"Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Areas System" Project

PIMS 3957

Midterm Evaluation

Final Report

28th April 2011

Francis Hurst

Contents

Acknowledgments

An evaluation is always a difficult and challenging time for any project as it invariably requires a level of scrutiny and criticism of the efforts of project partners by someone from outside who may be unaware of the efforts that have gone into bringing the project to where it is at the midterm or final evaluation.

As a general rule most individuals working within UNDP-GEF biodiversity projects are dedicated and resourceful people with a deeply felt commitment to their work. So it can be all the more frustrating when an external evaluator, who might have never even heard of the project before, comes along and questions their work, judgment and even their passion.

In this instance it is safe to say that the general rule outlined above has not been broken. This Evaluator would like to thank the Project Manager and Project Assistant, UNDP Georgia (past and present), APA, TPAC management and communities, NACRES and FFI, ECFDC and GCCW and WWF Georgia for their hospitality, patience, understanding and help during the MTE.

Disclaimer

The opinions and recommendations in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the position of the Ministry of Environment, GEF, UNDP or the Project's partners. The MTE is responsible for any errors or omissions.

Acronyms

APA	Agency for Protected Areas
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CPATF	Caucasus Protected Areas Trust Fund
CNF	Caucasus Nature Fund
CO	Country Office
ECFDC	European Consulting for Developing Countries
FFI	Flora and Fauna International
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
GCCW	Georgian Centre for the Conservation of Wildlife
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GoG	Government of Georgia
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
LFM	Log Frame Matrix
MoE	Ministry of Environment
MSP	Medium-sized Project
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NACRES	Noah's Ark Centre for the Recovery of Endangered Species (Centre for Biodiversity Conservation and Research)
NEX	National Execution (of a project)
PA	Protected Area
PEB	Project executive is the Project Executive Board
PMU	Project Management Unit
PPP	Public Private Partnership
RAPPAM	Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Areas Management
RFP	Request for Proposals
TNA	Training Needs Assessment
ToR	Terms of Reference
TPAC	Tusheti Protected Areas Complex
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Areas System Project PIMS 3957 Mid-Term Evaluation Final Report

Executive Summary

Brief description of the Project

The "Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Areas System" Project (PIMS 3957) is the first UNDP-GEF project to be executed through National Execution (NEX) modality. The Project Document was signed in May 2009 for a three year project. The Project is implemented by the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) and executed by the Ministry of Environment (MoE) through the Agency for Protected Areas (APA) with a Project Management Unit (PMU) directly contracted by UNDP. The Project executive is the Project Executive Board (PEB) comprised of the key partners (UNDP, APA and a number of other stakeholders).

The Project budget is US$ 14,418,836 of which US$ 685,000 is the GEF Grant and US$190,420 is provided by the Implementing Agency (total US$ 875,420). The remaining financing is made up of the Government of Georgia (GoG) US$ 11,648,000 (in kind) and other donors[1] US$ 1,895,416 (in kind). Budget execution by January 2011 is approximately 51.3% disaggregated to GEF US$145,573, UNDP US$ 104,444, GoG US$ 6,147,555 and other donors US$ 1,000,358[2].

The Project's actual implementation started in August 2009 and the Inception Phase was completed by October 2009. During this period the Project encountered a number of challenges some of which were beyond its control (*e.g.* the appointed Project Manager left to take up another position) and some which were as a result of the Project's initial design (*e.g.* the large number of deliverables to be managed by the PMU under components 1 and 2). That said; the Project Document was on the whole well-written and provided a coherent strategy for achieving the objectives although the MTE considers that it did not sufficiently consider the issue of governance of the protected areas as a cross-cutting issue and there were weaknesses in the design of the operational aspects of the Project (*e.g.* the management of technical aspects of components 1 and 2 by the PMU) as well as the risk identification.

Context and purpose of the Midterm Evaluation

The Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is an integral component of the UNDP GEF project cycle management. It serves as an agent of change and plays a critical role in supporting accountability. Its main objectives are:

1. To assess overall performance against the project objective and outcomes as set out in the Project Document, Project's Logical Framework, and other related documents;
2. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project;
3. To analyze critically the implementation and management arrangements of the project;
4. To assess the progress to date towards achievement of the outcomes;
5. To review planned strategies and plans for achieving the overall objective of the project within the timeframe;
6. To assess the sustainability of the project's interventions;
7. To list and document initial lessons concerning project design, implementation and management;

---

[1] BP/EURASIA Partnership Foundation, WWF – MAVA, EU/FFI-NACRES and IUCN
[2] Other donors calculated to February 2011

8. To assess project relevance to national priorities, and;
9. To provide guidance for the future project activities and, if necessary, for the implementation and management arrangements;

The intention being that the MTE, as part of the overall GEF project cycle management and adaptive management approach, will:

- Strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the project;
- Enhance the likelihood of achievement of the project and GEF objectives through analyzing project strengths and weaknesses and suggesting measures for improvement;
- Enhance organizational and development learning;
- Enable informed decision-making;
- Create the basis of replication of successful project outcomes achieved so far.

The MTE is guided by the MTE Terms of Reference (ToR) and UNDP-GEF Project Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures[3]. The evaluation process is independent of UNDP, GEF and the Ministry of Environment (MoE) and APA. The opinions and recommendations in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the position of the GEF, UNDP, the MoE, APA or the other project stakeholders, however, once accepted the MTE becomes a recognized component of the project's documentation.

Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

Overall the Project is rated as **Satisfactory** at the midpoint of its implementation with a **Moderately Likely** chance that the outcomes of the Project will be sustainable after the close of the Project.

On the whole the PEB and PMU have responded well to the inevitable challenges showing a degree of innovation and adaptation. The decision to "package" the component 1 and 2 studies and reports and contract them out to a contractor was a sensible move. Trying to manage that volume of studies and technical reports (and technical experts) through the PMU would have been extremely difficult and time consuming. However, the insistence on a set number of 23 separate deliverables rather than consolidating them into a smaller number of reports (while still retaining much of the scope of these studies and reports) has resulted in delays with the contractor. In the interests of fairness and for the avoidance of doubt the MTE feels that the original proposal by the Consultant (to reduce the number of deliverables) was not financially motivated and made in good faith with respect of meeting the overall Project objectives. Therefore both parties are acting in good faith and the MTE concludes that there should be an agreement to move on with the work on a "no fault" basis in the best interests of achieving a successful Final Evaluation.

The tendering process for these two contracts began in December 2009 and was completed in May 2010 and the handling the complicated tendering process was organized efficiently and transparently by the PMU and UNDP CO.

As a result of these issues the Project has lost approximately six months of implementation time. However, the MTE makes it clear that many of these challenges are the ordinary setbacks that almost every project faces and does not reflect poorly on the PEB, PMU or Contractor. Rather, they are the result of trying to achieve too much in too little time, a reoccurring theme in many UNDP-GEF projects.

---

[3] http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html

There were a number of weaknesses in the design of the Project. Most importantly the Project is under-funded and should have been given more time for its implementation. This has put at risk the benefits of internalizing the process of developing a sustainably financed protected areas system.

In addition to this the issue of protected areas governance (at the system level and the individual protected area) is largely overlooked in the Project's design. However, the MTE considers that the issue of governance is critical to the successful financing of the protected areas system on the basis that a protected areas system that is well-governed but poorly financed is likely to be more resilient than one that is weakly governed but well-financed. On the last point; increasing the financing to a weakly-governed system might arguably make the system less resilient to economic, socio-political and environmental shocks and surprises.

However, none of these concerns are serious enough to take drastic action and a number of corrective actions are recommended:

Recommendation 1 – The Project applies for a budget-neutral extension to allow it the extra time to complete the activities. However, if this is not possible then the PMU and UNDP should review the risks and opportunities to review the Project's risk assessment in light of the technical reports produced by the two Contractors with regards to some of the more difficult decisions that will need to be made which will require, *inter alia*; structural changes to the way in which APA operates, or the allocation of funds, transfer of powers, accounting systems, etc., in order to direct the Project's efforts in the remaining time with a view to making as much progress as possible and internalizing the experience within APA.

Recommendation 2 – Consolidation of components 1 and 2 deliverables into a limited number of key deliverables not exceeding four main deliverables, given the technical nature and size of the project, and the relative small amount of input available to the consultant team. The main result areas that are intrinsically relevant to the objectives of the project are:

- Legal/enabling environment framework;
- A protected areas economic valuation;
- Financial business management and planning for protected areas, and;
- Related training.

The 23 deliverables can effectively be consolidated into fewer deliverables, since some of the deliverables are sub-sets or sub-chapters of other studies and reports, while others do not represent additional value to the overall objective of the project and should be reconsidered.

Recommendation 3 – The Project becomes more actively involved in the planned process of decentralizing financial responsibilities to the protected areas level. APA has plans to test this process with Borjom-Kharagauli National Park with a view to decentralizing the financial management by 2012. The TPAC could be included in this process (as a pilot) thus testing the model across a broader spectrum of circumstances and using the experience of the Project to drive the process. If this is not possible then there should at least be a deconcentration of financial and management decisions to the protected area level.

Recommendation 4 – Rationalising the number of type of indicators in the LFM because the inclusion of 35 RAPPAM assessments which are in themselves of a very technocratic means of measuring effective protected areas management is an onerous task and it is unreasonable to expect that any benefits from the Project will register themselves across such a wide range of situations and geographic extent within the three years of the projects lifetime.

Making amendments to the LFM invariably raises concerns amongst project partners. Part of this is the reporting system and part is a genuine concern that a project might be somehow "moving the goalposts". However, adaptive management must surely require that changes in the way that a project operates and is measured should change in light of experience and be reflected in the LFM.

Regardless of whether the Project decides to address the issue of governance directly through engaging with the process of decentralisation or continues to travel along the planned course. It is important that there is a measure of effective governance to evaluate the impact of the Project.

Recommendation 5 – The PEB dedicates considerable time to discussing how the various recommendations emanating from the reports are implemented. It is not immediately clear just how the benefits of the Project can be realised in the long-term without significant structural changes to APA and at a minimum the decentralisation of various powers to the protected areas level.

With a possibility of approximately 37 reports within the Project's lifetime it is not possible for the MTE to scrutinise even the number that have been produced to date in any depth. However, what is apparent from the rapid review of the reports and studies (mostly in draft) so far, is that there are some hard decisions that need to be made. A "business as usual approach" is simply not enough because these reports throw up some significant challenges to APA and the protected areas system, in particular; how to build the financial planning capacity within APA.

Recommendation 6 – UNDP CO mainstreams protected areas management and could bring an extra dimension to the project in line with the Country Programme. The Government of Georgia's stated commitment is to achieve a 20.2% coverage (1,417, 522 ha) by 2010 by establishing new protected areas and enlarging some of the existing ones. By 2011 approximately 7% of the land area is under protected areas management. Without doubt protected areas have served a purpose in protecting resources (biological, aesthetic, cultural and many others), but they throw up particular challenges in terms of governance and there are synergies between the objectives of this Project and UNDP's Country Programme as it relates to governance. Arguably the financing of these areas is of real concern to local people and local civic organizations as well as national agencies.

Lessons Learned
The important lessons learned are related to the design and operation of the Project. These are summarized here:

- The Project was too ambitious in as much as it is under-resourced and realistically would benefit from more time. That is not to say that it will not provide benefits and receive a favorable final evaluation. But the time and resources available make it extremely vulnerable and there is always a risk that *process* is sacrificed for the *products* that need to be achieved by the end of the project. Three years is reasonable for a single issue project but when dealing with "big" issues, and protected areas financing is a "big issue", more time and more resources are needed. In many ways this over ambitious approach is a credit to the people involved as it reflects their commitment and very often the urgency of addressing the problems that the project seeks to resolve. But in reality those problems are not going to go away, so it may be worth a project giving itself the luxury of a little more time.
- Technical assistance is expensive and dividing components of a project into different contracts can lessen the commercial attractiveness of the contract or even make it unprofitable. It is extremely difficult for a project management unit to handle large numbers of individual consultants and studies because there are numerous other duties that they have to perform. It is an inescapable fact that project management units are invariably

overworked, under-resources and has an unenviable job because they appear to be answerable to everyone (or at least seem to have to keep everyone happy). Contracting out services makes good sense and given due process it is likely to provide better services to the project. Therefore it is important to also consider how the private sector is working and the way that a bidding company might put together a proposal. The best outcome is when both parties are comfortable with the arrangements and there is a high degree of trust. The lesson should be that if services are to be contracted out then this should be fully integrated into the projects' design rather than the PMU having to do this at a later date and consideration given to how a bidding company might put together its proposal.

- Translation services should be fully taken into account when developing a project either as a standalone component of the budget or a percentage of the total cost of technical assistance services. While this is not necessarily the case in this instance translation can often place an additional burden upon project managers and distract from their administrative and technical duties.

- Invariably any UNDP CO has a programme for strengthening democratic process and governance. This capacity might be utilized at key points throughout the project cycle (project design, inception, and midterm) to strengthen the design and implementation of a project against a range of agreed governance measures and building stronger linkages between UNDP programmes that might not necessarily appear related to biodiversity *per se.*

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Project background

Since independence in 1991 Georgia has developed a comprehensive protected areas system in recognition of its importance within the eco-region which is reflected in the Government of Georgia's stated commitment to achieve a 20.2% coverage (1,417, 522 ha) by 2010 by establishing new protected areas and enlarging some of the existing ones. The Parliament of Georgia adopted the law on Protected Areas System in 1996, providing the protected areas network with a legal framework. Georgia now has a system of protected areas covering about 482,842 ha of land or 7 % of the country's territory, below the 2010 target but impressive nonetheless.

Understandably, given the transitional process that is taking place in Georgia there has been considerable change taking place within the institutional and regulatory framework for protected areas management and the current statutory responsibility lies with the Agency for Protected Areas a parastatal agency under the oversight of the Ministry of Environment.

Furthermore, Georgia has had to build its national protected areas experience within a very short period of time, while transitioning from a centralized "command and control" approach of government with a centralized economy to a modern democracy with a free market economy.

In recognition of the countries conservation importance there has been considerable international assistance to the establishment and development of protected areas which, is well documented in the Project Document and need not be restated here. However, the system *per se* has remained chronically underfinanced; the 2008 government contribution (to the protected areas system) was still only 34% of the estimated optimum level of funding needed to cover operational and investments costs for the protected areas network[4]. This is as much a reflection on the competing demands of the national budget than any neglect of, or lack of interest in, the protected areas system.

In 2006 the Caucasus Protected Areas Trust Fund (CPATF), now the Caucasus Nature Fund (CNF)[5] was established to provide up to 50% of operational costs of priority protected areas in the three countries (identified in WWF Eco-regional planning process), once the following conditions are in place: (i) the government already covers 50% of the management costs of the respective protected area; (ii) the protected area has or is in the process of developing a management plan and a business plan; and (iii) the government submits a grant proposal to the Trust Fund.

Clearly effective financing of the protected areas system would have been foremost in the minds of anyone considering the future of Georgian protected areas system particularly as no other funding agency or project was directly addressing this issue. Therefore a decision was made by UNDP Georgia, UNDP-GEF Bratislava and the APA to pursue a medium size project (MSP) "Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Areas System". However, the project that was developed did not request the full amount available for a medium-sized GEF project (US$ 797,500 - whereas GEF medium-sized projects can request up to US$1,000,000[6]) and the timeframe for the project implementation was set at three years.

---

[4] PIMS 3957 Project Document P12 Para. 28
[5] http://www.caucasus-naturefund.org/donor.html
[6] http://207.190.239.143/Documents/medium-sized_project_proposals/medium-sized_project_proposals.html

1.2 Purpose of the evaluation

The Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is an integral component of the UNDP GEF project management cycle. It serves as an agent of change and plays a critical role in supporting accountability. Its main objectives are:

1. To assess overall performance against the project objective and outcomes as set out in the Project Document, Project's Logical Framework, and other related documents;
2. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project;
3. To analyze critically the implementation and management arrangements of the project;
4. To assess the progress to date towards achievement of the outcomes;
5. To review planned strategies and plans for achieving the overall objective of the project within the timeframe;
6. To assess the sustainability of the project's interventions;
7. To list and document initial lessons concerning project design, implementation and management;
8. To assess project relevance to national priorities, and;
9. To provide guidance for the future project activities and, if necessary, for the implementation and management arrangements;

The intention being that the MTE, as part of the overall GEF project cycle management and adaptive management approach, will:

- Strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the project;
- Enhance the likelihood of achievement of the project and GEF objectives through analyzing project strengths and weaknesses and suggesting measures for improvement;
- Enhance organizational and development learning;
- Enable informed decision-making;
- Create the basis of replication of successful project outcomes achieved so far.

The MTE is guided by the MTE Terms of Reference (ToR) and UNDP-GEF Project Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures[7]. The evaluation process is independent of UNDP, GEF and the Ministry of Environment (MoE) and APA. The opinions and recommendations in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the position of the GEF, UNDP, the MoE, APA or the other project stakeholders, however, once accepted the MTE becomes a recognized component of the project's documentation. The ToR for the MTE are given in Annex 1.

1.3 Key issues to be addressed

Given the complexity and scale of the PA Financing Project there are limitations on the scope and detail that can be achieved by the MTE[8] and it should be clearly understood that the MTE will provide a largely strategic view of the Project.

The MTE will broadly address the issues of project design and strategy, project management cycle and performance, progress towards the objectives and how the project has responded *vis a vis* the risks and assumptions that were identified in the original project document or have materialized since as part of an adaptive management approach. These issues have been outlined below in the form of a number of questions that the MTE will attempt to answer and include *inter alia:*

---

[7] http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html
[8] A total of 20 person days was available for the MTE. Furthermore the MTE was carried out by one international consultant without the benefit of a national counterpart.

- Was the Project's strategy articulated in the Project Document a reasonable response to the problems to be addressed?
- Were the risks and assumption correctly identified during the critical point of the project cycle (project development, inception phase, etc.)? Have new or different risks been identified during the project.
- Do the indicators set out in the LFM reflect a good measure of performance and effectiveness?
- What has been the impact on the project where risks have been realized and assumptions found to be incorrect?
- Has the project had significant impact upon the enabling environment in terms of influencing policies and events both inside and outside of the immediate project area?
- Given that modern protected areas management is as much about governance as it is about financing, science and regulation/enforcement, to what extent is the Project addressing issues of protected areas governance?
- How is the experience gained from the project being internalized and mainstreamed through policy development?
- How effective are the institutional coordination arrangements established by the project?
- What should the UNDP-GEF, Ministry of Environment and APAs' future response be to ensure that the benefits of the project are internalized and made sustainable after the end of the GEF funding?

Critically the MTE will pose the question:

> *Is a poorly governed but well-financed protected areas system more or less resilient than a well-governed but poorly financed system?*

1.4 Key outputs of the MTE and how they will be used

The key output of the MTE is the Final Report with recommendations; however, the MTE takes the view that the *process* of evaluating the project is also a critical output because it provides an opportunity to challenge the project and to internalize any necessary changes to strategy and implementation.

1.5 Methodology of the MTE

The first phase of the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) of the "Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Areas System" Project (PIMS 3957) took place from the 8th February 2011 to the 18th February 2011. The first phase of the MTE involved examining the project documentation, field visits and consulting stakeholders. The second phase, consisting of further analysis and the MTE Report production follows on from this.

The MTE provides evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be clearly understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period. The MTE was carried out in line with GEF principles on:

- Independence
- Impartiality
- Transparency
- Disclosure
- Ethics
- Partnership
- Competencies and Capacities

- Credibility
- Utility

The MTE has provided disaggregated data where possible, particularly with regard to gender.

The MTE was carried out by an international consultant, independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. A brief resume of the consultant is given in Annex 5.

The MTE consisted of 3 days desktop study of available project documentation, 7 days in country consisting of field trips, interviews, meetings etc., and 2 days travelling, 6 days for analysis and report writing and 2 days to incorporate corrections, comments and suggestions giving a total 20 person days.

The following analysis constitutes the MTE's understanding of the project. It is based upon the history of the project cycle as it is represented in the project documentation, field visits and interviews with the various stakeholders.

The MTE has reviewed the project's performance over its lifetime. It has considered what has been the impact of the project and how has it contributed to the GEF *Objectives*. Therefore the MTE has:

- Assessed the effectiveness of the individual <u>*activities*</u> (monitoring performance);
- Assessed the effectiveness of the various activities in achieving the <u>*Outcome*</u> (monitoring the impact), and;
- Assessed the effectiveness of the various *Outcomes* on achieving the <u>*Objective*</u> (monitoring the change).

The analysis of this has allowed the MTE to comment on the:

- Implementation – did the project do what it planned to do (*i.e.* is the plan still untested because the implementation was poor);
- Effectiveness – did the plan meet the predicted objectives (*i.e.* has the plan been tested and found to have flaws), and;
- Validation of the model's parameters and relationships (*i.e.* which assumptions, variables and interactions were correct).

Based upon this the MTE can make justified[9] statements about the projects progress towards anticipated results and the *GEF Objective*.

2.0 The project and its development context

The "Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Areas System" Project[10] (PIMS 3957) is the first UNDP-GEF project to be executed through National Execution (NEX) modality. The Project Document was signed in May 2009 for a three year project. The Project is implemented by the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) and executed by the Ministry of Environment (MoE) through the Agency for Protected Areas (APA) with a Project Management Unit (PMU) directly contracted by UNDP. The Project executive is the Project Executive Board (PEB) comprised of the key partners (UNDP, APA and a number of other stakeholders).

---

[9] Justified by evidence or reasonable argument.
[10] Hereafter referred to as the "PA Finance Project" or "Project"

The Project budget is US$ 14,418,836 of which US$ 685,000 is the GEF Grant and US$190,420 is provided by the Implementing Agency (total US$ 875,420). The remaining financing is made up of the Government of Georgia (GoG) US$ 11,648,000 (in kind) and other donors[11] US$ 1,895,416 (in kind).

The Project's actual implementation started in August 2009 and the Inception Phase was completed by October 2009. During this period the Project encountered a number of challenges some of which were beyond its control (*e.g.* the appointed Project Manager left to take up another position) and some which were as a result of the Project's initial design (*e.g.* the large number of deliverables to be managed by the PMU under components 1 and 2). That said, the Project Document was on the whole well-written and provided a coherent strategy for achieving the objectives, although the MTE considers that it did not sufficiently consider governance of the protected areas as a cross-cutting issue and there were weaknesses in the design of the operational aspects of the Project (*e.g.* the management of technical aspects of components 1 and 2 by the PMU) as well as the risk identification. The implications of this will be dealt with Section 3.0.

On the whole the PEB and PMU have responded well to these challenges showing a degree of innovation and adaptation. The decision to "package" the component 1 and 2 studies and reports and contract them out to a contractor was a sensible move. Trying to manage that volume of studies and technical reports (and technical experts) through the PMU would have been extremely difficult and time consuming. However, the insistence on a set number of 23 separate deliverables rather than consolidating them into a smaller number of reports (while still retaining much of the scope of these studies and reports) has resulted in delays with the contractor. This issue will be dealt with in the later parts of this report.

The tendering process for these two contracts began in December 2009 and was completed in May 2010 and the handling the complicated tendering process was organized efficiently and transparently by the PMU and UNDP CO.

As a result of these issues the Project has lost approximately six months of implementation time. However, the MTE makes it clear that many of these challenges are the ordinary setbacks that almost every project faces and does not reflect poorly on the PEB, PMU or Contractor. Rather, they are the result of trying to achieve too much in too little time, a reoccurring theme in many UNDP-GEF projects.

Budget execution by January 2011 is approximately 51.3% disaggregated to GEF US$145,573, UNDP US$ 104,444, GoG US$ 6,147,555 and other donors US$ 1,000,358[12].

2.1 Immediate and development objectives of the project

The objective and Outcomes of the Project as set out in the Project's Log Frame Matrix (LFM) are:

Objective: To improve the financial sustainability of the protected area system in Georgia.

> **Outcome 1:** Sustainable Financing Plan for Georgia's protected area system.

> **Outcome 2:** Improved institutional effectiveness of protected area institutions in sustainable financing

---

[11] BP/EURASIA Partnership Foundation, WWF – MAVA, EU/FFI-NACRES and IUCN
[12] Other donors calculated to February 2011

Outcome 3: New financial mechanisms and public/private partnerships
tested/demonstrated at pilot field site contributing to the improved financial sustainability

The Project's strategy can be summarized as:

- Developing the enabling and policy environment for sustainable protected areas financing;
- Capacity development for more cost effective protected areas management, and;
- Site testing of approaches within the Tusheti Protected Areas complex.

A strong justification was developed during the project's preparation for the allocation of GEF financing under GEF 4 SO1 (Catalyzing Sustainability of the Protected Areas System) and SP1 (Sustainable Financing of the Protected Areas System at the National Level) both in terms of the global importance of the Georgian protected areas system and also in terms of the critical needs of developing the protected areas system, for instance, the 2008 government contribution (to the protected areas system) was still only 34% of the estimated optimum level of funding needed to cover operational and investments costs for the protected areas network[13].

As stated in the Project Document:

> *"There is clearly a need for finding new financial resources to supplement existing funding for PAs and developing the capacity at the systemic, institutional and individual level for planning, developing and implementing a sustainable finance plan for the PAS. Recognizing that the current governmental financing is insufficient, that the Caucasus PAs Trust Fund requires an enabling legislative and institutional environment, and that these two sources of funding would still not cover the total optimal costs of the expanding PA system [and would therefore need to be completed by site-level revenue generation mechanisms and increases in site management cost-effectiveness], the Government of Georgia is requesting financial assistance from the GEF to cover the incremental costs associated with creating the enabling environment for achieving financial sustainability of the Protected Areas System which in time will enable the expansion of the system."[14]*

Furthermore, the outcomes of the Project are a necessary prerequisite to accessing the Caucasus Protected Areas Fund (CPAF), now the Caucasus Nature Fund (CNF).

2.2 Main Stakeholders

The main stakeholders are not listed in the Project Document although "stakeholders" are mentioned in a variety of contexts (at least 40 times) throughout the document and its annexes. Furthermore, the MTE has not seen any evidence of a stakeholder analysis which might give (even in the limited scope available to a project formulation) greater insight to the stakeholders and particularly the likely dynamic that might result from the Project's intervention. This is particularly important when it comes to the ubiquitous "local stakeholders". The costs and benefits of conservation management that are critical to the financing of any protected areas system are very often unevenly distributed throughout the system, as a result those stakeholders who are impacted most by a project are also least able to influence the outcomes. In the Project's response to the first draft of the MTE Report it was suggested that the protected areas listed in the project's result framework might be the main stakeholders. While this is true as a general statement it is much too broad a category and does not represent the diversity of interests, agendas, costs and benefits. It

---

[13] PIMS 3957 Project Document P12 Para. 28
[14] Project Document P 12, Para. 28

has also been suggested that there was a presumption that APA would be the beneficiary, which is also correct, and through its position on the PEB would filter knowledge from the Tusheti experience to other protected areas. This is also correct but the nature of many of the interventions (*e.g.* testing site-level revenue generation mechanisms) requires a broader understanding of stakeholder relationships and dynamics.

The MTE recommends that this analysis is undertaken to produce a "living document" which lists all stakeholders in the project area (TPAC) and in protected areas management countrywide, which would help to establish effective communication channels between the principle partners in the Project (APA, PMU, Contractors) and the other stakeholders. Bearing in mind that over the life of a project the relationship between different stakeholders will change, an impartial stakeholder analysis can provide a useful tool for monitoring a project's impact.

In addition to this it is also useful to track the institutional arrangements through institutional mapping. Once again, this is a "living document" that seeks to explain the hierarchy in institutional terms and can shine a light on any inefficiencies and inequalities that might exist within the system, as well as on roles and responsibilities of institutions directly involved in the geographical areas of the project.

2.3 Analysis of the situation with regard to outcomes

It is hard to state with any authority at this point in the Project, to what extent the Project will achieve the stated outcomes as the various project components are still very much "works in progress" and it will be hard even at the Final Evaluation stage to measure with any confidence the impact of the Business Planning, Management Planning and system planning. However, the MTE can state with a degree of confidence that the Project is moving in the right direction and has a reasonable chance of success. Amongst these would be:

- The quality and recommendations of the technical reports produced by the Project
- The understanding of the Tusheti Protected Area Manager of the issues and likely courses of action
- The interview with the (albeit limited in number) local community in Tusheti National Park
- The participatory approach taken by the Contractor NACRES in implementing component 3 of the Project

That said, if increased financing of the protected areas system reinforces the centralization of APA *rather* than promoting decentralization and the devolution of decision-making to the protected areas level with greater local civic and community participation, *then* the MTE would argue that the Project is having a negative impact.

Therefore it would be advisable for the PEB to review the Project's risk assessment in light of the technical reports produced by the two Contractors with regards to some of the more difficult decisions that will need to be made which will require, *inter alia*; structural changes to the way in which APA operates, or the allocation of funds, transfer of powers, accounting systems, etc.

3.0 Findings and Conclusions

On the whole the Project has been performing well and the speed and efficiency, with which activities have been implemented by the PMU and Project's partners, is acknowledged by the MTE (despite the delays that have occurred), as is the obvious commitment of all the Project partners and the degree of "ownership" expressed at all levels within APA. The relationship between the different Project Partners appears to be very effective particularly as it relates to the institutional

stakeholders and NGOs with the one exception of the contracted consortium European Consulting for Developing Countries (ECFDC) in cooperation with the Georgian Centre for the Conservation of Wildlife (GCCW).

As was discussed earlier, there have been a number of delays that are hardly surprising considering the scope of the Project, which reflect on the ambitious nature of the Project rather than any inefficiency of the PMU. In many ways these are the normal challenges that all projects face from time to time, indeed the MTE compares these to "injury time" in a football match and will discuss in later sections the options for adding "extra time" to complete the Project's activities.

The Project has achieved the following:

Component 1 (Enabling environment)
Draft reports have been prepared for the economic valuation of Tusheti Protected Area Complex (TPAC), the revenue options assessment, the assessment of cost-saving opportunities for natural resource management, the portfolio of diversified revenue mechanisms and the guidelines and standard format for business planning in IUCN category I and II protected areas.

Component 2 (Capacity building)
The draft report on the training needs analysis and the selection of a host institution for training has been submitted.

Component 3 (TPAC demonstration project)
Final reports on the Tusheti Development Fund (feasibility study), the assessment for the TPAC re-classification, the biodiversity assessment, the socio-economic survey and a task report on the workshops and meetings for facilitating partnerships and small companies and local communities have been submitted and appear to be of a good quality. Draft reports on the sub-plan for tourism and marketing, the development of a law enforcement strategy and a biodiversity monitoring system have been designed.

The MTE can reasonably conclude that the Project is making good progress, the implementation of the demonstration projects in the TPAC by the NGO NACRES-FFI appears to be going well and the technical assistance contract for components 1 and 2 (ECFDC and GCCW) appear to be providing good quality material. With the benefit of hindsight, it would probably have been better to have these components included into a single request for proposals (RFP), in the interests of efficiency and economy as well as linking the interventions at different levels (*i.e.* enabling environment, capacity building and site testing). This would also have helped with the sequencing of activities but it is still hard to see how all of this could be reasonably sequenced into a three-year timeframe.

Regardless of the above, the delays in implementing the ECFDC and GCCW contract have resulted in slippage as have the finalization of some of the NACRES reports[15]. The latter appearing to be a common problem shared by both Contractors and related to the translation (a contractual requirement), commenting and reviewing of the reports. The MTE makes three observations on this issue.

Firstly, for good or bad, the body of literature relating to conservation and in particular protected areas financing is in English as is the language of the Project. Good translation services (between any

---

[15] The PMU noted in response to the First Draft that "it could potentially influence [the] timely submission of NACRES reports (*e.g.* Tusheti Business Plan) but so far it is not a case, since timeframes of deliverables of ECFDC and NACRES reports was agreed accordingly"

languages) are expensive and more so when dealing with technical documents. Given the price (and the timeframe) of these contracts it is difficult to see how high quality translations could have been achieved within the time and resources available which leads the MTE to conclude that the Project was under-resourced and to question why more resources were not made available given that the overall GEF budget was under US$1,000,000. As the original Project Document called for a number of international consultants (as well as national consultants) to carry out many of these studies; the MTE assumes that this was a problem with matching the Project's budget to its design.

To be fair to the Project the issue of translation is a frequently encountered challenge in projects, and not just GEF projects. It is essentially a problem with the project design and costing, but it is a common problem and this project should not be unduly criticized for this. To find a budget line for translation services in a GEF project is rare indeed. Indeed the PMU has managed to agree a new timeframe for the delivery of these reports which demonstrates that it is in control of the process despite the setbacks.

The evaluators experience is that the cost of technical assistance in UNDP-GEF projects *per se* is very often underestimated. At least four international companies known to the Evaluator have professed that they bid for these projects for strategic reasons rather than any immediate profit motive. While this means that a project can often access very good technical assistance because they very often carry out the work at "cost price". Arguably this is a very good arrangement but any delays or problems encountered will quickly move the contractor from "cost price" to "subsidy".

Secondly, project reports generally have a limited useful lifetime *particularly* when they are intended to be effective within the lifetime of the project. This is particularly relevant in a rapidly changing environment such as Georgia. There can be a tendency to measure the progress of a project by its reports and not by its impact. To be honest the MTE would not judge a report badly even if it were written on a paper table cloth as long as it made sense, could be readily operationalised and contributed to the agreed objective by moving the process forwards. As has already been stated; the technical assistance is of a high quality and the reports and the recommendations they contain have certainly not lost their relevance. However, the MTE is concerned at the time it is taking to process the reports through their final draft.

Therefore, the third and final point is a word of caution about the process of commenting and review of the various reports being produced by the Project. This should not be a "complex process[16]": if it is, and the review and comments are excessive, then something is going wrong somewhere and the Project needs to go back and examine the critical path and ask why this is happening. Both Contractors have provided very reasonable and experienced technical assistants quite capable of providing good quality material. It may be the way in which APA takes ownership of the outputs and attempts to internalize the experience of the Project in which case this raises a number of issues, mainly that, within any project, by the time a draft report is submitted (unless something has gone seriously wrong – which does not seem to be the case in this instance) there should already be a high degree of ownership of the methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations. The MTE was unable to come to any conclusion as to the cause of this "complex process" but suggests that the PEB looks carefully at this and looks for ways in which there might be greater participation[17] in the *process* of the studies and reporting on the basis that learned knowledge (through doing) is generally more useful than acquired knowledge (through reading about it in a report).

---

[16] Project Manager pers. Comm.

[17] The PMU noted in response to the First Draft that "maybe working sessions can be organized more to discuss/review main elements in reports produced with APA in Georgian before report finalization in order that APA be informed of main contents while waiting for translation?" The MTE considers that this would be a very reasonable response to the MTE.

3.1 Project formulation

The MTE has already commented on some of the concerns with the Projects formulation. It is very difficult, and indeed unfair on the Project, to make absolute statements about the project formulation at this stage in the project cycle, because issues of governance are *implicit* within all three components of the Project's strategy, however, the MTE would feel more confident if these had been made *explicit* in the document. Therefore the MTE is prepared to give the Project the "benefit of the doubt", while sounding a word of caution that the sequencing of "project events" – enabling environment, capacity building, site testing – would need to run like clockwork to fit within the three-year time frame. A three-year time frame poses a risk that project expedience "kicks in" and the step wise approach is lost in favour of getting things done in time.

It is hard to see, with the current centralized approach to protected areas management, how management plans and their associated business plans can function effectively unless there is greater decentralization and devolution of "power". This devolution should translate into the ability to take decisions at the protected areas level with a broad participation of local-level stakeholders about all aspects of the protected areas management including financing.

3.2 Project relevance

The MTE is satisfied that the issue of protected areas is both relevant and timely, within the national context and within the GEF 4 SO1 (Catalyzing Sustainability of the Protected Areas System) and SP1 (Sustainable Financing of the Protected Areas System at the National Level) framework. Furthermore, without this Project it will be much harder to operationalise the CNF.

3.3 Implementation approach

Implementation, as discussed in earlier sections, is through a small Project Management Unit (PMU) directly employed by UNDP CO. As stated in the Project Document, the executive powers for the Project lie within the PEB; with the PMU to some extent administering the Project, and technical decisions being made by the PEB (this is an observation and not a reflection on the abilities of the PMU). This arrangement appears to be working well and the PMU appears to be well supported by the PEB in this way. There is a risk, with this arrangement, that the PMU decision-making powers are reduced but it does not appear to be the case in this instance.

The Project has contracted out technical services for components 1 and 2 (the enabling environment and capacity building) and component 3 (field testing at TPAC). This arrangement also appears to be working well despite the delays encountered at the beginning of the Project, although, with the benefit of hindsight, it may have been more efficient to contract out all of these services under a single contract. The original plan was to have component 3 contracted out to a company of non-governmental organization (NGO) and two teams under the PMU – one team developing the protected areas financial plan and the other team building national capacities for sustainable protected areas financing[18].

The Project's LFM is not particularly useful in monitoring impact at the midterm of the project cycle while it does give some indication of the progress as measured by the deliverables under the two technical assistance contracts. There is considerable evidence that the PMU and PEB have been monitoring the risks through their regular meetings and putting in place actions to ensure that delays do not affect progress. However, the MTE's concern is that, given the short timeframe of the Project the process is as important as the product and the process requires time to build confidence and trust between stakeholders as is demonstrated by the minutes of the PEB meeting (13th July 2010) which record that "The PEB members reviewed all identified project risks and noted that none could be considered as critical. However one new risk has been identified, specifically - low

---

[18] Project Document P 24

awareness of the local population can hamper establishment of concessions." Given that these communities are likely to be cautious about entering into any such agreements and the APA is also encountering such arrangements for the first time this process of building trust and negotiating the concerns of all parties (including the private sector) will take time and adjustments to the eventual concession agreements and the enabling environment; this is at the very heart of adaptive management. This is not just about making the local community aware of concessions but about negotiating the concessions between stakeholders so that they fulfill the purpose for which they were intended. Therefore while adaptive management seems to be taking place in the Project's implementation there is limited "room" for adaptive management in the process it is driving.

3.4 Country ownership/Driveness

The main beneficiary of the Project's outcomes, the APA, clearly feels a high degree of ownership at both the central administration and the TPAC levels. Furthermore, the overall objectives of the Project are in line with the UNDP-GoG Country Programme of supporting the transition to a well-functioning market economy[19].

3.5 Stakeholder participation

There is a healthy and active participation in the Project at the institutional level. For instance APA provides a National Project Director and three other representatives on the PEB (including the Director of Tusheti National Park).

The situation *vis a vis* participation at the protected area level is not so clear and the MTE did not have sufficient time to investigate this thoroughly. Conservation areas, such as the TPAC, are not only complex ecological systems but complex socio-ecological systems. Managing and planning for this complexity, with high levels of uncertainty and a need for collaboration with local communities, is a challenging task. The management of natural resources, in these situations, cannot and should not be separated from the cultural and livelihood needs of the communities that live with these resources. The challenge for conservation is how the sustainable use of natural resources can be achieved when the system is poorly understood and exhibits a high degree of potential ecological uncertainty.

This is illustrated when we consider that "*any belief that sustainability can be precisely defined is flawed. It is a contested concept, and so represents neither a fixed set of practices or technologies, nor a model to describe or impose on the world. Defining what we are trying to achieve is part of the problem, as each individual has different values. For us to prescribe a concrete set of technologies, practices or policies would be to exclude future options, undermining the notion of sustainability itself. Sustainable protected area management is, therefore, not so much a specific strategy as it is an approach to understanding complex ecological and social relationships in rural areas*" (Pimbert and Pretty 1997).

Draft guidelines for national park management planning were developed by the Transboundary Joint Secretariat for the Southern Caucasus in the framework of the BMZ/KfW Ecoregional Programme for the Southern Caucasus[20], in 2009, to address the issue of local rural community participation in planning and implementing management in protected areas. However, there is no mention of these guidelines within the Project Document and NACRES were not aware of their existence either[21].

---

[19] http://www.undp.org.ge/files/4_93_870330_cpd-geo-2011-2015.pdf

[20] *National Park Management Planning in the Southern Caucasus – Draft Guidelines* published by the Transboundary Joint Secretariat for the Southern Caucasus in the framework of the BMZ/KfW Ecoregional Programme for the Southern Caucasus.

[21] I. Shavgulidze, pers. Comm.

While the guidelines are not "the last word" in protected areas management planning, they do provide a reasonable starting point for participatory planning and management. To be fair to the Project, the MTE had very little time available to verify these issues and the meeting with the members of the local community in Tusheti left a favourable impression. The MTE has considerable confidence in the Contractor's ability to carry out this work based upon their previous track record.

3.6 Replication approach

In the context of GEF projects *replication approach* is defined as:

"lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

- *Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).*
- *Expansion of demonstration projects.*
- *Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions.*
- *Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions."*

The design of the Project with the three components – enabling environment, capacity building and field testing – would bode well for the possibility of replicating the experience within the Georgian system but, given the diversity of national socio-political and cultural circumstances in the Caucasus, the experience may not be easily exported.

3.7 Cost-effectiveness

The largest parts of the Project's resources are in-kind contributions though co-financing, approximately 94% of the available resources and these are in the form of in-kind contributions. One might therefore argue that the UNDP-GEF funds are mostly likely to have the greatest impact because they can be more strategically used and their purpose, in terms of incremental costs, is to bring about changes that would not ordinarily have happened.

In this instance, the UNDP-GEF financing is being used to purchase the *technical expertise* necessary to develop the sustainable financing of the protected areas system. This is not to say that the co-financing (in-kind) contributions are not also very important, but rather to point out that the UNDP-GEF is financing a critical component. Therefore, it seems particularly risky to have been so cautious in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time given that a GEF MSP can request up to US$ 1,000,000. This might have been used to extend the lifetime of the Project, which is always an important factor in success or failure where capacity building is involved.

Lastly the Project Document provides a window into the prevailing enabling environment that is repeated here:

"Legal-regulatory and policy barriers - the current legislation on PAs is limited as: (i) the economic and financial elements of this law do not fully reflect existing budgetary regulations; (ii) standardized national PA business planning guidelines do not exist with the exception of the financing plan scenarios prepared for Kolkheti National Park with World Bank/GEF assistance; (iii) current level of public financing and donor assistance is not

sufficient for management effectiveness of PAS and innovative and sustainable models for revenue generation, including PPPs are not supported; (iv) there are inconsistencies and collisions among PA and other laws; (v) it fails to define clear codes of management, and gives only general principles (some of which have proved contradictory – e.g. some strict nature reserves allow tourism and some not); (vi) it fails to distinguish between the PA as a designated territory and the PA as a management unit. The present legal framework allows only for certain types of revenues to be reinvested into PA management, but does not allow the APA to reinvest revenues from tourist concessions back into PA management costs – they must go into the national budget. Laws on tendering serve as a barrier to the development of co-management partnerships with local populations holding traditional tenure/resource use rights. Laws do not specifically allow for co-management with local populations. For example, a broad consensus has developed amongst stakeholders that the enforcement of hunting bans in present and planned protected areas like the Tusheti complex is not a viable strategy" (Project Document P13 para. 30)

This begs the simple question: is it possible to unravel all of this within the lifetime of a project and put it all back together into a coherent policy and legal framework particularly given the transitional state of government in Georgia? Indeed there may be considerable risks in trying to do so in such a short space of time because, it is so complex that the cause and effect relationships which give rise to the "law of unintended consequences", that are an inevitable reality of any reform process, might themselves become set in stone.

3.8 Project ratings
The Projects progress and achievements must be tested against the following GEF evaluation criteria:

i. Relevance – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organisational policies, including changes over time – **Satisfactory**

ii. Effectiveness – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved – **Moderately Satisfactory**

iii. Efficiency – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible – **Satisfactory**

iv. Results/impacts – the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short to medium term outcomes, and longer-term impacts including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other local effects – **Satisfactory**

v. Sustainability – the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable – **Moderately Satisfactory**

3.8.1 Sustainability
The MTE is required to evaluate the "likelihood of sustainability of the outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this" with the following ratings:

- Likely – there are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
- Moderately Likely – There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
- Moderately Unlikely – there are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
- Unlikely – there are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

All risk ratings are critical in the following dimensions:

Financial resources: Moderately Likely – the Project outcomes themselves are designed to improve financial sustainability and there is sufficient donor interest as well, as the CNF, that might ensure a short to medium term financing of the protected areas.

Socio-political: Moderately Likely – there are considerable socio-political risks associated with any project in Georgia: however, the Project's objectives are broadly aligned with the larger transitional process taking place within the country. Against this background, it is reasonable to assume that the likelihood of sustained benefits is possible and that the risks are moderate.

Institutional framework and governance: Moderately Likely - this is more difficult to predict. Institutional changes such as the transfer of APA from the Ministry of Environment to the Ministry of Economics could prove catastrophic. However, trends in government suggest that there is a move towards decentralization and greater transparency and accountability. The risks are there, but whether they will be realized is impossible to say and the MTE takes the optimistic view that the process will continue to be positive.

Environmental: Moderately Likely – there are no foreseeable environmental risks. One might argue that there is a focus on economic development (for instance tourism within the protected areas is given a very high priority) but at the same time part of the Project's rationale is to address these conflicts of interest.

In drawing conclusions on the sustainability of the Project's outcomes the MTE's must place any risks within the national context in which the project is being implemented. Given the changes and events that have taken place in the last decade in Georgia one has to be cautious when "calculating" risks and bear in mind that what might appear to be a high risk in a comparatively stable democracy in Western Europe or North America is not necessarily so in a transitional economy in a comparatively volatile region such as the Caucasus. Indeed one might postulate that, if such risks were made explicit in Project Documents, the CEO might never approve funding for projects.

3.9 UNDP comparative advantage

There has been considerable governmental and non-governmental donor-driven development of the protected areas system in Georgia over the past decade, and UNDP has itself been involved in implementing biodiversity projects[22]. In the opinion of the MTE, UNDP has a much broader developmental mandate that makes it stand out against many other initiatives when implementing a conservation projects. Biodiversity conservation in general and protected areas projects in particular can become very single-minded, often applying scientific arguments to justify what are in reality value judgments.

However, and the MTE notes that this is particular to the Georgia Country Office, UNDP appears to take a more strategic approach that is more in line with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in determining sustainability within the economic, socio-political and ecological spheres. Perhaps this is unsurprising as GEF biodiversity projects are essentially designed to implement the CBD. Nonetheless, this allows UNDP to reasonably claim to represent the interests of a much broader cross-section of stakeholders that is a necessary prerequisite for effective conservation and protected areas management.

---

[22] *E.g.* Recovery, Conservation, and Sustainable Use of Georgia's Agrobiodiversity Project, Project Number UNDP/GEF Project: # 00037324, PIMS Number: 1636

The MTE realizes that this is a somewhat unusual view, and one which might only apply to the Georgia Country Office, but feels that is worth mentioning anyway.

3.10 Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

The Project Document sets out a convincing case for the linkages between the Project's objectives and other interventions in the sector. In particular, the Project will put in place the necessary instruments and capacities to utilize the CNF as a means to finance the highest priority sites, although it should be noted that the CNF covers three countries (Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia) and should not be seen as a *panacea*[23] to the challenges of financing the protected areas system[24] in Georgia.

3.11 Indicators

The choice of indicators in the LFM should provide a reasonable measure of the Project's progress and impact, although they cannot be expected to do so at this point in the Project, with one exception. The Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management (RAPPAM) provide one measure of success although, in the MTE's opinion, it is a very technocratic measure. The MTE has made clear *ad nauseam*, successful protected areas management must be based on a very wide range of interests, some of which may have very different values and measures of success. The RAPAM, however, does provide one measure, but the MTE questions the usefulness and indeed the practicality of carrying this out in 34 or 35[25] different protected areas. Therefore the MTE's concern is that the number of RAPPAM assessments should be reduced.

With just three years to implement the Project, it is unlikely that the impact will be spread across the entire protected areas sites. Any changes in these RAPPAM evaluations would provide a spurious measure of the Project's success and, in the interests of accuracy (and fairness to the Project) the number should be reduced to sites in which the Project is actually operating and a smaller number of (two or three) sites which the Project has not been directly working in as a control or comparison.

Other issues with the LFM indicators include the Outcome 1 indicators and the source of verification. Amendments to laws can only be proposed and normally it requires an Act of Parliament which is clearly beyond the Project.

It is not clear to what extent the Project can be involved in or influence the updating of management plans in other protected areas as these are the responsibility of other projects or initiatives. However, Vashlovani and Borjomi National Parks are in the process of updating management plans (through WWF/CNF and GTZ projects) and the Project might provide business plans for these.

There have been several critical points where these two issues could have been raised, for instance during the CEO Approval stage and then during the inception phase, but it was not. However, the PMU is aware of this and has reasonably raised it during the MTE.

3.12 Management arrangements

The Project's organization and management arrangements are satisfactory with one proviso. There appears to be considerable participation at the level of the TPAC, which is understandable because the Contractors role there is much more "hands on". However, with regards to the enabling environment component, the "complex process" of commenting on reports that appears to be taking place raises concerns that either due to the earlier misunderstandings with the Consultants, or the way in which the roles are organized. There may be room for greater APA personnel

---

[23] hypothetical remedy for all ills or diseases

[24] It should be noted that the MTE does not have the time or mandate to comment on the CNF in any detail.

[25] The exact number is not entirely clear

participation in the process of carrying out the studies and compiling the reports (the analysis and strategic thinking). To be fair to all involved, this comment is made before any training has taken place.

3.13 Project implementation

As was discussed earlier, despite the delays caused in re-organizing components 1 and 2 and the delays in starting implementation, the Project has on the whole made good progress. That is, when it has been faced with a challenge, both the PEB and the PMU have quickly decided on a course of action and got on with it.

3.14 Financial management

According to the schedule, no audit has been carried out on the Project to date and the MTE is not aware of any financial issues of any concern within the Project.

The only issue related to financial management might be the funding of the Tusheti Festival, but the MTE notes that proper consideration was given to this: "*the amount of funds required for the festival should be estimated after receiving the Training Needs Analysis from the ECFDC on July 12, 2010. The preparation of TNA Report was planned in 2010, in order to prioritize other activates and accumulate free funds for the festival.[26]*" and notes that this decision was taken only after APA guaranteed that administration costs related to the training proper planning (office costs, travel of APA staff, etc.) would be covered by APA. Therefore it can be considered as an in-kind contribution to the Project.

3.15 Monitoring and evaluation, identification and management of risks

The PMU has monitored the performance of the Project diligently and reported regularly on the progress and quality of the outputs. However, the Project Document described a number of risks to the Project's outcomes and objective and like all projects there are a number of assumptions both stated and unstated in the Project's intervention strategy.

It is inevitable that any project, but particularly a conservation project, will be based upon a number of assumptions that carry a risk to the outcomes. This is because conservation, especially as it relates to protected areas management, is taking place where three principal "drivers" of change collide – the economic, socio-political and the ecological. Therefore, the planning – management, financial or other - is taking place in multiple fields such as ecology, economics, natural resource management, politics, business and the social sciences. In these fields there is a large and unquantifiable number of known and potential variables: all subject to continual change, all interacting with each other in ways that may be predictable or non-predictable. Applying science to the problems will make no difference to our inability to predict precisely or accurately given the complexity of multivariate, non-linear, cause and effect relationships[27].

Market led approaches to conservation are on the whole robust and effective; however, economists might want to simplify the equation by putting a financial value on the *quid pro quo* of the trade-off between protection and utilization. Nonetheless, it is important to bear in mind basic human nature in respect of determining a range of motivations and values. Self-reliance, independence, the security to manage their resources and determine their future are all characteristics of rural communities, and can be strong motivational factors in encouraging sustainable management of natural resources. Passive participation through consultation, that is inherent in a centralized system, implies an element of conceding or relinquishing territory, resources, or *authority* and *responsibility* (the ability to make decisions about the future), in return for increased dependence

---

[26] Minutes of the 4th PEB meeting, 13th July 2010
[27] Adapted from a discussion by Dr. Graham Webb

upon an external provider. While this may not always be the case, it is important to bear this in mind and consider that strengthening the local-level governance of protected areas, as well as the central governance – that is the *power over* the system to make strategic policy decisions - gives the *power to* protected areas site managers and the local communities who are very often the *de facto* (even if they are not the *de jure*) mangers of the natural values we seek to conserve.

The risk assessment made during the project formulation appears, to a large extent, to dismiss protected areas governance either for convenience, or because there was a lack of understanding that it cuts across all three components of the Project. This is not to say that issues of governance are not being addressed by the Project but the risk rating (Project Document Section G) down plays the risk giving the impression that the Project is to a large extent ignoring issues of governance. However, broad participation (a component of any governance system) by local communities cannot be addressed through a socio-economic study and, given the complex and unpredictable nature of any protected areas system, it is important that there is a broad participation in the decision-making process including financial management. Indeed, it might also be argued that "*resilience is determined not only by a system's ability to buffer or absorb shocks, but also by its capacity for learning and self-organization to adapt to change*" (Gunderson and Holling 2002). Therefore a governance system, that allows for a broader participation in planning and management of a protected area, might arguably be more resilient than one which has a narrow scientific or financial focus.

This brings us back to the question posed earlier: *is a poorly governed but well-financed protected areas system more or less resilient than a well-governed but poorly financed system?*

Clearly there is a limit to what the Project can do to about this because the issue of protected areas governance is nested within the larger national political and administrative framework and must be broadly aligned with the national policy and legal framework.

However, the MTE feels that the risk posed by weak governance was underplayed in the Project Document and there appears to be an unstated assumption that a well-financed protected areas system is more important than a well-governed one. The MTE argues that, from a rural community perspective, this might not be the case and indeed a well-financed but weakly governed protected area may be significantly worse.

To be fair to the Project, issues of governance are implicit in addressing the enabling environment, building agency capacities and the field testing in TPAC (*e.g.* the management planning, reclassification, etc.): it is perhaps premature for the MTE to be making such statements since much of the activities are still in progress. Therefore the MTE is prepared to give the Project the benefit of the doubt in this matter and suggest either one or both of two courses of action.

The first is to assume that governance is adequately addressed already within the Projects strategy and agree on a set of criteria for measuring governance which can be retro-fitted to the LFM and evaluated during the Final Evaluation and the MTE can provide some guidance on selecting the criteria and carrying this out (Annex 4).

The second course of action would require the Project to more actively participate in the planned process of decentralizing financial responsibilities to the protected areas level. In this case the APA has plans to test this process with Borjom-Kharagauli National Park[28] with a view to decentralizing the financial management by 2012. The TPAC could be included in this process, thus testing the model across a broader spectrum of circumstances and using the experience of the Project to drive

---

[28] G. Shonvadze pers. comm.

the process. Clearly there is a limit to what the Project can take on, and just how much it might reasonably be expected achieve in the remaining time. This would need to be reflected in any additions to the LFM on the basis that is a slow process and quality is better than quantity.

From UNDP's perspective, there are synergies in this approach with the Country Programme (2011 – 2015):

> "*UNDP will support Georgia to continue reforming its governance structures, seeking to establish modern, balanced, transparent, effective and efficient systems and democratic and independent institutions to ensure development and justice for all, with a particular emphasis on protection of vulnerable people, especially in rural areas, and with the active participation of civil society and the media.*" (Draft Country Programme Document for Georgia 2011 – 2015, P4 para. 19)[29]

Before leaving this issue, the ToR of the MTE provides a reasonable mandate to comment on the institutional arrangements of the APA, as they relate directly to the outcomes of this Project. During the country visit and field work, the MTE was informed that that there was a proposal for APA to be placed under the Ministry of Economy. This was part of a larger package of reforms that would see the dissolution of the Ministry of Environment and the transfer of some statutory roles to the Ministry of Economy and the Ministry of Energy.

The MTE comments that the management of protected areas requires statutory regulation and there should be institutional separation between this regulation and other policy sectors in the interests of good governance in order to avoid any risk of a conflict of interest. The protected areas system provides considerable goods and services that are broadly considered a *public good* and to a very large extent underpin national social and economic development. Annex 6 provides a more detailed discussion on this issue.

The management of the Project has proved itself adaptive in terms of implementation responding rapidly and thoughtfully when challenged on a range of issues, for instance consolidating the component 1 and 2 studies and engaging an external contractor. However, the MTE feels that adaptive management begins from the very conception of any project. As a consequence, there are various points where proposed activities, interventions and operational aspects of a project can be scrutinized and adapted. One such point in the project cycle is the GEF CEO endorsement. In this case the MTE feels that some of these issues (for instance the PMU management of components 1 and 2, the issue of governance and the) should have been picked up and it is surprising that this was not the case as the CEO comments are normally more challenging and thus more useful.

3.16 Execution and implementation modalities

As described earlier, project execution is through National Execution modality (NEX) and UNDP CO is the implementing agency. There appears to be a good working relationship between the two partners.

3.17 Management by the UNDP CO

The UNDP CO in Georgia is very efficient and supportive of the Project and (based upon this and past experience of the MTE Consultant) appears to take a "soft touch" approach to managing projects which is only possible when there is considerable trust between the projects partners. This arrangement works well and it is worth noting that *trust* is a key component of any project as it is in any commerce, because *trust* increases efficiency and significantly reduces transaction costs.

---

[29] http://www.undp.org.ge/files/4_93_870330_cpd-geo-2011-2015.pdf

UNDP CO has representation on the PEB including the Assistant Resident Representative and Team Leader for Energy and Environment, UNDP Georgia although the Team Leader, Energy and Environment position is now vacant (pending employment of new individual). However, the previous incumbent has continued to support the Project with guidance and advice; and will continue to do so until such time as there is a new Team Leader.

4.0 Results
The outputs of the Project to date have been reported in section 3.0. The purpose of this section is to take a more philosophical look at the Project and ask: *is it working?*

4.1 Attainment of objectives
It is worth restating the Project's objective at this point:
> *"to improve the financial sustainability of the protected area system in Georgia"*

 and ask:

- What is the likelihood of achieving this objective within the lifetime of the Project?
- What will be the impact of the Project on the protected areas system?
- How sustainable are any gains made by the Project likely to be?
- Has the Project contributed to upgrading the skills of the APA staff?

It is important to note that, given the time available for the MTE and the current stage in the project cycle, it is difficult and indeed unfair to make sweeping statements about what the Project, and in particular the work that the two Contractors, are doing. It has already been noted that both Contractors have provided a high quality of technical assistance and therefore there is a high degree of confidence that they will deliver good quality studies, reports and training. Furthermore, having a good quality strategic financial plan for the protected areas system, business plans (in at least one protected area) associated with good quality management plans and personnel who have received a level of training is reasonable grounds to assume that the Project will achieve its objective (it is noted that the objective is very sensibly only to *improve* the financial sustainability of the protected areas system). Thus the Project is likely to have a significant and positive impact upon the protected areas system. That is, of course, assuming that sustainable financing equates to effective biodiversity conservation and a range of other social, cultural and aesthetic functions of the protected areas system.

4.2 Findings and Conclusions and recommendations
For the purpose of summing up, the MTE considers the Project from its very first conceptual beginnings to the present and makes cautious predictions about its future. The Project has been and continues to operate in a highly dynamic and often unpredictable socio-political and economic environment. This high level of uncertainty makes the prediction of precise outcomes extremely difficult (as was highlighted during the MTE with the proposed plans to place APA under the Ministry of Economy).

The allocation of GEF financing under GEF 4 SO1 (Catalyzing Sustainability of the Protected Areas System) and SP1 (Sustainable Financing of the Protected Areas System at the National Level) was a very reasonable decision in this instance and likely to have an impact well beyond the "size" of the GEF commitment. The MTE concludes that, notwithstanding the comments on protected areas governance, the Project was reasonably formulated with a relatively coherent strategy for attaining the objective.

There were a number of weaknesses in the operational design. In particular, the Project was under-resourced and overambitious given the time available and the somewhat optimistic view that the PMU would be able to manage components 1 and 2. These and the governance issue were not picked up during the CEO scrutiny of the Project Document.

However, the PEB and PMU responded well during the Inception Phase and consolidated components 1 and 2 into an external contract and moved rapidly to engaging a Contractor. This notwithstanding, an important opportunity was missed to consolidate the number of deliverables for the sake of coherence and efficiency. Both Contractors have provided good quality technical assistance.

The Project partnership is working well and despite some lost time at the beginning, it is recovering well overall. Serious consideration should be given to an extension, in order to allow the activities to take place in a timely fashion and without a frantic "race to the finish". Without this extension, it will still be possible to complete the activities but the benefits of the *process* may well be sacrificed for the delivery of the *product.* For the purpose of clarity, the MTE is of the opinion that there is more to be gained from the process than from the end product.

If any adjustments are to be made to the Project, these should be intended to address the issue of protected areas governance. This might be achieved through monitoring a number of governance criteria, assuming that through addressing the issue of protected areas financing in this way (*e.g.* enabling environment, agency capacities and field testing management plans and business plans, etc.), there will be improvements in protected areas.

In common with many UNDP-GEF projects, insufficient time and resources were provided for the MTE. There is a commonly held feeling that final evaluations are more important than midterm reviews. However, the midterm of any project is a critical point in the project cycle where adaptive management measures can be used to rescue a poorly performing project or build on a successful one. By the time the final evaluation comes along, it is normally too late: so it would be better to invest in the MTE.

The MTE concludes that despite the issues raised above, the "Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Areas System" Project (PIMS 3957) is progressing well, faces no serious challenges and is rated overall as Satisfactory.

4.3 Recommendations
The following recommendations are made on the understanding that the PEB has the capacity, intellect and confidence to make decisions, therefore the MTE has a high degree of confidence to provide a degree of flexibility in meeting these recommendations. None of the recommendations are conditional (*i.e.* a requirement for the Project to continue).

4.3.1 Recommendation 1: Project Extension
The Project applies for an extension of not less than six months to allow time to complete the activities without sacrificing process for project expedience. The reasoning behind this is that, for a number of reasons, there have been delays in getting the Project started and as noted earlier, these delays cannot (and should not) be attributed to any fault of the Project or Contractors. Rather, they are the sort of thing that "just happens" in projects. However, to internalize the experience within the APA and the local communities more time would greatly increase the benefits from the Project. The risk of completing the Project's activities within the current timeframe is in the loss of *process.* That is: the experience from the Project's activities would be lessened.

However, the MTE is aware that a budget neutral extension is not possible because the PMU costs would need to be met from either Project funds or from UNDP CO funds, the latter being the more likely. Therefore the MTE leaves the decision to the PEB and states, for the record, that it would still be possible to achieve a satisfactory rating in a Final Evaluation without the extension, but the impact would likely be greater if an extension was granted.

Should the Project decide on an extension then this decision should be taken at the earliest possible time and the extension secured and the activities rescheduled. In other words: do not wait until the closing months of the Project and then request an extension.

If an extension is not possible, which appears likely, then the PMU and UNDP should review the risks and opportunities to review the Project's risk assessment in light of the technical reports produced by the two Contractors with regards to some of the more difficult decisions that will need to be made which will require, *inter alia*; structural changes to the way in which APA operates, or the allocation of funds, transfer of powers, accounting systems, etc., in order to direct the Project's efforts in the remaining time with a view to making as much progress as possible and internalizing the experience within APA. This would need to be linked to recommendation 4 (section 4.3.4).

4.3.2 Recommendation 2: Consolidation of component 1 and 2 deliverables

The key result areas of the ECFDC and GCCW Contract are broken down into 23 different deliverables, with each deliverable representing a report. Each report needs to be provided in both English and Georgian (as drafts) and this leads to a very slow process, and places a heavy administrative burden on an assignment which can be implemented in a more simple, effective, and efficient form.

The Consultant has proposed to have a limited number of key deliverables not exceeding four main deliverables, given the technical nature and size of the project, and the relative small amount of input available to the consultant team. The main result areas that are intrinsically relevant to the objectives of the project are:

- Legal/enabling environment framework;
- A protected areas economic valuation;
- Financial business management and planning for protected areas, and;
- Related training.

The 23 deliverables can effectively be consolidated into fewer deliverables, since some of the deliverables are sub-sets or sub-chapters of other studies and reports, while others do not represent additional value to the overall objective of the project and should be reconsidered. Furthermore, given the recent changes in the government and the move of APA into the Ministry of Economics, even if this does not go ahead it creates a climate of uncertainty and some outputs may become obsolete for the time being.

In the interests of fairness and for the avoidance of doubt, the MTE feels that the original proposal by the Consultant (to reduce the number of deliverables) was not financially motivated and made in good faith with respect of meeting the overall Project objectives. Therefore both parties are acting in good faith and the MTE concludes that there should be an agreement to move on with the work on a "no fault" basis in the best interests of the Project.

Realistically with 23 deliverables (mostly reports) from the ECFDC and GCCW Contract, and approximately 14 reports and studies from the NACRES Contract – 37 reports in total, with approximately one month to "turn them around" in terms of commenting and editing means 37

months of report editing in a 36 month project. This places a very heavy burden on the PMU, APA and the PEB in reviewing and commenting, not to mention the Consultants. Essentially, the unit costs (translation, binding, submission, editing, comment, etc.) of producing an individual reports is inevitably going to be higher.

Any "savings" of technical assistance time within this contract should be used to address issues of governance (e.g. the internal institutional governance, streamlining decision-making process, towards decentralising, etc.).

The MTE recommends that the PMU discuss the various options with the Consultant and adjust the Contract accordingly. It is not unusual for a Contractor to re-negotiate ToR post Contract award, indeed this is the reasoning behind an inception phase in any project/contract.

4.3.3 Recommendation 3: TPAC is included in the decentralisation process

The Project becomes more actively involved in the planned process of decentralizing financial responsibilities to the protected areas level. The APA has plans to test this process with Borjom-Kharagauli National Park[30] with a view to decentralizing the financial management by 2012. The TPAC could be included in this process (as a pilot) thus testing the model across a broader spectrum of circumstances and using the experience of the Project to drive the process. Clearly there is a limit to what the Project can take on and just how much it might reasonably be expected achieve in the remaining time. This would need to be reflected in any additions to the LFM on the basis that is a slow process and quality is better than quantity.

The risks to the Project would be that there is no way of predicting how fast this process might move. However, there are obvious benefits of being involved in what is an inevitable process of decentralizing and eventually devolving not just financial considerations, but the whole decision-making process to the protected area level.

This risk to the Project could be reduced by selecting realistic targets for the LFM should this process go ahead.

In its response to the First Draft of the MTE Report the PMU noted that "*decentralization is not possible at this stage due to the legal framework, institutional and capacity barriers, APA is looking more on de-concentration (might the terminology be reviewed?)*"

The 5th IUCN World Parks Congress held in Durban in 2003 identified a number of challenges to the global protected areas system and are summarized below:

- **Objectives** – the objectives of protected areas are increasingly moving from protection of spectacular wildlife and wilderness managed mostly for the benefit of tourists and scientists to the management of scientific, economic and socio-cultural objectives through a far more inclusive management regime that incorporates the needs of local people with more emphasis on restoration and rehabilitation of habitats and other key components of the natural values.
- **Governance** – management is moving from a centralised state bureaucracy to decentralised partnerships of multiple stakeholders.
- **Local people** – in the past management has tended towards excluding, and even relocating local people with little regards for their social, cultural and economic aspirations to a more inclusive management that often includes local management and co-management agreements, often for the direct benefit of local people.

---

[30] G. Shonvadze pers. comm.

- **Systematically** – historically many protected areas were established on an ad hoc basis to protect specific features or species, often simply as a result of opportunity creating islands of protected areas with little thought to ecological process and the temporal movements of key components of the ecosystem and the impact of externalities. Modern protected areas systems should be part of a national and even regional or global planned system of strictly protected areas and other categories of reserved land linked by corridors and buffers to ensure that sufficient components of the ecosystem and its functions are conserved.
- **Management techniques** – in the past protected area management has been highly protectionist and prohibitive, heavily influenced by scientific or technocratic approaches with very specific and short term objectives. Modern protected areas management is moving towards an adaptive management approach that recognises that there is considerable uncertainty in predictive management. Longer time horizons and a multiplicity of drivers require less rigid and more adaptive management relying on clear objectives, monitoring and the capacity of management authorities to make changes in response to an increased understanding of the socio-ecological, and even economic, processes.
- **Finance** – once heavily dependent upon centralised state funding protected areas have had to develop mechanisms for cost recovery, revenue generation and retention as well as sourcing funding from other sources. However, state funding to protected areas should always be the primary source of financing.
- **Management skills** – the roles of protected areas managers are changing considerably from being almost entirely staffed by scientists or protection staff to a multi-disciplinary team approach that incorporates a wide diversity of ecological, social, financial, business and communication skills as well as drawing upon local knowledge, civil society and the private sector.

The MTE would argue that the decentralization of decision-making (be it fiscal or management) is an important factor in meeting all of these challenges. However, decentralization is often poorly defined and assigned different meanings within political science. Furthermore, it must be nested within a larger set of national reforms that will support the process. This is why the MTE has suggested that the Project should set itself modest targets given the short time remaining which might even be related to opening the discussion on Recommendation 6 (see section 4.3.6 below).

Deconcentration might be defined as "one of administrative decentralization which redistributes decision-making authority and financial and management responsibility among levels of the central government; there is no real transfer of authority between levels of government. It may involve only a shift of responsibilities from federal forest service officials of the capital city to those stationed in provinces, districts, etc" (Gregersen et al. 2004).

Given the challenges outlined by the WPC and the *National Park Management Planning in the Southern Caucasus – Draft Guidelines* published by the Transboundary Joint Secretariat for the Southern Caucasus [31] it is (in the opinion of the MTE) necessary to go further than deconcentration. However, as step in the right direction it might be a target that is worth aiming at even if it cannot be achieved within the lifetime of this Project.

4.3.4 Recommendation 4: Rationalise the LFM indicators
The inclusion of 35 RAPPAM assessments, which are in themselves a very technocratic means of measuring effective protected areas management, is an onerous task and it is unreasonable to

---

[31] *National Park Management Planning in the Southern Caucasus – Draft Guidelines* published by the Transboundary Joint Secretariat for the Southern Caucasus in the framework of the BMZ/KfW Ecoregional Programme for the Southern Caucasus.

expect that any benefits from the Project will register themselves across such a wide range of situations and geographic extent within the three years of the projects lifetime.

Making amendments to the LFM invariably raises concerns amongst project partners. Part of this is the reporting system and part is a genuine concern that a project might be somehow "moving the goalposts". However, adaptive management must surely require that changes, in the way that a project operates and is measured, should be made in light of experience and be reflected in the LFM.

Regardless of whether the Project decides to address the issue of governance directly through engaging with the process of decentralisation or continues to travel along the planned course, it is important that there is a measure of effective governance to evaluate the impact of the Project.

It is recommended that criteria developed by Graham *et al* (2003) are included in the LFM taking the midterm of the Project (to provide an index figure) as the baseline and repeating the assessment during the Final Evaluation. An explanation of this is provided in Annex 4 and from the internet[32]. There is no reason why the criteria and scoring cannot be adjusted by the PMU/PEB to fit the specific requirements of the Project and the scoring table is given only as guidance.

4.3.5 Recommendation 5: The PEB develops an implementation plan

The PEB dedicates considerable time to discussing how the various recommendations emanating from the reports are implemented. Given the experience of the MTE, it cannot claim to be an expert in protected areas financing and business planning, but it is not immediately clear just how the benefits of the Project can be realised in the long-term without significant structural changes to APA and at a minimum the decentralisation of various powers to the protected areas level.

With a possibility of approximately 37 reports within the Project's lifetime, it is not possible for the MTE to scrutinise even the number that have been produced to date in any depth. However, what is apparent from the rapid review of the reports and studies (mostly in draft) so far, is that there are some hard decisions that need to be made. A "business as usual approach" is simply not enough, because these reports throw up some significant challenges to the APA and the protected areas system, in particular; how to build the financial planning capacity within the APA.

Therefore, there are some difficult decisions to be made which will require, *inter alia*, structural changes to the way in which APA operates, or the allocation of funds, transfer of powers, accounting systems, etc.

It would be unreasonable to expect all of this to take place within the timeframe of the Project, but it would be useful for the Final Evaluation to see some sort of programme developed, because these reports have a limited "shelf-life" beyond which they will need to be carried out again if they are to be relevant.

4.3.6 Recommendation 6: UNDP mainstreams protected areas management

"There is also potential for enhancing local-level funding by increasing the degree to which PAs are incorporated in development financing. There is a strong case for funding of community PAs to be part of rural development and poverty reduction strategies. This requires making a better case for the economic benefits of PAs, as well as raising the priority accorded to PA funding among development planners and decision makers in both host-country governments and donor agencies." (Overall Assessment of Revenue Options and Cost-Saving Opportunities for Improved Natural Resources Management, ECFDC and GCCW, 2011 Draft Report)

---

[32] http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/governance_of_protected_areas_for_cbd_pow_briefing_note_08_1.pdf

The Government of Georgia's stated commitment is to achieve a 20.2% coverage (1,417, 522 ha) by 2010 by establishing new protected areas and enlarging some of the existing ones. By 2011 approximately 7% of the land area is under protected areas management. Without doubt protected areas have served a purpose in protecting resources (biological, aesthetic, cultural and many others), but they throw up particular challenges in terms of governance, and there are synergies between the objectives of this Project and UNDP's Country Programme as it relates to governance. Arguably the financing of these areas is of real concern to local people and local civic organizations as well as national agencies.

UNDP could bring an extra dimension to the project in line with the Country Programme given that:

> *"UNDP will support Georgia to continue reforming its governance structures, seeking to establish modern, balanced, transparent, effective and efficient systems and democratic and independent institutions to ensure development and justice for all, with a particular emphasis on protection of vulnerable people, especially in rural areas, and with the active participation of civil society and the media."* (Draft Country Programme Document for Georgia 2011 – 2015, P4 para. 19)[33]

The MTE feels that there is an assumption – not stated in the Project Document – that the lack of finances is the root cause of the problems faced by the protected areas system. To an extent this is a correct assumption, as long as the available finances are wisely spent. Determining what is wise might be at the root of what is effective protected areas management. Murphree *et al* noted that "*the delivery of the products of professional science and technology to rural communities has consistently been marked by asymmetrical relationships*" and that "*firstly, science and technology are associated with power – the entire power apparatus of government, international and national development agencies, private capital and bureaucracy – which determines in large part what rural communities can or cannot do. The second aspect is a pervasive assumption of the inherent superiority of professional science and technology over the abilities of rural people to understand and manage the resource base on which they depend for their livelihood*" (Murphree, *et al,* 1998).

Protected areas management, including their financing, is highly complex. By way of illustration the Director of TPAC asked the MTE a very intelligent and thoughtful question: *what methodology should he use to determine the carrying capacity for sustainable tourism in TPAC?*

It is an interesting question and one which there is no easy answer to. Applying science to a question that has its basis in a set of value judgments is unlikely to provide a solution. The easy answer is *adaptive management*; but this presupposes that there are clear objectives to management *and* the relative merits of the value judgments which are the basis of these objectives remain the same. Even if this were the case, we must also assume that the socio-political, economic and environmental drivers that shape the ecosystem will remain the same. This poses very real challenges (some might say "headaches") for protected areas managers because decision-makers need absolute answers: they strive for a level of certainty which is simply not possible when managing a protected area.

This is why the MTE has labored the issue of governance as a cross-cutting issue in addressing the sustainable financing of the protected areas system. Protected areas financing is of course critical to the conservation of Georgia's globally important biodiversity, but we must always consider that the overall objective is the conservation of biodiversity and the natural values contained in the protected areas system. Finance alone can have a distorting effect on this objective. For instance, a frequently repeated statement, heard during the MTE, related to the importance placed on tourism in the protected areas system by decision-makers. Arguably, a protected areas system with a narrow

---

[33] http://www.undp.org.ge/files/4_93_870330_cpd-geo-2011-2015.pdf

focus of tourism, regardless of how benign this was, would not meet the globally agreed objectives of a protected areas system.

Far better we speak in terms of resilience: the resilience of the protected areas systems and ecosystems to conserve a range of broadly agreed values. What is meant by *ecosystem resilience*? "Resilience can be defined as the capacity of a system to undergo disturbance while maintaining both its existing functions and controls and its capacity for future change" (Gunderson 2000).

However, in complex socio-ecological systems, such as those found in the Caucasus, it might also be argued that "resilience is determined not only by a systems ability to buffer or absorb shocks, but also by its capacity for learning and self-organization to adapt to change" (Gunderson and Holling 2002).

With the prospect of 20% of the land area in Georgia under protective management in the future, there may be very real synergies in building this resilience at the protected areas level and the UNDP Country Programme, which would be worth exploring.

5.0 Lessons learned

The *lesson learned* section of any evaluation report can be the hardest to write. The author invariably feels that he or she should come up with some ground-breaking insight into protected areas management and financing or biodiversity conservation. The truth is much less glamorous and indeed the first lesson is one which seems destined to repeat itself in evaluations with a sinking feeling of a "groundhog day" moment[34].

The Project was too ambitious in as much as it is under-resourced and realistically would benefit from more time. That is not to say that it will not provide benefits and receive a favorable final evaluation. But the time and resources available make it extremely vulnerable and there is always a risk that *process* is sacrificed for the *products* that need to be achieved by the end of the project. There is no sign that this is happening, but internalizing the experience needs time to be absorbed and discussed.

Protected areas and biodiversity conservation projects are, by their very nature, dealing with highly complex and unpredictable systems and issues. There is an assumption that the project preparation phase is sufficient to understand the system and issues, and that adaptive management will follow through in the project. But one has to ask the question: *just how adaptive can a project be in three years.* Invariably the first year is taken up with the inception phase, the second year is taken up with studies and, by the time the midterm review takes place, its almost time to think about winding down (or asking for an extension).

Three years is reasonable for a single issue project but when dealing with "big" issues, and protected areas financing is a "big issue", more time and more resources are needed. In many ways this over ambitious approach is a credit to the people involved, as it reflects their commitment and very often the urgency of addressing the problems that the project seeks to resolve. But, in reality, those problems are not going to go away, so it may be worth a project giving itself the luxury of a little more time.

The second lesson relates to external contractors. Technical assistance is expensive, and dividing components of a project into different contracts can lessen the commercial attractiveness of the

---

[34] "Groundhog Day" is a 1993 American film in which the main character played by Bill Murray finds himself repeating the same day over and over again.

contract or even make it unprofitable. It is extremely difficult for a project management unit to handle large numbers of individual consultants and studies, because there are numerous other duties that they have to perform. It is an inescapable fact that project management units are invariably overworked, under-resourced and have an unenviable job, because they appear to be answerable to everyone (or at least seem to have to keep everyone happy). Contracting out services makes good sense and, given due process, it is likely to provide better services to the project.

Therefore, it is important to also consider how the private sector is working and the way that a bidding company might put together a proposal. The best outcome is when both parties are comfortable with the arrangements and there is a high degree of trust. The lesson should be that if services are to be contracted out, this should be fully integrated into the projects' design rather than the PMU having to do this at a later date, and consideration given to how a bidding company might put together its proposal.

The third lesson relates to translation of documents. It is an inescapable fact that the bulk of the literature on conservation and protected areas management is written in English or at least in a language different to that of the country that the project is being implemented in. For the avoidance of any doubt, the MTE makes it clear that this not the case for *this* project, but in some circumstances, it can lead to technical assistance simply providing access to information that is already freely available if the beneficiaries were able to read English.

Translation services should be fully taken into account when developing a project: either as a standalone component of the budget or a percentage of the total cost of technical assistance services. While this is not necessarily the case in this instance, translation can often place an additional burden upon project managers and distract from their administrative and technical duties.

The fourth point is neither lesson nor recommendation but in response to a comment on the first draft of this report.[35] One of the challenges in reviewing GEF projects is in understanding the dynamics that are driving not only the processes taking place within and around the protected areas but also the communities and agencies that they are interacting with. The land use processes (that impact upon biodiversity) are being driven by ecological, socio-administrative and economic *drivers.* These driving forces are operating in different time scales for example; driving forces that effect change in community perceptions and values operate over a much longer time frame than the time frames expected by project cycles, as does the acceptance and internalization of experience within individuals and subsequently within institutions. All of which assumes that we have "got it right" in the first instance with the project's design! This inconsistency sets up a tension between "*project*" versus "*process*".

The principal tool to deal with these dynamic and complex situations is the *project;* which given the inherent complexity, is really an extremely blunt tool. However, it is still the best tool that we have available. Furthermore, the log frame matrix (LFM) is by far the most effective means of planning and monitoring projects, but, it is not necessarily the most flexible framework for adaptive management. Indeed there is a tendency in trying to make indicators "SMART" (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely) that they can form a straight jacket for the project restricting adaptive management. Indeed one might argue that the choice of indicators might set up

---

[35] "Considering various observations of the evaluator, if there are any suggestions/conclusions for GEF regarding project design and review of the projects related to governance issues, as you mention in various parts of the report. It would be great to include something in this way in recommendations/conclusions/lessons learned which could be shared with RBEC."

a tension between the need to audit the performance of a project and the need to monitor impact and effectiveness in order adapt an intervention.

This becomes increasingly difficult when a project involves a large number of issues related to governance, which is likely to be the majority of GEF protected areas projects. Invariably any UNDP CO has a programme for strengthening democratic process and governance. This capacity might be utilized at key points throughout the project cycle (project design, inception, midterm) to strengthen the design and implementation of a project against a range of agreed governance measures and building stronger linkages between UNDP programmes that might not necessarily appear related to biodiversity *per se* as part of recommendation 6 of the MTE (see section 4.3.6). It is important to stress that rural communities are not just motivated by economic incentives; "*benefit is usually conceptualized in terms of financial revenue, and in unusual circumstances this can be substantial. Normally however natural resource production can only supplement inputs from agriculture and other modes of production, and it is important not to regard community participation in conservation as a panacea for rural poverty. Benefit should also be understood in non-pecuniary terms, and when economic benefit is linked with authority and responsibility large increments in social capital can result*[36]".

The final lesson to be drawn from this evaluation relates to complexity, and perhaps it is both a lesson and a recommendation for GEF. As was stated, *ad nauseam* in the main report, GEF projects addressing biodiversity conservation management issues are dealing with highly complex systems with numerous "drivers" – economic, socio-political, environmental, *ad infinitum* – all interacting with each other in a non-linear way that makes it impossible to predict precisely the outcomes of any intervention. Furthermore, these "drivers" are interacting over very different timescales.

Under these circumstances any project is invariably going to be based on a large number of assumptions. As many a project manager finds out to his or her cost, the first thing that happens following the award of the grant is that the key assumptions do not hold true, and, to make matters worse, some assumptions were not even identified in the first place. If this is not confusing enough, it may be that circumstances have changes *vis a vis* a range of socio-political, economic and environmental issues. This does not necessarily mean that the project was poorly designed, it is rather a reflection of the complexity of causal relationships into which the project is moving.

In Georgia there are a large number of interests in the field of biodiversity and protected areas conservation as might be expected given the importance of the country and the region. There are numerous different initiatives supporting the development of protected areas and biodiversity conservation in Georgia, as well as in the region. There is also a degree of coordination of these efforts in Georgia by the APA.

The Diversification of the Revenue Mechanism Portfolio report recommends that:

> "Working within the Agency, it is suggested that those responsible for the donor programme develop a medium to long term Strategy and Action Plan for application of donor funding within the PA system. The Strategy would be based on forecast needs and be prioritized to ensure that funding is directed to the most important projects and needs, taking into account the donors broad aspirations for the way the money should be spent."

Any such strategy would need to be highly adaptable. That is: it would need considerable "*capacity for learning and self-organization to adapt to change*" without which it might simply react to circumstances rather than shape them.

---

[36] Adapted from an abstract by Professor Marshall Murphree (in press)

Scenario planning provides possibly the most effective way to allow conventional planning tools to be effective when faced with such complexity. It does not replace conventional planning approaches but rather it helps the sometimes rigid planning framework to adapt in light of experience, experimentation and changes in circumstances.

Scenario planning, initially developed as a strategic military planning tool, is an approach that has evolved to become a widely accepted methodology in understanding and addressing management issues in complex systems. The scenario planning process has two main components. Firstly, it analyses the factors, or drivers, that are influencing the system to build a "default" scenario or picture of the current system and its complexities. Secondly, it extrapolates the current drivers into possible futures that can be used to guide research or management interventions, or indeed financial considerations.

The importance of the first step of identifying drivers and building the default scenario is that it creates awareness of current complexities and causal relationships that might not have otherwise been understood or realised. The second step of developing future scenarios is important for coping with uncertainty, determining research, management or financial priorities, guiding interventions, supporting policy requirements and determining monitoring or surveillance needs.

The core of scenario planning is the identification of those elements that are shaping events or systems. These elements, known as "drivers", interact with each other often at different physical and temporal scales. Conventional planning often fails to adequately address change, because it is based on the assumption that drivers are constant (or predictable) and yet, because of their interaction, drivers are invariably in a state of change and this is often unpredictable. At times, this driver interaction change is quick and at other times, the change may be slower.

Scenario planning is predicated on understanding what constitutes the current system drivers and the cause/effect relationship between the drivers. This understanding also helps to comprehend the scale (both physical and temporal) and impact that various drivers have on a system. Once the drivers are identified and their relationship understood, scenario planning provides a methodology for examining how the drivers might possibly interact in the future. Since driver interactions in socio-ecological systems are complex, the scenario planning process attempts to analyse possible and plausible future driver relationships, rather than attempting to create predicted futures.

While scenario planning may be used in different ways, as outlined above, there are certain consistent elements regarding the use of scenario planning:

- There is no one single scenario planning methodology, and approaches will vary depending on the issues to be addressed and the scale of the scenario plan.
- Scenario planning is a systematic way of looking into and "rehearsing the future" without attempting to be predictive.
- Scenario planning helps us understand the "drivers" that are shaping the present and how they may influence the future.
- Scenario planning helps us understand that the future is not pre-determined. We can influence the future by understanding and managing current drivers. The example of carbon emissions and their effect on climate change is a case in point.
- Scenario planning helps us prepare for the uncertainties, shocks and surprises that will inevitably arise in any socio-ecological system.
- Scenario planning is a reiterative process which is best effective when it becomes an integral part of the planning and management systems, thus building capacity within the 'project

owners'.

It is important, however, to realise that scenario planning has its limitations, and as such scenario planning is not about predicting the future, nor is it necessarily a replacement for conventional forms of planning – in fact it has been argued by Segal and others that ".. it is not planning at all" (Segal, 2007) but rather a way thinking. Scenario planning can be used by policy makers, planners, managers and communities to:

- Assist in testing existing plans and strategies in different futures.
- Identifying the key drivers for long-term monitoring in an adaptive management system.
- Guide short-term management responses where "rapid response scenario planning" is used.
- Assist communities in communicating their aspirations in large scale planning processes.
- To build understanding and consensus on key issues between stakeholders in order to work towards a common vision.
- Provide an understanding of system dynamics to recognise and address "wicked problems" – a *"wicked problem"* being a problem which is impossible to resolve without creating additional problems.[37]

In short, scenario planning is a way to avoid that "groundhog day" feeling.

Annex 1   **Terms of Reference MTE PIMS 3957**

Annex 2   **Itinerary and Persons Met**

Annex 3   **PIMS 3957 Ratings Table**

Annex 4   **Governance Criteria**

Annex 5   **Summary of MTE Experience**

Annex 6   **Statutory framework**

Annex 7   **References**

Annex 8   **PIMS 3957 METT**

Annex 9   **PIMS 3957 Co-financing**

Annex 10   **Documents Reviewed**

---

[37] Adapted from: Strengthening conventional Protected Area planning in Syria: A Scenario Planning Approach By Michael Murphree, Francis Hurst, Clara Bocchino, With Co-facilitation by Sami Tarabieh, Osama Al-Nouri & Anwar Elhalah, Via Nova Group. Amman, Jordan, 2010

Georgia

TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOR

MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE UNDP/GEF Project: PIMS 3957 - "Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Areas System"

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Standard UNDP/GEF M&E requirements

UNDP/GEF wishes to contract Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) Expert to carry out mid-term evaluation of the project "Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Areas System".

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:

- (i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- (ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- (iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and
- (iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation periods are strongly encouraged to conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

1.2 Project Context

In May 2009, the medium-sized project: "Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Area System" was signed by UNDP and the government of Georgia and its implementation started.

The project objective is to strengthen the financial sustainability of the protected area system and its legal foundation. This will be achieved through developing PA Network Sustainable Financing Plan (PANSFP), facilitating implementation of legal/policy/regulatory reforms that will allow PANSFP enforcement, building capacities of existing training institutions and Agency for Protected Areas in implementation of sustainable financial plan and, testing of innovative finance tools and management practices in Tusheti Protected Areas.

The duration of the project is three years. Total budget of the project is US$ 14,418,836. This includes allocated resources in the amount of US$ 875,420; including US$ 685,000 GEF grant and US$190,420 UNDP financing. The remaining amount is in-kind parallel co-funding, including: government of Georgia, BP/EURASIA Partnership Foundation, WWF – Mava; EU/FFI-NACRES, and IUCN in kind contribution.

UNDP is a GEF implementing agency for the project; The Project Management Unit (PMU) (composed of a UNDP recruited Project Manager and a Project Assistant) is in charge of project day-to-day management. The project is executed by the Ministry of Environment through the Agency of Protected Areas of Georgia (APA); the APA assigned a National Project Director (NPD) responsible for implementation of the project as well as for the achievement of the overall project outputs. The Project Executive Board (PEB) (composed of representatives of the APA, MoE/GEF focal point, Tusheti National Park Administration, UNDP, World Bank Tbilisi Office and Trans-boundary Joint Secretariat) directs the project and is an ultimate decision-maker for it.

The actual implementation of the project has started later than was planned; However, the PMU managed that all components of the project were on the way to reaching the project objectives. The Tusheti Demo Project as well as Sustainable Financial Strategy and Capacity Raising for APA for PAs Effective Management components have been initiated and launched. Thus, for the beginning of 2011 the project will reach the phase, when the progress should be reviewed, the project approach analyzed and if found necessary modified, lessons learned captured, replication strategy developed and implemented.

2.   OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation is initiated and commissioned jointly by UNDP Georgia Country Office and by the UNDP/GEF regional coordination unit (Bratislava). Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments. To this end, the MTE will serve to:

(i)   Strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the project;
(ii) Enhance the likelihood of achievement of the project and GEF objectives through analyzing project strengths and weaknesses and suggesting measures for improvement;
(iii) Enhance organizational and development learning;
(iv) Enable informed decision-making;
(v)   Create the basis of replication of successful project outcomes achieved so far.

Particular emphasis should be put on the current project results and the possibility of achieving all the objectives in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is proceeding. More specifically, the evaluation should assess:

Project concept and design
The MTE Expert will assess the project concept and design. MTE Expert should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. The MTE Expert will revise and re-assess the relevance of indicators and targets, review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

Implementation
The MTE will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular the MTE is to assess the Project Management Unit's use of adaptive management in project implementation.

Project outputs, outcomes and impact

The MTE will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. MTE should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The MTE Expert should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The MTE Expert will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

3.   DETAILED SCOPE OF WORK

The MTE expert(s) will look at the following aspects:

3.1   Project Concept

3.1.1   **Project relevance and strategy:** The extent to which the project is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time as well as the extent the activities contribute towards attainment of global environmental benefits:

➢ How and why project outcomes and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results.
➢ Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective way towards results.
➢ Do the outcomes developed during the inception phase still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives (in light of updated underlying factors)? Consider alternatives.
➢ Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project preparation?
➢ Does the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project?

3.1.2   Preparation and readiness

➢ Are the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe?
➢ Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?
➢ Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?
➢ Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
➢ Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?

3.1.3   Stakeholder participation during project preparation

➢ Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project's design?

3.1.4   Underlying Factors/Assumptions

➢ Assess the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project's management strategies for these factors.

➢ Re-test the assumptions made by the project management and identify new assumptions that should be made
➢ Assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project

3.1.5   Project organization/Management arrangements

➢ Were the project roles properly assigned during the project design?
➢ Are the project roles in line with UNDP and GEF progamme guides?
➢ Can the management arrangement model suggested by the project be considered as an optimum model? If no, please come up with suggestions and recommendations

3.1.6   Project budget and duration

➢ Assess if the project budget and duration were planned in a cost-effective way?

3.1.7   Design of Project Monitoring and Evaluation system

➢ Examine whether or not the project has a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives.
➢ Examine whether or not the M&E plan includes a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results and adequate funding for M&E activities.
➢ Examine whether or not the time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs are specified.

3.1.8   Sustainability and replication strategy

➢ Assess if project sustainability and replicability strategy was developed during the project design? And assess its relevance

3.1.9   Gender perspective

➢ Extent to which the project accounts for gender differences when developing project interventions.
➢ How gender considerations are mainstreamed into project interventions?

3.2   Project Implementation

3.2.1   Project's Adaptive Management

➢ Monitoring Systems
  ■ Assess the monitoring tools currently being used:
    o Do they provide the necessary information?
    o Do they involve key partners?
    o Are they efficient?
    o Are additional tools required?

- ■ Reconstruct baseline data if necessary1. Reconstruction should follow participatory processes and could be achieved in conjunction with a learning exercise2
- ■ Ensure the monitoring system, including performance indicators, at least meets GEF minimum requirements3. Apply SMART indicators as necessary.
- ■ Apply the GEF Tracking Tool and provide a description of comparison with initial application of the tool.

➢ Risk Management
- ■ Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why.
- ■ Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted
- ■ Assess the project's risk identification and management systems:
    - o Is the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System4 appropriately applied?
    - o How can the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System be used to strengthen the project management?

➢ Work Planning
- ■ Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it
    - o Ensure the logical framework meets UNDP/GEF requirements in terms of format and content
    - o What impact did the retro-fitting of impact indicators, if such have on project management
- ■ Assess the use of routinely updated work plans;
- ■ Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities;
- ■ Are work planning processes result-based5? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning;
- ■ Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. Any irregularities must be noted.

➢ Financial management
- ■ Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. (Cost-effectiveness: the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible. Also called cost-effectiveness or efficacy). Any irregularities must be noted.
- ■ Is there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits?
- ■ Did promised co-financing materialize? (Please fill the form on co-financing attached table 1).

➢ Reporting
- ■ Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management;

---

1 See p.67 of UNDP's "Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results", available at
  http://www.undp.org/gef/monitoring/policies.html
2 See Annex C of "Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: approaches to sustainability", available at
  http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html
3 See section 3.2 of the GEF's "Monitoring and Evaluation Policy", available at
http://207.190.239.143/uploadedFiles/Policies_and_Guidelines-me_policy-english(1).pdf
4 UNDP-GEF's system is based on the Atlas Risk Module. See the UNDP-GEF Risk Management Strategy resource kit, available at
  Annex XI at http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html
5 RBM Support documents are available at http://www.undp.org/eo/methodologies.htm

■ Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

➢ Delays
- Assess if there were delays in project implementation, then what were the reasons?
- Did the delay affect the achievement of project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

3.2.2   UNDP Contribution

■ Assess the role of UNDP against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. Consider:

   o Field visits
   o Participation in Steering Committees
   o Project reviews, PIR preparation and follow-up
   o GEF guidance
   o Skill mix
   o Operational support

■ Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide[6], especially the Project Assurance role, and ensure they are incorporated into the project's adaptive management framework
■ Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP in terms of "soft" assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination) and suggest measures to strengthen UNDP's soft assistance to the project management.

3.2.3   Stakeholder Participation, Partnership Strategy

➢ Assess whether or not local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making. Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project and suggestions for improvement if necessary;
➢ Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms;
➢ Identify opportunities for stronger partnerships;

3.2.4   Implementation of replication approach;

➢ Sustainability: extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project scope, after it has come to an end. The evaluators may look at factors such as establishment of sustainable financial mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the broader development policies and sectoral plans and economies or community production;

---

[6] The UNDP User Guide is currently only available on UNDP's intranet. However UNDP can provide the necessary section on roles and responsibility from http://content.undp.org/go/userguide/results/rmoverview/progprojorg/?src=print

3.3   Project Results (Outputs, Outcomes and Impact)

3.3.1   Progress towards achievement of intended outcomes/measurement of change: Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after (so far) the project intervention, e.g. by comparing current conditions for development of Protected Areas management effectiveness, financial sustainability and capacity to the baseline ones;

4.   PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

➢ Detailed methodology, work plan and outline;
➢ Mid-term evaluation report with findings;
➢ Lessons learned and recommendations for improvement, including recommendations for the revision of project strategy, approach, outputs and activities, if necessary;
➢ Recommendations for a strategy for future replication of the project approach for other types of the biodiversity projects, for other countries in the region;
➢ Description of best practices, and an "action list" in a certain area of particular importance for the project.

5.   EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The project progress and achievements will be tested against following GEF evaluation criteria:

(i)   Relevance – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
(ii) Effectiveness – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
(iii) Efficiency – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.
(iv) Results/impacts – the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short-to medium term outcomes, and longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other, local effects.
(v)   Sustainability – the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

The Project will be rated against individual criterion of ***relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact/results based*** on the following scale:

➢ Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
➢ Satisfactory (S): The project has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
➢ Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
➢ Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project has significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
➢ Unsatisfactory (U) The project has major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
➢ Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project has severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.

As for **sustainability criteria** the evaluator should at the minimum evaluate the "likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this.

The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability should be addressed:

Financial resources:
➢ Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?
➢ What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, *income* generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-political:
➢ Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?
➢ What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?
➢ Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?
➢ Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?

Institutional framework and governance:
➢ Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits?
➢ While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.

Environmental:
➢ Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project.

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows:
➢ Likely (L): There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
➢ Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
➢ Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
➢ Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an 'Unlikely' rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than 'Unlikely'.

The MTE Expert should develop detailed methodology and work plan for MTE during the preparatory phase of the MTE. The MTE tools and techniques may include, but not limited to:

➢ Desk review;

➢ Interviews with major stakeholders, including UNDP/GEF project implementing and executing agencies, government representatives, etc.
➢ Field visits to the project sites;
➢ Questionnaires;
➢ Participatory techniques and other approaches for gathering and analysis of data.

An indicative outline of the Mid-term Evaluation Report is presented below.

6.   INDICATIVE OUTLINE OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT

The key product expected from this mid-term evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the following contents:

➢ Executive summary (1-2 pages)
- Brief description of the project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

➢ Introduction (2-3 pages)
- Project background
- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues to be addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

➢ Project and its development context (3-4 pages)
- Project start and its duration
- Implementation status
- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

➢ Key findings (including best practice and lessons learned, assessment of performance) (8-10 pages)

- Project formulation
  - Project relevance
  - Implementation approach
  - Country ownership/Driveness
  - Stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach
  - Cost-effectiveness
  - UNDP comparative advantage
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  - Indicators
  - Management arrangements

- Implementation

- o Financial management
- o Monitoring and evaluation
- o Execution and implementation modalities
- o Management by the UNDP country office
- o Coordination and operational issues
- o Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)

- ■ Results
  - o Attainment of objectives
  - o Prospects of sustainability
  - o Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

➢ Conclusions and recommendations (4 – 6 pages)
- ■ Corrective actions for the design, duration, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- ■ Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- ■ Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- ■ Suggestions for strengthening ownership, management of potential risks

➢ Lessons learned (3 – 5 pages)
- ■ Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

➢ Annexes
- ■ TOR
- ■ Itinerary
- ■ List of persons interviewed
- ■ Summary of field visits
- ■ List of documents reviewed
- ■ Questionnaire used and summary of results
- ■ Co-financing and Leveraged Resources (see Annex 2)
- ■ METT

The length of the mid-term evaluation report shall not exceed 30 pages in total (not including annexes).

7.   MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The mid-term evaluation will be carried out by international Mid-term Evaluation expert. The logistical support and venue to the MTE team will be provided by the UNDP Georgia CO under overall supervision of Energy and Environment Portfolio manager and Programme Associate. The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP-Georgia.

In preparation for the evaluation mission, the project manager, with assistance of UNDP CO, will arrange completion of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT). Results of METT should be used by an international project evaluation consultant, who will track the progress in management effectiveness of Tusheti PA. METT results should be attached as a mandatory Annex to the MTE evaluation report.

8.   DURATION OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

It is expected to start MTE in the second half of January, 2011 and complete it maximum in 20 man/days.

The proposed dates for the in-country mission to Georgia are 24 January - 1 February, 2011. The assignment is to be completed no later than February, 2011.

9.   DUTIES, SKILLS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF MID TERM EVALUATION EXPERT

International Expert

Duties and Responsibilities:

➢ Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and MTE outline (maximum 4 man/day homework);
➢ Debriefing with UNDP CO, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the MTE report (1 day);
➢ Interviews with project implementing partner (executing agency), relevant Government, NGO and donor representatives and UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor (maximum 3 days);
➢ Field visit to the pilot project site and interviews with Tusheti PA administration key staff (2 days);
➢ Debriefing with UNDP and project implementing partner (1 day);
➢ Development and submission of the first MTE report draft (maximum of 4 man/days). Submission due is the 17-th day of the assignment. The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF RCU Bratislava) and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;
➢ Finalization and submission of the final MTE report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report (maximum 5 man/days);

Required Qualifications and Competencies:

➢ At least Master's degree in Biodiversity Conservation, Natural Resource Management, Environmental Economics or other related areas;
➢ At least 7 years of working experience in providing management or consultancy services to the biodiversity conservation and/or protected areas projects, preferably in protected areas finance;
➢ Experience in monitoring and evaluating protected areas and/or biodiversity conservation projects for UN or other international development agencies (at least in one project);
➢ Knowledge of the CIS region, particularly Georgia's context;
➢ Knowledge of GEF M&E guidelines and procedures;
➢ Sound knowledge in results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation);
➢ Fluency in English both written and spoken and good technical writing skills
➢ E-literacy;

Competencies:
➢ Ability to critically analyze issues, find root-causes and suggest optimum solutions;
➢ Ability to interact with a wide range of partners: government officials, development agencies and etc.;
➢ Excellent team working and management skills;

CV and P11 should provide evidence on the abovementioned qualifications and competencies.

Evaluation Criteria:
Experts will be evaluated against combination of technical and financial criteria. Technical evaluation stage encompasses desk review of applications. Experts not meeting any of minimum technical qualification requirements will be automatically excluded from the list of candidates for further technical evaluation.

Maximum obtainable score is 100, out of which the total score for technical criteria equals to 70 points (70%) and for financial criteria 30 (30%). Candidates who pass 70% of maximum obtainable scores of the technical criteria (i.e. 70 x 70% = 49 points) as a result of a desk review of applications will be considered as short-listed candidates.

Only candidates who pass 70% of total technical score will be requested to submit financial proposals - Lump Sum amount that should include remuneration (daily fee*number of total man/days), travel costs, Daily Subsistence Allowances (DSA)[7] ((DSA)*number of total days to be spent in the field) and other associated costs, if such. DSAs should not exceed UN DSA rates for Georgia.

A maximum of 30 points will be assigned to the lowest price offer. All other price offers will receive points in inverse proportion, using the formula:
Financial score offer X = 30*the lowest price/price offer X,Y, etc.)

Technical score: 70 points (70%)							Financial score: 30 points (30%)	Total score: 100 points
1. Education Background	**2. Work Experience, knowledge**					**3. Other, English knowledge**		
1.1Minimum qualification requirement: Master's degree in Biodiversity Conservation, Natural Resource Management, Environmental Economics or other related areas: 10	*2.1.1 Minimum qualification requirement:* 7 years of working experience in providing management or consultancy services to the biodiversity conservati	2.2.1 *Minimum qualification requirement* Experience in monitoring and evaluating protected areas and/or biodiversity conservation projects for UN or other international development agencies (at least in one project): 1 points	2.3 Knowledge of the CIS region, particularly Georgia's context: 5 points	2.4 Knowledge of GEF M&E guidelines and procedures: 5 points	2.5 Sound knowledge in results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring	*3.1 Minimum qualification requirement:* Fluency in English both written and spoken: 5 points 3.2 Technical writing skills in English:	Proposed price	Price score

---

[7] DSA includes accommodation, meals and in-town travel

points: 1.2 PhD – additional 5 points	on and/or protected areas projects, preferably in protected areas finance: 15 points 2.1.2 Between 7 and 10 years – additional 5 points; 2.1.3 More than 10 years – additional 10 points	2.2.2 2-3 projects – additional 2 points; 2.2.3 More than 3 projects – additional 4 points ;			and evalu ation) : 5 points	Additional 5 points			
15	25	5	5	5	5	10		30	100

*For minimum qualification criteria/requirement either maximum obtainable score or 0 (zero) should be assigned to the candidate; Applicant not meeting any of minimum qualification criteria, will be automatically exduded from the list of applicants for further evaluation

** Additional to minimum criteria any score between 0 (zero) and maximum obtainable score can be assigned to the applicants

** *Scores against criteria 1.1, 1.2; 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3; 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3; 2.3; 2.4; 2.5 and 3.1; will be assigned to the applicants based on CVs and/or filled in P11 forms.

*** Scores against criteria 3.2 will be assigned to the applicants based on CVs and/or filled in P11 forms and maximum 1-page technical writing samples to be submitted to UNDP as part of applications.

Suggested Level:

Senior expert

Contract Type, Duration and Payment Modality:

The consultant will be hired for maximum 20 man/days under Special Service Agreement (SSA) with maximum 13 man/days of home based work and maximum 7 days of mission to Georgia. He/she will be paid daily fee and DSAs according to UNDP salary scale for international experts and local DSA rate, travel and other associated costs, if such. DSA payments will be made based on actual days spent in Georgia. Fee payments will be made based on following milestones:

20% - First draft of MTE report;
80% - Final MTE report

Duty Station:

Home Based with mission to Georgia

10. LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED

➢ Project document and its annexes;
➢ Annual/Quarter work plans;
➢ Project financial work plans and expenditure reports;
➢ Annual/Quarter operational and progress reports;
➢ 2010 UNDP/GEF Project Implementation Reviews (PIR);
➢ Minutes of the PEB meetings;
➢ Minutes of the stockholder meetings;
➢ METT scores for Tusheti PAs
➢ GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies;
➢ Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results;
➢ Other upon request.

11. EVALUATION POLICY

The evaluators should follow the major GEF principles for evaluation[8]:
➢ Independence
➢ Impartiality
➢ Transparency
➢ Disclosure
➢ Ethics
➢ Partnership
➢ Competencies and Capacities
➢ Credibility
➢ Utility

The evaluators must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore applications will not be considered from evaluators who have had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project. Any previous association with the project must be disclosed in the application.

If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

---

[8] See p. 22 of the GEF's Monitoring and Evaluation Policy

APPLICATION:

Interested candidates are requested to send a cover letter, CV, filled in P11 form (to be downloaded at: http://undp.org.ge/files/P11_modified_for_SCs%20and_SSAs-Draft.doc) and a short technical writing sample (synopsis or excerpt from the relevant reports) to Ms. Kristina Nachkebia, project assistant at e-mail: kristina.nachkebia@undp.org.ge with a CC to Ms. Ana Shubitidze, project manager at ana.shubitidze@undp.org.ge no later than 18:00 p.m. (local time) 6 December, 2010. Please indicate vacancy title "Mid-Term Evaluation Expert" in the subject line.

ANNEX 1: TENTATIVE LIST OF MEETINGS TO BE HELD

Location	Meetings
UNDP Georgia CO	Meeting with UNDP Energy and Environment Team Leader and Management: DRR, ARR
Ministry of Environment of Georgia	Meeting with UNDP / GEF Project Manager and Assistant
Ministry of Environment of Georgia	Meeting with UNDP / GEF National Project Director
Ministry of Environment of Georgia	GEF operational focal point, Nino Tkhilava
Agency of Protected Areas of Georgia (APA)	Meeting with deputy head of APA and other key staff
Tusheti, Alvani	Meeting with Tusheti PA director and other key staff
Tbilisi	Meeting with representatives of Contracted NGOs (Nacres and ECFDC/GCCW)
Tbilisi	Meeting with representatives of WB Tbilisi Office, KFW, WWF Caucasus office, USAID Georgia, Tourism Department and CPAF-project manager

ANNEX 2 - CO-FINANCING AND LEVERAGED RESOURCES

Table 1: Co-financing and Leveraged Resources,

Co financing (Type/ Source)	IA own Financing (mill US$)		Multi-lateral Agencies (Non-GEF) (mill US$)		Bi-laterals Donors (mill US$)		Central Government (mill US$)		Local Government (mill US$)		Private Sector (mill US$)		NGOs (mill US$)		Other Sources* (mill US$)		Total Financing (mill US$)		Total Disbursement (mill US$)	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grant																				
Credits																				
Loans																				
Equity																				
In-kind																				
Non-grant Instruments*																				
Other Types*																				
TOTAL																				

➢ "Proposed" co-financing refers to co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement.
➢ Please describe "Non-grant Instruments" (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc):

_____
➢ Please explain "Other Types of Co-financing": _____
➢ Please explain "Other Sources of Co-financing": _____

Projects that have not realized expected co-financing levels must provide explanations. Please describe in 50 words the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's global environmental objective.

Annex 2 Schedule and meetings

Day	Location	Meetings
12.02	Tbilisi	14:00 Meeting with PMU (Ana Shubitidze)
14.02	UNDP Georgia CO	11:00 Briefing with UNDP management (Inita Paulovica - DRR, Sophie Kemkhadze - ARR and Silvija Kalnins - Portfolio Consultant) 14:00 Mariam Shotadze (former Energy and Environment Team Leader at UNDP)
	Ministry of Environment of Georgia	16:00 Tea Barbakadze - head of the planning division at APA and UNDP / GEF National Project Director, Lasha Moistrapishvili - deputy head of APA and Lali Tevzadze - head of the development division at APA
15.02	Tbilisi	11:00 Meeting with representatives of Contracted company ECFDC/GCCW (Ramaz Gokhelashvili) 15:00 Meeting with representatives of Contracted NGO Nacres (Irakli Shavgulidze)
16.02	Tbilisi	11:00 Meeting with Maka Bitsadze - PA4LP Project Regional Coordinator / WWF Caucasus Programme Office) 13:00 conference call with Maxim Vergeichik - Biodiversity and ecosystem management specialist for Europe and CIS 16:30 Meeting with Darejan Kapanadze - Senior Environmental Specialist / World Bank Regional Office for the Caucasus) 17:00 Michael Garford 18:00 Meeting with Giorgi Shonvadze - APA Director and Tea Barbakadze
17.02	Tusheti, Alvani	Meeting with Tusheti PA director (Anzor Gogotidze) and other key staff
18.02	Tbilisi	10:30 Debriefing with APA 12:00 Debriefing with UNDP management

- *conference call to ECFDC representative -Olaf Kooijmans and*
- *CNF-executing director (David Morrison)*

ANNEX 3: RATE TABLES

Table: Status of objective / outcome delivery as per measurable indicators

OBJECTIVE	MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME	END-OF-PROJECT TARGET	STATUS OF DELIVERY*	RATING**
Objective: To improve the financial sustainability of the protected area system in Georgia.	Improved financial sustainability of PAS measured by financial sustainability score card: - improved legal-regulatory and institutional frameworks - improved business planning and tools for cost-effective management - improved availability and utilization of tools for revenue generation	50% -- 98/196 61.5%-50/78 37.7%-23/61 43.9% - 25/57	Difficult to assess without running the scorecard But ECFEC reports on training, economic valuation, revenue and cost savings, diversification of revenue and business planning guidelines prepared in draft.	<mark>Yellow</mark>
	Improved management effectiveness of the 35 PAs (381,969.76 ha) as measured by RAPPAM tool	By the end of the project Overall Management Effectiveness Scores for 35 PAs improved by at least 50%	Not possible to assess without running the scorecard but considered improbable to have such a significant impact and MTE suggests that this target is revised	**Not possible at MTE**
OUTCOMES	MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME	END-OF-PROJECT TARGET	STATUS OF DELIVERY	RATING
Outcome 1: Sustainable Financing Plan for Georgia's protected area system.	Existence of legal-regulatory framework supportive to financial sustainability of PAS	Legal-regulatory framework: - allows for all after taxes revenues from concession to be retained in PAS; - lays the basis for co-management	Preparation of Legal review of existing legal-regulatory framework for PAs management and financing is underway	<mark>Yellow</mark>

		partnerships between APA and local resource users for NRM in PA	Overall Assessment of Revenue Options and Cost-Saving Opportunities for Improved Natural Resources Management (draft)	
	Improved funding of 35 PAs of Georgia covering 381,969.76 hectares	Funding sources will be identified for covering the remaining 47% funding needs. Potential funding options to be considered: Tourism concessions awarded to private sector, increased tourist entry fees, CNF funding, donations	Diversification of the Revenue Mechanisms Portfolio (draft) Overall Assessment of Revenue Options and Cost-Saving Opportunities for Improved Natural Resources Management (draft)	<mark>Yellow</mark>
Outcome 2: Improved institutional effectiveness of protected area institutions in sustainable financing	Number of approved PA management plans that include business plans completed by professionals trained in business planning by the project	At least 3 PA with updated management plans, each including a business plan, completed by project-trained professionals	TPAC Management Plan elaboration is underway Guidelines and Standard Format for Business Planning for IUCN Category I and II Protected Areas in Georgia (draft)	<mark>Yellow</mark>
	Level of systemic, institutional and individual capacities of PAS agencies for PAS management as measured by capacity assessment score card	Total score (2011): -systemic: 80%:24/30 -institutional: 80% - 38/45 -individual: 67% - 14/21 - Policy Formulation: 83% - 5/6	Hard to assess without running the score card exercise Training Needs Analysis and selection of Host Institution Report (draft)	<mark>Yellow</mark>

		100% - 3/3		
		- Implementation: 78% - 7/9 81%- 22/27		
		67% - 8/12		
		- Eng. and consensus: 83% - 5/6 83% - 5/6 67% - 2/3		
		-Info and knowledge: 67% - 2/3 67% - 2/3 67% - 2/3		
		- M&E and learning: 83% - 5/6 67% - 4/6 67% - 2/ 3		
Outcome 3: New financial mechanisms and public/private partnerships tested/demonstrated at pilot field site contributing to the improved financial sustainability	Management effectiveness of the Tusheti PAs field demonstration site by the METT scorecard	70	METT Scorecard is 56	<mark>Yellow</mark>
	Amount of PA-based revenues in dollar values for Tusheti PA	2011 revenues: at least $20,824, 100% increase in Tusheti PA revenues compared to 2009 figures	In 2009 revenue was 2505 USD and in 2010 -6273 USD	<mark>Yellow</mark>
	Number of NRM or tourism-based public-private partnerships and/or concessions established	At least one public private partnership or concession on NRM/or tourism established	Sub - Plan for Tourism Development and Marketing for Tusheti Protected Area Complex Workshops and meetings for facilitating	<mark>Yellow</mark>

			establishment of partnerships between the small companies and locals	

Status of delivery colouring codes:

Green / completed – indicator shows successful achievement
Yellow – indicator shows expected completion by the end of the project
Red – Indicator show poor achievement - unlikely to be complete by end of Project

** Ratings code as are detailed in Annex 2.

ANNEX 4

The "Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Areas System" Project has three components; namely:

- Developing the enabling and policy environment for sustainable protected areas financing;
- Capacity development for more cost effective protected areas management, and;
- Site testing of approaches within the Tusheti Protected Areas complex.

These three components add up to a reasonably coherent strategy to achieving the Project's objective of strengthening the financial sustainability of the Georgian protected areas system.

However, from the early analysis of the project documentation (Project Document, Reports, etc.) the MTE considers that the issue of protected areas governance has been overlooked to a largeextent in the Project's design and implementation.

The MTE argues that sustainable protected areas management cannot be determined using a narrow financial criteria alone given the complexity and unpredictability of any protected areas system. This is particularly relevant in the Georgian situation given the long association of traditional use and human activity (in this case in the Tusheti Region).

The MTE argues that protected areas governance is critical to ensuring that the protected areas system is properly financed and sustainability (if indeed it can be predetermined) must be measured using economic (financial), ecological and social indicators.

Governance is the means for achieving direction, control, and coordination that determines the effectiveness of management (Eagles 2008). While it may be possible to put in place mechanisms that ensure a sustained flow of finances to the protected areas system, this does not in itself imply high quality management and effective conservation of the natural values of the protected areas system.

To an extent this may be being achieved at the site level through component three of the project but the MTE is interested to determine how much the Project is addressing the issue of governance in particular with relation to authority and responsibility, cost and benefit and security of tenure. An important aspect of this is the level within the system and the degree to which decisions about how finances are spent.

Why is governance an issue? The MTE considers that protected areas governance is a significant issue when addressing the financing of the Georgian protected areas system. The various planned interventions are likely to bring about some significant changes to the ways in which protected areas are financed and managed that could impact for good or bad upon the lives of rural people who live in or around the protected areas – public-private partnerships, concessions and greater involvement of the private sector in the management of resources that may be regarded as common property or are in some way contested is a serious governance issue and carries with it a number of risks that may be unfairly distributed.

Market led approaches to conservation are on the whole robust and effective; however, economists might want to simplify the equation by putting a financial value on the *quid pro quo* of the trade-off

between protection and utilisation. But, it is important to bear in mind basic human nature in respect of determining a range of motivations and values. Self-reliance, independence, the security to manage their resources and determine their future are all characteristics of rural communities and can be strong motivational factors in encouraging sustainable management of natural resources. The protected areas, alternative livelihoods trade-off approach and ecotourism imply an element of conceding or relinquishing territory, resources, or *authority* and *responsibility* The ability to make decisions about the future), in return for increased dependence upon an external provider. While this may not always be the case it is important to bear this in mind.

The risk assessment made during the project formulation appears to dismiss protected areas governance either for convenience or because there was a lack of understanding that it cuts across all three components of the Project. This is not to say that issues of governance are not being addressed by the Project but the risk rating (Project Document Section G) down plays the risk giving the impression that the Project is to a large extent ignoring issues of governance. However, broad participation (a component of any governance system) by local communities cannot be addressed through a socio-economic study and given the complex and unpredictable nature of any protected areas system it is important that there is a broad participation in the decision-making process. Indeed, it might also be argued that "*resilience is determined not only by a systems ability to buffer or absorb shocks, but also by its capacity for learning and self-organisation to adapt to change*" (Gunderson and Holling 2002). Therefore a governance system that allows for a broader participation in planning and management of a protected area might arguably be more resilient than one which has a narrow scientific or financial focus.

Using criteria developed by the United Nations Development Programme Graham *et al (2003)*[1] suggested that good governance can be understood through the use of a set of nine major characteristics (Eagles 2008[2]). These are namely:

- Public participation
- The application of the rule of law
- Transparency in decision making
- Responsiveness
- Consensus-oriented decisions
- Equity and inclusiveness
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Accountability

Graham *et al* (2003) further suggested that these nine principles for good governance can be grouped under five categories for consideration in parks and protected areas:

---

[1] Graham, J., B. Amos and T. Plumptree. 2003. "Governance principles for protected areas in the 21st century." Paper prepared for the 5th IUCN World Parks Congress, Durban, South Africa. Ottawa: Institute of Governance.
[2] Eagles, Paul F J, 2008, Governance models for parks, recreation, and tourism. *In: Transforming Parks and Protected area: policy and governance in a changing world. Eds. Kevin S. Hanna, Douglas A. Clark, and D. Scott Slocombe.*

1. Legitimacy and voice
   - Public participation
   - Consensus orientation
2. Direction
   - Strategic vision, including human development and historical, cultural, and social complexities
3. Performance
   - Responsiveness to stakeholders
   - Effectiveness and efficiency
4. Accountability
   - Accountability to the public and stakeholders
   - Transparency
5. Fairness
   - Equity
   - Rule of law

A version of the following evaluation technique form was first presented at the 5th IUCN Worlds Parks Conference in South Africa. It was based on work carried out by Graham *et al* (2003) and the criteria are also based on the United Nations Development Program's list of the characteristics of good governance.

The evaluation criteria have been slightly modified here and the MTE suggests that this may be a useful tool to evaluate the impact of the Project using more than just financial criteria.

The Rating System Index

The following rating system index was developed from the Graham *et al (2003)* criteria and it is suggested as a means of providing some indication of the overall impact of the Project on the protected area (Tusheti Complex) and the overall national system using a broader set of criteria that reflect issues of governance.

The Allocation of Points

The allocation of 5 points for each criteria presented in the following table provides an index figure that can be used to measure some aspects (it should be noted that that these can be added to) of good governance. The ratings are arguably subjective and may reflect bias. However, any bias is not likely to more than is inherent in both the METT and RAPPAM evaluation methodologies.

1 point; unsatisfactory

2 points; marginally satisfactory

3 point; satisfactory

4 point; very satisfactory

5 point; excellent

The assessment should be carried out by different stakeholders and the results should be disaggregated accordingly (*e.g.* APA, Protected Areas Management Unit, local civic society, local

community users, NGOs, donors, etc.) in order to provide a diversity of perspectives.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	POINTS
1. LEGITIMACY AND VOICE	
Appropriate degree of decentralization in decision-making for PAs; any devolution or divestment is through local bodies that:	
- are accountable to local people	
- have the requisite powers and capacity to perform their functions	
- have some constraints, such as minimum environmental standards, to act in the broader national and international interest	
Collaborative management in decision-making for PAs involving representatives of all affected parties, particularly local people	
Citizen participation occurring at all levels of decision-making related to PAs (legislation, system planning, PA establishment, management planning, business planning, operations) with special emphasis at the local level and the equal participation of men and women	
Existence of civil society groups and an independent media to act as a check and balance on the exercise of the powers granted to PA political leaders and managers	
High levels of trust among the various actors, governmental and non-governmental, national, state and local, involved in the management of PAs	
2. DIRECTION	
Consistency with international direction relevant to PAs (as appropriate)	
- international conventions, e.g., World Heritage Convention, Convention on Biological Diversity, Ramsar	
- intergovernmental programs, *e.g.,* UNESCO, Man and the Biosphere	
- regional and European agreements, e.g. Natura 2000, PAN Parks	
- other guidance documents, *e.g.,* IUCN/WCPA best practice guidelines, FFI	
Existence of legislative direction that	
- sets out clear purpose and objectives for the PAs	
- establishes clear authorities relating to means (governance instruments)	
- provides for viable organizations to administer the PAs	
- includes requirements for citizen participation in decision-making	
- is elaborated in written policy statements	
For national PA systems, existence of system-wide plans that	
- have quantified objectives for the full range of PA management categories	
- establish priorities for the planning period	
- include provision for citizen participation, particularly local people in their implementation	
Existence of management plans for individual PAs that	
- reflect citizen participation, particularly local people	
- have formal approval of the appropriate authorities	
- set out clear objectives consistent with legislation	
- set out measurable results to be achieved within specific timeframes	
- are reviewed and updated on a regular cycle (e.g., every five years)	

- are implemented through annual work plans	
Demonstration of effective leadership, including political leaders and managers responsible for systems, as well as individual PAs, that	
- provides an inspiring and consistent vision for the long term development of the PA system or individual PA	
- mobilizes support for this vision	
- garners the necessary resources to implement the various plans for the system or individual PA	
3. PERFORMANCE	
Cost Effectiveness – Efficiency in achieving objectives: conservation, science, visitor opportunities, local communities	
Capacity – Capacity to undertake required functions, particularly in regard to its mandate (i.e., conservation, science, visitor opportunities, local socio-economic needs) and authorities (i.e., regulation and planning, spending, revenue-generation, agreements), its policy capacity and the adequacy and security of its funding	
Co-ordination – Ability and capacity to co-ordinate efforts with the principal affected 'players' both within and outside government	
Performance Information to the Public – Provision of sufficient information to facilitate the assessment of performance by governments and the public	
Responsiveness – Responsiveness in dealing with complaints and public criticism	
Monitoring and Evaluation – Capacity to undertake regular and comprehensive monitoring and evaluation, including long term monitoring of key ecological and cultural values, and to respond to findings	
Adaptive Management – The ability to provide for policy learning and adjustment of management actions on the basis of operational experience as part of an adaptive management approach	
Risk Management – Capacity to identify key risks and manage them	
4. ACCOUNTABILITY	
Clarity – Clarity in the assignment of responsibilities and the authority to act is critical in being able to answer the question, "Who is accountable to whom for what?"	
Coherence and Breadth – The degree to which broader concepts of accountability to the global community, future generations and nature are integrated with more traditional concepts of political accountability 1	
Role of Political leaders – Appropriateness of responsibilities assigned to political leaders as opposed to non-elected officials or semi-independent bodies and the absence of corruption	
Public Institutions of Accountability – Effective public institutions of accountability, including access to information, capacity to analyze and report, ability to get action, comprehensiveness of mandates	
Civil Society and the Media – Effectiveness of civil society and the media in mobilizing demand for accountability	
Transparency – The capacity of citizens, civil society and the media to access information relevant to the performance of PA management and to its use of regulatory, spending and other powers	
5. FAIRNESS	
Existence of a supportive judicial context characterized by respect for the rule of law	

including - an independent judiciary, equality before the law - the requirement for government and its officials to base their actions on well-defined legal authorities - citizens having the right to seek legal remedies against the government and against their fellow citizens	
Fair, impartial and effective enforcement of any PA rules including - the transparency of the rules themselves (their existence is known and accessible) - the absence of corruption among public officials - the right of appeal for those charged with transgressions	
Fairness in the process for establishing new PAs including - respect for the rights, uses and traditional knowledge of local peoples related to the area - an assessment of other options for the use of the area - public participation in the process of establishing the PA, particularly including local peoples - the appropriate balancing among PA objectives (local use, science, conservation and visitors' use)	
Fairness in the management of PAs including - practices that achieve a favourable balance of costs and benefits to local peoples (*e.g.,* traditional uses, revenue-sharing, preferential employment and contracting procedures) - mechanisms for sharing or devolving the management decision-making of the PA with local peoples - use of traditional knowledge and resource management methods of local people - equitable human resource management practices for the staff of the PA - processes for recognizing and dealing with past injustices resulting from the establishment of PAs	
6. FUNCTIONALITY	
Do the current PAs perform the following functions	
- Protection of key sites and issues as defined by the European Habitats Directive and Birds Directive	
- Protection of important bird areas (IBAs/SPAs)	
- Protection of Species and Habitats of national importance	
- **Provides connectivity between sites** (corridors) to permit wildlife migration	
Conserve cultural values including traditional agricultural practices and work ethic, village lifestyle and sense of community,	
Offer recreation opportunities for local and national activities including hiking, picnicking, boating, special events, etc.	
Protect important representative landscapes and scenic areas of national significance	
Protect essential ecosystem functions *e.g.* water catchments, natural process, local climate, etc.	
Mitigation of climate change (wetland, bog, forest cover protection, mountain systems, etc.)	
Support of subsistence and economic activities such as, rural tourism and ecotourism, harvesting of natural products, cheese production, hunting, etc.	
Provision of environmental education programs	
Provision of conservation education programs	
Undertaking scientific research (universities, national institutions and research	

centres, etc.)	
7. MANAGEMENT: NATIONAL LEVEL	
- Current in house (APA, PA Management Units) national protected area planning and management skills	
- Access to national strategic planning training programs	
- Available system-wide coherent protected area management strategy	
- Protected area management budget(s) and available financial resources	
• Government of Georgia	
• Protected Areas revenues	
• NGOs/donations	
- Available protected area infrastructure and equipment	
MANAGEMENT: SITE LEVEL	
- Site specific protected area management plans	
- Current site specific national protected area planning and management skills	
- Access to site-specific training programs	
- Access to partnership local funding sources	
TOTAL	**350/**
Average	

Francis Hurst has a BSc. in Zoology and a MSc. in Conservation. He has worked in biodiversity conservation, protected areas management and natural resource management for over 20 years with practical experience of managing protected areas. For the past 15 years he has worked as an independent consultant in more than 20 countries including UNDP-GEF and EU midterm and final evaluations in Uzbekistan, Georgia, Egypt, Russia, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Turkey and Botswana. Much of his work is related to project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation as well as in collaborative management systems and adaptive management approaches.

ANNEX 6

The ToR of the MTE provides a reasonable mandate to comment on the institutional arrangements of the APA as they relate directly to the outcomes of this Project. It was recently announced (Cite ref) that the APA would be placed under the Ministry of Economy (check correct title) as part of a larger package of reforms that would see the dissolution of the Ministry of Environment and the transfer of some statutory roles to the Ministry of Economy and the Ministry of Energy.

As noted above, this move is presumably part of the larger national reforms and efficiency measures taking place towards transforming Georgia towards a free market economy. The MTE should not draw any conclusions, nor make any predictions about the likely outcomes of these reforms. However, the MTE can raise some issues that should be considered by the Project Partners, reiterate some principles and highlight some of the risks inherent in the institutional management of the environment *per se,* and particularly as it relates to protected areas and biodiversity.

The MTE takes the view that biodiversity conservation and protected areas management is not an exact science and cannot be measured by mere scientific arguments and absolute indicators and targets. Therefore the MTE takes a somewhat philosophical approach towards biodiversity conservation and protected areas management.

There is already a large body of evidence available to support the vital role that protected areas play in underpinning social and economic development, indeed it is arguable that sustainability in any field can only be achieved when management considers the three principle drivers - socio-political, economic and environmental - that are shaping the systems we seek to manage.

However, it is not useful to repeat here the multiple roles that protected areas play in sustaining life, nor provide an exhaustive list of the provisioning, regulating, supporting or cultural services[1] that underpin social and economic development. Rather the MTE will develop an example of the complexity and uncertainty that exists in managing biodiversity and protected areas to support the need for a well-regulated system of protected areas and institutional separation between statutory agencies responsible for biodiversity management and other sectors of the economy. The example we will use is agricultural biodiversity (*agrobiodiversity*), this is the sum of wild relatives of modern day crops, the traditional land races and farming systems and the modern cultivars in use in farming today.

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Article 15 recognises that "*agricultural biodiversity provides not only food and income but also raw materials for clothing, shelter, medicines, breeding new varieties, and performs other services such as maintenance of soil fertility and biota, and soil and water conservation, all of which are essential to human survival. Nearly one third of the world's land area is used for food production*".

Estimates of the value of the wild crop[2] relatives (CWR) to the global annual food production have been put as high as US\$ 115 billion (Maxted and Kell 2009). However, future use values and benefits that might accrue from access and benefit sharing and the genetic value to plant breeders and livestock breeders are less easily or immediately captured by farmers as are the benefits from maintaining genetic reserves within the protected areas system. That is; the value of maintaining these genetic resources does not translate immediately or easily in to direct financial benefits.

---

[1] A full description of these service is provided in the United Nations 2004 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment

[2] A crop wild relative (CWR) is a naturally occurring species that is closely related to a modern agricultural crop. It retains genetic material that can give rise to future crop varieties.

The conservation of agricultural biodiversity requires two distinct approaches. These can be characterised as "*genetic reserve conservation*" and "*on farm conservation*". That is, CWR and land races[3] and the natural and farming systems that perpetuates them. Furthermore, this needs to be set in the context of the wider ecosystem because these resources are vulnerable on a number of levels. Therefore, the conservation of agricultural biodiversity requires two distinct approaches. These can be characterised as "*genetic reserve conservation*" and "*on farm conservation*". The two activities can be described thus:

"*Genetic Reserve Conservation*: the location, management and monitoring of genetic diversity in natural wild populations of crop wild relatives within defined areas designated for active, long term conservation" and;

"*On-farm Conservation*: the sustainable management of genetic diversity of locally developed crop varieties (land races), with associated wild and weedy species or forms, by farmers within traditional agricultural, horticultural or agro-silvicultural systems." (Maxted *et al.* 2002)

Our scientific understanding of the importance of agrobiodiversity is a very recent and expanding development. Critical to this understanding is the dynamics that are driving the process of evolution. These species are not fixed in time, to do so through seed banks or other means of storing genetic material (although useful as a backup) fixes the genetic material in time and isolates it from these processes. Neither can this dynamic or scale of evolutionary process be recreated by technology. Given that we are entering a period of unprecedented climatic, social and economic change as we enter the 21st Century it would be risky indeed not to maintain, *in situ,* these genetic resources, constantly adapting through recombination, mutation and selection, constantly changing.

It has been estimated that the average functional life of a modern cultivar crop might be less than ten years (cite ref). Given the uncertainty about the future, stochastic events and the probable extremes of climate change and rising human populations, ten years focuses our minds on the value of protected areas to maintain these evolutionary processes that ensure genetic "fitness" whereas normally we would cast aside evolution as being too long term for management purposes.

This single facet of protected areas and biodiversity conservation is used here to demonstrate nature of *conservation* and not because it is any more important than the many other facets of protected areas. Further, it demonstrates that while economic and financial considerations play an important role in conservation; *conservation per se* and particularly the management of protected areas cannot be distilled down to a simple financial accounting of profit and loss. The point is that there are apparent inefficiencies within individuals or populations, a genetic load that has no apparent application today, but might be useful in the future when circumstances change. It is only through maintaining these *in situ* populations and the processes that act upon them that we can state with any degree of confidence that economic and social development is sustainable.

Indeed the diversity of life and the processes that are acting on life within the protected areas might be compared with the capital that banks must hold on their books. We don't know what the future holds, therefore to face the future without a genetic reserve that is intrinsically fit for today, and capable of evolving for the challenges of tomorrow is the difference between *prudent planning* and *gambling*.

Other economic values such as tourism may provide a more immediate return on investments in the protected areas, many might also argue that scientists are not best suited for managing service

[3] A Land Race is a traditional crop variety that has been developed purely through farmer selection and as a result of specific local environmental and biological pressures. By their very nature, they are highly adapted to local physical conditions and exhibit a high level of resistance to crop pests and disease. Furthermore, although yields are lower for the land races, they require fewer inputs.

industries such as tourism and they might be right. However, tourism will only ever be one means of off-setting the costs of maintaining a genetic reserve *in situ* that will provide for the future. Given the pace of climate, socio-political, economic and environmental change in the 21st Century this future is closer to hand than is normally envisaged in evolutionary terms. Agrobiodiversity, in particular the necessity of maintaining genetic reserves of CWR, is no more important than the many other components of the protected areas system; it merely serves to highlight the complexity of managing life for the future.

Arguably managing for this future requires a statutory regulation and there should be institutional separation between this regulation and other policy sectors in the interests of good governance because protected areas regulators, managers and the communities that live in and around them have a function similar to James Tobin's trustees in as much as they are "*the guardians of the future against the claims of the present*".

Eagles, Paul F J, 2008, Governance models for parks, recreation, and tourism. *In: Transforming Parks and Protected area: policy and governance in a changing world. Eds. Kevin S. Hanna, Douglas A. Clark, and D. Scott Slocombe.*

Gregersen, H., Contreras-Hermosilla, A., White, A. and Phillips, L. 2004, Forest Governance in Federal Systems: An Overview of Experiences and Lesson

Gunderson, L.H. (2000). Ecological resilience – in theory and application. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 31, 425-439.

Gunderson, L.H. and Holling, C.S. *Eds.* (2002). Panarchy: Understanding transformations in human and natural systems. Washington, DC. Island Press.

Muphree, M. J. (2005) Principles for developing a sustainable use system (adapted from Murphree, M. J., Wildlife Division Support Project, CREMA Review Report No. 56. Wildlife Division of the Forestry Commission, Ghana and IUCN. October 2005)

Marshall W Murphree, Phanuel Mugabe and Michael J Murphree, 1998. Socio-economic Considerations in the Community Initiation and Implementation of the M2C2 Programme.; Background Paper For The Gwaai River Workshop, August 4-7 1998.

Pimbert M and J N Pretty, 1997. Parks, People and Professionals: Putting 'Participation' into Protected Areas Management, Michel Pimbert and Jules N. Pretty. *In*: Social Change and Conservation, *Eds. Khrishna B Ghimire and Michel P Pimbert, Earthscan Publications Ltd. UK, 1997*

National Park Management Planning in the Southern Caucasus – Draft Guidelines published by the Transboundary Joint Secretariat for the Southern Caucasus in the framework of the BMZ/KfW Ecoregional Programme for the Southern Caucasus.

Strengthening conventional Protected Area planning in Syria: A Scenario Planning Approach By Michael Murphree, Francis Hurst, Clara Bocchino, With Co-facilitation by Sami Tarabieh, Osama Al-Nouri & Anwar Elhalah, Via Nova Group. Amman, Jordan, 2010

UNDP-GoG Draft Country Programme Document for Georgia 2011 – 2015

APPENDIX I: METT SCORECARD FOR TUSHETI FIELD DEMONSTRATION SITE

Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for Tusheti National Park and Tusheti Nature Reserve

Reporting Progress at Protected Area Sites: Data Sheet 1

Name, affiliation and contact details for person responsible for completing the METT (email etc.)	Tea Barbakadze; National Project Director, Agency of Protected Areas – Head of planning division. (teabarba@yahoo.com) Giorgi Tsintsadze; Consultant; 5 Tamar mefe str. Tbilisi 0112, Georgia (e-mail:giorgitsinstadze@rocketmail.com)		
Date assessment carried out	22 – 31 January, 2011		
Name of protected area	Tusheti State Reserve and National Park		
WDPA site code (these codes can be found on www.unep-wcmc.org/wdpa/)	N/A		
Designations	National X	IUCN Category Strict Nature Reserve: I National Park: II	International (please also complete sheet overleaf) N/A
Country	Georgia		
Location of protected area (province and if possible map reference)	Kakheti Province / Akhmeta Region		
Date of establishment	2003		
Ownership details (please tick)	State X	Private	Community	Other
Management Authority	Tusheti PA Administration under the Agency of Protected Areas of the (The Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Georgia)		
Size of protected area (ha)	83 340,2		
Number of staff	Permanent 24	Temporary 10-12	
Annual budget (US$) – excluding staff salary costs	Recurrent (operational) funds No separate budget	Project or other supplementary funds UNDP/GEF project "Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Areas System"	
What are the main values for which the area is designated	Wildlife, recreation, tourism, cultural heritage.		
List the two primary protected area management objectives			
Management objective 1	Conservation and protection of the ecosystem's biodiversity		
Management objective 2	Improvement of socio-economic status of local communities		

No. of people involved in completing assessment						
Including: (tick boxes)	PA manager	☑	PA staff	☑	Other PA agency staff ☐	NGO ☑
	Local community ☐		Donors	☐	External experts ☑	Other ☐
Please note if assessment was carried out in association with a particular project, on behalf of an organisation or donor.			UNDP/GEF project "Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Areas System"			

Information on International Designations			
UNESCO World Heritage site (see: whc.unesco.org/en/list)			
Date listed	Site name	Site area	Geographical co-ordinates
Criteria for designation (i.e. criteria i to x)			
Statement of Outstanding Universal Value			
Ramsar site (see: www.wetlands.org/RSDB/)			
Date listed	Site name	Site area	Geographical number
Reason for Designation (see Ramsar Information Sheet)			
UNESCO Man and Biosphere Reserves (see: www.unesco.org/mab/wnbrs.shtml)			
Date listed	Site name	Site area Total: Core: Buffer: Transition:	Geographical co-ordinates
Criteria for designation			
Fulfilment of three functions of MAB (conservation, development and logistic support.)			
Please list other designations (i.e. ASEAN Heritage, Natura 2000) and any supporting information below			
Name:	Detail:		
Name:	Detail:		
Name:	Detail:		
Name:	Detail:		
Name:	Detail:		
Name:	Detail:		

Protected Areas Threats: Data Sheet 2

Please tick all relevant existing threats as either of high, medium or low significance. Threats ranked as of **high** significance are those which are seriously degrading values; **medium** are those threats having some negative impact and those characterised as **low** are threats which are present but not seriously impacting values or **N/A** where the threat is not present or not applicable in the protected area.

1. Residential and commercial development within a protected area
Threats from human settlements or other non-agricultural land uses with a substantial footprint

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			X	1.1 Housing and settlement
			X	1.2 Commercial and industrial areas
		X		1.3 Tourism and recreation infrastructure

2. Agriculture and aquaculture within a protected area
Threats from farming and grazing as a result of agricultural expansion and intensification, including silviculture, mariculture and aquaculture

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
		X		2.1 Annual and perennial non-timber crop cultivation
			X	2.1a Drug cultivation
			X	2.2 Wood and pulp plantations
X				2.3 Livestock farming and grazing
			X	2.4 Marine and freshwater aquaculture

3. Energy production and mining within a protected area
Threats from production of non-biological resources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			X	3.1 Oil and gas drilling
			X	3.2 Mining and quarrying
		X		3.3 Energy generation, including from hydropower dams

4. Transportation and service corridors within a protected area
Threats from long narrow transport corridors and the vehicles that use them including associated wildlife mortality

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			X	4.1 Roads and railroads (include road-killed animals)
			X	4.2 Utility and service lines (e.g. electricity cables, telephone lines,)
			X	4.3 Shipping lanes and canals
			X	4.4 Flight paths

5. Biological resource use and harm within a protected area
Threats from consumptive use of "wild" biological resources including both deliberate and unintentional harvesting effects; also persecution or control of specific species (note this includes hunting and killing of animals)

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
	X			5.1 Hunting, killing and collecting terrestrial animals (including killing of animals as a result of human/wildlife conflict)
		X		5.2 Gathering terrestrial plants or plant products (non-timber)
		X		5.3 Logging and wood harvesting
	X			5.4 Fishing, killing and harvesting aquatic resources

6. Human intrusions and disturbance within a protected area
Threats from human activities that alter destroy or disturb habitats and species associated with non-consumptive uses of biological resources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
		X		6.1 Recreational activities and tourism
			X	6.2 War, civil unrest and military exercises
			X	6.3 Research, education and other work-related activities in protected areas
			X	6.4 Activities of protected area managers (e.g. construction or vehicle use, artificial watering points and dams)
			X	6.5 Deliberate vandalism, destructive activities or threats to protected area staff and visitors

7. Natural system modifications
Threats from other actions that convert or degrade habitat or change the way the ecosystem functions

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
		X		7.1 Fire and fire suppression (including arson)
			X	7.2 Dams, hydrological modification and water management/use
		X		7.3a Increased fragmentation within protected area
			X	7.3b Isolation from other natural habitat (e.g. deforestation, dams without effective aquatic wildlife passages)
			X	7.3c Other 'edge effects' on park values
		X		7.3d Loss of keystone species (e.g. top predators, pollinators etc)

8. Invasive and other problematic species and genes
Threats from terrestrial and aquatic non-native and native plants, animals, pathogens/microbes or genetic materials that have or are predicted to have harmful effects on biodiversity following introduction, spread and/or increase

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
		X		8.1 Invasive non-native/alien plants (weeds)
			X	8.1a Invasive non-native/alien animals
			X	8.1b Pathogens (non-native or native but creating new/increased problems)
			X	8.2 Introduced genetic material (e.g. genetically modified organisms)

9. Pollution entering or generated within protected area
Threats from introduction of exotic and/or excess materials or energy from point and non-point sources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			X	9.1 Household sewage and urban waste water
			X	9.1a Sewage and waste water from protected area facilities (e.g. toilets, hotels etc)
			X	9.2 Industrial, mining and military effluents and discharges (e.g. poor water quality discharge from dams, e.g. unnatural temperatures, de-oxygenated, other pollution)
			X	9.3 Agricultural and forestry effluents (e.g. excess fertilizers or pesticides)
		X		9.4 Garbage and solid waste
			X	9.5 Air-borne pollutants
			X	9.6 Excess energy (e.g. heat pollution, lights etc)

10. Geological events
Geological events may be part of natural disturbance regimes in many ecosystems. But they can be a threat if a species or habitat is damaged and has lost its resilience and is vulnerable to disturbance. Management capacity to respond to some of these changes may be limited.

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			X	10.1 Volcanoes
			X	10.2 Earthquakes/Tsunamis
		X		10.3 Avalanches/ Landslides
	X			10.4 Erosion and siltation/ deposition (e.g. shoreline or riverbed changes)

11. Climate change and severe weather
Threats from long-term climatic changes which may be linked to global warming and other severe climatic/weather events outside of the natural range of variation

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
			X	11.1 Habitat shifting and alteration
			X	11.2 Droughts
			X	11.3 Temperature extremes
			X	11.4 Storms and flooding

12. Specific cultural and social threats

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
	X			12.1 Loss of cultural links, traditional knowledge and/or management practices
		X		12.2 Natural deterioration of important cultural site values
			X	12.3 Destruction of cultural heritage buildings, gardens, sites etc

Assessment Form

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
1. Legal status Does the protected area have legal status (or in the case of private reserves is covered by a covenant or similar)? *Context*	The protected area is not gazetted/covenanted	0		Current status - from 2003.	
	There is agreement that the protected area should be gazetted/covenanted but the process has not yet begun	1			
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted/covenanted but the process is still incomplete (includes sites designated under international conventions, such as Ramsar, or local/traditional law such as community conserved areas, which do not yet have national legal status or covenant)	2			
	The protected area has been formally gazetted/covenanted	3	X		
2. Protected area regulations Are appropriate regulations in place to control land use and activities (e.g. hunting)? *Planning*	There are no regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area	0		Regulation and control of existing pasture lands on protected landscapes is one of the main problems. Zoning issues of Tusheti PAs should be reviewed.	
	Some regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area exist but these are major weaknesses	1	X		
	Regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some weaknesses or gaps	2			
	Regulations for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and provide an excellent basis for management	3			
3. Law enforcement Can staff (i.e. those with responsibility for managing the site) enforce protected area rules well enough? *Input*	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0		The number of rangers is not sufficient for proper enforcement of PA internal rules.	
	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget, lack of institutional support)	1	X		
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2			
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	3			

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
4. Protected area objectives Is management undertaken according to agreed objectives? *Planning*	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0		Since Tusheti PAs management plan is currently outdated, PAs are managed by agreed annual work plans.	
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1			
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is only partially managed according to these objectives	2	X		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3			
5. Protected area design Is the protected area the right size and shape to protect species, habitats, ecological processes and water catchments of key conservation concern? *Planning*	Inadequacies in protected area design mean achieving the major objectives of the protected area is very difficult	0		Traditional hunting methods are totally ignored. Hunting is not properly regulated.	
	Inadequacies in protected area design mean that achievement of major objectives is difficult but some mitigating actions are being taken (e.g. agreements with adjacent land owners for wildlife corridors or introduction of appropriate catchment management)	1	X		
	Protected area design is not significantly constraining achievement of objectives, but could be improved (e.g. with respect to larger scale ecological processes)	2			
	Protected area design helps achievement of objectives; it is appropriate for species and habitat conservation; and maintains ecological processes such as surface and groundwater flows at a catchment scale, natural disturbance patterns etc	3			
6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? *Process*	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0		New demarcation needs to be conducted.	
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1			
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents/neighbouring land users but is not appropriately demarcated	2	X		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents/neighbouring land users and is appropriately demarcated	3			

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
7. Management plan Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? *Planning*	There is no management plan for the protected area	0		The term of current management plan expired in 2008. Currently, provisional regulation rules have been developed, but not enforced.	The new management plan elaboration is underway.
	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1	X		
	A management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2			
	A management plan exists and is being implemented	3			
Additional points: *Planning*					
7a. Planning process	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1	X	Planning process is undertaken by participation and consultation with the Scientific Council members.	
7b. Planning process	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1			
7c. Planning process	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1			
8. Regular work plan Is there a regular work plan and is it being implemented *Planning/Outputs*	No regular work plan exists	0		Annual work plans of individual PAs are agreed with APA and implemented by individual PAs.	Work-plans should correspond to the new management plan.
	A regular work plan exists but few of the activities are implemented	1			
	A regular work plan exists and many activities are implemented	2	X		
	A regular work plan exists and all activities are implemented	3			
9. Resource inventory Do you have enough information to manage the area?	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0		Within the framework of UNDP/GEF project soc-economic, biodiversity assessment and bio-monitoring reports have been elaborated, which contain sufficient information in this respect.	During planning new management plans all available information will be considered.
	Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1			
	Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for most key areas of planning and decision making	2	X		

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
Input	Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support all areas of planning and decision making	3			
10. Protection systems Are systems in place to control access/resource use in the protected area? *Process/Outcome*	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) do not exist or are not effective in controlling access/resource use	0		Illegal hunting cannot be properly controlled. Pasturing is partially controlled. There are no problems with controlling of the illegal lodging of timber wood.	It is planned to establish new patrolling/anti-poaching mechanisms at Tusheti PA in 2011.
	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access/resource use	1	X		
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access/resource use	2			
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access/ resource use	3			
11. Research Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work? *Process*	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0		Existing data is not completely processed and systematized.	It is planned to implement the bio-monitoring plan in 2011.
	There is a small amount of survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	1			
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2	X		
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3			
12. Resource management Is active resource management being undertaken? *Process*	Active resource management is not being undertaken	0		Issues related to hunting and pasturing are not still properly regulated.	
	Very few of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values are being implemented	1			
	Many of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and, cultural values are being implemented but some key issues are not being addressed	2	X		
	Requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and, cultural values are being substantially or fully implemented	3			
13. Staff numbers Are there enough people employed to manage the protected	There are no staff	0		Number of staff is sufficient at the given moment. However number of rangers is critical and doesn't allow proper operation of certain activities.	
	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1			
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2	X		

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
area? *Inputs*	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the protected area	3			
14. Staff training Are staff adequately trained to fulfil management objectives? *Inputs/Process*	Staff lack the skills needed for protected area management	0		Several trainings have been organized for Tusheti PA staff, e.g.: • Forums guide's training course – 2008, APA, Elkana, EPF • Fire Safety Planning and Leadership 29.03 – 2.04.2009 - USAID • Communication with the community 29-30.09.2010 NACRES • Skills of Successful Partnership 24-28.05.2010 - USAID • Wilderness First Aid skills 19-20 november, 2010 - NACRES	It is planned to organize trainings in bio-monitoring, patrolling, economic valuation, tourism marketing etc. under the UNDP/GEF project.
	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1			
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2	X		
	Staff training and skills are aligned with the management needs of the protected area	3			
15. Current budget Is the current budget sufficient? *Inputs*	There is no budget for management of the protected area	0		Since there is centralized system the APA allocates funds needed for Tusheti PAs with consultation of TPA management.	
	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1			
	The available budget is acceptable but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2	X		
	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3			
16. Security of budget Is the budget secure? *Inputs*	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or highly variable funding	0		Budgets are allocated by the APA. Government could potentially cut funding.	
	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1	X		
	There is a reasonably secure core budget for regular operation of the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2			

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs	3			
17. Management of budget Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs? *Process*	Budget management is very poor and significantly undermines effectiveness (e.g. late release of budget in financial year)	0		A detailed budget for management plan needs to be developed	It is planned to elaborate the new management plan for Tusheti PAs as well as business plan in 2011.
	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1	X		
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2			
	Budget management is excellent and meets management needs	3			
18. Equipment Is equipment sufficient for management needs? *Input*	There are little or no equipment and facilities for management needs	0		There is need of some equipment; e.g. Portable radio transmitters are in bad condition.	FFI –NACRES project intends to provide certain equipment for Tusheti PA administration.
	There are some equipment and facilities but these are inadequate for most management needs	1			
	There are equipment and facilities, but still some gaps that constrain management	2	X		
	There are adequate equipment and facilities	3			
19. Maintenance of equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? *Process*	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0			
	There is some *ad hoc* maintenance of equipment and facilities	1			
	There is basic maintenance of equipment and facilities	2	X		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3			
20. Education and awareness Is there a planned	There is no education and awareness programme	0			
	There is a limited and *ad hoc* education and awareness programme	1			

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
education programme linked to the objectives and needs? *Process*	There is an education and awareness programme but it only partly meets needs and could be improved	2	X		
	There is an appropriate and fully implemented education and awareness programme	3			
21. Planning for land and water use Does land and water use planning recognise the protected area and aid the achievement of objectives? *Planning*	Adjacent land and water use planning does not take into account the needs of the protected area and activities/policies are detrimental to the survival of the area	0			
	Adjacent land and water use planning does not takes into account the long term needs of the protected area, but activities are not detrimental the area	1			
	Adjacent land and water use planning partially takes into account the long term needs of the protected area	2	X		
	Adjacent land and water use planning fully takes into account the long term needs of the protected area	3			
Additional points: Land and water planning					
21a: Land and water planning for habitat conservation	Planning and management in the catchment or landscape containing the protected area incorporates provision for adequate environmental conditions (e.g. volume, quality and timing of water flow, air pollution levels etc) to sustain relevant habitats.	+1			
21b: Land and water planning for connectivity	Management of corridors linking the protected area provides for wildlife passage to key habitats outside the protected area (e.g. to allow migratory fish to travel between freshwater spawning sites and the sea, or to allow animal migration).	+1			
21c: Land and water planning for ecosystem services & species conservation	"Planning adresses ecosystem-specific needs and/or the needs of particular species of concern at an ecosystem scale (e.g. volume, quality and timing of freshwater flow to sustain particular species, fire management to maintain savannah habitats etc.)"	+1			
22. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users	0		There is quite intense cooperation with local government authorities.	
	There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users but little or no cooperation	1			

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
with adjacent land and water users? *Process*	There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users, but only some co-operation	2	<u>X</u>		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users, and substantial co-operation on management	3			
23. Indigenous people Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the protected area have input to management decisions? *Process*	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0			
	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management	1			
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some relevant decisions relating to management but their involvement could be improved	2	X		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in all relevant decisions relating to management, e.g. co-management	3			
24. Local communities Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? *Process*	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0			
	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management	1			
	Local communities directly contribute to some relevant decisions relating to management but their involvement could be improved	2	X		
	Local communities directly participate in all relevant decisions relating to management, e.g. co-management	3			
Additional points *Local communities/indigenous people*					
24 a. Impact on communities	There is open communication and trust between local and/or indigenous people, stakeholders and protected area managers	+1			

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
24b. Impact on communities	Programmes to enhance community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1	X	Several programs in this respect are underway, e.g.: FFI – NACRES Project GTA/EPF Solar systems for Tusheti CzDA Renewable Energy Systems for Tusheti	
24c. Impact on communities	Local and/or indigenous people actively support the protected area	+1			
25. Economic benefit Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities, e.g. income, employment, payment for environmental services? *Outcomes*	The protected area does not deliver any economic benefits to local communities	0		PAs are having benefits for local communities and especially for those who are involved in tourism sector (e.g. Guest-house owners, traditional handicraft makers, etc.)	
	Potential economic benefits are recognised and plans to realise these are being developed	1			
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities	2	X		
	There is a major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities associated with the protected area	3			
26. Monitoring and evaluation Are management activities monitored against performance? *Planning/Process*	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0		APA conducts systematic monitoring and evaluation process of individual PAs. Tusheti PA administration provides monthly/quarterly/annual reports.	
	There is some *ad hoc* monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1			
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results do not feed back into management	2	X		
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3			
27. Visitor facilities Are visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services despite an identified need	0			CNF is planning to implement the infrastructure
	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation	1			

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
adequate? *Outputs*	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2	X		development programme for Tusheti PA
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3			
28. Commercial tourism operators Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management? *Process*	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0			
	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1			
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2	X		
	There is good co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, and maintain protected area values	3			
29. Fees If fees (i.e. entry fees or fines) are applied, do they help protected area management? *Inputs/Process*	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0		Fees are collected and revenues mainly come from tourism services.	In 2011 it is planned to test tourist entrance fee collection system at Tusheti PA.
	Fees are collected, but make no contribution to the protected area or its environs	1			
	Fees are collected, and make some contribution to the protected area and its environs	2	X		
	Fees are collected and make a substantial contribution to the protected area and its environs	3			
30. Condition of values What is the condition of the important values of the protected area as compared to when it was first designated? *Outcomes*	Many important biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded	0			
	Some biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded	1			
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2	X		
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3			
Additional Points: Condition of values					

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
30a: Condition of values	The assessment of the condition of values is based on research and/or monitoring	+1			
30b: Condition of values	Specific management programmes are being implemented to address threats to biodiversity, ecological and cultural values	+1			
30c: Condition of values	Activities to maintain key biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are a routine part of park management	+1			
TOTAL SCORE		**56**			

ANNEX 9

Co-financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (mill US$)			Government (mill US$)			NGOs (BP/EURASIA Partnership Foundation, WWF – Mava, EU/FFI-NACRES and IUCN) (mill US$)			Total Financing (mill US$)			Total Disbursement (mill US$)	
	Proposed (CEO document)	Actual (Inception Report)	06.2009-01.2011	Proposed (CEO document)	Actual (Inception Report)	06.2009-01.2011	Proposed (CEO document)	Actual (Inception Report)	06.2009-02.2011	Proposed (CEO document)	Actual (Inception Report)	06.2009-01.2011	Proposed	Actual
In kind	-	-	-	11,648,000.00	11,648,000.00	6,147,555.56	1,895,416.00	1,895,416.00	1,000,358.44	13,543,416.00	13,543,416.00	7,147,914.00	13,543,416.00	7,147,914.00
In cash	190,420.00	190,420.00	104,444.61	-	-	-	-	-	-	190,420.00	190,420.00	104,444.61	190,420.00	104,444.61
Totals	190,420.00	190,420.00	104,444.61	11,648,000.00	11,648,000.00	6,147,555.56	1,895,416.00	1,895,416.00	1,000,358.44	13,733,836.00	13,733,836.00	7,252,358.61	13,733,836.00	7,252,358.61

Task Report on Workshops and Meetings for Facilitating Establishment of Partnerships between the Small Companies and Locals, NACRES November 2010

Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Areas System INCEPTION REPORT October 2009

Task Report on Assessment for Tusheti PA Reclassification, NACRES June 2010

Report on Socio-economic survey Tusheti PA Complex, Irakli Sakandelidze and Helen Anthem, NACRES December 2010

Sub - Plan for Tourism Development and Marketing for Tusheti Protected Area Complex, Olaf Malver, Ph.D., Nvember 2010

Report on Biodiversity Assessment of Tusheti Protected Areas Complex, NACRES, November 2010

Training Needs Assessment and Selection of a Host Institution, ECFDC & GCCW, DRAFT

Economic Valuation of the Tusheti Protected Areas Complex and the Georgian Protected Areas Network, ECFDC & GCCW, DRAFT

Overall Assessment of Revenue Options and Cost-saving Opportunities for Improved Natural Resource Management, ECFDC & GCCW, DRAFT

Diversification of the Revenue Mechanisms Portfolio, ECFDC & GCCW, DRAFT

Guidelines and Standard Format for Business Planning for IUCN Category I and II Protected Areas in Georgia, ECFDC & GCCW, DRAFT

"Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Areas System" PIMS 3957 Project Document

REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL "Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Areas System" PIMS 3957 Project Document

Biodiversity GEF Tracking Tool (METT) "Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia's Protected Areas System" PIMS 3957

2010 UNDP Annual Project Review (APR) and Project Implementation Report (PIR) combined

Minutes of PEB Meetings

ToR and RFP for Contractors

PIMS 3957 Quarterly Reports

Minutes of meetings with Contractors[1]

---

[1] Please note that this list is not exhaustive