: a herd of tarpan horses in a cleared area



Sporovsky reserve: mowing the bog with the help of equipment purchased under the project





Sporovsky reserve: the beginning of the tourist ecological trail



Sporovsky reserve: Alena Sinilo, tourism specialist, certified guide near the stand equipped on the tourist ecological trail





Sporovsky reserve: ferry across the Yaselda River - part of the tourist ecological trail



Sporovsky Reserve: observation tower - part of the tourist ecological trail





Sporovsky reserve: view of the swamp from the observation tower. The border between cleared (left) and uncleared (right) territories is visible



Sporovsky Reserve: view of the trail from the observation tower