

BULGARIA

Integrating Global Environmental Issues into Bulgaria's Regional Development Process

PIMS 3333



Integrating Global Environmental Issues into
Bulgaria's Regional Development Process,
UNDP/GEF Project

17-19 St.st. Kiril and Metodii Str.
floor 6, room 601 A
Sofia 1202, Bulgaria

Tel/ Fax: + (359 2) 94 05 575
<http://www.rioconventions.org/>

UNDP GEF APR/PIR 2007
(1 July 2006 to 30 June 2007)




I. Basic Project Data

Official Title:	Integrating Global Environmental Issues into Bulgaria's Regional Development Process		
Country/ies:	Bulgaria	PIMS Number	3333
		Atlas Project Number	00051783
Focal Area	Multi-focal (BD, CC, LD)	Project Type (FSP/MSP)	MSP
Strategic Priority	CB-2	Operational Programme	Capacity Building. OP 12
Date of Entry into Work Programme	22 March, 2006	Planned Project Duration	4 (years)
ProDoc Signature Date	28 June, 2006	Original Planned Closing Date	27 June, 2010
Date of First Disbursement	30 November, 2006	Revised Planned¹ Closing Date	N/A
Is this the Terminal APR/PIR?	NO	Date Project Operationally Closed (if applicable)	N/A
Date Mid Term Evaluation² carried out (if applicable)	N/A	Date Final Evaluation¹ carried out (if applicable)	N/A
Dates of visits to project by UNDP country office	N/A	Date of last TPR Meeting	19 Feb 2007
Date of last visit to project by UNDP-GEF RTA	N/A		

¹ Please explain any entry here in section V on "Changes in project schedule"

² If an evaluation has been carried out in the last 12 months the report should be attached to this document.

Project Contacts:

Title	Name	E-mail	Date	Signature
National Project Manager / Coordinator	Natalia Dimitrova	natalia@rioconventions.org	July, 16 2007	
Government GEF OFP ³ (optional)				
UNDP Country Office Programme Manager	Carsten Germer	carsten.germer@undp.org	July, 16 2007	
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor	Keti Chachibaia	Keti.chachibaia@undp.org	August 10, 2007	

Project Summary (as in PIMS and ProDoc)

The project objective is to build capacities for mainstreaming global environment into the formulation and implementation of regional and local development, as well as spatial planning policies. This will be achieved by the project strategy that is to promote a proactive integration of global environmental issues into the very process of regional and local development, as well as spatial planning, both of which are managed by Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works. This will be done by developing the capacity of MRDPW and MOEW to integrate global environmental objectives into the regional and local development policies and practices, as well as into spatial planning documents.

³ In the case of a project involving more than 1 country, it is suggested that for simplicity only the OFP (optional) and Country Office Programme Manager from the lead country sign-off. If representatives from more than 1 country sign off, please add additional rows as necessary, clearly indicating the country name for each signature.

II. Progress towards achieving project objectives

Note 1: Although the project start was 28 June, 2006, as per the project document, the actual start of the project did not occur until 13 November, 2006 when the Project Manager was hired. The reason for the prolonged project manager identification process was that the original identified Project Manager (identified in August) declined the position and a new call for the position had to be undertaken. Due to the belated start of the project, the project spending for the first year has been affected. Also the timing of activities although generally following the project work-plan is five months behind compared to the project documented start date. The project is aware of this issue and will during the project implementation take this into account and make all efforts to make up for time lost.

Note 2: Following the project start it was identified that the project indicators were very open and thus difficult to work with. Because of this the Steering Committee in February 2007 instructed the project to revise the indicators and this request was mentioned at the Project's inception workshop. A new set of indicators is currently being developed and a draft is attached to this PIR. However, for the reporting in this year PIR the project has kept the old indicators as the new still has to be accepted by the Project Steering Committee UNDP/GEF.

Project Objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator ⁴	Baseline Level ⁵	Target Level ⁴	Level ⁴ at 30 June 2007
<p>Objective 1: To build capacities for mainstreaming global environment into the formulation and implementation of regional and local development, as well as spatial planning policies</p>	<p>1. The agenda for mainstreaming GE into RD is being effectively championed Scorecard: 0 -- There is essentially no mainstreaming agenda; 1 -- There are some persons or institutions actively pursuing a mainstreaming agenda but they have little effect or influence; 2 -- There are a number of champions that drive the mainstreaming agenda, but more is needed; 3 -- There are an adequate number of able "champions" and "leaders" effectively driving forward a mainstreaming agenda</p>	1	3	<p>0 Comment: Due to the short time of its operations the project is still in the process of developing the tools and methodologies which will ultimately lead to the objective.</p>
<p>Outcome 1: The methodologies, skills, knowledge, and information management system for mainstreaming global environmental considerations into the formulation, implementation and evaluation of regional development and spatial planning policies are in place</p>	<p>1. Overall there are adequate skills for mainstreaming GE into RD at all levels in the MRDPW and MOEW Scorecard: 0 -- There is a general lack of skills for mainstreaming GE into RD; 1-- Some skills exist but in largely insufficient quantities to guarantee effective planning and implementation; 2 -- Necessary skills exist but are stretched and not easily available; 3 -- Adequate quantities of the full range of skills necessary for effective mainstreaming of GE into RD are easily available</p>	0	3	<p>0 Comment: The project is in the process of identifying the international and national entities which will develop the projects training material. It is expected that the training development package will start in August 2007.</p>
	<p>2. There are appropriate systems of training,</p>	0	3	1

⁴ This should describe the quantitative indicator

⁵ This should be a quantitative numerical value

	<p>mentoring, and learning in place to maintain a continuous flow of new staff Scorecard: 0 -- No mechanisms exist; 1 -- Some mechanisms exist but unable to develop enough and unable to provide the full range of skills needed; 2 -- Mechanisms generally exist to develop skilled professionals, but either not enough of them or unable to cover the full range of skills required; 3 -- There are mechanisms for developing adequate numbers of the full range of highly skilled regional development planners capable of integrating GE issues.</p>			<p>Comment: Although the project still has to develop its training packaged, there are already some mechanisms for training of new staff: i.e. existing bachelor programs in RD and policy (since the projects PDF-B phase two such programs were initiated in Sofia universities alone).</p> <p>However, these programmes are not specifically focusing on the integration of the conventions and pay little attention to the environment as such. Also there is still no institutionalized connection for placement of young graduates between universities and MRDPW /regional authorities, as potential employers of the professionals from such programs.</p>
	<p>3. Set of indicators that assesses impact of Regional Development and spatial planning documents on achievement of global environmental convention objectives</p>	<p>Current indicator set does not include global environmental performance indicators</p>	<p>By project end, there is a comprehensive set of indicators that can be used to assess impact of development and spatial planning at regional, district and municipal levels on the achievement of BD, CC, LD Convention objectives</p>	<p>Current indicator set does not include global environmental performance indicators</p> <p>Comment: The work on the indicators is expected to start in the fall of 2007 and it is hoped that a workable draft will be ready in the late spring of</p>
	<p>4. Access to data for reporting on the global environmental performance indicators</p>	<p>MRDPW staff have limited</p>	<p>MRDPW staff have full access to data needed for</p>	<p>MRDPW staff have limited access to data</p> <p>Comment: some of the needed data is held</p>

		access to data	reporting on progress in terms of impact on global environment convention commitments	by different institutions and is difficult to obtain. Other data (e.g. the one provided by NSI ⁶) is supplied with a big time-lag. Yet, other (free-access) data sources are not known by MRDPW staff (e.g. Corine landcover data).
	5. Institutions have the information they need to develop, implement and monitor regional development strategies/ plans that integrate GE issues. Scorecard: 0 -- Information is virtually lacking; 1 -- Some information exists, but is of poor quality and of limited usefulness and difficult to access; 2 -- Much information is readily available, mostly of good quality, but there remain some gaps both in quality and quantity; 3 -- Adequate quantities of high quality up to date information for mainstreaming GE into RD is widely and easily available	1	3	1 Comment: as mentioned above, there is still a general lack of unified data sources and reporting formats in institutions.
	6. Civil Society monitors the effect of regional development planning on BD, CC and LD concerns in the pilot region or group of municipalities Scorecard: 0 -- There is no dialogue at all; 1 -- There is some dialogue going on, but not in the wider public and restricted to specialized circles; 2 -- There is a reasonably open public dialogue going on but certain issues tend not to be discussed;	1	3	1 Comment: The project has yet to start working in this area and because of this the project we are still at baseline levels.

⁶ NSI – National Statistic Institute.

	3 -- There is an open and transparent public dialogue about the effect of RD planning on achievement of GE objectives			
Outcome 2: Institutional changes that support mainstreaming of global environment into regional development and spatial planning are in place	1. Human resource performance management systems are geared to encouraging development and application of acquired mainstreaming skills Scorecard: 0 -- Job requirements and performance management systems do not explicitly mention mainstreaming skills; 1 – There is indirect reference to importance of mainstreaming environmental and GE considerations in RD planning; 2 – Few job descriptions and performance assessments directly emphasize mainstreaming skills with their being scope for extension; 3 – Explicit emphasis on mainstreaming skills in all relevant job descriptions and performance assessments	0	3	0 Comment: Due to the short time of its operations the project has not yet produced an impact on the HR performance management systems at MRDPW. However, the project will be initiating work towards this indicator in the fall of 2007
	2. Individuals are highly motivated for mainstreaming GE considerations Scorecard: 0 -- No motivation at all; 1 -- Motivation uneven, some are but most are not; 2 -- Many individuals are motivated but not all; 3 -- Individuals are highly motivated	1	3	1 Comment: A training needs assessment commissioned by the project is under implementation. As a first logical step towards motivating employees for mainstreaming GE considerations, it shall identify existing gaps in knowledge and skills and “feed” this information into the training program development.
Outcome 3: Regional development plan and one municipal-level spatial development plan are revised to integrate global environmental objectives in	Model regional development and spatial development documents are submitted for approval by the respective bodies in charge of approving them.	Pilot region’s RDP or municipalities developme	By project end, revised planning documents are submitted for approval	Pilot region’s RDP or municipalities development and spatial plans do not explicitly take account of GE issues Comment: Work related to this indicator is only to begin in the latter part of the project

a pilot region or group of municipalities.		nt and spatial plans do not explicitly take account of GE issues		and because of this the project can only report baseline levels.
--	--	--	--	--

Rating of Project Progress towards Meeting Objective⁷

	2006 Rating	2007 Rating	Comments
National Project Manager/Coordinator	N/A	S	<p>Despite its belated start, the project is in compliance with the initial work-plan and as such is on target. However, the project has to make up the lost ground resulting from the late project start. This is nonetheless seen as a very possible task.</p> <p>Through discussions with interested stakeholders (during the Inception workshop) and steering committee members (during the 1st SCM in Feb 2007), the project identified the need to refine the project log-frame and indicators in order to facilitate an easy and more meaningful monitoring process. The finalized indicator set will be submitted for approval at the 2nd SCM in the fall of 2007.</p> <p>As the project is in all practical terms on target, the project is currently confident in that it will be able fully achieve the set objective.</p>
Government GEF OFF ⁸ (optional)			
UNDP Country Office	N/A	S	<p>The Project has with all intent and purposes gotten off to a good start. The project management has settled in well and fully understood the need for timely and effective management.</p> <p>Because of this, the project seems to be very much on target and should have no problem in reaching the set project objective. What further strengthens this belief is that the project management, as well as the national counterpart provides a great deal of strategic thinking into the process and shows a good deal of adaptive management.</p> <p>Although the project could have been a bit more proactive in developing new indicators the approach of getting Steering Committee agreement for changing the indicators followed by a subsequent approval seems very prudent. The approach also underlines the relationship between the project and the main government counterparts. As this is a very strategic project which is to work closely with the government structures clear</p>

⁷ Ratings: See instruction sheet for definitions of ratings. Use only:

HS - Highly Satisfactory; S – Satisfactory; MS – Marginally Satisfactory; MU - Marginally Unsatisfactory; U – Unsatisfactory; HU – Highly Unsatisfactory.

⁸ In the case of a project involving more than 1 country, it is suggested that for simplicity only the OFP (optional) and Country Office Programme Manager from the lead country sign-off. If representatives from more than 1 country sign off, please add additional rows as necessary, clearly indicating the country name for each signature.

UNDP Regional Technical Advisor	N/A	S	lines of communications and transparency is very important. There is a firm confidence that the project will achieve most of the stated outcomes. Despite dramatic delays, the project picked up well and seems to be fully on track. The project team has demonstrated ability for adaptive management, revised the project indicators to make them fit to the current circumstances as well as to make them more concrete and meaningful for tracking the progress. The project team should document all changes in indicators compared to the original indicators of score-card system and the reasons for changes. This is a very useful exercise that the team has to go through and secure the approval by the steering committee. This will be essential for clarifying key strategic directions of the project towards achieving the main outcomes and the objective. As well this will lay the ground for the second year PIR and subsequently a mid term evaluation.
---------------------------------	-----	---	--

Action Plan to Address Marginally Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory Rating

Where a project has received a rating of MU, U or HU describe the actions to be taken to address this:

Action to be Taken	By Whom?	By When?

N/A

III. Progress in Project implementation

List the 4 key outputs delivered so far for each project Outcome:

Project Outcomes	Key Outputs
<p>Outcome 1: The methodologies, skills, knowledge, and information management system for mainstreaming global environmental considerations into the formulation, implementation and evaluation of regional development and spatial planning policies are in place</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Background studies for collecting information on available training programs in Bulgaria in the area of GE and RD and existing training manuals on EIA, SEA and N2000 assessments. 2. Agreeing training program content (background, toolbox and practical skills sections) and structure (training package consisting of introductory, “core” and academic course) with UNDP and MRDPW. 3. Conducting a successful RFP procedure which resulted in a sufficient number of high-quality international applicants, and selection of a reliable and experienced international training institution, which shall play a leading role in the training program development. 4. Developed and inaugurated project web site both in Bulgarian and English, which shall provide visibility and transparency in project results and operations. Please provide the link here
<p>Outcome 2: Institutional changes that support mainstreaming of global environmental into regional development and spatial planning are in place.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project office and a meeting room established at MRDPW to facilitate day-to-day contacts with the implementing partner⁹. The meeting room shall provide a convenient venue for SC and other project related meetings. 2. Partnership with Greening Regional Development Programs Project (GRDP) re-established. The partnership provided an initial set of good practices in the cross-cutting area of RD and GE, which shall be adapted and translated for the needs of MRDPW employees and other stakeholders. 3. A potential pool of host regional level organizations that exemplify a successful example for integration of GE indicators into regional development policies identified and contacted to partner with RCP in the organization of a study visit for high-level officials from the two target ministries. 4. Successfully conducted 1st Steering Committee Meeting and Project Inception workshop.
<p>Outcome 3: Regional development plans and municipal-level spatial development plans are revised to integrate global environmental objectives in a pilot region through application of capacities developed in Outcomes 1 and 2.</p>	<p>There are no outputs produced under this outcome during the rating period.</p>

⁹ Project management activities are included under Outcome 2 in the Main Project Document.

Rating of Project Implementation¹⁰

	2006 Rating	2007 Rating	Comments
National Project Manager/Coordinator	N/A	S	<p>The project has initiated its activities according the overall project work-plan. However, the project identified that additional background information was needed before the project engaged in the training programme development (the fist major Output of the project)</p> <p>Because of this the project set up a series of smaller assignments to :</p> <p>(1) collect key background data on existing Bulgarian training programmes and training institutions; existing online and free-access training materials related to different impact assessments (EIA, SEA, Natura 2000, etc.) in the cross-cutting area of environment and regional development;</p> <p>(2) streamlining and agreeing training program content (3 main sections: background, “toolbox” and practical skills) and structure (3 training courses: introductory, “core” and academic) with MRDPW;</p> <p>(3) re-establishment of connections with international partners like GRDP project, which shall provide the project with valuable background publications and suggest appropriate regional level institution in the EU which provide a model for GE integration in RD and planning processes</p> <p>The project also has paid attention to coordinate with other GEF projects in Bulgaria which work towards integrating conventions into local planning. In contrast with the current project these projects only work on individual conventions.</p>
Government GEF OFP ¹¹ (optional)			
UNDP Country Office	N/A	S	The project has initiated project implementation very efficiently and is well within the projects work-plan.

¹⁰ Ratings: See instruction sheet for definitions of ratings. Use only:

HS - Highly Satisfactory; S – Satisfactory; MS – Marginally Satisfactory; MU - Marginally Unsatisfactory; U – Unsatisfactory; HU – Highly Unsatisfactory.

¹¹ In the case of a project involving more than 1 country, it is suggested that for simplicity only the OFP (optional) and Country Office Programme Manager from the lead country sign-off. If representatives from more than 1 country sign off, please add additional rows as necessary, clearly indicating the country name for each signature.

			<p>The project showed its flexibility and professionalism when it identified the (not foreseen) need for additional background information prior to initiating the training programme process (which includes the identification of training institutions).</p> <p>The implementation of the past and current project activities provides a good reference for how things will be managed during the duration of the project. In this connection, the project management has shown to be conscientious and timely.</p> <p>In addition, the project management has and is paying particular attention to the project planning, activity monitoring and project reporting.</p> <p>Based on this, there is a reason to believe that the project implementation in the future will be targeted and that this will lead to the achievement of the project outcomes.</p>
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor	N/A	S	<p>The project has taken all necessary steps to establish the project infrastructure. And some initial steps towards achieving the key outcomes. However, once the indicator framework is revised and agreed upon the team should take more robust steps towards achieving the outcomes. It should take a good stock of current legal and policy framework for regional development and planning, identify the critical policy and institutional bottlenecks and come up with a clear strategy for policy change and capacity development. This should provide for the foundation for the next year PIR, which is going to be critical for the project.</p> <p>However important, the project should not get overly focused on staff training and other similar actions of activity level, but rather pursue impact oriented, high level policy and institutional change, (this approach should also be adequately captured in the indicator framework).</p>

Action Plan to Address Marginally Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory Rating

N/A

FINAL 1 June 2007

IV. Risks

1. Please annex to this report a print out of the corresponding Atlas Risk Tab (please use landscape format and only print the frame).

See Project Quarterly Progress Report generated from Atlas attached to this report.

FINAL 1 June 2007

1. For any risks identified as “critical” please copy the following information from Atlas:

Risk Type	Date Identified	Risk Description	Risk Management Response

N/A

V. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Change Made to:	Yes/No	Reason for Change
Project Objective	No	
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs/ Activities / Inputs	Yes	<p>While there has been no change in the outputs the project has taken a slightly different approach in connection with the development of the training package, which is to be used in the project.</p> <p>The project found that the best way to ensure accreditation of the project training was to have it under the auspices of a National University or recognized training institution. Because of this the project will have an international entity (separately contracted) to work together with a national institution (in the process of being identified) on the development of the training package. The taken project approach is expected to provide a stronger national ownership and facilitate the future trainings, as well as training of stakeholder outside the project sphere of operations.</p>

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

Change	Reason for Change
Delay in project start up	<p>Although the project start was 28 June, 2006, as per the project document, the practical start of the project did not occur until 13 November, 2006 when the Project manager was hired. The reason for the prolonged project manager identification process was that the original identified Project Manager (identified in August) declined the position and a new call for the position had to be undertaken. Due to the belated start of the project, the project spending for the first year has been affected. Also the timing of activities although generally following the project work-plan is five months behind compared to the project documented start date. The project is aware of this issue and will during the project implementation take this into account and make all efforts to make up for time lost.</p>

VI. Financial Information

Please present all financial values in US\$ millions to 2 decimal places only (e.g. \$3,502,000 should be written as \$3.50m)

Name of Partner or Contributor (including the Private Sector)	Nature of Contributor ¹²	Amount used in Project Preparation (PDF A)	Amount committed in Project Document ¹³	Additional amounts committed after Project Document finalization ¹¹	Estimated Total Disbursement to 30 June 2007	Expected Total Disbursement by end of project
GEF Contribution	GEF	0.0438	0.499	0	0.054	0.499
Cash Cofinancing – UNDP Managed						
UNDP (TRAC)	UN Agency					
<i>(add rows as necessary)</i>						
Cash Cofinancing – Partner Managed						
<i>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works</i>			1.019	0	0	1.019
Others			0.01	0	0	0.01
In-Kind Cofinancing						
<i>(add rows as necessary)</i>						
Total Cofinancing			1.029		0	1.029
Total for Project		0.0438	1.528		0.054	1.528

¹² Specify if: UN Agency, other Multilateral, Bilateral Donor, Regional Development Bank (RDB), National Government, Local Government, NGO, Private Sector, Other.

¹³ Committed amounts are those shown in the approved Project Document. These may be zero in the case of new leveraged project partners.

FINAL 1 June 2007

Comments

Please explain any significant changes in project financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement:

There are no changes in project financing since Project Document signature.

VII. Additional Financial Instruments used in the Project

N/A – There are no additional financial instruments used under the project.

VIII. Lessons

i) **Exchange of Good Practices with International Expert Networks in the Crosscutting Area of Global Environment and Regional Development**

During the project formulation phase communication was initiated with the Greening Regional Development Programmes¹⁴ and the project management re-established the contacts with the GRDP project in late 2006. This contact and resulting cooperation represents a good example on how communication and exchange of experience with international expert networks (in the cross cutting area of global environment and regional development) can “boost” the implementation of similar projects with less experience, like the “Rio Conventions” project.

So far the GRDP has supported the Rio Conventions project in: the search of high quality international training organizations (for the training program development); producing of initial set of good practice materials and the initial organization of a study visit for key officials from the two target ministries in Bulgaria. Through the cooperation with the GRDP, Bulgaria will benefit from the developed tool-kit which is aimed at helping public sector bodies to, alongside economic and social objectives, give full weight to environmental issues in their development programmes.

In addition, through the project (Rio Conventions) interaction with the GRDP, Bulgaria is now being considered for becoming part of the second phase of the GRDP project (currently under development), something which would not have happened had it not been for the early efforts of establishing solid working relations with the GRDP project

ii) **Stakeholder engagement at national and sub-national levels to cover the entire governance system for global environmental mainstreaming**

From the very onset of the preparatory stage, the project developers ensured broad scale involvement of key stakeholders, particularly from central and regional governmental structures. This close collaboration helped the project identify where the project could be most suitably placed, with respect to the targeted interventions of the project. As Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works exercises a central part in the policy making, implementation and steering of regional development, the Bulgarian Government deemed that the Ministry was a very suitable partner for the project. A main reason for this view was that the Ministry is responsible for the national, regional and local planning which translates the national strategies into national regional and local development plans. At the same time the Government also felt that a clear link and cooperation should be established with the Ministry of Environment and Water, as it has the monitoring and regulatory responsibilities for the environment.

The early, and detailed, negotiations with project stakeholders assisted the project in finding the right partners. By subsequently involving these partners in the project development process an “ownership”, by the responsible institutions was created, which, over time, resulted in a greater Governmental, and stakeholder “buy-in” at the time of project start.

iii) **“SMART” indicators a critical component in project formulation**

One of the key problems that the management of the Rio Conventions project has been faced with in its initial year of operation is its very loosely defined project indicators. Because the indicators were very subjective, difficult to measure etc. the project are now in the process of reformulating them.

One can rightly consider that a newly started project should not have to revise its indicator set, this early into the project, particularly when the project parameters and “reality” have only changed little

¹⁴ The Greening Regional Development Programmes (GRDP) is an EU-wide network co-funded by the Interreg IIIC programme. The GRDP project brings together local, regional and national authorities, environmental authorities, development agencies and research institutes from 8 EU Member States.

since the GEF Project Brief approval. Regardless, the key point to take note of is that the project documentation is not a document set in stone, but should be adjusted (within limits and as part of the projects adaptive management) to current project situations. Therefore it is important for the project management to review its project documentation to ensure that it provides it with the needed guidance. Also it is important that the monitoring and reporting tools for the project (i.e. logical-framework and project indicators) are targeted and can be used to measure project outcomes and objective in a meaningful manner.

IX. Project Contribution to GEF Strategic Targets in Focal Area – Capacity Building

The Project is still in its initial phase and currently undergoing the process of identifying the national and international entities which are to develop the project training programme that will subsequently be rolled out in the framework of the project. The project will introduce number of policy change at the regional and municipal level by specifically targeting the development planning frameworks, including spatial planning. Due to this early stage it is impossible to attribute any contribution to the GEF strategic targets. At the same time, the GEF Secretariat, in cooperation with the Implementing Agencies (UNDP and UNEP), is currently developing an indicator framework for capacity development. The framework will serve as a benchmark for project monitoring and will enable to detect project progress towards the GEF's global capacity development targets.

Annex 1: List of Abbreviations

APR / PIR	Annual Project Review / Project Implementation Review
AWP	Annual Work Plan
BE	Bulgarian Entity
CO	Country Office
CPD	Country Programme Document
DDS	District Development Strategies
EU	European Union
ExAs	Executing Agencies
GE	Global Environment
GRDP	Greening Regional Development Programmes
IE	International Entity
ISPA	Instrument for Structural Policies for Pre-Accession
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDPs	Municipal Development Plans
MEER	Ministry of Energy and Energy Resources
MOEW	Ministry of Environment and Water
MOF	Ministry of Forestry
MRDPW	Ministry for Regional Development and Public Works
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NPD	National Project Director
NOPRD	National Operational Program for Regional Development
NSFRD	National Strategy for Regional Development
NSI	National Statistical Institute
OPs	Operational Programs
PA	Project Administrator
PAB	Project Advisory Board
PDF-B	Project Development Facility Block B
PM	Project Manager
PMU	Project Management Unit
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PTA	Principal Technical Advisor of UNDP/GEF
RCP	Rio Conventions Project
RCU	Regional Coordination Unit
RDA	Regional Development Act
RDPs	Regional Development Plans
SBAA	Standard Basic Assistance Agreement
SEAs	Strategic Environmental Assessments
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SMEs	Small and Medium Enterprises
TDA	Territorial Development Act
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
TP	Training Program
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

Annex 2: Draft version of Proposed new indicators for the RIO Conventions Logical Framework Matrix

Project Goal To embed global environmental concerns into the processes of regional and local development, and spatial planning in Bulgaria.					
Objective/ Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p>Project Objective: To build capacities for mainstreaming global environment into the formulation and implementation of regional and local development, as well as spatial planning policies.</p>	<p>National Operational Programme for Regional Development (NOPRD) maintains “zero negative impact on the environment” or an improvement compared to the baseline is obtained. (Mid term target: N/A)</p>	N/A	<p>NOPRD mid-term evaluation¹⁵ verifies “zero negative impact on the environment” is maintained.</p> <p>Project report</p>	<p>Mid-term evaluation of the NOPRD</p>	<p>GOB remains committed to integrating global environmental considerations into regional development and spatial planning processes. MRDPW remains the key responsible Ministry for implementing the RDA and TDA MRDPW and MOEW continue to cooperate closely to ensure appropriate integration of environmental issues in regional development planning</p>
	<p>Percentage of projects under the NOPRD funded after 2008 fulfill national environmental requirements and contains, as well as report on, relevant Global Environment (GE) indicators (Mid term target: 40% of project under the NOPRD funded after 2007 fulfill national environmental requirements and contains relevant GE indicators)</p>	0	<p>100% of project under the NOPRD funded after 2007 fulfill national environmental requirements and contains relevant GE indicators</p>	<p>Review of approved NOPRD projects.</p> <p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works (MRDPW) annual reporting</p>	

¹⁵ NOTE the mid-term evaluation is National Operational Programme for Regional Development which is expected in 2010 and not the Project mid-term evaluation which is planned for the end of 2008.

Objective/ Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p>OUTCOME 1: The methodologies, skills, knowledge, and information management system for mainstreaming global environmental considerations into the formulation, implementation and evaluation of regional development and spatial planning policies are in place</p>	<p>At least 130 staff, are applying their training(developed by the project) in their review of plans, projects and programmes. (Mid-term target: Training programme fully developed and 20 people trained)</p>	0	130	<p>Project reports. Report from training institution Results from annual survey.</p>	<p>MRDPW and MOEW are willing to put in place institutional incentives to encourage staff to acquire and apply skills related to mainstreaming of GE in regional development planning Adequate access to necessary data can be effectively facilitated Cooperation and links can be established with other countries in the region and beyond to tap into existing experience and knowledge.</p>
	<p>GE indicators identified and used in the evaluation of MRDPW implementation of NOPRD planning and projects (Mid-term target: Information on GE indicators accessible, reporting process and reporting format pilot tested.)</p>	GE indicators have not been identified	Identified GE indicators is use to verify “zero negative impact on the environment” of NOPRD planning and projects	<p>Project reports. Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works annual reporting</p>	
	<p>That the established web-site for “GE integration into local and regional planning” is viewed and used as an useful information source in work related matters by municipal and regional planners, interested stakeholders and Government staff (MRDPW etc.) (Mid-term target: The established website is fully operational and its existence is recognized by municipal and regional planners, interested stakeholders and Government staff (MRDPW etc.))</p>	web-site for “GE integration into local and regional planning” not established	web-site for “GE integration into local and regional planning” used as an information source	<p>Project reports. Results from annual survey.</p>	

Objective/ Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p>OUTCOME 2: Institutional changes that support mainstreaming of global environmental into regional development and spatial planning are in place.</p>	<p>Staff participation in (xx hours) of trainings, seminars and workshops related to “green” development planning and implementation through Ministry support (as well as from other funding sources). (Mid term target: Staff participation in (1000 hours) of trainings, seminars and workshops related to “green” development planning and implementation)</p>	0	6250 hours	<p>Project reports. Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works annual reporting</p>	<p>MRDPW views PMU and its functioning as an integral part of its operations. MRDPW staff can be vocal proponents of mainstreaming GE in their interaction with other Managing Authorities (through participation in Working Groups).</p>
	<p>At least 100 staff TOR’s within the relevant departments and structures of Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works have been revised, so as to outline the specific task required, by the individual positions, to ensure overall integration of GE into the Ministry’s activities. (Mid term target: 25 of the staff’s TOR’s have been revised.)</p>	0	At least staff TOR’s have been revised	<p>Project reports. Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works annual reporting</p>	
	<p>Number of meetings held by the “Coordinating Committee for Environment Sustainability” aimed at inter-ministerial cooperation piloted within Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works (Mid term target: At least 3 meetings held by the “Coordinating Committee for Environment Sustainability”)</p>	0	At least 6	<p>Project reports. Minutes of CCES meeting</p>	

Objective/ Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p>OUTCOME 3: Regional development plans and municipal-level spatial development plans are revised to integrate global environmental objectives in a pilot region through application of capacities developed in Outcomes 1 and 2.</p>	<p>That new GE sensitive guidelines, for regional and municipality planning are adopted by the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works are introduced to the municipal by the 28 regional administrations. (Mid-term target: Review of regional and municipal planning documentation underway.)</p>	Current guidelines is not GE sensitive	Adopted guidelines introduced to Municipalities	Guidelines Project reports. Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works annual reporting	Capacity development measures for mainstreaming GE include appropriate staff from the SE region.
	<p>Number of public hearings that is held for each of the development plan reviewed and an equal number of seminars on civil participation in plan development and plan monitoring held. (Mid term target: Materials for seminars on civil participation in plan development and plan monitoring developed)</p>	0	At least 2 per plan	Project reports.	

¹⁶ National planning follows the cycle. National strategy -> Regional Strategy -> municipality planning according to the regional strategy -> regional planning combining the municipality planning wishes -> national planning following the planning wishes outlined in the regional plans.

Annex 1: Project Quarterly Progress Report



UN Development Programme
Report ID: UNPMQTRR

Project Quarterly Progress Report

Page 1 of 5
Run Time: 08-08-2007 00:08:14

Business Unit: BGR10
Award Id: 00044167
Description: PIMS 3333 Bulgaria MSP Cross Cutting - Integrating Glob
Implementing Partner: 00451 Ministry of Regional Development and Reconstruction
Award Start Date: 01/06/2006 Award End Date: 01/06/2010
Report Period From: 28/06/2006 Report Period to: 27/06/2010 Total Award Amount: 499,000.00

Section 1. Project Implementation

A. UPDATED PROJECT RISKS

Type	Date	Description	Date	Manager Resp	Critical Status
ENVIRONMENTAL		No Record			
OPERATIONAL	07/08/2007	MRDFW does not remain the key responsible Ministry for implementing the RDA and TDA - low	07/08/2007	This risk is not eminent at the current moment. Management response that shall be taken in case the risk materializes: Project will cooperate with the new authorities if they are assigned responsibilities for the implementation of RDA and TDA implementation	N
OPERATIONAL	07/08/2007	MRDFW and MOEW do not continue to cooperate closely to ensure appropriate integration of environmental issues in regional development planning - low	07/08/2007	This risk is not eminent at the current moment. Management response that shall be taken in case the risk materializes: PMU shall facilitate contacts among representatives from the two ministries (through SC meetings). Also representatives from both ministries are included in the future trainings	N
OPERATIONAL	07/08/2007	Inadequate access to necessary data can be effectively facilitated -low risk	07/08/2007	This risk is not eminent at the current moment. Management response that shall be taken in case the risk materializes: Development and endorsement of an appropriate protocol for data collection, processing and delivery	N

Project Quarterly Progress Report

OPERATIONAL	07/08/2007	MRDPW does not view the PMU and its functioning as an integral part of its operations -low risk	07/08/2007	<p>This risk is not eminent at the current moment.</p> <p>Management response that shall be taken in case the risk materializes: UNDP and the PMU will stress the need for the operational linkages between the PMU and MRDPW with the aim of reaching an understanding. The project will seek appropriate office premises and will make the necessary adjustments in the project strategy</p>	N
ORGANIZATIONAL	07/08/2007	MRDPW and MOEW are not willing to put in place institutional incentives to encourage staff to acquire and apply skills related to mainstreaming of GE in regional development planning -low to modest risk	07/08/2007	<p>This risk is not eminent at the current moment.</p> <p>Management response that shall be taken in case the risk materializes: UNDP and the PMU have to negotiate and stress the reason for staying committed to the project agenda.</p> <p>The Training Program package is tailored to the needs of the end beneficiaries and is practically oriented with respect to the day-to-day responsibilities of MRDPW and MoEW employees.</p> <p>The academic course is accredited and MRDPW starts graduates placement program</p>	N
ORGANIZATIONAL	07/08/2007	MRDPW staff can not be vocal proponents of mainstreaming GE in their interaction with other Managing Authorities (through participation in Working Groups). - low risk	07/08/2007	<p>This risk is not eminent at the current moment.</p> <p>Management response that shall be taken in case the risk materializes: PMU seeks direct contacts with other MAs through bi-lateral meetings, attending workshops and conferences. Project web site is actively used for dissemination of good practices and results</p>	N



Project Quarterly Progress Report

POLITICAL	07/08/2007	GOB will not remain committed to integrating global environmental considerations into regional development and spatial planning processes -low	07/08/2007	This risk is not eminent at the current moment. Management response that shall be taken in case the risk materializes: Engage in negotiations with GOB to ensure that they honor their agreements, particular at the project level.	N
REGULATORY		No Record			
STRATEGIC	07/08/2007	Cooperation and links can not be established with other countries in the region and beyond to tap into existing experience and knowledge - low risk	07/08/2007	This risk is not eminent at the current moment. Management response that shall be taken in case the risk materializes: Continue cooperation with Greening Regional Ddevelopment Programme Project. Search for and establish contact with other relevant regional and international professional associations	N
STRATEGIC	07/08/2007	Capacity development measures for mainstreaming GE does not include appropriate staff from the SE region. - low risk	07/08/2007	This risk is not eminent at the current moment. Management response that shall be taken in case the risk materializes: Appropriate partner institutions and experts are sought beyond the SEE region	N
X_OTHER		No Record			

B. UPDATED PROJECT ISSUES

Type	Date	Description	Date	Manager Resp	Solved Status
02_PROBLEM	07/08/2007	Project indicators for monitoring project progress are imprecise and difficult to monitor.	07/08/2007	The current indicator set (which was approved by GEF) are highly subjective and difficult to monitor and verify and are not seen as being SMART indicators. In response to this the Project is currently (July 2007) working together with UNDP/GEF Bratislava on improving the project indicators. Following the revision of the indicator set they will be reviewed and approved by the Projects steering committee in September 2007. The approved indicators will following this become the tool for overall project monitoring and evaluation for the remainder of the project.	N