UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 11
(1 July 2010 to 30 June 2011)

1. PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Title:	Russian Federation – Support to the National Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment, Tranche 1

Executing Agency:	Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation (MED)

Project partners:	NEFCO

Geographical Scope:	Country: Russian Federation

Participating Countries:	Russian Federation

GEF project ID:	1164	**IMIS number*[1]:**	GFL / 2732-03-4694
Focal Area(s):	IW	**GEF OP #:**	10
GEF Strategic Priority/Objective:	IW-3/SP-3	**GEF approval date*:**	31/07/2003
UNEP approval date:	18/07/2005	**First Disbursement*:**	31/08/2005
Actual start date[2]:	01/09/2005	**Planned duration:**	60 months
Intended completion date*:	30/06/2007 (Phase I)	**Actual or Expected completion date:**	May 31, 2011
Project Type:	Full size	**GEF Allocation*:**	US$ 5,885,000
PDF GEF cost*:	US$ 306,000	**PDF co-financing*:**	US$ 474,000
Expected MSP/FSP Co-financing*:	US$ 5,800,000	**Total Cost*:**	US$ 12,465,000
Mid-term review/eval. (planned date):	2009.09	**Terminal Evaluation (actual date):**	
Mid-term review/eval. (actual date):	2010.03	**No. of revisions*:**	
Date of last Steering Committee meeting:	24-25/03/2011	**Date of last Revision*:**	November 2010
Disbursement as of 30 June 2010*:	US$ 5,103,394	**Date of financial closure*:**	
Date of Completion[3]*:	31.05.2011	**Actual expenditures reported as of 30 June 2011[4]:**	US$5,789,179
Total co-financing realized as of 30 June 2011[5]:	US$9,516,745	**Actual expenditures entered in IMIS as of 30 June 2011*:**	US$ 5,547,314
Leveraged financing:[6]			

[1] Fields with an * sign (in yellow) should be filled by the Fund Management Officer
[2] Only if different from first disbursement date, e.g., in cases were a long time elapsed between first disbursement and recruitment of project manager.
[3] If there was a "Completion Revision" please use the date of the revision.
[4] Information to be provided by Executing Agency/Project Manager
[5] Projects which completed mid-term reviews/evaluations or terminal evaluations should attach the completed co-financing table as per GEF format.

Project summary[7]	Major outcomes will include a nationally approved Strategic Action Programme to address damage and threats to the arctic environment from land-based activities in the Russian Federation; direct and related improvements to environmental protection (legislative, regulatory and institutional and technical capacity) within the Russian Federation; the completion of ten pre-investment studies to determine the highest priority and tractable interventions to correct or prevent transboundary impacts of land-based activities; and three categories of demonstration projects dealing respectively with marine environmental clean up, the transfer of two decommissioned military bases to civilian control, and involving indigenous peoples in environmental and resource management. The results are intended to benefit the international arctic environment, particularly the Arctic Ocean basin and its shelf seas, and contribute to two principal international agreements: Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS); and the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities (GPA) as implemented in the Arctic Region 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).

Project status FY10[8]	During reported period SAP component was successfully completed last year. At the moment PO is busy with updating of all individual sections of Diagnostic analysis of environmental problems of the Russian Arctic (DA) and submitted them to Executing Agency (EA). During reported period the Project Office (PO) focused on implementation of 3 other Project components: The Pre-investment studies (PINS) Component has been virtually completed in all three selected regions (western, central and eastern) of the Russian Arctic and resulted in a set of 16 environmental investment projects (EIP) for these sectors of the Russian Arctic. Proposed EIP are strongly supported by regional and local authorities. Some projects are still waiting to be finally acknowledged by the Executing Agency (EA). The EPS Component (Environmental Protection System Improvements) has been mainly completed. All prepared under this component documents had been submitted to EA. Proposals on improvement of environmental legislation in Russia with the emphasis on the Arctic environment were prepared for the Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology and for the Ministry of regional Development of Russia. In the framework of this sub- component prepared: 1) – Several versions of Draft Report to the Government of the Russian Federation on Improvement of Environmental Protection System in the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation; 2) – Two versions of Analytical Materials to the Report to the Government of the Russian Federation on Improvement of Environmental Protection System in the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation; 3-4) - two different versions of Concept of Federal Law on Special Regimes of Natural Resources Use and Environment Protection the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation. All three mentioned in the Project Document main demo projects have been successfully finalised. Two additional pilot projects, which were approved by the 2nd Steering

[6] See above note on co-financing and Glossary (Annex 1)
[7] As in project document
[8] Please include additional lines to keep prior year implementation status (if any)

	Committee meeting, namely: BIOREMEDIATION (Designing of bioremediation technology for oil sludge and oil contaminated soil in Arctic conditions) and TIKSI (Removing of sunken wood and ship frames from the sea bottom in Tiksi Bay) have also been successfully finalised. The demo project ONEGA-BASE (Remediation of Environment in Area of Decommissioned Military Base near Pokrovskoe Settlement, Arkhangelsk Region) approved by the 3d Steering Committee meeting in Helsinki started last year and to date stage 1 of the demo project has been completed. Pilot projects FJL BASES-2 (Environmental remediation of Decommissioned Military Bases on Franz-Josef Land Archipelago), TIKSI-2 and RITEG KONDRATYEV (Localisation and removal from a thermokarst crater of two radioisotope thermoelectric generators (RITEGs) of GONG type at the Kondratiev navigation beacon site in Ust-Yanski Ulus of Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)) were also started and to date completed their first stages. Contracts for another 4 pilot projects approved by the 4th Steering Committee meeting in Reykjavik are at different stages of their preparation: PCB (Design of production engineered and logistic solutions with the purpose of introduction of a system for collection and elimination (utilisation) of PCB wastes and PCB containing equipment in the Russian Arctic region) –contract with bid winner was prepared and agreed; NEW SIBERIAN ISLANDS (Inventory of pollution sources at the area of decommissioned military sites on New Siberian Islands) - draft contract were prepared and is now under consideration; INDIGENOUS PEOPLE HEALTH (Development of recommendations aimed at improvement of indigenous population health protection system in the Russian Arctic) - a contract was prepared, agreed and signed/ Now pending to obtain the tax-free status by contractor. OIL SPILLS (Review and introduction of system of reaction to emergency of oil spills and oil products in the Arctic conditions for protection of especially sensitive to petroleum coastal areas (with examples from Barents Sea and White Sea))– supported also by NEFCO. Contract is under preparation.

Project status FY11[9]	SAP component was successfully completed, approved by the Russian governmental body – Maritime Board, and disseminated among Russian Arctic regions and all interested parties. Diagnostic analysis of environmental problems of the Russian Arctic (DA) was completed and full text of the final report (in Russian) uploaded in the Project website: http://npa-arctic.ru/rus/da_content_ru.html. Basing on this report a book "Diagnostic analysis of the environmental status of the Russian Arctic (Advanced Summary)" were prepared and published in both Russian and English by the "Scientific World" publishing house (Moscow, 2011. – 172 p.) An electronic versions of the book was also uploaded in the Project website: http://npa-arctic.ru/publications/da_adv_sum/da_summary_en.pdf. Hard copies of the book were disseminated among interested parties nationally and internationally. All 3 other Project components were also successfully finalised: The Pre-investment studies (PINS) Component was completed in all three selected regions (western, central and eastern) of the Russian Arctic and resulted in a set of 16 environmental investment projects

[9] Progress made during current reporting period (one paragraph stating key changes since previous reporting period)

	(EIP) for these sectors of the Russian Arctic. This EIPs were selected out of several tens of investment project proposals and were strongly supported by regional and local authorities who highly appreciated quality of the work done by Project consultants. Complete reports on each EIP can be seen also on the Project website in Russian and English: http://npa-arctic.ru/html/pins.html. The Environmental Protection System Improvements (EPS) Component was also successfully completed. Proposals on improvement of environmental legislation in Russia with the emphasis on the Arctic environment were passed the Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology and for the Ministry of regional Development of Russia. In the framework of this sub- component prepared: 1) – Several versions of Draft Report to the Government of the Russian Federation on Improvement of Environmental Protection System in the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation; 2) – Two versions of Analytical Materials to the Report to the Government of the Russian Federation on Improvement of Environmental Protection System in the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation; 3-4) - two different versions of Concept of Federal Law on Special Regimes of Natural Resources Use and Environment Protection the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation. A final proposal on the draft federal law "On Special Regimes in the Natural Resources Management and Environmental Protection in the Russian Arctic" was submitted by the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation to the Council of Federation of the Russian Parliament and included in its Report on the Arctic to be submitted to leaders of the Russian Federation (can be seen here: http://npa-arctic.ru/html/eps.html). Demonstration and Pilot Projects (DEMOS) Component. All three mentioned in the Project Document main demo projects have been successfully finalised. Twelve additional demo and pilot projects approved by the Project Steering Committee were developed by the PO and also completed. Final reports on all demo and pilot projects in Russian and English uploaded on the Project website: http://npa-arctic.ru/html/demos_all.html. Based on results of the DEMOS component the publication "Demonstration and Pilot Projects: outputs and outcomes, their assessments and scaling up in the Arctic context" was prepared by the PO and widely spread among all interested parties. An electronic version of the publication can be find also on the website: http://npa-arctic.ru/publications/Pilot%20projects/index.html

Planned contribution to strategic priorities/targets[10]	Major outcomes will include a nationally approved Strategic Action Programme to address damage and threats to the arctic environment from land-based activities in the Russian Federation; direct and related improvements to environmental protection (legislative, regulatory and institutional and technical capacity) within the Russian Federation; the completion of ten pre-investment studies to determine the highest priority and tractable interventions to correct or prevent transboundary impacts of land-based activities; and three categories of demonstration projects dealing respectively with marine environmental clean up, the transfer of two decommissioned military bases to civilian control, and involving indigenous peoples in environmental and resource management. The results are intended to benefit the international arctic

[10] For Full Size Projects this information is found in the front page of the project Executive Summary; for Medium-Sized Projects the information appears in the MSP brief cover page.

	environment, particularly the Arctic Ocean basin and its shelf seas, and contribute to two principal international agreements: Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS); and the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities (GPA) as implemented in the Arctic Region 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).

2. PROJECT OBJECTIVE

State the global environmental objective(s) of the project[11]

The project's global environment objective is to protect the global marine environment in which the Arctic plays a pivotal role. The more specific objective of the Project is to develop and establish a sustainable framework to reduce environmental degradation of the Russian Arctic from land-based activities on a system basis by implementation of the SAP developed at the first stage of the Project in favour of all Arctic States and global community and to comply with obligations of the Russian Federation under international conventions and agreements taking into account decisions and programmes of the Arctic Council. As such, it would create conditions, which will allow for capital investments to flow in the Russian Arctic in order to ensure long term protection of coastal and marine environment of the Arctic and to address main root causes of trans-boundary pollution in the Russian Arctic.

*Please provide a narrative of progress made towards meeting the project objective(s). Describe any **significant** environmental or other changes attributable to project implementation. Also, please discuss any major challenges to meet the **objectives** or specific project **outcomes** (not more than 300 words)*

The main achievements of the Project towards meeting the project objectives include:

- Finalization of the SAP document and its approval by the Maritime Board under the Government of the Russian Federation. In the framework of this component the diagnostic analysis of environmental problems of the Russian Arctic (DA) is prepared and the Advanced Summary of the DA published in Russian and English by the "Scientific World" publishing house.
- Completion PINS in western, central and eastern parts of the Russian Arctic. Sixteen (16) EIP supported by regional and local authorities were developed. A list of 100 hot spots has been prepared and a prioritized short list of hot spots (30 hot spots) for the potential pre-investment studies (PINs) has been prepared and included in SAP-Arctic. A full database of the hot-spots is available on the project website: http://npa-arctic.ru/rus/hs/hs_list_ru.html. The list of the hot spots was included in the Arctic Council Regional Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (2009).. The completed IEP were disseminated among Russian and international potential investors. Some of the EIP were selected by the Russian Ministry for Natural Resources and Ecology as a priority projects, NEFCO confirmed their interest in projects connected with oil pollutions and spills in Barents-sea region. At the moment local authorities of Arkhangelsk region and Komi Republic (Vorkuta city) in cooperation with private businesses launched implementation of two EIP attracting local budget and NEFCO funds.
- Work under EPS component started ahead of schedule in 2008 resulted in several documents, which are important for improvement the Russian Arctic environment : of Draft Report to the Government of the Russian Federation on Improvement of Environmental Protection System in the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation, Analytical Materials to the Report to the Government of the Russian Federation on Improvement of Environmental Protection System in the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation, two conceps of Federal Law on Special Regimes of Natural Resources Use and on Environment Protection the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation. A final proposal on the draft federal law "On Special Regimes in the Natural Resources Management and Environmental Protection in the Russian

[11] Or immediate project objective

- Completion of a set of 15 demo and pilot projects provided firm bases for future developments in the field of the environment cleaning in the Arctic regions. Positive consequences of the demo/pilot projects outcomes and outputs were in playing the role as an impetus for further environment cleaning activities and additional funds allocation in Archangelsk region and in Komi Republic together with new technology and new environmental approaches use. The publication "Demonstration and Pilot Projects: outputs and outcomes, their assessments and scaling up in the Arctic context" based on results of the DEMOS component will help in knowledge and new technologies dissemination what will improved environmental situation in the Russian Arctic. Demo and pilot projects implemented under UNEP/GEF Project played a role of triggering mechanism in ensuring preparation of several new full scaled environmental projects in Arkhangelsk, Murmansk regions and in Republic Sakha (Yakutiya). Projects aimed at decommissioned military bases remediation attracted attention of the Russian Ministry of Defence and Russian Prime Minister, what resulted in extra funds allocation for the abandoned military bases cleaning purpose (Franz-Josef Land archipelago)
- Project achievements towards the new benchmarks approved by 3rd STC meeting as major outcomes for the Project Phase I:
  1. Project Management: Project implementation structures established, including Project Office, Project Steering Committee, Project Supervisory Council and Inter-Agency Working Group - ***achieved*.**
  2. Strategic Action Programme: Strategic Action Programme fully developed and endorsed by relevant stakeholders. Diagnostic analysis document prepared and ready for publication in English and Russian – ***achieved + (Advanced Summary of DA was published)***.
  3. Pre-investment Studies: Hot spots list updated and finalised. Pre-investment studies successfully carried out and interest of financial institutions preliminary confirmed – ***achieved***.
  4. Improving Environment Protection System: Report on gap analysis of the environmental legislation applicable to the Russian Arctic with recommendations on improvements prepared and submitted to the Russian Government ***-.achieved.***
  5. Demo and Pilot Projects: Demonstration activities in accordance with the original Project Document fully implemented. New demonstration and pilot projects approved by the Steering Committee are prepared and implemented –***achieved***.
  6. Project Phase I Evaluation: Project results for all components evaluated by Interagency Working Group ***(achieved)***. Independent evaluation of the project completed confirming satisfactory – ***partly achieved***. *As per agreement reached in 3rd StC meeting in Helsinki the Project mid-term review was completed and submitted to UNEP..*

Please provide a narrative of progress towards the stated GEF Strategic Priorities and Targets if identified in project document [12] (not more than 200 words)

Under the GEF Strategic Priority IW-3/SP-3: Balancing overuse and conflicting uses of water resources in surface and groundwater basins that are transboundary in nature – Monitoring improved water use efficiency in demonstrations; and IW-4: Reducing persistent toxic substances and testing adaptive management of waters with melting ice – Monitoring level of reduction of PTS releases at demonstration sites and Industry codes of conduct, possible private sector initiatives for PTS reduction; the current Project is designed for the Russian Federation to substantiate, consistently with its "World Ocean" Federal Targeted Oriented Programme (FTOP) initiative, the necessity to institute major changes in legislation, procedures and public attitudes to environmental protection and restoration in the Arctic environment; and to demonstrate that technological barriers can be overcome or that measures aimed at removing barriers can be implemented.

During the reported period the Project made following progress towards the stated GEF Strategic Priorities and Targets:

- Completion of the Diagnostic analysis of environmental problems of the Russian Arctic (DA) and publishing the Advanced Summary of the DA.
- Completion the PINS component (16 PINS projects) for selected areas in western, central and

[12] Projects that did not include these in original design are encouraged to the extent possible to retrofit specific targets.

- Completion of the EPS component. The outcome of this component has a great potential for improving Russian legislation system in the field of Arctic environment
- Several new demo and pilot projects were successfully completed. Results of the demo and pilot projects were published and knowledge and new technologies developed under the projects were disseminated among interested parties.

The results have been of benefit to the international arctic environment, particularly the Arctic Ocean basin and its shelf seas, and contributing to the two principal international agreements: Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS); and the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities (GPA) as implemented in the Arctic Region 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).

3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

*Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **UNEP Task Manager**[13] will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:*
(i) Progress towards achieving the project objective(s)- see section 3.1
(ii) Implementation progress – see section 3.2

Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.

3.1 Progress towards achieving the project objective (s)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[14]	Baseline level[15]	Mid-term target[16]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2011	Progress rating [17]
Objective[18] Improved management of the Arctic environment in the Russian Federation and clear appreciation of priorities.	1. Adoption of the SAP for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment from Land-based Activities by relevant executive authorities of the Russian Federation by the end of Phase I.	The National Action Plan (NAP) for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment has been developed and agreed upon.	SAP fully developed and endorsed by relevant stakeholders	Adoption of the SAP for the Russian Arctic as a component of the FTOP 'World Ocean' by the Russian Federation	100 %. The SAP has been adopted by relevant executive authorities - the Maritime Board at the Government of the Russian Federation which was recommended the SAP-Arctic for further promotion by the relevant governmental bodies. The diagnostic analysis of environmental problems of the Russian Arctic (DA) is prepared and the Advanced Summary of the DA published in Russian and English	HS

[13] For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.
[14] Add rows if your project has more that 3 key indicators per objective or outcome.
[15] Depending on selected indicator, quantitative or qualitative baseline levels and targets could be used (see Glossary included as Annex 1).
[16] Many projects did not identify Mid-term targets at the design stage therefore this column should only be filled if relevant.
[17] Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). See Annex 2 which contains GEF definitions.
[18] Add rows if your project has more than 4 objective-level indicators. Same applies for the number of outcome-level indicators.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[14]	Baseline level[15]	Mid-term target[16]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2011	Progress rating [17]
	2. 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.	Selected lead implementing organization and members of each of the three working groups for the development of the EPS		The survey of the regulatory framework at the local, regional and federal levels has been performed and environmentally sustainable development concerns are incorporated in the SAP. Work on EPS is successfully completed	S
	3. Contributions by the Russian Federation to the AEPS of the Arctic Council (AC). 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 recognized by the Arctic Council and GPA.	The Russian representative at the AC provides information on the SAP and the minutes of the AC can indicate the contribution of the SAP to the Arctic Council activities		Progress reports on the Project implementation are delivered to the AC and AC WGs. NPA-Arctic Project is mentioned in all minutes of the AC as well as in Salekhard Declaration of the AC. Presentation on NPA-Arctic project progress was given at 2nd IGR of GPA	HS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[14]	Baseline level[15]	Mid-term target[16]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2011	Progress rating[17]
Outcome 1: Finalisation and endorsement of the Strategic Action Programme for the Russian Arctic	By the end of Phase I, review and publication* of the SAP for the Russian Arctic	There is no SAP formulation at the onset of the project.	Adoption of the SAP by relevant authorities	Strategic Action Programme fully developed and endorsed by relevant stakeholders	100%. The forth draft of SAP was submitted to the third StC meeting in March 2009. The final version of SAP document has been adopted by relevant executive authorities - Maritime Board at the Government of the Russian Federation which was recommended the SAP-Arctic for further promotion by the relevant governmental bodies. The diagnostic analysis of environmental problems of the Russian Arctic (DA) is prepared and the Advanced Summary of the DA published in Russian and English. The work approved by the Project Steering Committee and by the Interagency Working Group.	HS
Outcome 2: Improved legislation, administrative procedures and institutional capacity for the environmental protection of the Arctic environment.	By the end of Phase I, selection of lead organisations and members of the working groups selected and confirmed.	There is an existing legal, regulatory and administrative framework, which does not take into consideration the programmatic requirements to be outlined in the SAP.	Selected lead implementing organization and members of each of the three working groups for the development of the Environmental Protection System		100%. Ahead of schedule. A final proposal on the draft federal law “On Special Regimes in the Natural Resources Management and Environmental Protection in the Russian Arctic” was submitted by the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation to the Council of Federation of the Russian Parliament and included in its Report on the Arctic to be submitted to leaders of the Russian Federation.	HS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[14]	Baseline level[15]	Mid-term target[16]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2011	Progress rating [17]
Outcome 3: Conditions for further interventions and investments to remediate or prevent the degradation of the Arctic Environment are realised.	By the end of Phase I, investments are prepared based on at least 8-10 pre-investment studies and demonstration projects are fully developed and ready for implementation.	The project PDF-B; NEFCO and Russian authorities, respectively issued a list of hot spots. Limited demonstrative activities have been developed or implemented.	Finalisation of the pre-investment studies Demonstration projects are in the process of practical implementation	Conducted pre-investment studies Implemented demonstration projects	100%. PINS component implementation in all three selected regions of the Russian Arctic: western, central and eastern was completed. 16 environmental PINS were prepared and disseminated among interested parties nationally and internationally. . Some of the EIP were selected by the Russian Ministry for Natural Resources and Ecology as a priority projects, NEFCO confirmed their interest in projects connected with oil pollutions and spills in Barents-sea region. Local authorities of Arkhangelsk region and Komi Republic (Vorkuta city) launched implementation of two EIP attracting local budget and NEFCO funds. 100%+. The demo projects component was overfulfilled – three demonstration activities mentioned in the original Project Document and twelve additional demo and pilot projects approved by the Project StC were successfully completed. These activities gave powerful impetus to local and regional authorities for starting their own environmental activities basing on the experience and knowledge gained during demo and pilot projects implementations	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[14]	Baseline level[15]	Mid-term target[16]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2011	Progress rating [17]
Outcome 4: Successful establishment of the project implementation structure, incl. Project Office, Project Steering Committee, Project Supervisory Council (Phase I benchmark)	All project implementation units are functional and deliver expected outcomes on time.	There was no project structure before.	Successful establishment of Project implementation structure, including Project Office, Project Steering Committee, Project Supervisory Council, and Russian IAWG.	Successful establishment of Project implementation structure, including PO, Project StC, Project SC, and Russian IAWG	100%. All project implementation units have been successfully established. Project website with all project documents was renewed and placed in public server for further use.	HS

Overall rating of project progress towards meeting project objective(s) (*To be provided by UNEP GEF Task Manager. Please include columns to reflect all prior year ratings*)

FY2010 rating	FY2011 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods
HS	**HS**	The Project made substantial progress in completing all planned activities and even more – publishing Advanced Summary of DA (in English and Russian), EPS component was successfully completing resulting in the final proposal on the draft federal law "On Special Regimes in the Natural Resources Management and Environmental Protection in the Russian Arctic", which was submitted to the Russian Government for further use. Successful completion of all additional pilot projects and issuing a book in English and Russian on main results, outcomes and outputs of demo and pilot projects.

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating *(To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager in consultation with Project Manager)*

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

This section should be completed if project progress towards meeting **objectives** was rated MS, MU, U or HU during the previous Project Implementation Review (PIR) or by the Mid-term Review/Evaluation (*To be completed by Project Manager*).

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When

3.2 Project implementation progress

Outputs [19]	Expected completion date [20]	Implementation status as of 30 June 2011 (%)	Comments if variance[21]. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating[22]
Output 1: *Preparation and adoption of a comprehensive Strategic Action Programme for the Russian Arctic*	June 2009	**100**	Completed	HS
Activity 1: Development of financial mechanisms of the SAP implementation	September 2007	100	Completed	HS
Activity 2: Preparation of scoping report on regional SAP sub-programs with recommendations for SAP	June 2008	100	Completed. Regional sub-programmes are included in SAP	HS
Activity 3: Strategic environmental assessment on the SAP	April 2007	100	Completed.	HS
Activity 4: Diagnostic analysis of environmental situation in Arctic region	October-November 2008	95	Completed. Advanced Summary of DA were published in Russian and English and disseminated among interested parties nationally and internationally	HS
Activity 5: Causal chain analysis	November 2007	100	Completed	HS
Activity 6: Stakeholder analysis and development of public involvement. Information to stakeholders and communication strategy to public on project results	December 2008	100	Completed by PO; Initially was planned to be executed by ACOPS.	HS
Activity 7: Preparation of the first draft of the SAP	August 2007	100	Completed	HS
Activity 8: Preparation of the second draft of the SAP.	Dec. 2007	100	Completed	HS
Activity 9: Review of the second draft of the SAP by federal and regional executive authorities.	June 2008	100	Completed	HS
Activity 10: Preparation of the third draft of the SAP	Sept. 2008	100	Completed	HS
Activity 10.1: Preparation of the fourth draft of the SAP	Feb. 2009	100	Completed	HS
Activity 10.2: Preparation of the SAP final document	May 2009	100	Completed	HS
Output 2: *Completion of a set of Pre-investment studies (PINS)*	**June 2008**			HS
Activity 11: Update and review of the existing hot spots identified at	July 2007	100	Completed	HS

[19] Outputs and activities as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision.
[20] As per latest workplan (latest project revision)
[21] Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.
[22] To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager

Outputs [19]	Expected completion date [20]	Implementation status as of 30 June 2011 (%)	Comments if variance[21]. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating[22]
PDF-B stage				
Activity 12: Preparation of Guidelines on conduction of pre-investment studies	August 2007	100	Completed	HS
Activity 13: Development of criteria for selection of hot spots for which PINS will be prepared	August 2007	100	Completed	S
Activity 14: Hot spots screening and selection. Preparation of the list of potential pre-investment studies.	October 2007	100	Completed	HS
Activity 15: Preparation of tenders dossiers and ToRs for three lead cooperating organisations.	January 2008	100	Completed	HS
Activity 16: Selection of three LCO for the conduction of PINS. Concluding the contracts with bid-winners	September 2008	100	Completed	HS
Activity 16.1: Completion of a set of Pre-investment studies (PINS)	Oct.-Nov. 2009	100	Completed	HS
Output 3: *Environmental Protection System improvements (EPS)*	**June 2008**			HS
Activity 17: Proposals for and selection of the Co-ordinator of the Task Team on Implementation of the SAP (TT EPS).	September 2008	100	Completed	HS
Activity 18: Proposals for and selection of TT members.	Sept. 2008	100	Completed	S
Activity 18.1: Contract with coordinator of TT EPS prepared and signed	October 2008	100	Completed	HS
Activity 18.2: Contracts with TT EPS members prepared and signed	October 2008 - June 2009	100	Completed	HS
Activity 18.3: Elaboration of proposals on improvements of Russian legislation for Environmental Protection System (EPS). Submitting of these proposals to relevant executive authorities	December 2009	95	Completed	HS
Output 4: *Rehabilitation of the Environment by Use of Brown Algae (Demonstration Project CLEANUP)*	**November 2007**			HS
Activity 19: Preparation of ToR and conduction of the tender and preparation of the contract with the lead cooperating organisation for the CLEANUP pilot project. Signing of contract	August 2007	100	Completed	HS
Activity 20: Preparation and review of Progress Report to be considered at the Second Meeting of the WG	October 2008	100	Completed	S
Activity 20.1: Finalisation of the project	August 2009	100	Completed	HS
Output 5: *Environmental Remediation of Two Decommissioned Military Bases (Demonstration Project BASES)*				HS
Activity 21: Review of the working document at the First Meeting of the WG BASES, Moscow	July 2007	100	Completed	HS
Activity 22: Preparation of ToR and conduction of the tender and preparation of the contract with the lead cooperating organisation for the BASES demo project. Signing of contract	August 2007	100	Completed	HS
Activity 23: Preparation and Review of Progress Report to be	December 2008	100	Completed	S

Outputs [19]	Expected completion date [20]	Implementation status as of 30 June 2011 (%)	Comments if variance[21]. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating[22]
considered at the Second Meeting of the WG BASES				
Output 6: *Indigenous Environmental Co-management (Demonstration Project COMAN)*				HS
Activity 24: Preparation of ToR and conduct of the tender and preparation of the contract with the lead cooperating organisation for COMAN demo project. Signing of contract	October 2007	100	Completed	HS
Activity 25: Preparation and Review of Progress Report to be considered at the Second Meeting of the WG COMAN	November 2008	100	Completed	HS
Activity 25.1: Finalisation of the project	Feb. 2009	100	Completed	HS
Output 7: *New Pilot projects*				HS
Activity 26: Preparation of project documentation for pilot projects	1-2 quarters of 2008	100	Completed	HS
Activity 27: Contracting companies on selected pilot projects (preparation of tenders where applicable)	3-4 quarters of 2008	100	Completed	HS
Activity 28: Final evaluation of conducted pilot projects and their replicability potential	November of 2010	60	Completed	HS

Overall project implementation progress [23] *(To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager. Please include columns to reflect prior years' ratings):*

FY10 rating	FY11 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the rating for this FY and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
S/HS	HS	Project management successfully completed all planned activities. It substantially exceed range of activities planned in the original Project Document and on top of it the PO issued two publications both in Russian and English

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating. *(To be completed by UNEP Task Manager in consultation with Project Manager[24])*

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

[23] Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
[24] UNEP Fund Management Officer should also be consulted as appropriate.

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

This section should be completed if project **progress** was rated MS, MU, U or HU during the previous Project Implementation Review (PIR) or by the Mid-term Review/Evaluation (*To be completed by Project Manager)*.

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When

3.3. Risk

*There are two tables to assess and address risk: the first "risk factor table" to describe and rate risk factors; the second "top risk mitigation plan" should indicate what measures/action will be taken with respect to risks rated **Substantial** or **High** and who is responsible to for it.*

RISK FACTOR TABLE
***Project Managers** will use this table to summarize risks identified in the **Project Document** and reflect also **any new risks** identified in the course of project implementation. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, **as relevant**. The "Notes" column has one section for the Project Manager (**PM**) and one for the UNEP Task Manager (**TM**). If the generic risk factors and indicators in the table are not relevant to the project rows should be added. The **UNEP Task Manager** should provide ratings in the right hand column reflecting his/her own assessment of project risks.*

				Project Manager Rating						**Notes**	**Task Manager Rating**					
Risk Factor	**Indicator of Low Risk**	**Indicator of Medium Risk**	**Indicator of High Risk**	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
Management structure	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	X						PM :……. TM:						
Governance structure	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. TOR unclear	Members lack commitment Committee/body does not fulfil its TOR	X						PM :……. TM:						

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
Internal communications	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	X						PM :……. TM:						
Work flow	Project progressing according to work plan	Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable	Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation	X						PM :……. TM:						
Co-financing	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	X						PM :……. TM:						
Budget	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget	X						PM :……. TM:						
Financial management	Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for	Financial reporting slow or deficient	Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds	X						PM :……. TM:						

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
Reporting	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	X						PM :……. TM:						
Stakeholder involvement	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	X						PM :……. TM:						
External com-munications	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is	Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or	X						PM :…….						

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
	understand project and are regularly updated on progress	successfully transmitted	misunderstand-ings concerning objectives and activities evident							TM:						
Short term/long term balance	Project is addressing short term needs and achieving results with 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	X						PM :……. TM:						
Science and technological issues	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	X						PM :……. TM:						
Political influences	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	X						PM :……. TM:						
Other, please specify. Add				X						PM :……..						

				Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
Risk Factor	**Indicator of Low Risk**	**Indicator of Medium Risk**	**Indicator of High Risk**	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
rows as necessary										TM:						

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
EXTERNAL RISK																
Project context																
Political stability	Political context is stable and safe	Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation	Very disruptive and volatile	X						PM :……. TM:						
Environmental conditions	Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors	Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes	Project area has very harsh environmental conditions	X						PM :……. TM:						
Social, cultural and economic factors	There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results	Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation but mitigation strategies have been developed	Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers	X						PM :……. TM:						
Capacity issues	Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners	Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity	Capacity is very low at all levels and partners require constant support and technical assistance	X						PM :……. TM:						
Others, please				X												

				Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
Risk Factor	**Indicator of Low Risk**	**Indicator of Medium Risk**	**Indicator of High Risk**	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
EXTERNAL RISK																
Project context																
specify																

If there is a significant (over 50% of risk factors) discrepancy between Project Manager and Task Manager rating, an explanation by the Task Manager should be provided below

TOP RISK MITIGATION PLAN
Rank – importance of risk Risk Statement – potential problem (condition and consequence) Action to take – action planned/taken to handle the risk Who – person(s) responsible for the action Date – date by which action needs to be or was completed

Rank	**Risk Statement**[25]		**Action to Take**	**Who**	**Date**
	Condition	**Consequence**			
No visible essential risks					

[25] Only for Substantial to High risk.

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High) (*Please include PIR risk ratings for all prior periods, add columns as necessary*):

FY08 rating	FY09 rating	FY10 rating	FY11 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Low	Low	Low	LOW	
				If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period or as a result of the Mid-Term Review/Evaluation please report on progress or results of its implementation

4. RATING MONITORING AND EVALUATION

*Based on the answers provided to the questions in 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 below, the **UNEP Task Manager** will provide ratings for the following aspects of project monitoring and evaluation:*

*(i) Overall **quality** of the Monitoring & Evaluation plan*
*(ii) Performance in the **implementation** of the M&E plan*

4.1. Does the project M&E plan contain the following:

- Baseline information for each outcome-level indicator — Yes √ — No □
- SMART indicators to track project outcomes — Yes √ — No □
- A clear distribution of responsibilities for monitoring project progress. — Yes √ — No □

4.2. Has the project budgeted for the following M&E activities:

- Mid-term review/evaluation — Yes √ — No □
- Terminal evaluation — Yes √ — No □
- Any costs associated with collecting and analysing indicators' related information — Yes □ — No √

Please rate the **quality** of the project M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU):

4.3 Has the project:

- Utilized the indicators identified in the M&E plan to track progress in meeting the project objectives; — Yes √ — No □
- Fulfilled the specified reporting requirements (financial, including on co-financing and auditing, and substantive reports) — Yes √ — No □
- Completed any scheduled MTR or MTE before or at project implementation mid-point; — Yes √ — No □
- Applied adaptive management in response to M&E activities — Yes √ — No □
- Implemented any existing risk mitigation plan (see previous section) — Yes √ — No □

Please rate the performance in **implementing** the M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU): HS

4.4. Please describe activities for monitoring and evaluation carried out during the reporting period[26]

Mid-term review has been fulfilled in the end of 2009 by independent expert hired by UNEP. Project progress were reviewed in StC and IAWG meetings. Detailed reports for all meetings with all associated documentation distributed among all interested

[26] Do not include routine project reporting. Examples of M&E activities include stakeholder surveys, field surveys, steering committee meetings to assess project progress, peer review of documentation to ensure quality, etc.

parties and uploaded on the Project website: http://npa-arctic.ru. The website was renewed and order to make it friendlier for users.
The PO scrutinised all technical reports prepared by the project consultants and LCOs. After that, most of the technical reports were reviewed by EA (through its Project advisor) and IA. From the other hand, all documentations issued by PO were also under thorough quality control by both EA and IA. These include Half yearly, Quarterly and PIR reports, all financial documents. Packages of necessary documents for all project consultants tenders as well as for LCOs for pilot projects and three PINS tenders and contracts have been prepared by PO in close cooperation with both EA and IA. EA and IA representatives participated in most of meetings and workshops held by PO. All versions of the SAP document and its separate chapters and sections were closely reviewed also by the representatives of both agencies. With the purpose of quality control improving EA, IA and PO were held several meetings. At the moment Project manager finalising a Termination report wich will be submitted to EA and than to IA. UNEP is preparing to lead an independent final Project review

4.5. Provide information on the quality of baseline information and any effects (positive or negative) on the selection of indicators and the design of other project monitoring activities

Quality of baseline information was quite satisfactory and positively effected on the selection of indicators and the design of other project monitoring activities

4.6. Provide comments on the usefulness and relevance of selected indicators and experiences in the application of the same.

The indicators are useful and relevant to the Project purposes

4.7. Describe any challenges in obtaining data relevant to the selected indicators; has the project experienced problems to cover costs associated with the tracking of indicators?

The Project has never experienced any challenges in obtaining data relevant to the selected indicators

4.8. Describe any changes in the indicators or in the project intervention logic, including an explanation of whether key assumptions[27] are still valid

The Project on its lifetime evolved from Phase I into full scaled project which includes virtually all activities envisaged in Project Document for both Phase I and II the third meeting of the Project StC decided to change original benchmarks in PD into new ones which correspond more to the new realities.

4.9. Describe how potential social or environmental negative effects are monitored

PO has constant feedback with local authorities and LCOs implementing Project activities (demo/pilot project and PINS) in the field.

4.10. Please provide any other experiences or lessons relevant to the design and implementation of project monitoring and evaluation plans.

5. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS

[27] Assumptions refer to elements of the "theory of change" or "intervention logic" (*i.e, the problem is a result of A, therefore, if we change B, this will lead to C*) and not to pre-conditions for project implementation. It is a common mistake to include statements such as "political will" as an assumption. This is rather a necessary condition to implement the project.

5.1. Please summarize any experiences and/or lessons related to project design and implementation. Please select relevant areas from the list below:

Special request from GEF Sec for FY11 is to highlight Best Practices and Lessons learned from the following categories:

i. CLO1[28]: Enhancing social impacts through the improved understanding of the causal relationships between environmental management and local community welfare.

The existing outputs of the EPS project component lay a solid ground for further strengthening of the legislative and institutional framework of environmental protection in the Russian Arctic. The final proposal on the draft federal law "On Special Regimes in the Natural Resources Management and Environmental Protection in the Russian Arctic" was submitted to the Council of Federation - an upper House of the Russian Parliament - and included in its Report on the Arctic to be submitted to leaders of the Russian Federation.

ii. CLO2: Enhancing the catalytic effect of GEF financing with the aim of: identifying, scaling up and replicating best practices, improving the science evidence base to develop projects, strategies and policies, and capturing learning from demonstrations across all focal areas.

It is very important to recognize such an achievement when GEF project generated further development. The importance for GEF is to see positive consequences and sustainability of outcomes of the pre-investment studies and demo/pilot projects implementation. The implemented project components ensured a transition to the follow-up actions, as well as new technology and new environmental approaches. The selected environmental investment projects (EIP) were focused on a potential for reduction industrial pollution, to cope with past environmental liabilities and to develop new or upgrade environmental management infrastructure (in waste management and water treatment sectors in particular). The completed EIP were widely disseminated among Russian and international potential investors and some of them expressed their interest. Several of EIP were selected by Russian Ministry for Natural Resources and Ecology as a priority projects, NEFCO confirmed their interest in projects connected with oil pollutions and spills in Barents-sea region. At the moment local authorities of Arkhangelsk region and Komi Republic (Vorkuta city) in cooperation with private businesses launched two EIP attracting local budget and NEFCO funds to this projects implementation.
Some of demo and pilot projects offered a good signs of co-financing, as well as highlighted the 'soft' aspect of the results of the project implementation (stakeholder involvement, attracting more funds, and knowledge dissemination). Demo and pilot projects implemented under UNEP/GEF Project played a role of triggering mechanism in ensuring preparation of several new full scaled environmental projects in Arkhangelsk, Murmansk regions and in Republic Sakha (Yakutiya). Projects aimed at decommissioned military bases remediation attracted attention of the Russian Ministry of Defence and other governmental bodies, what resulted in extra funds allocation for the abandoned military bases cleaning purpose. In this respect it would be relevant to emphasize the importance of the Russian Prime Minister's recent pledge to earmark 740 million RUB (US$ 25 million) for cleanups on the Franz Josef Land Archipelago in 2011 and 2012, which was resulted from the NPA-Arctic demo project.

iii. CLO3: Enhancing the impact of capacity development support provided across focal areas.

[28] CLO: Corporate Learning Objective of GEF Sec.

The NPA-Arctic Project had established very important and sustainable basis for the next step in improving environmental situation in the Russian Arctic and as a consequence internationally in the whole Arctic Region through development of new Arctic Agenda 2020 Programme

iv. CLO4 : Improving performance monitoring at project and portfolio level

If the Lessons Learned from this project does not fit the above CLO categories, please provide them in the relevant categories below:

- Conditions necessary to achieve global environmental benefits such as (i) institutional, social and financial sustainability; (ii) country ownership; and (iii) stakeholder involvement, including gender issues.
- Institutional arrangements, including project governance;
- Engagement of the private sector;
- Capacity building;
- Scientific and technological issues;
- Interpretation and application of GEF guidelines;
- Factors that improve likelihood of outcome sustainability;
- Factors that encourage replication, including outreach and communications strategies;
- Financial management and co-financing.

6. PROJECT CO-FINANCING

(For projects which underwent a mid-term, phase or a terminal evaluation in FY 2011)

Co-financing	IA Own Financing (mil US&)		Government (mil US&)		Private Sector (mil US&)		Other Sources* (mil US&)		Total Financing (mil US&)		Total Disbursement (mil US&)	
(Type/Source)	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grant							3,03	2,58	3,03	2,58	2,58	2,58
Credits												
Loans												
Equity												
In-kind			6,21	6,46					6,21	6,46	6,46	6,46
Non-grant Instruments												
Other Types			0,64	0,48					0,64	0,48	0,48	0,48
TOTAL			**6,85**	**6,94**			**3,03**	**2,58**	**9,88**	**9,52**	**9,52**	**9,52**

*Other refers to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector etc.

- "Proposed" co-financing refers to co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement.
- Describe "Non-grant Instruments" (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc): _____
- Explain "Other Sources of Co-financing": Channelled to ACOPS incl. Preparatory Phase – 1,78; EPA – 0,39; Iceland – 0,1: NEFCO 0,25: GPA- 0,05 _____