

UNEP/GEF Project:

“Russian Federation: Support of the National Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment”

Mid-Term Review
Evgeny Konygin

Reykjavik, Iceland, 4-5 February 2010

Overall, the project design, implementation and current achievements are satisfactory

1. The design is moderately satisfactory for the following reasons:

- PD was resigned three times and as result of changes introduced there are some gaps in the design.
- PD was prepared for two Phase of the project considering development of the SAP-Arctic at the Phase I and mainly preparatory works for other Components at the Phase I.
- The list of activities presented in the project document does not reflect changes since initial signing the document in 2001.

Overall, the project design, implementation and current achievements are satisfactory

- 2. Utilization of project resources (efficiency) is moderately satisfactory** due to implementation delays, management issues and problems with donor funds transfers.
- 3. The project is relevant in meeting the objectives** of the UNEP, GPA and Arctic council. It responds well to the country needs.
- 4. The project effectiveness is satisfactory.**
- 5. The potential to achieve the long-term project goal and objectives is satisfactory**
- 6. The potential for the long-term sustainability of the project is satisfactory.**

Lessons

- *Sustained political commitment at federal and regional levels*
- *Top-level stakeholders from governmental institutions at federal and regional levels*
- *Fully Test Government Commitment and its Sustainability:*
- *Broader stakeholder support at the high level is required for introduction of environmental policy changes and ensuring their sustainability*
- *Ensure Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs Are Realistic and Focused*
- *Less Complex Implementation Arrangements*
- *Closer cooperation amongst other relevant activities in the Arctic*

Recommendations for Remaining Implementation Period of the Project

1. Considering the large amount of information generated by the Project so far, it is recommended to synthesize this knowledge and to give public access to this body of knowledge.
2. Publish, disseminate and make accessible the information produced so far.
3. Emphasize/support web site development and strategize this development within the context of the Arctic Council Working Groups similar activities. The website should become a forum on Arctic environmental issues.
4. Establish closer co-operation with existing initiatives under umbrella of the Arctic Council.
5. Develop as soon as possible a project exit strategy, which should be endorsed by all project partners. This exit strategy – which could be the development of a design documentation (proposal) for the second phase of the project or for the new project - will set the critical targets for each of the implementing partners to ensure a smooth ending of this project.

Recommendations for Remaining Implementation Period of the Project

6. Conduct a thorough review of actual total expenditures at end of 2009, assess planned expenditures for 2010 and relocate of funds that can appear for new project initiatives.

7. Organize several workshops/seminars/conferences on results of demonstration/pilot projects with the aim of increasing awareness and potential for replicability.

8. To conduct an international workshop/ conference on environmental status of the Russian Arctic on the basis of the Diagnostic analysis of environmental problems of the Russian Arctic.

9. To conduct an international workshop on Franz Josef Land demonstration project in collaboration with Ministry of Defense.

10. Keeping in mind a considerable changes of personnel representing federal and regional authorities in the Project supervisory bodies it is desirable to have an effective succession of these representatives in terms of their in-depth understanding of the project targets and it terms of ownership if the project results.

Recommendations for Remaining Implementation Period of the Project

It is strongly recommended that a new project is formulated and implemented in order to benefit from the momentum created by the achievements of the current project. This would allow to follow-up on existing activities and also introduce a broader scope addressing other management issues and approaches based on integrated environmental management

Recommendations for Phase II of the Project (new Arctic Project).

It is recommended the following main Components for the new Project:

Component 1.

Implementation of the agreed SAP for the Russian Arctic with emphasis on a number of key sectoral interventions at federal and regional levels with testing particularly relevant and highly replicable approaches in a number of selected geographical areas. Such interventions should address important environmental problems in the Russian Arctic, most of them are transboundary in nature. This strategic approach aims to address the problems and to take advantage of the high political momentum to strengthen and sustain the platform for environmentally and socially sustainable development in this globally significant region of the world taking into account interests of the Russian Federation and those of the neighboring Arctic countries;

Recommendations for Phase II of the Project (new Arctic Project).

It is recommended the following main Components for the new Project:

Component 2.

Build a collaborative model with the public (focusing on the indigenous communities and the private sector) **and among government entities**, particularly at the Arctic regional level, review and enhancement of relevant legislation and institutional frameworks. Interventions under this component will include development of regulatory acts for the establishment of special regimes for the use of natural resources and environmental protection at the federal, regional and municipal levels. Outcomes of this Component will significantly intensify participation of the Russian Federation in addressing the above five environmental problems through the Arctic Council and Barents/Euroarctic region, as well as through bilateral cooperation programs with the Arctic states. As an outcome, this Component will establish a new institutional coordinating mechanism of environmental governance for the Russian Arctic involving representation of multiple stakeholders.

Recommendations for Phase II of the Project (new Arctic Project).

It is recommended the following main Components for the new Project:

Component 3.

Increase and align climate change incentives for best practices in the Arctic Region. This component will integrate climate impact assessments with pilot climate change adaptation projects and capacity building activities. Implementation of this Component will translate scientific knowledge on current and future climate impacts in the Arctic into policy development and implementation, increase understanding and identify mechanisms (incl. financial such as risk insurance) to address issues of climate resilience promote building federal, regional and local capacity for environmental management under multiple climate risks;

Recommendations for Phase II of the Project (new Arctic Project).

It is recommended the following main Components for the new Project:

Component 4.

Introduction and/or promotion of appropriate technology and practice. The emphasis within this Component should be given to implementation of best practices to reduce short-lived pollutants such as black carbon (BC) particles that explain a significant fraction of the observed Arctic warming. BC is the second to CO₂ largest contributor to global warming. This Component will have a transformative and catalytic impact on the promotion of low-carbon development in the Russian Arctic without compromising its fragile environment. Also pilot clean-up initiatives testing new methods and approaches in the Arctic hot-spots should be of priority within this Component.

Component 5.

Agreements on Arctic LMEs accompany programmatic approach contributing to prevention of further depletion/degradation.

Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

Quarterly Financial Reports are submitted to UNEP DGEF Nairobi in a timely manner during the whole project period. Project Advisor to the EA has been conducting a total control of all Project activities by means of regular revision of project financial and operational documents. Project audit by independent audit company is fulfilled on the permanent basis annually.

Detailed reports for all meetings, demo and pilot projects implementation with all associated documentation distributed among all interested parties and uploaded on the official Project website: <http://npa-arctic.ru>. Visual materials (photo and video) collected during demo and pilot projects implementation are also available on the Project website.

Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

The PO scrutinised all technical reports prepared by the project consultants and LCOs. Quality of the reports was usually acceptable in general. All documentations issued by PO were also under thorough quality control provided by both ExA and IA. All draft versions of the SAP and EPS documents were also closely reviewed by the ExA representatives.

The Project Executing Agency has established an Interagency Working Group for the Project which meets at least twice yearly or as needed. The PO functions as the IAWG secretariat and reports the results to the PStC.

Project Finance and Mobilization of Co-financing

- Project budget appears to be adequate considering the focus on SAP development, pre-investment studies and demonstration projects and the co-financing contributed by government of the Russian Federation (for SAP) and the regions and private companies in the demonstration projects.
- The level of total disbursement of GEF funds (delivery) was 62 percent as of December 2009
- Total actual level of co-financing by government has exceeded that planned. However data for contributions by the private sector have also been substantial.



The utilization of project resources (efficiency) is moderately satisfactory due to implementation delays, management issues and problems with donor funds transfers.