

Final Project Evaluation Report

Your Details	
Full Name	Andrii Plyha
Project Title	Conservation of old-growth oak forests of Kyiv Polissya as habitats of Red List Species of Ukraine
Application ID	24888-1
Grant Amount	£4841
Email Address	aplyha@wwfdcp.org
Date of this Report	30.04.2019

1. Indicate the level of achievement of the project's original objectives and include any relevant comments on factors affecting this.

Objective	Not achieved	Partially achieved	Fully achieved	Comments
Looking of Red List species in old oak forests				Almost all of our target oak forest sites were visited by at least one researcher (a lot of them – by some or all of the team). As the result I have clear picture about red list presence or absence on majority of old oak forest sites.
Including of Red List data to forestry management plans				As the process of including data from current year is taking place on first half of next year, technically it has not finished yet; but I have official letter from forest authorities, that our data will be included to forestry management plans. Data from 2017 year were fully included in 2018, so I hope 2018 data will be included in full scale as well.
Environmental education about importance of oak forests				Educational poster was developed and shared among state forest enterprises; movie about oak forests was created as well and shared through webpages.

2. Please explain any unforeseen difficulties that arose during the project and how these were tackled.

First of difficulties was related to time management challenges of members of the team. Each of us was responsible for piece of work in this project, and each of us had own duties and responsibilities at our main work. Time overlapping sometimes led to changing of time of field visits and finally led to situation, that some members of the team had not done field research of some targeted sites.

Second of difficulties was related to unwillingness of foresters for cooperation. One of subjective reason was that some of them just don't want to have deal with biologists and protected species at whole; one objective reason was that state forest enterprises had governmental inspection in the end of the summer of 2018 and they staff did not have time for us. Altogether it led to situation that not all sites with protected species were shown to foresters.

3. Briefly describe the three most important outcomes of your project.

Most important outcomes are connected with our objectives, which were commented under first question.

Briefly they are:

- Information about presence of red list species in old oak forests (list of forests sites with list of threatened species which were found there),
- Willingness of forest authorities to include our data to forestry management plans (official letter of responsible forestry institution, that our data will be included in first half of 2019),
- Rising awareness about importance of old oak forests for biodiversity (developed poster and movie).

4. Briefly describe the involvement of local communities and how they have benefitted from the project.

Local communities were not involved in the project, because in general they are not forest owners in this region and they are not decision makers in our case. They will be indirectly benefited from conservation of old oak forests through using of them as source of mushrooms, berries etc., and using of them as place for recreation.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes, there are plans to continue work about conservation of oak old forests. There are few ideas:

- organising conference about conservation of old oak forests in Ukraine. The idea is to bring together ideas of biologists, foresters to one table and to see best practices in Ukraine (or abroad) which can be used in Kyiv region, and, vice versa, to share our experience broadly;
- providing seminars for foresters about importance of oak forest conservation for better understanding by them reasons of our work;
- developing educational materials for foresters and local people about some concrete oak forest sites and protected areas, with aim to raise awareness about value of such places;
- looking for threatened species in some remote areas which were not covered by research during this work, and expanding of such work to state forest enterprises on eastern part of Zhytomyr region, which belongs to Kyiv Polissya according to geobotanical classification of territories.

The mechanism of forest conservation we used proved itself to be effective. Therefore, it does make sense to do similar activities in other parts of Ukraine, where valuable forests are threatened with logging. Such activities are to be performed on a case-by-case basis.

Implementation of such ideas depends on opportunity to use grant money, which left after finishing of this project (see budget table under question 8).

6. How do you plan to share the results of your work with others?

Actually I have already started to share results of work:

- with main stakeholders (foresters): apart of regular meetings and communication with forest authorities in the process of project implementation, we conducted meeting with head of state forest enterprises in the regional forestry office.
- with Rufford network: I presented intermediate results of project on Rufford conference in Georgia at August 2018
- with other scientists: data obtained during project was submitted to the materials for new edition of Red List of Ukraine
- with general public: results of project were shared through WWF webpage.

Obviously sharing of project results will be continued for foresters and scientists, mainly via different conferences and meetings.

7. Timescale: Over what period was the grant used? How does this compare to the anticipated or actual length of the project?

Expenses were done during all time of project (1 year). Just one thing, that time of financing of some issues was little a bit different, than it was mentioned in the project (for instance, it was planned that educational materials should be developed in the November-January, but actually some of them were developed in February-March).

As the costs still left, there are ideas to continue oak forest conservation project (see answer on question 5).

8. Budget: Provide a breakdown of budgeted versus actual expenditure and the reasons for any differences. All figures should be in £ sterling, indicating the local exchange rate used. It is important that you retain the management accounts and all paid invoices relating to the project for at least 2 years as these may be required for inspection at our discretion.

Project money was spent in UAH and EUR, so for further calculation next exchange rates were used: 1EUR = 0, 86 £, 1£ = 34, 2554 UAH

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
Subsistence payments	2207	1148	-1059	The difference is explained by two reasons: overestimating of number of days needed on the

				one hand, and the lesser number of working days conducted in the field by some experts due to different reasons (time overlapping, illness etc.)
Fuel for car and public transport expenses	1324	411	-913	The difference is explained by overestimating fuel needed for field work, and lesser number of working day conducted in the field by some experts due to different reasons (time overlapping, illness etc.)
Car maintenance	264	137	-127	Costs were spent for wheel replacement and repairing of running gear.
Stationary (including notebooks, envelopes, post stamps, pens etc.)	51	39	-12	Costs were spent to sending of posters, for printing of maps etc.
Design of poster (copywriting and illustrations)	220	207	-13	Costs were spent for buying photos for the poster and for designing of it. The difference is explained by overestimating of prices.
Publishing of poster (printing)	200	190	-10	Costs were spent for printing of posters. The difference is explained by overestimating of prices.
GPS (2 devices)	353	533	-180	The difference is explained by changing of prices of GPS-MAP64 devices.
Gas cylinders	22	4	-18	The difference is explained because budget was calculated for few cylinders, but one was enough
Tent	200	202	+2	The difference is explained by underestimating of price.
Movie about oak forests		214	-214	This point was absent in project description, but considering the underusing of money and after emails with Rufford grant administrator this point was included.
Total	4841	3085	-1756	Remainder of the budget will be returned to RSG

9. Looking ahead, what do you feel are the important next steps?

Some of important next steps were already mentioned in answer on 5th question. Apart of them, important thing is the monitoring of our targeted oak forest sites. First of all it is monitoring of permits for timber harvesting there, for quick public reaction in the case if such permits will be obtained by foresters. Secondly, it is monitoring of red list species on our targeted sites, and time to time notification of foresters that species are still living there (by official letters and by providing joint field visits together with foresters).

What is very important and need to be highlighted again, it is providing some seminars for forest enterprise staff about red list species and their importance, about principles of protected areas and about nature conservation in general. Forestry staff often do not have any understanding what is it and why it is very important.

And, of course, important thing is expanding of looking for Red List species location to other forest sites.

10. Did you use The Rufford Foundation logo in any materials produced in relation to this project? Did the Foundation receive any publicity during the course of your work?

Yes, logo was used in poster about importance of oak forests, and in short movie about oak forests as well. Foundation was mentioned in thesis which was submitted to materials for new edition of Red List of Ukraine. It was also mentioned in article for general public on web-page.

11. Please provide a full list of all the members of your team and briefly what was their role in the project.

Yehor Hrynyk (Ukrainian nature conservation group, WWF Ukraine). He was responsible for coordinating of some field visits with foresters to Red Lists species sites, and for technical assistance with dead wood amount calculation, creating movie and poster about oak forests. Also he was responsible for technical assistance with coordinating of team and as biologist he participated in some field trips.

Tetiana Karpiuk (WWF Ukraine). As botanist she was responsible for looking for Red List species of plants

Oleksandr Panchuk (Kyiv Zoo). As ornithologist, he was responsible for looking for Red List species of birds. Also he is author of some Red List plants finds.

Maria Zykova (M.G. Kholodny Institute of Botany, NAS Ukraine). As mycologist, she was responsible for looking for Red List species of fungi. Also he is author of some Red List plants finds.

Lena Godlevska (Schmalhausen Institute, NAS of Ukraine). As chiropterologist, she was responsible for looking for Red List species of bats.

Grigorii Popov (Schmalhausen Institute, NAS of Ukraine). As entomologist, he was responsible for looking for Red List species of insects.

Olexii Prohorov (Schmalhausen Institute, NAS of Ukraine). As entomologist, he was responsible for looking for Red List species of insects. Due to illness he took part in only one field visit.

Important part of team were WWF volunteers (and some other volunteers): **Oleksandr Danilov, Andrii Shelestov, Kateryna Klyueva, Olena Gnezdilova, Oksana Omelchuk, Zhanna Zinkevich, Bohdan Kuchenko, Oleksandr Kvyatkovskyi, Maxim Kovalov, Hanna Volkova, Yurii Bondarchuk, Ihor Davydenko & Vasyl Stopchyk**. They helped us to reach our distant target sites and participated in the field researches.

12. Any other comments?

I want to thank to Rufford Foundation for support of nature conservation activities in Ukraine and over the world, and for possibility with you support to protect things which are really does have matter.