

**UNDP GEF Projects**  
**2009 Annual Performance Report (APR)/ Project Implementation Review (PIR)**

**CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION**  
Reporting Period = 1 July 2008 to 30 June 2009

**1. Basic Project Data**

Official Project Title: <b>Lake Balaton Vulnerability Assessments, Early Warning and Adaptation Strategies</b>
---

<p><b>Project Summary (as in PIMS and Project Document)</b></p> <p>The overall purpose of the project is to contribute to a better understanding of the Lake Balaton ecological and socio-economic system's vulnerability and resilience arising from multiple forces of global and local change, including land use, demographic, economic and climate change and build capacity for more effective policy-making and adaptation measures in response. The project is complementing ongoing policy initiatives and scientific research, and has a clear niche by focusing on better understanding the vulnerability of the Lake and its watershed from an integrated perspective. Climate change is seen as one of the emerging important determinants of vulnerability, but its impacts are considered in the broader context of sustainable development. Through its training component the project will lead to measurable improvements in vulnerability assessment and adaptation capacity, and on-the-ground results will be achieved through initiatives financed by a small grants program using innovative financing mechanisms, such as public-private partnerships. Longer-term impact will be ensured by integrating criteria related to adaptation to global change into the regular grant-making activities of the Lake Balaton Development Council. Due to Lake Balaton's high profile and a focused engagement and influencing strategy, the project will significantly increase awareness of climate change impact, vulnerability and adaptation issues locally, nationally and internationally.</p>
---

Country: Hungary	PIMS Number:	3334			
	Atlas Award Number	00042289			
	Atlas Project Number	00048480			
	Project Type:	FSP		MSP	X
GEF Focal Area	<b>Climate Change Adaptation</b>				
GEF 4 Focal Area	Adaptation -SPA				

Strategic Objective and Strategic Priority	
GEF 2 / 3 Operational Programme	17. Climate Change Adaptation

**Project milestones and timeframe:**

Pipeline entry (Concept approval per previous GEF cycle) OR PIF approval by GEF Council/CEO for new project cycle)	June 6, 2005	GEF CEO endorsement/approval of project document	09/06/2005			
Project Document Signature Date	January 16, 2006	Planned Project Duration	30 months			
Date of First Disbursement	March 16, 2006	Original Planned Closing Date	June 30, 2008			
Date project manager hired	March 16, 2006	Revised Planned <sup>1</sup> Closing Date	December 31, 2008			
Is this the Final / Terminal APR/PIR?	<u>YES</u>	x	NO			
Has the project been operationally closed in Atlas?	YES		NO	x	Actual Date of Operational Closure (if applicable)	December 31, 2008
					Planned Date of Operational Closure	September 2008
Has the project been financially closed in Atlas?	YES		NO	x	Actual Date of Financial Closure	n/a
					Planned Date of Financial Closure	December 2009

**Project Supervision:**

Date of Project Steering Committee meetings during reporting period.	July 2-4, 2008
--	----------------

**Project Evaluation:**

Has the mid-term evaluation (MTE) been carried out	YES	X	NO		Actual Date of MTE	<b>July – September 2008</b>
					Planned Date of MTE	July – September 2007
Has the Final evaluation (FE) been carried out?	YES		NO	X	Actual Date of FE	
					Planned Date of FE	<b>December 2009</b>
Overall Rating of the project in the final evaluation by the project evaluator					n/a	

<sup>1</sup> Please explain any entry here in section 8

**Project documentation and information:**

<p>List documents/ reports/ brochures / articles that have been prepared about the project this reporting period.</p>	<p>Conceptual framework and indicators  Indicator systems review  Influencing strategy meeting report  Indicator status and trend report  IMS report: Internet Map Server and Metadata  Model report on climate and land cover scenarios  SWAT report: Soil and Water Assessment Tool  SWAT step by step course  Scenarios for Balaton region  Stakeholder priorities on adaptation  Modeling Lake Water Quantity and Quality (overview)</p>
<p>List other monitoring and/or reporting requirements for this project.</p>	<p>Quarterly progress and Financial Reports  Quarterly Workplans  Annual Workplans  Annual Budget Revision  Annual Financial Audit</p>
<p>List the Website address (URL) of project.</p>	<p><b><u>Main project internet sites:</u></b>  Homepage: <a href="http://www.balatonregion.hu/adaptation/">http://www.balatonregion.hu/adaptation/</a>  Balatontrend: <a href="http://test.balatontrend.org/">http://test.balatontrend.org/</a>  Internet Map Server: <a href="http://balaton.grid.unep.ch/ims">http://balaton.grid.unep.ch/ims</a></p> <p><b><u>Project pages on partners' website:</u></b>  LBDCA: <a href="http://www.balatonregion.hu">http://www.balatonregion.hu</a>  IISD: <a href="http://www.iisd.org/measure/knowledge/national/balaton.asp">http://www.iisd.org/measure/knowledge/national/balaton.asp</a>  GRID: <a href="http://www.grid.unep.ch/activities/sustainable/balaton/index.php">http://www.grid.unep.ch/activities/sustainable/balaton/index.php</a></p> <p><b><u>Additional sites:</u></b>  Online-monitoring: <a href="http://bir.webeye.hu/">http://bir.webeye.hu/</a>  Data Warehouse: <a href="http://balaton.grid.unep.ch/zipped">http://balaton.grid.unep.ch/zipped</a>  Metadata: <a href="http://212.203.125.170/Balat/dev/edt/">http://212.203.125.170/Balat/dev/edt/</a>  SWAT IMS: <a href="http://balaton.grid.unep.ch/swat/">http://balaton.grid.unep.ch/swat/</a></p>

**Project contacts:**

<i>Title</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>E-mail</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Signature</i>
National Project Manager/Coordinator	Dr. Gábor Molnár	<a href="mailto:molnarg@balatonregion.hu">molnarg@balatonregion. hu</a>	13 August 2009	
Government GEF OFP <sup>2</sup> (optional)				
Executing Agency (optional)				

---


<sup>2</sup> 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 indicating the country name for each signature.

## 2. UNDP Country Officer ONLY

List the dates of <u>site</u> visits to project during this reporting period. 4/VII/2008; 3/X/2008; 24/X/2008
General Comments:  The project has provided tools and instruments to better understand the Lake Balaton ecological and socio/economic system's vulnerability and resilience. These web-based tools were developed with a strong scientific and technical background. Along the development of these tools and instruments, capacity was developed through on-the-job training, workshops and training seminars. Vulnerability assessment and adaptation measures have been mainstreamed in planning instruments such as the Balaton Regional Development Strategy, and a small grant scheme. All projects funded under this scheme have to comply with a set of identified climate change adaptation criteria. Project results such as the overall approach to assess vulnerability and identify adaptation measures were incorporated into the current development of the National Climate Change Adaptation Action Plan and the SWAT instrument has been institutionalized within the Water Management Authority. Capacity development aspects, institutionalization, sustainability strategy and exit strategy were not sufficiently addressed from the outset but only at the later stage of the project. The project did not conduct any capacity assessment to define the needs, gaps and opportunities to strengthen the existing capacity in climate change adaptation. Capacity development has been interpreted mostly as the training component. A stronger involvement of Hungarian institutions, especially the Ministry of Environment and Water and the Water Management Authority would have given the project a more national perspective.

***UNDP Country Officers must sign this APR/PIR. This indicates that you have checked it and to your understanding it is as complete and accurate as possible.***

Name: Klara Tothova

Signature:     ,    

Date: 13/VIII/2009

### 3. UNDP Regional Technical Advisor ONLY

Please insert the following information before sending the APR/PIR to the Principal Technical Adviser.

<i>Key indicator</i>	<i>Please complete</i>					
Number of <b>critical</b> risks (1)	Full and sustained utilization of tools and policies developed might need further actions (see section 6)					
Overall Rating <sup>3</sup> of project progress toward meeting objectives (circle one)	HS	(S)	MS	MU	U	HU
Overall Rating of project implementation (circle one)	HS	(S)	MS	MU	U	HU
Overall Risk Rating (circle one)	HIGH	SUBSTANTIAL		(MODEST)	LOW	
Has the project strategy been adjusted? (circle one)	(Yes)			No		
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The project was designed in response to high sensitivity of the Lake Balaton ecological system to climate change due, among others, to its shallow profile and precarious water quality and water balance situation, Lake Balaton is uniquely sensitive to both natural and anthropogenic influences. Historically, like most ecosystems, Lake Balaton has been characterized by change; however, recent trends show that global and local forces are increasing the vulnerability of both ecological and socio-economic systems. Regional authorities and the Lake Balaton Development Coordination Agency in partnership with IISD designed the project request for the GEF funding through UNDP. The project aimed at improving the understanding of a complex dynamic of change the system's vulnerability to multiple forcings, including climate change, developing essential local capacities and laying the foundation for local action towards improved resilience of the Lake system. The project has developed advanced tools for vulnerability assessment, forward looking planning and decision-making tools for watershed management and monitoring abilities at local level. It has also identified a suit of priority adaptation measures and tested some of them on a pilot basis with participation of local population, NGOs and municipalities that also contributed financially to the implementation of these measures. The project improved the skill sets of local experts and raised an overall awareness of climate change impacts on Lake Balaton that provides important livelihood source for population through their agricultural and tourism activities. The project also influenced number of policy and development frameworks and paved the way towards science-based decisions to manage the Lake water resources and its larger watershed.</p>						
List the dates of <u>site</u> visits to project this reporting period. None						

<sup>3</sup> See all rating formulas in separate information note for RTAs.

Draft, Aug 2009

***UNDP RTAs must sign this PIR. This indicates that you have checked it and to your understanding it is as complete and accurate as possible.***

Name: \_\_\_\_\_Keti Chachibaia\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_*K. Chachibaia*\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_18/09/2009\_\_\_\_\_

#### 4. Progress towards achieving project objectives

<i>Project Objective and Outcomes</i>	<i>Description of Indicator</i>	<i>Baseline Level<sup>4</sup></i>	<i>Target Level at end of project</i>	<i>Level at 30 June 2008</i>	<i>Level at 30 June 2009</i>
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------

---

<sup>4</sup> This should be a quantitative numerical value



<p><b>Objective</b></p> <p>To contribute to a better understanding of the Lake Balaton ecological and socio-economic system's vulnerability and resilience arising from multiple forces of global and local change, including climate change, and build capacity for more effective policy-making and adaptation measures</p>	<p>1. Regional development frameworks across the relevant sectors integrate adaptation to climate change</p>	<p>There have been a number of scientific and expert fora where discussions about current vulnerabilities of Lake Balaton to climate change took place. Local governments are aware of some of the impacts and through LBDCA, the project was supported to acquire better understanding that will subsequently be translated into policy change and local action.</p> <p>There is regular monitoring of many key ecosystem variables but a more profound understanding of the dynamics of change is missing</p> <p>There are limited capacities to understand and act on the climate change induced impacts on the ecosystem and the local economies.</p>	<p>Adaptation Policy Framework (APF) for Lake Balaton basin has been developed to integrate adaptation into sectoral and regional development plans and programmes</p>	<p>The Lake Balaton Long Term Development Concept (2008-2020) as a horizontal principle integrates adaptation to climate change. The concept is on public consultation till August. It will be finalized by the end of 2008.</p> <p>Other to regional framework is targeted to integrate adaptation such as, the river basin management plan, and the action plans of regional operational programs.</p>	<p>The Lake Balaton Long Term Development Concept was accepted by the Lake Balaton Development Council on May 8, 2009. A resume of the concept is currently on public consultation. Afterward, the concept will be proposed to the government for approval. In addition some specific measures, adaptation is a horizontal issue in the concept.</p> <p>A list of recommended adaptation measures developed in the project has been forwarded to the Ministry of Environment and Water in the development phase of the National Climate Change Strategy (NCCS). Some elements have been built in to the document. NCCS is a strategic document and does not allocate funds. Based on the project result the team also supported the preparation of a 2-years action plan of NCCS. The action plan is being finalized..</p> <p>Input to the Hungarian Parliament's Environmental Protection Committee as it works towards Hungary's EU presidency, on the issues of water and climate change is ongoing (ongoing as of July 2009).</p> <p>Input to the 3<sup>rd</sup> national Environmental Management Plan of Hungary.</p> <p>Input to the River Basin Management Plan of the Lake Balaton catchment prepared corresponding to implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive. (in progress).</p>
	<p>2. Allocation of financial resources for vulnerability studies and adaptation measures by local</p>	<p>Balaton region local governing bodies and development organizations allocate funding for adaptation measures</p>	<p>Vulnerability assessment and adaptation measures have been mainstreamed into regional small grant schemes. The last call for proposals was made</p>	<p>In order to initiate pilot projects, call for proposals was published in the framework of the Norwegian Grant Programme. The 370 million HUF fund was established</p>	

	governing bodies			<p>public in 2007 and the selection is now in process.</p> <p>During the fall 2008, LBDCA is planning the next cycle of this small grant scheme 2009-2010.</p>	<p>by the financial contribution of the EEA and Norwegian fund co-funded with the financial contribution by the local governments (almost 60 million HUF)</p> <p>The main objectives of the pilot project initiatives were to improve resilience of the Lake Balaton ecosystem by improving shoreline management and reducing the population pressures.</p> <p>The project applications submitted were evaluated in two steps: after the administrative compliance check (formal requirements), the technical adequacy of the project (technical requirements) was evaluated by independent experts in July-August, 2008. The final beneficiaries were selected by a Professional Committee in September, 2008. 32 project applications were granted and 5 applications were rejected. After signing the grant contracts, the implementation of the approved projects started on November, 2008 and they have to be completed before July 31, 2009.</p> <p>In the course of revisions, section on climate change and adaptation is included in 18 local environmental management programmes. The elaboration of 2 municipal climate change and adaptation strategies is in progress.</p>
--	------------------	--	--	--	--

	3. Elements of Lake Balaton ecosystem management system fully integrate adaptation approaches		Adaptation measures have been undertaken	Preliminary list of adaptation measures has been developed.	<p>A list of adaptation measures has been developed and introduced in the report “Investigating Stakeholder Decision Priorities for Adapting to Climate Change in the Lake Balaton Recreational Area of Hungary”.</p> <p>Adaptation measures are incorporated into the Long-term Regional Development Concept (approved by LBDC) and being integrated into the River Basin Management Plan of the Lake Balaton catchment being developed in accordance with the EU-WFD.</p>
	4.				
<p><b>Outcome 1</b></p> <p>Improved understanding of integrated vulnerability and adaptation options in the context of sustainable development in the Lake Balaton watershed</p>	5. Information system for systematic vulnerability assessment introduced and institutionalized	Even though necessity of adaptation measures is well recognized and extensive research conducted, there has not been any concerted effort placed on vulnerability assessment and adaptation strategy formulation.	Information system with set of vulnerability indicators defined by end of first year of the project	Indicator system with 32 indicators has been finalized, data has been collected and analyzed both at the regional and where applicable municipal or ecosystem level. Results have been presented to regional stakeholders. Indicators entered into BalatonTrend portal. Draft analysis of interlinkages between indicators has been prepared. Priority adaptation options targeting key vulnerabilities developed through participatory process. An Internet Map Server was built to store, visualize and make available the spatial data and their metadata that were needed for the project indicators and hydrological modeling parts.	<p>BalatonTrend portal, with comprehensive indicators, was presented at several fora and its use in the context of other projects is being considered in Canada and Brazil.</p> <p>An analyses of inter-linkages of key indicators has been prepared and published.</p> <p>The life after-project plan for this IMS is to integrate it into the Black Sea catchment observation system being built in the new FP7 European project led by Anthony Lehmann from UNEP-GRID.</p> <p>The on-line Balaton monitoring system is operating. The operation and maintenance costs are provided annually by LBDC.</p>

	<p>6. Changes and response model developed for better understanding of vulnerability and best option scenarios for adaptation.</p>	<p>There is no sustainable mechanism in place to exchange data for the purpose of assessing the impacts of climate change and analysing sensitivities of ecological and socio-economic sub-systems.</p>	<p>Changes and response model developed and introduced by end of the project</p>	<p>Four Balaton region specific future scenarios developed, based on these fifth scenario incorporating adaptation options and building on core indicators is under development.                  SWAT model to analyze watershed scale physical processes developed.                  There is an ongoing discussion on how the model is to be used by the water authority in developing the watershed management plan in accordance with the EU Water Framework Directive.                  Water quality model has been developed to evaluate climate pressures on eutrophication.                  Development of meta-model to link physical and socio-economic processes (in Stella) in progress.</p>	<p>The SWAT database and tool was presented at the local water authorities that are now planning to integrate it in their own toolbox with the help of the National Hydrological Institute (VITUKI).                  Following the workshop a trilateral user agreement was signed by LBDC, the Central-Transdanubian Water and Environmental Management Directorate and the National Hydrological Institute.                  Corresponding to the agreement, a four day course was given to two Hungarian GIS experts in Geneva in March 2009 to teach them how to build and calibrate SWAT models. A master student from Geneva is helping improving the calibration of the model with newly provided data                  After the course a joint workshop was organized by LBDC and the Central-Transdanubian Water and Environmental Directorate in Siófok.</p>
	<p>7.</p>				
	<p>8.</p>				

<p><b>Outcome 2</b></p> <p>Strengthened organizational and individual capacity for interpreting emerging vulnerabilities, and increasing resilience by implementing adaptive measures in response</p>	<p>9. Regional Development Council and other relevant institutions adopt and employ adaptation and vulnerability indicator framework for socio-economic development planning</p>	<p>The Lake Balaton Development Coordination Agency provides a strong governing body for regional policy formulation, stakeholder coordination and fund allocation to the communities, but has very limited capacity to understand and formulate adaptation policy framework</p>	<p>Vulnerability indicator framework adopted and applied by at least 5 micro-regions by the end of the second year of the project (impact timeline 6-18+months)</p>	<p>Adaptation needs identification methodology has been developed and workshops (4 on adaption and 1 on scenarios) held in three sub-regions around Lake Balaton with key local stakeholders.</p> <p>Community scale indicators are shown on BalatonTrend for 9 key communities around the lake, technical options for local control and continued utilization of this information is being explored. Responsibility for maintaining community scale indicator sets and data will be discussed with municipal leaders after BalatonTrend's official launch in Hungarian.</p> <p>Four municipal and micro-regional environmental management plans already incorporated adaptation indicators, two others in the planning phase.</p>	<p>Adaptation indicators have been incorporated into important documents of municipalities of the Lake Balaton Region:</p> <p><u>Local and micro-regional Environmental Management Programs:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Balatonszentgyörgy, 2. Balatonalmádi, 3. Hévíz, 4. Balatonederics, 5. Nemesvita, 6. Lesencetomaj, 7. Lesenceistvánd, 8. .Lesencefalu, 9 .Szigliget, 10. Uzza, 11. Hegymagas, 12. Balatonmáriafürdő, 13. Ábrahámhegy, 14. Balatonrendes, 15. Sávoly, 16. Főnyed, 17. Szegerdő, 18. Szökedencs</li> </ol> <p><u>Local and micro-regional Waste Management Plans:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hévíz, 2. Balatonalmádi, 3. Balatobérény, 4. Balatonederics, 5. Nemesvita, 6. Lesencetomaj, 7. Lesenceistvánd, 8. Lesencefalu, 9 .Szigliget, 10. Uzza, 11. Hegymagas,</li> </ol> <p><u>In progress:</u> Environmental Management Program for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sármellék, 2. Szentgyörgyvár, 3. Siófok, 4. Zalavár, 5. Hollád, 6. Balatonfüzfő</li> </ol> <p>In addition, the development of climate change and adaptation strategies for Balatonalmádi and Balatonfüzfő is in progress.</p>
---	--	--	---	--	---

	10. LBDCA integrates adaptation in the organisational structure and mandate	Currently there are no tasks defined in relation to global change, particularly climate change impacts and need for adaptation. This need has been increasingly recognised but there are some capacity gaps to accommodate adaptation as a well established function within the LBDCA	Tasks defined in job description and mandate	Adaptation was identified as the task of the environmental program director of LBDCA	Adaptation was incorporated into the Terms of Reference of the environmental program director of LBDCA
	11.				
	12.				
Outcome 3 Policy framework conducive to adaptive management strengthened	13. Regional, national and sectoral development frameworks integrate adaptation approach	Adaptation needs for the Lake Balaton region have been recognized as a result of tangible effects. Due to capacity limitations adaptation to climate change as it appears in the broader context of other interacting forces of global and local change has not been an integral part of sectoral development planning or programming	At least 2 regional scale frameworks integrate adaptation by the end of the project  APF has been formulated for the Lake Balaton watershed by end of the project (timeline of impact 6-30+ months)	Project provided written input from the implementation point of view to the development of Hungary's National Climate Change Strategy. Also, there is an ongoing discussion with the Ministry of Environment and Water to prepare a pilot implementation plan (required by the Strategy) for the lake Balaton region.  The approach is narrowed down into three medium-term regional development framework to integrate adaptation measures: - Lake Balaton Long Term Development Concept (2008-2020)- already integrated (1) - EU Water Framework Directive conform river basin management plan for Lake Balaton (1) - The two years action plans of Regional Operative Program under the EU's three NUTS2 regional planning units in the Lake Balaton area (3)	In accordance with the adaptation measures determined by the project, several programming documents were supervised and commented with suggestions, e.g.: - 2 years action plan of the National Climate Change Strategy - 3 <sup>rd</sup> Environmental Protection Plan of Hungary - River Basin Management Plan for Lake Balaton catchment  Findings from the project are being incorporated into discussions with the Environmental Committee of the Hungarian Parliament as Hungary prepares to hold the rotating Presidency of the European Union and considers having water as one of the focal areas.
	14.				
	15.				

	16.				
<p><b>Outcome 4</b></p> <p>Pilot initiatives to facilitate adaptation to the impacts of climate change through direct action implemented</p>	<p>17. Observable changes of improved adaptive management and risk reduction against vulnerability indicator framework</p>	<p>LBDC operates a grant facility for local municipalities and communities to support local development in the Lake Balaton region; but there is no criteria or incentives to promote local actions to address the impacts of global change, particularly climate change through local adaptive capacity building</p>	<p>The response system to vulnerability at local levels shows improvements against vulnerability indicator system (by the end of the project)</p>	<p>Improvement is expected in the areas of understanding and awareness of climate change and vulnerability, and nature of potential adaptation options. By the end of the project we also expect increased institutional capacity to build adaptation related activities into project proposal development.</p>	<p>Through engagement with stakeholders and experts, there have been efforts throughout the project to increase the understanding and awareness of climate change and vulnerability, and nature of potential adaptation options.</p> <p>LBDC provided grant facilities for villages for on-site small scale sewage treatment facilities, in which climate change adaptation played significant priority. Currently pilot actions are under implementation at 2 settlements (Nyim and Gétye).</p> <p>Moreover, fund was also provided for the rehabilitation of green plantation at lake shore areas as well as improvement of reed management. Funded adaptation activities concerning <i>water protection</i>: (i) Removal of polluted sediment from certain lake areas (improving water quality); (ii) Restoration of river mouth sedimentation and filtration area (elimination of waste disposal, prevention of the spread of weeds); (iii) improving rainwater-drainage system; and (iv) Lakeshore control and regulation (improving water circulation conditions). Funded adaptation activities concerning <i>landscape management</i>: (i) Rehabilitation of shore areas: Establishment of green spaces and public parks at lake shore areas (dredged sediment disposal areas); Establishment of coastal promenades through the re-classification of unsettled resort territories; and Afforestation at suitable lake shore areas; and (ii) Establishment of lake shore zones (land filling of small bays)</p>

	<p>18. LBDC grant facility integrates adaptation into the funding eligibility criteria</p>			<p>The small-grant scheme of LBDC was reviewed (and will be reviewed further in the fall 2008) to integrate better climate change adaptation measures.</p> <p>Adaptation criteria were built into Calls for Proposals of Lake Balaton Tourism Development calls of ROP in the fall of 2007 and also into the call of Norwegian Grant in the Spring of 2008.</p>	<p>The call for proposals for adaptation project has increased awareness on climate change and adaptation measures.</p> <p>The efficiency of incorporating adaptation issues as eligible criteria for funding is under evaluation.</p>
	<p>19. LBDC fund allocation schemes will increase funding for adaptation by 30</p>	<p>There is no fund allocation that specifically targets adaptation to global change, particularly climate change</p>	<p>At least two adaptation pilot projects implemented by the end of the project</p>	<p>Proposals received are currently under review. Implementation of projects awarded is to start later in 2008.</p>	<p>The implementation of the projects, approved in the framework of the Norwegian Grant Programme, started on November, 2008 and completed by July 31, 2009.</p> <p>The closing and evaluation of projects are in progress.</p>
	<p>20.</p>				



<p><b>Outcome 5:</b></p> <p>Knowledge generated and awareness raised of integrated vulnerability and adaptation approaches locally, nationally and internationally enhanced through knowledge management, dissemination and replication strategy;</p>	<p>21. “Influencing strategy” and knowledge products developed and employed according to the replication plan</p>	<p>There is insufficient knowledge and understanding of local communities and policy makers of integrated vulnerability and adaptation approaches</p>	<p>“Influencing strategy” and knowledge products developed and employed for scaling up and replication by the end of the project (impact timeline 6-30+months)</p>	<p>Influencing strategy tools have been continuously updated and used during the several engagement events. The overall project strategy, methods and parts of the results are being written up as a special issue for a Hungarian language journal (Comitatus) whose primary audience is municipal governments. A similar paper with emphasis on approach is prepared for a Hungarian journal of regional planners and landscape architects. Information will be posted on revamped project website. Knowledge related to the developed watershed model (SWAT) has been transferred to Water Authorities and Water Research Institute (Vituki Kht.)</p> <p>A large integrative project under the FP7 EU research framework was submitted in February 2008 to literally upscale the Balaton project to the entire Black Sea watershed. This project has received very good evaluation and is now waiting to enter negotiation for funding.</p> <p>The projects outputs were presented at several international conferences.</p> <p>The project provided input for an EEA effort to establish adaptation indicators at EU level (EEA/REC workshop 2008 September)</p>	<p>The overall project strategy, methods and parts of the results have been published in a special issue of the Hungarian language journal “Comitatus” whose primary audience is municipal governments.</p> <p>A similar article with emphasis on approach has been prepared for a Hungarian journal of regional planners and landscape architects.</p>
	<p>22. Number of local initiatives introducing adaptation approach</p>		<p>At least 5 end-user agreements to undertake adaptation approach</p>		

	23. Good practices disseminated through GEF Adaptation Learning Mechanism.		At least one knowledge product produced and disseminated through ALM project	Project final report is being planned, will be ready for distribution through ALM by the end of the project.	Climate Change Adaptation Experience Template was prepared and submitted by UNDP Bratislava office to the ALM for broader lessons learned sharing
	24.				
Outcome 6:	25.				
	26.				
	27.				
	28.				

**Rating of Project Progress towards Meeting Objective<sup>5</sup>**

	<b>2008 Rating</b>	<b>2009 Rating</b>	<b>Comments<sup>6</sup></b>
National Project Manager/Coordinator	S	S	<p>The project contributed to the development of some of the key regional and national development frameworks. In particular, at the regional level it provided inputs to the Long-term Regional Development Plan. As a result RDP includes climate adaptation as one of the horizontal issue. It provided basis for the recommendations to the <u>River Basin Management Plan</u> of the Lake Balaton catchment area that is being finalized. The plan has being prepared in correspondence with implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive. The plan includes activities concerning sewage treatment and drainage system, as well as actions for the rehabilitation of lake shore areas carrying important adaptation value and representing no regret options. However, there were additional set of activities that need special attention for building long term resilience of the Lake Systems. Following measures were strongly recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Potential water conveyance solutions for Lake Balaton;</li> <li>- Harmonization of water management activities to mitigate climate change impacts and maintain water level;</li> <li>- Raising awareness of the importance of adaptation measures.</li> </ul> <p>(The River Basin Management Plan is currently under development. Its public consultation has been recently completed.)</p> <p>In addition, the project findings were used during the revision of the Lake Balaton Act, the spatial development plan of the region. These documents serve as the basis for regional development actions in the area.</p>

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> Comment on the rating for 2009 and also on any observable trends from 2006 – 2009.

			<p>At national level, inputs were provided to the new documents of <u>National Climate Change Strategy and its 2 years action plan</u>. Comments and recommendations were sent to integrate Lake Balaton specific adaptation aspects into the documents. Based on the project results, the most important comments were: retention and treatment of rainwater, introduction of sustainable water management practices, limitation of non-native invasive species, establishment of a UV radiation monitoring system and integrate it into the national climate and health information system; promote adaptation pilot projects in the field of agriculture and water management; establish a fund to finance the elaboration of municipal climate change strategies.</p> <p>Moreover, the project commented the <u>3<sup>rd</sup> National Environmental Program</u> by using the project results and as a result, Lake Balaton region has its own dedicated section in the revised document. The project's adaptation recommendations (concerning the Lake Balaton Region), which have been built into the program were the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Operation and maintenance of the tributaries of the lake (establishment of filtration areas)</li> <li>- Operation and maintenance of facilities regulating the water level (e.g. flood-gate at the Sió Canal)</li> <li>- Harmonization of water management activities to mitigate climate change impacts and maintain water level</li> <li>- Assessment of the hydrological, hydro meteorological and geomorphologic conditions of the catchment area;</li> <li>- Promotion of sustainable reed management;</li> <li>- Promotion of shoreline rehabilitation;</li> </ul> <p>At local and micro sub-national level the project made progress by including developed indicators into 29 environmental programs and waste management plans. The programmes and plans have to be revised every 4 and 6 years; therefore, it is a continuous process. At present 6 programmes are under preparation at LBDCA, as well as 2 municipal climate and adaptation strategies.</p> <p>Thus, in the Balaton region adaptation has become a more known and better recognized</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>issue at policy level.</p> <p>The tools developed during the project are scientifically sound and have high planning and decision-making support value. Some of the tools developed by international partners with participation of local experts need further discussions on local utilization, including available technical capacities and gaps. The sustainable use of the models is ensured by a trilateral agreement of LBDCA, Central-Transdanubian Water and Environmental Directorate and the National Hydrological Institute. The on-line monitoring system is operational and maintained by LBDCA.</p> <p>The project has organized a series of training workshops aimed at technical capacity development in Hungary. As such, a workshop for 10 modeling and simulation experts was organized in April, 2008, that was followed by a 4 days training for 2 experts in Geneva in 2009. About 20 experts participated on the scenario development workshop in Keszthely and 8-9 experts on the indicator development workshops. The outputs of the workshops were incorporated into project results.</p> <p>Pilot programs to implement adaptation measures were first tested through the open call of tourism development projects. During the selection procedure adaptation measures were honored in the scoring process. Among the 48 projects the scoring system did not make significant difference. It was due to its relatively low weight (4/100).</p> <p>Environmental fund was launched where activities were set exclusively for selected adaptation measures. The fund was established by the financial contribution of local governments, the EEA and Norwegian fund. The total amount of fund was HUF 369 404 328, of which HUF 59 999 917 was provided by local governments.</p> <p>Open call was issued and 32 sub-project applications were granted. The fund was available for NGOs. During the selection process, agreement with local government was honored. To sustain sub-project results and institutionalize long term cooperation, it was recommended to sign local agreements</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>between the NGOs and municipalities. These agreements became popular: 7 agreements are already signed and it is expected that 8 or more will be concluded. Pursuant to the cooperation agreements, local municipalities had to ensure the sustainability of the pilot projects' results for 5 more years: e.g. maintenance of parks and green areas established by the projects, maintenance of rainwater drainage systems, maintenance of purchased equipments etc. Thereby, the adaptation measures implemented by the NGOs are expected to be continued in the future. In addition, by showing good example, it is expected that more and more similar activities will also be implemented by other NGOs and local populations.</p> <p>Due to changes of the development fund allocation policies after the EU accession of Hungary, funds available by LBDC were substantially reduced following the inception of the project. Therefore, LBDCA had to mobilize the required co-funding from other financial resources (EU and EEA/ Norway funds). This funding mechanism contributed to meet the co-financing requirements (see comments in section 9). However, the LBDC grant scheme is planned to be restructured in order to provide financing for adaptation projects in the future. The size of the fund may change on an annual basis but the implementation of adaptation measures will be sustained.. The Association of Lake Balaton Civil Groups has already issued a statement on the positive impacts of the fund and a recommendation to continue such kind of funding mechanism.</p> <p>The sustainability of the overall project results is ensured by LBDCA's activities.</p>
Government GEF OFP <sup>7</sup> (optional)			
Executing Agency			

<sup>7</sup> 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.

(optional)			
UNDP Country Office	MS	MS	<p>The project developed several advanced modeling tools and instruments to assess the vulnerability of Lake Balaton to climate change and the impact of future adaptation scenarios. In last year of project implementation, the National Water Management Directorate took over the developed tools and plans to apply it for integrated water management planning. But still the future maintenance and use of developed tools is not addressed sufficiently, as these tools require regular update of data that can be difficult to collect and are expensive to process.</p> <p>Wide range of stakeholders has been involved in identification of adaptation responses and needs for adaptive capacity development, they were trained on how to formulate and implement adaptive strategies, how to use the developed tools. However, the focus on capacity development was quite weak; and a capacity development strategy was missing to identify capacity gaps and capacity needs. The project succeeded to integrate aspects of climate change adaptation into two development plans for the Balaton region, and mainstreamed adaptation criteria into the evaluation system of two tourism development schemes in the Balaton region. A small-grants scheme was launched (from external resources) to support 32 pilot adaptation actions. The implementation of pilot projects goes beyond the time-frame of this project. In general, it can be noted that the project objectives were too optimistic given the anticipated timeline. The expected project results were delivered but were not fully institutionalized.</p>
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor	S	S	<p>The project idea was conceived as a result of long partnership (since 2002), between the Lake Balaton Development Coordination Agency (LBDCA) and its partners, such as IISD, concerned about the intense heat wave that resulted in dramatic reductions of water levels in the Lake Balaton. The GEF project was designed with the objective to improve</p>

			<p>vulnerability assessment and adaptive capacity. From the project's last year implementation perspective the project delivered on all five outcomes and progressed well towards all indicators. On vulnerability assessment side the project developed series of tools that have considerably improved the knowledge of climate change impacts on the Lake Balaton and its watershed as well as equipped the key stakeholders with the tools and methods necessary for a sound adaptation planning and decisions. As such, a web based information tool "Balaton Trend" provides information on ecological and socio-economic trends in the Lake system. It is currently maintained and operated by the IISD and is being replicated in other countries of the world (in the context of coasts, watersheds); The portal is accessible for use. Internet map server stores and makes available all metadata that were needed for modeling exercise. Scenarios for climate and land cover change provide the basis for forward-looking planning for the Lake and watershed region. A customized Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) is a decision-support tool that will be owned and maintained by the Central TransDanubian Environmental and Water Management Directorate and the National Water Research Institute and among the others will also be used by the LBDCA. These advanced tools have been developed with engagement and consultations with the national experts and wider groups of stakeholders that contributed with their knowledge. As a result, this process identified</p>
--	--	--	---



			<p>some of the least cost, no regret adaptation measures that had wider support. Some of these measures, such as rehabilitation of plantations and greening the shorelines of the Balaton Lake, including the reed management, sedimentation management, land filling etc, are to reduce the coastal erosion and improve the water balance in the Lake. Augmenting water inputs to the Lake that will suffer from the increased rates of evaporation and minimize water pollution from the wastewater effluents are another critical adaptation solutions agreed by key stakeholders, such as local populations, municipalities and NGOs. These were largely the types of measure tested on a pilot basis through over 30 initiatives implemented by local NGOs with support and financial contributions by the local municipalities. External funds were mobilized (EEA / Norwegian fund) complemented by local municipal resources to set a small grant fund for the measures that contribute to the climate change resilience of the Lake system. The pilot measures funded by the project will be largely picked up by the local municipalities based on the concluded agreements. Project has influenced number of critical development frameworks such as, Regional Development Plan, 3<sup>rd</sup> Environmental Strategy, Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan, River Basin Management Plan for Balaton region and contributed to important policy formulation processes. As a result of a project, Hungary now has a comprehensive long term concept of the Balaton Region Development that fully</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>incorporates identified adaptation priority measures. The document is important, as much as it should underpin all policies and decisions relevant to the Lake Balaton and its wider watershed management. Despite these positive results and obvious successes the project would have been much better off if it had managed to influence local tourism operators and industry to bring them into conservation and adaptation processes thereby lifting critical pressures on the Lake system, diminishing its resilience. LBDCA grant scheme for tourism development included the adaptation component but it did not appear strong in a weighing system therefore, could not influence the prioritization for approvals. Therefore, a separate, set a side grant fund turned out a better option for local adaptation funding. Despite its increasing popularity, long term sustainability is questionable and the LBDCA should beef up the adaptation profile of its regular grant scheme (as was initially conceived by the project). Despite the agreed institutional homes for the designed tools, the risk of inadequate maintenance and their ineffective and unsystematic use remains valid. However, the very fact that as a result of the project, LBDCA environmental director has a new mandate that includes adaptation strategies for the region grants, to a certain degree, institutional ownership over the project findings and results at sub-national level. In conclusion it should be noted that complexity of the project was inherent to its design. A Medium size project has five ambitious</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>outcomes to be delivered in less than three years. This was a result of limited experience (the first UNDP SPA / adaptation project ever) with adaptation projects and equally limited guidance available from the GEF for the adaptation project development. Despite this inherent complexity and associated risks the project has delivered on its commitments and therefore considered satisfactory in its progress towards the objective.</p>
--	--	--	---

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

Where a rating of MU, U or HU is noted above describe the actions to be taken to address this:

<i>Action to be Taken</i>	<i>By Whom?</i>	<i>By When?</i>
N/A	N/A	N/A

## 5. Progress in Project implementation this reporting period

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

<i>Project Outcomes</i>	<i>Key Outputs</i>
Outcome 1:	1. The database (developed in Excel for the organization of statistical indicator data and metadata) was structured and finalized to keep developing and improving SWAT for handovering.
	2. The report on socio-economic and ecological status and trends, with 32 indicators, was finalized. The reporting on the business as usual (BAU) scenario was completed. The BalatonTrend portal (accessible at <test.balatontrend.org> in English), where the indicators entered into is operational and maintained by the international partner organization of IISD. IISD aims at making further developments of the portal. The portal was presented at several fora and its use in the context of other projects has been considered in Canada and Brazil. An analysis of inter-linkages of key indicators has been prepared and published for the systematic use by LBDCA's socio-economic research unit.
	3. Regarding the watershed management support model (incorporating geospatial environmental data), correction and supervision was made in the report on SWAT modeling. The model is used to analyze physical watershed processes and produce quantitative results that can be used as input in an integrated assessment model to better understand the current situation and to develop scenarios. Based on the partnership agreements of the utilization of SWAT, the model will be regularly updated by the national partners of Central-Transdanubian Environmental and Water Management Directorate and the National Water Research Institute (VITUKI) and also used by LBDCA:
	4. Input data and results of the SWAT analysis are available through an Internet Map Server. The life after-project plan for this IMS is to integrate it into the Black Sea catchment observation system being built in the new FP7 European project led by Anthony Lehmann from UNEP-GRID.
Outcome 2:	1. As part of capacity development activities, a master student from the University of Geneva is going to continue the collaboration on SWAT modeling with local water authorities and VITUKI national hydrological institute. This arrangement will be financed by the "Black Sea" adaptation research and development project through the EU FP7 program. Database for Lake Balaton in the SWAT model will be updated, extended and quality of model prediction will be improved.
	2. Priority adaptation options have been identified in a participatory process. Reports, presenting the results, have been disseminated among regional stakeholders.
	3. As part of the capacity building element of the project, papers and other publications on adaptation have been prepared and presented.
	4. As a result of the project, adaptation to climate change has been incorporated into the task of the environmental program director of LBDCA (e.g. elaboration of climate change and adaptation strategy constitutes a new task). This means institutionalization of adaptation task at the sub-national level, in the Balaton region.

<p>Outcome 3:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adaptation measures have been integrated into 18 Environmental Management Programmes (in addition, the elaboration of 6 more programmes is in progress) and 11 Waste Management Plan (for more information see Chapter 4 – Progress towards achieving project objectives.)</li> <li>2. The project was presented at local / regional conferences and workshops on adaptation, such as: Black Sea Hot, 2008; Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe Workshop: Adaptation to the Consequences of Climate Change Process: Progress Achieved and Capacity Building Needed, Budapest, 2007; Regional Environmental Centre for Central and Eastern Europe: Expert meeting on climate change vulnerability and adaptation indicators, Szentendre, 2008.</li> <li>3. Stakeholder forums were organized (at Siófok in July 2, 2008 and at Keszthely, November 5, 2008) to discuss climate change scenarios and policy options in response to priority adaptation needs: (a) to discuss priority trends; (b) review inter-linkages between trends and indicators; (c) review climate change scenarios in the Lake Balaton Region; and (d) identify key (national and EU) policy measures and their feasibility in the region (policy barriers and options). The vision was developed using a collage technique; results are written up in a workshop report.</li> <li>4. Based on the project outcomes, the National Climate Change Strategy and its 2-years action plan, as well as the 3<sup>rd</sup> National Environmental Program were commented and revised to incorporate its own section of Lake Balaton region. The adaptation recommendations, which have been built into the later program, includes: the harmonization of water management activities to mitigate climate change impacts and maintain water level, the promotion of sustainable reed management, the promotion of shoreline rehabilitation, etc. . At regional level, the Balaton Act (spatial plan for the Lake Balaton region) and the River Basin Management Plan for the Lake Balaton Region (under reparation) were revised and commented. Input to the Hungarian Parliament’s Environmental Protection Committee, as it works towards Hungary’s EU presidency, with water as one of the key elements (ongoing as of July 2009).</li> </ol>
<p>Outcome 4:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On one hand, as a result of the project, calls for proposals of lake Balaton grant programs have included requirements to address adaptation (directly or indirectly). Screening and evaluation criteria were developed to select and prioritize proposals that best meet these criteria.  On the other hand initiating pilot activities, the project applications were submitted in the framework of the Environmental Fund supported by both local municipal governments and by the EEA and Norwegian Grant Programme. The project applications were evaluated (both checking the administrative compliance and technical content of the applications) by independent experts in July-August, 2008. The final beneficiaries were selected by a Professional Committee in September, 2008. After signing the grant contracts, the implementation of the approved projects started on November, 2008 and completed before July 31, 2009. Currently, the implemented projects are in the final reporting period (elaboration of final reports).  In general, the applicant organizations were societies: civil organizations, associations, foundations / public endowments and public benefit organizations. The pilot actives focused on the improvement of the quality of natural and built environment and/or the improvement of waste management. Complex projects addressing both two objectives were favored in the course of project evaluation.</li> </ol>

	<p>Grants could cover up to 90% of the total eligible sub-projects costs. The minimum amount of grant was HUF 2,486,600 and the maximum amount was HUF 49,732,000.</p> <p>Evaluation of project results: The final beneficiaries were obliged to periodically (on a quarterly basis) submit technical and financial reports, as well as submit a final report to the LBDCA. In addition, all projects have been monitored on-site by LBDCA at least once during the project implementation. Based on the final reports submitted so far, it can be concluded, that the final beneficiaries have taken into account the horizontal objectives during the implementation of sub-projects, in particular the principle of sustainable development. The acquired equipment contributed to the good environmental management practices of the settlements, the reduction of climate change-related invasive species (e.g. ragweed), and improved the conditions of green surfaces around recently developed bicycle roads. Extensive tree planting contributed to mitigation of higher temperatures through reduction of heat-island effects. In addition, the newly planted, drought resistant and fast growing vegetation contributes to the fixation of carbon dioxide. Development and good management of green areas located in the vicinity of the lake shore contributes to lake water quality improvement and erosion control.</p> <p>To ensure sustainability signing of long term (minimum 5 years), it was proposed to sign cooperation agreement between local partners, such as the NGO and local governments. Seven such agreements have already signed and other 8 are under preparation.</p> <p>2. The project has developed a list of adaptation priority areas based on the project indicator list.</p> <p>3. LBDC provided grant facilities for villages for the installments of small-scale waste water treatment facilities, in which water is treated causing less pollution and at the same time by draining the treated effluents in the spot offering more adaptive water utilization for locals. Adaptation played significant priority. Currently pilot actions are under implementation at 2 settlements (Nyim and Gétye). Moreover, fund was also provided for the rehabilitation of green spaces at lake shore areas.</p> <p>4. The SWAT database and tool was presented at the local water authorities that are now planning to integrate it in their own toolbox with the help of the National Hydrological Institute (VITUKI). A 4 days course was organized in Geneva to teach about SWAT modeling and it was also agreed that the database will be further improved.</p>
<p>Outcome 5:</p>	<p>1. In the framework of the project a list of key audiences was developed involving stakeholders and organizations that are interested in the project and could ensure long term sustainability of project results.</p> <p>The aim of the influencing strategy is to identify the key stakeholders of the project and help to determine the tool how they could be engaged in the most effective way. In order to determine the group of invitees to stakeholder workshop and the list of regional stakeholders to whom the climate change questionnaire was sent out, the influencing strategy was revised and updated.</p>

	<p>2. Papers in Hungarian were prepared for a special issue of the “Comitatus” monthly journal for local governments. Reviewing project results, the publication included a summary paper on project goals, structure and process, and a paper on indicators, vulnerability and adaptation. Six papers were prepared, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Overview of the Balaton Adaptation Pilot Project – L. Pintér and K. Kutics</li><li>▪ Elaboration of the Lake Balaton Indicator System and the Relationship between the Indicators – K. Kutics</li><li>▪ A Study of Adaptation to Climate Change in the Lake Balaton Recreational Area – L. Bizikova and L. Pintér</li><li>▪ Climate Change: Opinions, Attitudes and Activities in the Lake Balaton Region – G. Dombi, M. Oláh and T. Retz</li><li>▪ National Climate Change Strategy – Z. Egerszegi</li><li>▪ Will there be enough water flowing into Lake Balaton under a changing climate to sustain the socio-economical activities of the region? – A. Lehmann and B. Chatenoux</li></ul> <p>The papers have been also available on the project’s website at: <a href="http://www.balatonregion.hu/adaptation/">www.balatonregion.hu/adaptation/</a></p>
	<p>3. The project has prepared and delivered presentations on project at national and international fora: at national level, results were presented to the representatives of the civil society (Annual Meeting of the Alliance of Civil Organizations operating in the Lake Balaton Region, November 20, 2008, Gyenesdiás), the representatives of the Rural Development Network and micro-regions (December 12, 2008); while at international level, Landscape, Environment and Society – Past and Present Environmental Issues in Hungary, Bloomington, Indiana University, April 4-5, 2009; BalatonTrend presentation at the American Statistical Association conference, Washington, July 2009.</p>
	<p>4. The presentation of project achievements to the general public and experts were made on the open meeting of LBDC held on December 7, 2008 at Siófok. Around 120 people participated the meeting.</p>

**Rating of Project Implementation**

	<b>2008 Rating</b>	<b>2009 Rating</b>	<b>Comments<sup>8</sup></b>
National Project Manager/Coordinator	S	S	<p>The project provided sufficient information to ensure inputs to national and regional level strategic documents. It has served as basis to formulate a set of critical recommendations to the river basin management planning of the Lake Balaton catchment area.</p> <p>The project contributed to the effective transfer of knowledge in the course of preparation of more than 20 local environmental related management plans. The sustainability of the project is already proved by the request of two municipalities asking LBDCA to prepare their climate and adaptation strategies.</p> <p>Risks lying in funding pilot initiatives were recognized early in project implementation. Efforts have been made to find additional sources. By the support of local governments and the EEA and Norwegian Grant Program, an environmental fund was set up providing open calls for proposals. The environmental fund is widely appreciated in the region, especially as it supported local environmental actions. Support letters and recommendations to continue such a grant system have already been received. Direct support to continue the fund is not yet available. However, its basic financial philosophy, that is to raise local financial resources and use it as seed money to target larger amount of matching fund, makes its sustainability possible.</p> <p>A more effective strategy with international partners for institutionalizing project results could have been applied. Instead of partnership agreement, a sub-contract-based relation could have served this purpose more efficiently.</p> <p>The dissemination of project results</p>

<sup>8</sup> Comment on the rating for 2008 and any observable trends from 2006 - 2008



			<p>targeted local, regional, and national, as well as international audiences. The dissemination activities were most effective at local and regional levels, and less effective at national and international levels. However, activities are still under progress at latter two levels.</p> <p>The adaptation capacity developed can provide sustainability of the implementation of small scale adaptation measures throughout the grants of LBDC as well as through the introduced climate change adaptation criteria introduced into the evaluation conditions of development grants.</p>
Government GEF OFP <sup>9</sup> <i>(optional)</i>			
Executing Agency <i>(optional)</i>			
UNDP Country Office	MS	MS	<p>The original 30 months duration (even with 6 month extension) appeared as not sufficient to implement all the planned components. The project team recommends a minimum duration of 5 years. Additionally, the project inception took longer than expected, adding pressure on the scheduling of project activities. The project management team recognized early the problem and tried to address the delay by re-planning the work to be done in a tighter schedule. However, the implementation continued to be behind the schedule, as the implementation logic did not allow implementing activities in parallel In first two years the project focused on understanding the Lake Balaton ecological and socio/economic system's vulnerability and resilience. Delays and increased costs were encountered, but finally the project has provided high quality tools and instruments, based on strong scientific and technical background. Only at that stage</p>

<sup>9</sup> 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 was in a strong position to strengthen the policy framework and the capacity for formulating and implementing adaptive strategies. These were thus addressed in late stages of the project implementation, in last six months. The risk of unavailability of high quality data was identified at the beginning of the project. The changes agreed to mitigate the risk (more time consuming data processing and different model) affected the whole project implementation. The main co-financing contributor for this project was the national executing agency (USD 3M). Only USD 0.3M was disbursed due to budget constraints in the last two years as a result of the economic crisis in Hungary. Nevertheless, under a new grant programme funded by Norway USD 2.7M was earmarked to climate change adaptation projects.</p>
<p>UNDP Regional Technical Advisor</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>The project experienced delays as vulnerability assessment and customized tool design processes took much longer than initially planned. The inputs from the vulnerability assessment were essential to kick start any policy work or on the ground adaptation pilot activities. The project team had to acquire the knowledge of key drivers of vulnerability and anticipated scenarios of change before moving ahead with local testing of priority measures or providing substantive inputs to various policy frameworks. The poor baseline conditions with data availability, especially processed data availability, demanded greater amount of time for the outcome 1. At the same time, the project could have used this time lag for more robust capacity development at more macro, institutional level. It had limited itself to training and technical capacity development. This clearly is of critical importance for having local human resources with adequate skills to operate the tools introduced by the project. But stronger institutional affiliations and dedicated resources for maintenance are still to be resolved. On more positive side that grants the project a satisfactory rate is its extremely proactive approach to</p>

		<p>influencing policy frameworks and mobilizing local populations and most importantly municipalities around the adaptation action through the grant scheme and consultations. As the financial crisis hit the country the local budget was cut considerably to employ a grant scheme for adaptation through the LBDCA facility. It was a result of proactive efforts of LBDCA that enabled the project mobilize external as well as local (municipal) resources to fulfill the project co-financing commitment and implement the pilot measures. This also prompted the delays as the time and efforts were taken for the partnership building and resource mobilization. The very fact that the local LBDCA was owning and implementing the project made these successes in partnership building possible. It is also recognized however, that more upstream institutional anchors and project advocates at the national level were largely missing. This could have made the project implementation process smoother and sustainability options stronger. It can be concluded that in the implementation arrangement a national institutional ownership was missing. Therefore, the project impacts are somewhat limited to sub-national level. However, it can also be stated that the project provided for a solid analytical base for adaptation decisions and actions in future.</p>
--	--	---

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

Where a rating of MU, U or HU is noted above describe the actions to be taken to address this:

<i>Action to be Taken</i>	<i>By Whom?</i>	<i>By When?</i>
N/A	N/A	N/A

## 6. Critical Risks

Only critical risks need to be entered here. All other risks will appear in the Atlas risk tab that must be attached to this APR/PIR. Critical risks are those assessed to have medium or high impact and a probability of occurrence above 50%. All financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalizations of energy service companies (ESCOs) are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature.

<i>Critical Risk Type</i>	<i>Date Identified</i>	<i>Risk Description</i>	<i>Risk Management Response</i>
other	June 2008	Full and sustained utilization of tools and policies developed might need further actions	<p>Agreements have been concluded between LBDC and Water Authorities as well as LBDC and VITUKI Kht. (Water Research Institute Public Interest Company) in order to utilize the developed watershed modeling tool;</p> <p>Further improvement of SWAT model database and prediction quality is being carried out with the cooperation of VITUKI Kht. and University of Geneva, financed through international projects, such as the EU FP7 Black Sea program;</p> <p>Data of installed online monitoring stations is shared with regional institutions and stakeholders;</p> <p>Being a multi-stakeholder organization, Lake Balaton Development Council serves as the end user of all the other tools and policies developed in the project. To this end, LBDC is the responsible organization to provide appropriate information and prepare initiatives for LBDC.</p>

## 7. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the logical framework matrix, since the Project Document signature:

Changes have been reported in previous PIR and there are no additional changes to report	<b><i>Year reported:</i></b> <b>2007</b>
--	---

<i>Change Made to:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>	<i>Reason for Change</i>
Project Objective <sup>10</sup>	No	
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs/Activities/Inputs	No	

<sup>10</sup> Any changes to Objective or Outcomes must be cleared by the RTA and sent to GEFSEC for GEF CEO approval

### 8. Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes.

<i>Change</i>	<i>Reason for Change</i>	<i>Scope of delay (in months)</i>
July 2006	As reported in the PIR 2007 change of project leader at the partner organisation UNEP/GRID resulted in some loss of time while new leader Mr. A. Lehmann became familiar with the project, as well as the addition of new ideas, such as using SWAT model as key watershed analysis tool.	2 month delays in some activities (Outcome 1) within unchanged project duration
November 2007	Date of Mid-term Evaluation postponed for 2008 due to difficulties encountered in the competitive selection of international expert	6
May 2008	Taking into consideration the consequences of the early risks encountered and to better harmonize with the Hungarian National Climate Change Strategy put out for public debate in late 2007	Extension of project duration by 6 month

**9. Financial Information: cumulative since project started to 30 June 2008.**

Please present all financial values in US\$. Note that certain section below must match the project document. Please do not leave any blank entries. If a particular field is not applicable, please indicate so by marking it as N/A.

<i>Name of Partner or Contributor (including the Private Sector)</i>	<i>Nature of Contributor<sup>11</sup></i>	<i>Amount used in Project Preparation (PDF A, B, PPG)</i>	<i>Amount committed in Project Document<sup>12</sup></i>	<i>Additional amounts committed after Project Document finalization<sup>11</sup></i>	<i>Estimated Total Disbursement to 30 June 2009</i>	<i>Expected Total Disbursement by end of project</i>
<b>GEF Contribution</b>	GEF	0	0.99	0	0.95	0.99
<b>Cash Cofinancing – UNDP Managed</b>						
UNDP (TRAC)	UN Agency					
Cash Co-financing – Partner Managed						
UNEP-GRID			0.02		0.02	0.02
LBDC	National Gov.		3.0		0.3	0.3
LBDCA	NGO			2.7	2.7	2.7
<b>In-Kind Cofinancing</b>						
IISD	NGO		0.04		0.04	0.04
UNEP-GRID	UN Agency		0.03		0.03	0.03
<b>Total Cofinancing</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>3.09</b>
<b>Total for Project</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>4.08</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>4.04</b>	<b>4.08</b>

<sup>11</sup> Specify if: UN Agency, other Multilateral, Bilateral Donor, Regional Development Bank (RDB), National Government, Local Government, NGO, Private Sector, Other.

<sup>12</sup> Committed amounts are those shown in the approved Project Document. These may be zero in the case of new leveraged project partners.

## Comments

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

The national co-financing to be obtained through LBDC has been reduced dramatically. However, the difference was compensated by the increased contribution by LBDCA. In details:

The project document that was submitted to the GEF for approval included the co-financing commitment of \$3million against the GEF's \$985.000 of total funding. During the planning phase the co-financing commitment was signed by the chairman of the LBDC. The final version of the project document (including the co-financing contribution) was discussed at the meeting of LBDC on August 18, 2005 and by LBDC resolution No. 71/2005 (VIII.18.) the chairman was authorized to sign the necessary documents (project document).

The LBDC planned to allocate the necessary co-financing amount through its regular annual small-grant distribution scheme that was around 4.5 million USD, annually in 2005 and before. The small-grant scheme was financed from national development funds.

After the EU accession the national development funds were reorganized. In the period of 2004-2006 there were minor adjustments, but from 2007 fundamental changes occurred. Being member of the EU, Hungary become eligible for the structural and cohesion funds of EU for the full financial period of 2007-2013. The amount of funds available for Hungary significantly increased, but they require 25% national co-financing (EU pays 75%). To provide the national co-financing amount necessary to receive the EU funds for Hungary, the government merged several funds that were available at various sectors earlier. The EU funds now are redistributed through sectoral and regional programs. LBDC is not involved directly into this re-distribution system. It is still benefiting only from the decreased, entirely national resources. Coupled with the unfavorable macroeconomic situation of Hungary much less funds are available now for LBDC as compared to earlier periods. It is the reason of the drop of expected co-financing from 3.0 to 0.3 million USD.

The remaining part of national co-financing was made available through the development agency of LBDC, i.e. LBDCA. LBDCA adjusted running programs and applied for new funds to meet the requirements. 0.5 million USD was used from an EU LIFE project to co-finance the establishment of the monitoring system (water quality, quantity and some hydro-meteorological elements). Around 2.7 million USD is allocated for pilot projects. LBDCA applied and won a block grant from the joint fund of European Economic Area (EEA) and Norway. The call for proposals of sub-projects (equivalent to the pilot projects of this UNDP project) was launched in March, 2008. The selection of sub-projects was carried out in August, 2008. The donor organization approved the selected sub-projects in September, 2008. Afterward, the grant contracts were signed with the final beneficiaries. Sub-projects (around 32) could start from October 1, 2008 and depending on projects completed in the first half of 2009, but not later than July 31, 2009.

Despite the difficulties with co-financing, the issue has been detected at an early stage and addressed as a result of proactive action and adaptive management.

**10. Cumulative Procurement Data.**

**DO NOT complete this section for projects or project components executed by UNOPs.**

Only report values when they are US\$2,000 or more. Please update project expenditures accumulated from project start up to 30 June 2009.

Please do not leave any blank entries. If a particular field is not applicable, please indicate so by marking it as N/A.

	<i><u>Personnel</u> contracted that come from these countries (US\$)</i>	<i><u>Sub-contracts</u> that are with groups based in these countries (US\$)</i>	<i><u>Equipment</u> purchased outside of the project country from these countries (US\$)</i>	<i><u>Training</u><sup>13</sup> with groups or individuals from these countries (US\$)</i>	<i><b>Total</b></i>
Australia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Austria	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Belgium	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Canada	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
China	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Czech Republic	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Denmark	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Finland	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
France	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Germany	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Greece	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
India	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ireland	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Italy	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Japan	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Korea	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Luxembourg	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mexico	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

<sup>13</sup> Those not included under personnel and sub-contracts.



Netherlands	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
New Zealand	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Nigeria	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Norway	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Pakistan	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Portugal	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Slovenia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
South Africa	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Spain	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Sweden	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Switzerland	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Turkey	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
United Kingdom	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
United States	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

## 11. Additional Financial Instruments used in the Project

This section only needs to be completed if the project provides funds to any Financial Instruments such as: Trust Funds, Sinking Funds, Revolving Funds, Partial Credit Risk Guarantees, Microfinance services, Leasing or Insurance mechanisms. If this project does not use any Additional Financial Instruments you do not need to complete this section.

<i>Financial Instrument</i>	<i>Financial Institution Responsible for Management</i>	<i>Basis for Selection of Financial Institution</i>
N/A		

For Each Financial Instrument please complete the following two tables:

Name of Financial Instrument:

N/A

<i>Source of Funds (add rows for each source)</i>	<i>Funds Committed in Project Document</i>	<i>Amount Disbursed to Date</i>	<i>Issues or Comments</i>
GEF	N/A		


**Rating of Performance of Financial Instrument**

	<b>2008 Rating (from 08 PIR)</b>	<b>2009 Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
National Project Manager/Coordinator	N/A		No financial instruments such as listed above were used
Government GEF OFP (optional)			
Executing Agency (optional)			
UNDP Country Office			
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor			

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

Where a rating of MU, U or HU is noted above describe the actions to be taken to address this:

<b>Action to be Taken</b>	<b>By Whom?</b>	<b>By When?</b>

**End of Project Situation**

What is to happen to any funds remaining in the Financial Instrument at the end of the project?

--

## 12. Good Practice in this reporting period.

Were any problems encountered? If so, how were they addressed?

<b><i>Problem</i></b>	<b><i>Solution</i></b>
<p><i>Balaton lake system's adaptation needs may be overlooked by the Hungarian National Climate Change Strategy</i></p> <p>Hungarian National Climate Change Strategy (NCCS) was formulated in 2007 and approved by the Government and subsequently by a Parliamentary Resolution in March, 2008.</p>	<p>NCCS draft version was studied and it was taken into consideration in the preparation of workshop and training material. Comments and recommendations on NCCS by the PMB were sent to the Ministry of Environment in order to include policies relevant to the adaptation of the Lake Balaton Region.</p> <p>In addition, discussions started with the Ministry of Environment and Water (MEW) as well as the Water Management Authority (WMA) to strengthen the cooperation and assure more national perspective for the project, with future prospects of up-scaling.</p> <p>Pursuant to the NCCS, a 2-year action plan has to be elaborated. Based on the project results, Lake Balaton specific recommendations on adaptation measures were also provided for the draft plan.</p>
<p><i>Change of national co-financing scheme</i></p> <p>National (LBDC) co-financing has changed substantially after the inception of the project.</p>	<p>Funds available by LBDC were substantially reduced but LBDC managed to mobilize the required co-funding from other financial resources (EU and EEA/ Norway funds). This proactive approach enabled the project to meet the co-financing requirement (see comments in section 9).</p> <p>However, at the end of 2008, the central government dedicated development fund for the LBDC to allocate it in the region co-financing regional initiatives. The main topics of grant project calls were: (i) improve the quality of family-friendly services, (ii) support event organization, and (iii) promote the development of settlements. Adaptation measures were indirectly incorporated into the projects.</p>
<p><i>Incorporation of adaptation measures into evaluation criteria of calls for proposals</i></p> <p>Adaptation measures are only indirectly supported</p>	<p>Although adaptation was not directly supported, adaptation aspects were incorporated into the evaluation criteria of the calls for proposals called “<i>Improving the attractiveness of the Lake Balaton Region</i>” published in the Regional Operational Programme: maximum 2 points could be given for the “relevance to global environmental changes”.</p> <p>In spite of the fact that it was a good initiative, it could not reach the expected results. Only a few applicants took the opportunity to implement adaptation measures in their projects. Therefore, we recommend publishing calls for proposals, which directly support adaptation (like pilot projects funded in by the Norwegian Grant). Another possibility would be to set the co-financing rate to the level of contribution to adaptation.</p>
<p><i>Pilot initiatives could start late</i></p> <p>The delays accumulated in the first year of the project accompanied by the co-financing issues of the second</p>	<p>Pilot projects were contracted in October 2008. The implementation of the pilot projects could start only after contracting. The maximum duration of project implementation was 10 months, but they had to be completed not later than July</p>

year resulted in changes in the implementation schedule of pilot initiatives. (Outcome 4)	31, 2009. The projects were implemented during the first half of 2009. Currently most of the projects are under the procedure of final reporting.
---	---

**General Comments:**

- 1) Is there anything noteworthy/special/critical that was learned this year that is important to share with other projects so they can avoid this mistake/make use of this opportunity?

The block-grant facility offered for the implementation of pilot projects was highly appreciated by local NGOs. The implementation of pilot activities directly contributed to adaptation to climate change through the arrangements of the settlements' surroundings, rehabilitation of green spaces and the improvement of waste management. Planting trees and establishing public parks decreased pollution and improve the quality of environment in general.

Based on the lesson learnt through the implementation of the call for pilot projects and the call for tourism development projects, it can be concluded, that offering direct grants for adaptation measures are more efficient, than involving adaptation aspects in the evaluation criteria of calls for proposals. Unfortunately relatively few extra points were given for adaptation issues through the evaluation of projects proposals; therefore, it was not incentive enough for the applicants to spend time and energy to involve adaptation measures in their proposals. In contrast, the implementation of pilot projects, and this type of environmental funding mechanism was very popular in the region.

In addition, the success of pilot projects was also supported by the cooperation agreements signed by the local NGOs and municipalities. These agreements play an important role as they ensure the long-term sustainability and the institutionalization of projects results. Therefore, it is recommended for all local actors to sign similar agreements in the future.

- 2) Please summarize in 200 words the progress made this reporting period. This may be used for publication purposes.

**PIMS 3334, Lake Balaton Vulnerability Assessments, Early Warning and Adaptation Strategies**

The main focus was put on **the finalization of project activities and the dissemination of project results**. Therefore, the vulnerability assessment, climate scenarios and models were finalized. The **SWAT database and tool was presented** to local water authorities interested in integrating it. A course was given to two Hungarian GIS experts in Geneva to teach them how to build and calibrate SWAT models.

**Adaptation indicators have been incorporated** into environmental management programmes and waste management plans. The elaboration of a municipal-level climate change strategy is in progress.

**Facilitating dialogue between regional stakeholders and national authorities**, the National Climate Change Strategy was commented based on the opinions of regional stakeholders attending the project workshops (such as the meeting organized on November 5, 2008 to discuss climate change scenarios and policy options).

Disseminating the lessons learnt **several publications have been prepared**. For instance, articles were published in a special issue of the *“Comitatus”* monthly journal for local governments. Project results were also introduced for the *Living Lakes Network* by the help of the Global Nature Fund.

Promoting adaptation, **pilot initiatives have been implemented** contributing to improve the quality of green spaces. Through the improvement of environment, the adaptation and mitigation capacity of the region has also been improved.

3) Engagement with civil society this reporting period:

Is this project directly executed by an NGO? (also called implementing partner in harmonized countries)	YES		<u>NO</u>		Is this project implemented by an NGO? (also called responsible party in harmonized countries)	YES		<u>NO</u>	
Is an NGO s9b-contracted to undertake some tasks in this project?	<u>YES</u>		NO		Name of the NGO	Global Nature Fund			
Is the NGO a national NGO?	YES		<u>NO</u>		Is the NGO affiliated with an international NGO?	YES		NO	
Outline the contribution the NGO has made to the results of the projects (200 words maximum):  Global Nature Fund (GNF) is a non-profit, private, independent international foundation established in Germany for the protection of environment and nature. GNF is the coordinator of the Living Lakes Network, which is an international network and partnership whose mission is to enhance the protection, restoration and rehabilitation of lakes, wetlands, other freshwater bodies of the world and their catchment areas.  A partnership agreement was signed with the Global Nature Fund to facilitate the dissemination of the project results through the network, to present on relevant forums, and on-line media. It also aims at helping the replication of the project in other lake areas worldwide.									

4) Engagement with the private sector this reporting period:

Has a private company been sub-contracted to undertake some tasks in this project?	YES		<u>NO</u>		Is the company investing in or supplying a particular technology in this project?	YES		NO	
						What kind of technology?			
Is the company a national company?	YES		NO		Is the company an affiliate of an international company?	YES		NO	
						Which one?			
Is the company a signatory of the UN Global Compact?  www.unglobalcompact.org	YES		NO		Name of the company				
Outline the contribution the company has made to the results of the projects (200 words maximum):									

### 13. Impact results for Climate Change Adaptation

The metrics below are designed to measure and report on the level of achievement of a climate change adaptation project for the 2009 APR/PIR process based on the Climate Change Adaptation M&E Framework. Projects may be unable to report data for some of the indicators listed below because they may not be relevant to that project or data may not be available yet. Project managers are requested to complete the information in the Value/Score/Comments column, to the extent possible:

CC Performance Indicator	Metric	Value/score/comments	
<b>All CCA projects, as applicable</b>			
	Who are the target vulnerable groups and key stakeholders of the project? Please indicate units (e.g. households, farmers, communities) and number.	Units	(a) municipalities (incl. mayors) (b) permanent population (c) NGOs
Involved in project		(a) 40 in planning, pilot projects and capacity building/trainings (b) partly through NGOs, partly through media (c) 30 through capacity building and pilot projects	
Total in affected area		(a) 52 directly (exposure unit), 179 indirectly (b) 250,000 (c) 100	

Coverage	Has the project resulted in any changes to the policy, legislative and regulatory framework to incorporate climate change risks?	Titles	<p>(a) Local Environmental Management Programmes and Waste Management Plans;</p> <p>(b) Regional Development Concept of Lake Balaton Resort Area (2008-2020);</p> <p>(c) National Climate Change Strategy and the 2-year action plan</p>
		Description	<p>(a) 18 Environmental Management Programmes and 11 Waste Management Plans include adaption aspects (indicators, measures) (the elaboration of 6 more environmental management programmes and 2 municipal climate change strategies is in progress)</p> <p>(b) as a horizontal issue adaptation is included in the concept</p> <p>(c) Incorporation of Lake Balaton specific adaptation options into the NCCS, inputs to the 2-year action plan</p>



<p>Has the project resulted in any changes in investment / programme decisions made to incorporate climate change risks? (please describe)</p>	<p>Titles</p>	<p>(a) LBDC programmes; (b) National Strategic Reference Framework Programme (2007-2013) (Regional biannual action plans) (c) 3rd Environmental Protection Plan of Hungary (d) River Basin Management Plan for Lake Balaton catchment</p>
--	---------------	---

	Descriptions	<p>(a) Pilot projects were implemented, which were financed by an NGO fund set up and launched by LBDCA on selected adaptation measures (pilot projects); Shoreline rehabilitation programmes and sewage treatment projects have been granted</p> <p>(b) Incorporation of adaptation aspects into the evaluation process of proposals through the scoring system of regional tourism development grants.</p> <p>(c) Inputs to 3rd Environmental Protection Plan of Hungary (Lake Balaton specific adaptations measures)</p> <p>(d) Inputs to River Basin Management Plan for Lake Balaton catchment (Lake Balaton specific adaptations measures)</p>
--	--------------	--

<p>Has the project developed capacity (institutional, individual) for adaptation to climate change? Please indicate the number of stakeholders (individuals, institutions, etc.)</p>	<p>Stakeholders</p>	<p>Over 100 individuals (farmers, small entrepreneurs, members of civil society organisations, employees of public and private companies, researchers) 6-8 Institution (LBDCA, National Park Directorate, Environment and Water management Directorate, Water Research Institute)</p>
	<p>Description of capacity building</p>	<p>Better understanding of the consequences of climate change and adaptation option. Improved ability to identify and implement adaptation measures. Improved capability in development of watershed management plans by modelling</p>
<p>Has the project established new or expanded climate information management systems (e.g. early warning systems, forecasting, etc.)? Please indicate the geographic coverage and number of beneficiaries.</p>	<p>Type of info system(s)</p>	<p>Online hydro-meteorological, storm alert, water quality, road traffic and tourist counting system was developed/improved. Forecasting of river discharge through SWAT model.</p>

		Coverage, number of beneficiaries	Directly: shoreline (exposure unit) population 250.000, indirectly: population of whole watershed (400,000 inhabitants, about 6000 km <sup>2</sup> ) Environment and water Directorate, Water Research Institute, 179 municipalities, through on-line web accessibility the general public
Impact	(Percent) change in stakeholders' behaviours utilizing adjusted practices or resources for managing climate change risks, assessed via QBS.	Baseline: 0-10	Value: 0-10
		3	7
	(Percent) change in stakeholders' capacities to manage climate change (e.g. communicate climate change risks, disseminate information, or make decisions based on high quality information), as relevant, assessed via QBS.	Baseline: 0-10	Value: 0-10
		2	6
	<u>Percent change in perceived vulnerability</u> <sup>14</sup>	Baseline: 0-10	Value: 0-10
	(Percent) change in stakeholder perceptions of vulnerability to a recurrence of primary climate change-related threat(s), assessed via QBS.	3	7
	(Perceived) success of project interventions (list below) in reducing vulnerability, assessed via QBS.		
	Intervention: Integrating adaptation aspects into planning documents	2	6
	Intervention: Implementation of pilot projects	3	7
Intervention: Facilitation of cooperation between local actors	2	6	
<u>Percent improvement in perceived adaptive capacity</u> <sup>17</sup>	Baseline: 0-10	Value: 0-10	

<sup>14</sup> Either vulnerability OR adaptive capacity should be reported, as relevant to the project. It is anticipated that projects will take a specific approach, although in practice, vulnerability reduction and enhanced adaptive capacity are difficult to meaningfully differentiate. Both indicators should not be reported.

	(Percent) change in stakeholder perceptions of the range or robustness of options available to cope with recurrence of primary climate change-related threat(s), assessed via QBS.		
	Perceived success of project interventions in delivering improvements in options to cope with climate change-related threat(s), assessed via QBS.		
	Intervention:		
	Intervention:		
	Intervention:		
Sustainability	Has the project ensured local or spatially-appropriate availability of skills and resources necessary to continue adaptation after conclusion of project? And how?	Baseline: 0-10	Value: 0-10
		3	7
		Description	Improved awareness and ability to take action of individuals. Use of database information and modelling tools. Higher activity of NGOs
Replicability	“Lessons learned” from the project, please describe briefly (expand in section VIII).	1. target local stakeholders for implementing adaptation measures, facilitate dialogues and help cooperation between local governments and NGOs, both are your vital allies	
		2. limit international partnership to deliver know-how and methodology, rely more on local capacities in implementation	
		3. for the facilitation and replication it is advised to have partnership agreements with international networks with similar interests and problems (e.g. Living Lakes Network)	
		4. for the implementations of adaptation measures it is recommended to offer direct grants and funding opportunities with involvement of local stakeholders, such as local governments, NGOs, etc.	
Buy-in / acceptability	Support for project activities among participating communities as assessed by QBS.	Baseline: 0-10	Value: 0-10
		3	7

	Have the project outcomes been incorporated into the processes of other programmes, policies or projects?	<u>Municipal and micro-regional level:</u> environmental management programmes and waste management plans <u>Regional level:</u> Long-term Regional Development Plan for the Lake Balaton region; River Basin Management Plan for Lake Balaton catchment (in progress) <u>National level:</u> Climate Change Strategy and its 2-years action plan; 3 <sup>rd</sup> national Environmental Protection Plan of Hungary.			
<b>Supplementary Impact Indicators, to be completed in the relevant TA(s):</b>					
<b>TA1: Agriculture/food security</b>					
Impact	Food production deficits (crop/livestock losses) during years characterised by climate extremes (e.g. drought or false start to wet season), compared with deficits in previous years characterised by similar extremes.	Previous extreme(s)		Current extreme	
	Changes in food security (predictability, ability to purchase food) among project participants attributable to the project.	Contributing factors <sup>15</sup> :			
		Variable assessed	Baseline: 0-10	Value: 0-10	
		Contributing factors:			
<b>TA2: Water resources &amp; quality</b>					
Impact	Percentage of population in areas targeted by project classified as suffering from water stress or severe water stress, compared with baseline.	Previous % water stressed		Current % water stressed	
	Percentage or population entering (severe) water stress category during drought periods compared with past drought episodes.	Contributing factors <sup>18</sup> :			
		Previous episode(s)		Current episode	
		Contributing factors:			
<b>TA3: Public health</b>					
Impact	Infection rates of climate-sensitive diseases, as compared with past population infected per year under similar climatic conditions.	Disease	Previous rate	Current rate	
	Extent of diseases in epidemic areas during periods when climatic conditions favor	Contributing factors <sup>18</sup> :			
Previous episode(s)		Current episode			

<sup>15</sup> “Contributing factors” should include both climate- and non-climate-related factors that contribute to and help to explain the relative role of the project in producing change.

		Contributing factors:		
<b>TA4: Disaster risk management</b>				
Impact	Incidence of complex disasters (e.g. flooding, landslides) associated with climatic extremes (e.g. heavy rainfall) compared with recent historical experience of baseline projections.	Previous average	Current	
		Contributing factors <sup>18</sup> :		
	Losses resulting from disasters (e.g. mortality, injury, properties or infrastructure lost or damaged, soil loss) compared with recent historical experience or projected baseline.	Losses previously, include year	Losses current episode	
Contributing factors:				
<b>TA5: Coastal zone development</b>				
Impact	Losses resulting from coastal disasters (e.g. mortality, injury, financial, properties or infrastructure lost or damaged, coastline eroded) compared with recent historical experience or projected baseline.	Losses previously, include year	Losses current episode	
		Contributing factors <sup>1618</sup> :		
<b>TA6: Natural resources management</b>				
Impact	Evidence of migration of relevant ecosystems into new areas likely to be more viable under climate change.	Evidence		
		Contributing factors <sup>18</sup> :		
	Decline in natural resources (area, density, quality) relative to projected baseline.	Baseline rate of decline, include time period	Observed rate of decline	
	Contributing factors:			

<sup>16</sup> <sup>18</sup> “Contributing factors” should include both the climate- and non-climate-related factors that contribute to and explain the relative role of the project in producing a change.

### **Definition of Terms:**

**Project Objective:** intended impact contributing to global environmental benefits via one or more development interventions.

**Outcomes:** The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs (e.g. energy efficiency of existing heat and hot water supply companies in X city improved, new trust fund for the conservation of the PAs established, laws and bylaws approved to reduce impact of forestry practices on biodiversity)

**Outputs:** The products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention relevant to the achievement of outcomes. (e.g. 10 staff trained to operate and maintain an early warning system, data capture in 5 regions of costal lowlands).

### **Acronyms:**

APR	Annual Performance Review
CO	Country Office
EEA	European Environmental Agency
ERC	Evaluation Resource Center of UNDP
FSP	Full size project
MSP	Medium size project
OFP	Operational Focal Point
PIMS	Project Information Management System (UNDP GEF)
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PTA	Principal Technical Advisor
RCU	Regional Coordination Unit
REC	Regional Environmental Centre
RTA	Regional Technical Advisor
TPR	Tripartite Project Review



**Annex 1. Co-financing**

Co financing (Type/ Source)	IA own Financing (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other Sources* (mill US\$)		Total Financing (mill US\$)		Total Disbursement (mill US\$)	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grant			3.000	0.300		2.700	3.000	3.000	3.000	0.500
Credits										
Loans										
Equity										
In-kind					0.065	0.065	0.065	0.065	0.065	0.040
Non-grant Instruments					0.025	0.025	0.025	0.025	0.025	
Other Types										
<b>TOTAL</b>			3.000	0.300	0.090	2.790	3.090	3.090	3.090	0.540

(Table completed for mid-term evaluation conducted in July 2008)

- Other Sources refer to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector etc.
- “Proposed” co-financing refers to co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement.
- Describe “Non-grant Instruments” (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc):
  - UNEP: \$25k in direct financial resources for fieldwork, meetings and travel costs.
- Explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”:
  - LBDCA: \$2.2M (small grant programme)
  - LBDCA: \$0.5M (monitoring system funded by LIFE)
  - IISD: \$40k (in-kind)
  - UNEP: \$25k (in-kind)
  - UNEP: \$25k (cash for project related costs)