



2013 Annual Project Review (APR)

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

PIMS 4347 - Project Title: Integrated natural resource management in the Baikal Basin transboundary ecosystem.

Focal Area	Multiple Focal Area
Lead RTA	
Lead Country(ies)	(MON) Mongolia(RUS) Russian Federation
Revised Planned Closing Date	
Overall Risk rating	Low
Overall DO rating	Satisfactory
Overall IP rating	Highly Satisfactory
GEF grant amount disbursed so far	1,365,065

Project Summary

Lake Baikal, situated in eastern Siberia on the Russian border with Mongolia, is the world's oldest (>25 million years old) and deepest lake (1,637 m). It contains 20 percent of the Earth's fresh surface water and supports a diverse and highly endemic flora and fauna. Although the lake is in Russia, the catchment around this vast freshwater reservoir (Baikal Lake Basin) is a transboundary resource extending over a 500,000 km² area shared between Russia and Mongolia, with over 300 rivers and streams. Ongoing pressure to expand the economy in both countries is driving the largely uncontrolled expansion of industrial, agricultural and urban developments within the watershed on both sides of the lake. These developments have increased the number and types of inputs and the release of nutrients and persistent toxic substances. While the lake waters remain relatively clean (due to mixing and the sheer volume of the lake) localized contamination and eutrophication events have reportedly increased, particularly within certain heavily impacted areas. Continuation of this pressure on the watershed has serious implications for the local indigenous population and the wildlife supported by this once pristine lacustrine ecosystem. In recognition of their shared responsibility for this preservation of this globally important ecosystem, the countries have attempted to establish joint monitoring and management programmes. The intention of the proposed Project is to assist the countries to revitalize these agreements, harmonize policies and facilitate the establishment of an effective transboundary integrated water resource management regime to reduce land-based sources of contamination and ensure the sustainable use of this vast, ancient and unique fresh water reservoir for the benefit of future generations.

UNDP-GEF Technical Advisor's Comments

Explanation for change to Overall DO Rating or Overall IP Rating:

Is this the terminal PIR that will serve as the final project report? No

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was started but not completed this reporting period, please explain how these are progressing and note if any delays are expected:

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was completed this reporting period, or if this is the final APR/PIR, please address the following points here:

UNDP Country Office's Comments

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was started but not completed this reporting period, please explain how these are progressing and note if any delays are expected:

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was completed this reporting period, or if this is the final APR/PIR, please address the following points here:

Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board meetings during reporting period:

April 2013

PROGRESS TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2009	Level at 30 June 2010	Level at 30 June 2011	Level at 30 June 2012	Level at 30 June 2013
To spearhead integrated natural resource management of the Lake Baikal / Selenga River Basin (including Lake Hövsgöl in Mongolia), ensuring ecosystem resilience and reduced water quality threats in the context of sustainable economic development.	1) Baikal Basin Strategic Action Programme, including mitigation strategies to address climate change to focal species and aquatic/riparian habitat and strategies for invasive species. 2) National Action Plans for national portions of Baikal Basin.	Not completed, approved or adopted.	Completed, approved, and adopted by EoP (end of project)					The preliminary TDA has been revised. Updated TDA additionally includes specific studies like climate change assessment, groundwater pollution risks and ground / surface water intermixing, Selenga Delta study and etc.SAP team will be formed at the end of 2013. SAP will be prepared based on the TDA in 2014 and will be analyzed and endorsed in 2015.
	The long-term security of aquatic biodiversity for at least three sub-basins in the transboundary Baikal Basin as measured by the # of hectares in target sub-basins under improved management.	Zero hectares in these three sub-basins have watershed management plans mainstreamed with biodiversity conservation objectives.	Target: 11,047,790 hectares Russia: Tugnuy-Sukhara basin (4,640,000 ha) Mongolia: Ider River basin (2,275,730 ha) Egiin River basin 4,132,060 ha					Two sub-basin management plans for Russia (Tugnuy-Sukhara and Khilok) have been completed and endorsed by government. Russia: Tugnuy-Sukhara basin (4,640,000 ha) Three sub-basin management plans for Mongolia (Ider, Eg and Orkhon) are ready on 50% and

								will be finished by the end of 2013.
	Pollution levels in pollution hot spot monitoring areas.	Mercury, other mining pollutants at elevated levels in hot spot areas. Specific levels TBD at inception.	Reduction of at least 20% in target areas by EoP.					Hot spot assessment has been made for Russia and Mongolia. Pollution levels have been detected.
	Ecosystem resilience parameters for Hovsgol Lake. - Nutrient concentrations: soluble reactive phosphorus (SRP) /Chlorophyl-a) - Secchi depth - Abundance and age structure of Hovsgol grayling	SRP: 0.5-2; Chl-a: 0.2-1 16-20 meters TBD first summer season of project.	Targets: SRP & Chl-a: No upward change; Secchi depth: no reduction. Abundance and age structure: maintained at baseline levels.					This indicator has been removed on the Second Steering Committee Meeting because of absence of any annual monitoring programs.
	# of productive sector policies and regulations that incorporate biodiversity management and ecosystem resilience objectives in Russian and Mongolian portions of Baikal Basin. (Improved enabling environment for biodiversity conservation in target productive sectors of tourism, recreation and mining.)	Zero	By EoP a total of 10 policies or regulations modified to incorporate measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity: - Tourism: Revised and enhanced tourism plans adopted/not adopted by three target PA in Russia. - Mining: At least 2 policies modified in each country, for total of four. - Sport fishing: At least 1 regulation or policy modified by 2 protected areas in Russia. - Watershed management planning: at least one watershed management planning policy modified in each country.					4 policies or regulations have been modified: - Tourism: two tourism plans adopted and endorsed in two PA in Russia (Baikal State Nature Biosphere Reserve and Zabaikalsky National Park) - Watershed management planning: 2 watershed management plans have been prepared and endorsed.
	Replication quantification measure: # of resource users applying biodiversity mainstreaming practices in	Zero	At least 5 mining companies in Russia by EOP. At least 5 tourism companies in Russia					Two tourism plans have been revised and adopted for two protected areas in

	mining and tourism sectors in Russia Baikal Basin.		by EoP					Russia Two workshop on tourism development in protected natural areas of Buryatia was held The International Ecological Tourism Forum "Ecotourism in Baikal 20" was organized 10 tourism companies in Russia have been involved in ecotourism sector with PA.
	Trend of Taimen and Grayling populations in two types of riverine habitat: healthy "stronghold" habitat and degraded "troubled" habitat.	Trend is stable at healthy population levels in strongholds. Egiin River Taimen: 19 individuals/km Trend is downward or stable at low population levels in troubled areas.	No change in health population dynamic. i.e.: Egiin River: at least 19 individuals/km No deterioration or upward trend of at least 10% improvement.					No change in health population dynamic.
Stakeholders Elaborate and Adopt a strategic Policy and Planning Framework.	Completed TDA by end of project yr.1	Preliminary TDA during project PPG	Agreed and jointly implemented TDA/SAP providing road map for ecosystem protection, and addressing epidemiological concerns, groundwater pollution issues and attention to high risk industrial hot spots.					The TDA has been completed.
	Improved mainstreaming of biodiversity primary and secondary impact considerations into the EIA reporting within the Russian portion of the Basin. # of SAP implementation pilots developed for implementation in	Biodiversity mentioned in reports but little analysis of potential impacts and no alternative steps proposed in 90% of EIA. No concepts developed.	At least 50% of the EIA reports show measurable improvement in treatment of primary and secondary impact considerations for mining and tourism development projects.					EIA approaches have been analyzed and recommendations for their enhancement have been developed.

	Mongolian portion of the Basin.							
	New policy and regulatory frameworks incorporating groundwater assessment results.	Some data available on industrial pollution hot spots and on groundwater, but with significant gaps and not linked to .	[not given]					The groundwater assessment has been completed. Policy recommendations for sustainable, integrated management of transboundary groundwater and surface water resources into country National Water Master Plan have been developed.
	Baikal Basin-Wide Pollution Hot Spot Analysis and Reporting Methodology adopted/not adopted by Joint Commission on Baikal Basin	No such basin-wide methodology exists or adopted.	Adopted by year 2.					Baikal Basin-Wide Pollution Hot Spot Analysis and Reporting Methodology is preparing.
	Groundwater protection policy recommendations approved/not approved by the Joint Commission on Baikal Basin.	No such policies exist.	Approved by end of year 3.					Policy recommendations for sustainable, integrated management of transboundary groundwater and surface water resources into country National Water Master Plan have been developed.
	Model sub-basin Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) properly assessed and mapped.	No EFH.	At least 12 EFH by year 3 of the project.					n/a
	# of sub-basin watershed management plans that	None.	At least 2 by end of year 4.					2 sub-basin management plans for

	incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services management objectives.							Russia (Tugnuy-Sukhara and Khilok) have been completed and endorsed by government.
Institutional strengthening for IWRM.	Governments of Russia and Mongolia extend/do not extend legal status to Joint Commission on Baikal Basin.	Joint Russian-Mongolian Task Force on Transboundary Waters Use is not a legal entity.	Legal status obtained under Russian and Mongolian law by end of year 3.					Concept paper and road map for the process of developing and enhancing the legal and institutional framework of bilateral transboundary water cooperation have been developed. During Second Steering Committee Meeting the decision of preparation of new bilateral agreement with Joint Commission structure has been made.
	Full-time Executive Director of Joint Commission appointed/not appointed.	No full time director of Joint Task Force.	Appointed by year 4.					No full time director of Joint Task Force.
	# of National and/or regional Baikal or Selenga inter-ministerial commissions or working groups in Russia and Mongolia.	1 – the Baikal Commission in Russia.	2 additional by EoP: - A Selenga Working Group or Commission in Mongolia; - A Selenga Delta/Baikal Working Group in Buryatia					5 – the Baikal Commission in Russia, the Plenipotentiaries working group in Russia, the Plenipotentiaries working group in Mongolia, the joint Russian-Mongolian commission on environmental protection

								“Cooperation in Environment Conservation” and the National Water Committee in Mongolia (it was established in 2012)
	% improvement in knowledge of key technical aspects of ecosystem-based IWRM management in the following institutions: Baikalkumvod, Buryat regional authorities, PA of Russian Baikal; Water Authority of Mongolia, Ministry of Nature Environment and Tourism (Mongolia); # of people in staff trained in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ecological resilience modeling • IWRM and basin planning • ecological monitoring and risk assessment • EIAs, industrial site inspections • GIS & spatial planning • Avoidance and containment of invasive species • Enforcement of water quality and biodiversity regulations. 	Knowledge level TBD at beginning of each training by brief test;	At least 30% improvement for all trainees. - Baikalkumvod: At least 20 people trained. - Buryat regional authorities: at least 30 people. - PA of Russian Baikal: at least 30 people from 3 PA. - Water Authority of Mongolia; at least 20 people; - Ministry of Nature Environment and Tourism (Mongolia): at least 30 people. In total at least 130 people trained by EoP.					- Buryat regional authorities: 10 people. - PA of Russian Baikal: 30 people from 5 PA. - Ministry of Nature Resources (Russia): 20 people. In total 60 people trained.
	Strengthened status of Joint Commission.	Joint Commission has no legal status or authority/capacity to do anything.	Legal status granted by Russia/Mongolia, with first-ever executive director employed.					New agreement has not been developed and signed. New Joint Commission has not been established.
	# of data parameters jointly monitored on a quarterly basis by the two countries across the Baikal Basin to enable comparability of water quality	Zero	At least 6 by year 3.					The Harmonized water quality monitoring program for the Baikal Basin has been developed. At list 13 of

	and species data.							data parameters jointly monitored by the two countries across the Baikal Basin. About 30 parameters have been harmonized.
Demonstrating technologies for water quality and biodiversity mainstreaming.	% by which 4 pilot mining sites reduce water pollution due to mainstreaming demonstrations.	Baseline to be set during yr 1.	At least 30% by end of year 4.					3 pilot project in different mining sites were started in 2013.
	# of cases of anthrax diagnosed per year in Barguzinsky and Kurumkansky Districts of the Republic of Buryatia.	8 in 2009.	0 by end of project.					The Strategy for (dead) livestock disposal has been developed. 0 cases in 2010,2011,2012.
	# of eco-tourism plans approved at regional level (Oblast, Republic) in Russia-Baikal Basin with biodiversity management objectives mainstreamed. # of SAP pilot concepts developed under IW work in Mongolia.	Zero	At least 3 in Russian portion of Baikal Basin by EoP. At least 3 Aimag-level SAP pilot concepts in Mongolian portion by EoP.					2 eco-tourism plans approved in Russian portion of Baikal Basin
	Increase in investment in sustainable ecotourism over life of the project in pilot PA within the Baikal Basin	2010 fiscal year will be the Baseline to be confirmed at project inception.	At least an increase in US\$10 million by end of Project over baseline levels.					In 2012 The State Baikal Biosphere Reserve has got 37 700 000 RUB ~ \$1 216 129.03 USD In 2013: - Tunkinski National Park - 32 100 000 RUB ~ \$1 035 483.87 USD - Zabaikalski National Park 3 900 000 RUB ~ \$125 806.45 USD - State Baikal Biosphere Reserve - 52 300 000 RUB - \$1 687 096.77 USD - Baikalo-Lenski

								Reserve 8 100 000 RUB ~ \$261 290.32 USD Additionally for eco-tourism development for different PA: 2012 - 13 400 000 RUB ~ \$432 258.06 USD 2013 - 16 300 000 RUB ~ \$525 806.45 USD
	# of website hits made by Baikal region and Russian/Mongolian stakeholders accessing the Baikal Information Center website.	Zero	Increasing levels during years 2-4 of the project of at least 10% year over year.					Baikal Information Center website has been established. http://bic.iwlearn.org
	# of organizations around the Baikal region using the first of an annual "State of the Baikal-Hovsgol Basin" report in Russian, Mongolian and English (Universities, Libraries, Local and National government offices, Management entities and Schools) in Russian and Mongolian portions of the Baikal Basin.	2010 fiscal year will be the Baseline to be confirmed at project inception.	Published by EoY 4. At least 90 distributed to 30 institutions by EoP; At least 20 downloads of PDF file by country per year.					Report does not yet exist.
	# of km of Baikal shoreline and tributary rivers cleaned of litter/solid waste; # of news articles published on this cleaning work around Lake Baikal.	0 0	50 by EoP 20 by EoP					35 km 50 media sources

RATINGS OF PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

DO Rating: Please review the Development Objective Progress page of this APR/PIR and then answer the questions below. A DO rating will be generated based on your answers.	
1	Please rate the cumulative progress being made toward achieving the end-of-project targets as reported in the project results framework in the DO page of this APR/PIR
2	Please rate the likelihood that the project will deliver environmental and social benefits for an extended period after project completion?
3	Please rate the likelihood that social or political risks may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes
Project Manager/Coordinator: Is the person managing the day to day operations of the project.	
MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.	
1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating.
2.	Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet.
3.	Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress.
4.	Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU.
Overall 2009 Rating	
Overall 2010 Rating	
Overall 2011 Rating	
Overall 2012 Rating	
2013 Rating	Highly Satisfactory
Comments	<p>Firstly, the Baikal project has achieved its annual major global environmental objectives and has yielded substantial global environmental benefits without major shortcomings. Approved first year budget of the Project has been realized by 95.41%. The Project participated in different events relevant to its goals and tasks, as well as it supported their organization. Totally in 2012, Project implementation bureau staff took part in 29 events. Moreover 50 media sources published information about project activities. The Project web-site has been launched. It works now in Russian, Mongolian and English. Information is regularly updated. RSS channels are functional in three languages as well. Separately it is important to underline that the preliminary TDA has been revised. In TDA a prioritisation of problem areas appears was justified. The major problem area is modification of hydrological flows because of climate change impact and increasing of water demands. It was found that gaps exist in monitoring data and it is necessary to harmonise of monitoring methods and standards. The levels of water pollution were on the same level. Additionally TDA revision shows necessity of: preparation of an overview of groundwater and</p>

surface water use per sector; preparation of a sustainable landuse strategies (e.g. agroforestry, reforestation sustainable agriculture, etc.) based on land degradation hotspot maps; analysis of economic benefits of ecosystem services provided by healthy aquatic and terrestrial systems, and economic losses from unsustainable land use; promotion of a structured, integrated approach to sustainable transboundary natural resource management, including enhanced cooperation in science, technology and policy; enhancement of legal transboundary frameworks. Secondly, the general trend in achievement of all outcomes is positive and stable. From 2012 to 2020 the Russian government will invest about 2 billion USD into the Baikal territory for environment protection actions. Mongolian economy grows about 20% per year and government invests time and recourses into green economy. New water law entered into force in 2011. Mongolian government actively builds water management infrastructure. In 2012 more than 15 sub-basin management authorities were established. Thirdly, it is necessary to mention about one risk that might effect on progress. According to project document signed by both governments the current 1995 bilateral agreement "Protection and Use of Transboundary Waters" (PUTW) between the Russian Federation and Mongolia needs to be enhanced. New agreement has to be signed and new commission has to be capacitated. During the Inception Steering Committee meeting Mongolian representatives mentioned that official government opinion is to remain the current structures. Therefore the project supported existing structures in 2012 year and improved knowledge of responsible governmental person in international legal aspects of transboundary water cooperation. Project supported the Plenipotentiaries meeting and their working group. The concept paper and the road map for the process of developing and enhancing the legal and institutional framework of bilateral transboundary water cooperation have been developed. The learning exchange with Sava River Basin Commission has been organized. However on the Second Steering Committee meeting the decision of new agreement preparation was made. Mongolia is upstream country and has plans of dam construction for water supply and energy production purposes. World Bank is going to finance this activity. Russia worries that these plans might have negative effect on Lake Baikal, UNESCO world heritage site. The Mongolian government thinks that new agreement will block these plans. Therefore the new agreement signature and new commission formation might have a delay. Finally, the fundamental principle and philosophy of success is how consistently the Project understands, meets and delivers customer requirements. An effective quality management system underpins a successful project by providing direction in a systematic and transparent manner. Satisfaction of the client, however, does not mean that your project should rush to finish the work on time without ensuring that standards are met. The reputation of UNOPS and UNDP would depend on the quality of your project's delivery. To ensure that GEF, UNDP, countries' governments and other stakeholders are happy at the end of your project, it is needed to manage expectations carefully. The Lake Baikal (LB) Project did good use of UNOPS management procedures including Prince2 methods that the Baikal project team carefully followed at the right time. All necessary management documents, policies and information were taken from UNOPS intranet resource. Moreover, it is important to emphasize the significant role of science and scientific organizations involved in all the project's activities. In addition desired goals would not be reached without careful studying of lessons learned of previous IW projects. The LB project worked very tightly with the UNDP-GEF IW:Learn project and actively used IW:Learn's web portal. The project team was fully motivated and worked like one living organism. Each team member's voice was heard and considered. The project organized different trainings and learning courses for the team members who were always involved in most important project events and activities. The

	team really felt as being a part of big international family of UN.
UNDP Country Office Programme Officer: Is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project.	
MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.	
1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating, for example, if your rating differs from the rating provided by the project manager please explain why.
2.	Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet.
3.	Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress.
4.	Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU.
Overall 2009 Rating	
Overall 2010 Rating	
Overall 2011 Rating	
Overall 2012 Rating	
2013 Rating	(S) Satisfactory
Comments	<p>This is the first PIR submitted by the project. The project has been demonstrating very efficient performance and made a good progress towards its development objective. It is likely that the project development objective and outcome indicators will be achieved by the end of the project. Therefore the project is being rated as satisfactory with a good potential to achieve highly satisfactory results over the next years. The project team managed to establish good working relationships with and buy in from key national partners in the Russian Federation and Mongolia and enjoys trust and respect among national and local stakeholders. The project is open to partnerships and effectively manages relationships with new partners. High level of technical expertise and professionalism is secured through the engagement with key academic and scientific institutions and experts including the Moscow State University and the Russian Academy of Science as well as with the partner international organizations (UNESCO, OECD, etc.). The key substantive achievements of the project include development of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis for the Baikal Basin, an integrated/harmonized monitoring programme, development of local sub-basin integrated management plans and sustainable tourism plans, launch of demonstration projects on dead livestock disposal. The latter outputs (tourism and livestock) secure important social and developmental benefits of this project on top of the scientific value and institutional capacity building. Environmental awareness and education work of the GEF project is strengthened through a partnership with the UNDP-Coca Cola \\\\"Every Drop Matters\\\\" programme in the Russian part of the Baikal Basin with a series of educational initiatives and community small grants (co-financing leveraged by the UNDP/GEF project). Through these activities the project has built effective cooperation with local environmental NGOs, CSOs and educational institutions. An updated Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) for the Baikal lake Basin is the key output delivered by the project to-date. An updated TDA lays the ground for the development of a Strategic Action Programme and national action plan for the integrated water and nature resources management in the Baikal Basin. During the reporting period the TDA has been updated with the information on water quality and pollution levels, the hot spots analysis, the ground water analysis and the climate change impacts study for the Baikal lake basin. It is important that the project in</p>

	the future years further pursues institutional strengthening for effective integrated transboundary water and natural resources management in the Baikal Basin with Russian and Mongolian government partners. It is also recommended for the project to further align its implementation with the Russian national target investment programme for the Baikal region.
--	--

Project Implementing Partner: Is the representative of the executing agency (in GEF terminology). This would be Government (for NEX/NIM execution) or NGO (for CSO Execution) or an official from the Executing Agency (for example UNOPS).

RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for projects under implementation in one country and regional projects.

Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.

1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating.
2.	Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet.
3.	Provide recommendations for next steps.

GEF Operational Focal point: Is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point.

HIGHLY RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.

Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.

1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating.
2.	Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet.
3.	Provide recommendations for next steps.

Other Partners: For jointly implemented projects, a representative of the other Agency working with UNDP on project implementation (for example UNEP or the World Bank).

RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for jointly implemented projects.

Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.

1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating.
2.	Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet.
3.	Provide recommendations for next steps.

UNDP Technical Adviser: Is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser.	
MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for all projects.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.	
1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating (do not repeat the project objective).
2.	Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet.
3.	Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress.
4.	Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU.
UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser	
Overall 2009 Rating	
Overall 2010 Rating	
Overall 2011 Rating	
Overall 2012 Rating	
2013 Rating	(S) Satisfactory
Comments	<p>The project is well advancing in its implementation and is making a good progress towards its development objective. Most of the outcomes and outputs foreseen in the work plan for the reporting period have been delivered, therefore the project can be rated satisfactory. The project is managed by a dedicated project manager that was able to build a strong project team, two national directors are greatly supporting the work of the PCU in Ulan-Ude. The project team established excellent network of key national partners in the Russian Federation and Mongolia, that are fully supportive of the project implementation. The project is well supported by both governments and other important stakeholders. This project is also a good example of the inter agency partnership, the ground water component and the hot spot report are prepared with a strong support from IHP UNESCO. Environmental awareness and education work of the project is strengthened through a partnership with the UNDP-Coca Cola \\\\\"Every Drop Matters\\\\\\" project. Some major outputs, delivered during the reporting period include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis for the lake Baikal Basin, • integrated/harmonized monitoring programme, • local sub-basin integrated management plans and sustainable tourism plans, • hot spots analysis report and methodology • Baikal information center website • ground water analysis report, and • the climate change impacts study

	for the Baikal lake basin. It should be noted that due to reluctance from both government the project was not able to develop the new agreement for the lake Baikal watershed and there is no progress in establishment of the new Joint Commission. The project, though have prepared all the necessary documentation and guiding principles for this work, including the review of existing river-lake commissions in other regions.
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as 'good practice'.
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING

IP rating: Please review the Implementation Progress page of this APR/PIR and then answer the questions below. An overall IP rating will be generated based on your answers.	
1	Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this APR/PIR)?
2	Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?)
3	Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively?
4	Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the APR/PIR last year?
5	Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation
Project Manager/Coordinator: Is the person managing the day to day operations of the project.	
MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.	
1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating.
2.	Summarize annual progress and address timelines of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans.
3.	Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation.
Overall 2009 Rating	(-) No rating submitted or requested for this year
Overall 2010 Rating	(-) No rating submitted or requested for this year
Overall 2011 Rating	(-) No rating submitted or requested for this year
Overall 2012 Rating	(-) No rating submitted or requested for this year
2013 Rating	(HS) Highly Satisfactory
Comments	Project Annual workplan for 2012 year was developed and approved during The Inception Steering Committee meeting. Project activities were implemented minimum on 90% on-time in accordance with regulation and rules and in full transparency and accountability. Within the scope of the Project according to 2012 work plan 17 activities were implemented by the government scientific organizations and NGO from

Moscow, Ulaanbaatar, Irkutsk, Ulan-Ude, Chita, Rostov on Don. During implementation of the Project in 2012, 13 individual contracts were concluded with Russian and Mongolian experts of water resource management, interaction of surface waters and underground waters, biodiversity preservation in mining and tourism, Baikal basin hot spots, climate change on the Baikal nature territory, communication and public awareness of environment pollution and tourism development, training programs development and stakeholders' self-assessment. Moreover, 3 contracts with international experts were concluded. Approved first year budget of the Project was realized by 95.41%. Approved 2012 year budget was 1 084.275 USD and expenditure by the end of 2012 was 1 034 484.45 USD. In 2012 the Project Management Unit took part in 29 events. Moreover 50 media sources published information about project activities. The Project web-site worked in Russian, Mongolian and English. Information was regularly updated. RSS channels were functional in three languages as well. The Inception Steering Committee meeting was held in November 2011, the Second Steering Committee meeting was held in April 2013. Project board carefully reviewed all project results and activities and was satisfied with the project implementation. With use of adaptive management principles several changes in the project document and strategic framework results were made. The Third Steering Committee meeting will be held in July 2014. Short reports outlining main updates in project progress were provided quarterly to the UNDP by the project team based upon a standard format provided by UNDP-GEF. An annual monitoring process mandated by the GEF and UNOPS were prepared on time. On demand from UNDP, UNDP-GEF or the Implementing Partner, the project team prepared Specific Thematic Reports, focusing on specific issues or areas of activity. Keep Team Members Happy was one of the major principles of the Baikal Project. If the team members are unhappy with the way things are being carried out, productivity will also decrease, pulling you further away from achieving project goals. Project has a very good international team. All project achievements are a result of team effort. We tried to maintain a warm friendly relationship in project team. Project team recognizes that project goals are also their goals. We organized regular and open communication within the team. Their opinions are very important to us. We always listen to their suggestions and consider them in the project. During 2012 year we also increased motivation of project staff members. We organized different trainings and learning courses for them. In addition project procurement specialist got PhD degree last year. Project team was involved in most important project events and activities. Their salaries were increased a bit using updated salary scale level. We are sure that they feel themselves as a part of UN international family.

UNDP Country Office Programme Officer: Is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project.

MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.

Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. The QORs and delivery data in the ERBM portfolio project monitoring report should inform your rating. Please

keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.	
1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating. If your rating differs from the rating provided by the project manager please explain why.
2.	Summarize annual progress and address timeliness of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans.
3.	Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation.
Overall 2009 Rating	(-) No rating submitted or requested for this year
Overall 2010 Rating	(-) No rating submitted or requested for this year
Overall 2011 Rating	(-) No rating submitted or requested for this year
Overall 2012 Rating	(-) No rating submitted or requested for this year
2013 Rating	(HS) Highly Satisfactory
Comments	<p>The project implementation could be rated as Highly Satisfactory based on a number of considerations. The project has been delivering its outputs in a timely and efficient manner. The project demonstrated the best budget delivery rates and the annual work plans implementation effectiveness among the UNDP/GEF portfolio in Russia. The outputs and initial results delivered by the project since its launch are likely to contribute to the achievement of the project outcomes and objective. In spite of the relatively small scale of the project compared to the vast area it is targeting the project has been leveraging strong partnerships with various stakeholders and deliver tangible and meaningful results. The project team is dynamic, professional and open to new partnerships. The project team has been successful in engaging into substantive partnerships with academic and research institutions, local communities, environmental NGOs and protected areas as well as international partners (UNESCO, OECD, etc.). The project reporting and monitoring have been timely and complete with high quality inputs from the project team and consultants. The project management has been very efficient in risk management, application of adaptive management and human resources management. The project procurement has been similarly effective allowing the project to meet its annual delivery targets. The project Steering Committee functions effectively with annual meetings and regular working level interactions among the Steering Committee members and the project team. The Steering Committee discussions have been substantive and demonstrated a high level of national ownership over the project. The project has been active with its communication and outreach work that included participation in major regional fora and conferences on sustainable socio-economic development and environment protection of the Baikal region. In view of the above the UNDP PSO would like to commend the excellent work of the project team and its partners.</p>

GEF Operational Focal point: Is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point.	
MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.	
1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating.
2.	Note trends, both positive and negative.
3.	Provide recommendations for next steps.
Other Partners: For jointly implemented projects, a representative of the other Agency working with UNDP on project implementation (for example UNEP or the World Bank).	
RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for jointly implemented projects.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.	
1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating.
2.	Note trends, both positive and negative.
3.	Provide recommendations for next steps.
UNDP Technical Adviser: Is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser.	
MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for ALL projects.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. The QORs and delivery data in the ERBM portfolio project monitoring report should inform your rating. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.	
1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating. If your rating differs from the rating provided by the UNDP Country Office Programme Officer and/or the Project Manager please explain why.
2.	Summarize annual progress and address timelines of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans.
3.	Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation.
UNDP Technical Adviser	
Overall 2009 Rating	(-) No rating submitted or requested for this year

Overall 2010 Rating	(-) No rating submitted or requested for this year
Overall 2011 Rating	(-) No rating submitted or requested for this year
Overall 2012 Rating	(-) No rating submitted or requested for this year
2013 Rating	(HS) Highly Satisfactory
Comments	<p>This is the first PIR for this project, even though the project document was dully signed by all parties in June 2011. Due to several reasons, political and human factor, it has only been launched at the Inception workshop held 6 months after the project document had been signed. Despite the fact that upon signature of the project document by all parties, the Executing Agency immediately initiated competitive recruitment of the project team/project implementation units in Russia and Mongolia, the positions had to be re-advertised several times due to lack of candidates. The core project implementation unit (project manager and two technical project directors) were finally hired only in November 2011, thus implementation start was significantly delayed and this delay reported on in the Adjustment tab of this PIR. In this reporting period, the project progressed well with implementation of project outcomes as per the strategic framework and in line with UNDP norms and standards. Project activities were implemented on time, effectively and fully transparently. An updated Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) for the Baikal lake Basin is the key output delivered by the project to-date. Subsequently, SAP team will be formed at the end of 2013 and SAP will be prepared based on the TDA in 2014. The Project web-site has been launched and it now works in 3 languages, Russian, Mongolian and English. Information is regularly updated. Baikal Information Center website has been established. Financial management of the project is highly satisfactory. GEF funds delivery in 2012 reached 96.2%, which is absolutely satisfactory and supports the excellent financial management. Project delivery in 2012 is calculated as ratio of project annual expenditure of \$971,949 versus project budget/Annual Spending limit of \$1,010,471. The project delivery thus met/exceeded the UNDP target of at least 80% in 2012. Delivery in 2013 is 30.6% so far as per Atlas financial system. 2013 delivery is significantly lower, but this is caused by the fact that 2nd quarter 2013 expenditures are not included in this ratio yet. These will be incorporated/reflected in UNDP financial system upon Executing agency (UNOPS) submission of 2nd Q Project delivery report and its acceptance/upload by UNDP. The progress in activities was regularly reported and well-documented in quarterly and annual progress reports with only a minor shortage, which is missing progress reports for the 4th quarter of 2012 in ERBM. The project team regularly monitored project risks through UNDP monitoring tools. In this reporting period, no risks have been identified as critical. All operations, procurement and necessary procedures were done in accordance with UNDP requirements and rules. During the reporting period, the project held one Steering Committee meeting in April 2013 and the project meetings were held at the regular basis to ensure accurate information exchange within the project team. The project team has shown a dedicated support to the project in order to achieve its outcomes. The project</p>

	team has explored and was successful in engaging into substantive partnerships with academic and research institutions, local communities, environmental NGOs and protected areas as well as international partners (UNESCO, OECD, etc.) for further work on the Baikal lake basin. The RTA would like to congratulate the PM and the whole project team for excellent work and dedication.
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as 'good practice'.
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

PROGRESS IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Outcome 1- Key Outputs this Reporting Period: Stakeholders Elaborate and Adopt a strategic Policy and Planning Framework.
The Detailed Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis has been prepared.
Within TDA preparation additional studies have been made. There are: a) Study on the Selenga Delta water quality issues. b) Study on the Selenga Delta habitat and the health of the benthic zone. c) Groundwater resources assessment. d) Pollution hotspot assessment. f) Climate change assessment.
Best practice conservation standards for tourism, mining using international and regional examples have been elaborated and the gap analysis has been provided.
Two sub-basin watershed management plans have been prepared and endorsed (Tungui-Sukhara and Khilok sub-basins in Russia).
Outcome 2- Key Outputs this Reporting Period: Institutional strengthening for IWRM.
Project supported of the Plenipotentiaries meeting and their working group within implementation of the bilateral agreement 1995 "Protection and Use of Transboundary Waters" (PUTW) between Russia and Mongolia. Additionally the learning exchange with Sava River Basin Commission has been organized.
The concept paper and the road map for the process of developing and enhancing the legal and institutional framework of bilateral transboundary water cooperation have been developed.
The database for modeling and simulation of pollutants transport in the Baikal basin waters has been developed.
The harmonized water quality monitoring program for the Selenga Basin has been created.
Outcome 3- Key Outputs this Reporting Period: Demonstrating technologies for water quality and biodiversity mainstreaming.
Self-assessment methodology has been adopted for the countries. Surveys for the relevant stakeholders using IWRM have been prepared. Two Ecological Education Enhancement Plans have been developed for the Russian Federation. Trainings for enhancement competency of administrative staff have been conducted.
Strategy for (dead) livestock disposal has been created.

Tourism plans for Baikal Biosphere Reserve and Zabaikalsky National Park have been developed.

The conception of Baikal Information Center has been developed and BIC web portal has been launched (<http://bic.iwlearn.org/>). Communication and public awareness plans for both countries have been prepared. Shoreline clean-up companies in Russia and Mongolia for raising public awareness in environment conservation issues have been organized.

Adjustments

Adjustments to Project Milestones, Project Strategy and Risk Management.

Key Project Milestones

Have significant delays occurred in the project start, inception workshop, Mid-term Review, Terminal Evaluation or project duration?

Yes

If yes, were these changes reported in a previous APR/PIR?

No

Key project milestone	Scope of delay (in months)	Briefly describe change or reason for change	Briefly describe the implications or consequences this has had on project implementation
Project Start (i.e. project document signature date)			
Inception Workshop	6	Upon signature of the project document by all parties, the Executing Agency initiated competitive recruitment of the project team/project implementation units in Russia and Mongolia. The positions had to be advertised several times due to lack of candidates. The core project implementation unit (project manager and two technical project directors) were hired during in November 2011.	The project duration has to be extended by 6 months in accordance with the approved workplan.
Mid-term Review	6	Because of delay during inception phase.	Mid-term review has to be organized in January-February 2014.
Terminal Evaluation	6	Because of delay during inception phase.	The Terminal Evaluation has to be done at the end of 2015.
Project Duration (i.e. project extension)	6	Because of delay during inception phase.	The Project Duration has to be extended by 6 months.

Adjustments to Project Strategy

Has the project made any changes to its strategy (i.e. logframe/results framework) since the Project Document was signed?

Yes

If yes, were these changes reported in a previous APR/PIR?

No

Change Made to	Yes/No	Briefly describe the change and the reason for that change
Project Objective		
Project Outcomes		
Project Outputs/Activities	Yes	<p>Change 1: to buy an ion chromatograph for chemical laboratory of Institute of Meteorology, Hydrology and Environment (Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia) instead of monitoring buoys based on recommendations in the Joint Harmonized Water Quality Monitoring program. Reason for Change 1: In the project document is mentioned that project resources will be used to fund cost-effective monitoring work using instrumented buoys (50K USD). After consultations with stakeholders it was identified that both countries do not have boats for transportation buoys. This is necessary action because of lakes annual freezing. In addition 4 buoys cannot provide adequate view on climate changing in the whole lake. Change 2: Remove ecosystem resilience parameters for Hovsgol Lake from the Strategic Results Framework. Reason for Change 2: Monitoring data from annual monitoring program do not contain this information. Mongolia has one climate monitoring station on Hovsgol Lake. There are no any factories and hotspots near Hovsgol Lake. Industrial and private fisheries are not popular in Mongolia and are not developed because of cultural features. Mongolian do not use fish like traditional food. Fish estimation reserves have never been made. Project budget does not contain money for field monitoring. Change 3: In the Strategic Results Framework. 1)Replace sentence "By EoP a total of 10 policies or regulations modified to incorporate measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity:" on "By EoP a total of 8 policies or regulations modified to incorporate measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity:". 2)Replace sentence "Mining: At least 2 policies modified in each country, for total of four." on "Mining: At least 2 policies modified in Russia". 3)Replace sentence "Replication quantification measure: # of resource</p>

		<p>users applying biodiversity mainstreaming practices in mining and tourism sectors in Russia and Mongolia Baikal Basin.” on “Replication quantification measure: # of resource users applying biodiversity mainstreaming practices in mining and tourism sectors in Russian part of the Baikal Basin.” 4)Replace sentence “At least 10 mining companies in Mongolia and 10 in Russia by EoP” on “At least 5 mining companies in Russia by EoP”. 5)Replace sentence “At least 15 tourism companies in Russia and 15 in Mongolia by EoP” on “At least 5 tourism companies in Russia by EoP”. Reason for Change 3: Based on the Project Document the biodiversity component is oriented only for The Russian Federation. Also there are not so many mining and tourism companies in the Russian part of the Baikal Basin. The mentioned quantity has to be decreased. Change 4: Pilot/model sport fishing program “catch and release” in Russia has to be oriented only for not Red species. Reason for Change 4: According to the project document the Pilot/model sport fishing program “catch and release” on Taimen in Russia has to be organised. Taimen is included into the Red Species Book and based on Russian laws any fishery activities on Taimen are prohibited.</p>
--	--	---

Risk Management

List number of critical risks as noted in the ATLAS risk log and briefly describe actions undertaken this reporting period to address each critical risk.

# of Critical Risks (type/description)	Risk management measures undertaken this reporting period

Adjustments general comments:

Finance: cumulative from project start to June 30 2013

DISBURSEMENT OF GEF GRANT FUNDS

How much of the total GEF grant as noted in Project Document plus any project preparation grant has been spent so far? (e.g. PPG + MSP or FSP amount. Do not break down by PPG or project budget.)

Estimated cumulative total disbursement as of 30 June 2013. (i.e.CDR information up to 20 June 2013)	1365065.00
Add any comments on GEF Grant Funds	Total GEF grant including PPG \$120,000 is \$4,018,000.

DISBURSEMENT OF CO-FINANCING

How much of the total Co-financing as noted in Project Document has been spent so far? Co-financing is the amount committed in the project document for which co-financing letters are available

Estimated cumulative total co-financing disbursed as of 30 June this year. Please breakdown by donor.	24467721.00
Add any comments on co-financing including other types and amounts of additional co-financing such as in-kind, private sector, grants, credits and loans.	There is a typo in planned co-financing, it should read \$49,288,169 instead of \$10,810,000.

ADDITIONAL LEVERAGED RESOURCES

These additional resources can be from the same donors or new donors.

Estimated cumulative leveraged resources as of 30 June 2013	
Add any comments on Leveraged Resources.	

Other Financial Instruments

Does the project provide funds to other Financial Instruments?	
If yes, please discuss developments that occurred this reporting period only.	

Communications and KM

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

During this reporting period the Baikal Project activities were implemented on 95% on-time in accordance with regulation and rules and in full transparency and accountability. On the one hand the major beneficiaries of the Baikal Project are all people in the world because Baikal Lake is UNESCO World Heritage Site. It is the world's oldest (>25 million years), deepest lake (1,642 m). With 20% of the Earth's unfrozen fresh water, it is the world's most voluminous lake (23,600 km³), containing more water than all five of North America's Great Lakes combined. On the other hand

local people from the Baikal Basin are specific beneficiaries. Although the Lake Baikal is located entirely in Russia, the Baikal Basin is a transboundary ecosystem encompassing over 500,000 km² shared between Russia and Mongolia, with over 400 rivers and streams. Thus, the manner in which these transboundary water resources are managed, utilised and developed extends beyond the scope of the two countries' bilateral relations. This imposes additional obligations on the two States – Russia and Mongolia – as the custodians of these unique aquatic resources and ecosystems. Due to the transboundary nature of the watercourses in question, their effective management, sustainable use and protection cannot be achieved through unilateral or uncoordinated actions and require a collaborative approach. To be successful bilateral cooperation must be based on a solid legal foundation, which includes both adequate normative framework and effective institutional arrangements. Therefore the Baikal Project provides both governments with wide UNDP-GEF experience in supporting of successful international cooperation and innovative regional legal framework, aimed at facilitating cooperation between the states sharing the same transboundary waters. It was very important to carefully inform stakeholders and involved them in all project activities. Our project PR Strategy was divided into two important parts: direct and indirect influence. The project directly worked with all stakeholders mentioned in the Project Document (Pro-Doc), informed them about project plans, tenders and results every month and made agree with all project activities. The LB project web-site was launched in Russian, Mongolian and English as part of the IW:Learn portal - <http://baikal.iwlearn.org> shortly after the project's initiation. The site is a corner stone and our nerve for communication with stakeholders, and we keep it updated constantly to ensure optimum outreach and relevance. Information was regularly updated. Project team sent stakeholders information about all project events. Our indirect influence tactic consisted of participation in as many different events relevant to project goals and tasks, as possible. As well as the support of their organization. Stakeholders were present at most of these events and the project team could therefore update them more often and in details on project activity and different situations. The project team took part in 29 events in total during 2012. Moreover, 50 media sources published information about project activities in Russia and Mongolia. Within the scope of the Project according to 2012 work plan 17 activities were implemented by the government scientific organizations and NGO from Moscow, Ulaanbaatar, Irkutsk, Ulan-Ude, Chita, Rostov on Don. During implementation of the Project in 2012, 13 individual contracts were concluded with Russian and Mongolian experts of water resource management, interaction of surface waters and underground waters, biodiversity preservation in mining and tourism, Baikal basin hot spots, climate change on the Baikal nature territory, communication and public awareness of environment pollution and tourism development, training programs development and stakeholders' self-assessment. Moreover, 3 contracts with international experts were concluded. Approved first year budget of the Project was realized by 95.41%. The Detailed Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis was prepared. Within TDA preparation addition studies were made: a) Study on the Selenga Delta water quality issues b) Study on the Selenga Delta habitat and the health of the benthic zone c) Groundwater resources assessment as a contribution to the TDA d) Pollution hotspot assessment f) Climate change assessment. Best practice conservation standards for tourism, mining using international and regional examples were elaborated and the gap analysis was provided. Two sub-basin watershed management plans were prepared and endorsed (Tungui-Sukhara and Khilok sub-basins in Russia). Project supported of the Plenipotentiaries meeting and their working group within implementation of the bilateral agreement 1995 "Protection and Use of Transboundary Waters\" (PUTW) between Russia and Mongolia. Additionally the learning exchange with Sava River Basin Commission has been organized. The concept paper and the road map for the process of developing and enhancing the

legal and institutional framework of bilateral transboundary water cooperation were developed. The database for modeling and simulation of pollutants transport in the Baikal basin waters was developed. The harmonized water quality monitoring program for the Selenga Basin was created. Self-assessment methodology was adopted for the countries. Surveys for the relevant stakeholders using IWRM were prepared. Two Ecological Education Enhancement Plans were developed for the Russian Federation. Trainings for enhancement competency of administrative staff were conducted. Strategy for (dead) livestock disposal was created. Tourism plans for Baikal Biosphere Reserve and Zabaikalsky National Park were developed. The conception of Baikal Information Center was developed and BIC web portal was launched. Communication and public awareness plans for both countries were prepared. Shoreline clean-up campaigns in Russia and Mongolia for raising public awareness in environment conservation issues were organized.

Adaptive Management this Reporting Period

According to project document signed by both governments the current bilateral agreement 1995 "Protection and Use of Transboundary Waters" (PUTW) between the Russian Federation and Mongolia needs to be enhanced. New agreement has to be signed and new commission has to be formed. During the Inception Steering Committee meeting Mongolian representatives mentioned that official government opinion is to leave the current structures. Mongolia's GDP is 20 per cent up last year and country's energy and water demands are rapidly increasing. Mongolia is upstream country and has plans of dam construction for water supply and energy production purposes. The World Bank is going to finance this activity. Russia worries that these plans might have negative effect on Lake Baikal - UNESCO world heritage site. The Mongolian government thinks that new agreement might block these plans. Therefore In 2012 the Project supported existing structures, particularly plenipotentiaries meeting and their working group workshops. In addition the project improved knowledge of responsible governmental person in international legal aspects of transboundary water cooperation in both countries. The Baikal Project and IW:Learn project organized twinning exchange. Representatives of Mongolia government visited the Sava River Basin Commission. Learning objective was to study and review of the current structure, capacity and activities of Sava River Basin Commission to enhance and capacitate the activities and responsibilities of the Russian-Mongolian Plenipotentiaries through the formation of a new Joint Commission, with expanded participation of other relevant sectors and civil society. This event helped a lot to start dialog with Mongolian government about possible enhancement of existing transboundary structures. Lately the concept paper and the road map for the process of developing and enhancing the legal and institutional framework of bilateral transboundary water cooperation were developed. In Russia during 2012 the Project had tight contact with "Baikal" group of Deputies of the State Duma of the Russian Federation. Lately the Project presented a current status and options for enhancing of the legal and institutional frameworks of cooperation in the protection and sustainable management of transboundary waters between the Russian Federation and Mongolia to the State Duma Committee on Natural Resources, Environment and Ecology during the round table «Harmonization of legislation on the protection of Lake Baikal under the federal program "Protection of Lake Baikal and the socio-economic development of the Baikal natural territory for the years of 2012-2020"».

The Baikal Project recommendation was to develop and to adopt a new comprehensive agreement which should rectify the obvious shortcomings of the existing one, including its institutional arrangements. This new agreement should be significantly more detailed from the point of view of the content of its "substantive" obligations, as well as its procedural norms, including procedures for the EIA in the transboundary context, notification and consultations in the event of planned

measures. The institutional mechanism (ideally in the form of a joint commission) should be provided in more detail, including its sphere of competence, functions, structure and legal nature of decisions. Project's recommendation was noted by the State Duma Committee on Natural Resources, Environment and Ecology and included into the round table recommendations to Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation and Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. Finally all these affords allow to start developing of new agreement within implementation of Outcome 2. This decision was made on the Second Steering Committee meeting.

Lessons Learned

1. Transboundary projects are often supported by regional UNDP offices. The role of UNDP country offices sometimes is not very clear and underestimated. It is significant to increase the role of UNDP countries and involve them in all project activities. 2. Each project has to work with country scientific organizations. It is important to involve international science to the work of local scientific institutions. In this case local science can increase its knowledge and experience and might maintain project deliverables. 3. From the beginning each IW Project has to be a part of IW:Learn informational portal. All project news, events and results will be available for all GEF IW projects and will be alive after project closure. In addition project will save a lot of money on informational support and web development and will identify itself as a part of big GEF IW project portfolio. 4. Project team has to develop good communication strategy during the project inception stage and agree it with stakeholders.

PARTNERSHIPS

Civil Society Organisations/NGOs

Under implementation of Outcome 3 the conception of Baikal Information Center (BIC) was developed and BIC web portal was launched. The NGO network "Friends of Baikal Basin" was a part of the BIC. Annual meetings on this network will be organized. Additionally the communication and public awareness plans for both countries were developed. These plans are oriented on stakeholder groups targeted by the project: government (line departments, parliamentarians, local authorities and the judiciary); civil society (NGOs, community organizations and sociability). Shoreline clean-up companies in Russia and Mongolia for raising public awareness in environment conservation issues were organized.

Indigenous Peoples

n/a

Private Sector

The Coca-Cola Company (UNDP EDM partnership programme) invested over \$450,000 into the Baikal region which is a part of co-financing to the UNDP-GEF Baikal project.

The Baikal Project built close relationships with a private sector during preparation of the pilot projects in mining and tourist sector based on biodiversity principles. Additionally several joint projects were organized with private "Baikal Conservation Fund" for raising public awareness in environmental issues.

GEF Small Grants Programme

n/a

Other Partners

The Joint OECD&UNDP-GEF Project in Russia was officially started in May 2013 after half year of preparation. This project will benefit from another project focused on cost control and incentives for improving efficiency of performance of water service providers in the irrigation and WSS sectors, as well as cost-effectiveness of public expenditures in two sectors in the Russian part of Lake Baikal basin.

PROGRESS IN ADDRESSING GENDER EQUALITY

Has a gender or social needs assessment been carried out?

No

If a gender or social assessment has been carried out what were the findings?

Does this project specifically target women or girls as direct beneficiaries?

No

Have there been any changes in specifically targeting women or girls as direct beneficiaries this reporting period?

No

If yes, please explain:

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

Some points to consider: impact of project on daily workload of women, # of jobs created for women, impact of project on time spent by women in household activities, impact of project on primary school enrolment for girls/boys, increase in women's income etc. Be as specific as possible and provide real numbers (e.g. 100 women farmers participating in sustainable livelihoods programme).

ENVIRONMENTAL OR SOCIAL GRIEVANCE

What environmental or social issue was the grievance related to?

What is the current status of the grievance?

How would you rate the significance of the grievance?

Please describe the on-going or resolved grievance noting who was involved, what action was taken to resolve the grievance, how much time it took, and what you learned from managing the grievance process (maximum 500 words). If more than one grievance was addressed this reporting period, please explain the other grievance (s) here: