

Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species

Final Report

1. Darwin Project Information

Project Reference No.	162/13/004
Project title	Developing a model for the conservation of Croatia's grassland biodiversity
Country	Croatia
UK Contractor	Fauna & Flora International (FFI)
Partner Organisation (s)	Žumberak-Samoborsko Gorje Nature Park (ŽSGNP) and the Institute of Grassland and Environmental Research (IGER)
Darwin Grant Value	£150,600
Start/End date	May 2004 – March 2007
Project website	www.ppzsg.org/darwin
Author(s), date	Antonia Eastwood and Paul Hotham, June 2007

2. Project Background/Rationale

- *Describe the location and circumstances of the project*

Situated at the crossroads of four bio-geographical regions, Croatia, in the western Balkans, has an incredibly diverse range of ecosystems, habitats and species relative to its small size. Since independence from Yugoslavia in 1991, Croatia has undergone extensive social, economic and political change, including four years of regional conflict. As a newly emergent state, and in recognition of its rich natural heritage, Croatia established five new protected areas in 1999. Although Croatia now boasts a network of 18 protected areas, there is still a lack of capacity in areas such as management planning and stakeholder participation. There is also a recognised need to develop sustainable management and monitoring strategies for threatened habitats such as semi-natural grasslands. Croatia's semi-natural grasslands support a wealth of biological diversity including rare and threatened orchids, birds and butterflies but are under threat due to a rapid decline in traditional agricultural activities such as grazing and hay making.

- *What was the problem that the project aimed to address?*

The project aimed to address the lack of capacity, experience and skills of the Žumberak Samoborsko gorje Nature Park (ŽSGNP) in stakeholder participation, management planning and practical grassland management and monitoring.

It also aimed to share its experiences and expertise with the wider Croatia conservation constituency, in particular Učka Nature Park (UNP).

- *Who identified the need for this project and what evidence is there for a demand for this work and a commitment from the local partner?*

The need for the project was identified by Dr Matija Franković, the director of the ŽSGNP from 2001- 2005, who approached FFI in the spring of 2003. The Park demonstrated significant commitment to the project;

through substantial in kind contributions, contributing financially towards the Darwin Scholar's salary and committing to employ the Darwin scholar beyond the length of the project.

3. Project Summary

- *What were the purpose and objectives (or outputs) of the project? Please include the project logical framework as an appendix if this formed part of the original project proposal/schedule and report against it. If the log frame has been changed in the meantime, please indicate against which version you are reporting and include it with your report.*

The purpose of the project was to build the capacity of the ŽSGNP and to initiate the development of sustainable management systems to conserve the biodiversity and wildlife riches of Croatia's grasslands.

The main outputs of the project are summarised below:

- i) A ŽSGNP management plan
- ii) ŽSGNP staff trained in participatory management planning & conservation of grassland biodiversity
- iii) UNP trained in participatory management planning
- iv) Other protected areas trained in the conservation of grassland biodiversity
- v) Production of habitat and species action plans for ŽSGNP
- vi) Public awareness of grassland biodiversity raised

A copy of the project's logical framework can be found in Appendix V. The project has successfully completed all of the above five main outputs and the majority of the associated activities as outlined in the logical framework. The project has produced three key strategic documents for the Park; a participatory management plan (PMP), a grassland action plan (GAP) and a grassland biodiversity monitoring plan (GBMP). These three documents will provide the Park with a focused strategy to conserve the natural and cultural heritage of the park for the next 10 years.

The outputs of the project, focusing on raising the capacity of the ŽSGNP, should have added together to fulfil the above project purpose. Unfortunately, and with great disappointment, the overall purpose of the project was not fully achieved. The primary reason for this was that in November 2005 a new director was appointed at the ŽSGNP. This was a political appointment due to a change in government. Following the appointment of a new director, Mr Stjepan Gregorić, the conservation manager, who plays a key role in managing the park, resigned. The park authority subsequently remained without a conservation manager for 10 months. During this time staff moral and motivation declined and continues to do so to date. The lack of a conservation manager was further compounded by the resignation of the Darwin Scholar in July 2006. This was due to irreconcilable differences between her and the new park management. Although the project team appointed a new Darwin Scholar in August 2006 and a new conservation manager started in September 2006, the lack of commitment and engagement by the new management has significantly affected the project and the attainment of its overarching purpose. As an example, we have been informed that the new management declined the opportunity to trial Croatia's first ever agri-environmental scheme within ŽSGNP. This was a disappointment to staff and local stakeholders and a missed opportunity to implement the Grassland Action Plan (GAP) and initiate sustainable grassland management systems in the ŽSGNP.

Although the ŽSGNP park authority has not initiated sustainable grassland management systems or began to implement the GAP the project has significantly raised the capacity of Učka Nature Park in participatory management planning. The park authority is now not far from completing their first ever management plan. The project has also contributed significantly (through discussions, presentations and training manuals) to the development of Croatia's national guidelines on management planning. In addition, the project, through the professional development of staff, has raised the capacity of a number of young and enthusiastic

conservationists. These individuals now hold key positions in Croatia's conservation constituency and therefore will continue to influence and shape nature conservation in Croatia well beyond the project. For example, three of the project's principal trainees have recently established the first NGO in Croatia (Eco-centric) dedicated to the conservation of natural and cultural heritage. Zrinka Mesić, our first Darwin scholar, is employed as an ecologist in a private consultancy company Oikon Ltd., whilst Vesna Zlatar, our second Darwin scholar, has just been appointed as a management planning officer within the State Institute of Nature Protection.

- *Were the original objectives or operational plan modified during the project period? If significant changes were made, for what reason, and when were they approved by the Darwin Secretariat?*

There were some minor changes to the operational plan to compensate for the delayed start up of the project and the additional training that had to be provided due to significant staff changes with our in country partners.

- *Which of the Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) best describe the project? Summaries of the most relevant Articles to Darwin Projects are presented in Appendix I.*

Articles 7 (Identification and monitoring), 8 (In-situ conservation) and 17 (Exchange of information) best describe the project.

- *Briefly discuss how successful the project was in terms of meeting its objectives. What objectives were not or only partly achieved, and have there been significant additional accomplishments?*

The project was fully successful in meeting four of the five main objectives (outputs). The project has produced a participatory management plan (PMP), a grassland action plan (GAP) and a grassland biodiversity monitoring plan (GBMP) for the ŽSGNP. These are now ready to be sent out for public consultation and approval by the park's board of trustees.

The extension of training to other protected areas and conservation agencies through workshops and supplementary handbooks proved to be effective and was very well received by trainees and benefactors. The project team has had numerous requests from other protected areas (Biokovo Nature Park, Krka National Park, Lonjsko Polje Nature Park and Medvenica Nature Park) and the State Institute of Nature Protection for collaboration and exchange of expertise in grassland conservation and management planning. In addition, Fauna & Flora International, ŽSGNP and Učka Nature Park were asked to present their two management plans and the methodologies used at a national conference on management planning. The presentation was highly praised and the project's methodology has significantly shaped the current national guidelines on management planning.

Although only initially a benefactor of the project, our relationship with Učka Nature Park over the three years developed into a strong collaborative partnership. The park has now almost completed their management plan and Marin Grgurev, the conservation manager, is now recognised as a national expert in management planning in his own right. Already several protected areas in Croatia have requested his advice and guidance.

The project was effective in raising the public awareness of grasslands at both a local community level and higher ministerial level. The project produced a regular newsletter throughout its implementation, appeared on national TV and radio, and produced numerous local and international articles. We also, in addition to the planned public awareness activities, maintained an up-to-date project website.

The project only partly achieved one of its main objectives - that of raising the capacity of staff at the ŽSGNP in participatory management planning and the conservation of grassland biodiversity. Halfway through the project, three key staff members (the director, conservation manager and Darwin scholar) were either demoted or resigned. Despite efforts to engage and work with the new management of the park, their lack of experience and knowledge in nature conservation proved to be very difficult to overcome and was compounded by their reluctance to engage with the project. This also significantly limited the effectiveness of the remaining members of staff, including the new Darwin Scholar, who despite having the skills and knowledge to take initiatives forward, lacked the institutional support. Current experience suggests that the

significant achievements of the project such as the PMP, GAP and GBMP will not be implemented by the current Park management unless obliged to do so by the State Administration.

4. Scientific, Training, and Technical Assessment

- *Please provide a full account of the project's research, training, and/or technical work.*
- **Research** - *this should include details of staff, methodology, findings and the extent to which research findings have been subject to peer review.*

The first research element of the project focused on improving the park authority's understanding of the grassland biodiversity in the nature park and the management regimes required to maintain it. In addition, the research should have enabled the park to prioritise those grasslands requiring immediate conservation management. Four bespoke survey methodologies were developed; a rapid biodiversity assessment, a rare plant survey, a plant community survey and a farmer interview. Details on these survey techniques can be found in our training handbook "Grassland Biodiversity and surveying" which can be downloaded from the project website. A grassland biodiversity database was developed alongside the surveys to manage and analysis the data and allow it to be mapped onto the park's GIS system. The survey work was done predominantly by the first Darwin scholar (Zrinka Mesić) and the park rangers, with extensive training provided by IGER (Jerry Tallwin, Anna Gundrey) and FFI staff (Antonia Eastwood). In total, over 30 sites were surveyed for plant communities, 15 rare plant surveys completed, 60 rapid biodiversity surveys completed and 15 farmer interviews conducted. Soils samples for all the 30 sites surveyed for plant communities were also taken. The number of rare plant surveys, rapid surveys and farmer interviews was much lower than had been originally planned. This is a reflection on the poor leadership and management of the park authority since December 2005.

Unfortunately, the extensive training in grassland surveying and analysis (including a 3 month study visit to IGER) provided to the first Darwin scholar, Zrinka Mesić, could not be utilised to analyse the data collected during the project. Due to irreconcilable differences between her and the new park management Zrinka resigned in July 2006. This was a great shame for the park and the project's investment in her professional development. However, as she indicated in her exit interview her resignation was no reflection on the project or the UK partners, whom she greatly respects and holds in high regard.

Unfortunately, due to the additional training and mentoring that needed to be provided to the newly appointed Darwin scholar and conservation manager so late on in the project, the project team no longer had the capacity to analyse the data collected during 2004-2006. The UK partners are currently looking at the possibility of Zrinka Mesić analysing the data as part of a M.Sc. thesis.

The second research element of the project was the stakeholder consultations conducted for the participatory management plans of ŽSGNP and Učka Nature Park respectively. Prior to starting the stakeholder participation for the management plans the park authorities developed a stakeholder engagement plan. This was based on a thorough stakeholder analysis, which included an evaluation of the relationship and impact of different stakeholders on the Park, as well as other sectors such as tourism and business. The two parks focused on four main stakeholder participation activities; i) semi-structured interviews, ii) a stakeholder workshop, iii) village meetings and iv) focus group meetings. The details of the activities conducted by ŽSGNP are highlighted below in Table 1. The majority of the stakeholder engagement activities were conducted by Park staff, with guidance and mentoring from FFI. The main aim of the activities was to gather viewpoints and opinions on topics and issues such as i) the values of the Park, ii) the threats to the Park, iii) the role of the park authority, iv) any observed changes in lifestyle of Park residents, v) their vision for the Park and, vi) the Park's future management. The results of the stakeholder consultations for the ŽSGNP were analysed by Zrinka Mesić and discussed in a report (Mesić, 2005). The report findings were summarised for the management plan, and the view points and issues of the consulted stakeholders considered during the plan development. Učka Nature Park is yet to fully complete the analysis of their stakeholder consultation activities.

Table 1: Summary of the stakeholder participation activities conducted by the ŽSGNP

Type of activity	No.	Target group etc.
Newsletter	4 issues, 2000 copies each	All stakeholders but with a focus on local communities
Semi-structure interview	68	Representatives of a range of stakeholders
Stakeholder workshop	1	Representatives of a range of stakeholders
Focus group meetings	3	Representatives of 12 hunting societies
Village meetings	9	Local communities in or near the villages of Gornja Vas, Jarušje, Kašt, Kostanjevac, Stojdraga, Sošice, Plešivica, Vivodina and Veliki Lipovec.

- **Training and capacity building activities** – *this should include information on selection criteria, content, assessment and accreditation.*

A summary of all the training and capacity building activities conducted by the project over the three years is provided in Table 2. The focus of the project was to build the capacity of ŽSGNP in participatory management planning and grassland biodiversity conservation. In total, over the 3 years, the project held 5 training workshops in participatory management planning and 5 training workshops on grassland biodiversity conservation to staff of the ŽSGNP. Intensive mentoring, hands on training and professional development was also provided to two key staff within the Park; the Darwin scholar, Zrinka Mesić and the conservation manager, Biljana Janev Hutinec. The Darwin scholar also had the opportunity to go to IGER (the Institute of Grassland and Environmental Research) for a 3 month study visit on grassland biodiversity research and management. She also attended numerous conferences and workshops on grassland management and landscape ecology. These two staff members were responsible for planning conservation work in the Park and were also in a position to share their newly acquired skills and experience to other staff members and protected areas.

Unfortunately these two key members of staff left the park in January 2006 and July 2006 respectively, primarily due to the change in leadership. Although the park authority lost a huge amount of capacity and experience through their departure both individuals have gained employment in the field of nature conservation and are still applying what they learnt through the project to this day.

Due to the significant staff changes in 2006 the UK project team provided the new Darwin scholar, Vesna Zlatar, and new conservation manager, Krešo Vrbanac, with intensive training in grassland biodiversity conservation and management planning. This was delivered through workshops and one-to-one mentoring. The additional support and mentoring, particularly to Vesna, proved to be very effective. Vesna very quickly became integrated into the project team and proved to be a huge asset to the project.

The project extended its training activities in management planning and grassland conservation to other protected areas in Croatia. This included holding five workshops on stakeholder participation and management planning for Učka Nature Park, two workshops on grassland biodiversity and management for representatives of Croatia's protected area network and the production of three training handbooks. The capacity building of Učka Nature Park has enabled the park to develop a draft management plan, and has resulted in them being recognised as national experts in management planning in their own right. The workshops on grassland biodiversity and management were extremely well received and feedback from workshop evaluations was excellent. A lot of the techniques and methodologies in practical habitat management, particularly grazing regimes, are totally new to conservationists in Croatia and the project stimulated much discussion and debate on the topic.

Table 2: Details of training and capacity building activities

Trainee details	Area of training/capacity building				Timescale
	Grassland biodiversity, surveying, management and monitoring	Stakeholder analysis and consultation	Management planning	Other eg. time management, professional development etc.	
Darwin scholar (ZM), conservation manager (BJH), rangers (x3)	On the job training in grassland biodiversity				ŽSGNP, 4 weeks, July 2004
Darwin scholar (ZM)	Workshop in the Peak District on grazing for wildlife.			Study trip to Peak District National Park	ŽSGNP, 1 week, Oct 2004
Darwin scholar (ZM), conservation manager (BJH)		On the job training in stakeholder analysis and conducting semi-structured interviews			ŽSGNP, 1 week, Sept 2004
All ŽSGNP staff (12)		Workshop on stakeholder participation			ŽSGNP, 4 days, Nov 2004
All ŽSGNP staff (12)			Workshop on management planning		ŽSGNP, 1 week, Nov 2004
All UNP staff		One day workshop on stakeholder analysis			UNP, 1 day, Nov 2004
Darwin scholar (ZM)				Mentoring and exercises in time management and work planning	ŽSGNP, 1 week, Dec 2004
All ŽSGNP staff (12)			Workshop on management planning		ŽSGNP, 1 week, Feb 2005
UNP staff (x 8)		On the job training in stakeholder analysis and conducting semi-structured interviews			UNP, 1 week, May 2005
Darwin scholar (ZM), conservation manager (BJH), rangers (x3)	On the job training in grassland surveying				ŽSGNP, 2 weeks, June 2005
Conservation manager (BJH)	Workshop in Peak District on grassland management for nature conservation				ŽSGNP, 1 week, June 2005
Conservation manager (BJH)				Attendance at international conference on Landscape	UK, 1 week, June 2005

				scale conservation	
All ŽSGNP staff (12)	Training workshop on grassland biodiversity and surveying				ŽSGNP, 3 days, July 2005
Representatives of Croatia's protected areas (20)	Training workshop on grassland biodiversity and surveying				4 days, July 2005
Darwin scholar (ZM)	Study visit to IGER, including visits to Yorkshire Dales National Park and Dartmoor National Park				UK, 3 months, August-October 2005
Darwin scholar (ZM)				Attendance at international conference on Landscape ecology; planning, people and practice	UK, 1 week, Sept 2005
UNP (all staff)		Workshop on stakeholder participation			UNP, 1 week, Nov 2005
UNP (all staff)			Workshop on management planning		UNP, 1 week, Nov 2005
All ŽSGNP staff (12)	Grassland Action Plan workshop				ŽSGNP, 1 week, Nov 2005
MF (park biologist and former director of ŽSGNP)				Training workshop on sustainable livelihoods and conservation, Yorkshire Dales National Park	UK, 1 week, Dec 2005
UNP (all staff)			Workshop on management planning		UNP, 1 week, April 2006
Biokovo Nature Park (all staff)		1 day workshop on stakeholder participation			Biokovo NP, 1 day, April 2006
All ŽSGNP staff (12), including new director	Grassland Action Plan and management workshop				ŽSGNP, 1 week, May 2006
Protected areas and Croatia's conservation constituency	Handbook on grassland biodiversity and surveying				100 copies with further ones available from the project website
Representatives of Croatia's protected areas (25)	Training workshop on grassland management for nature conservation				ŽSGNP, 4 days, June 2006
New Darwin scholar (VZ)				1 week project induction and mentoring	ŽSGNP, 1 week, Sept 2006
Core conservation team at ŽSGNP, including new Darwin scholar (VZ) and	Grassland biodiversity & monitoring workshop				ŽSGNP, 1 week, Sept 2006

new conservation manager (KV)					
Core management planning team at ŽSGNP (5)			Workshop on management planning including zoning/landscape mapping		ŽSGNP, 1 week, Oct 2006
UNP (all staff) plus Darwin scholar			Workshop on management planning		UNP, 3 days, Oct 2006
Conservation manager from UNP (MG), Director and biologist from ŽSGNP (SG, MF), Darwin scholar (VZ)				Presentation of management plans at national management planning conference	Ministry of Culture, Dec 2006
Protected areas and Croatia's conservation constituency	Handbook on grassland management for nature conservation				Over 100 CDs sent out with further copies available from the project website, Feb 2007
Core management planning team at ŽSGNP (5)			Workshop on management planning - monitoring		ŽSGNP, 3 days, Mar 2007
Core conservation team at ŽSGNP (5)	Grassland monitoring workshop				ŽSGNP, 3 days, Mar 2007
Protected areas and Croatia's conservation constituency	Handbook and toolkit on protected areas management planning in Croatia				Over 100 CDs sent out with further copies available from the project website, Mar 2007

ŽSGNP – Žumberak-Samoborsko gorje Nature Park, UNP – Učka Nature Park, ZM – Zrinka Mesić (Darwin scholar May 2004 – July 2006), BJH – Biljana Janev Hutinac (conservation manager till Dec 2005), MF – Matija Franković (Park director till Dec 2005), VZ – Vesna Zlatař (Darwin scholar Aug 2006 –March 2007), KV – Krešo Vrbanac (conservation manager from Sept 2006), SG - Stjepan Gregorić (Park director from Dec 2005), MG – Marin Grgurev (conservation manager, UNP)

5. Project Impacts

- *What evidence is there that project achievements have led to the accomplishment of the project purpose? Has achievement of objectives/outputs resulted in other, unexpected impacts?*

Recent evidence indicates that the project has not fully accomplished its main purpose. Despite the considerable investment in capacity building provided by the project to the ŽSNGP and the excellent legacy of the previous management, the current park authority has not initiated sustainable management systems for grasslands. Although the project has produced three key strategic documents (including a grassland action plan) and equipped the park staff with a range of tools and techniques in practical grassland management and monitoring, none of the strategies have been initiated. This is despite the fact that the previous management secured a grant to purchase a tractor and mower with all the associated consumables and staff costs with the intention of commencing work on grassland management. We have also been informed that the current (new) management has also declined to trial a national agri-environment scheme developed specifically for the park by the Ministry. In addition, contrary to the initial commitment made by the park authority, the current management have decided not to employ the Darwin scholar beyond the project.

- *To what extent has the project achieved its purpose, i.e. how has it helped the host country to meet its obligations under the Biodiversity Convention (CBD), or what indication is there that it is likely to do so in the future? Information should be provided on plans, actions or policies by the host institution and government resulting directly from the project that building on new skills and research findings.*

The project has developed three key strategic documents for the ŽSNGP; a participatory management plan, a grassland action plan (GAP) and a grassland monitoring plan (GBMP). It has also greatly influenced the current national guidelines on management planning, ensuring that future management plans in Croatia are developed in participatory way. This will also ensure that Croatia's protected area management plans are better informed, more appropriate to local conditions, have support and buy in from the local community and are hence, more sustainable. Učka Nature Park will shortly complete their management plan and be one of the first parks to do so in Croatia. This will set a benchmark and precedent for future management plans in Croatia.

The GAP and GBMP are the first of their kind in Croatia, and will hopefully, set a bench mark for future habitat and monitoring plans. Our workshops on practical grassland management were the first of their kind in Croatia, tackling issues not previously considered amongst Croatia's conservation constituency. It is too early to tell how the new skills and knowledge acquire through our workshops will become integrated into policy and conservation action on the ground, although Učka Nature is very keen to develop a GAP.

- *Please complete the table in Appendix I to show the contribution made by different components of the project to the measures for biodiversity conservation defined in the CBD Articles.*
- *If there were training or capacity building elements to the project, to what extent has this improved local capacity to further biodiversity work in the host country and what is the evidence for this? Where possible, please provide information on what each student / trainee is now doing (or what they expect to be doing in the longer term).*

Fortunately, although most of the capacity developed amongst individuals within the ŽSNGP has not been retained within the authority itself, all the trained individuals are still actively working in the field of conservation and will continue to influence and shape nature conservation in Croatia. Zrinka Mesić, the first Darwin scholar, now works as a biologist in a private company specialising in applied ecology. She uses the species and habitat surveying skills she acquired through the Darwin project on a day-to-day basis. Biljana Janev Hutinec, the previous conservation manager, is now the conservation manager of Maksimir Park and is still very active and influential amongst Croatia's conservation constituency. Although Vesna Zlatar, the second Darwin officer, was only with the project for 9 months her ability to learn quickly and make full use of

her training has meant that she has already been employed by the State Institute for Nature Protection (SINP) as a management planning officer. She will be responsible for advising protected areas on participatory management planning and evaluating completed plans. This is excellent news and couldn't have happened to a more deserving young conservationist. Her employment at the SINP will ensure that the project leaves a lasting legacy in Croatia and that the knowledge and skills she acquired during the project will be disseminated throughout Croatia's protected areas. In addition to the above, three of the trainees from ŽSGNP have recently established a NGO in Croatia, the first of its kind dedicated to natural and cultural heritage conservation.

As already mentioned before, Učka Nature Park has almost completed their management plan. Because of the training provided to Marin Grgurev, the Park's conservation manager, Marin is now considered to be one of the leading experts in management planning and stakeholder participation in Croatia. A great achievement indeed, for someone who is only 28 years old. As well as the regional impact, Učka Nature Park's increased capacity in management planning is also having cross-border ramifications as they share their experiences and expertise with Slovenian INTEREGG partners Škocjan Caves Regional Park.

- *Discuss the impact of the project in terms of collaboration to date between UK and local partner. What impact has the project made on local collaboration such as improved links between Governmental and civil society groups?*

Until December 2005 the UK partners and the main Croatian partner, the ŽSGNP, had an excellent collaborative partnership. The Croatian partners were fully engaged and committed to the project. This was reflected in their applications for grants to support practical grassland management and the significant staff time committed to the project. Through the implementation of the project, such as the stakeholder participation activities, the park improved their relations with the local community and other stakeholders. This even led to a number of new initiatives and partnerships, for example, the collaborative mowing of meadows with the hunting societies.

Unfortunately, since the new management (Dec 2005), collaboration within the ŽSGNP has deteriorated to the point of being virtually non-existent. The park authority has become less and less engaged with the project and has not met the majority of its commitments.

However, collaboration with Učka Nature Park, particularly with Marin Grgurev, the conservation manager, has gone from strength to strength. The park authority is fully committed to completing their management plan in the near future.

Throughout the 3 years the project has greatly improved links, not only with the local community but also the scientific community (Centre for Grasslands, Natural History Museum), other protected areas in Croatia, state agencies and other international projects in Croatia (CARDS, KEC etc.).

- *In terms of social impact, who has benefited from the project? Has the project had (or is likely to result in) an unexpected positive or negative impact on individuals or local communities? What are the indicators for this and how were they measured?*

Both the PMP and the GAP for the ŽSGNP have actions dedicated to supporting the local community such as establishing community grazing co-operatives, developing initiatives that stimulate and promote local services and products etc. If implemented, the PMP and GAP and therefore the long term impact of the project should have a positive impact on the local community and their livelihoods. The PMP, GAP and GBMP have monitoring indicators embedded within the plans to measure the success of the actions on not only the local community but also grassland biodiversity.

6. Project Outputs

- *Quantify all project outputs in the table in Appendix II using the coding and format of the Darwin Initiative Standard Output Measures.*
- *Explain differences in actual outputs against those in the agreed schedule, i.e. what outputs were not achieved or only partly achieved? Were additional outputs achieved? Give details in the table in Appendix II.*

The outputs not achieved or only partially achieved are detailed below in Table 3. This includes an explanation of the difference between actual outputs and those in the agreed schedule.

Table 3: List of outputs not achieved or only partially achieved

Standard output no.	Description	Explanation
22	5 permanent quadrats/transects established	Although specific guidance (Demonstration Plot Guidelines) was produced by the project this has not yet been initiated by the new park management. In addition, due to the significant staff changes in the project, and the subsequent additional capacity building this entailed, the project did not have the capacity to initiate the grassland biodiversity monitoring plan although training to park staff was provided in how to do this.
7	1 educational poster produced	Due to the significant staff changes in the project, and the subsequent additional capacity building this entailed, the project did not have the capacity to produce the poster. Nor would it have had the required support and commitment from the new park management.
7	Training handbook on grassland monitoring	The additional workload imposed on the project manager due to the significant staff changes in the Park meant that this was not produced. In addition, the significant cut-backs and redundancies at IGER meant that they also lacked the capacity to take this forward.
17B	1 grassland biodiversity network developed and formalised	For this to have been established the main drivers would have had to have been the main in-country partner, the ŽSNGP. The lack of commitment and engagement from the new park management in grassland conservation meant that this was not feasible.

The project produced a substantial number of additional outputs during the 3 years. These are listed below in Table 4

Table 4: List of additional outputs achieved by the project

Standard output no.	Description
6b	An additional 6 training workshops in participatory management planning, grassland management and monitoring for ŽSNGP and Učka Nature Park
9	Draft management plan for Učka Nature Park
10 x2	Production of a Tractor Mowing Plan and Demonstration Plot Guidance
9	Grassland Monitoring Plan
16a	Establishment of project website www.ppzsg.org/darwin
	Establishment of national NGO dedicated to the conservation of natural and cultural heritage by key trainees

- *Provide full details in Appendix III of all publications and material that can be publicly accessed, e.g. title, name of publisher, contact details, cost. Details will be recorded on the Darwin Monitoring Website database.*
- *How has information relating to project outputs and outcomes been disseminated, and who was/is the target audience? Will this continue or develop after project completion and, if so, who will be responsible*

and bear the cost of further information dissemination?

Project outputs and outcomes have been publicised and disseminated primarily via the bi-annual newsletter and the project website. The Croatian newsletter 'Kosilica' was targeted predominately towards the local community and national protected areas and conservation bodies. The English newsletter "Grass cuttings" was targeted towards British and international conservation bodies, research institutions and other academia. The website was targeted to in-country and international conservation bodies, protected areas and academia. All the major project outcomes will be available for download from the project website for a year after the project ends. The ŽSGNP will be responsible for its upkeep and maintenance.

The ŽSGNP had intended to continue producing the Park newsletter "Kosilica" to keep the local community and other stakeholders informed on the Park activities etc. The production of a regular newsletter is one of the actions in the Park's new management plan and should it be implemented. .

7. Project Expenditure

- *Tabulate grant expenditure using the categories in the original application/schedule.*
See Table 5
- *Highlight agreed changes to the budget.*
See Table 5
- *Explain any variation in expenditure where this is +/- 10% of the budget.*
See Table 5

Table 5: Details of project budget, approved budget changes and actual expenditure over the 3 years

Item	Original budget Y1	Revised budget Y1	Actual expenditure Y1	Balance Y1	Original budget Y2	Revised budget Y2	Actual expenditure Y2	Balance Y2	Original budget Y3	Revised budget Y3	Actual expenditure Y3	Balance Y3
Approval of budget changes/carry forwards	A carry forward of £5083 was requested from the Darwin Secretariat in the first year. Darwin Secretariat approved a carry forward of £5394 (plus the £311 under spend).								A budget line change (£3,000 from printing) request was approved by Darwin Secretariat in the beginning of 2007.			

Item	Total original budget	Total actual expenditure	Total balance	Explanation of +/- 10% changes to budget
				The project had an under spend of 15 percent in the printing budget line. As explained in more detail previously, the production of an educational poster was cancelled due to the lack of capacity and commitment of the new park management. The money was re-directed to the travel and conference budget lines. This was to provide significant extra training and mentoring to the new park management and the new Darwin scholar.

8. Project Operation and Partnerships

- *How many local partners worked on project activities and how does this differ from initial plans for partnerships? Who were the main partners and the most active partners, and what is their role in biodiversity issues? How were partners involved in project planning and implementation? Were plans modified significantly in response to local consultation?*

The main project partner was the Žumberak-Samoborsko gorje Nature Park (ŽSGNP). Učka Nature Park (UNP) was a benefactor of the project, receiving training in participatory management planning. The ŽSGNP were very active and committed partners in the first 1½ years of the project. They were fully engaged and active in all the project's activities from grassland surveying to project planning and writing funding proposals. However, since the change in senior management (a new director was appointed in Dec 2005) the park have shown little commitment to the project or to biodiversity conservation in general. This is not just an opinion of the project leaders but is recognised by the majority of protected areas in Croatia as well as the State Institute from Nature Protection.

The partnership with UNP grew from strength to strength over the three years, with the conservation manager showing great commitment in developing the park's first ever management plan.

- *During the project lifetime, what collaboration existed with similar projects (Darwin or other) elsewhere in the host country? Was there consultation with the host country Biodiversity Strategy (BS) Office?*

The project was the only project at the time in Croatia focusing on grassland biodiversity and management. However, the project did collaborate with the international KEC project (Karst Ecosystem Conservation) and the EU funded CARDS project in the area of participatory management planning. Our work with the two nature parks, as well as the manual and our presentation at the national conference on management planning have all contributed greatly to the national guidelines on management planning. There was not any formal consultation with the BS office, although the State Institute for Nature Protection where it is based were involved in our training workshops.

In addition, the ŽSGNP hosted one of the EU funded Probioprise (Pro Biodiversity Enterprise) project's workshops on small and medium enterprises (SMEs). The workshop held in Croatia focused on grasslands, the findings of which are being fed into future EU policy on promoting SMEs and sustainable natural resource use.

How many international partners participated in project activities? Provide names of main international partners.

Our other main project partner was the Institute of Grassland and Environmental Research who provided the expertise and training in grassland biodiversity and management.

- *To your knowledge, have the local partnerships been active after the end of the Darwin Project and what is the level of their participation with the local biodiversity strategy process and other local Government activities? Is more community participation needed and is there a role for the private sector?*

Unfortunately, the main project partner, the ŽSGNP, has not been active since the end of the Darwin Project. Although the management plan is complete, the Park has yet to finalise it and send it out for public consultation. To the best of our knowledge the park has not started to implement any of the GAP or incorporate it into any of this year's work plans.

9. Monitoring and Evaluation, Lesson learning

- *Please explain your strategy for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and give an outline of results. How does this **demonstrate** the value of the project? E.g. what baseline information was collected (e.g. scientific, social, economic), milestones in the project design, and indicators to identify your achievements (at purpose and goal level).*

In addition to regular meetings by the project partners, FFI's annual project reporting and monitoring cycle and the annual Darwin reports, the project has also recently completed a questionnaire based evaluation

tool. This evaluation tool was devised by the Cambridge Conservation Forum. The tool measures the conservation success of projects by assessing the project's ultimate impact on species, habitats, populations, conservation policy, education, capacity building, research and peoples' livelihoods.

Despite the difficulties outlined above, the project has delivered exceptional value for money. We have achieved the majority of the milestones over the three years, in addition to some extra activities. Ultimately, despite delivering on all of the outputs, the change in leadership in our main project partner has limited, and will continue to limit in the medium to short term, the attainment of the main project purpose. However, as the project has produced a number of key strategic documents to guide the management of the Park's cultural and natural heritage, as well as producing three training handbooks, any new management will be able to, re-continue delivering the project purpose; that is, to initiate sustainable management systems to conserve the biodiversity rich grasslands of Croatia. With Croatia being a country in transition and under the current political climate, a change in management, is just as likely to happen as it did two years ago.

It is also important to note that the project has empowered a number of young, extremely competent and enthusiastic conservationists. With great certainty the project leaders are confident that they will share their knowledge and new skills with the broader conservation constituency in Croatia and make a significant contribution to help shape protected area management planning and grassland biodiversity conservation well into the future.

- *What were the main problems and what steps were taken to overcome them?*

The main problem was the lack of commitment and engagement of the new senior management (from December 2005) to the project. The Darwin scholar, Vesna Zlatar and previously, Zrinka Mesić, with our support attempted to motivate and engage the senior management, as well as motivating other staff members. This was largely unsuccessful as the senior management, in our absence, did not support the majority of planned activities. Staff members were not given any direction or leadership, leading to a virtual cessation of ongoing project activities. The frustration of the situation led ultimately to the resignation of the first Darwin, Zrinka Mesić, in July 2006.

The project team, through meetings and discussions, raised our concerns to the senior management with very little affect. Unfortunately we had to resign ourselves to giving as much support and encouragement to the Darwin scholar and organise additional staff workshops to implement the planned activities.

Another problem during the project, and one which had a significant impact on project planning and delivery in the 3rd year, was the recent restructuring and redundancies at IGER, our main British partner. With a much reduced capacity, IGER had to reduce its project commitments in the final year by half. This meant that the project leaders had to commit more staff time to ensure delivery of some activities and combine training activities (eg. workshops) to utilise IGER's expertise to the full.

- *During the project period, has there been an internal or external evaluation of the work or are there any plans for this?*

The State Institute of Nature Protection, the government advisory body for nature conservation, will be responsible for evaluating the two management plans the Park's have produced. They have already visited both Učka Nature Park and the ŽSGNP to make an initial assessment on progress etc.

- *What are the key lessons to be drawn from the experience of this project? We would welcome your comments on any broader lessons for Darwin Initiative as a programme or practical lessons that could be valuable to other projects, as we would like to present this information on a website page.*

The main lesson learnt from this project is to, particularly in countries which are still in economic and political transition, invest capacity building and training in a broader range of partners and people. This will help to mitigate any serious problems due to changes to staff and park management. Another lesson is to play a more active role in recruiting project staff. This is to ensure that any staff solely dedicated to the

project, have the ability and desire to take on board new skills and experience.

With regards to any suggestions or recommendations to the Darwin Secretariat; would a flexible top up fund (say of a maximum of £5,000) be a useful mechanism to assist projects who, through no fault of their own, need extra resources to delivery the project? As a lot of Darwin project work in countries which are either in political or economic transition, or are post-conflict, etc. this could provide additional support and adaptability in response to factors out of the project's control.

10. Actions taken in response to annual report reviews (if applicable)

- *Have you responded to issues raised in the reviews of your annual reports? Have you discussed the reviews with your collaborators? Briefly summarise what actions have been taken over the lifetime of the project as a result of recommendations from previous reviews (if applicable).*

Yes, the project team have responded to the issues raised in the two reviews, although we only got a copy of the second year review in January 2007, some 9 months after we had submitted our report. As requested by the reviewer after the 1st year report we supplied copies of the grassland biodiversity surveying manual which was highly praised by the reviewer.

The lack of capacity of our main project partner, the ŽSNGP, due to significant staff changes, losses and sickness in the 2nd year and the impact of this on our project was a key concern of the reviewer. This was a major concern of ours too, and we responded by adapting the project to include significantly more training than anticipated. This was to get the new staff members up to speed and to ensure the delivery of outputs. The investment of training in the new Darwin scholar, Vesna Zlatar, proved to be hugely effective. Vesna, within a relatively short time, became a huge asset to the project team and helped to ensure that the majority of the key milestones were produced and all to a very high standard. Yes, some of the milestones were completed later than planned but this was an inevitable consequence of the staff changes in the Park and the late start up of the project. The skills, experience and empowerment Vesna gained through the project meant that she was quickly snapped up by the State Institute for Nature Protection as a management planning officer.

11. Darwin Identity

- *What effort has the project made to publicise the Darwin Initiative, e.g. where did the project use the Darwin Initiative logo, promote Darwin funding opportunities or projects? Was there evidence that Darwin Fellows or Darwin Scholars/Students used these titles?*

The Darwin Initiative was publicised at every opportunity; during workshops, at presentations and on the range of publications produced by the project.

- *What is the understanding of Darwin Identity in the host country? Who, within the host country, is likely to be familiar with the Darwin Initiative and what evidence is there to show that people are aware of this project and the aims of the Darwin Initiative?*

The majority of Croatia's conservation constituency now know about the Darwin Initiative and that it supports well planned, executed projects of exceptional high standard and value for money. Numerous conservationists have commented on how much our project has delivered in comparison to a parallel World Bank project, the Karst Ecosystem Conservation project, worth some five million dollars.

- *Considering the project in the context of biodiversity conservation in the host country, did it form part of a larger programme or was it recognised as a distinct project with a clear identity?*

The project had its own clear identity in the country although developed strong links with other protected areas and conservation bodies like the State Institute for Nature Protection.

12. Leverage

- *During the lifetime of the project, what additional funds were attracted to biodiversity work associated with the project, including additional investment by partners?*

In 2006 the Park was successful in its application to the national Environment and Energy Fund to purchase

a tractor and other grassland management equipment. This was worth circa £26,000 and will enable the Park to start implementing the GAP, including the management and restoration of meadows.

The development of Učka Nature Park's management plan, and their collaboration with the Darwin project, assisted them in a successful application to EU INTERREG funding for a cross border project with Škocjan Caves Regional Park. This 2 year project entitled the 'Karst Associated Management' or KAM project is worth 250,000 Euro in total.

- *What efforts were made by UK project staff to strengthen the capacity of partners to secure further funds for similar work in the host country and were attempts made to capture funds from international donors?*

The project applied for post-project funding from the Darwin Initiative to increase the impact of the project's legacy in Croatia. The project with three new in-country partners (Učka Nature Park, Biokovo Nature Park and the State Institute for Nature Protection) was unsuccessful.

FFI are currently looking to develop a project with the recently established NGO, Eko-centric, which was established by three of the project's trainees.

13. Sustainability and Legacy

- *What project achievements are most likely to endure? What will happen to project staff and resources after the project ends? Are partners likely to keep in touch?*

The project achievement that is most likely to endure are the young, enthusiastic and committed conservationists which the project has empowered and trained in skills and knowledge not attainable currently in Croatia. These include Zrinka Mesić, Biljana Janev Hutinec, Dr Matija Franković, Marin Grugurev and last, but by far least, our 2nd project officer, Vesna Zlatar. All these colleagues now hold positions of responsibility within Croatia's conservation constituency and will share their skills with the wider conservation community, ensuring the project's legacy within Croatia.

Another key achievement of the project that is likely to endure is the four strategic planning documents produced by the project; i) The ŽSGNP management plan, ii) the UNP management plan, iii) the Grassland Action Plan for ŽSGNP and iv) the Grassland Biodiversity Monitoring Plan for ŽSGNP. These four documents of exceptional high quality will set a precedent for other protected areas to follow and learn from.

The third major achievement of the project are the three training handbooks;

- i) Grassland biodiversity and surveying: a handbook
- ii) Grassland management for nature conservation: a handbook
- iii) Protected Area Management Planning in Croatia: a manual and toolkit

These handbooks, targeted towards protected areas and other conservation bodies, fill a much needed knowledge gap in practical grassland management, stakeholder participation and protected area management planning in Croatia. These handbooks coupled with the above examples of strategic planning documents will provide Croatia's protected areas with the know how and guidance to develop their own management plans and grassland action plans as well as implement them to conserve Croatia's unique grassland biodiversity.

It is highly likely that the key trainees of the project will stay in touch with the UK partners. Already FFI is planning to develop a collaborative NGO twinning project with the newly established NGO, Eko-centric.

- *Have the project's conclusions and outputs been widely applied? How could legacy have been improved?*

The project's conclusions and outputs have already started to be applied in Croatia. Croatia's national guidelines on management planning include much of the principals and methodologies used in the project. In addition, one of the project's trainees is now recognised as a management planning expert in his own right, with numerous protected areas asking his advice on management planning. Vesna Zlatar, as a management planning officer in the State Institute for Nature Protection and advisor to other protected areas will ensure that the projects outputs will be widely applied throughout. In addition, a number of protected areas and the State Institute of Nature Protection have indicated that they will start to develop

Grassland Action Plans in the new future using the methodologies and principles of the project.

Legacy could have been improved if the project had worked with a greater number of partners, and not solely relied on the ŽSNGP to take forward the main conclusions/outputs of the project. However, at the onset of the project it was not envisaged that there would be such significant staff changes/losses in the Park and the impact it would have.

A post-project would have significantly increased the legacy of the project in Croatia as we would have worked with three well positioned partners. The potential significant gain of the post-project was also recognised by the Darwin Secretariat. Unfortunately, the post-project was not funded as the UK partners would have had to play a significant role in the project again. We would have had to transfer the skills and expertise to three new partners as the ŽSNGP currently does not have the desire or capacity.

Are additional funds being sought to continue aspects of the project (funds from where and for which aspects)?

FFI and the NGO-Ekocentric (founded and established by key trainees in the project) are looking to develop a collaborative twinning project in Croatia.

14. Value for money

- *Considering the costs and benefits of the project, how do you rate the project in terms of value for money and what evidence do you have to support these conclusions?*

The project has provided exceptional value for money, predominately due to the commitment of individuals within our project partners. The total amount funded by the Darwin project amounted to £150,600. This was matched by project partners by over £93,000, which included a leverage of funds of £26,000 for grassland management equipment.

Although our project has been the “Cinderella” of a much bigger, longer and better funded project, the Karst Ecosystem Conservation project, our outputs, in terms of quality, relevance and applicability have stood out amongst the conservation community, receiving much praise and respect.

15. Appendix I: Project Contribution to Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

Please complete the table below to show the extent of project contribution to the different measures for biodiversity conservation defined in the CBD Articles. This will enable us to tie Darwin projects more directly into CBD areas and to see if the underlying objective of the Darwin Initiative has been met. We have focused on CBD Articles that are most relevant to biodiversity conservation initiatives by small projects in developing countries. However, certain Articles have been omitted where they apply across the board. Where there is overlap between measures described by two different Articles, allocate the % to the most appropriate one.

Project Contribution to Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity		
Article No./Title	Project %	Article Description
6. General Measures for Conservation & Sustainable Use	5	Develop national strategies that integrate conservation and sustainable use.
7. Identification and Monitoring	20	Identify and monitor components of biological diversity, particularly those requiring urgent conservation; identify processes and activities that have adverse effects; maintain and organise relevant data.
8. In-situ Conservation	20	Establish systems of protected areas with guidelines for selection and management; regulate biological resources, promote protection of habitats; manage areas adjacent to protected areas; restore degraded ecosystems and recovery of threatened species; control risks associated with organisms modified by biotechnology; control spread of alien species; ensure compatibility between sustainable use of resources and their conservation; protect traditional lifestyles and knowledge on biological resources.
9. Ex-situ Conservation	0	Adopt ex-situ measures to conserve and research components of biological diversity, preferably in country of origin; facilitate recovery of threatened species; regulate and manage collection of biological resources.
10. Sustainable Use of Components of Biological Diversity	0	Integrate conservation and sustainable use in national decisions; protect sustainable customary uses; support local populations to implement remedial actions; encourage co-operation between governments and the private sector.
11. Incentive Measures	10	Establish economically and socially sound incentives to conserve and promote sustainable use of biological diversity.
12. Research and Training	15	Establish programmes for scientific and technical education in identification, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity components; promote research contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, particularly in developing countries (in accordance with SBSTTA recommendations).

13. Public Education and Awareness	10	Promote understanding of the importance of measures to conserve biological diversity and propagate these measures through the media; cooperate with other states and organisations in developing awareness programmes.
14. Impact Assessment and Minimizing Adverse Impacts	0	Introduce EIAs of appropriate projects and allow public participation; take into account environmental consequences of policies; exchange information on impacts beyond State boundaries and work to reduce hazards; promote emergency responses to hazards; examine mechanisms for re-dress of international damage.
15. Access to Genetic Resources	0	Whilst governments control access to their genetic resources they should also facilitate access of environmentally sound uses on mutually agreed terms; scientific research based on a country's genetic resources should ensure sharing in a fair and equitable way of results and benefits.
16. Access to and Transfer of Technology	0	Countries shall ensure access to technologies relevant to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity under fair and most favourable terms to the source countries (subject to patents and intellectual property rights) and ensure the private sector facilitates such assess and joint development of technologies.
17. Exchange of Information	20	Countries shall facilitate information exchange and repatriation including technical scientific and socio-economic research, information on training and surveying programmes and local knowledge
19. Bio-safety Protocol	0	Countries shall take legislative, administrative or policy measures to provide for the effective participation in biotechnological research activities and to ensure all practicable measures to promote and advance priority access on a fair and equitable basis, especially where they provide the genetic resources for such research.
Total %	100%	Check % = total 100

16. Appendix II Outputs

Please quantify and briefly describe all project outputs using the coding and format of the Darwin Initiative Standard Output Measures.

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)	Quantities
Training Outputs			
1a	Number of people to submit PhD thesis		
1b	Number of PhD qualifications obtained		
2	Number of Masters qualifications obtained		
3	Number of other qualifications obtained		
4a	Number of undergraduate students receiving training		
4b	Number of training weeks provided to undergraduate students		
4c	Number of postgraduate students receiving training (not 1-3 above)		
4d	Number of training weeks for postgraduate students		
5	Number of people receiving other forms of long-term (>1yr) training not leading to formal qualification(i.e not categories 1-4 above)	3 month study visit by first Darwin scholar to IGER, plus continuous mentoring and training throughout Y1 andY2. Training and mentoring of 2 nd Darwin scholar.	2
6a	Number of people receiving other forms of short-term education/training (i.e not categories 1-5 above)	Training workshops in participatory management planning, grassland surveying, management and monitoring	80
6b	Number of training weeks not leading to formal qualification	Workshops for ŽSGNP, UNP, Biokovo NP and other protected areas/conservation agencies	20
7	Number of types of training materials produced for use by host country(s)	3 training manuals: i) Grassland biodiversity and its surveying; a handbook ii) Grassland management for nature protection; a handbook and iii) Protected areas management planning in Croatia; a manual and toolkit	3
Research Outputs			
8	Number of weeks spent by UK project staff on project work in host country(s)	Surveying, project planning and management	10
9	Number of species/habitat management plans (or action plans) produced for	2 participatory management plans (ŽSGNP, UNP), 1 grassland action plan (ŽSGNP) 1 grassland monitoring	4

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)	Quantities
	Governments, public authorities or other implementing agencies in the host country (s)	plan (ŽSGNP)	
10	Number of formal documents produced to assist work related to species identification, classification and recording.	Tractor mowing plan and grassland demonstration plot plan	2
11a	Number of papers published or accepted for publication in peer reviewed journals		
11b	Number of papers published or accepted for publication elsewhere		
12a	Number of computer-based databases established (containing species/generic information) and handed over to host country	Grassland biodiversity database	1
12b	Number of computer-based databases enhanced (containing species/genetic information) and handed over to host country		
13a	Number of species reference collections established and handed over to host country(s)	Grassland herbarium collection for the park	1
13b	Number of species reference collections enhanced and handed over to host country(s)		
Dissemination Outputs			Quantities
14a	Number of conferences/seminars/workshops organised to present/disseminate findings from Darwin project work		3
14b	Number of conferences/seminars/workshops attended at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated.	Presentation of the two management plans at national conference	1
15a	Number of national press releases or publicity articles in host country(s)	Articles in national papers	8
15b	Number of local press releases or publicity articles in host country(s)	Articles in local papers, annual reviews etc.	5
15c	Number of national press releases or publicity articles in UK	Including article in FFI magazine "Protecting a Natural Treasure in the Balkans"	3
15d	Number of local press releases or publicity articles in UK		

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)	Quantities
16a	Number of issues of newsletters produced in the host country(s)	One bi-annual newsletter entitled <i>Kosilica</i> in Croatia and one entitled <i>Grass cuttings</i> in UK	8
16b	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the host country(s)		2,000
16c	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the UK		100
17a	Number of dissemination networks established		
17b	Number of dissemination networks enhanced or extended		
18a	Number of national TV programmes/features in host country(s)	Interviews on popular national TV programme “Good morning Croatia”	2
18b	Number of national TV programme/features in the UK		
18c	Number of local TV programme/features in host country		
18d	Number of local TV programme features in the UK		
19a	Number of national radio interviews/features in host country(s)	Interviews on national radio	2
19b	Number of national radio interviews/features in the UK		
19c	Number of local radio interviews/features in host country (s)	Interviews on local radio	3
19d	Number of local radio interviews/features in the UK		
Physical Outputs			
20	Estimated value (£s) of physical assets handed over to host country(s)	Laptop computer, digital camera, books, aerial photographs, permanent markers etc.	£3,000
21	Number of permanent educational/training/research facilities or organisation established		
22	Number of permanent field plots established		
23	Value of additional resources raised for project	In kind salary contribution, Darwin scholar salary, workshop venue and subsistence, grant to purchase tractor and mowing equipment (£26,000) etc.	£93, 400

17. Appendix III: Publications

Provide full details of all publications and material that can be publicly accessed, e.g. title, name of publisher, contact details, cost. Details will be recorded on the Darwin Monitoring Website Publications Database that is currently being compiled.

Mark (*) all publications and other material that you have included with this report

Type * (e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (title, author, year)	Publishers (name, city)	Available from	Cost £
Newsletter	"Kosilica", Winter 05		www.ppzsg.org/darwin	-
Newsletter	"Grass cuttings", Winter 05		www.ppszg.org/darwin	-
Newsletter	"Kosilica", Autumn 05		www.ppzsg.org/darwin	-
Newsletter	"Grass cuttings", Autumn 05		www.ppszg.org/darwin	-
Newsletter	"Kosilica", Spring 06		www.ppzsg.org/darwin	-
Newsletter	"Grass cuttings", Spring 06		www.ppzsg.org/darwin	-
Manual* (CD and PDF)	Eastwood, A., Tallowin, J., & Gundrey, A. (2006) Grassland biodiversity and surveying: a handbook	FFI, Cambridge	www.ppzsg.org/darwin	-
Manual (printed handbook and PDF)	Eastwood, A., Tallowin, J., i Gundrey, A. (2006) Biološka raznolikost i pregled stanja travnjaka – Priručnik	FFI, Cambridge	www.ppzsg.org/darwin and the ŽSGNP	-
Newsletter	"Kosilica", Autumn 06		www.ppzsg.org/darwin	-
Manual* (CD and PDF)	Eastwood, A. and Tallowin, J. (2007) Grassland management for nature conservation: a handbook	FFI, Cambridge	www.ppzsg.org/darwin	-
Manual (CD and PDF)	Eastwood, A. i Tallowin, J. (2007) Upravljanje travnjacima radi očuvanja prirode – Priručnik.	FFI, Cambridge	www.ppzsg.org/darwin	-
Newsletter	"Grass cuttings", Spring 07		www.ppzsg.org/darwin	-
Habitat Action Plan	Zlatar <i>et al.</i> (2007) Grassland Action Plan for the Žumberak-Samoborsko gorje Nature Park	PPŽSG, Samobor	www.ppzsg.org/darwin	-
Monitoring Plan	Eastwood <i>et al.</i> (2007) Grassland Biodiversity Monitoring Plan for the Žumberak- Samoborsko gorje Nature Park – Version 1	FFI, PPŽSG and IGER	www.ppzsg.org/darwin	-
Manual* (CD and PDF)	Appleton, M.R. & Hotham. P.A.E. (2007) Protected area management planning in Croatia: a manual and toolkit	FFI, Cambridge	www.ppzsg.org/darwin	-
Manual (CD and PDF)	Appleton, M.R. i Hotham. P.A.E. (2007) Izrada planova upravljanja zaštićenim područjima u Hrvatskoj - Priručnik.	FFI, Cambridge	www.ppzsg.org/darwin	-

18. Appendix IV: Darwin Contacts

To assist us with future evaluation work and feedback on your report, please provide contact details below.

Project Title	Developing a model for the conservation of Croatia's grassland biodiversity
Ref. No.	162/13/004
UK Leader Details	
Name	Paul Hotham
Role within Darwin Project	Provided protected area management planning training to two protected areas and facilitated development of their respective management plans
Address	Fauna & Flora International, 4 th Floor, Jupiter House, Station Road, Cambridge, CB1 2JD.
Phone	
Fax	
Email	
Other UK Contact (if relevant)	
Name	Dr Antonia Eastwood
Role within Darwin Project	Overall project manager and trainer in grassland biodiversity conservation
Address	Macaulay Institute, Craigiebuckler, Aberdeen, AB15 8QH UK
Phone	
Fax	
Email	
Partner 1	
Name	Krešo Vrbanac
Organisation	Žumberak-Samoborsko gorje Nature Park
Role within Darwin Project	Training recipient
Address	Slani Dol 1, Samobor, HR-10430
Fax	
Email	
Partner 2 (if relevant)	
Name	Jerry Tallwin
Organisation	Institute of Grassland and Environmental Research
Role within Darwin Project	Provided expert advice, guidance and training on grassland biodiversity conservation
Address	North Wyke, Okehampton, Devon, EX20 2SB
Fax	
Email	

Appendix V: Logical Framework

Project summary	Measurable indicators	Means of verification	Important assumptions
<p>Goal:</p> <p>To draw on expertise relevant to biodiversity from within the United Kingdom to work with local partners in countries rich in biodiversity but poor in resources to achieve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components, and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources 			
<p>Purpose</p> <p>To build the capacity of the ŽSGNP and to initiate the development of sustainable management systems to conserve the biodiversity and wildlife riches of grasslands in Croatia.</p>	<p>New data on habitats, species and agricultural practices in the ŽSGNP</p> <p>Stakeholders integrated into management/action plan (s)</p> <p>Restoration/maintenance of high conservation value meadows and pastures.</p> <p>Mosaic of landscapes/habitats maintained in park</p> <p>Other PAs initiate sustainable</p>	<p>Biodiversity data base</p> <p>No. of stakeholders collaborating with Park</p> <p>Stakeholders integration in PAs management/action plans</p> <p>Habitat management and monitoring reports</p> <p>Annual reports, work plans</p> <p>Reports, correspondence and newsletters from other nature parks</p>	<p>Stakeholders (farmers, hunters, etc.) wish to participate</p> <p>The Government (central and local) supports the initiative and develops agri-environmental policies</p> <p>Traditional agricultural practices are economically viable for remaining stakeholders</p> <p>Supplementary income generation is feasible (eco-</p>
<p>Outputs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> ŽSGNP Park Management Plan ŽSGNP park staff trained in management planning, surveying, monitoring and habitat management Other PAs trained in above Production of habitat and species action plans Public awareness of grasslands raised 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Production of management plan No. of weeks in-country training, 4 Workshops, 2 Conferences, UK study visit, Course attendance. Additional management planning workshop for another PA, 4 training handbooks, 3 training workshops Production of habitat and species action plans Educational poster, press releases, TV or radio broadcast, 5 newsletters 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Management plan Travel itineraries, Workshop attendance, Presentation of UK study visit and report, Conference/course summary presented to other park staff Handbooks distributed to PAs, A list of trainees attending workshops and assessment records/feedback, Preparation of additional management plan Habitat/species action plans Copies sent to Darwin Initiative 	<p>Management plan is adopted and implemented</p> <p>Prescribed management and monitoring is adopted and continues to be supported</p> <p>ŽSGNP Darwin scholar, staff motivated and responsive to training</p> <p>ŽSGNP staff able to train others</p> <p>Trainees motivated and responsive to training</p> <p>Trainees initiate sustainable management systems in other PAs</p>
<p>Activities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop, stakeholder assessment, surveys, data collation; Workshops, on-the-job training, study visit, conferences; Training workshops, handbooks; Stakeholder participation, collaboration with experts, surveys, data collation; establishment of database Press releases, poster, newsletters, broadcast. 	<p>Activity Milestones (Summary of Project Implementation Timetable)</p> <p>1. Yr 1) Management planning workshop, Biodiversity/agriculture/policy and stakeholder assessment, consultations. Yr 2) Collation and analysis of data, Establishment of database. Yr 3) Management plan review workshop, Production of draft management plan. 2. Yr 1) Workshop in surveying techniques, DI scholar attends course, Conference attendance for 2 key staff. Yr 2) Workshops in habitat and species management and monitoring, UK study visit for Darwin Scholar, Conference attendance for 2 key staff. 3. Yr 1) -. Yr 2) Workshop in Surveying, Production of 1st and 2nd handbook, Management planning workshop for additional PA. Yr 3) Production of 3rd and 4th handbook, Workshops in habitat management and monitoring, Management plan review for other PA. 4. Yr 1) Biodiversity surveys and consultations with experts, stakeholders etc, Literature reviews. Yr 2) Collation and analysis of data, Establishment of database. Yr 3) Production of habitat and species action plans. 5. Yr 1) Press releases, 1 newsletter, project on websites. Yr 2) Press releases, 2 newsletters. Yr 3) Press releases, 2 newsletters, educational poster.</p>		

