

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### **Mid-term Review of the UNEP/GEF Project: “Russian Federation: Support of the National Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment”**

#### **Part I - Summary of Project Background and Overview**

The Arctic Ocean and its shelf seas represent an area of global significance in terms of their influence on global oceanic and atmospheric circulation. Their unique biological species also constitute an essential element of global biological diversity. A further important feature of the Arctic is its indigenous inhabitants. Indigenous peoples have been living as part of the Arctic ecosystem for millennia and, in most areas, continue to do so. Despite its vast area, small human population, and limited economic development, the Arctic is affected by several aspects of human activities. The main economic development in the region include ocean fisheries, agriculture, petroleum exploration and production, mining and metallurgic industry, and military activities. Physical disturbances due to economic development activities have had negative impacts on the ecosystems and contributed to the deterioration of the Arctic environment. Pollution sources outside the Arctic region increase the threat to the Arctic from long-range transboundary pollutants transported through air and water, accumulating to hazardous levels in the Arctic food chain. As consumers of local resources, indigenous peoples and animal populations of the Arctic are frequently the most exposed recipients of contaminants from local and distant sources.

The Project on ‘Russian Federation: Support of the National Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment’ aims to overcome existing environmental problems in the Russian Arctic, as well as to reduce possible risks of their appearance, taking into account the influence of such threats and potential remedies on both regional and global levels. The system boundaries for interventions within the current Project are marine areas of the northern region of the Russian Federation, covering the Arctic basin (which stretches from the Bering Strait across the North Pole to Spitsbergen and Greenland) and its adjacent seas (i.e., the Barents Sea, the Greenland Sea, Baffin Bay, and some parts of the Bering Sea).

The current Project uses an incremental cost approach to support the Government of the Russian Federation in adopting a comprehensive approach towards environmental protection of the Arctic and its indigenous peoples. The goal of the Project is to create a system to facilitate the investments that benefit the international Arctic environment, particularly the Arctic Ocean Basin and its shelf seas. It also aims at contributing to implementation of the two principal international agreements, the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS) and the UNEP Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (UNEP/GPA), through the Regional Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (RPA) and the Arctic Council Plan of Action to Eliminate Pollution of the Arctic (ACAP).

The main objectives, activities, and outputs of the Project include:

- (1) to prepare and adopt a Strategic Action Programme (SAP) that creates the enabling conditions and identifies the necessary actions required to improve the environmental situation in the Arctic region of the Russian Federation, taking full account of the existing state and projected scope of contamination in the Russian Arctic, interests of the inhabitants including indigenous peoples, and the necessity to meet international obligations of the Russian Federation;
- (2) to select and complete a set of (10) Pre-investment Studies (PINs), addressing serious environmental threats posed to the Russian Arctic environment from previous and current

- (3) to develop and implement an Environmental Protection System (EPS) for the Russian Arctic through the process of analyzing and identifying gap-filling measures for improving levels of institutional, technical, administrative and legal efficiency designed to ensure SAP implementation; and,
- (4) to implement a set of pilot and demonstration projects for restoration and prevention of environmental damage caused by pollution in the Russian Arctic region, initially focusing on indigenous environmental co-management (COMAN), marine water clean-up by using brown algae (CLEANUP), and environmental remediation in the areas of decommissioned military bases (BASES).

Through donor and/or partner consultation processes, additional pilot/demonstration projects have been prepared and implemented (or will be implemented) as follows:

- Cleaning of hazardous substances from the bottom sediments of the Kola Fjord (KOLABAY);
- Designing bioremediation technology for oil-contaminated soil (BIOREMEDIATION);
- Removing of sunken wood and ship wrecks from sea bottom in the Tiksi Bay (PILOT TIKSI and TIKSI II);
- Disposal of 200-ton outdated and dangerous pesticides (PESTICIDES);
- Chemical and hazardous substance clean-up of the decommissioned military bases on Franz Joseph Land (FJL) Archipelago (DEMO-BASES II);
- Removal and recycle of the hunting ship ‘Teriberka’ (TERIBERKA);
- Environmental clean-up of the decommissioned military bases in Arkhangelsk region (BASES II – Arkhangelsk);
- Mitigation of risks associated with transportation of petroleum products for specially protected areas in Barents and White seas (TRANSPORTATION); and,
- Disposal of outdated RITEGs on the Arctic coasts of Republic of Sakha (Yakutiya) and Chukchi Autonomous Okrug (DEMO-RITEG and PILOT-RITEG-Vrangel/Kondratiev).

### **Relevance to GEF Programmes**

The current project is in conformity with the GEF Operational Programme (OP) No. 10 – Contaminant-based, which states that ‘the contaminant-based operational program is intended to include an array of projects that address certain high priority contaminants in the areas of land-based activities which degrade marine waters, global toxic pollutants, and ship related contaminants.’ In the contaminant-based operational program, the GEF works with countries to demonstrate ways of overcoming barriers to the adoption of practices that limit contamination of international water systems. Projects under this operational program can also be aimed at deriving and disseminating lessons learned from, and among, international waters projects.

### **Executing Arrangements**

The Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation (Minekonomrazvitiya) is responsible for overall project execution as the Executing Agency (EA). The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) is the Implementing Agency (IA) for the Project, managing

and overseeing GEF-funded activities. To ensure efficient implementation of the Project, in coordination with the IA, the EA has entrusted an existing independent non-profit organization (i.e., the Executive Directorate of the Russian National Pollution Abatement Facility –NPAF ED) to sign the agency agreement on the project and host the Project Office (PO) in Moscow. The PO comprises a Project Manager, a Deputy Project Manager, a Financial Management Officer, and a Secretary. A UNEP/GEF project unit, comprising a Project Management Officer and a Finance Assistant, is established in Moscow to oversee the technical activities and fund/financial management of the Project Office, working closely with the IW Task manager (in Nairobi/Bangkok), the Fund Management Office (in Nairobi), and the UNEP Moscow representative.

### **Partner Agencies**

At the starting of the project implementation, the Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea (ACOPS, based in London) and the Nordic Environment Finance Corporation (NEFCO, based in Helsinki) were designated as the Partner Agencies. At present, the Project's Partner Agencies include NEFCO and the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and Far East (RAIPON, based in Moscow). NEFCO funds are regulated by special procedure adopted by the Steering Committee.

### **Project Steering Committee**

In order to maintain the integrity of the project, a Project Steering Committee (PStC) was established as the Project supreme governing body. The PStC functions as a forum to discuss and approve annual work plans and budgets for the Project, oversee the progress of the implementation of the agreed work plans and budgets, and adopt corrective actions relating to the further implementation of the Project. The PStC's membership is divided into three categories according to participation: full member, permanent member, and observer. Designated representatives from the following agencies/organization enjoy the full membership status: the Executing Agency (i.e., the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation), the Implementing Agency (i.e., UNEP), USA, Canada, Italy, Iceland, UNEP/GPA Secretariat, and IOC of UNESCO. The Partner Agencies are the permanent members, whereas NEFCO will have a full membership status when speaking as a donor. EBRD and NDEP are invited as observers.

### **Project Supervisory Council**

A Project Supervisory Council (PSC) was established to oversee and manage the project activities according to the project work plan approved by the Project Steering Committee in order to ensure the efficient and cost-effective implementation in a coordinated manner. Its membership comprises the designated representative of the Executing Agency (i.e., the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation), the Implementing Agency (i.e., UNEP), and the Partner Agencies. Project donors may be represented at the PSC meetings through their respective Partner Agencies. The PSC shall convene a meeting once in every three months or as often as required, possibly through teleconference, and report progress to the Project Steering Committee in a timely manner.

### **Coordination of the Russian Stakeholders**

The Project Executing Agency (i.e., the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation) has established an Interagency Working Group for the UNEP/GEF Project – Russian Federation: Support to the National Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (IAWG), comprising representatives from federal and regional authorities, Russian Academic of Sciences, RAIPON, private sector, and non-governmental organizations ('stakeholders'). The IAWG tasks, as agreed upon by the participants during its first meeting held on 21 March 2006, include providing recommendations and guidance on Russian inputs and

stakeholder coordination, as well as on new pilot/demonstration project proposals, in order to ensure effective and successful project implementation. The IAWG meets at least twice yearly or as needed. The PO functions as the IAWG secretariat and reports the results to the PStC.

### **Consultation and Communication**

The Arctic Council Secretariat (in Tromsø, Norway) and the UNEP/GPA Coordination Office (in Nairobi, Kenya) represent the primary international coordination centres for the protection of the Arctic and the marine environment from land-based activities, respectively. It is therefore anticipated that the Secretariat and the Office will provide a means of independent evaluation on progress towards the project goals to the extent that these goals meet their interests. In addition, to avoid any duplication of efforts, the PO and the Executing Agency will keep necessary consultations and communications with other relevant UN agencies, as well as with the GEF Secretariat, on the project implementation. All engaged organizations and nations, including those representing indigenous peoples' interests and those having interests or responsibilities in environmental protection (stakeholders) as well as the secretariats of all environmental conventions and agreements to which the Russian Federation is a contracting party, will be provided with regular updates on project activities and progress.

### **Progress To Date**

Since the Project commenced in July 2005, the Russian Federation: Support of the National Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment Project (Phase I) has made considerable progress – the following meeting minutes and reports provide information on the key highlights to date:

- The 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Interagency Work Group - 21 of May 2009, Moscow
- The 3<sup>rd</sup> Steering Committee Meeting - 25-26 of March 2009, Helsinki, Finland
- The 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of Interagency Work Group - 20 of February 2009, Moscow
- The 5<sup>th</sup> Supervisory Council Meeting - 11 of March 2008, Teleconference chaired by the (then) Mineconomrazvitia of Russian Federation
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of Interagency Work Group - 08 of February 2008, Moscow
- Coordinating Seminar on a Demo project "Environmental Co-Management by Indigenous Peoples, resource extracting companies and local authorities of the Russian North" (DEMO-COMAN) - 25 of January 2008, Moscow
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> Steering Committee Meeting - 25-26 of April 2007, Saint-Petersburg
- The 4<sup>th</sup> Supervisory Council Meeting - 14 of November 2006, Teleconference chaired by UNEP
- The 3<sup>rd</sup> Supervisory Council Meeting - 10 of July 2006, Teleconference chaired by the (then) Mineconomrazvitia of Russian Federation
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> Supervisory Council Meeting - 18 of April 2006, Teleconference chaired by UNEP
- The 1<sup>st</sup> Interagency Work Group Meeting - 21 of March 2006, Moscow
- The 1<sup>st</sup> Supervisory Council Meeting - 16 of December 2005, Teleconference chaired by the (then) Mineconomrazvitia of Russian Federation
- The 1<sup>st</sup> Steering Committee Meeting - 14-16 of November 2005, Moscow
- Project Presentation - 14 of November 2005, Moscow

## Project Budget (Phase I)

(in USD)

Project Activities	Russian Federation*	US-EPA	Iceland	Others	GEF **	Total
Outcome 1. SAP Development	3,964,130	155,390	--	--	474,266	4,593,786
Outcome 2. Pre-Investment Studies	--	190,825	--	--	1,093,100	1,283,925
Outcome 3. Environmental Protection System Improvements	--	--	--	--	408,300	408,300
Outcome 4. Demonstration Projects	--	597,885	100,000	1,000,000-	2,505,031	4,202,916
Project Coordination and Management	199,500	--	--		1,404,303	1,603,803
Sub-total	4,163,630 <sup>1/</sup>	944,100	100,000	1,982,000	5,885,000	13,074,730
PDF-B	171,000	--	--	303,000	306,000	780,000
Total	4,334,630	944,100	100,000	2,285,000	6,191,000	13,854,730

- In cash and in kind
- \*\* Budget, adopted in 2008
- <sup>1/</sup> As of 31 December 2008
- To be filled in by the PO and/or the consultant(s)

## Part II - Terms of Reference for the Review

### 1. Objective and Scope of the Review

The objective of this mid-term review (MTR) is to assess operational aspects, such as project management and implementation of activities and also the level of progress towards the achievement of the objectives. The review will assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. The risks to achievement of project outcomes and objectives will also be appraised (see Annex 5). **The Mid Term Review focuses on identifying the corrective actions needed for the project to achieve maximum impact. Review findings will feed back into project management processes through specific recommendations and 'lessons learned' to date.**

The review focus on the following main questions:

- Is the project on track to achieve its goal of “overcoming the existing environmental problems in the Russian Arctic and reducing possible risks of their appearance, taking into account the influence of such threats and potential remedies on both regional and global levels?”
- Has the project contributed to implementation of the two principal international agreements, the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS) and the UNEP Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (UNEP/GPA)?
- Has the process to “prepare and adopt a Strategic Action Programme (SAP) that creates the enabling conditions and identifies the necessary actions required to improve the environmental situation in the Arctic region of the Russian Federation” been effective and efficient, based on the scientific and technical knowledge and analysis? What actions should the project take to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this process?

- Has the process to “create a system to facilitate the investments that benefit the international Arctic environment, particularly the Arctic Ocean Basin and its shelf seas” been initiated and effective? What actions should the project take to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this process?
- Have the demonstration activities effectively initiated and functioned to restore and prevent environmental damage caused by pollution in the Russian Arctic region and benefit the indigenous peoples?
- Has progress been made in developing a partnership mechanism to objectively measure effects of investment initiatives and management actions?
- Has there been an effective regional/national coordination mechanism established and functioning?

## **2. Methods**

This mid-term review will be conducted as an in-depth project review using a participatory approach whereby the UNEP staff associated with the project, key representatives of the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation, the NPAF ED, the PO, and other relevant stakeholders are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the review. The review consultants will liaise with the UNEP/GEF on any logistic and/or methodological issues to properly conduct the review in as effective way as possible, given the circumstances and resources offered. The draft report will be delivered to UNEP/GEF in English and then circulated to project management staff (translation into Russian may be required). Any comments or responses to the draft report will be translated into English and sent to UNEP/GEF for collation and the consultant(s) will be advised of any necessary revisions.

The findings of the review will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
  - (a) The project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNEP and GEF annual Project Implementation Review report) and relevant correspondence.
  - (b) Notes from the Steering Committee and Supervisory Council meetings.
  - (c) Other project-related material produced by the project staff and partners.
  - (d) Relevant material published on the project web-site.
2. Person-to-person interviews with project management and technical support including Mariya Kalugina.(NPAF ED); Mr. Boris Melnikov (Project Technical Advisor); Dr. Ivan Senchenya, Mr. Sergey Tambiev, Ms. Galina Zaitseva (Project Office); members and staff of selective (3-5) pilot/demonstration projects, selective (5-7) consultants from the SAP and PINs components.
3. Person-to-person interviews and/or telephone interviews with the Steering Committee and Supervisory Council members, as well as executives and/or staff of the key Partner Agencies (i.e, NEFCO and RAIPON). There will be telephone interviews with lead existing and potential donors, including NEFCO, US-EPA, and Icelandic Government representatives.
4. Person-to-person interviews and/or telephone interviews with the former UNEP/DGEF project task manager (Dr. Takehiro Nakamura), former technical and Fund Management Officers (Dr. Lev Neretin and Sergey Kurdjukov), and other relevant staff in UNEP, including the GPA Coordination Office. The evaluator shall also gain broader perspectives from discussions with relevant GEF Secretariat staff.
5. Attend stakeholder meetings (if available/planned) in Moscow and project sites where relevant stakeholders of the project will be invited to review the project progress so far.

6. Visit 2-3 pilot/demonstration sites involved in the project.

### **Key Review principles.**

In attempting to evaluate any outcomes and impacts that the project may have achieved, evaluator(s) should remember that the project's performance should be assessed by considering the difference between the answers to two simple questions "*what happened?*" and "*what would have happened anyway?*". These questions imply that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. In addition it implies that there should be plausible evidence to attribute such outcomes and impacts to the actions of the project.

Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluator, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.

### **3. Project Review Parameters**

#### **A. Attainment of objectives and planned results (progress to date):**

The assessment of project results seeks to determine the extent to which the project objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any other positive or negative consequences. While assessing a project's outcomes the review will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching the project's objectives as stated in the project document and also indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established (or state simplifying assumptions used). Since most GEF projects can be expected to achieve the anticipated outcomes by project closing, assessment of project outcomes should be a priority. Outcomes are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Examples of outcomes could include but are not restricted to stronger institutional capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes of behaviour), and transformed policy frameworks or markets. The review should assess the extent to which the project's major relevant objectives were effectively and efficiently achieved or are expected to be achieved and their relevance.

- *Effectiveness*: Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives have been met, taking into account the "achievement indicators" specified in the project document and logical framework.
- *Relevance*: In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities? The review should also assess the whether outcomes specified in the project document and or logical framework are actually outcomes and not outputs or inputs. Ascertain the likely nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the wider portfolio of the GEF Operational Programme (OP) #10.
- *Efficiency*: Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. Include an assessment of outcomes in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost-effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was then did that affect cost-effectiveness? The review should assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project leveraged additional resources.

Specifically the review shall:

- Evaluate the progress towards the outcomes and objectives in each of the four main component of the project.

## **B. Assessment of the progress towards sustainability of project outcomes:**

Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The review will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. *At mid-term, identification of any likely barriers to sustaining the intended outcomes of the project is especially important.* Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, e.g. stronger institutional capacities or better informed decision-making.

Four aspects of sustainability should be addressed: financial, socio-political, institutional frameworks and governance, and environmental (if applicable). The following questions provide guidance on the assessment of these aspects:

- *Financial resources.* To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project outcomes/benefits once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market trends that support the project's objectives)? Was the project successful in identifying and leveraging co-financing?
- *Socio-political:* To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on socio-political factors? What is the likelihood that the level of stakeholder ownership will allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- *Institutional framework and governance.* To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? While responding to these questions consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how are in place.
- *Environmental.* Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits?

As far as possible, also identify the potential longer-term impacts considering that the review is taking place at mid-term and that longer-term impact is expected to be seen in a few years time.

## **C. Catalytic role**

The mid-term review will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project, both within the project (such as the replication of demonstrations) and outside of the project. What examples are there of replication and catalytic outcomes that suggest increased likelihood of sustainability? Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects, or replication within the projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). If no effects are identified, the review will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. Does the project have a strategy for replication?

## **D. Achievement of outputs and activities:**

- **Delivered outputs:** Assessment of the project's success in producing each of the programmed outputs to date, both in quantity and quality as well as usefulness and timeliness.



- Assess to what extent the project outputs produced so far have the weight of authority / credibility, necessary to influence policy and decision-makers, particularly at the national or regional levels.

#### **E. Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:**

- **M&E design.** Does the project have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives? The Mid-term Review will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for the application of the Project M&E plan (Minimum requirements are specified in Annex 4). The review shall include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and review plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART (see Annex 4) indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results. The time frame and budget for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.
- **M&E plan implementation.** Is an M&E system in place and does it facilitate tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives? Are Annual project reports complete, accurate and with well justified ratings? Has the information provided by the M&E system been used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs?
- **Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.** Have adequate budget provisions been made for M&E made and have such resources made available in a timely fashion during implementation?
- **Long-term Monitoring.** Is long-term monitoring envisaged as an outcome of the project? If so, comment specifically on the relevance of such monitoring systems to sustaining project outcomes and how the monitoring effort will be sustained.

#### **F. Assessment of Processes That Affected Attainment of Project Results.**

The review will consider, but need not be limited to, consideration of the following issues that may have affected project implementation and attainment of project results:

- i. **Preparation and readiness.** Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were capacities of the executing institutions and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to implementation? Was availability of counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), passage of enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?
  - Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed. In particular, assess the role of the various committees established and whether the project document was clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation, whether the project was executed according to the plan and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project to enable the implementation of the project.
  - Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management and the supervision of project activities / project execution arrangements at all levels (1) policy decisions: Steering Committee; (2) day to day project management; (3) GEF guidance: UNEP, UNDP and UNIDO.
- ii. **Country ownership/drivenness.** This is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements. Examples of possible evaluative questions include: Was the project design in-line with the national sectoral and development priorities and plans and

- iii. **Stakeholder involvement.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in project's design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation? For example, did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Did the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design, implementation and evaluation of project activities? Were perspectives of those that would be affected by decisions, those that could affect the outcomes and those that could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and the powerful, the supporters and the opponents, of the processes properly involved? Specifically the review will:
- Assess the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders in each participating country and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism was successful, and identify its strengths and weaknesses.
  - Assess the degree and effectiveness of collaboration/interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project.
  - Assess the degree and effectiveness of any various public awareness activities that were undertaken during the course of implementation of the project.
- iv. **Financial planning.** Did the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds. Specifically, the review should:
- planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables throughout the project's lifetime.
  - Present the major findings from the financial audit if one has been conducted.
  - Did promised co-financing materialize? Identify and verify the sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing (in co-operation with the IA and EA).
  - Assess whether the project has applied appropriate standards of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
  - Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and
  - The review should also include a breakdown of final actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. This information will be prepared by the relevant DGEF Fund Management Officer of the project for scrutiny by the reviewers attached in Annex 2: Co-financing and leveraged resources).
- v. **UNEP Supervision and backstopping.** Did UNEP staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate their seriousness? Did UNEP staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approved modifications in time and restructure the project when needed? Did UNEP provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, frequency of field visits?
- vi. **Co-financing and Project Outcomes & Sustainability.** If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing secured, then what are the reasons for this? Will the extent of materialization of co-financing affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it might affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

- vii. **Delays and Project Outcomes & Sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation the review will summarise the reasons for them. Have delays affected the likelihood that the project's outcomes will be achieved and/or affect the likely sustainability, and if so in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The *ratings will be presented in the form of a table* with each of the categories rated separately and with **brief justifications for the rating** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The rating system to be applied is specified in Annex 1:

#### **4. Review Report Format and Review Procedures**

The report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain; the purpose of the review, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should provide information on when the review took place, the places visited, who was involved and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. The review report shall be written in English, be of no more than 50 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

- i) An **executive summary** (no more than 3 pages) providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the review;
- ii) **Introduction and background** giving a brief overview of the evaluated project, for example, the objective and status of activities;
- iii) **Scope, objective and methods** presenting the review, the review criteria used and questions to be addressed;
- iv) **Project Performance and Impact** providing factual evidence relevant to the questions asked by the reviewers and interpretations of such evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report and should provide a commentary on all review aspects (A – F above).
- v) **Conclusions and rating** of project implementation success giving the reviewers' concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given review criteria and standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to questions about whether the project is considered good or bad, and whether the results are considered positive or negative;
- vi) **Lessons learned** presenting general conclusions from the standpoint of the design and implementation of the project, based on good practices and successes or problems and mistakes. Lessons should have the potential for wider application and use. All lessons should stand alone and should:
  - Specify the context from which they are derived
  - State or imply some prescriptive action;
  - Specify the contexts in which they may be applied (if possible who when and where)
- vii) **Recommendations.** High quality recommendations should be *actionable* proposals that are:
  - Implementable within the timeframe and resources available
  - Commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
  - Specific in terms of who would do what and when
  - Contain results-based language (i.e. a measurable performance target)
  - Include a trade off analysis, when its implementation may require utilizing significant resources that would have otherwise been used for other project purposes.

- viii) **Annexes** include Terms of Reference, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, brief summary of the expertise of the review team, a summary of co-finance information etc. Dissident views or management responses to the review findings may later be appended in an annex.

Examples of UNEP GEF Mid-term Evaluation Reports are available at [www.unep.org/eou](http://www.unep.org/eou).

### **Review of the Draft Mid-Term Review Report**

The draft mid-term review report is submitted to UNEP and further to the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation and NPAF ED. The UNEP staffs are allowed to comment on the draft review report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The comments may also address the feasibility of the recommendations suggested. All comments are collated by UNEP DGEF for onward transmission to the reviewers. UNEP DGEF collates the review comments and provides them to the reviewers for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

### **5. Submission of Final Mid-term Review Report**

The final report shall be submitted in electronic form in MS Word format in English and Russian and should be sent to the following persons:

Ms. Maryam Niamir-Fuller, Director  
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination  
P.O. Box 30552-00100  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: + 254-20-762 4686  
Fax: + 254-20-762 3158/4042  
Email: [maryam.niamir-fuller@unep.org](mailto:maryam.niamir-fuller@unep.org)

Ms. Ampai Harakunarak  
Task Manager, International Waters  
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination/ROAP  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Block B, UN Building  
Rajdamnern Nok Avenue  
Bangkok, Thailand  
Tel: + 66-2-288 1977  
Fax: + 66-2-280 3829  
Email: [harakunarak@un.org](mailto:harakunarak@un.org)

The final Mid-term Review Report will be disseminated to: The GEF Operational Focal Point, The Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation, Relevant Government representatives, UNEP, The project's Executing Agency (NPAF ED) and Technical Staff (PO and Technical Advisors). The full list of intended recipients is attached in Annex 6.

### **6. Resources and schedule of the review**

This mid-term review will be undertaken by a reviewer contracted by the UNEP DGEF. The contract for the reviewer will begin on Monday, 14 September 2009 to Thursday, 31 December 2009 (28 days) spread over 16 weeks. The reviewer shall submit a draft report to UNEP/DGEF Task Manager on Friday, 16 October 2009. Comments to the final draft report will be sent to the consultant by Monday, 2 November 2009 after which the consultant will submit the final report no later than Friday, 13 November 2009.

With the aim of having an objective and independent evaluation, the Mid-term Review Consultant(s) is expected to conduct the project review according to international criteria and professional norms

and standards as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group. With the aim of having an objective and independent evaluation, the Mid-term Review Consultant is expected to conduct the project review according to international criteria and professional norms and standards as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group. The consultant should be familiar with the projects that address certain high priority contaminants in the areas of land-based activities which degrade marine waters, global toxic pollutants, and ship related contaminants; and shall have relevant field-based experience in monitoring and evaluation of projects. S/he should have experience working in the Russian Federation; and have excellent cross-cultural communication skills. Knowledge of UNEP programmes and GEF activities is desirable. Fluency in oral and written English and Russian is a must.

## **7. Schedule Of Payment**

The consultants shall select one of the following two contract options.

### **Lump-Sum Option**

The reviewer will receive an initial payment of 30% of the total amount due upon signature of the contract. A further 30% will be paid upon submission of the draft report. A final payment of 40% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual Special Service Agreement (SSA) of the reviewer and IS **inclusive** of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses.

### **Fee-only Option**

The reviewer receive an initial payment of 40% of the total amount due upon signature of the contract. Final payment of 60% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual SSAs of the reviewer is NOT inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses. Ticket and DSA will be paid separately.

**The consultant's choice of payment option will be specified in the signed contract with UNEP.**

In case, the reviewer does not provide the products in accordance with the TORs, the timeframe agreed, or his products are substandard, the payment to the reviewer could be withheld, until such a time the products are modified to meet UNEP's, standard. In case the reviewer fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP the product prepared by the reviewer may not constitute the final report.

## Annex 1 – Overall Rating Table

Criterion	Reviewers' Summary Comments	Reviewer's Rating
<b>Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating)</b>		
<b>Sub criteria (below)</b>		
Effectiveness		
Relevance		
Efficiency		
<b>Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating)</b>		
<b>Sub criteria (below)</b>		
Financial		
Socio Political		
Institutional framework and governance		
Ecological		
<b>Achievement of outputs and activities</b>		
<b>Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating)</b>		
<b>Sub criteria (below)</b>		
M&E Design		
M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)		
Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities		
<b>Catalytic Role</b>		
<b>Preparation and readiness</b>		
<b>Country ownership / drivenness</b>		
<b>Stakeholders involvement</b>		
<b>Financial planning</b>		
<b>UNEP Supervision and backstopping</b>		
<b>Overall Rating</b>		

### **RATING OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS**

Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Unsatisfactory (U) The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Please note:** Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results **may not be higher** than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

## RATINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability will be understood as the probability of continued long-term outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The Mid-term review will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, i.e. stronger institutional capacities, legal frameworks, socio-economic incentives /or public awareness. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes..

### Rating system for sustainability sub-criteria

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows.

Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an Unlikely rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than Unlikely, regardless of whether higher ratings in other dimensions of sustainability produce a higher average.

## RATINGS OF PROJECT M&E

Monitoring is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, its design, implementation and results. Project evaluation may involve the definition of appropriate standards, the examination of performance against those standards, and an assessment of actual and expected results.

The Project monitoring and evaluation system will be rated on ‘M&E Design’, ‘M&E Plan Implementation’ and ‘Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities’ as follows:

Highly Satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Satisfactory(S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

“M&E plan implementation” will be considered a critical parameter for the overall assessment of the M&E system. The overall rating for the M&E systems will not be higher than the rating on “M&E plan implementation.”

All other ratings will be on the GEF six point scale.

<b>GEF Performance Description</b>	<b>Alternative description on the same scale</b>
HS = Highly Satisfactory	Excellent
S = Satisfactory	Well above average
MS = Moderately Satisfactory	Average
MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory	Below Average
U = Unsatisfactory	Poor
HU = Highly Unsatisfactory	Very poor (Appalling)

**Annex 2. Co-financing and Leveraged Resources**

**Co-financing (basic data to be supplied to the consultant for verification)**

\* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

***Leveraged Resources***

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO’s, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s ultimate objective.

Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other* (mill US\$)		Total (mill US\$)		Total Disbursement (mill US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
- Grants										
- Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate)										
- Credits										
- Equity investments										
- In-kind support										
- Other (*)										
-										
-										
-										
<b>Totals</b>										

**Table showing final actual project expenditure by activity to be supplied by the UNEP Fund management Officer. (insert here)**



## Annex 3 – Quality Control and Assessment

### Review of the Draft Report

Draft reports submitted to UNEP are shared with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The UNEP and senior Executing Agency staff provide comments on the draft review report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. UNEP collates the review comments and provides them to the reviewers for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report. General comments on the draft report with respect to compliance with these TOR are shared with the reviewers.

### Quality Assessment of the Review Report

All UNEP GEF Mid Term Reports are subject to quality assessments by UNEP. These apply GEF Office of Evaluation quality assessment and are used as a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluator.

The quality of the draft review report is assessed and rated against the following criteria:

GEF Report Quality Criteria	UNEP EOU Assessment	Rating
A. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable?		
B. Was the report consistent and the evidence complete and convincing and was the ratings substantiated when used?		
C. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes?		
D. Were the lessons and recommendations supported by the evidence presented?		
E. Did the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?		
F. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of the project M&E system and its use for project management?		
G. Quality of the lessons: Were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
H. Quality of the recommendations: Did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can they be implemented? Did the recommendations specify a goal and an associated performance indicator?		
I. Was the report well written? (clear English language and grammar)		
J. Did the report structure follow EOU guidelines, were all requested Annexes included?		
K. Were all evaluation aspects specified in the TORs adequately addressed?		
L. Was the report delivered in a timely manner		

**GEF Quality of the MTE report = 0.3\*(A + B) + 0.1\*(C+D+E+F)**

**EOU assessment of MTE report = 0.3\*(G + H) + 0.1\*(I+J+K+L)**

**Combined quality Rating = (2\* 'GEF EO' rating + EOU rating)/3**

The Totals are rounded and converted to the scale of HS to HU

### Rating system for quality of mid-term review

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.

## **Annex 4 - GEF Minimum Requirements for M&E**

### **Minimum Requirement 1: Project Design of M&E<sup>1</sup>**

All projects must include a concrete and fully budgeted monitoring and evaluation plan by the time of Work Program entry (full-sized projects) or CEO approval (medium-sized projects). This plan must contain at a minimum:

- SMART (see below) indicators for project implementation, or, if no indicators are identified, an alternative plan for monitoring that will deliver reliable and valid information to management
- SMART indicators for results (outcomes and, if applicable, impacts), and, where appropriate, corporate-level indicators
- A project baseline, with:
  - a description of the problem to address
  - indicator data
  - or, if major baseline indicators are not identified, an alternative plan for addressing this within one year of implementation
- An M&E Plan with identification of reviews and evaluations which will be undertaken, such as mid-term reviews or evaluations of activities
- An organizational setup and budgets for monitoring and evaluation.

### **Minimum Requirement 2: Application of Project M&E**

- Project monitoring and supervision will include implementation of the M&E plan, comprising:
  - Use of SMART indicators for implementation (or provision of a reasonable explanation if not used)
  - Use of SMART indicators for results (or provision of a reasonable explanation if not used)
  - Fully established baseline for the project and data compiled to review progress
  - Evaluations are undertaken as planned
  - Operational organizational setup for M&E and budgets spent as planned.

**SMART INDICATORS** GEF projects and programs should monitor using relevant performance indicators. The monitoring system should be “SMART”:

1. **Specific:** The system captures the essence of the desired result by clearly and directly relating to achieving an objective, and only that objective.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://gefweb.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/MEPTools/meptstandards.html>

2. **Measurable:** The monitoring system and its indicators are unambiguously specified so that all parties agree on what the system covers and there are practical ways to measure the indicators and results.
3. **Achievable and Attributable:** The system identifies what changes are anticipated as a result of the intervention and whether the result(s) are realistic. Attribution requires that changes in the targeted developmental issue can be linked to the intervention.
4. **Relevant and Realistic:** The system establishes levels of performance that are likely to be achieved in a practical manner, and that reflect the expectations of stakeholders.
5. **Time-bound, Timely, Trackable, and Targeted:** The system allows progress to be tracked in a cost-effective manner at desired frequency for a set period, with clear identification of the particular stakeholder group to be impacted by the project or program.

## **Annex 5 – Risk Factor Table**

*Evaluator(s) will use this table to summarize risks identified in the **Project Document** and reflect also **any new risks** identified in the course of the evaluation in regard to project implementation. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk **as relevant**.*

<b>INTERNAL RISK Project management</b>										
<b>Risk Factor</b>	<b>Indicator of Low Risk</b>	<b>Indicator of Medium Risk</b>	<b>Indicator of High Risk</b>	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	<b>NOTES</b>
<b>Management structure</b>	Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood	Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others	Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems							
<b>Governance structure</b>	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/ inputs	Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate	Members lack commitment (seldom meet) and therefore the Committee/ body does not fulfil its function							
<b>Internal communications</b>	Fluid and cordial	Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good	Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment /factions							
<b>Work flow</b>	Project progressing according to work plan	Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall implementation	Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation							
<b>Co-financing</b>	Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time	Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic	A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize							

<b>Budget</b>	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget							
<b>Financial management</b>	Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for	Financial reporting slow or deficient	Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds							
<b>Reporting</b>	Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues	Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues	Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting							
<b>Stakeholder involvement</b>	Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners	Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners	Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders							
<b>External communications</b>	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted	Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstandings concerning objectives and activities evident							
<b>Short term/ long term balance</b>	Project is meeting short term needs and results within a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability	Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term	Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected							

<b>Science and technological issues</b>	Project based on sound science and well established technologies	Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks	Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties							
<b>Political influences</b>	Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven	Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated	Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives							
<b>Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary</b>										

## **Annex 6 - List of Intended Recipients for the Mid-term Review**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Email</b>
Ms. Maryam Niamir-Fuller,	GEF Executive Coordinator and Director, UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination, Nairobi	<a href="mailto:maryam.niamir-fuller@unep.org">maryam.niamir-fuller@unep.org</a>
Ms. Ampai Harakunarak	Task Manager, International Waters, UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination/ROAP, Bangkok	<a href="mailto:harakunarak@un.org">harakunarak@un.org</a>
Ms. Sandeep Bhambra	Fund Management Officer, UNEP/DGEF, Nairobi	<a href="mailto:sandeep.bhambra@unep.org">sandeep.bhambra@unep.org</a>
Ms. Jessica Kitakule-Mukungu	GEF Evaluation Office, UNEP/Evaluation and Oversight Unit, Nairobi	<a href="mailto:Jessica.Kitakule-Mukungy@unep.org">Jessica.Kitakule-Mukungy@unep.org</a>
<b>Government Officials</b>		
Mr. Boris Morgunov	Assistant of the Minister, Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation	<a href="mailto:morgunovba@economy.gov.ru">morgunovba@economy.gov.ru</a>
Mr. Andrey Peshkov	Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation	<a href="mailto:aspeshkov@mnr.gov.ru">aspeshkov@mnr.gov.ru</a>
<b>Steering Committee</b>		
Mr. Magnús Jóhannesson	Secretary General Ministry for the Environment	<a href="mailto:magnus.johannesson@umh.stjr.is">magnus.johannesson@umh.stjr.is</a>
Ms. Eleonora Barnes	Program Manager, Office of Regional and Bilateral Affairs, Office of International Affairs, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	<a href="mailto:barnes.eleonora@epa.gov">barnes.eleonora@epa.gov</a>
Ms. Neilima Senjanlia	Deputy Office Director, Office of Regional and Bilateral Affairs, Office of International Affairs, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	<a href="mailto:senjalia.neilima@epa.gov">senjalia.neilima@epa.gov</a>
Ms. Jane Metcalfe	Senior Advisor, Office of Regional and Bilateral Affairs, Office of International Affairs, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	<a href="mailto:metcalfe.jane@epa.gov">metcalfe.jane@epa.gov</a>
<b>GEF Focal Point(s)</b>		
To be provided	GEF Operational Focal Point in Moscow	
<b>Executing Agency/Partners</b>		
Dr. Mariya Kalugina	NPAF ED, Moscow	<a href="mailto:mkalugina@fcpf.ru">mkalugina@fcpf.ru</a>
Dr. Ivan Senchenya	Project Manager, Project Office, Moscow	<a href="mailto:senchenya@npaf.ru">senchenya@npaf.ru</a>
Mr. Boris Melnikov	Project Advisors, Moscow	<a href="mailto:Melnikov@economy.gov.ru">Melnikov@economy.gov.ru</a>
Mr. Henrik Forsström	Senior Adviser, NAFCO, Helsinki	<a href="mailto:henrik.forsstrom@nefco.fi">henrik.forsstrom@nefco.fi</a>
Mr. Magnus Rystedt	Managing Director of NEFCO	<a href="mailto:magnus.rystedt@nefco.fi">magnus.rystedt@nefco.fi</a>
Mr. Pavel Sulyandziga	First vice-president RAIPON	<a href="mailto:psulandziga@mail.ru">psulandziga@mail.ru</a>