

Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species

Final Report

1. Darwin Project Information

Project Reference No.	162/9/011
Project title	<i>Podaj dlon Naturze (Give a hand to Nature)</i>
Country	<i>Poland</i>
UK Contractor	<i>Community Environmental Educational Developments</i>
Partner Organisation (s)	<i>Polska Zielony Siec (Polish Green Net)</i> <i>Pronatura, Wroclaw</i> <i>FWIE, Krakow</i> <i>Greenworks, Nowy Sacz</i> <i>Towarzystwo dla Natury i Czlowieka, Lublin</i> <i>Towarzystwo ne rzecz Ziemi, Oswiecim</i>
Darwin Grant Value	68,714
Start/End date	2000/2003
Project website	<i>NYA (CEED website under reconstruction)</i>
Author(s), date	Mike Wilson, Pam McCarthy, Derek Blair. July 2004

2. Project Background/Rationale

- Describe the location and circumstances of the project
- *The project has been based in Southern Poland involving organisations in five cities from Lublin in the east to Wroclaw in the west and centred on Krakow. All are community based NGOs working in the environmental sector.*
- What was the problem that the project aimed to address?
- *The problem examined is the creation of urban nature spaces, to protect Poland's atypical urban biodiversity, by NGOs as part of a response to socio-economic and environmental regeneration.*
- 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 project need was identified by CEED from previous work in the Polish urban environment. Previous projects were local works creating urban nature spaces that demonstrated a requirement for a regional response to both dealing with the process of site creation/maintenance and creating a strategy for biodiversity action.*

3. Project Summary

- What were the purpose and objectives (or outputs) of the project?
- *The specific purpose has been to train Polish personnel and help NGOs to create and develop management plans for urban nature spaces in selected areas. Project results are to be used in the creation of a Guide for similar groups to use in their own project work. The whole to aim towards producing a culture of biodiversity planning in southern Poland.*
- 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?
- *Yes. The Operational plan was modified to reflect a change of partner. Project administration in Poland moved from FWIE (the original partner) to PZS from 08/01 when FWIE terminated and between 12/01 - 02/02 when notice and transfer were executed. PZS took up as the main partner and PZS took over as financial administrator in 2002, offering enhancement opportunities, when FWIE was removed as financial administrator. These significant actions, undertaken by CEED, were approved by the Darwin Secretariat. As a result, only 4 out of 5 of the original partner outputs are achievable.*
- 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.
- *6,8 & 12 are the most relevant, with further input in the areas of 13 and 17.*
- 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 very successful in achieving the training, site survey and management plan, consultation and project review objectives. All but one partner completed the above, the other partner finding itself unable to continue with participation due to organisational difficulties. The processes of producing biodiversity action plans, due to the bureaucratic nature of Polish local government, was not completed during the project period but continues. The guide will be completed and published in September 2004.*

4. Scientific, Training, and Technical Assessment

- Please provide a full account of the project's research, training, and/or technical work.
- *Five project officers were trained, in five separate sessions, in Project management and negotiation skills, consultation and community involvement skills, biodiversity assessment and survey skills, practical conservation, community education, and biodiversity planning. The project officers had been selected from applicant organisations by interview at the beginning of the project. These were all post-graduate level personnel, so the training was pitched at a suitable level. There were a number of cultural difficulties on both sides during the training, as Polish education has a much more formal style than western Europe has developed in the last thirty years. The officers were expecting a much more pedagogical approach and the trainers were expecting more feedback and participation. During less "scientific" sessions, such as exercises designed to demonstrate community participation sessions, students spent much time questioning the validity of the subject. Normally, this would have been valid participation but, due to time constraints caused by the delayed start to the project, there was insufficient time to address these concerns*

adequately. In the circumstances, a more authoritarian approach to the session was necessary to make sure that it proceeded to completion. This problem did not improve already strained relationships.

These sessions took place in Poland, at various venues provided by the partner bodies. Trainers were British and Dutch for the majority of courses, with some input from Polish experts. Modified training materials will be included in annexes to the guide. Excerpts from training materials can be found in annex XXx of this report.

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?
- *Due to the bureaucratic nature of Polish government there is, at present, little evidence that the project purpose has been accomplished. Sites in all partner locations are now in the consideration process for legal protection. There are signs that the Polish NGO community is coming round to the notion of being activist in the “hands on” rather than the campaigning sense.*
- 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 substantially achieved purpose. This will be enhanced in the near future by the launch of the project guide. Future collaborative plans include work to promote the guide and to repeat the type of field work project undertaken by the present partners, in a different part of Poland. Additionally, project work in the sustainable development field will be undertaken.*
- 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).
- *The training has improved capacity greatly. The trainees are all members of the partner organisations and have the capacity to cascade their information further. Present activities:*
 - *Krakov – undertaking further training in the UK*
 - *Osciecim – working full time in partner organisation*
 - *Wroclaw – undertaking PhD, prior to further work with partner*
 - *Nowy Sacz – working full time in partner organisation*
 - *Lublin – undertaking PhD, prior to further work with partner*
- 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?
- *Two of the partners are long standing collaborators with CEED and will be participating in further activities. All of the partners have better than usual links with local government but these have been enhanced by the project’s ability to show a functional link between the NGO sector and the authorities. This is in direct contradiction to the usual role of NGOs in Poland, which is a confrontational, campaigning role, involving demonstrations and other publicity creating tactics to highlight issues. To be able to fulfil a functional role in the governmental process is a novelty and has been very difficult to promote as a valuable*

and efficient tool.

- 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?
- *Schoolchildren have been taken to sites for environmental education and awareness. Teachers are either shocked by the thought or embrace it quickly. In some areas, especially cosmopolitan Krakow, it is seen as the norm to take children out of the classroom for specialist work. In others, it is unknown. As yet, simple factors such as insurance are not concepts that schools have had to consider but Local Education Authorities are slowly getting out of the “pedagogical only” mindset of education and are encouraging their staff to examine lessons’ relevance to the local situation.*
Other beneficiaries will include the communities local to sites.

6. Project Outputs

- 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?
Some output information has already been disseminated through Polish environmental publications such as Zielony Brygady (Green Brigades) and through a paper given at a conference in Krakow in October 2003.
Further work to reach the target audience of environmental NGOs, Local Authorities and community groups will take place after the publication of the project guide, both in paper and on the Internet. This will be facilitated by PZS, assisted by CEED, and will be accompanied by further project work.

7. Project Expenditure

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

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?

- *Five partners initially, the primary original partner replaced with another organisation at the end of the second year. The project plan included more than one partner precisely for the reason that NGOs are not as stable as other organisations and the possibility of partner failure needed to be spread over several. This turned out to be good planning. Other participants included local wildlife experts, local authority officers, academic institution staff and members of non-partner NGOs. Main partners were NGOs with an interest in environmental issues including, but not limited to, biodiversity. The officers recruited to the project had worked already on projects affecting biodiversity so were aware of the topic. One partner was heavily involved in the project planning; unfortunately, this was the partner that, after a major reorganisation had settled down, decided that its priorities were in other environmental areas. Plans were not modified significantly in response to local consultation as local consultation was part of the original 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?

*No collaboration with other Darwin projects but collaboration with existing Polish biodiversity and environmental protection projects such as the Sola river campaign.
<http://www.zb.eco.pl/gb/21/sola.htm>*

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

- *Argus Ecological Services (British ecological consultancy) Environmental Advisory (Dutch environmental consultancy) both participated in training and Argus worked in the field with the project officers on their individual site surveys.*

Six Polish partners participated in the project. These were:

Polska Zielony Siec (Polish Green Net)

Pronatura, Wroclaw

Fundacja Wspierania InicjatywE Ekologiczne, Krakow

Greenworks, Nowy Sacz

Towarzystwo dla Natury i Człowieka, Lublin

Towarzystwo ne rzecz Ziemi, Oswiecim

- 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?

Local partnerships have been active in all locations; the Darwin project has been a springboard for further work in biodiversity by all partners. A major, unlisted, output has been the change of attitude in the partners, giving them the self-possession to make approaches to local authorities regarding co-operative work. Where community participation has been cultivated, it has proven to be a useful tool. This is especially true in the case of the site in Krakow, Skarby Krzemionek, which has a powerful community association working for its preservation. British and Dutch private sector workers have brought the ability to explain commercial advantages of increased biodiversity to the project.

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).

See annex XXx for evaluative reports from Dr Nina Wilson and Mr EnstJan Stroes.

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

- *Loss of FWIE*

The main problem that adversely affected the project was the collapse of the main partner – FWIE - in Krakow. FWIE proved unable to provide the capacity required to fulfil project outcomes and regrettably had to withdraw. As CEED had located its project officer in their office and set up management and financial systems with them, the enforced departure was serious, as documented elsewhere. It also affected the quality of communication between the Polish partners as uncertainty confused the programmes, meeting and targets.

Consensus has not been achieved entirely but all partners are now clearer about each other's expectations and manner of working. Relationships between "friendly" partners have become stronger. Further work is planned between some of them. One partner seems to be working hard towards excluding itself from the results, and therefore the rewards, of this project.

However, this change brought about a positive result by creating a more positive partnership with Polska Zieleony Siec (Polish Green Net) thereby providing a more secure and supportive base for the project. Directors and managers of PZS and CEED have met on a number of occasions and are drafting a future co-operation strategy to relate this project's work to urban sustainability and public participation, which is a project thread begun in Russia since Podaj dlon Naturze began.

FWIE was allowed by CEED and PZS to continue as financial administrator after their collapse as the main partner since their finance officer was common to both. However, when some maladministration came to light involving FWIE staff, CEED trustees immediately and completely installed PZS in their place. A financial loss (approximately £■■■■) was covered by CEED. Factors such as the implosion of the main partner, the lack of a suitable candidate for the post of deputy co-ordinator and the shortage of volunteer time in the UK have combined to increase the management workload to an unsatisfactory level. Notwithstanding this, there has been enough upside to maintain the success of the project. In particular, partners who are discerned as "difficult" to work with have voluntarily expressed opinions about the way to promote biodiversity in Poland that coincide with the contractor's. Some very honest discussions have taken place about how projects such as this should run.

- *Financial issues*

Financial issues - especially the amount of money available to Polish partners - were also responsible for tensions in relationships between partners, especially led by the NGO in Oswiecim. Possible misunderstandings by the organisation at conception existed but tensions became difficult at a number of meetings at which money shortages were

continuously raised. This destabilised good working relationships and brought great pressure on the CEED employee in Poland who exerted massive and continual efforts to seek compromise and consensus. In the end, her health was affected. The Oswiecim NGO became too strident even for other Polish partners and finally left the project.

When CEED received the contract for the project, a new clause relating to project financial auditing was noticed. This requirement had not been mentioned before. The Darwin Secretariat was contacted and queried on the need and extra cost of this requirement. CEED's financial consultant was also contacted and asked if he was qualified to undertake the audit. Darwin Secretariat assured CEED that the audit cost should be non-existent or very cheap. Our financial consultant said that it was unlikely to be free but would not be very expensive from him. CEED accordingly signed the contract. Subsequently, CEED discovered that its consultant was, in fact, not qualified to conduct the audit. Further enquiries to local auditing companies produced the information that the cost would be unlikely to be lower than £█████ per annum. This cost is not budgeted in the project finances and cannot be met. The accounts cannot, therefore, be audited by CEED to the requirements of Darwin. The misunderstanding seems to have arisen from the "normal" contractor of Darwin work. Universities and other, similar, establishments can get the audit done "in house" at no apparent cost. This is not the case with a small NGO with no accounting department. CEED has raised this matter again with DEFRA as late as June 2004 for resolution. In July 2004, CEED's new financial advisor became aware of the situation and has proposed a tactic to deal with the problem. Funding is now being applied for to cover the anticipated £█████ cost of providing certificates to date.

- *Lack of an (Polish) Assistant Co-ordinator.*
This post was to be based in the project base in Krakow with FWIE and to take responsibility for communications and co-ordination with Polish partners in support of the CEED officer and to seek funding to support the project. One person was appointed temporarily but was deemed to be unsuitable for permanent employment. No suitably trained person was identified or available to carry on the work, leading to a doubling of the workload for the CEED employee and impairing the quantity and quality of the communication across the team.
- *Cultural differences.*
Scientific standards and procedures are markedly different in Poland and personnel are often highly resistant to change. NGO capacity is also substantially different in Poland and relationships between NGOs and Local Authorities are less developed. Also, L.A. capacity for biodiversity work is almost non-existent compared to the UK.
- *IT and communication*
In an attempt to cut costs, IT and communication resources were not included in the project budget. In hindsight, given the rate at which IT and communication technology progresses, this was not a correct decision. Three years is a very long time in IT and machines that were near the cutting edge when the project began are now almost unable to fulfil their function. That is CEED's equipment – in Poland, the situation is even worse. One of the prime requisites of further applications to work with NGOs in Poland must be provision of basic office capacity for the term of the project.
- *Volunteer manager time problems*
At the end of 2002, the CEED Officer in Poland resigned to take up a post in a similar project with WWF on a much higher salary. Although this was a life-enhancing choice for the officer and a great compliment to CEED, the partners and the project, it meant that the project, already behind in its programme due to the difficulties noted above, now had to be managed from the UK by someone whose free time to do so was already severely curtailed. Since the project began, matters such as job change, moving and marriage had changed his circumstances considerably. As a result, time and capability for project work had been reduced. Nonetheless, several special, and privately funded, trips were made to Krakow to progress the project and to secure the remaining outputs.

Although this part of the report may be one of the largest sections (problem-solving is what all this is about) it should not be underestimated how successful the project has actually

been to date. Given the problems of managing ambitious projects on a part-time basis and the difficulties of cross-cultural differences in co-operative techniques (amply demonstrated in the Polish government's tactics in the recent run-up to accession) CEED, PZS and the other partners feel that significant, worthwhile advances in urban biodiversity protection have been made so far. Publication and publicising the guide for NGOs will be an even bigger step in allowing local communities to have a say in the preservation and enhancement of their own environment.

- During the project period, has there been an internal or external evaluation of the work or are there any plans for this?
- *Dr Nina Wilson has been evaluating the project externally. Her report is attached. ErnstJan Stroess, a Dutch environmental worker with a great deal of experience in project work in Poland, conducted both the project management training and a review of the project management. His report is attached. Internal evaluation was conducted along normal project management guidelines at the seminars noted on the original project timetable.*
- 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.
- *It is becoming obvious that it is almost impossible to evaluate whether a partner has the capacity required before working with them. Potential partners seem to have developed a habit of saying "yes", whether they understand what is required or not. There must be some way of evaluating partner capability but it seems to be difficult to do and retain the trust of potential partners.*

Aims implementation via tasks is often different to the process first envisaged. For example, site protection; partners wish to protect as many sites as possible. This is a very bureaucratic process. By concentrating on the community involvement angle, however, it is possible to functionally protect sites by making the owners and the surrounding community aware of the sites' importance. The ability to see the options and take advantage of them is a useful skill to acquire.

The cultural environment of NGO work in Poland is still not an enhancing one. By this is meant the difficulties involved in everyday processes are still at a higher magnitude than in the UK. The accustomed infrastructure of Western Europe is lacking in all but the most wealthy organisations in Eastern Europe. Others have to put up with poor communications and power supply, small and poorly designed offices and continual financial crises. The old, adversarial method of work, whereby anyone outside the NGO coterie is seen as opponents seems to cling to some organisations. Unsurprisingly, these organisations are the ones where the officers rely on the NGO salary for a living. Possibly, there is still a requirement for these factors to be dealt with before further hands-on biodiversity work is undertaken.

Processes need to be broken into really quite small steps before some workers feel confident to undertake them. Self-esteem is easily broken down in the face of contrary opinion by, for example, an academic or a local government officer. One of the unexpected and unquantified outcomes of this project has been the huge increase in NGO personnel capacity in this area. The project workers have told CEED that they feel much more confident about dealing with such people since the project forced them into the situation. Some of the training was aimed at this type of situation and this was the training that was originally derided by the project workers.

The importance of face-to-face meetings with partners must not be underestimated. Misunderstandings are far fewer in these meetings than in emails, faxes and even

telephone conversations, where even the smallest slip of syntax or spelling can cause problems. Often, this is due to the person concerned feeling unable to query a statement in case it is thought their grasp of English is poor. It is also vitally important for UK staff working in the host country to have meetings with UK based staff. It is easy for these personnel to feel isolated without if they have none. This has been a particular problem for CEED's worker in Poland. Regular visits should be part of the application and budgeting process for this type of project.

- *There was an unfortunate isolated incident where a visiting consultant was mugged for his mobile phone whilst working in Poland. Future visitors will be made aware of this type of hazard, which is easy to forget about in an otherwise friendly environment.*
- *Despite numerous reminders, partners seem to be completely incapable of either mentioning funders in publicity or placing logos in publications. At present, there seems to be no known cure for this affliction. Bizarrely, producing their own publicity and publications were two of the few tasks that partners were happy to conduct without excessive hand-holding by the contractor.*
- *At organisational level, the interaction between NGOs, Local Authorities and consultancies has been explored at some depth. The possibilities for enhanced function available through changed processes of interaction have been quickly realised by some organisations. This may form a more important part of future projects, although it seems that those organisation still acting in an isolationist, adversarial way are already suffering because of it and this emphasis may cease to be a prime requirement.*

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.
- N/a

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?
- *As mentioned previously, it has been extremely difficult to get partners to utilise Darwin logos effectively. At least in part, this may be due to a kind of national embarrassment that such an initiative is necessary in their country. UK members of the project have been extremely diligent in publicising the funders.*
- 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 Darwin Initiative is little known to the environmental activist community in Poland. This is partly because that may not be the target audience of Darwin. National government personnel, when contacted, were aware of Darwin, as were some of the local experts (academics, etc) who were associated with the project.*
- 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?

- *Probably the latter, although its aims towards national policy were recognised by the Polish Ministry of the Environment.*

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?
- *Darwin funding was approximately 60% of the total project costs.*
- 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?
- *CEED made great efforts to encourage partners to apply for further funding. One major application was created but CEED staff felt that it was nowhere near sufficiently well-presented to be suitable for submission. One partner was successful in an application to the British Embassy in Warsaw for further funding under the DFID programme.*

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 guide to NGOs will be part of a series of publications that is to be available on a website (<http://www.ceti-ceed.org/>) that is host to others already. The trained staff will continue to be part of their organisations. Partner organisations are part of Polish Green Net (PZS), so communication will continue amongst them.*
- Have the project's conclusions and outputs been widely applied? How could legacy have been improved?
- *Not yet. The guide will help to promulgate this process, through the communication network of PZS. This will be the subject of further work between CEED and PZS.*
- Are additional funds being sought to continue aspects of the project (funds from where and for which aspects)?
- *There are plans to continue the work of promoting the guide and undertake further project work with PZS. Funding will be required for this but, until the present work is completed properly, funding applications are not being prepared.*

14. Post-Project Follow up Activities (max. 300 words)

This section should be completed ONLY if you wish to be considered for invitation to apply for Post Project Funding. *Each year, a small number of Darwin projects will be invited to apply for funding. Selection of these projects will be based on promising project work, reviews, and your comments within this section. Further information on this funding scheme is available from the Darwin website.*

- What follow-up activities would help to embed or consolidate the results of your Darwin project, and why would you consider these as suitable for Darwin Post Project Funding?
- *Publication, promotion and promulgation of the guide will help considerably.*
- What evidence is there of strong commitment and capacity by host country partners to enable them to play a major role in follow-up activities?
- *PZS is an existing communication organisation that has members in all areas of Poland. The successes of this project can be advertised and promoted to activist environmental organisations through it in a cost effective manner. PZS has been asking CEED for some time how the two organisations will work together in the future.*

15. 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?
- *Under a rating system of poor, reasonable and excellent, the project at present is reasonable value for money. Some aspects, such as the amount of worker time invested against salaries actually paid, are excellent value. Once the final few outputs are complete, the project will represent overall excellent value for money. The evidence comes from CEED's own accounts, whereby it was compensated for one urban nature space in the UK to the value of £[REDACTED] from the local authority. Going on this value, the project is in the process of creating four protected areas, producing a guide for organisations wishing to undertake the process themselves and has trained five activists in the process, all for approximately £[REDACTED]. This does not include any further value accrued by the creation of a culture of biodiversity conservation generated in Polish environmental NGOs.*

16. 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		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		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	20	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		Establish economically and socially sound incentives to conserve and promote sustainable use of biological diversity.
12. Research and Training	20	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	15	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		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		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		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 access and joint development of technologies.
17. Exchange of Information	5	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		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

17. 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)
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)	
6a	5	Train partner officers in Biodiversity assessment, site survey techniques, project management, negotiation, community consultation and involvement, biodiversity planning and production of local and regional biodiversity action plans (This training at postgraduate level - not declared at project inception due to unknown abilities of recruits) Does not count individual training time given to project officers by Poland-based co-ordinator.
6b	10	
7	1	Modified materials relating to biodiversity assessment and survey, project management, community consultation and biodiversity planning used in project training will be annexes of the NGO guide. Not including actual training materials produced for the trainees.
Research Outputs		
8	18 (102)	Training, review meetings, site survey assistance, etc. Not including full-time officer in Poland (figure in brackets) for two years.

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)
9	4	(in process) Exemplars to be included in the guide
10	1	Guide
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	
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)	
13b	Number of species reference collections enhanced and handed over to host country(s)	

Dissemination Outputs		
14a	5	Seminars organised in Krakow, Lublin, Wroclaw & Nowy Sacz. UK Seminar in Sunderland.
14b	1	Paper presented at conference “Management Tools in the Environmental Protection (Environmental Impact Assessment Issues on the Eve of Joining the European Union)” at Academy of Mining and Metallurgy, Krakow, 16-18 October, 2003 (Annex X)
15a	17	Very few copies of publicity passed to contractor. These numbers are under-representative.
15b	7	As above
15c	Number of national press releases or publicity articles in UK	
15d	Number of local press releases or publicity articles in UK	
16a	Number of issues of newsletters produced in the host country(s)	
16b	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the host country(s)	
16c	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the UK	
17a	1	Polska Zielony Siec (Polish Green Net) is a national network of environmental NGOs that is disseminating the work of Podaj dlon Naturze.
17b	Number of dissemination networks enhanced or extended	
18a	Number of national TV programmes/features in host country(s)	
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)	
19b	Number of national radio interviews/features in the UK	
19c	1	Interview with project officer in Krakow – no record.
19d	Number of local radio interviews/features in the UK	
Physical Outputs		
20	£██████	Maps, reference books, survey equipment.
21	Number of permanent educational/training/research facilities or organisation established	
22	Number of permanent field plots established	

23	£45,500	<p><i>Approx £ [REDACTED] cash, Funding from Charity Know-How, Staples fund and private donations. Not including recent grant application for accountancy fees</i></p> <p><i>£ [REDACTED] in volunteer and CEED paid officer time.</i></p> <p>Amounts in kind are very difficult to evaluate. Based on recent ESF values for volunteer time.</p> <p>http://www.esf.gov.uk/guidance/documents/guidance_july_o3.pdf - page 40)</p>
----	---------	--

18. 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 (e.g. contact address, website)	Cost £
<i>Paper</i>	<i>The role of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in the preservation and enhancement of Polish urban ecology. Blair, Honour & Wilson. 2003</i>	<i>Faculty of Mining Surveying and Environmental Engineering Stanislaw Staszic University of Mining and Metallurgy, Krakow</i>	http://galaxy.uci.agh.edu.pl/~konfoos/sub_eng.html <i>CEED</i>	<i>Free</i>
<i>Booklet</i>	<i>Zielony Lublin (Green Lublin)</i>	<i>Towarustwo dla Natury I Czlowieka, Lublin</i>	<i>CEED</i>	<i>Copy free</i>
<i>Leaflet</i>	<i>Skarby Krzemionek</i>	<i>FWIE, Krakow</i>	<i>CEED</i>	<i>Copy free</i>
<i>Leaflet</i>	<i>W twoim ogrodzie moze mieszkac jez!</i>	<i>FWIE, Krakow</i>	<i>CEED</i>	<i>Copy free</i>
<i>Manual</i>	<i>Give a hand to Nature, a guide to site selection and evaluation in Poland</i>	<i>CEED</i>	<i>CEED</i>	<i>Free to NGOs, price on negotiati on to local and regional governm ent and other institutio ns</i>

