



1. Project Data :		Date Posted : 06/28/2000	
PROJ ID: P039166	OEDID:	Appraisal	Actual
Project Name : Danube delta biodiversity project	Project Costs (US\$M)	1.74	1.74
Country: Ukraine	Loan/Credit (US\$M)	1.50	1.54
Sector, Major Sect .: Natural Resources Management, Environment	Cofinancing (US\$M)		
L/C Number:			
	Board Approval (FY)		95
Partners involved :	Closing Date	12/31/1998	06/30/1999
Prepared by :	Reviewed by :	Group Manager :	Group:
John C. English	Andres Liebenthal	Ridley Nelson	OEDST

2. Project Objectives and Components

a. Objectives
To protect and enhance the Ukrainian part of the Danube Delta ecosystem and contribute to biodiversity conservation within the delta.

b. Components
There were seven components:

- (i) strengthening the Danube Plavny Authority and the warden service;
- (ii) establishing the Danube Biosphere reserve;
- (iii) improving monitoring and data base management;
- (iv) initiating the restoration of three areas of wetland;
- (v) improving public awareness in local communities of the functioning and importance of the Delta ecosystem;
- (vi) facilitate the participation of the Danube Biosphere Reserve in regional initiatives; and
- (vii) establish a Trust Fund to assist with the financing of the reserve's recurrent costs in the operational phase.

c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates

3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives :
The project was implemented as planned. The Ukraine Danube Biosphere Reserve was established, and improved techniques and participatory methods for the protection and management of its biodiversity were implemented. With the strengthening of the warden service, a more proactive approach to management of the protected area was established, and the capacity of the Reserve Authority to manage the area in collaboration with local users was increased. The project fostered collaboration with Romania, especially on technical exchanges. At the end of the project, a Romanian-Ukraine transboundary biosphere reserve was established. The project also led to collaboration and partnerships on delta conservation and natural resource management, which are continuing.

4. Significant Outcomes /Impacts :
The delta is particularly important as a habitat for migratory birds. Its improvement and maintenance will, under the current economic conditions in the Ukraine, depend heavily on obtaining continued external support. The project played a significant role in developing links between the authority and relevant organizations in western Europe and increased the confidence of the Ukrainians in working with external parties (including expanding their language skills).

5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):
The principal shortcoming was that it was the proposed trust fund, to provide continued support was not established. While other sources of external support (e.g. from the Dutch Government and the WWF) are continuing, the lack of a trust fund does weaken the financial base of the Biosphere Reserve.

6. Ratings:	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Institutional Dev .:	Substantial	Substantial	
Sustainability:	Uncertain	Uncertain	
Bank Performance:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Borrower Perf .:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Quality of ICR:		Satisfactory	

7. Lessons of Broad Applicability :

Particularly in societies where public participation has been minimal, and where the collaboration of local users is important for successful management of an ecosystem, well -planned public education and awareness programs are needed early in the project to get the public involved in a meaningful way .

8. Audit Recommended? Yes No

9. Comments on Quality of ICR :

The ICR is of good quality. It provides a detailed review of the outcome of the project and assessment of its current position.