

UNEP/GEEF Project - Russian Federation: Support to the National Programme of Action
for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment

2nd Supervisory Council Meeting in a form of conference call between SC members

April 18, 2006, 16:00 – 18.30, Moscow Time.

REPORT

of the Second Project Supervisory Council meeting

Prepared by Project Office

Required actions: approved by the Project Supervisory Council

Table of Contents

Report	
Annex I	List of Project Supervisory Council Meeting participants
Annex II	Agenda of the Meeting
Annex III	Information on progress in implementation of the Project
Annex IV	Budget for 1 st Phase of the Project
Annex V	Integrated Work Plan for 1 st Phase of the Project
Annex VI	Monitoring and Evaluation of Project Implementation
Annex VII	Procedure for disbursement of donor funds from the Trust Funds and Relevant Reporting

REPORT

Introduction

The 2nd meeting of the Project Supervisory Council for the UNEP/GEF Project "Russian Federation - Support to the National Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment" took place on April 18, 2006 in a form of a conference call between Project Supervisory Council members.

The conference call has been organised by the Project Office from Moscow and connected with the Project Supervisory Council members in Minekonomrazvitiya of Russia (Moscow), UNEP (Nairobi), NEFCO (Helsinki), EPA (Washington) and ACOPS (London). Conference call started at 16.00 (Moscow time).

A list of the Project Supervisory Council Meeting participants is given in Annex I.

1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the Agenda (SC 2/1)

The meeting was chaired by Mr. Takehiro Nakamura (Implementing Agency). Mr. Nakamura welcomed participants and proposed to adopt the Agenda of the Project Supervisory Council meeting prepared by the Project Office in consultation with both Implementing and Executing Agencies. He also proposed to start discussion on Integrated Work Plan for Phase 1 before consideration of Project Budget. The meeting adopted the Agenda.

The agenda of the meeting is attached as Annex II to the report.

2. Agenda item 2. Information on progress in implementation of the Project (SC 2/2)

The Information on progress in implementation of the Project has been prepared by the Project Office for the period from the middle of December 2005 till the middle of April 2006 and has been agreed with the Executing Agency. The only Executing Agency comments have been received to this document and were included into final document.

The meeting approved the information on progress in implementation of the Project submitted by the Project Office.

The adopted document is reproduced in Annex III.

3. Agenda item 4. Integrated Workplan for 1st Phase of the Project (SC 2/4 (1))

The Integrated Workplan for 1st Phase (1PIWP) has been prepared by the Project Office in consultation with Executive Agency and ACOPS and has been circulated through the Project Supervisory Council and Project Steering Committee members together with all

other documents prepared by the Project Office to the Second Project Supervisory Council meeting.

All comments received prior the meeting have been summarized by the Project Office, new wordings have been proposed on a basis of comments received. This document was distributed among all Project Supervisory Council members prior the meeting.

The discussion was focused mainly on donor funding.

ACOPS highly appraised the new IWP edition and briefly outlined the situation with donors funding. During his visit in Moscow on 24-26 of April, 2006 ACOPS will be participating in finalisation of the IWP in direct cooperation with the Project Office.

NEFCO confirmed that they could fund some specific Project activities but they would need more information on it and discussed the possibility of making amendments to projects.

The USA raised a question whether a preliminary study for each proposed demonstration project should be carried out with the purpose which one should be accepted. EPA agreed to provide a copy of the Agreement with ACOPS to the Executing Agency.

The discussion was focused mainly on the demonstration projects an extra funding attraction to the demonstration projects and mechanisms employed to their fulfillment.

Executive Agency proposed to remove the word "expert" from the item 1.2 in the IWP and put words "Russian consultant" instead of.

The Project Supervisory Council approved in general the submitted Integrated Work Plan for 1st Phase of the Project and asked for its further elaboration jointly by the Project Office and ACOPS during a last week of April. The Project Supervisory Council suggested to the Steering Committee also approving the Project IWP for 1st Phase via electronic communication. The content of the IWP was agreed with ACOPS and EXA during the last week of April (minor amendments in wordings and some changes in amount of money allocated for different activities).

The final Integrated Work Plan for 1st Phase of the Project is presented as the Annex V.

4. Agenda item 3. Budget for 1st Phase of the Project (SC 2/3)

Project Manager presented the Project Budget for the 1st Phase elaborated by the Project Office in close cooperation with the EXA and IA.

Executing Agency proposed to use saving by budget lines 1181 and 1182 in the first quarter of 2006 for preparation of demonstration projects. UNEP proposed to consider this issue during a week. During the next days after the conference-call UNEP suggested to remain the funds allocated for budget lines 1181 and 1182 at the same level. It was also agreed during the conference-call that minor issues raised during the discussion will be resolved via electronic communication between Project Office and financial officer of UNEP. The updated budget should be circulated among all Supervisory Council and Steering Committee members with the purpose of full financial transparency of the Project.

The Supervisory Council approved the Budget for 1st Phase of the Project with discussed amendments.

The final Budget in UNEP format for 1st Phase of the Project is presented below as Annex IV. The budget is subject of approval by the Project Steering Committee members.

5. Agenda item 5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Project Implementation (prepared by IA) (SC 2/5).

Mr. T. Nakamura presented the document. Only EXA presented comments to this document in written form. Other participants noted that they didn't have enough time to go thoroughly through the document.

Meeting has decided to give one week for SC member to submit their comments on this document in written form. UNEP and Project Office should finalise this document.

Mr. T.Nakamura attracted the participants' attention that NPA-Arctic project is a two phase Project and suggested monitoring and evaluating indicators are applicable only for 1st Phase of the Project.

Meeting has decided to accept the Monitoring and Evaluation of Project Implementation document and asked SC members providing their comments in written form by 24 of April, 2006 to finalise this document.

The final Monitoring and Evaluation of Project Implementation document with included amendments received from Project Supervisory Council members is presented below as Annex VI.

6. Agenda item 6. Procedure for disbursement of donor funds from the Trust Funds and Relevant Reporting (SC 2/6)

Project Manager presented the Procedure for disbursement of donor funds from the Trust Funds and Relevant Reporting. He also reminded on the history of this document. Initial procedure has been prepared by Project Office in consultations with Executing and Implementing agencies for the Project Steering Committee in November 2005. Following a lengthy discussion at the Project Steering Committee meeting a decision was taken to create a working group consisting of donors to improve the document. A document prepared by this working group was a subject of further discussion. The Execution Agency expressed its concerns that the document prepared did not address to a full extent all the issues that can appear in the process of disbursement of the donor funds accumulated in the Trust Funds established by the Partner Agencies. In particular, the document does not contain a description of procedure of disbursement of funds from the trust funds in a case when funds are channeled from the trust funds to special currency account of the Project as well as for a case when donor funds accumulated in trust funds are disbursed by Partner Agencies directly. No consensus was reached on this item and meeting agreed that decision on this document would be taken through written communications with members of the Project Steering Committee.

In a week after that meeting on November 23, 2005 Executing Agency circulated its proposals to this document. Only limited comments were received to these proposals of the Executing Agency. A revised according to the comments procedure was submitted for the second meeting of the Project Supervisory Council.

After lengthy discussion on the document it was agreed that EPA will contact all donors and within two weeks will prepare new version of the document.

The meeting agreed that on 19 April Project Office would send the document to all parties including Project Supervisory Council members and all donors. This version is attached to the report as Annex VI. In two week period donors will provide their comments on the document and then NEFCO and Project Office will come in touch with all the donors again to try consolidating all the donors' comments received.

7. Agenda item 7. Any Other Business.

The UNEP raised a question about Project tax-free currency account. Project Manager informed the SC members about state of the art on this matter.

Closure

In his closing statement, the meeting Chairman Mr. Nakamura thanked all members of the Project Supervisory Council meeting for their active and fruitful input and expressed

his hope that all SC members will receive this meeting report just after summarising comments received by Project Office to all the documents.

The meeting was closed by the Chairman at 18:30 hours on 18th of April 2006.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ACOPS

Timothy Turner

11 Dartmouth Street
London, SW1H 9BN

Tel: +44 (0) 207 799 3033
Fax: +44 (0) 207 799 2933
E-mail: tturner@binternet.com

NEFCO

Magnus Rystedt

NEFCO Managing Director
Fabianinkatu 34 P.O Box 249
FIN-00171 Helsinki, Finland

Tel. +358 9 18001 / 1800344
Fax +358 9 630 976
E-mail: magnus.rystedt@nefco.fi

RUSSIA

Boris Morgunov

Assistant of the Minister
Minekonomrazvitiya of Russia
1.3, 1-Tverskaya-Jamskaya Str.,
125993, Moscow
Tel.: (095) 209 85 25
Fax: (095) 209 84 58
E-mail: morgunovba@economy.gov.ru

Boris Melnikov

Senior research scientist
All Russian scientific and coordination
centre «Sever» of Minekonomrazvitiya of
Russia
Tel./Fax: (095) 209 84 58
E-mail: Melnikov@economy.gov.ru

UNEP

Takehiro Nakamura

Project Manager Officer
International Waters
Division of GEF Coordination
United Nations Environment Programme
P.O. Box 30552, 00100, Nairobi, Kenya
Tel.: +254 (20) 7623886
Fax: +254 (20) 7624041 / 42
E-mail: Takehiro.Nakamura@unep.org

Sandeep Bhambra

Fund Management Officer
Division of GEF Coordination
UNEP P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi 00100 KENYA
Tel: 254 20 7623347
Fax: 254 20 7624041
E-mail: Sandeep.Bhambra@unep.org

USA

William Freeman

NIS Director

Office of International Affairs

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (2650R)

Washington, DC 20460

Tel.: + 1(202) 5646406

Fax: +1 (202) 5652412

E-mail: freeman.bill@epa.gov

PROJECT OFFICE

Ivan Senchenya

Project Manager,

NPA-Arctic

National Pollution Abatement Facility

19 Leninsky prospect,

Moscow 119991

Tel./fax: +7 095 7304097, 9553114,

9553468; mobile +7 095 7234680

E-mail: senchenya@npaf.ru,

I_Senchenya@mail.ru

ANNEX II

UNEP/GEEF Project - Russian Federation: Support to the National Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment

2nd Meeting of Supervisory Council

April 18, 2006

Conference call between SC members

SC 2/1

Agenda

Prepared: by Project Office

Status: approved

Tuesday, April 18, 2006, 16:00-18.00

Meeting of the Supervisory Council

(in a form of conference call, chaired by UNEP)

- | | |
|-------|--|
| 16.00 | 1. Adoption of Agenda |
| 16.05 | 2. Information on progress in implementation of the Project (Project Manager) |
| 16.15 | 3. Budget for 1 st Phase of the Project (Project Manager) |
| 16.35 | 4. Integrated Workplan for 1 st Phase of the Project (Project Manager) |
| 17.15 | 5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Project Implementation (UNEP) |
| 17.25 | 6. Procedure for disbursement of donor funds from the Trust Funds and Relevant Reporting (Project Manager) |
| 18.15 | 7. Any other business |

UNEP/GEEF Project - Russian Federation: Support to the National Programme of Action
for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment

2nd Meeting of Supervisory Council

April 18, 2006

Conference call between SC members

SC 2/2

Information on progress in implementation of the Project

Prepared: | by Project Office

Status: | approved

Information on progress in implementation of the Project

Strategic Action Program (SAP) Component

SAP Task Team

The Task Team (TT) Coordinator for SAP development has been selected in close coordination with Executive Agency. Members of the Task Team for the SAP development have been also selected.

The TT meeting on February 15, 2006 considered basic concept of the SAP and relevant documents. The decision was made to create special working groups that will deal with communications and mobilisation of stakeholders involved in the SAP development, Strategic Environmental Assessment of SAP under development, mechanisms of financing of SAP implementation and others. Report of the meeting that includes basic SAP concept; objectives; principles; content; outputs; work plan; timetable; role of TT co-ordinator and members, procedure for the national and international review of the draft SAP; procedure for the adoption of the SAP; and basic ideas about the mechanism of the implementation; terms of reference (ToR) for the TT as well as for the proposed working groups was considered at the meeting of interagency working group (IAWG) held on March 21, 2006. Reports on TT and IAWG meetings are posted at the Project web-site.

SAP Development Process

According to the GEF, the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) is an agreement among participating countries on actions needed to resolve priority threats to international waters, including actions for the national benefit of each country, actions addressing trans-boundary issues and institutional mechanisms at regional and national level for implementation of those actions. In a case of Russian Arctic-SAP the project is implemented at the territory of one country and in addition a lot of studies have been performed on current state of Arctic environment in the Russian Federation. A distinction feature of the UNEP/GEF Project is that there is adopted by Russian officials NPA-Arctic and GEF-UNEP project is directed to support it.

The GEF commissioned a comprehensive programme study for its Operation Programmes¹. According to this report, the preparation of a Strategic Action Programme (SAP) is recommended for most projects proposed for financing in Operational Programmes 8 and 9 of the GEF International Waters Focal Area.

¹ The Final Report of the International Waters Program Study is available on the IW:LEARN Web site at: <http://www.iwlearn.net/ftp/iwps.pdf>.

GEF Operational Strategy states that: “The SAP should provide for a balanced program of preventive and remedial actions, support both investment and capacity-building activities, and identify key activities in the following areas:

- Priority preventive and remedial actions
- Cross-cutting issues and linkages to other focal areas
- Institutional strengthening and capacity-building needs
- Stakeholder involvement and public awareness activities
- Program monitoring and evaluation
- Institutional mechanisms for implementation.”

To that end, the Arctic SAP uses the unified vision of Best Practice according to the GEF TDA/SAP Course Design and Development Session (DACUM) held at the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, Office of Legal Affairs, United Nations from 15 to 19 July 2002. The only difference is that instead of TDA a detailed diagnostic analysis of marine and continental part of Russian Arctic is performed by a group of consultants in the Task Team. Trans-boundary issues are also considered in a global scale. Several brainstorming on long-term EcoQOs and options for achieving them have been also organized.

SAP principles

The following are some of the key underlying principles incorporated into the unified vision of Best Practice and the Arctic-SAP:

Full stakeholder participation. In order to be objective in analysis and effective in solutions, the DA/SAP process must reflect a shared vision that enables stakeholder to be independently identified, fully involved in the DA and fully consulted throughout the SAP process. Whilst understanding that some solutions may not be acceptable to all parties, it is imperative that those that are eventually adopted should reflect a rigorous social assessment and be subjected to open stakeholder consultation.

The ecosystem approach, adaptive management, accountability, inter-sectoral policy building, stepwise consensus building, subsidiarity, incremental costs, donor partnerships, government commitment and other recommended principles are used or will be used in the process of SAP development.

Working Groups on DEMOS and PINS

Terms of Reference for PINS have been developed and PINS co-ordinator has been selected and agreed by the Executive Agency.

TORs for DEMOS consultants have been developed and the work on preparation of design documentation for DEMOS projects has been started.

Inter-Agency Working Group

An interagency working group (LAWG) of official representatives of the federal executive authorities, regional executive authorities of the Russian Federation and industrial companies for coordination of activities on project implementation and for taking into account their interests has been set up.

The first meeting of LAWG was conducted on March 21, 2006. The following issues were considered at the 1st meeting of LAWG: information on Project implementation, on TT and WG formation, on development of IWP for the 1st Phase, concept of the SAP, requirements to the SAP development, requirements of Russian legislation to the documents of strategic level, procedures for the adoption of the SAP, basic ideas about the mechanism of SAP implementation, structure of the SAP and regional components within the SAP, procedures for pre-investment studies, hot spots prioritisation, preparation of demonstration projects. LAWG has approved the following documents:

- the ToR for LAWG and ToRs for TT and WGs and their panels;
- The concept of the SAP and its structure;
- Necessity of creation of WG on strategic environmental assessment (SEA) and need of stakeholder involvement plan;
- ToR for SEA;
- Necessity of creation of small WG for preparation of Guidelines for conduction of preinvestment studies and ToR for this group;
- Proposals of regional and federal authorities and industrial companies on detailisation of hot spots list
- Necessity of creation of special WG for preparation of demonstration projects

ToR for the LAWG and its panel was approved by Deputy Minister of Economic Development and Trade Mr. Andrey Sharonov.

Other Activities

Preliminary negotiations with representatives of several Arctic regions on information available from regions and on regional priorities of the Project have been conducted.

An electronic library of the documents and materials needed for the Project implementation (state reports on environmental protection, regional reports on state of the environment, ACOPS PDF-B reports, Arctic Council reports, etc.) has been created. Project Office contacted several prospective potential data suppliers and e-library of the project is permanently updated.

Special attention is given to raising awareness on the project among major stakeholders and to creating linkages with other projects under implementation in the Arctic region.

ToRs for several WGs have been prepared.

All necessary documents have been prepared and sent to the Commission for International Humanitarian and Technical Assistance under the Government of the Russian Federation to obtain a tax-free status for the Project.

Project Manager delivered message on project implementation at the PAME Working Group of the Arctic Council meeting in Oslo on March 1-3, 2006. He also participated in round-table discussion “Prospects of indigenous peoples cooperation with industrial companies” organized by Russian Association of Indigenous People of North. Siberia and Far East (RAIPON) in cooperation with International Development Fund “Batani” on April 6, 2006.

Conclusions

Project is behind the schedule however the IWP for the 1st Phase of the Project and fruitful cooperation between Project Office and ACOPS during preparation of IWP provide a good background that activities scheduled in IWP will be implemented in the agreed timeframes. Lack of consensus on disbursement of donor funds from Trust Funds also slows the process down.

UNEP/GEF Project - Russian Federation: Support to the National Programme of Action
for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment

2nd Meeting of Supervisory Council

Tuesday, April 18, 2006, 16.00-18.00

Conference call between SC members

SC 2/3

Budget for 1st Phase of the Project

Prepared: by Project Office

Status: approved by Project Supervisory Council

**Explanatory note for the budget of the 1st Phase of the UNEP/GEEF Project
“Russian Federation – Support to the National Programme of Action for the
Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment”**

I. Changes in Budget in correspondence with the decision of the 1st Steering Committee Meeting.

The following changes in budget for 2006 have been approved by the first meeting of the Project Steering Committee in November 2005:

1) Transfer savings of 2005 in amount 242,6 K\$ into 2006-2007 budget for the same lines:

- Line 1200 Consultants – 135,1 K\$ (into 2006 budget);
- Line 1600 Travel on official business – 34,0 K\$ (17,0 into budget of 2006 and 17,0 into budget of 2007);
- Line 2200 Sub-contracts with cooperation organizations – 28,5 K\$ for 2006;
- Line 3300 Meetings/conferences – 11,0 K\$ (5,5 into budget of 2006 and 5,5 into budget of 2007);
- Line 4200 Non-expendable equipment – 15,0 K\$ into 2006 budget;
- Line 5200 Reporting activities – 17,0 K\$ \$ (9,0 into 2006 budget and 8,0 into 2007 budget);
- Line 5300 Sundry – 2,0 K\$ into budget of 2006.

2) Due to savings of 2005 for lines 1100, 1245, 1300 and elimination of line 5400 to increase financing of information services (budget line 5302) in 2006 by 2,4 K\$ up to 9,8 K\$, as well to increase man-month load for Russian consultants in 2006 (with the same level remuneration fee) as follows:

- Lines 1208 – 1211 - Russian consultant (TT) - for 1-month by 13, 2 K\$;
- Lines 1212 – 1213 - Russian consultants (TT) - for 2 months by 10, 4 K\$;
- Line 1214 - Lead Russian consultant (WG-1) - for 4 months by 15,6 K\$;
- Line 1215 - Russian consultant (WG-1) - for 2 months by 6,6 K\$;
- Line 1216 - Russian consultant (WG-1) - for 3 months by 9,9 K\$;
- Line 1217 - Lead Russian consultant (WG-1) - for 3 months by 11, 7 K\$;

- Lines 1218-1219 - Russian consultants (W/G-2) - for 2 months by 13,2 K\$.

3) Combination of lines 2201 and 2202 into one line 2201 – subcontract with organization (to conclude a contract with one organization in amount of 28,5 K\$)

II. Changes proposed by Project Office:

Project Office proposes the following additional changes in the budget due to actual savings 2005:

1. To eliminate line 1244 International consultant, Unspecified (Activity 1-SAP) in amount 30,0 K\$ for 2006 and to use this amount for initiating activities on DEMOS.
2. To reduce man/month load of International consultant, TT (Activity 1-SAP, Line 1201), for 1 month by 10,0 K\$ for 2006, and to use this amount for initiating activities on DEMOS.
3. To transfer savings of 2005 for Line 3301 for 2006-2007 (9,377K\$ and 9,0K\$ accordingly).
4. To transfer savings of 2005 for Line 5200 (3,0 K\$) into budget of 2006.
5. To transfer savings of 2005 for Lines 5301-5302 into budget of 2006 by 6,4 K\$ for line 5301 up to 10,6K\$ and up to 7,7K\$ for 2007 budget. The remainder is allocated for line 5302 up to 6,2K\$ for 2007.
6. To create line 5303. UNDP administrative cost & auditing, divide amounts of the Line 5301 in 2 lines 5301 and 5303.
7. To transfer savings of 2005 for Lines 1181-1182 into budget 2006-2007 according to UNEP proposals.
8. To reduce Line 1600 in 2007 budget for 8,116 K\$.
9. To reduce Line 3300 in 2006-2007 budget for 51,5 K\$
10. To allocate savings for lines 1201 and 1244 in amount 40,0 K\$ for Russian consultants for Activity 4 for 2006 - DEMOS as follows:

CLEANUP

- Line 1265 - Russian consultant for 4 months with monthly installment 3,300\$;
- Line 1266 – Russian consultant for 2 months with monthly installment 2,600\$;

BASES

- Line 1267 - Russian consultant for 3 months with monthly installment 3,300\$;
- Line 1268 – Russian consultant for 1,5 months with monthly installment 2,600\$;

COMAN

- Line 1269 - Russian consultant for 2 months with monthly installment 2,600\$;
- Line 1270 – Russian consultant for 1 month with monthly installment 2,600\$.

11. To delete the following lines:

- Line 1104, which duplicate Line 1301;
- Line 1105 which is absent in the Project Document;
- Line 2202 (see item 3 of section I of this explanatory note; and
- Line 5400, 5401 as eliminated by Steering Committee decision.

Project Office asks the Project Supervisory Council for approval the budget for the 1st Phase of the Project. The approved budget will be sent to members of the Project Steering Committee for further approval.

Budget of the 1st Phase

		2005	2006	2007	TOTAL
	PC&M				
1100	Project Personnel	43 646	99 600	53 950	197 196
1300	Administrative Support	4 000	14 400	7 620	26 020
1600	Travel on official business		13 500	16 500	30 000
3300	Meetings	18 623	34 877	34 500	88 000
4100-4200	Equipment	29 021	20 979	4 000	54 000
5100	Operation	1 157	5 843	5 000	12 000
5200	Reporting activities		20 000	20 000	40 000
5300-5500	Sundry, Evaluation	1 975	20 370	26 860	49 205
1181-1182	UNEP		142 500	86700	229200
Subtotal		98 422	372069	255130	725621
	Activity 1 -SAP				
1200	Consultants TT	9020	279 500	10 725	299 245
	Consultants WG1		63 700		63 700
	Consultants WG2		56 500		56 500
1600	Travel on official business		20 000	15 000	35 000
2200	Sub-contracts		28 500		28 500
3300	Meetings		40 000	5 000	45 000
5200	Reporting activities		12 500	12 500	25 000
Subtotal		9020	500700	43225	552945
	Activity 2 - PINS				
1200	Consultants		103 950	40 400	144 350
1600	Travel on official business		32 500	37 384	69 884
2200	Sub-contracts		1 070 000	977 800	2 047 800
3300	Meetings		30 000		30 000
5200	Reporting activities		7 500	7 500	15 000
Subtotal			1 243 950	1 063 084	2 307 034
	Activity 3 - EPS				
1200	Consultants			113 200	113 200
1600	Travel on official business			30 000	30 000
2200	Sub-contracts			568 200	568 200
3300	Meetings			15 000	15 000
5200	Reporting activities			11 000	11 000
Subtotal				737 400	737 400
	Activity 4 - DEMOS				
1600	Travel on official business		30 000	30 000	60 000
3300	Meetings		12 500	12 500	25 000
1200	Consultants				
	CLENUP		18 400		18 400
	COMAN		7 800		7 800
	BASES		13 800		13 800
2200	Sub-contracts				0
	CLENUP		196 000	298 000	494 000
	COMAN		196 000	298 000	494 000
	BASES		150 000	299 000	449 000
Subtotal			624 500	937 500	1 562 000
Total		107 442	2 741 219	3 036 339	5 885 000

ANNEX 1: Budget in UNEP format - PHASE I

			Unit	2005 Actual W/m	2006 Budget W/m	2007 Budget W/m			TOTAL W/m		
1100			<u>Project Personnel</u>								
1101	PC&M	Project Manager, Project Office Moscow	3 700	5,0	18 500	12,0	44 400	6,5	24 050	23,5	86 950
1102	PC&M	Project Deputy Manager, Project Office Moscow	2 000	5,47	10 933	12,0	24 000	6,5	13 000	23,97	47 933
1103	PC&M	Project Financial Management Officer, Project Office Moscow	2 600	5,47	14 213	12,0	31 200	6,5	16 900	23,97	62 313
Sub Total				15,94	43 646	36,0	99 600	19,5	53 950	71,44	197 196
1200			<u>Consultants</u>								
1201	SAP	Activity 1 - International consultant, Task Team (TT)	10 000		0	3,0	30 000			3,0	30 000
1202	SAP	Activity 1 - International consultant, TT	10 000		0	3,0	30 000			3,0	30 000
1203	SAP	Activity 1 - International consultant, TT	10 000		0	2,0	20 000			2,0	20 000
1204	SAP	Activity 1 - International consultant, WG 1	10 000		0	1,0	10 000			1,0	10 000
1205	SAP	Activity 1 - International consultant, WG 2	10 000		0	1,0	10 000			1,0	10 000
1206	SAP	Activity 1 - Lead Russian consultant, TT	3 900		0	11,0	42 900			11,0	42 900
1207	SAP	Activity 1 - Russian consultant, TT	3 300		0	9,0	29 700			9,0	29 700
1208	SAP	Activity 1 - Russian consultant, TT	3 300		0	7,0	23 100			7,0	23 100
1209	SAP	Activity 1 - Russian consultant, TT	3 300		0	6,0	19 800			6,0	19 800
1210	SAP	Activity 1 - Russian consultant, TT	3 300		0	5,0	16 500			5,0	16 500
1211	SAP	Activity 1 - Russian consultant, TT	3 300		0	5,0	16 500			5,0	16 500

1212	Activity 1 - SAP	Russian consultant, TT	2 600	0	6,0	15 600			6,0	15 600
1213	Activity 1 - SAP	Russian consultant, TT	2 600	0	6,0	15 600			6,0	15 600
1214	Activity 1 - SAP	Lead Russian consultant, WG1	3 900	0	7,0	27 300			7,0	27 300
1215	Activity 1 - SAP	Russian consultant, WG1	3 300	0	4,0	13 200			4,0	13 200
1216	Activity 1 - SAP	Russian consultant, WG1	3 300	0	4,0	13 200			4,0	13 200
1217	Activity 1 - SAP	Lead Russian consultant, WG2	3 900	0	6,0	23 400			6,0	23 400
1218	Activity 1 - SAP	Russian consultant, WG2	3 300	0	4,0	13 200			4,0	13 200
1219	Activity 1 - SAP	Russian consultant, WG2	3 300	0	3,0	9 900			3,0	9 900
1220	Activity 2 - PINS	International consultant, Working Group (WG)	10 000	0	2,5	25 000	1,0	10 000	3,5	35 000
1221	Activity 2 - PINS	International consultant, WG	10 000	0	2,0	20 000	1,0	10 000	3,0	30 000
1222	Activity 2 - PINS	International consultant, WG	10 000	0	1,5	15 000	0,5	5 000	2,0	20 000
1223	Activity 2 - PINS	Lead Russian consultant, WG	3 900	0	3,5	13 650	1,5	5 850	5,0	19 500
1224	Activity 2 - PINS	Russian consultant, WG	3 300	0	3,0	9 900	1,0	3 300	4,0	13 200
1225	Activity 2 - PINS	Russian consultant, WG	3 300	0	1,5	4 950	0,5	1 650	2,0	6 600
1226	Activity 2 - PINS	Russian consultant, WG	3 300	0	2,0	6 600	0,5	1 650	2,5	8 250
1227	Activity 2 - PINS	Russian consultant, WG	3 300	0	1,0	3 300			1,0	3 300
1228	Activity 2 - PINS	Russian consultant, WG	3 300		0,5	1 650	0,5	1 650	1,0	3 300

1229	Activity 2 - PINS	Russian consultant, WG	2 600	0	1,0	2 600			1,0	2 600	
1230	Activity 2 - PINS	Russian consultant, WG	2 600		0,5	1 300	0,5	1 300	1,0	2 600	
1231	Activity 3 - EPS	International consultant, Task Team (TT)	10 000		0,0		2,0	20 000	2,0	20 000	
1232	Activity 3 - EPS	International consultant, TT	10 000		0,0		2,0	20 000	2,0	20 000	
1233	Activity 3 - EPS	International consultant, TT	10 000		0,0		2,0	20 000	2,0	20 000	
1234	Activity 3 - EPS	Lead Russian consultant, TT	3 900		0,0		3,0	11 700	3,0	11 700	
1235	Activity 3 - EPS	Russian consultant, TT	3 300		0,0		3,0	9 900	3,0	9 900	
1236	Activity 3 - EPS	Russian consultant, TT	3 300		0,0		2,0	6 600	2,0	6 600	
1237	Activity 3 - EPS	Russian consultant, TT	3 300		0,0		2,0	6 600	2,0	6 600	
1238	Activity 3 - EPS	Russian consultant, TT	3 300		0,0		1,0	3 300	1,0	3 300	
1239	Activity 3 - EPS	Russian consultant, TT	3 300		0,0		1,0	3 300	1,0	3 300	
1240	Activity 3 - EPS	Russian consultant, TT	3 300		0,0		1,0	3 300	1,0	3 300	
1241	Activity 3 - EPS	Russian consultant, TT	3 300		0,0		1,0	3 300	1,0	3 300	
1242	Activity 3 - EPS	Russian consultant, TT	2 600		0,0		1,0	2 600	1,0	2 600	
1243	Activity 3 - EPS	Russian consultant, TT	2 600		0,0		1,0	2 600	1,0	2 600	
1245	Activity 1 - SAP	Russian consultant, Project Advisor	3 300	2,8	9 020	6,0	19 800	3,3	10 725	12,0	39 545
1247	Activity 4 - DEMOS	Russian Consultant, (CLEANUP)	3 300			4,0	13 200		4,0	13 200	

1248	Activity 4 - DEMOS	Russian Consultant, (CLEANUP)	2 600			2,0	5 200		2,0	5 200			
1249	Activity 4 - DEMOS	Russian Consultant, (BASES)	3 300			3,0	9 900		3,0	9 900			
1250	Activity 4 - DEMOS	Russian Consultant, (BASES)	2 600			1,5	3 900		1,5	3 900			
1251	Activity 4 - DEMOS	Russian Consultant, (COMAN)	2 600			2,0	5 200		2,0	5 200			
1252	Activity 4 - DEMOS	Russian Consultant, (COMAN)	2 600			1,0	2 600		1,0	2 600			
Sub Total						2,8	9 020	131,5	543 650	32,3	164 325	166,5	716995
1300	<u>Administrative Support</u>												
1301	PC&M	Project Assistant, Financial Management Officer, Project Office Moscow	800	0	0	3,0	2 400	1,4	1 120	4,4	3 520		
1302	PC&M	Project Secretary, Project Office Moscow	1 000	4,0	4 000	12,0	12 000	6,5	6 500	22,5	22 500		
Sub Total				4,0	4 000	15,0	14 400	7,9	7 620	26,9	26 020		
1600	<u>Travel on official business</u>												
1601	PC&M	Travel on official business			0		13 500		16 500		30 000		
1602	Activity 1 - SAP	Travel on official business			0		20 000		15 000		35 000		
1603	Activity 2 - PINS	Travel on official business			0		32 500		37 384		69 884		
1604	Activity 3 - EPS	Travel on official business							30 000		30 000		
1605	Activity 4 - DEMOS	Travel on official business					30 000		30 000		60 000		
Sub Total					0		97 500		127384		224 884		
2200	<u>Sub-contracts with cooperating organisations</u>												
2201	Activity 1 - SAP	Sub-contract with one organisation			0		28 500				28 500		
2210	Activity 2 - PINS	Sub-contract with three organisation					1 070 000		977 800		2 047 800		

2220	Activity 3 - EPS	Sub-contract with one organisation for Legislative Improvements (LEGIM)	0	228 200	228 200
2221	Activity 3 - EPS	Sub-contract with one organisation for Administrative Improvements (ADIM)	0	170 000	170 000
2222	Activity 3 - EPS	Sub-contract with one organisation for Institutional and Technical Improvements (INTEC)	0	170 000	170 000
2230	Activity 4 - DEMOS	Sub-contract with one organisation for Contaminant Cleanup (CLEANUP)	196 000	298 000	494 000
2231	Activity 4 - DEMOS	Sub-contract with one organisation for Indigenous Environmental Co- management (COMAN)	196 000	298 000	494 000
2232	Activity 4 - DEMOS	Sub-contract with one organisation for Decommissioned Military Bases (BASES)	150 000	299 000	449 000
2299	Sub Total		0	1 640 500	2 441 000
3300 Meetings / Conferences (travel, DSA, administrative support, interpretation, translation, preparation of documents, copying, sundry, hospitality)					
3301	PC&M	Steering Committee Meetings	18 623	24 377	24 000
3302	Activity 1 - SAP	Task Team Meetings	0	20 000	5 000
3303	Activity 1 - SAP	Meetings of the Working Groups		20 000	
3304	Activity 2 - PINS	Meetings of the Working Groups		30 000	
3305	Activity 3 - EPS	Meetings of the Task Team			15 000
3306	PC&M	Unspecified meetings	0	1 500	1 500
3307		Supervisory Council		3 000	3 000
3308		Russian Coordination WG		6 000	6 000
3309		WG for Demonstration Projects		12 500	12 500
3399	Sub Total		18 623	121 377	63 000
4100	Expendable equipment				
4101	PC&M	Expendable equipment	1 713	3 287	2 000

4199		Sub Total		1 713	3 287	2 000	7 000			
4200		Non-expendable equipment								
4201	PC&M	Non-expendable equipment		27 308	17 692	2 000			47 000	
4299		Sub Total		27 308	17 692	2 000			47 000	
5100		Operation and maintenance of equipment								
5101	PC&M	Operation & maintenance of equipment		1 157	5 843	5 000			12 000	
5199		Sub Total		1 157	5 843	5 000			12 000	
5200		Reporting Activities								
5201	PC&M	Reports to UNEP & partners, translation		0	4 000	3 000			7 000	
5202	PC&M	Reports to UNEP & partners, copying & distribution		0	2 000	1 000			3 000	
5203	PC&M	Information, promotion		0	3 000	5 000			8 000	
5204	PC&M	General translation		0	5 500	5 500			11 000	
5205	PC&M	General copying & distribution		0	5 500	5 500			11 000	
		Activity 1 -								
5206	SAP	General translation		0	12 500	12 500			25 000	
		Activity 2 -								
5207	PINS	General translation		0	7 500	7 500			15 000	
		Activity 3 -								
5208	EPS	General translation				11 000			11 000	
5299		Sub Total		0	40 000	51 000			91 000	
5300		Sundry								
5301	PC&M	Sundry		1 975	6 570	4 680			13 225	
5302	PC&M	Communication Services		0	9 800	6 180			15 980	
5303	PC&M	UNDP admin costs \$ auditing			4 000	3 000			7 000	
5300		Sub Total		1 975	20 370	13 860			36 205	
5500		Evaluation								
5501	PC&M	Evaluation, auditing & peer review				13 000			13 000	
5599		Sub Total		0	0	13 000			13 000	
		UNEP Participation Costs								
1181	PC&M	Technical Expert	13 328	0	6,0	100 000	3,3	66 700	9,3	166 700

1182	PC&M	Technical Expert		10 000		0	3,0	42 500	1,6	20 000	4,6	62 500
Total for UNEP participation						0	9,0	142 500	4,9	86 700	13,9	229 200
99	Grand Total (including UNEP participation)					107 442		2 741 219		3 036 339		5 885 000
		Previous Budget				513 091		2 390 018		2 981 891		5 885 000
		Variance				(405 649)		351 201		54 448		
		Grand Total										
1100		Project Personnel	16,0		43 646	36,0		99 600	19,5	53 950	71,5	197 196
1200		Consultants	2,8		9 020	131,5		543 650	32,3	164 325	166,5	716 995
1300		Administrative support personnel	4,0		4 000	15,0		14 400	7,9	7 620	26,9	26 020
1600		Travel on official business			0			96 000		128 884		224 884
2200		Sub-contracts with cooperating organisations			0			1 640 500		2 441 000		4 081 500
3300		Meetings / Conferences			18 623			117 377		67 000		203 000
4100		Expendable equipment			1 713			3 287		2 000		7 000
4200		Non-expendable equipment			27 308			17 692		2 000		47 000
5100		Operation and maintenance of equipment			1 157			5 843		5 000		12 000
5200		Reporting costs			0			40 000		51 000		91 000
5300		Sundry			1 975			20 370		13 860		36 205
5500		Evaluation			0			0		13 000		13 000
1180		UNEP Participation Costs						142 500		86 700		229 200
		Grand Total	22,8		107 442	182,5		2 741 219	59,7	3 036 339	264,8	5 885 000

UNEP/GEF Project - Russian Federation: Support to the National Programme of Action
for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment

2nd Meeting of Supervisory Council

Tuesday, April 18, 2006, 16.00-18.30

Conference call between SC members

SC 2/4

Integrated Work Plan for 1st Phase of the Project

Prepared: by Project Office in consultation with Executive Agency and ACOPS

Status: approved by the Project Supervisory Council

INTEGRATED WORK PLAN FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UNEP/GEF PROJECT, PHASE 1

1. Strategic Action Programme (SAP)

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / Agency *	Target date
			GEF	Russia	Donors		
1.1	Proposals and selection of the Task Team (TT) Co-ordinator.	Approval of TT Co-ordinator familiar with the methodology for the preparation of the SAP and familiar with the organisations and individuals that might be involved in the preparation of the SAP.	0,0 ¹⁾	0,0 ²⁾	0,0	Manager/ ExA	January 2006
1.2	Proposals and selection of the TT members.	Selection of TT members to cover all major sectors of the SAP and the NPA-Arctic. TT to include 13 Russian consultants, 3 international consultants; 1 representative of Executing Organisation.	0,0 ¹⁾	0,0	0,0	Manager/ ExA	January 2006
1.3	Preparation of the consultancy contract with TT Co-ordinator.	Signed contract with TT Co-ordinator, including duties, outputs, work plan, timetable and other details.	0,0 ¹⁾	0,0	0,0	Manager/ ExA	January 2006
1.4	Preparation of consultancy contracts with TT members.	Draft contracts including duties, outputs, work plan, timetable and other details discussed with the potential TT members and signed subsequently.	0,0 ¹⁾	0,0	0,0	Manager	January 2006
1.5	Preparation of the working document to be considered at the First Meeting of the TT.	Working document to include the basic SAP concept; objectives; principles; content; outputs; work plan; timetable; role of TT co-ordinator and members, as well as lead organisation; procedure for the national and international review of the draft SAP; procedure for the adoption of the SAP; and basic ideas about the implementation mechanism. The document is also to contain proposals for the terms of reference for the TT. This document is to be considered, amended and adopted by the First	9.8	0,0 ²⁾	0,0	TT co-ordinator/ Manager	February 2006

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / Agency *	Target date
			GEF	Russia	Donors		
		Meeting of the TT.					
1.6	Review of the working document at the First Meeting of the TT.	Report of the meeting to include the basic SAP concept; objectives; principles; content; outputs; work plan; timetable; role of TT co-ordinator and members, as well as lead organisation; procedure for the national and international review of the draft SAP; procedure for the adoption of the SAP; and basic ideas about the mechanism of the implementation; terms of reference for the TT; tender documentation for selection of the lead co-operating organisation; and decision on the establishment of working groups.	21,35	0,0 ²⁾	0,0	TT co-ordinator/ Manager	February 15, 2006
1.7	Preparation of ToR for lead co-operating organisation. Carrying out of the tender and preparation of the contract with the lead co-operating organisation.	ToR is prepared. Signed contract with the tender winner lead co-operating organisation that includes duties, outputs, work plan, timetable and other details in compliance of schedule of payments.	30,45 including 28,5 contract (committ ed fund for this contract)	0,0	0,0	TT co-ordinator/ Manager	May 2006
1.8	Preparation of ToRs for WGs and their consultants (activities 1.8.1 – 1.8.7 will be carried out by these WGs).	Established WGs for particular topics and with defined tasks, work plan, timetable, outputs and other details.	7,85	0,0	0,0	TT co-ordinator/ Manager in coordination with ExA and PA	March – May 2006
1.8.1	Development of financial mechanisms of the SAP implementation	Scoping report on mechanisms of financing the activities included into the SAP	0,0	0,0 ²⁾	36,30 ³⁾	TT co-ordinator/ Manager in coordination with ExA and PA	September 2006

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / Agency *	Target date
			GEF	Russia	Donors		
1.8.2	Regional aspects of SAP	Scoping report on regional SAP sub-programs with recommendations for SAP	0,0	0,0 ²⁾	54,45 ³⁾	TT co-ordinator/ Manager in coordination with ExA and PA	August 2006
1.8.3	Strategic environmental assessment of the SAP under development	Report on SEA to support SAP with recommendation on improvement of SAP	63,7 ⁴⁾	0,0 ²⁾	0,0	TT co-ordinator/ Manager in coordination with ExA	August 2006
1.8.4	Diagnostic analysis of environmental situation in Arctic region	Interpretive reports on environmental problems in Russian Arctic with recommendations for SAP	0,0	0,0 ²⁾	45,54 ³⁾	TT co-ordinator/ Manager in coordination with ExA and PA	April 2006
1.8.5	Causal chain analysis	Report on causal chain analysis with recommendations	0,0	0,0 ²⁾	19,80 ³⁾	TT co-ordinator/ Manager in coordination with ExA and PA	June 2006
1.8.6	Stakeholder analysis and development of public involvement	Stakeholder perception survey report and draft public involvement plan	0,0	0,0 ²⁾	88,0 ³⁾	TT co-ordinator/ Manager in coordination with ExA and PA	August 2006
1.8.7	Information of stakeholders and communication strategy to public on project results	Report on information of public and stakeholders and communication plan	56,5 ⁴⁾	0,0 ²⁾	0,0	TT co-ordinator/ Manager in coordination with ExA	June 2007
1.9	Preparation of the first draft of the SAP to be reviewed at the Second Meeting of the TT.	The first draft of the SAP prepared in accordance with the conclusions and recommendations elaborated at the First Meeting of the TT.	23,3	0,0 ²⁾	0,0	TT co-ordinator/ Manager	May 2006

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / Agency *	Target date
			GEF	Russia	Donors		
1.10	Review of the first draft of the SAP at the Second Meeting of the TT	Report of the meeting to include detailed comments on the first draft of the SAP that will enable effective amendment of the document; to include the work plan, timetable, and distribution of tasks for the preparation of the second draft of the SAP; and to include a decision to which federal and regional departments and agencies and industrial enterprises the second draft will be sent for comments.	26,3	0,0 ²⁾	26.95 ³⁾	TT co-ordinator/ Manager in coordination with ExA	June 2006
1.11	Preparation of the second draft of the SAP.	The second draft of the SAP, to include response to comments and suggestions made at the Second Meeting of the TT. This draft will be sent to federal and regional executive authorities, agencies and companies of all forms of ownership for comments.	38,3	0,0 ²⁾	0.0	TT co-ordinator/ Manager	June 2006
1.12	Review of the second draft of the SAP by federal and regional executive authorities.	Comments by federal and regional executive authorities that will be taken into account in preparing the third draft of the SAP.	29,3	0,0 ²⁾	0.0	TT co-ordinator/ Manager in coordination with ExA	June - July 2006
1.13	Preparation of the third draft of the SAP to be reviewed at the Third Meeting of the TT, Moscow.	The third draft of the SAP, to address comments by federal and regional executive authorities.	33,5	0,0 ²⁾	0.0	TT co-ordinator/ Manager	July 2006
1.14	Review of the third draft of the SAP at the Third Meeting of the TT, Moscow.	Report of the meeting to include detailed comments on the third draft; decision to whom in the international community fourth draft will be sent for comments; and detailed procedure of the process of adoption of the SAP by executive authorities of the Russian Federation.	43,5	0,0 ²⁾	0.0	TT co-ordinator/ Manager	August 2006
1.15	Preparation of the fourth	The fourth draft of the SAP, to address comments	13,5	0,0 ²⁾	0.0	TT co-ordinator/	August

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / Agency *	Target date	
			GEF	Russia	Donors			
	draft of the SAP.	by the TT. This draft is to be sent to the international partners for comments.				Manager	2006	
1.16	International review of the SAP	Comments by international community on the fourth draft of the SAP. Comments received are addressed	52,55	0,0 ²⁾	0.0	TT co-ordinator/ Manager in coordination with ExA and IA	September 2006	
1.17	Preparation of the fifth draft of the SAP.	The fifth draft of the SAP, to address comments by the international community. This draft will be sent to executive authorities of the Russian Federation for adoption.	39,5	0,0 ²⁾	0.0	TT co-ordinator/ Manager	October 2006	
1.18	Endorsement of the SAP by relevant state authorities after taking into account comments received on a basis of international evaluation	Endorsed SAP, ready for approval.	14,0	0,0 ²⁾	0.0	Manager/ExA	December 2006	
1.19	Adoption of the SAP by the relevant executive authority.	SAP adopted by the relevant executive authority of the Russian Federation.	10,0	0,0 ²⁾	0.0	Manager/ExA	January 2007	
TOTAL			513,4	600,000 ²⁾	271,04			
Total			552,945 ¹⁾	600,000	271,04			
<u>TOTAL</u>			1,423,985.00					

¹⁾GEF funds from budget line 1100 (Project personnel), 1300 (administrative support) and 1245 (Project adviser). For convenience cost associated with several activities of TT coordinator is not divided by activities and is given in corresponding lines. Cost associated with Project adviser work (39,545) is included into total expenditures.

²⁾The Russian Federation funding includes funding of FTP “World Ocean” only (separate document justifying the funds will be sent to UNEP in line with item 46 of the Project Document and then to the Supervisory Council and the Steering Committee). Data on regional funding and industrial enterprises funds will be provided to the next Supervisory Council meeting.

³⁾The donor funds breakdown is given in ToR for corresponding WG or consultants. They includes approved by the EPA funding of activities 1.8.1, 1.8.2, 1.8.4, 1.8.5, 1.8.6 in amount of 244,09 K\$ and approved by Canada activity 1.10 (26,95 K\$).

⁴⁾The breakdown of costs for these WGs is given in corresponding ToRs

Explanatory note on GEF funding:

Description	Activity 1/5	Activity 1/6	Activity 1/7	Activity 1/8	Activity 1/9	Activity 1/10	Activity 1/11	Activity 1/12	Activity 1/13	Activity 1/14	Activity 1/15	Activity 1/16	Activity 1/17	Activity 1/18	Activity 1/19	wg1	wg2	Total
International consultant							15000		15000	15000		20000	15000			10000	10000	100000
Lead Russian Consultant	3900	1950	1950	1950	3900	3900	3900	3900	3900	3900	3900	1950	3900			27300	23400	93600
Russian Consultant 3300	3300	13200		3300	13200	13200	13200	13200	6600	6600	6600	6600	6600			26400	23100	155100
Russian Consultant 2600	2600	5200		2600	5200	5200	5200	5200										31200
Travel on official business									6000	6000		6000	6000	6000	5000			35000
Meetings		1000				1000	1000	2000	2000	10000	3000	15000	4000	4000	2000			45000
Subcontract			28500															28500
Reporting					1000	3000		5000		2000		3000	4000	4000	3000			25000
Project Adviser																		39545
Total	9800	21350	30450	7850	23300	26300	38300	29300	33500	43500	13500	52550	39500	14000	10000	63700	56500	552945

2. Pre-Investment Studies (PINS)

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / agency	Target Date
			GEF	Russia	Donors		
2.1	Proposals for and selection of the Co-ordinator of the Working Group (WG) for Pre-Investment Studies (PINS) will be prepared.	Approval of the selected WG Co-ordinator familiar with the methodology for the preparation of PINS and familiar with the organisations and individuals that might be involved in the preparation of PINS.	0,0 ¹⁾	0.0 ²⁾	0.0 ³⁾	Manager/ExA	March 2006
2.2	Proposals for and selection of the WG members.	Approval of the selected WG members for development of criteria for the hot spots selection and co-ordination of PINS taking into account environmental, economic, social and political factors. The WG will be composed of 8 Russian and 3 International consultants, and 1 representative from the Executing Agency.	0,0 ¹⁾	0.0 ²⁾	0.0	Manager/ExA	April 2006
2.3	Preparation of the consultancy contract with WG Co-ordinator.	Signed contract with WG Co-ordinator, including duties, outputs, work plan, timetable and other details.	0,0 ¹⁾	0.0 ²⁾	0.0	Manager/ExA	April 2006
2.4	Preparation of consultancy contracts with WG members.	Draft contracts, including duties, outputs, work plan, timetable and other details, to be discussed with the potential consultants and signed subsequently.	0,0 ¹⁾	0.0 ²⁾	0.0	WG Co-ordinator / Manager	April 2006
2.5	Preparation of the working document to be considered at the First Meeting of the WG.	Working document to include the basic concept of PINS; overview of priority environmental hot spots selected during the work on the NPA-Arctic and PDF B GEF Project; objectives and the content of PINS; work plan; timetable; and the role of the co-ordinator of the WG and its members and of the lead cooperating and participating organisations. The document is also to contain proposals for the criteria for the selection of hot spots for which PINS will be	3,95	0.0 ²⁾	0.0	WG Co-ordinator / Manager	April 2006

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / agency	Target Date
			GEF	Russia	Donors		
		prepared and terms of reference for the WG. This document is to be considered, amended and adopted by the First Meeting of the WG.					
2.6	Review of the working document at the First Meeting of the WG, Moscow.	Report of the meeting to include the basic concept of PINS; overview of hot spots selected during the work on the NPA-Arctic and PDF B GEF Project; objectives and targets, the content and outputs of PINS; work plan and timetable; the role of the co-ordinator of the WG and its members and of lead cooperating and participating organisations. The Report is also to contain proposals for the criteria for selection of hot spots for which PINS will be prepared and terms of reference for the WG.	21,575	0.0 ²⁾	0.0	WG Co-ordinator / Manager	May 2006
2.7	Update and review of the existing hot spots identified at PDF-B stage	Update (data collection), review and analysis of the situation with hot spots	0.0	0.0 ²⁾	24.20 ⁴⁾	WG co-ordinator / Manager in coordination with PA	June 2006
2.8.	Preparation of Guidelines on conduction of preinvestment studies	Guidelines for conducting the preinvestment studies (methodology and procedures)	0,0	0.0 ²⁾	43.56 ⁴⁾	WG co-ordinator / Manager in coordination with PA	June 2006
2.9	Development of criteria for selection of hot spots for which PINS will be prepared, on the basis of comments given at the First Meeting of the WG.	Criteria for selection of hot spots for which PINS will be prepared, which will include criteria for taking into account environmental, economic, social, and other aspects in the process of selection.	15,575	0.0 ²⁾	16,17 ⁴⁾	WG Co-ordinator / Manager in coordination with PA	July 2006
2.10	Hot spots screening and selection. Preparation of the list of potential pre-	On the basis of the work done on analysis of environmental hot spots in the PDF B GEF Project, the hot spots identified in the NPA-Arctic and	53,800	0.0 ²⁾	19,25 ⁴⁾	WG Co-ordinator / Manager in coordination with	September 2006

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / agency	Target Date
			GEF	Russia	Donors		
	investment studies.	submitted by federal and regional authorities, the list of potential pre-investment studies will be prepared. Using the adopted criteria for selection, about 8-10 hot spots will be selected for which PINS will be prepared. The Report of the Second Meeting will include selected hot spots and the rationale for the selection.				PA	
2.11	Preparation of tenders dossiers and ToRs for cooperating organisations. Selection of lead cooperating organisations for the conduction of PINS.	Tender for the selection of three lead cooperating organizations for conducting PINS (for the western, central and eastern parts of the Russian Arctic) will be announced by the Project Office. Terms of reference for lead cooperating organisations will be included in the conditions of the tender.	34,25	0.0 ²⁾	193,82 ⁵⁾	WG Co-ordinator / Manager in coordination with PA	Sep 2006 to Jan 2007
2.12	Selection of hot spots for which PINS will be done, at the Second Meeting of the WG.	The Report of the Second Meeting will include selected hot spots and the rationale for the selection.	22,434	0.0 ²⁾		WG Co-ordinator / Manager	August 2006
2.13	Concluding the contracts with bid-winners	On the basis of the tender and criteria adopted by the Executing Agency, three lead cooperating organisations are selected. Contracts are concluded that includes schedule of payments.	1070,0 (2006) 977,8 (2007)	0.0 ²⁾		WG Co-ordinator / Manager	September 2006
2.14	Preparation of ToRs for sub-groups (SGs) for each PINS and their consultants	ToRs for SGs and consultants for each PIN Study will be prepared. Each SG will consist of the co-ordinator, up to five Russian consultants and one or two international consultants. The SGs will co-operate with lead cooperating organisations and participating organisations, which will be defined by lead cooperating organisations and approved by Project Office.	107,65 ⁶⁾ , ⁷⁾	0.0 ²⁾		SG Co-ordinator / Manager	September 2006

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / agency	Target Date
			GEF	Russia	Donors		
	TOTAL		2307,034	400.000	297,000.0		
	<u>TOTAL</u>		3,004,034.00				

¹⁾ GEF funds from budget line 1100 (Project personnel), 1300 (administrative support). For convenience cost associated with several activities of WG coordinator is not divided by activities and is given in corresponding lines.

²⁾ The Russian Federation funding includes funding of FTP “World Ocean” only (separate document justifying the funds will be sent to UNEP in line with item 46 of the Project Document and then to the Supervisory Council and the Steering Committee). Data on regional funding and industrial enterprises funds will be provided to the next Supervisory Council meeting.

³⁾ Donor funds include USA EPA funding in amount 257,000.0 US\$ and Iceland funds in amount 40,000 US\$. ToRs for donor funds are in process of elaboration

⁴⁾ USA EPA funding are approved in amount 24,2 K\$ for activity 2.7; 43,56 K\$ for activity 2.8; 16,17 K\$ for activity 2.9 and 19,25 K\$ for activity 2.10

⁵⁾ USA EPA funding in amount of 151,83 K\$ and Iceland funds in amount 40,0 K\$ to be confirmed

⁶⁾ Activities associated with working out of selected PINS and potential WG for their further development.

⁷⁾ Funds are absent in GEF budget for financing of SG for each PINS and donor fund can be additionally requested for fulfillment of this activity.

Explanatory Notes:

GEF funding:

Description	Activity 2/5	Activity 2/6	Activity 2/9	Activity 2/10	Activity 2/11	Activity 2/12	Activity 2/13	Activity 2/14	Total
International consultant		10000	5000	20000	15000	5000		30000	85000
Lead Russian Consultant	1950	975	975	3900	1950	1950		7800	19500
Russian Consultant 3300		3300	3300	6600	3300	3300		14850	34650
Russian Consultant 2600		1300	1300	1300		1300			5200
Travel on official business		4000	2000	14000	10000	5884		34000	69884
Meetings	2000	2000	2000	5000	2000	3000		14000	30000
Subcontract							2047800		2047800
Reporting			1000	3000	2000	2000		7000	15000
Total	3950	21575	15575	53800	34250	22434	2047800	107650	2307034

3. Environmental Protection System Improvements (EPS)

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / agency	Target Date
			GEF	Russia	Donors		
3.1	Proposals for and selection of the Co-ordinator of the Task Team on Implementation of the SAP (TT SAP).	Approval of the TT Co-ordinator familiar with the methodology for the implementation of the SAP and with organisations and individuals that might be involved.	0,0 ¹⁾	0.0 ²⁾	0.0 ³⁾	Manager/ExA	January 2007
3.2	Proposals for and selection of TT members.	Approval of the TT members to cover various aspects of this activity, to be developed by three WGs (Legislative Improvements, Administrative Improvements and Institutional and Technical Improvements). It is envisaged that the TT will be composed of 10 Russian and 3 international consultants and 1 representative of the Executing Agency.	0,0 ¹⁾	0.0	0.0	Manager/ExA	January 2007
3.3	Preparation of the consultancy contract with the TT Co-ordinator.	Signed contract with the TT Co-ordinator, including duties, outputs, work plan, timetable and other details.	0,0 ¹⁾	0.0	0.0	Manager/ExA	January 2007
3.4	Preparation of consultancy contracts with TT members.	Signed contracts with TT members, including duties, outputs, work plan, timetable and other details, to be discussed with the potential consultants and signed subsequently.	0,0 ¹⁾	0.0	0.0	TT Co-ordinator / Manager	January 2007
3.5	Preparation of the working document to be considered at the First Meeting of the TT.	Working document to include basic concept of the Environmental Protection System (EPS); overview of priority improvements in environmental protection mechanisms for which the need was identified during work on the NPA-Arctic and PDF B GEF Project; proposals for the establishment of three WGs subordinate to the TT, including proposals for the	14,25	0.0	0.0	TT Co-ordinator / Manager	February 2007

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / agency	Target Date
			GEF	Russia	Donors		
		respective Co-ordinators, tasks on EPS improvement in general and in all three directions for lead cooperating and participating organisations, outputs, work plan, timetable and other details. The document is also to contain draft terms of reference for the TT, including expected outputs, work plan, timetable and other details; the role of the co-ordinator of the TT and its members; as well as the role of cooperating and participating organisations. This document is to be considered, amended and adopted by the First Meeting of the TT.					
3.6	Review of the working document at the First Meeting of the TT, Moscow.	Report of the meeting to include basic concept of EPS; overview of priority improvements in environmental protection mechanisms for which the need was identified during work on the NPA-Arctic and PDF B GEF Project; and proposals for the establishment of three WGs subordinate to the TT, including proposals for the respective Co-ordinators, tasks on EPS improvement in general and in all three directions for lead cooperating and participating organisations, outputs, work plan, timetable and other details. Report is also to contain terms of reference for the TT, including outputs, work plan, timetable and other details; the role of the co-ordinator of the TT and its members; as well as the role of cooperating and participating organisations.	34,55	0.0	0.0	TT Co-ordinator / Manager	March 2007
3.7	Preparation of ToR for the lead cooperating organisation. Carrying out of the tender and selection of the lead	As a result of the tender, the lead cooperating organization for the development of the EPS (in general) is selected. Signed contract with this organisation to include terms of reference, expected outputs, work plan, timetable and other details. Contracts with cooperating organisation are	32,75 100,0	0.0	0.0	TT Co-ordinator / Manager	April 2007 May 2007

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / agency	Target Date
			GEF	Russia	Donors		
	cooperating organisation for the development of the EPS in general and preparation of the contract with the selected organisation.	concluded.					
3.8	Proposals for the members of each of the three WGs. Preparation of ToRs and a tender documentation for the three lead participating organisations.	Selection of the WG members. It is envisaged that each WG will be composed of 6 Russian and 3 international consultants, and 1 representative from the Executing Agency. ToRs for each lead participating organisation are prepared.	42,85	0.0	0.0	TT Co-ordinator / Manager	May 2007
3.9	Carrying out of the tenders and selection of the lead participating organisation for each of the three WGs and preparation of contracts with each organisation.	As a result of the tenders the lead participating organisation is appointed for each of the three WGs on the basis of agreed TORs. Signed contracts with these organisations to include TORs, outputs, work plan, timetable and other details.	44,8 468,200 - - contracts	0.0	0.0	WG and TT Co-ordinators / Manager	June 2007
TOTAL			737,4 US\$K	1000,0	0.00		
			1737,400				

¹⁾ GEF funds from budget line 1100 (Project personnel), 1300 (administrative support). For convenience cost associated with several activities of WG coordinator is not divided by activities and is given in corresponding lines.

²⁾ The Russian Federation funding includes funding of FTP "World Ocean" only (separate document justifying the funds will be sent to UNEP in line with item 46 of the Project Document and then to the Supervisory Council and the Steering Committee). Data on regional funding and industrial enterprises funds will be provided to the next Supervisory Council meeting.

³⁾ NO DONOR FUNDS ARE COMMITTED FOR THE DATE FOR THIS COMPONENT

Explanatory Notes:

GEF funding:

Description	Activity3/5	Activity3/6	Activity3/7	Activity3/8	Activity3/9	Total
International consultant	5000	15000	10000	15000	15000	60000
Lead Russian Consultant	1950	1950	1950	1950	3900	11700
Russian Consultant 3300	3300	6600	6600	9900	9900	36300
Russian Consultant 2600			5200			5200
Travel on official business	3000	6000	4000	9000	8000	30000
Meetings		4000	2000	5000	4000	15000
Subcontract			100000		468200	568200
Reporting	1000	1000	3000	2000	4000	11000
Total	14250	34550	132750	42850	513000	737400

4. Demonstration Projects (DEMOS)

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / agency	Target Date
			GEF	Russia	Donors		
4.1	Proposals for and selection of the Co-ordinator of the WG on Contaminant Clean-up (WG CLEANUP).	Approval of the WG Co-ordinator familiar with the methodology for decontamination of marine waters through the use of brown algae as well as of organisations and individuals that might be involved.	0,0 ¹⁾	0,0 ²⁾	0,0 ³⁾	Manager / ExA	March 2006
4.2	Proposals for and selection of the WG CLEANUP members.	Approval of the WG members to cover various aspects of this demonstration project.	0,0 ¹⁾	0,0	0,0	Manager / ExA	April 2006
4.3	Preparation of the consultancy contract with the WG CLEANUP Co-ordinator.	Signed contract with the WG Co-ordinator, including duties, outputs, work plan, timetable and other details.	0,0 ¹⁾	0,0	0,0	Manager / ExA	April 2006
4.4	Preparation of consultancy contracts with the WG CLEANUP members.	Draft contracts, including duties, expected outputs, work plan, timetable and other details, to be discussed with the potential consultants and signed subsequently.	0,0 ¹⁾	0,0	0,0	WG Co-ordinator / Manager	April 2006
4.5	Preparation of the working document to be considered at the First Meeting of the WG CLEANUP.	Working document to include basic concept of the Contaminant Clean-up method; draft terms of reference for the WG, including expected outputs, work plan, timetable and other details; the role of the co-ordinator of the WG and its members; the role of the lead cooperating organisation. This document is to be considered, amended and adopted by the First Meeting of the WG.	6,9	0,0 ²⁾	3,3 ⁴⁾	WG Co-ordinator / Manager in coordination with PA	May 2006
4.6	Review of the working document at the First Meeting of the WG CLEANUP, Moscow.	Report of the meeting to include basic concept of Contaminant Clean-up method; terms of reference for the WG, including outputs, work plan, timetable and other details; the role of the co-ordinator of the WG and its members; the role of	8,3	0,0	3,3 ⁴⁾	WG Co-ordinator / Manager in coordination with PA	June 2006

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / agency	Target Date
			GEF	Russia	Donors		
		the lead cooperating organisation.					
4.7	Preparation of ToR and conduct of the tender and preparation of the contract with the lead cooperating organisation for the development of Contaminant Clean-up demonstration.	ToR for the lead cooperating organization for the development of CLEANUP-DEMOS is prepared. Signed contract with the lead cooperating organisation (which won the tender) to include duties, expected outputs, work plan, timetable and other details. Contract is concluded that includes schedule of payments	9,9 Plus 196,0 (2006) 298,0 (2007)	0,0	30,0 ⁴⁾	WG Co-ordinator / Manager in coordination with PA	August 2006
4.8	Proposals for and selection of the Co-ordinator of the WG on Indigenous Environmental Co-Management (WG COMAN).	Approval of the WG Co-ordinator familiar with the methodology for the implementation of the Indigenous Environmental Co-Management Project as well as of organisations and individuals that might be involved.	0,0 ¹⁾	0,0	0,0	Manager /ExA	July 2006
4.9	Proposals for and selection of the WG COMAN members.	Approval of the WG members to cover various aspects of this demonstration project.	0,0 ¹⁾	0,0	0,0	Manager	August 2006
4.10	Preparation of the contract with the WG COMAN Co-ordinator.	Signed contract with the WG Co-ordinator including duties, expected outputs, work plan, timetable and other details.	0,0 ¹⁾	0,0	0,0	Manager /ExA	September 2006
4.11	Preparation of contracts with the WG COMAN members.	Draft contracts, including duties, outputs, work plan, timetable and other details, to be discussed with the potential consultants and signed subsequently.	0,0 ¹⁾	0,0	0,0	WG Co-ordinator / Manager	October 2006
4.12	Proposals for and selection of the Co-ordinator of the WG on the Environment Remediation in the areas of Two Decommissioned Military Bases (WG BASES).	Approval of the WG Co-ordinator familiar with the methodology for the environment remediation in the areas of two decommissioned military bases as well as of organisations and individuals that might be involved.	0,0 ¹⁾	0,0	0,0	Manager /Executing Agency	November 2006

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / agency	Target Date
			GEF	Russia	Donors		
4.13	Proposals for and selection of WG the BASES members.	Approval of the WG members to cover various aspects of this demonstration project.	0,0 ¹⁾	0,0	0,0	ExA/Manager	November 2006
4.14	Preparation of the contract with the WG BASES Co-ordinator.	Signed contract with the WG Co-ordinator, including duties, expected outputs, work plan, timetable and other details.	0,0 ¹⁾	0,0	0,0	ExA/Manager	November 2006
4.15	Preparation of contracts with the WG BASES members.	Draft contracts, including duties, expected outputs, work plan, timetable and other details, to be discussed with the potential consultants and signed subsequently.	0,0 ¹⁾	0,0	30,0 ⁵⁾	WG Co-ordinator / Manager in coordination with PA	November 2006
4.16	Preparation of the working document to be considered at the First Meeting of the WG COMAN.	Working document to include basic concept of the environmental co-management method for extracting companies and indigenous peoples of the North; overview of relevant needs identified during the work on the NPA-Arctic and PDF B GEF Project; draft terms of reference for the WG, including expected outputs, work plan, timetable and other details; the role of the co-ordinator of the WG and its members; the role of the lead cooperating organisation. This document is to be considered, amended and adopted by the First Meeting of the WG.	3,6	0,0	24,5 ⁶⁾	WG Co-ordinator / Manager in coordination with PA	October 2006
4.17	Preparation of the working document to be considered at the First Meeting of the WG BASES.	Working document to include basic concept of the environmental remediation method for the areas of two decommissioned military bases; overview of relevant needs identified during the work on the NPA-Arctic and PDF B GEF Project; draft terms of reference for the WG, including outputs, work plan, timetable and other details; the role of the co-ordinator of the WG and its members; the role of the lead cooperating organisation. This document is to be considered, amended and	8,3	0,0	20,0 ⁵⁾	WG Co-ordinator / Manager in coordination with PA	October 2006

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / agency	Target Date
			GEF	Russia	Donors		
		adopted by the First Meeting of the WG.					
4.18	Review of the working document at the First Meeting of the WG COMAN, Moscow	Report of the meeting to include basic concept of the environmental co-management method for extracting companies and indigenous peoples of the North; overview of relevant needs identified during the work on the NPA-Arctic and PDF B GEF Project; terms of reference for the WG, including expected outputs, work plan, timetable and other details; the role of the co-ordinator of the WG and its members; the role of the lead cooperating organisation.	7,6		9,0 ⁶⁾	WG Co-ordinator / Manager in coordination with PA	November 2006
4.19	Preparation of ToR and conduct of the tender and preparation of the contract with the lead cooperating organisation for Indigenous Environmental Co-Management	ToR is prepared. Signed contract with the lead cooperating organization (which won the tender) to include ToR, expected outputs, work plan, timetable, schedule of payments for the contract and other details.	3,6 Plus 196,0 (2006) 298,0 (2007)	0,0	50,4 ⁴⁾	WG Co-ordinator / Manager in coordination with PA	November 2006
4.20	Review of the working document at the First Meeting of the WG BASES, Moscow.	Report of the meeting to include basic concept of the environmental remediation method for the areas of two decommissioned military bases; overview of relevant needs identified during the work on the NPA-Arctic and PDF B GEF Project; draft terms of reference for the WG, including outputs, work plan, timetable and other details; the role of the co-ordinator of the WG and its members; the role of the lead cooperating organisation.	11,9	0,0	20,0 ⁵⁾	WG Co-ordinator / Manager in coordination with PA	November 2006
4.21	Preparation of ToR and	ToR is prepared. Signed contract with the lead	5,6	0,0	40,0 ⁵⁾	WG Co-ordinator	December 2006

No.	Activity	OUTPUT	Cost (US\$*1K)			Responsible person / agency	Target Date
			GEF	Russia	Donors		
	conduction of the tender and preparation of the contract with the lead cooperating organisation for the environmental remediation in the areas of two decommissioned military bases	cooperating organisation (which won the tender) to include ToR, expected outputs, work plan, timetable, schedule of payments for the contract and other details.	Plus 150,0 (2006) 299,0 (2007)			/ Manager Manager in coordination with PA	
4.22	Preparation of Progress Report to be considered at the Second Meeting of the WG CLEANUP.	Progress Report to include suggestions for further work.	6,65	0,0	0,0	WG Co-ordinator / Manager	January 2007
4.23	Review of the Progress Report at the Second Meeting of the WG CLEANUP, Moscow.	Report of the meeting and reviewed Progress Report with suggestions for further work.	6,65	0,0	0,0	WG Co-ordinator / Manager	February 2007
4.24	Preparation and Review of Progress Report to be considered at the Second Meeting of the WG BASES	Reviewed Progress Report with suggestions for further work	23,0	0	0,0	WG Co-ordinator / Manager	April 2007
4.25	Preparation and Review of Progress Report to be considered at the Second Meeting of the WG COMAN	Reviewed Progress Report with suggestions for further work	23,0	0	0,0	WG Co-ordinator / Manager	April 2007
			1562,0	1000,0	230.5		
			2,792,500.00				

¹⁾ GEF funds from budget line 1100 (Project personnel), 1300 (administrative support)

²⁾ The Russian Federation funding includes funding of FTP "World Ocean" only (separate document justifying the funds will be sent to UNEP in line with item 46 of the Project Document and then to the Supervisory Council and the Steering Committee). Data on regional funding and industrial enterprises funds will be provided to the next Supervisory Council meeting.

³⁾ Donor funds include USA EPA funding in amount 110,000 US\$ (to be confirmed) and Canadian funds in amount 62,500 US\$ (received by ACOPS) and funds in amount 87,000 US\$ (to be confirmed). ToRs for donor funds are in process of elaboration

⁴⁾ Donor funds to be requested from Canada's second tranche

⁵⁾ Donor funds to be requested from the EPA

⁶⁾ Donor fund approved by Canada

Explanatory Notes:

GEF funding:

Description	Activity4/5	Activity4/6	Activity4/7	Activity4/16	Activity4/17	Activity4/18	Activity4/19	Activity4/20	Activity4/21	Activity4/22	Activity4/23	Activity4/24	Activity4/25	Total
Russian Consultant 3300	3300	3300	3300		3300			3300	3300	1650	1650			23100
Russian Consultant 2600	2600		2600	2600		2600	2600	2600	1300					16900
Travel on official business	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	2000	1000	5000	5000	20000	20000	60000
Meetings		4000	3000		4000	4000		4000				3000	3000	25000
Subcontract			494000				494000		449000					1437000
Reporting														0
														0
Total	6900	8300	503900	3600	8300	7600	497600	11900	454600	6650	6650	23000	23000	1562000

5. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

	Project personnel	197,196
	Administrative support	26,020
	Travel on official business	30,000
	Meetings	88,000
	Equipment	54,000
	Operation support	12,000
	Reporting	40,000
	Sundry, evaluation	49,205
	UNEP	229,200
TOTAL		725,621

Total Budget for 1st Phase ^{**}

No.	Activity	Cost (US\$*1K)			
		GEF	Russia	Donors	TOTAL
1	SAP	552,945	600,000 ¹⁾	271,040	1423,985
2	PINS	2307,034	400,000	297,000 [*]	3004,034
3	EPS	737,400	1000,000	0,0 ^{**}	1737,400
4	DEMOS	1562,000	1000,000	230,500 ^{***}	2792,50
5	PM	725,621	136,800 ¹⁾	0,000	862,421
TOTAL		5885,000	3136,800	798,540	9,820,340.00

¹⁾ office premises and related expenditures provided by the Russian Federation

* Donors' funds are needed for consultants of sub-groups for PINS (there is no GEF funding)

** Donors' funds are needed for contract with the lead cooperating organisation for EPS (there is no GEF funding)

*** Donors' funds are needed for consultants of working groups DEMOS (limited GEF funding is available for 2006 only)

UNEP/GEEF Project - Russian Federation: Support to the National Programme of Action
for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment

2nd Meeting of Supervisory Council

April 18, 2006

Conference call between SC members

SC 2/5

PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN

Prepared: by UNEP

Status: approved by Project Supervisory Council

PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN
Support to the National Plan of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment

INTRODUCTION

The objective of monitoring and evaluation is to assist all project participants in assessing project performance and impact, with a view to maximising both. Monitoring is the continuous or periodic review and surveillance by management of the implementation of an activity. Monitoring helps to ensure that all required actions are proceeding according to plan. Evaluation is a process for determining systematically and objectively the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and impact of the activities in light of their objectives. Mid-term evaluation is the analysis, during the implementation phase, of continuing relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness and the present and likely future outputs, effects, and impacts.

The general and specific objectives of the project, and the list of its planned outcomes, have provided the basis for this M&E plan. The project will be evaluated on the basis of execution performance, outputs delivery, and project impact.

EXECUTION PERFORMANCE

Execution monitoring will assess whether the management of project activities is efficient. It seeks to improve efficiencies when needed so as to improve overall effectiveness of project implementation. It is a continuous process, collecting information about the execution of activities programmed from the integrated workplans, advising on improvements to methods and performance, and comparing accomplished with programmed tasks. This activity will be the direct responsibility of the Project Office (PO), under the supervision of the Supervisory Council and Steering Committee. See Table 1 for the execution performance tools. The UNEP and the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, in collaboration with the PO, will employ the following execution performance monitoring tools.

Table 1: tools for monitoring whether the project implementation progress is made in accordance with the Integrated Work Plan

Indicator	Means Verification²	of
Quarterly and annual activity progress reports are prepared in a timely and satisfactory manner	Arrival of reports to UNEP after the drafts reports have been reviewed by the Supervisory Council	
Quarterly financial reports are prepared in a timely and satisfactory manner.	Arrival of reports to UNEP after the draft	

² The responsible officer to track this will be the GEF project task manager in consultation with the project manager.

	reports are reviewed by the Supervisory Council
Performance targets, outputs, and outcomes are achieved as specified in the annual integrated workplans.	Semi annual and Annual progress reports to be submitted to the Supervisory Council and Steering Committee
Deviations from the annual work plans are corrected promptly and appropriately. Requests for deviations from approved budgets are submitted in a timely fashion.	Work plans, minutes of PSC meetings, timely submission of revised budget to UNEP for final approval after the draft requests are reviewed by the Supervisory Council and as necessary by the Project Steering Committee
Disbursements are made on a timely basis, and procurement is achieved according to the procurement guidelines.	IMIS system at UNEP and Bank Account statements of Project Office
Report on the procurement of non-expendable equipment against the project budget filed in a timely manner.	Inventory of Non-Expendable Equipment reports to be submitted to UNEP
Audit reports and other reviews showing sound financial practices.	Audit statements to be submitted to UNEP on a yearly basis
Project Steering Committee (PSC) and Supervisory Council (SC) are tracking implementation progress and project impact, and providing guidance on annual work plans and fulfilling TOR.	Minutes of PSC and SC meetings are agreed upon among the members.
PSC is providing policy guidance, especially on achievement of project impacts.	Minutes of PSC meetings

PROJECT IMPACT AND DELIVERABLES

The project's success in achieving its outcomes will be monitored continuously throughout the project through semi-annual progress reports, annual summary progress reports, a mid-term review and final evaluation. Based on the project Logframe (attached as Annex), Table 2 presents the key performance indicators. Methods of data collection is designed to ensure that data is collected regularly throughout project implementation. The list of performance indicators includes interim indicators and numerical targets with timeframes.

Table 2. List of Key Performance Indicators

	Key performance indicator	Baseline (if baseline is not known, please identify how and when baseline will be established)	Method of data collection/Data collection strategy (including frequency)
Project objectives:			
Improved management of the Arctic environment in the Russian Federation and clear appreciation of priorities.	By the end of Phase I, adoption of the Strategic Action Plan (SAP) for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment from Land-based Activities by the Government of the Russian Federation.	The National Action Plan for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment has been developed and agreed upon.	The minutes of the inter-agency WG and confirmations from federal and regional authorities indicate that the SPA is adopted by the Government of the Russian Federation.
Environmentally sustainable development of natural resources in the Russian Arctic.	By the end of Phase II, the reformed regulatory framework is implemented by local, provincial, federal administrations.	There is an existing regulatory framework, which does not take into consideration the programmatic requirements to be outlined in the SAP and NAP.	The survey of the regulatory framework at the local, provincial and federal levels indicates that environmentally sustainable development concerns are incorporated as the means to implement the SAP.
Improved regional co-ordination of the management of the Arctic environment; and Russia meeting its obligations under the AEPS and its commitments to objectives of the GPA.	Contributions by the Russian Federation to the Arctic Environment Protection Strategy of the Arctic Council. Acknowledgement by the Arctic Council of the SAP as a component of the Regional Programme of Action for the Arctic.	The initiated work of this project is recognised by the Arctic Council and GPA.	The Russian representative at the Arctic Council provides information on the SAP and the minutes of the Arctic Council can indicate the contribution of the SAP to the Arctic Council process.
Project outcomes:			
Finalisation and endorsement of the SAP for the Russian Arctic.	By the end of Phase I, review and publication* of the SAP for the Arctic.	There is no SAP formulation at the onset of the project.	The minutes of the inter-agency WG and confirmations from federal and regional authorities indicate that the SPA is adopted by the Government of the Russian Federation.

Improved legislation, administrative procedures and institutional capacity for the environmental protection of the Arctic environment.	<p>By the end of Phase I, selection of lead organisations and members of the working groups selected and confirmed.</p> <p>By the end of Phase II, adoption of agreed proposals for revised legislation and new administrative arrangements, including assignments of responsibility and capacity requirements, to the relevant federal Ministries, the Government of the Russian Federation and provincial governments.</p>	There is an existing legal, regulatory and administrative framework, which does not take into consideration the programmatic requirements to be outlined in the SAP and NAP.	Adoption of a work plan of concrete follow-up actions that will lead to the implementation of the proposals for EPS improvements in the Russian Arctic
Conditions for further interventions and investments to remediate or prevent the degradation of the Arctic Environment are realised.	<p>By the end of phase I, necessary working documents are revised at the working group meetings</p> <p>By the end of Phase II, investments are prepared based on at least 8-10 pre-investment studies.</p> <p>By the end of Phase I all demonstration projects are fully developed and ready for implementation.</p> <p>By the end of phase II, demonstration projects are ready to be replicated elsewhere in Russia.</p>	<p>The project PDF-B; NEFCO and Russian authorities, respectively issued a list of hot spots.</p> <p>Limited demonstrative activities have been developed or implemented.</p>	<p>The minutes of the PINS working groups and the Steering committee should indicate that the progress and adoption of the pre-investment studies to be accepted by financial institutions. Round tables and Partnership Conference will be held taking into account PINS.</p> <p>Feasibility of the demonstration project can be judged through the Supervisory Council. Demo results will be provided to the federal and regional authorities concerned.</p>
<u>Project component deliverables</u>			
1: SAP Development	<p>By May 2006, a first draft SAP is prepared</p> <p>By January 2007, the SAP is adopted by relevant stakeholders</p>	No SAP related actions are carried out.	The published SAP in English and Russian are widely circulated.
2. Pre-Investment Study	<p>By July 2006, hot spots are selected on which pre-investment studies will be carried out;</p> <p>By June 2007, first draft pre-investment studies are reviewed by the Steering Committee</p>	Environmental hot spots were identified by project PDF-B and NEFCO, but actual remediation actions should be intensified.	The minutes of the PINS working groups and the Steering committee should indicate that the first draft PINs are prepared and reviewed by the steering committee
3. Environmental Protection System Improvement	By the end of phase I, all lead organisations and members of working groups are selected and approved.	Work on EPS Improvement in the Russian Arctic should be better organized and intensified.	The steering committee report indicates that the organisations and members of working groups are selected.

4. Demonstration projects	By the end of phase I, all the demonstration project are prepared and ready for implementation.	Limited demonstrative actions (ACAP and others) were designed or implemented.	Feasibility of the demonstration project can be judged through the Supervisory Council.
----------------------------------	---	---	---

EVALUATION

UNEP's annual mandatory self-evaluations will be performed, and results will be used to adapt project implementation strategies. UNEP will inform GEF of the evaluations during the annual Project Implementation Review (PIR). Evaluation reports will also be made available to the public, and will be shared with other GEF projects in the region to facilitate mutual learning, and strengthen strategic planning. Towards the end of the first phase of the project implementation, UNEP Evaluation and Oversight Unit will conduct an independent project review, which should be reported to the Project Steering Committee. The project review will be submitted to the GEF Office of Evaluation as well as GEF Secretariat to serve as the basis for requesting the second phase GEF funding. When the second phase project is approved, upon completion of the second phase activities, external consultant(s) will be recruited to conduct a terminal evaluation of the project. The terminal evaluation report will be published by UNEP and shared with stakeholders involved and GEF Office of Evaluation. The project may be subject to other reviews, which may be carried out by UNEP in accordance with the requests from GEF Office of Evaluation.

RESPONSIBILITIES AND ROLES OF PROJECT PARTNERS

The Table 3 below outlines the responsibilities of the various organisations and mechanisms for the project monitoring and evaluation.

Table 3: Monitoring and Evaluation Roles and Responsibilities

UNEP	Ministry of Economic Development and Trade	Project Steering Committee	Supervisory Council	Project Office
Overall monitoring and oversight				
Oversee the project implementation	Establish reporting network to prepare necessary and acceptable reports in time for the Project Office to submit to UNEP	Review overall progress in the implementation based on the reports prepared	Oversee the operation of the Project Office and the review the progress in the implementation of the project, so that annual reporting can be made to the Steering Committee.	Draft progress reports to be submitted to the Supervisory Council and Steering Committee as necessary, and finalise the reports to be submitted to UNEP.
Outcome and output monitoring				
<p>Approve half-yearly progress report</p> <p>Participate in the steering committee and Supervisory Council meetings</p> <p>Regular communications with Project Office and occasional visits to demo sites</p> <p>Preparation of TOR and selection of external expert(s) for project reviews and terminal evaluation as deemed necessary.</p>	<p>Participate in the steering committee, Supervisory Council, TT, WG and IWG meetings</p> <p>Regular communications with Project Office and occasional visits to demo sites</p> <p>Report on the implementation progress to the GPA and Arctic Council processes.</p>	<p>Review of and agreement on the integrated workplan</p> <p>Review the progress reports prepared by the Project Office</p> <p>Approve any operation regulations and rules for the project.</p>	<p>Oversight of the day-to-day operations of the Project Office and Partner Agencies</p> <p>Preparation of reports for the Project Steering Committee.</p>	<p>Preparation of half-yearly progress reports and annual reports</p> <p>Regular visits to demo sites and communications with Partner Agencies and other supporting organisations</p> <p>Overall implementation oversight on components</p> <p>Secretariat function for PSC and SC and participation in the project review</p> <p>Preparation of a draft integrated work plan for submission to PSC</p>

				Preparation of financing related input to half-yearly progress reports and annual project
Financial monitoring				
<p>Review quarterly and annual financial reports and co-financing reports</p> <p>Decision on disbursement of GEF funds based on the disbursement plan and co-financing situation</p>	<p>Review draft quarterly and annual financial reports and co-financing reports and draft cash advanced statements</p>	<p>Review the overall financial situation, expenditure and co-financing.</p> <p>Review annual financial plans</p>	<p>Review overall project financing and expenditure.</p> <p>Review documentation on financial issues to be submitted to the PSC.</p>	<p>Prepare input on actual expenditure to the Supervisory Council and finally to UNEP</p> <p>Preparation of a procurement plan, and conduct actual procurement</p> <p>Solicit financial reports from supporting organisations</p> <p>Prepare co-financing reports Report on the financial expenditure on both GEF funds and co-financing to be submitted to the Supervisory Council.</p>
Substantive reports				
<p>Review all substantive reports in draft form, and clear the draft publications</p> <p>Ensure the publication format</p> <p>As necessary, organise UNEP and/or external review of substantive reports.</p>	<p>Review all substantive reports in draft form</p> <p>Ensure the publication format</p> <p>As necessary, organise additional Ministry review of substantive reports.</p>	<p>Agree on major documents (SAP, Pre-Investment Studies, etc.))</p>	<p>Make sure timely and quality input to substantive report preparation.</p> <p>Review drafts.</p>	<p>Submit draft reports to Supervisory Council and finally to UNEP and the Ministry for their review.</p> <p>Receive draft reports from supporting organisations for review</p> <p>Review of substantive reports emanating from the activities supported by</p>

				co-financing.
Project Evaluation				
<p>UNEP Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) to prepare Terms of Reference for first phase review and terminal evaluations</p> <p>UNEP EOU to select external consultants</p> <p>Comments on the draft evaluations reports</p> <p>Submit to UNEP annual self-evaluation fact sheets</p> <p>Prepare and submit PIR reports to GEF</p>	<p>Provide input to the evaluations.</p>	<p>Review recommendations from the evaluation reports</p>	<p>Review the draft evaluation reports.</p>	<p>Organise logistics for evaluations, including site visits</p> <p>Interviews with external evaluation consultants.</p> <p>Comment on draft evaluation reports</p> <p>Review recommendations in the evaluation reports through the PSC.</p>

ANNEX
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX

PROJECT PLANNING MATRIX			
SUMMARY	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions and Risks
Overall Goal			
Protect the Arctic marine environment from land-based activities in the Russian Federation.	Specific process, stress reduction, and environmental status indicators and their means of verification will be developed within the context of the SAP.		The risk is that political support for the sustainable development of the Arctic falters in the face of the appeal of short-term economic benefits. This risk is alleviated by the policy framework provided by the FTOP 'World Ocean' and by the existence of the Arctic Council as a forum to ensure long-term circumpolar support for the proposed activities.
Objectives			
Improved management of the Arctic environment in the Russian Federation and clear appreciation of priorities.	Adoption of the Strategic Action Plan (SAP) for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment from Land-based Activities by the Government of the Russian Federation.	Adoption of the SAP for the Arctic as a component of the FTOP 'World Ocean' by the Russian Federation.	The assumption is that all relevant Ministries and Agencies in Government will adopt the SAP for the Russian Arctic. This seems likely as it stems from the NPA Arctic, itself adopted formally by all relevant Ministries as part of the FTOP 'World Ocean' initiative.
Environmentally sustainable development of natural resources in the Russian Arctic.	The reformed regulatory framework is implemented by local, provincial, federal administrations.	Report in National Gazette and other official media of application decrees and circulars.	The risk is that legislation is not implemented. This risk is considered low due to the strong political commitment in the Russian Federation.
Improved regional co-ordination of the management of the Arctic; and Russia meeting its obligations under the AEPS and its commitments to objectives of the GPA.	Contributions by the Russian Federation to the Arctic Environment Protection Strategy of the Arctic Council. Acknowledgement by the Arctic Council of the SAP as a component of the Regional Programme of Action for the Arctic.	Reports of Arctic Council meetings.	The risk is that future Arctic Council policy directions may differ from current thinking. This is unlikely because of the consistency of past track record among Arctic states. While there is a risk due to changing priorities in the Arctic Council and the GPA, this is unlikely to undermine the acceptance of a well-considered and comprehensive SAP.
Outcomes			
Finalisation and endorsement of the SAP for the Russian Arctic.	Review* and publication* of the SAP for the Arctic.	Steering Committee meeting report. Official notification from the relevant Ministries and Agencies.	While delays may occur with ministerial review, endorsement is likely due to inter-departmental involvement and commitment
Improved legislation, administrative procedures and institutional capacity for the environmental protection of the Arctic environment.	Adoption of agreed proposals for revised legislation and new administrative arrangements, including assignments of responsibility and capacity requirements, by the relevant federal Ministries the Government of the Russian Federation and provincial governments.	Publication in National Gazette and other official media.	The risk is of lack of agreement among departments and provincial authorities. The inter-ministry committees that include representatives of provincial governments will play a key role in reducing this risk
Conditions for further interventions and investments to remediate or prevent the degradation of the Arctic Environment are realised.	Investments are prepared based on the preinvestment studies. Demonstration projects are ready to be replicated elsewhere in Russia.	Project documents and business plans.	The risk is that financing is not readily available. This is mediated by the interest showed by circumpolar countries through the Arctic Council in preserving the quality of the Arctic environment, the involvement of the private sector in the project

PROJECT PLANNING MATRIX			
SUMMARY	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions and Risks
			since the PDF-B phase and the commitment shown by the Russian Government though its cash contribution to the project.
Results			
Identification of the highest priority damage and sources of damage to the environment of the Russian Arctic and acceptance by the Russian Government of the priority list of interventions proposed for investment by Russian sources and/or other countries.	Review* and publication* of the analysis including specification of priorities for interventions in the Russian Arctic.	Official media and Steering Committee meeting reports	The risk is of lack of agreement among federal departments and provincial governments. The interagency working group will play a key role in reducing this risk.
10 pre-investment studies are submitted to potential financiers, including bilaterals and the private sector, and/or to a Partnership Conference and round tables.	Pre-investment studies are submitted to and discussed at the Partnership Conference and round tables.	Report of the Partnership Conference.	The assumption is that the pre-investment studies will be completed to the highest international standards. Consulting specialists in pre-investment studies in Europe ensure this.
Results of 3 demonstration projects, including specifications for replicability elsewhere disseminated widely within Russia.	Number of reports printed and distributed. Number of agencies, provincial administration, community leaders etc that have been sent the reports.	Progress report to UNEP/GEF from the Project Office and Executing Agency.	Every effort will be made to ensure beneficial replicability in Russia and/or other areas of the Arctic taking full account of any other potential barriers to their replication.
Revised national water-quality objectives and effluent and emission standards fully consistent with relevant international guidelines and agreements.	Adoption of revised environmental quality and standards, effluents and emission standards by the Government of the Russian Federation and other relevant administrations.	National Gazette and other official media.	Risk of lack of agreement among federal departments and provincial governments. Mitigated by having all relevant departments and ministries involved in the development of legislation, administrative procedures and consistent quality standards.
Improved compliance assessment procedures.	Adoption of new compliance assessment procedures fully supported by technical capability by the Government of the Russian Federation and other stakeholders.	National Gazette and other official media.	Time will have to be allowed for the introduction of new compliance assessment procedures and techniques. Appropriate time allowance has been made in the work plan.
Demonstration that increased involvement of Indigenous Peoples in co-management can increase the level of protection the Arctic Environment whilst increasing their quality of life.	Acceptance by the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples Of the North (RAIPON) of the plans for and the analysis of replicability of the demonstration project.	Publication of the results of the indigenous people management of the environment demonstration project.	Limited buy-in by communities of indigenous people. This is mitigated by the participation of representatives of RAIPON in the Project Steering Committee and relevant components of the GEF Project.
Components/Activities			
Establishment of National SAP Working Group and preparation of a comprehensive SAP for the Russian Arctic.	Review of draft SAP by major stakeholders; independent Russian reviewers; international reviewers, and submission to the Project Steering Committee.	Quarterly expenditures report and Half-year progress report to UNEP/GEF from the Project Office after coordination with Executing Agency and Steering Committee meeting report.	Ministries and other agencies might be slow to respond and reviews might not be completed to the planned schedule. Based on experience gained during the PDF-B phase, the timetable has been adjusted to make adequate time allowance.
Preparation of revised legislation, administrative procedures including compliance assessment, and guidelines and standards.	Review* and publication* of draft proposals for the revision of legislation, administrative procedures and environmental guidelines and standards by stakeholders and independent reviewers and submission to the Project Steering Committee.	As above	As above
Conduct of 10 pre-investment studies.	Review* and publication* of investment proposals	As above	As above

PROJECT PLANNING MATRIX			
SUMMARY	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions and Risks
	and submission to the Project Steering Committee according to workplan and timetable.		
Development of criteria for selection of pre-investment studies.	Review* and publication* of criteria for pre-investment studies and submission to the Project Steering Committee according to workplan and timetable.	As above	As above
Conduct of indigenous peoples environmental and resource management demonstration. (Establishment of task team; documentation of plans; report of the demonstration including replicability assessment.)	Submission of the design and endorsement of management plans for selected sites to the Executing Agency and subsequent endorsement by the Project Steering Committee according to workplan and timetable.	As above	The only risk foreseen is a lack of agreement among federal departments and provincial authorities on the choice of demonstration sites. Mitigated by the existence of interagency working group that includes representatives of provincial governments.
Conduct of algal cleanup demonstration. (Establishment of task team; documentation of plans; report of the demonstration including replicability assessment.)	As above	As above	As above
Conduct of 2 military base transfer demonstration. (Establishment of task team; documentation of plans; report of the demonstration including replicability assessment.)	As above	As above	As above

* The terms “*review*” and “*publication*” in this matrix refer to project documents distributed to major stakeholders and submitted for endorsement by the Project Steering Committee.

UNEP/GEF Project - Russian Federation: Support to the National Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment

2nd Meeting of Supervisory Council

April 18, 2006

Conference call between SC members

SC 2/6 (rev # 7)

Procedure of Disbursement of Donor Funds from the Trust Funds and Relevant Reporting

Prepared by: Project Office on a basis of document prepared by working group created by donors at the Steering Committee with incorporated comments of the Executive Agency, results of the conference-call between donors and further comments of the Executive Agency

Required actions: approved by Russia, USA, Iceland and agreed with ACOPS and NEFCO

Procedure of Disbursement of Donor Funds from the Trust Funds and Relevant Reporting

1. Introduction

1.1. The UNEP/GEF Project “Russian Federation – Support to the National Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment” (hereinafter UNEP/GEF Project) is implemented in accordance with the Project Document signed on July 18, 2005. The Executing Agency for the UNEP/GEF Project is the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of the Russian Federation and the Implementing Agency is the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP). The Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea (ACOPS) and Nordic Environment Finance Corporation (NEFCO) are designated as Partner Agencies with the functions set out in Annex X to the Project Document.

1.2. Pursuant to the Project Document, the Project Office established in Moscow manages activities in the integrated work plan approved by the Project Steering Committee. As appropriate, the Partner Agencies will take part in these activities upon confirmation from the Executing Agency and Project Manager.

1.3. The UNEP/GEF Project has three sources of funding:

- GEF funds;
- funds of the Russian Federation (in cash and in kind);
- funds from other co-financing countries and organisations (donors).

The procedure of disbursement of the GEF and Russian Federation funds and relevant reporting has been defined by the Project Document. Donor funds for the purposes of the UNEP/GEF Project implementation, if and when the donors wish, may be sent to the Currency Account of the Project Office (See STC 1/7) or channelled through the Trust Funds established by the Partner Agencies.

1.4. This document determines the disbursement and relevant reporting procedure for donor funds provided to Partner Agencies explicitly for the purpose of the UNEP/GEF project implementation through Trust Funds.

2. Procedure of Disbursement of Donor Funds and Relevant Reporting

2.1. Notification:

The Donor will send a letter to the Implementing and Executing Agencies, Project Office and relevant Partner Agency with the following information:

- donor's consent to participate in co-financing of the implementation of the entire UNEP/GEF Project or its individual components in accordance with the integrated workplan approved by the Steering Committee and on the basis of the amount of funds allocated by the donor;

- the Partner Agency with which the donor chooses to work;

2.2. *Agreement Between Donor and Partner Agency:*

The Donor and the Partner Agency will sign an agreement, whose activities will be in accordance with the integrated workplan, and which will be shared with the Implementing/Executing Agencies and Project Office.

The Partner Agency will be legally responsible for disbursement of the donors' funds received in the Trust Fund(s) established by the Partner Agency.

2.3. *Principles:*

Partner Agencies may establish Trust Funds for the UNEP/GEF Project after the official notification letter is received from the donor.

Work that will be financed with donor funds should be in conformity with the integrated workplan approved by the Steering Committee.

Donors will transfer funds to the Trust Fund(s) established by the Partner Agency based on the terms of their legal agreement.

Partner Agencies will transfer donors' funds to the Project Currency Account or disburse them directly, based on the choice of the donor.

2.4. If Partner Agencies will transfer donors' funds to the Project Currency Account:

- Donor will notify Executing Agency, Implementing Agency, Partner Agency and Project Office in a timely manner on donor's consent to channel its funds to the Currency Account of the Project for implementation of activities described in the Integrated Working Plan.
- Project Office after obtaining of approval of the Executing Agency will send to the Partner Agency a written request of disbursement of the above-indicated part of donor funds from the Trust Fund
- Partner Agency will transfer the agreed amount of funds to the Currency Account of the Project.
- Project Office after approval by the Executing Agency will send on a quarterly basis the reports to the Partner Agency on disbursement of donor funds channeled to the Currency Account of the Project from the Trust Fund.

- Executing Agency takes a legal responsibility for target disbursement of the donor funds received in the Currency Account of the Project Office.

2.5. If Partner Agencies disburse donors' funds directly:

- The Partner Agency on a basis of donor request will send to the Project Manager and the Executive Agency for agreeing the drafts of TORs for activities described in the Integrated Working Plan for donors funds and schedule of their implementation
- Partner Agency will sign the contracts for implementation of specified above activities after agreeing the TORs and the work schedules with the Project Manager and the Executing Agency
- Partner Agency will send to the Project Manager for comments the draft reports on implemented works in the framework of contracts concluded by the Partner Agency. Project Manager will evaluate these reports using competence of TT and WGs leaders, if necessary. Partner Agency should take into account comments received when preparing the final versions of the report, Project Manager informs Executing and Implementing Agencies in a case of difference in opinion on quality of performed works and contentious issues are subject for consideration at the next meeting of the Project Supervisory Council³.

- The Partner Agency will be legally responsible for disbursement of the donors' funds accumulated in the Trust Fund(s) established by the Partner Agency and disbursed directly by the Partner Agency

2.6. The Partner Agency will, in a timely manner, inform the Executing Agency, Implementing Agency and Project Office of the total amount of donor funds accumulated in respective Trust Fund(s) to be accounted for in drafting the integrated workplan and budget.

2.7. The Partner Agencies will quarterly submit reports on disbursement of donors' funds within co-financing of the UNEP/GEF Project to donors and in copy to the Executing and Implementing Agencies and Project Office.

2.8. For preparing budget applications and reports on expenditure of donors' funds, formats provided for by the Project Document are used, if not otherwise proposed by the donors.

³ According to item 53 of the Project Document "The Project Manager at the Project Office shall be responsible for ensuring that all Project activities are carried out in compliance with the Project design and the instructions of the Steering Committee, and Executing Agency".