**CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT**

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name:** Field Researchers` Union - Campester

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** Development and Capacity Building of Transboundary Bats Monitoring Network in the Caucasus

**Implementation Partners for this Project:** *Armenia* – NGO Armenian Nature Protectors Union; *Azerbaijan* – NGO Center of Biological Diversity*; Russia –Dr. Suren Gazaryan, independent expert, also, representing the Institute of Ecology of Mountain Territories, Russian Academy of Science.*

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** 1 July 2006 – 30 September 2008

**Date of Report (month/year):** February, 2009

## II. OPENING REMARKS

***Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this report.***

There are 34 Biodiversity Hotspots identified worldwide [Russell Mittermeier et al. 1999], one of them being the Caucasus. The Caucasus is a small region ranging from humid subtropics and semi-deserts to Alpine high-mountain areas, the range stipulating for the rich diversity of the Caucasus fauna including over 150 animal species.

Chiroptera are one of the mostly diverse classes of mammals in the Caucasus. Taking into account new approaches to taxonomy and newly discovered species, the overall number of Chiroptera in the Caucasus accounts to 35 species (Rakhmatulina, 1996; Benda, Tsytsulina, 2000), 7 of them being CEPF priority species, totaling to 13,7% of the overall number (51 species) of CEPF priority animal and plant species. Special priority is given to 5 species coming to 13,2% of the total 38 especial priority species. Chiroptera make up respectively 38,9% and 38,5% of the mammals on the same lists.

Chiroptera are very vulnerable to environmental changes and represent the indicator group for monitoring the environmental changes. Accordingly, observation over the status of Chiroptera populations enables not only biodiversity monitoring but also control over the region's general environmental status.

Until implementation of the given project the situation was as follows: No evaluation of the status of Threatened Chiroptera Species of IUCN Red List has ever been done for the overall territory of the Caucasus. There was no compete list of Threatened Chiroptera Species inhabiting the region. Present status of the majority of formerly known largest threatened Chiroptera colonies remained unexplored, and there was no list of key habitats. For certain reasons, no monitoring of key Chiroptera habitats had been done for many years, whereas Chiroptera monitoring in the entire Caucasus had never been carried out. At the same time, none of the region's countries had a program for the protection of Chiroptera and their key habitats nor has any examples of practical solutions of the problem.

Within the framework of the Project, the first attempt to conduct the joint researches at the large portion of the Caucasus was made. As the results of this project, the first joint researches and field-works were organized for evaluating the current status of the bats and explore their key habitats; the regional transboundary bats monitoring network has been established and the Regional Conservation Action Plan and four National Conservation Action Plans have been developed for bats conservation in the Caucasus.

## III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

***Project Purpose*** *The Transboundary Bats Monitoring Network effectively functioned and bats species monitored that contributes to observe the region's environmental status.*

Planned vs. Actual Performance

| Indicator | Actual at Completion |
|---|---|
| **Purpose-level: The Transboundary Bats Monitoring Network effectively functioned and bats species monitored that contributes to observe the region's environmental status.** | |
| *1. The Transboundary Bats Monitoring Network established, its capacity built and unified monitoring instructions adopted by February, 2008.* | The Transboundary Bats Monitoring Network has been established which involves leading experts and volunteers *(students, locals & speleologists)* from all project participating countries.<br><br>The unified monitoring instruction / methodology has been adopted by the experts and shared / communicated to all network members. This methodology is applied for the monitoring.<br><br>Capacity of the network members, which are the project partner organizations as well, has been built: vehicles, the relevant office and field equipments have been purchased. They will use this capacity for further monitoring of bats in the region. |
| *2. Monitoring activities started by the Transboundary Bats Monitoring Network and the first results processed by February, 2008.* | The monitoring activities were initiated and monitoring of some key habitats started with involving both experts and volunteers. However, there are some fundraising efforts to activate the monitoring for all key habitats and keep this process ongoing. |

***Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators.***

In the framework of the project, over 90 field-works have been organized in all four countries; 234 points / sites were observed: 33 in Azerbaijan, 49 in Armenia, 62 in Georgia and 90 in

Russia. Out of 35 bat species existing in Caucasus, 19 were registered in Azerbaijan, 17 in Armenia, 23 in Georgia and 22 in Russia. (See Table 1)

**Number of bat species observed within the reporting period**

| Country | Number of species observed | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Great Caucasus | Minor Caucasus | Total |
| Azerbaijan | 14 | 11 | 19 |
| Armenia | – | 17 | 17 |
| Georgia | 18 | 22 | 23 |
| Russia | 22 | – | 22 |

The Transboundary Bats Monitoring Network has been established which involves the experts and volunteers from all participating countries - Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia and Russia. It should be highlighted that the most experts from this network are national scientific focal-points for the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats / EUROBATS which is the crucial for partnership building and sustainability of this monitoring network.

***Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?***

Along with the CEPF priority species – *Rhinolophus hipposideros, Rhinolophus euryale, Rhinolophus mehelyi, Myotis bechsteinii, Myotis emarginatus, Myotis schaubi, Barbastella barbastellus* (IUCN listed species), seven additional bats species protected by the legislation of the participating countries were included into the list of the objects of special observation; these are: *Rhinolophus ferrumequinum, Myotis blythii, Myotis dasycneme, Nyctalus lasiopterus, Barbastella leucomelas, Tadarida teniotis, Miniopterus schreibersii*. Observations of any other species were also recorded, but they are not analyzed in this Report, since they do not fall under the subject of this Project.

One of the endangered, and categorized by IUCN as 'Vulnerable' (VU A2c) species – *Myotis dasycneme,* has not been included into the initial CEPF priority species list, since it was not registered at Caucasus. However, after submission of the grant proposal, the *Myotis dasycneme* has been discovered at Caucasus (Gazarjan, 2004) and was included into the Project list.

Along the above mentioned findings, the new spots of concentration of the bats have been discovered – 5 in Russia and 8 in Georgia.

Materials collected in the course of the Project allowed newly evaluating status of 14 target species. Such re-evaluation, for the entire region and for the each separate country, has been carried out in compliance with the IUCN Rules for Drawing up regional Red Lists.

Status of bats species protected by the laws of Caucasian countries

| № | Species | Azerbaijan | Armenia | Georgia | Russia | Caucasus | IUCN |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Rhinolophus ferrumequinum | NT | NT | VU | EN | VU | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Rhinolophus hipposideros | VU | VU | LC | NT | NT | |
| | Rhinolophus euryale | EN | EN | VU | CR | EN | VU A2c |
| | Rhinolophus mehelyi | CR | CR | CR | CR | CR | VU A2c |
| | Myotis blythii | LC | NT | LC | NT | NT | |
| | Myotis bechsteinii | DD | NE | NE | DD | DD | VU A2c |
| | Myotis dasycneme | – | – | – | NE | NE | VU A2c |
| | Myotis emarginatus | VU | VU | VU | EN | VU | VU A2c |
| | Myotis schaubi | – | DD | – | – | DD | EN B1+2c, C2a, D |
| | Nyctalus lasiopterus | – | – | DD | DD | – | |
| | Barbastella barbastellus | NT | DD | VU | VU | VU | VU A2c |
| | Barbastella leucomelas | DD | NT | – | DD | DD | |
| | Miniopterus schreibersii | VU | EN | VU | EN | EN | |
| | Tadarida teniotis | DD | DD | NE | DD | DD | |

Following the project results, five-scientific articles have been prepared and published.

At the end of the project, the project staff prepared the comprehensive Report on the project implementation and its results. This Report gives detailed information on the project implementation including scientific data and it was communicated to key stakeholders.

The project results were presented at the 11th European Bat Research Symposium held in Cluj-Napoka, Romania, in August 2008: in particular, one poster on the project and one scientific article based on the project results.

## IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

***Project Outputs****: Enter the project outputs from the Logical Framework for the project*

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

| Indicator | Actual at Completion |
|---|---|
| **Output 1: The Transboundary Bats Monitoring Network comprising of experts and volunteers established and its capacity built.** | |
| *1.1 Experts of the Transboundary Bats Monitoring Network nominated and capacity built by October, 2006.* | See the output purpose level indicator 1.<br><br>The Transboundary Bats Monitoring Network has been established consisting of seven specialists and around twenty four volunteers. The Network members work with the one methodology and survey system having the monitoring schedule of bats species and roosts. |
| *1.2. Volunteers of the Transboundary Bats Monitoring Network selected and trained by November, 2007.* | The network volunteers have been trained on the survey and monitoring methodology and they have contacts with bats specialists. Network bats specialists are equipped with the relevant survey equipment and literate and |

| | |
|---|---|
| | also, it should be underlined that the strong transboundary cooperation is established among bats specialists and relevant organizations of the Caucasus. |
| **Output 2: A key habitat database for each of the globally threatened bats species developed and submitted to the participating governments and EUROBATS, and made available at the website.** | |
| *2.1 A key habitat database for each of the globally threatened bats species developed and available at the web-site by January, 2008.* | The key habitat database for each of the globally threatened bats species developed and available at the web-site – **http://www.campester.org .** This web-site was created in the frame of this project and involves all detailed information on the project.<br><br>As for the key habitat database, it includes all key habitats with information on its location and coordinates and also, key remarks to these habitats.<br><br>Besides, the database has been developed for 14 threatened bats species with its map of distribution and information on threats, protection status, biological assessment, urgent actions and recommendations for species conservation. |
| *2.2 A key habitat database for each of the globally threatened bats species submitted to the participating Governments and EUROBATS by January, 2008.* | The key habitat database information has been included in the Regional and National Conservation Actions Plans and submitted to the relevant Governments and EUROBATS through these Actions Plans.<br><br>Besides, all these documents have been communicated to IUCN Southern Caucasus Programme Office. |
| **Output 3: Key basic data on the priority bats species and habitats obtained and submitted to governments and IUCN as a package of recommendations for further evaluation of the bats species status.** | |
| *3.1 Field works for obtaining of the key basic data on the priority bats species completed by October, 2007.* | In the framework of the project, over 90 field-works have been organized in all four countries; 234 points / sites were observed: 33 in Azerbaijan, 49 in Armenia, 62 in Georgia and 90 in Russia. Out of 35 bat species existing in Caucasus, 19 were registered in Azerbaijan, 17 in Armenia, 23 in Georgia and 22 in Russia. |

| | |
|---|---|
| *3.2 Results of the conducted field works processed, recommendations elaborated and submitted to Governments and IUCN by January, 2008.* | Results of the field-works are incorporated in the Action Plans and submitted to the Governments and IUCN Southern Caucasus Programme Office through the Action Plans. |
| **Output 4: National and Regional Conservation Action Plans for bats species elaborated and submitted to governments and EUROBATS.** | |
| *4.1 National Conservation Action Plans for bats species elaborated and submitted to governments by January, 2008.* | Five Conservation Action Plans have been developed for bats conservation:<br>✓ **Regional** Conservation Action Plan covering four countries – Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Russia / Russian Caucasus - *in English*<br>✓ **Three National** Conservation Action Plan for Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia - *in national languages*<br>✓ **One sub-regional** Conservation Action Plan for Russian Caucasus since only North Caucasian portion of the Russian Federation – *in national language*<br><br>All these Action Plans have been submitted to the relevant Governments. |
| *4.2 Regional Conservation Action Plan for bats species elaborated and submitted to EUROBATS by January, 2008.* | The above mentioned Regional Conservation Action Plan has been submitted to EUROBATS. |
| **Output 5: Establishment of a model protected area in the region, to demonstrate approaches to effective conservation of key bats species and their habitats, at least initiated.** | |
| *5.1 Preparatory assessment work, including consultations with key stakeholders, done and relevant site for the protected area selected by October, 2007.* | An assessment work, including analyzing of the relevant national legislations, has been done in all four countries. At the same time, consultations with key stakeholders have been organized.<br><br>Following this assessment / preparatory work, it was agreed to work in close cooperation with those partners / key stakeholders who are working in the field of PAs and in particular, for creation of new PAs. Otherwise, it would be impossible to motivate governments to cerate new PAs only for bats species. |

| | |
|---|---|
| *5.2 Establishment of a model protected area in the region, to demonstrate approaches to effective conservation of key bats species and their habitats, at least initiated by January, 2008.* | In relation to the above-mentioned under the indicator 5.1, it should be noted that in 2005-2006, the project group in Georgia participated in the development of Management Plan for Protected Areas in Central Caucasus *(in the frame of the Georgian Protected Areas Project financed by World Bank)*. This Management Plan was general and not focused on bats species for that time.<br><br>It should be underlined that we had very close cooperation with a WB financed project - ``Protected Areas Development in Georgia``. In the frame of this project the Protected Areas System has been developed in the Central Caucasus. In close cooperation with this WB project staff, we made a proposal to include the following three caves, as the key bats habitats, in the Protected Areas System of the Central Caucasus and provided the relevant justification:<br>✓ Gogoleti Cave<br>✓ Sakishore Cave<br>✓ Kidobana Cave<br>identified in Racha, Ambrolauri district.<br><br>We have to stress, that this justification was prepared based on results of the field-works conducted in the frame of the given / CEPF funded project. So, the expeditions arranged though the CEPF funded project, gave us the possibility to develop a scientifically sound justification. As we are informed by our partners from WB project, at the moment, the Management Guide and draft law on establishing of the Protected Areas System in the Central Caucasus are submitted to the Government.<br><br>We have to stress, that considering the existing legislation in the Caucasus countries, establishing of new protected area itself is quite difficult and time-consuming process and the WB project was the good opportunity for both projects to initiate the process. |
| **Output 6: Regional and National Conservation Action Plans for Bats species published and communicated to all key** | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **stakeholders.** | |
| *6.1 Regional and National Conservation Action Plans for Bats species published and communicated to all key stakeholders by the end of September, 2008.* | Regional and National Conservation Action Plans have been published and communicated to all key stakeholders – governmental bodies, scientific institutions, non-governmental organizations and independent experts. |

***Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.***

Three working meetings have been conducted where all experts of the Regional Bats Monitoring Network participated: 'Preliminary' – June 27-30, 2006 (Nunisi, Georgia), where the Project has been presented and the dates of expeditions, forms and terms of reporting have been identified. The second meeting ('First Planned') has been conducted on May 5-10, 2007 in Budapest; it coincided in time with the 12th meeting of EUROBATS Committee of Advisors. At this meeting, the preparation plan for Regional Action Plan for Caucasian Bats Conservation has been presented. The third meeting ('Second Planned') was conducted in Telavi, Georgia. At this meeting, the Vision for bats conservation outlooks in the Caucasus and the Bats Conservation Strategy have been developed and the Draft Regional Action Plan for Caucasian Bats Conservation has been presented. The final form and the volume of the Regional Action Plan for Caucasian Bats Conservation, specific goals, objectives and activities have been identified. The meeting also set the final shape of the scientific report and form of the national action plans for bats conservation in the Caucasian countries.

Since the representatives of Armenia were not present at the Budapest meeting, the visit to Armenia has been arranged, with the view of informing Armenian colleagues on the results of the First Planned meeting, and participation in the expedition to Armenian caves. The expedition visited Ekhagnadzor (Mageli, Small and Bird Caves), Vaik (Chaikend Grotto) and Gegarkuni (Tsapatakha caves and grottos) districts.

In the course of the Project, the bats were registered in caves, buildings, transects, routes (up to one kilometre), at the water bodies; both in the forests and at the open spaces. All the observations made during the expeditions and short field trips were registered. The bats were detected by both the ultrasound detectors (Peterrsson D – 200 and Peterrsson D – 240) and visually. After measuring and recording the results in the logbooks, the bats were released. Some animals were ringed, with the purpose of identification of their migratory routes in the future.

During the expeditions, all known underground sites were visited; the current status of bat population was identified; the new colonies, some of them being extremely important for conservation of endangered and protected by the law bats species were discovered; the forestlands important for conservation forest bats species' complexes were identified.

The researches allowed identifying the key sites. The following shall be mentioned:

- In Azerbaijan – galleries in vicinity of Kajaki Village (*Rhinolophus mehelyi* colony), church in Jalud Village (*Myotis emarginatus* colony), Bat Nest Cave in Bilav Village in the valley of Pargachai and Girmanchai Rivers (big colony of *Myotis blythii u Miniopterus schreibersii*), forest in the neighbourhood of Jamala-2 Village (high species diversity; existence of *Barbastella barbastellus*), Borchali, Biljasar, Siov Dilmadi and Tangerud Villages in Talish Region (*Barbastella barbastellus),* Bozdag Range near Mingechaur Reservoir *(Myotis emarginatus*);
- In Armenia – Karmir-Blur Cave (*Rhinolophus mehelyi* colony), Mageli Cave (*Rhinolophus euryale, Rhinolophus mehelyi* colonies*,* high species diversity), Kluch Cave (*Rhinolophus euryale* colony), Chaikend Cave (*Rhinolophus euryale* colony), grottos on the north side of

Sevan lake (high species diversity, *Myotis bechsteinii*), the Cave City Khndzoreska and temple ruins (*Rhinolophus mehelyi* colony), Khustup-Katar Labyrinth (*Rhinolophus euryale* colony);

- In Georgia – surroundings of Nunisi, Moliti and Zvare Villages (high species diversity (13 species, including *Barbastella barbastellus, Myotis emarginatus*)), Sachinkia Cave (*Rhinolophus euryale* colony), Gogolati Cave (*Rhinolophus euryale, Myotis emarginatus, Barbastella barbastellus* colonies), Khta Village, Okhvameshkari Caves No 2 and 3 (*Rhinolophus euryale* colony), Abaonoeti Village (*Rhinolophus euryale* colony in the abandoned house), Skhartali Village, Sakishore and Kidobana Caves (large colonies of *Miniopterus schreibersii, Myotis emarginatus*), Chivchavi River near Samshvilde Village (high species diversity and *Myotis emarginatus*), Aragvi River near Barisakho Settlement, galleries and forest (*Barbastella barbastellus, Myotis emarginatus*), Lagodekhi reserve, (*Barbastella barbastellus*);
- In Russia – Fanagoriiskaja Settlement, Bolshaja Fanagoriiskaja Cave (*Rhinolophus euryale, Myotis bechsteinii, Myotis emarginatus*), Chernigovskoe Village, Canyon Cave and karst massif Chernogorje (high species diversity (8 species), *Barbastella barbastellus* colony), Memzai Village, Arde Cave (*Myotis emarginatus*), Guamka Village, Guam Gorge (*Barbastella barbastellus*), Malii Utrish Settlement near city of Anapa (4 individuals of *Myotis bechsteinii* in the cellar of abandoned house), Derbend Settlement (Krasnodarskii Krai), gallery (high species diversity - 8 species, including *Barbastella barbastellus*), Belaja Rechka Village, caves in Ujanotup Tract, high-water bed (high species diversity - 9 species, including *Barbastella barbastellus*), Skirda Range, Babailovskaja and Spjashchaja Krasavitsa Caves (high species diversity - 10 species, Including *Barbastella barbastellus,* significant colonies of *Myotis blythii* and *Miniopterus schreibersii*), Shubi-Nikhas Cave, forest, Ardon River Basin (largest in the Northern Caucasus colony of *Myotis blythii*, in the vicinity the *Barbastella barbastellus* can be observed), Gebeus Mountain, forest and flood-land of Teshebs River, travertine grotto (*Myotis bechsteinii, Myotis emarginatus* colonies), Matsesta Village, Chortova Gora Cave and flood-land of Agura river (high number of protected bat species, small colony of *Rhinolophus euryale),* Tabsaran District, Karabudakhkent Village (*Myotis blythii, Rhinolophus mehelyi* ).

The existing literature sources and the results of our works allowed us justifying necessity and possibility of carrying out monitoring of populations of the 14 protected bats species in Caucasus at the following sites:

In Georgia:

1. Racha Range;
2. western and central parts of Iori Plateau;
3. western part of Trialeti Range;
4. Aragvi River gorge;
5. Urta Mountain;

and two virginal sites (as a control spots):

1. Lagodekhi Reserve;
2. Dashbash Canyon.

In Azerbaijan:

1. Outskirts of Nakhichevan City and spurs of Daralagez and Zangezur Ranges within the territory of Shakhbuz and Ordubad Districts of Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic;
2. southern slope of the Great Caucasus: from Belokan-Zakatala massif to Caspian Plane of Khachmass District;
3. surroundings of Mingechaur reservoir (Bozdag Range);
4. spurs of tallish Mountains;

5. Girkan National Park and its surroundings within the territory of Lenkoran, Astara and Lerik Districts.

In Armenia:

1. valleys of Debet, Agstav and Bldanchai Rivers, in the north-west part of the country;
2. Areguni and Sevan Ranges in the Sevan Lake Basin;
3. Metsamor Cave in Armavir district;
4. Khosrov Reserve and adjacent slopes lowering down towards Araks River in Ararat Valley;
5. Vorotan River Valley, northern and western slopes of Vaiotsdzor and Zangezur Ranges lowering down towards Arpa River;
6. Megri Range;
7. south-eastern slopes of Lalvar Mountain.

In Russia:

1. Coast and foothills of southern slopes of the Great Caucasus;
2. River Valley or at the Derbentskii Village;
3. Western spurs of Skirda Range;
4. spurs of Rocky Range on the territory of valleys of Bolshaja Laba, Malaja Laba, Urup, Kuban, Kuma, Ardon and Fiagdon Rivers;
5. southern spurs of Stavropol Heights;
6. Kuban River Valley between cities of Krasnodar and Kropotkin;
7. Belaja River Valley near Khamishki Mountain;
8. Nalchik River Valley between Belaja Village and town of Nalchik;
9. Psekups River Valley;
10. Psheskho River Valley near Chernigovskoe Village;
11. Chonkatau Range, Tabasaran District.

Within the reporting period, the two species – *Myotis schaubi* and *Tadarida teniotis* could not be found. For the first time after a long interval, *Rhinolophus euryale* has been observed in Russia. The most frequently, *Rhinolophus ferrumequinum, Rhinolophus hipposideros* and *Myotis blythii* were registered. *Myotis dasycneme* was observed only in Russia, *Barbastella leucomelas* – only in Armenia, *Nyctalus lasiopterus* – only in Georgia; *Rhinolophus mehelyi* was observed everywhere except Georgia. *Myotis bechsteinii* was registered only in Russia and Armenia; in Armenia it was found at absolutely not characteristic for this species place – 1,200 meters above the sea level, while never and nowhere before this species has been observed higher then 800 meters above the sea level. At the target territory only two colonies of *Myotis emarginatus* were discovered: in the old church in Jalud Village (Azerbaijan) and, recently (2002), split colony (Bukhnikashvili, Natradze, 2008 in print) in Tetri Senakebi/Davit Gareji. Colonies of *Miniopterus schreibersii* are very rare; they are located in easily accessible underground structures and most often suffer from the anthropogenic disturbances, which are due to increased numbers of tourist visits to caves and churches. *Barbastella barbastellus* was observed everywhere, except Armenia; in Azerbaijan the most frequently species was registered in Talish, although, there was one observation at Great Caucasus; in Georgia, on the contrary, it has been observed only at the Great Caucasus. *B. barbastellus* was most frequently observed in the places with moderate climate; it was not registered in dry areas and excessively humid forests. *B. Barbastellus* with the white spots on their wings were observed in the humid forests of both Georgia (Kolkhida) and Russia (mountains of Western Caucasus), and this, most probably, indicates towards isolation and small number of the population in the western part of Great Caucasus.

The works performed demonstrated that in many old habitats the sizes of populations were decreased, while the species composition remained the unchanged, except for the places imposed to the strong anthropogenic pressure. However, the rarest species, like *Rhinolophus mehelyi* and *Myotis bechsteinii*, could not be observed in many places, where they were known to exist before.

At the same time, the new significant habitats were, and still are found (for instance, habitats of *Barbastella barbastellus* in Aragvi River upstream, in the vicinity of Barisakho Settlement); the more intensive researches in the Caucasian forests started with the introduction of ultrasound detectors, and this enriches our knowledge on spatial distribution of bats in Caucasian region.

It can be stated that in case of appropriate planning of conservation measures, it is possible to significantly rehabilitate the populations of bats in the Caucasus.

**The main project deliverables are:**

- ✓ The Bats Monitoring Regional Network established, capacity built and functioning;
- ✓ Key basic data on the priority bats species and habitats obtained and species database developed;
- ✓ Re-evaluation of national status and evaluation of the regional status for 14 key bats species according to IUCN criteria;
- ✓ A key habitat database for each of the globally threatened bats species developed;
- ✓ Five Conservation Action Plans developed and published;
- ✓ Five-scientific articles prepared and published;
- ✓ The final comprehensive Report on the project implementation and its results prepared;
- ✓ Protection of three caves, as the key bats habitats, justified and initiated.

***Were any outputs unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?***
N/A

## V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

***Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.***
N/A

## VI. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT

***Describe any lessons learned during the various phases of the project. Consider lessons both for future projects, as well as for CEPF's future performance.***

Involvement of all key stakeholders should be ensured at both project design and implementation levels.

***Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/failure)***

All key partners were involved at the project design level and they were fully involved in the project implementation process in all stages which contributed to the successful implementation of the projects and finally the tangible results obtained.

***Project Execution: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/failure)***

As it was mentioned above, all project partners were fully involved in the project implementation which ensured successes at both national and regional levels. Also, the project staff has very close cooperation and consultations with key stakeholders while the project implementation.

## VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING

***Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.***

| Donor | Type of Funding* | Amount in USD | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

***Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:***

***A*** *Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)*

***B*** *Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF project)*

***C*** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)*

***D*** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

***Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.***

For the time being there is no any additional funding to continue the work with the results having from this project, however we are working with key stakeholders and donors to get them involved in the process and initiate the implementation of the Action Plans developed under this project. Also, it should be mentioned that we will do our best to keep the functioning of the monitoring network since it is based on volunteers and the key / leading experts in this field, however the funding is important to carry out the real field-work and start implementation of the Action Plans developed under this project.

## VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is very important to keep the functioning of the Regional Bats Monitoring Network and continue monitoring of the key bats species since they represent the indicator group for monitoring the whole environment and biodiversity itself. Also, we are working with key stakeholders and donors to get them involved in the process and initiate the implementation of the Action Plans developed under this project.

## VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned and results. One way we do this is by making programmatic project documents available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and by marketing these in our newsletter and other communications.

These documents are accessed frequently by other CEPF grantees, potential partners, and the wider conservation community.

**Please include your full contact details below:**

Name: Alexander *Bukhnikashvili*
Organization name: *Field Researchers` Union - Campester*
Mailing address: *# 2a, Tamarashvili street, 0162, Tbilisi, Georgia*
Tel: *(995 32) 917 192*
Fax: *(995 32) 917 192*
E-mail: *campester@campester.ge*