Sida Evaluation 05/15

Swedish EPA's Cooperation with Environmental Authorties in North West Russia and Transboundary Water Issues, 1999–2004

Lars Rylander
Johan Willert

Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation

Swedish EPA's Cooperation with Environmental Authorties in North West Russia and Transboundary Water Issues, 1999–2004

Lars Rylander
Johan Willert

Sida Evaluation 05/15

Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation

This report is part of *Sida Evaluations*, a series comprising evaluations of Swedish development assistance. Sida's other series concerned with evaluations, Sida Studies in Evaluation, concerns methodologically oriented studies commissioned by Sida. Both series are administered by the Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit, an independent department reporting directly to Sida's Board of Directors.

This publication can be downloaded/ordered from:
http://www.sida.se/publications

Authors: Lars Rylander, Johan Willert.

Sida Evaluation 05/15
Commissioned by Sida, Department for Infrastracture and Economic Cooperation

Registration No.: 2004-001125
Date of Final Report: May 2005
Printed by Edita Communication AB, 2005
Art. no. Sida4797en
ISBN 91-586-8678-9
ISSN 1401—0402

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Sveavägen 20, Stockholm
Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: sida@sida.se. Homepage: http://www.sida.se

Table of contents

Executive summary

Since 1993, Russia and Sweden has cooperated in the field of environmental administration, with focus on the situation in North West Russia. In 1996 the Prime Ministers in the Baltic region jointly declared that the cooperation around transboundary water issues needed to be improved. The operational arm in Sweden for this cooperation has been the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, EPA. Sida is, since 1999, funding EPA's cooperation programmes in these two areas, environmental administration and transboundary water. For practical purposes the support to the two areas has been included in one agreement between Sida and EPA. The agreement came to an end in 2004, and Sida decided to launch an external evaluation of its results as one input to the future cooperation.

The evaluation was carried out in January –April, including two field visits to Russia and Belarus, by Lars Rylander, SPM Consultants, and Johan Willert, SWECO. Due to the size of the project portfolio a selection of projects to be covered was made with criteria to ensure that larger projects in the five priority areas in the cooperation with Russia should be covered. The priority areas are: water management, protection of biodiversity, environmental training, environmental information and environmental protection. In addition it was decided that the component of the Transboundary Water Programme that covered Russia's and Belarus' involvement in the Daugava River would be included. The selection was agreed with Sida and EPA.

The team's main findings are that most projects have been successfully implemented, and that the internal effectiveness of the two programmes is considered to be high. In many cases the project objectives, although sometimes being outputs rather than objectives, set up in the project descriptions have been fulfilled. Delays in implementation have occurred, but largely all outputs have been achieved. EPA has managed the programme through its unit for international cooperation, whereas implementation has been entrusted to either in-house technical departments, regional institutions such as the county environmental administration or, in some cases, international organisations or consultants. Project selection has been based on special strategies developed for each of the two programmes: environmental administration in NW Russia and transboundary water management. Important guidelines have been to regard the projects as model projects, aiming at mainstream application of useful experiences, demands for counterpart funding and encouragement of cooperation between Russian authorities and organisations in the sector. In many cases, project development has been based on initiatives and proposals from the Russian and Belarusian counterpart.

However, the outputs and objectives from the projects have generally only marginally contributed to the identified development objectives. The overall development objective for the cooperation with NW Russia is *to strengthen the capacity of the environmental administration to manage environmental problems.* For some of the priority areas and projects more detailed development objectives have been defined. The Transboundary Water Programme has an overall objective *to contribute to an improved environment in the river basins and ultimately in the Baltic Sea.* The strategy also states a overreaching purpose being *to achieve a cooperation between those countries that share a common water so that it can be used in a long-term sustainable way*. True, some of these objectives are of a long term and visionary character, but there are also other explanations why the link between outputs and outcome has been weak. Moreover, with the exception of a few good examples in environmental protection, there have been a quite limited replication of project results, and several projects must be regarded as a one time effort.

It should also be emphasised that Russia as partner country offers substantial difficulties. On one hand Russia is a global giant, based on its nuclear capacity and oil-fuelled economic strength. On the other hand it is a fragile country with huge income gaps, including widespread poverty, and weak systems for public management and service delivery. The cooperation has been negatively affected particularly by

the lack of administrative consistency and general environmental awareness and vision. This finding does not exclude that many individuals in partner institutions have shown great commitment in the various projects and expressed great appreciation of the cooperation.

Altogether, the main explanation of the identified gap between outputs and outcome is lack of political commitment in Moscow. The projects are so formulated that both the achievement of objectives and the intended broader replication require political decisions at federal level either regarding legal and policy development or provision of federal financial and technical resources to technical nits at lower levels. And, since this has generally not materialised the overall programme impact and sustainability has been quite low. Also the cost benefit of the programme is negatively affected by the limited impact in terms of capacity building and environmental improvements.

One could of course argue that this is unavoidable in a cooperation with Russia, and that one should not expect short term results, but that the programme is the price a small nation has to pay to eventually see the federal Russian agenda include more resources to the environment in NW Russia and transboundary waters. Swedish EPA has also tried to limit these risks by designing small projects, often with a one year implementation perspective, and to join forces with other, especially other Nordic, countries. This prudence has surely avoided resource waste, but has not really addressed the root of the problem.

The evaluation team has chosen to argue another policy, one of more explicitly assessing the political risks of the cooperation and to design and formulate projects that may be less prone to succumb to weak political commitment. In fact, at least one of the evaluated projects has been designed in a fashion which has convinced most parties included that its result should be generalised. The so called BAT project delivered a model for environmental permitting that clearly demonstrated that absolute norms is an inferior and much more costly way of reducing emissions than the case-by-case model. This result was shared by the private and public sector organisations involved, it was in harmony with the HELCOM agenda and it reached all the way to the federal Ministry, where work is on-going to provide the legal platform for mainstream application of individual permitting.

Equally, a stricter reliance on state of the art logframe methodology in joint project formulation exercises would most likely have increased ownership and also more explicitly identified external risk factors, such as lack of political commitment. In case project agreements are built on such a methodology it is also easier to identify causes of no progress and to discuss and apply sanctions, also at highest level.

Finally, the evaluation team recommends that the goal of the cooperation is reconsidered. There is a strong self interest in the environmental cooperation with Russia and in transboundary water, since it affects the Baltic Sea. So rather than aiming at strengthening the environmental administration for such improvements to occur, the programme would focus more clearly on helping Russia to meet obligations assumed in international environmental conventions and agreements of relevance for the environment in the Baltic and Barents regions. A likely effect of such more action oriented programme would be more capacitated environmental administrations in NW Russia.

Abstract

Evaluation of Swedish EPA's cooperation with environmental authorities in NW Russia and in transboundary water issues.

Subject description

Since 1993, Russia and Sweden has cooperated in the field of environmental administration, with focus on the situation in North West Russia. In 1996 the Prime Ministers in the Baltic region jointly declared that the cooperation around transboundary water issues needed to be improved. The operational arm in Sweden for this cooperation has been the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, EPA. Sida is, since 1999, funding EPA's cooperation programmes in these two areas, environmental administration and transboundary water. For practical purposes the support to the two areas has been included in one agreement between Sida and EPA. The agreement came to an end in 2004, and Sida decided to launch an external evaluation of its results as one input to the future cooperation.

Evaluation methodology

The evaluation was carried out in January –April, including two field visits to Russia and Belarus, by Lars Rylander, SPM Consultants, and Johan Willert, SWECO. Due to the size of the project portfolio a selection of projects to be covered was made with criteria to ensure that larger projects in the five priority areas in the cooperation with Russia should be covered. The priority areas are: water management, protection of biodiversity, environmental training, environmental information and environmental protection. In addition it was decided that the component of the Transboundary Water Programme that covered Russia's and Belarus' involvement in the Daugava River would be included. The selection was agreed with Sida and EPA.

Major findings/lessons learned

The team's main findings are that most projects have been successfully implemented, and that the internal effectiveness of the two programmes is considered to be high. However, the outputs and objectives from the projects have generally only marginally contributed to the identified development objectives. The overall development objective for the cooperation with NW Russia is *to strengthen the capacity of the environmental administration to manage environmental problems.* For some of the priority areas and projects more detailed development objectives have been defined. The Transboundary Water Programme has an overall objective *to contribute to an improved environment in the river basins and ultimately in the Baltic Sea.* The strategy also states the overreaching purpose being *to achieve a cooperation between those countries that share a common water so that it can be used in a long-term sustainable way*. True, some of these objectives are of a long term and visionary character, but there are also other explanations why the link between outputs and outcome has been weak. Moreover, with the exception of a few good examples in environmental protection, there have been a quite limited replication of project results, and several projects must be regarded as a one time effort.

It should also be emphasised that Russia as partner country offers substantial difficulties. On one hand Russia is a global giant, based on its nuclear capacity and oil-fuelled economic strength. On the other hand it is a fragile country with huge income gaps, including widespread poverty, and weak systems for public management and service delivery. The cooperation has been negatively affected particularly by the lack of administrative consistency and general environmental awareness and vision. This finding does not exclude that many individuals in partner institutions have shown great commitment in the various projects and expressed great appreciation of the cooperation.

Altogether, the main explanation of the identified gap between outputs and outcome is lack of political commitment in Moscow. The projects are so formulated that both the achievement of objectives and the intended broader replication require political decisions at federal level either regarding legal and policy development or provision of federal financial and technical resources to technical nits at lower levels. And, since this has generally not materialised, the overall programme impact and sustainability has been quite low. Also the cost benefit of the programme is negatively affected by the limited impact in terms of capacity building and environmental improvements.

One could of course argue that this is unavoidable in a cooperation with Russia, and that one should not expect short term results, but that the programme is the price a small nation has to pay to eventually see the federal Russian agenda include more resources to the environment in NW Russia and transboundary waters. Swedish EPA has also tried to limit these risks by designing small projects, often with a one year implementation perspective, and to join forces with other, especially other Nordic, countries. This prudence has surely avoided resource waste, but has not really addressed the root of the problem.

The evaluation team has chosen to argue another policy, one of more explicitly assessing the political risks of the cooperation and to design and formulate projects that may be less prone to succumb to weak political commitment. In fact, at least one of the evaluated projects has been designed in a fashion which has convinced most parties included that its result should be generalised. The so called BAT project delivered a model for environmental permitting that clearly demonstrated that absolute norms is an inferior and much more costly way of reducing emissions than the case-by-case model. This result was shared by the private and public sector organisations involved, it was in harmony with the HELCOM agenda and it reached all the way to the federal Ministry, where work is on-going to provide the legal platform for mainstream application of individual permitting.

Equally, a stricter reliance on state of the art logframe methodology in joint project formulation exercises would most likely have increased ownership and also more explicitly identified external risk factors, such as lack of political commitment. In case project agreements are built on such a methodology it is also easier to identify causes of no progress and to discuss and apply sanctions, also at highest level.

Finally, the evaluation team recommends that the goal of the cooperation is reconsidered. There is a strong self interest in the environmental cooperation with Russia and in transboundary water, since it affects the Baltic Sea. So rather than aiming at strengthening the environmental administration for such improvements to occur, the programme would focus more clearly on helping Russia to meet obligations assumed in international environmental conventions and agreements of relevance for the environment in the Baltic and Barents regions. A likely effect of such more action oriented programme would be more capacitated environmental administrations in NW Russia.

1 Introduction

Sida agreed in 1999 with the Swedish EPA to financially support EPA's cooperation with environmental authorities an NW Russia and to promote transboundary water management (TBW) in the Baltic Sea region. 30 MSEK was allocated when the agreement was signed and a further 7 MSEK was contributed for 2004. In order to assess the results of this cooperation Sida has decided to undertake an evaluation of the programme.

According to the Terms of Reference (see attachment 1) the overall aim of the evaluation is to "draw on the experiences gained over the last four–five years (1999–2004) and, if needed make recommendations on changes or adjustments to be introduced during the current phase".

More specifically the evaluation shall assess to what extent (i) the objectives and expected results have been achieved, (ii) the methods for knowledge exchange/transfer were effective and had an impact, (iii) there was local ownership and quality in project planning and implementation and (iv) the support was relevant, cost-effective and sustainable in the Russian and regional context, including Sida's country strategy for Russia.

Sida contracted SPM Consultants (Lars Rylander) and SWECO (Johan Willert) to do the evaluation during the period January–April 2005. An Inception report was drafted and discussed with Sida and the Swedish EPA in January 2005 in order to agree on the detailed scope and time schedule for the evaluation (attachment 2). It was decided to cover all the main areas of the cooperation – biodiversity and natural resources, training of young environmental managers, water management, environmental protection, permitting and control, and environmental information – and assess the results in relation to the most important projects undertaken in each area. In some cases the evaluation is built on existing evaluation reports of specific projects, such as KREP, and this evaluation has then mainly focussed on the results after that particular evaluation. The projects were selected according to the Swedish EPA's project classification, and the documentation was made available to the team. The selection criteria applied were designed to ensure that all major projects were included in the evaluation. However, it should be mentioned that there are other projects and activities in the respective areas which have not been covered by the evaluation, and that it therefore is a possibility that the findings, conclusions and recommendations would have been more diversified if another selection had been made. In this respect it should be emphasised that the findings of the transboundary water cooperation only covers the Daugava River and the components that affect Russia and Belarus. It can therefore not be claimed that the report contains a thorough evaluation of this part of the cooperation[1]. The team's findings mainly also focus on the implementation of the legal framework for the establishment of the river basin management system, which is the ultimate purpose of the project.

In addition to the project documentation other relevant material, such as agreements, strategy documents, brochures, evaluation reports etc were reviewed. Interviews were held in Sweden with representatives for Swedish EPA as well as with other stakeholders, such as implementation partners and Sida. Interviews were also held in Russia and Belarus with representatives for counterpart institutions.

The team was supported by Vitaly Artyushchenko (national consultant) and Anastacia Muravieva (interpreter) during the field work, which took place in March (St Petersburg and Archangelsk) and in April (Moscow and Minsk). However, the responsibility for conclusions and recommendations set forth in the report rests entirely with Mr Rylander and Mr Willert.

[1] An in-house evaluation of the whole Transboundary WatervProgramme was made in 2003. The Team has shared its findings, particularly as regards the Daugava River

Due to the nature of the cooperation and the time available it has not been possible to base the evaluation on quantitative data as regards the results achieved, as for instance regarding the environmental impact of the main areas of the cooperation or the knowledge impact of the activities for capacity building. Rather the findings and conclusions are built on the assessments of the *results* the team has been able to do by sharing the rather extensive written documentation and interviews in relation to the selected projects. The basic methodology has been to identify the results achieved in relation to the expected results and objectives, as formulated in the project documents and other documents, such as the various strategies applied in the cooperation. It should be mentioned that most of the development objectives formulated in the cooperation have long time horizon. The evaluation team has then assessed to what extent actual results are contributing to the defined development objectives. The used model follows the result chain applied by DAC and most donors, i.e that *inputs* are used to implement *activities* in order to produce o*utputs* that generate effects (*outcome* in the short perspective and *impact* in the longer perspective)[2]. In this perspective activities and outputs serve the main purpose of generating the intended effect in the short and long term. The focus of the evaluation has been to identify the effects as they are reported or otherwise can be observed.

Moreover, the evaluation does not cover the financial and administrative procedures of the cooperation. These were evaluated in 2003 in a separate review[3]. However, the team has reviewed the recommendations referring to reporting of results and documentation of experiences.

It should be emphasised that the development cooperation with Russia is quite different from most other cooperation arrangements. Russia is a giant, both in terms of population, and as regards its political and economic power, and its policy choices have immediate consequences for neighbouring countries, Sweden included. Yet, Russia is also fragile with a large part of the population (20 million people) living in poverty, and often only marginally supported by the social welfare systems, which in themselves are weak. Moreover, the Russian administrative system suffers form lack of vision, vague mandates and poor financial and human resources. Since Putin came to power an intensification of the political and economic reform process has been launched, which also covers the public administration system. The admin reform, which includes the natural resources management system, has provoked turbulence in the form of changed organisational structures and relations, new staff appointments and retirement of previous staff members. For Swedish EPA this has meant that contact persons have changed over time and that the institutional memory, also regarding project cooperation, has been weak. These problems have affected the consistency of the cooperation negatively, despite the fact that many individuals have shown a great commitment to the cooperation.

The report starts with a short presentation of the main features of the cooperation programme in section 2, and then comprises an assessment of the results in relation to expected results and objectives in section 3 regarding the selected areas and projects, as well as in relation the strategies adopted by Swedish EPA for the cooperation. Section 4 draws the conclusions of the evaluation as regards the defined evaluation criteria in the Terms of Reference. Section 5 focuses on the lessons learnt, and section 6 includes the Teams' recommendations regarding the future support in terms of project formulation and planning and project implementation.

[2] See also Box 2 in Sida Evaluation Manual, 2004

[3] Systemrevision av Naturvårdsverkets utvecklingssamarbete i Central- och Östeuropa, Jarlskog Konsult AB, 2003-03-26.

2 Swedish EPA's cooperation with environmental authorities

Swedish EPA's cooperation with NW Russia in the field of environmental administration started in 1993. It has been funded by Sida since 1997 as part of the Swedish EPA's programme for Eastern Europe, and was developed into a three-year cooperation programme for NW Russia in 1999. The cooperation programme also included support to Transboundary Water cooperation (TBW) in three water basins: Peipus-Narva, Daugava-Zapadnaya Dvina and Nemunas. As a basis for the orientation of the three year programme, Swedish EPA developed strategic guidelines for the two areas (NW Russia and TBW). Both guidelines were derived from the Strategy for Swedish EPA's Programme for Eastern Europe 1999–2004.

The three-year funding agreement with Sida, signed in 1999, was extended in 2002 to include the period up to 2004. At the same time all the three strategy documents for EPA's activities in the area were reviewed and extended.

The overall objective of the strategy for the programme in Eastern Europe is

"to support the environmental administration to become effective and to meet international obligations".[4]

The detailed strategy for the cooperation with NW Russia moreover concludes that the overall objective is

"to strengthen the environmental activities, particularly at administration level in NW Russia. The support should contribute to enhance the competence within the environmental administration and in the sector in general".

Finally the detailed strategy for TBW mentions that the development objective is to contribute to

"a better environment in the relevant river areas and, in the end, in the Baltic Sea".

The strategy document for the cooperation with NW Russia states five priority areas: environmental information, environmental training, water management, biodiversity and environmental protection. These areas are also included as priorities for the technical assistance in the sector in the government country strategy for cooperation with Russia for 2002–2004[5].

According to a description of programme activities 1999–2003[6] more than 50 projects had been implemented in these five areas. A "project" in EPA's definition can, however, be both an activity to formulate a project document (classified as MA, a Minor Activity, altogether 34 MA projects during the period) and the actual implementation (classified as CEE, altogether 21 such projects). CEE projects implemented vary in size and length, but most of them represent a phase of the implementation of a larger project or programme. For instance, the Kola River Environmental Programme, KREP, is broken up in three CEE projects during the period, one for each of the years 1999, 2000 and 2001–02. A fourth project in 2003 refers to a KREP Dissemination Seminar. Two of the cooperation areas were a continuation of the pre1999 cooperation within the Barents region, KREP and the biodiversity project. Generally speaking each cooperation area represents a "project" or a "programme", and the various projects in each area constitute a number of activities implemented during a particular time period, mostly a year, of the whole period. The same could be said about the TBW programme.

[4] The above-mentioned review raised the issue to what extent the environmental quality objectives adopted by the Swedish parliament should guide also the international cooperation programme, but this opening was closed by Sida in its response to the review.

[5] Landstrategi Ryssland 2002–2004, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

[6] Sammanställning av insatser under Naturvårdsverkets Österuropaprogram i nordvästra Ryssland 1999–2003. Swedenviro 2005.

Project formulation within these areas has generally been based on Russian suggestions and ideas, discussed at annual or biannual consultations between the two governments, but also on a more recurrent basis during follow up missions and meetings. More elaborate project proposals emanating from the consultations are first discussed at a project advisory meeting[7], where also Sida is a member. Decisions to implement projects are taken by the head of the Unit for International Projects in case the budget is less then SEK 1 million; in larger projects the decision is taken by EPA's Director General.

Most projects are implemented by structures outside the Unit for international projects, both other by technical units of EPA, by regional environmental units under EPA or by other external partners, such as NGOs, universities and consultancy firms. Several projects are co-funded from other sources, such as EU-LIFE and TACIS or implemented in cooperation with other agencies, such as ministries of environment in the Nordic countries.

According to the latest available financial report[8] a total of SEK 28,2 million had been disbursed of the total contribution of SEK 37 million during the period. Another SEK 3.45 million was estimated to be disbursed during 2004, leaving a balance of SEK 5.35 million

Spending, or rather approved project budgets, in relation to priority areas have been calculated in the above mentioned report covering the period 1999–2003. When the table is updated with the budgets of TBW (SEK 5.7 million) included in the area of Water Management the following spending pattern appears:

Priority Area	Accumulated budget (SEK million)	Percentage
Training	3.9	13
Water management	7.5	25
Biodiversity	5.4	18
Environmental protection	8.7	29
Information	4.0	14
Total	29.5	99

The spending shows a rather even use of funds with a certain concentration to environmental protection and water management. The geographical pattern of disbursements has only been calculated as regards approved budgets for NW Russia and for the period 1999–2003. It shows a strong concentration to St Petersburg (29%), to projects which affect the whole district of NW Russia (30%) and to the county of Murmansk (21%).

[7] STYR-gruppsmöten
[8] Helårsrapport 2004

3 Findings

3.1 Results of interventions

3.1.1 Water management

Background

Water Management has been one of the cooperation areas within the programme in North-Western Russia. Besides some smaller projects, the area is dominated by the integrated project Kola River Environmental Programme, KREP, which therefore was chosen for evaluation. KREP is a multidiscipline project covering water management, environmental information and environmental protection, but the core of the project is water management.

The Kola River Environmental Programme, KREP, was developed to provide a systematic way to identify, integrate and set priorities of the environmental efforts that need to be taken in order to get clean water through effective environmental administrative work. KREP was established *inter alia* to serve as a demonstration model for the Barents region. During the five-year period 1997-2002 the Programme was carried out by the Nature Resource Committee in Murmansk Oblast and the County Administration of Norrbotten. KREP programme included the following areas: 1) Environmental Monitoring, 2) Environmental Information, 3) Local Co-operation, 4) Action Project Development and 5) Information Dissemination.

Focused on the relatively small but important basin of the Kola River, KREP has initiated concrete co-operation procedures between a number of federal and local authorities in Murmansk oblast. KREP has stimulated the involvement of enterprises and NGOs in the environmental management process. KREP has also introduced platforms for co-operation between federal and local authorities and/or local enterprises and NGOs such as:

- the Joint Agreed Monitoring Programme (JAMP), which determines the sampling sites, analyse methods etc to be used in the environmental monitoring of the Kola River,
- the KREP Environmental Information Centre (KREP EIC)
- and the Kola River Water Users' Partnership (KR-WUP), an association of enterprises located along the Kola River.

KREP was earlier evaluated by Swedish EPA using an external consultant. The evaluation concludes that:

- The objectives formulated were to a great extent fully or partially fulfilled.
- The sustainability of the results is low, due to uncertain future for the developed structure.
- The project had a major impact on the working methods and the general environmental awareness in the region.
- The relevancy of activities performed was in general high.

Further, according to the evaluation, the Kola River WUP has had a major impact on the recently established Slavianka User's Partnership. An intense cooperation between these two initiatives and the KRWUP statuses were te basis for the organisation in Slavianka.

The evaluation recommends Swedish EPA to continue the water management cooperation in Murmansk, however conditioned by a Russian commitment in terms of staff and budget resources. The stationing of Swedish Experts in Russia should be promoted.

KREP was seen also as a model to be replicated in other regions and a dissemination seminar was held in 2003. The Evaluation has particularly looked at the result of this workshop.

Achievements

Development objectives KREP 97-02	Results
To increase the public awareness to the understanding that a clean and healthy environment is the prerequisite for sustainable development	*
To establish a mechanism having the overview of the needs, to integrate efforts, to make priority to these, and to initiate and promote environmental efforts	*
To make environmental issues an integral part as a tentative protocol for regional and local co-operation between involved organisations	*
To develop an action oriented model demonstration mechanism for clean water through effective environmental work – the 'Kola River Environment Programme (KREP)' being the example and make the neighbouring regions appreciate the KREP concept for own implementation.	Influence during development of another donor funded project: Establishment of Slavianka User's Partnership. The Federal Ministry of Natural Resources in Moscow appreciates the project and has during bilateral meetings expressed a strong interest to use the KREP approach also in other waterbasins.The evaluation team could not confirm the picture of the high influence of KREP in interviews with Dvina-Pechora and Neva Ladoga WBA and other stakholders.
Project objectives Dissemination Seminar	**Results**
To demonstrate achievements and discuss broadly with other NRC:s and the MNR representatives the methods for effective environmental management. To assess how the KREP experiences might be used in other regions in NW Russia. Safeguard necessary support from the MNR for further development of the KREP concept on site in Murmansk Oblast	Seminar and workshop performed. The attendance was acceptable, but some important representatives from NRAs in Kaliningrad, Karelia and Novgorod as well as invited representatives from the Ministry of Natural Resources (Moscow), were missing, The Deputy Minister Ivan Glumov, at the time for the seminar on another mission in Murmansk, participated partly. A workshop was held with the attendants from the different regions, conclusion were drawn and presented in the Final report. MNR not present, but the issue of spreading the experiences from KREP to other regions were brought up at the bilateral meeting in February 2004..

* These development objectives regarding the overall KREP has not been specifically evaluated here.

Findings and critical factors

A visit made to one of the authorities attending the seminar, Dvina-Pechora WBA revealed that the seminar had left few, footprints in their present work or future plans. The authority could not refer to anything specific that had been useful in the seminar. According to Swedish EPA, discussions have been held about applying the KREP principle both in Murmansk and Archangelsk Oblast. However, so far no pratical achievements have been reached. During interviews with staff from Neva-Ladoga WBA no statements were made about applying the KREP-model in their region.

KREP is an example of an integrated project with activities in water management, environmental information, education/training and environmental protection, applied in a limited river basin, the Kola River. The methodology seems to be well adapted to a local perspective. It is questionable whether the applied methodology is directly replicable for implementation in larger river basins, or if that would call for a more ambitious programme, similar to the strategies applied in the Transboundary Water Programme. The on-going discussions about a new integrated project in the very large Neva-Ladoga river basin should carefully evaluate the two strategies and implementation procedures.

3.1.2 Protection of biodiversity

Background

This area was originally developed mainly as part of the emerging Barents cooperation initiated after the demise of the Soviet Union and the subsequent gradual democratisation in Russia. As part of a regional cooperation between provinces in Sweden and counterparts in NW Russia sparked by the Swedish government to support this development, the Northern provinces of Sweden concluded agreement with Oblasts in NW Russia. The Swedish EPA was part of this development and has, in cooperation with the counties involved, supported and financed activities in the area also before 1999.

Following the establishment of the Barents cooperation, working groups were set up in several sectors, including the environment[9]. Simultaneously, project work was initiated at a regional level, funded by the Ministry of Environment in Sweden, and implemented by the provinces. During the late 1990s this work was becoming more concrete, and following a Russian decree on the establishment of national parks, some capacity building around protection of biodiversity and two fact finding missions were undertaken with Swedish funding. These missions had a broad based and cross-sector participation of scientists, administrators and politicians, including representation from the province of Västerbotten, with the purpose of exploring and describing the social and environmental habitat. It turned out that also Norwegian and Finnish regional teams were invited to similar exercises and eventually a platform called Habitat Contact Forum was established in 1999 to facilitate the cooperation.

In May 2000, a decision was taken to close the federal Environmental Committee in Russia, and transferring the responsibility for environmental issues to the Ministry of Natural Resourcces. This led to extensive re-organisations at levels of the environmental authorities in Russia.This moreover meant that most of the plans developed following the fact finding missions were stalled. The second phase, including two more expeditions (Timansky Kryazh and Novaya Zemlya) and preparations for having the unique natural grown forest area of Belomorsko-Kuloiskoe declared as national park, was initiated in 2002. The third phase, which has been coordinated with the other Nordic countries (and other donors) in the Habitat Contact Forum, is being implemented since 2004. It should be mentioned that the co-operation area also covers projects implemented in other parts of NW Russia, e.g. in the Kaliningrad Region.

This evaluation focuses on the three projects concerning protection of areas in the Barents region, project number CEE 907, CEE 002 and CEE 207, with a total budget of more tan 3 M SEK, comprising more than 50% of the resources spent within the biodiversity cooperation area between 1999 and 2003. Since the projects are linked to each other, with similar overall objectives, focus has been on evaluation of the cumulative results after implementation of all three projects. Hence, intermediate results achieved have not been assessed.

[9] Refer to Interreg IV B:Barents2010.net

Achievements

Development objective	Results
Improve capacity of the Russian environmental administration to manage biodiversity in NW Russia	The main achievement has rather been to maintain the capacity and possibility for the management during numerous re-organisations of the public environmental sector in Russia.
Project objectives	**Results**
1. Protection of Kozhozero, Belomorsko-Kuloiskoe plateau, Russian Arctic Park and the island Kolguev	Kozhozero area protected. Application for B-K submitted to government. The project was important for attracting funding from GEF for the protection of the Kolguev Island.
2. Monitoring of already protected areas	Some publications have been published.
3. Ensure sustainability for the local population through ecotourism and environmental awareness	Successful awareness making among citizens in the Sojana village in B-K, but their possibilities to gain from eco-tourism has not improved. Eco-tourism is forbidden in the area of the village, according to the Mayor
4. Increase knowledge about he unique nature in the Barents region to the outside world	News Bulletin published

Conclusions and critical factors

Although the process of protecting the biodiversity in the vast region covered by the project has been rather well coordinated and managed, it can hardly be claimed that capacity of the regional environmental administration to manage biodiversity has been improved. Too many reorganisations have taken place to ensure this effect.

The Habitat Contact Forum seems to be a good platform for the dialogue between stakeholders. It is doubtful though if a regionally based cooperation is sufficient to push for the legal protection of targeted areas, which requires a government decision.

The vast number of activities supported under the umbrella of the Habitat contact Forum also makes monitoring difficult, and the Swedish contribution has become less based on technical expertise than on funding of a wide variety of activities.

One of the major achievements, the environmental awareness established among particularly young people in the Sojana village, now requires further support, probably using a twinning methodology with a commune in Sweden, Norway and Finland, asthis type of cooperation hardly is consistent with the agreement of the funds from Sida to Swedish EPA for environmental work in N Russia.

3.1.3 Environmental training of young managers

Background

Most Russian environmental managers have a scientific education, but are not trained to observe or address environmental issues from an integrated perspective. The old-fashioned, authoritarian style and lack of comprehensive view is characteristic for today's management in the environmental field in Russia. Environmental policy and management are two areas in which Russian administrators need to gain knowledge and experience. Another prerequisite of assuring the effectiveness of jointly administered projects in Russia is establishing working networks. The initiative to train a good number of young environmental managers came from the Russian federal ministry and regional environmental authorities.

The course was organised jointly by the Swedish EPA and Umeå University. Umeå University was a natural choice since it is the Swedish centre for education of Environmental Inspectors. Umeå University had also provided similar training for Environmental administrators from the Baltic countries. The Training of Young Managers in environmental management was very well perceived.

Achievements

Development objective	Results
To contribute to capacity building in the environmental administration in Northwest Russia.	Good capacity building on personal level, but low impact on the capacity of the environmental institutions. The bottleneck seem to be on organisational level both within each and between the institutions.
Accomplish a level of knowledge and create conditions for shaping future leaders within the environmental administration in Russia	Increased level of knowledge on a personal level. According to some sources, some of the attendants got promoted to head of department etc.
Build up relations and improve communication between Russian and Swedish environmental managers and authorities on both central and regional level	Some contacts established, but in general little contribution from this project
Increase the efficiency in the Russian-Swedish co-operation	According to Swedish EPA, the network has contributed to and simplified the dialogue in the cooperation in general. It s difficult to evaluate to what extent this has increased the efficiency of the cooperation.
Project objectives	**Results**
Train a number of Russian environmental experts working within environmental administration, thereby increasing their knowledge and understanding of a modern environmental policy and management systems in Sweden and Western Europe	About 70 young managers were trained, 25 in the first batch 1999 and about 45 in the second batch 2002. The training seemed to have high relevance and was well perceived by the attendants. In the second batch, the training started with one week of training in Russian Environmental law in St Petersburg by Russian experts. This part was relatively poorly performed, both according to the participants and the Swedish trainers.
Extend and strengthen the newly established network of Russian environmental administrators and experts and in this way facilitate co-operation and communication between Russian and Swedish counterparts in future projects.	A lecture in networking was part of the training in Umeå. Many of the participants claimed in the evaluation that the possibility to meet experts from other regions to discuss common problems was the most valuable result from the training. A website was created with contact information about all attendants. The activity on the website however is rather low.

Conclusions and critical factors

According to an evaluation made of staff trained, many of the participants are still active in the environmental administration field. The opinion whether the training have led to promotion of the managers varies. Some interviewees claimed that they were deliberately kept in the same position or changed field of work, whereas others meant that several of the participants had advanced to more leading positions in the organisation. According to Swedish EPA, the heads of the persons selected for the training courses were not particularly keen to send their staff to this learning opportunity.

The project has a low degree of sustainability and weak institutional capacity building – and no actions are planned at present. Although not expressed in the objectives, plans and mutual understanding between the parties existed for a continuation and institutionalisation of the training, with a gradual takeover by the Russian side, developing capacity for training in environmental management in a suitable education institution, in e.g. St Petersburg. Some attempts have been made to pursue this idea, but very little action has been taken by the Russian side, both at central and regional level. A contributing factor to that has been the reshuffling of the staff and constant reorganisations within the environmental administration since year 2000.

3.1.4 Environmental information

Background

The activities within the area of Environmental Information are dominated by two projects: KREP and a project about Strengthening the Production, Dissemination and Use of Environmental Information in NW Russia. The findings from KREP were elaborated on as part of the water management area, so the focus here will be on the latter project.

During the project development, introductory discussion seminars were held to identify need for environmental information by different actors. After this a cooperation was initiated between Swedish EPA, UNEP/GRID Arendal and State Committee for Environmental Protection in Moscow. The main idea was to apply the principles from the Århus-convention about Environmental Information. During project development, e.g discussions at the bilateral meetings, the Russian part declared that they would rather see a different approach, using existing structures within the environmental authorities, than building something new starting from scratch. This caused some delays of implementation; however, the original project idea was not changed. During implementation, GRID Arendal has been supervising the project. Much of the implementation has been carried out by Russian non-profit organisations, since these are considered to be more transparent.

One goal for the project was to develop eleven regional web sites, one for each Federation subject, and one main web site for the whole district. Another goal was to create four "Environmental Information Centres", where the general public should have easy access to environmental information. Typically, the centres are therefore located in public libraries etc. The centres basically consist of a computer with internet access. The information is available through an internet website. Existing staff has been trained to be able to use the web site. To date, four centres are in operation: St Petersburg, Arkhangelsk, Pskov and Kaliningrad. Much of the information consists of links to other websites and lists of publications, but also processed, easy available data can be accessed[10]. Each organisation contributing data is responsible for the quality of the data it provides. The organisation of the centres is informal; they are not a formal legal entity. It has been an expressive policy to appoint a non-profit organisation as co-ordinator for each centre; the purpose being to ensure transparency of the activities and funds used. The non-profit organisation also formally owns the computer hardware and software. The equipment is then provided to the authorities given that they provide space and public access for it etc. In this way interdependency is created between the stakeholders.

The co-operation project with UNEP/GRID Arendal contains a wide range of activities, workshops, seminars, production of graphical environmental "package" etc.

Achievements

Development objective	Results
To improve access to environmental information for decision-making and the general public in Northwest Russia and the city of St Petersburg	Some improved access. Four environmental centers opened. Links exists to other sites and some more easy understandable data is presented for all regions.

[10] See e.g. http://nw.refia.ru.

Project objectives (CEE 204)	Results
To make a broad range of information on the environment in North-West Russia and the city of St. Petersburg available in Russian and to some extent in English on Internet sites of the Ministry for Natural Resources (MNR) and the St Petersburg city administration (SPb), and on CD-ROMs.	Web site with links and publications database developed. CD-rom's developed and distributed.
To build capacity in the organisations of MNR and SPb for a sustainable production and presentation and dissemination of user-friendly environmental information on the Internet and CD-ROM.	Three-day seminar held in St Petersburg. The established working groups for the centres then participated in the development of web sites. The sustainability of the capacity building cannot be evaluated at this stage.
To promote and facilitate the use of environmental information among the public, media and decision-makers in Northwest Russia and St. Petersburg by exploring and documenting needs of different user groups and by actively familiarising producers and users of environmental information with demand-supply expectations and opportunities.	Sociological survey to assess information needs of different user categories: decision makers, NGOs, general public and education sector.
To enhance the quality of environmental information by raising the capacity of local state environmental agencies and by involving environmental journalists and NGO representatives in the process of assessment of official data provided by administration.	A two-day workshop was held on communicating the environmental information for staff from environmental authorities (14), NGO's (12) and environmental journalists (14).

Conclusions and critical factors

All centres are now opened. The project has applied a rather unorthodox approach by establishing informal networks around a node of a non-profit organisation and basically doing the project by learning to cooperate. There fore the project is less reliant on formal administrative structures, but the long term sustainability must be regarded as uncertain.

The direct access to information is based on the availability of internet. User groups that are not computerised must rely on any eventual secondary sources, such as newspaper articles etc.

The developed web site with simplified environmental information provides a good general overview for a non-expert. The other information is more like a database of publications, which might be difficult to obtain.

Both UNEP/GRID Arendal and the associated non-profit organisations are very engaged in the activities and eager to reach successful results. The level of commitment by other participating environmental institutions is less prominent, although representatives at "Rosprirodnadzor" for the district of NW Russia have expressed a clear ownership and willingness for continuous project engagement. To the evaluation team they also expressed their great satisfaction with Swedish EPA as a cooperation partner in general.

The project is a kind of "by-pass-solution" of the existing structures by setting up working groups with representatives from different stakeholders, including the environmental authorities. This has made the working group more action-oriented and less sensitive to the dramatic re-structuring of the Russian environmental administration during the period.

Another critical factor in terms of strengthening the administration is to what extent the existing organisation will adopt new practices and continues to contribute to the development of better quality and quantity of environmental information.

If the centres shall remain and continue to develop, sustainable financing for this must be arranged. TACIS has shown great interest in this project since they have the policy that good access to environmental information is important, also for the investment climate. However, to achieve long-term sustainability, own funding is a pre-requisite.

3.1.5 Environmental protection

Background

The area environmental protection is largely dominated by one single project "System for establishing effluent limits based on best available technology [BAT] in accordance with HELCOM recommendations as a basis for improved environmental conditions", shortly called the BAT-project. Examples of other projects in this area are management of PCB and solid waste master plans. This evaluation is limited to the BAT-project.

The Ministry of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation and the State Committee of the Russian Federation for Environmental Protection contacted the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency in 1997 with a wish to start a pilot project for revision the strict and unpractical Russian discharge norms and harmonising them with international, e.g. HELCOM standards. After further discussions it was concluded that it should not be a major objective of such a project to revise emission limit standards, but to introduce the concept of individual integrated permitting and BAT, replacing the rigid norm system used in Russia.

A seminar for experts from Russian authorities was arranged in 1998, where the Russian and Swedish systems for environmental permitting were described and discussed. It was agreed to start a joint co-operation project in order to develop an alternative permitting system in Russia. The system for establishing of conditions and effluent limits should be based on Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs), BAT and cost-benefit analyses for measures in order to reduce the pollution. Conditions and effluent limits should be determined individually for each enterprise. The system should allow for a step-by-step implementation of measures towards the ultimate objective, BAT measures for reductions of pollutants according to HELCOM recommendations.

After the seminar the project ideas and organisation were further developed and the project started formally in September 1999. At this time also Finland, through the Ministry of Environment, had joined the project. The Russian part of the project was financed by EU-LIFE. The project was finalised in the spring of the year 2003.

Achievements

Development objective	Results
To contribute to the development of a more efficient environmental legislation and administration in Russia, which would lead to an improvement of the environmental conditions in Russia and its neighbouring countries.	The project successfully demonstrated an alternative permitting system, based on an individual, integrated permitting process, where conditions and effluent limits are based on conducted Environmental Impact Assessments and the principles of Best available technology, with a possibility of stepwise implementation of BAT towards effluent limits in accordance with HELCOM recommendations. In this way, the enterprise will be able to re-direct financing resources earlier spent on discharge fees, to investments for reduction of pollution. Experiences from the project were used in the new environmental law from 2002. There is a huge interest among enterprises to be able to change their permit according to the demonstrated principle.

Development objective	Results
	A new project is presently launched for the pulp and paper industry, aiming at a similar permitting process. The Ministry of Natural Resources earlier expressed willingness to continue its implementation in other regions and sectors. Since the main responsibility for the permitting now as been transferred to Rostechnadzor, the Swedish EPA made efforts to involve this new authority in the co-operation. Rostechandzor so far seems well committed for disseminating the experience to other regions and branches, but first of all internally in its central organisation.
Project objectives	**Results**
To test BAT and individual integrated permitting as a concept for the permitting process for environmentally hazardous activities and enterprises. This as an alternative to the rigid Russian norm system, which leads to an inefficient environmental protection.	The system was tested with successful results. Temporary permits according to this alternative approach, were submitted to five enterprises in the St Petersburg area. In the process, a broad range of regional and local authorities participated. The idea of BAT was reflected in the federal legislation.

Conclusions and critical factors

The project has been successfully implemented due to a strong input from Swedish EPA in core area and dedicated Russian partners; learning by doing with strong demonstration effect. Funding from EU Life was a prerequisite for financing of the Russian staff.

This is a good example where the model or pilot project approach has been working. The project has side-stepped the existing organisational structure and procedures and proved to be successful and creating an energetic project team. There is, however, still some uncertainty about the sustainability. What will happen when the five year testing period and the annual prolongations of the permits ends in 2007?

Although largely very successful, the question should be raised if the concept applied so far provides enough input for changing the legal framework from the present norm system based on maximum allowable concentrations to individual permits as an instrument for pollution control and management? Anyway, it is likely that continued cooperation is necessary for this to happen. The reformation of the Russian environmental legislation is a prioritised issue with many actors involved, bilateral cooperation with Russia, regional cooperation and EU-Russia cooperation. It is unlikely that the issue will "die" with the finalisation of the BAT project.

The question should also be raised if the best strategy to ensure the institutionalisation of individual permits is to move into a new sector (pulp&paper) and/or extension to other companies participating in the cleaner technology project in St Petersburg?

3.1.6 Transboundary Water

Background

In 1997 the Swedish EPA initiated the Transboundary Water Programme to promote the co-operation between countries sharing a joint river basin. The programme has mainly concerned three basins: Lake Peipsi, River Daugava and River Nemunas. Some projects have been directed towards one of the countries involved only and concerns country specific issues, whereas others are part of the Transboundary water programme, dealing with multilateral issues. Some of the projects also have a different funding ("Östersjömiljarden") than the co-operation to be evaluated here. In this study the focus will be on the transboundary aspects of river basin management, based on the experiences from the Daugava river. A good number of projects have been initiated related to the river basin management of Daugava. In this evaluation we have examined the projects concerning development of transboundary

water co-operation for River Daugava on a general level and one of the most recent projects, "Preparing the establishment of river basin commissions for Daugava and Nemunas", in particular.

The results and conclusions from the Transboundary Water Programme for the period 1997–2002 have been evaluated by the Swedish EPA[11]. The main conclusion was that expected results in general were achieved, although projects were often delayed. Other conclusions were that the donor should be regarded as a catalyst in development process, but the beneficiary countries must be responsible for the water management co-operation, to ensure sustainability. Needless to say, the high-level political commitment is essential. Another conclusion was that with time confidence increases, as a result of the on-going process.

Achievements

Development objective (Transboundary Water Programme)	**Results**
Overall objective	
To contribute to an improved environment in the river basins and ultimately in the Baltic Sea.	According to Swedish EPA, the objective is more to be regarded as a vision or long-term objective (more than 15 years) and cannot be evaluated at this stage of programme implementation.
The strategy also mentions that the overall purpose with the programme is to achieve a cooperation between those countries that share a common water so that it can be used in a long-term sustainable way.	Co-operation established, but not formalised. Signing of agreements, establishment of commission, development of management plans etc remains to be implemented.
Specific objectives	
To help develop bilateral and trilateral agreements for each basin	Agreements successfully developed, but so far not signed
To help establish river basin management plans	Training in water resources management
To work for the establishment of joint river basin commissions	Proposals have been developed and principally agreed upon. The main unsolved issue is the financing of the commission.
To improve transboundary coordination of environmental monitoring and management of environmental information	Development of GIS database. On-going project about inter calibration of laboratories
To help develop a common, integrated approach to water management within each joint basin.	Not achieved because implementation of a common, integrated approach is dependant upon signing of the agreement and the sub-sequent activities.
Project objectives (Preparing the establishment of river basin commissions for Daugava and Nemunas)	**Results**
To elaborate proposals for the future role, tasks and financing of the river basin commissions	Proposals elaborated and principally agreed upon. The issue of financing remains unsolved.
To increase the knowledge about river basin commissions for a group of representatives for the countries concerned.	Study tour to the secretariat of River Rhine commission. Discussions and exchange of information between participants.
To accelerate the signing of the multilateral agreements	Difficult to evaluate

Conclusions and critical factors

In general, all project activities have been undertaken and are appreciated by the partners. However, the purpose of the project (s) – a trilateral agreement for the water management of Daugava – has not yet been achieved. The main reason is that the Russian government has not decided to allocate its part of the funds necessary for the operational management of the river basin secretariat. It was mentioned

[11] (report 5280).

by the Ministry of Natural Resources that a decision is forthcoming and will be declared at a conference with the other stakeholders in April of 2005. Latvia's entry into the European Union has been mentioned as a complication of the situation.

The strategy from EPA to step-wise introduce smaller well defined projects along the path of establishing joint river basin management have been successful and appreciated. One explanation for this is probably that the path towards the goal is rather well defined:

- Assessing national and international legal framework
- Developing relevant legal and institutional framework
- Elaborating a basin management plan
- Implementing the management plan
- Compliance monitoring and evaluation

With this structure in mind, sub-projects can be launched when deemed suitable. Another strategy seems to have been to have a mix of administrative with more practical and technical projects as well as a strong focus on training and capacity building. This mixture has had a positive effect on the level of commitment from the partners' side as well as on establishing a good cooperation atmosphere between representatives from the authorities from the different countries

One particular positive outcome of the Daugava project is the successful involvement of Belarus. During the site visit the Belarussian parties showed a strong commitment and high appreciation of the Daugava project. The Ministry of Natural Resources were very pleased with how the project was driven by Swedish EPA and wanted to intensify the cooperation.

It is the evaluators view that the Daugava project is now held back by the low interest from the Russian side.

3.2 Results in relation to EPA's strategies

3.2.1 Strategy for NW Russia 1999–2003

Background

The initial strategy was formulated in 1999 and was later reviewed following the new country strategy for the development cooperation with Russia for the period 2002–2004. The experiences from the first couple of years, following the economic downturn in Russia and the general economic and administrative reform initiated by President Putin negatively affected the cooperation and the commitment from Russian authorities. These difficulties were reported to continue even after the establishment of the Russian Ministry for Natural Resources, in particular as regarded the deficient cooperation between environmental authorities at different administrative levels (federal, regional, local). However, the regional administrations of the federal ministry were regarded as a stable counterpart, and according to the strategy Swedish EPA would encourage cooperation with these and the Swedish regional authorities.

Achievements

Overall purpose	Results
The overarching purpose is to strengthen the environmental management, particularly at administration level in NW Russia. The projects should contribute to develop the competence of environmental authorities and in general in the environmental sector	It cannot be evidenced that the capacity and competence of the environmental authorities has improved as a result of the programme. The most successful programmes appear to be run in informal working groups outside the proper administrative routines. These members of these groups clearly have increased their competence.

Strategy guidelines	Results
1. The projects should serve as model projects for the whole of NW Russia. Lessons and best practises should be spread in the region as a whole.	1. So far limited effects, for instance from KREP. There is a potential that individual environmental permits resulting from the BAT project can be mainstreamed, although with external funding.
2. Counterpart funding should be required.	2. Very exceptional, if at all. Contributions in time has however been provided.
3. Funding of Russian consultants can occasionally be done, as e.g in relation to protection of natural parks.	3. Of the projects covered, this was done in the biodiversity project and with good results
4. Improved cooperation between Russian stakeholders should be encouraged.	4. This has happened in the environmental information project, which is built on a network mode with NGOs as the project principle, not the authorities. KREP and BAT projects were founded on interagency cooperation, and particularly BAT seems to have maintained this cooperation.

Conclusions

Although well written and based on previous experiences, the strategy lacks a discussion of why the selected priority areas would be best suited to help fulfil the development objective. Rather than being based on an explicit analysis of the best ways to achieve the overall purpose, the selected areas were defined already in 1993 in the government agreement between Russia and Sweden. Since then there has apparently not been any internal or external discussion or review of the relevance of these areas, for instance when the present strategy was launched in1999. The priority areas are quoted both in EPA's strategy documents and in the official country strategy for Russia without being motivated from their potential to achieve the development objective. Therefore, it seems to be an analytical gap between the development objective and the areas given priority or the design of the projects.

The strategic guidelines, included in the box above, were identified to increase the impact of the programme, particularly by encouraging stronger Russian participation with financial and technical resources. This has, however, been one of the weak links in the cooperation. The guideline permitting occasional funding of Russian consultants facilitated several activities in the biodiversity project, particularly the EcoSojana activities. The important guideline to make the projects serve as models for a broader application in NW Russia has generally not served well (see further under section 4.Conclusions). The intention to encourage a more holistic approach to environment al issues and to promote horizontal cooperation between agencies was the foundation in the KREP and BAT projects. Cooperation between agencies and other stakeholders, such as the civil society, was encouraged in the project on Environmental Information Centres.

There is an underlying, although not expressive principle that the results of the projects would generate a beneficial impact on the Baltic Sea as a joint interest or self interest. This could also be referred to as meeting the international obligations assumed by the two countries as regards the environmental quality of the Baltic Sea, but this principle has obviously only had a limited impact on the orientation of the cooperation (BAT, and possibly TBW).

There is a section on risks in the strategy, especially the turbulent situation in the administration following the reorganisation in 2000. It is hence estimated that the path of the cooperation will be unstable and that the cooperation conditions would be affected by high staff turnover, lack of counterpart funds and policy uncertainty. How these expected changes could be compensated or reduced through the design of the programme, or if not considered possible, to what extent it would be useful to continue the cooperation at the intended level is not addressed in the strategy.

3.2.2 Strategy for transboundary water

Background

The background to this strategy is the meeting between the prime ministers of the Baltic Sea States in 1996 when it was emphasised that the cooperation around transboundary water needed to be improved. The meeting recommended the participants to ratify the UN-ECE Convention on the protection and use of transboundary watercourses and international lakes.

Another important input to the TBW strategy is the EU Water framework agreement. The directive requires that an authority is established in each river basin with the purpose of formulating a river basin management plan.

As mentioned above, the evaluation has only focused on one of the river basins covered by the EPA strategy; the Daugava basin which is shared by Russia, Belarus and Latvia. Only the Russian and Belarus contribution was included in the evaluation.

The overall and project objectives of the strategy are the same as included in the project document, see section 3.1.6 above.

Conclusions

The strategy is just as much a programme or project document as a strategy. As in the strategy for NW Russia it does not really include an analysis of the best ways to achieve better water quality in the Daugava and its implications for the Baltic Sea. It could for instance have been more clearly connected to the investment projects in water and wastewater treatment in the basin and included a discussion on the synergy effects between these and the river basin management.

The strategy also clearly demonstrates the weakness of a strategy when the decisive decision – the signing of the agreement – cannot be controlled by the project or the strategy. It can clearly be stated that Swedish EPA and its contracted partners have delivered qualified and excellent services, but that this has not been enough to ensure the intended effect of the project. In fact, the strategy does not mention that the project is totally dependent on external factors, such as the willingness of one of the signatories to actually sign the agreement, for its successful implementation. In all fairness, it should be emphasised that signing of trilateral government agreements often are complicated to process.

4 Conclusions

The general finding is that most projects have been implemented in accordance with the approved plans. Delays have occurred in some cases, mainly due to administrative insecurity and inertia in the Russian administration, but these have not implied other than time-wise deviations of the plans. What was decided to be delivered as outputs has been delivered. But, and this is a major finding, the delivery of the outputs has only in a few cases contributed to the project or programme objectives and generated the intended effect. There is one important exception to this general finding, which is the BAT project, where the demonstration effect, and the benefits generated for its beneficiaries (the target companies), were so strong that an institutional know-how has been established and a network of relevant institutions is active. It has moreover contributed to an adaptation of the Russian legislation which now allows individual permits. Another possible exception is the environmental information project, which eventually may strengthen the capacity of Russian environmental authorities to produce reliable and easy accessible environmental information. The key players here, though, are the non-profit organisations which are there to ensure sustainability and transparency in the establishment of the centres.

In the other projects, it is very difficult to conclude that the capacity of the environmental authorities have been strengthened as a result of the projects. In some cases, like the environmental information project, this was not even the main purpose. The component of the TBW project included in the evaluation has delivered all its outputs, and promoted intra-country cooperation. Yet, it has not been crowned with the international agreement that would provide the platform for a sustainable cooperation around the water management of Daugava.

The fact that experiences of the training project and the environmental monitoring included in the KREP have not been institutionalised or replicated on a larger scale must be seen as a major disappointment and it reduces the value of the cooperation to a one time effect.

Likewise, very little can be said bout the ecological impact of the programme. It is beyond doubt that the BAT project had a clear environmental impact, although the scale during the first phase of granting permission for four enterprises of course was limited. A more broadly applied methodology of individual permitting, in the St Petersburg area and in the paper and pulp industry, will of course increase the positive impact on the environment. The TBW project has a strong potential to improve the environment, but as long as the agreement is not signed this effect is uncertain. The same goes for biodiversity project where the final classification of Belomor-Kuloi and other areas as protected areas of course will have a sustainable environmental impact, but as long as theses decisions linger the impact is not substantiated (exception: Kozhozero national park, which the Finns worked with),.

Does this mean that the programme is a failure? No, this is not the correct conclusion to draw. As mentioned above, it is well proved that the activities implemented in the various areas are according to plan. The lack of impact can partially be explained by loss of effective time due to the reorganisations etc in the Russian public administration, which stalled several projects. Another explanation may be that one cannot expect that the rather small projects serving as models for best practises to have an effect on the macro situation, i.e the sector at large. But the most important explanation for the weak results, however, is the flaw in the intervention logic – the logical relationship between especially outputs, project objectives and development objectives – and the way the risks factors, especially the assumption that there would be political commitment from federal level, have been assessed and managed.

The main reasons the team has found of the reduced impact are discussed below, in section 4.2 and 5.

4.1 Methods for knowledge transfer and exchange

The training of young environmental managers was expressively defined as a capacity building project. There is no doubt that the training was useful and appreciated by most participants, and that it has had a capacity building impact at individual level. It can, however, not be ensured that the institutional environmental capacity has increased. The main institutional result is a network on young environmentalists which may become important over time, if it is maintained.

The methodology for capacity building in the other projects has generally been quite traditional and consisted of study tours, to Sweden and elsewhere, and workshops and training seminars. These have been quite appreciated and no doubt served as eye openers into modern environmental management and thinking, but the individual or accumulated effect cannot be assessed. The study trip to Koblenz and the Rhine secretariat was much appreciated and solidified the links between the members of the delegation. However, two of the workshops for sharing experiences, regarding KREP and the follow up workshop for young managers, were less successful since no replication was done (KREP) and very few young managers came to the workshop (14 out of 48).

There are two other special cases. The first is the environmental court proceedings held in the BAT-project, which clearly had a strong demonstration and learning effect. The applied methodology can be labelled "learning by doing", i. e. showing a model that is working to serve as impetus for change of the Russian system for environmental permitting. The proxy court hearings with target enterprises and the socially acceptable compromises they led to served as convincing arguments for applying individual permits rather than absolute standards. The other case may be the environmental information project, which expressively works outside of the formal administrative structures aiming at establishing some kind of critical mass for pursuance of the idea that the public should have easy access to environmental information. This project does not follow a ready made model and could be labelled as "doing by learning", meaning that the stakeholder in the network builds the project though cooperation around some basic roles.

4.2 Ownership and commitment

The main explanation behind the low impact is the lack of political ownership on the Russian part, particularly at federal level. Swedish EPA no doubt tried hard to base the programme on Russian initiatives, and in all cases but the environmental information project, the projects ideas were raised by the Russian counterpart. In addition, Swedish EPA, elaborated the design of the programme from the experiences of the previous cooperation with the three Baltic countries. The ownership these countries felt, for instance regarding the demand to capacitate the environmental administration was firmly based on their accession to EU. A similar political ownership has not been present in the programme in Russia. In fact, this may be one of the major explanations of the differences in result between the environmental cooperation with the Baltic States and with Russia.

Swedish EPA also applied the methodology of gradual evolvement of the projects, applying a step wise approach in the design and implementation. This may have been a good policy in relation to the close counterpart, to increase the readiness of the regional or local administrative bodies to implement the activities. Unfortunately, this methodology did not resolve the ultimate condition for impact and sustainability, i.e. that the political level pushed for necessary replication and legislation to provide the platform for a more generalised application of the project results. This has particularly affected the training of young environmental managers where no institutional solution has been identified for forward training in environmental management. Also the constructive work around the national parks and conservation of the biodiversity, and the trilateral water management instruments have stalled due to lack of political commitment.

Although the Swedish side has addressed these issues at the formal consultations in the environmental sector between the two governments there has been very little response from the Russian government. Working groups have been set up to focus on these issues, but very little action has been taken to resolve the situation. During the field trip to Moscow it was mentioned by the Russian counterpart that the trilateral agreement on Daugava river basin will be signed during the month of April. However, the decision is pending on the willingness of the Ministry of Finance to fund the Russian component of the joint river basin secretariat.

Weak political ownership has been affected most of the projects during and is the main explanation of the lack of replication of, it must be said important project experiences, such as KREP, training of young managers and biodiversity, and hence weak impact during the period. The risk management practised has basically focused on

- project identification by Russian partners,
- breaking implementation in shorter phases;
- teaming up, where possible, with other external sources.

As can be seen from this evaluation, these measures have not been effective.

With regard to these findings, it could be argued that Swedish EPA should have made a more elaborate risk analysis, and basically followed the format included in the logframe approach. The approach requests the programme or project manager to identify external risk factors and to assume the likely impact on the successful implementation of the project. It paves the way for a more explicit discussion on risk management and how the critical risk factors can be dealt with, if at all. By stating the risks, i.e the lack of political commitment or weak administrative capacity, the influence of the identified risks can be upgraded during implementation, and even be used as justification of temporary or permanent breaks in the implementation. The STYR-committee would be a good forum for such discussions, since these difficulties also are a concern for Sida.

In actual project implementation two of the projects have more deliberately addressed the external risk factors. The biodiversity project has expressively tried to reduce the risk by spreading the support to a large number if activities. It does so within the framework of the Habitat Contact Forum where donors and other stakeholders jointly discuss the project proposals formulated by Russian counterparts. It is not clear to what extent the adopted formula has generated better results than a more focused cooperation, but at least it represents a decisive measure to manage the risk situation. The other project is BAT, where the very strong input resulted in a high demonstration value that dealt with the inertia in a constructive way. It seems, though, that additional support is necessary to maintain and increase the momentum of the project.

4.3 Relevance, cost-effectiveness and sustainability

The Terms of Reference for the evaluation requests the evaluation team to assess the relevance of the programme as to poverty alleviation and to the demand for an increased engagement of Swedish actors in the process of development cooperation[12]. It should first be acknowledged that at the time of conception of the programme the cooperation with Russia was not subject to the general policy directive of poverty alleviation. Likewise the policy of global development was not in place. Rather, the country strategy for the cooperation with Russia emphasised that the overall objective of the cooperation was to promote sustainable development, integration and partnership in the Baltic region. The more precise guidelines for the cooperation require promotion of system change and integration into European cooperation structures, improved relations with Sweden and applying a perspective of gender equality in the cooperation. In the environmental sector it is expected that technical assistance is provided to the priority sectors included in the programme.

It can be stated that improvements of the environment in general has strong positive implications for poor people, in particular when it refers to water and air quality. However, as mentioned above the environmental impact of the programme has been quite limited during the period in question, and the effects on poor people's situation are therefore marginal. The relations with Sweden and the exposure of Swedish know how and methods have no doubt been strengthened as a result of the programme. In fact, it has been a major purpose of the programme to provide experiences and knowledge from Swedish environmental management to the Russian administration. In doing so a good number of Swedish (and other) institutions has been active. One project can also be seen as having an effect on the promotion of democratic change. The objective of the environmental information project was not primarily to strengthen the capacity of environmental administration (even though this is stated in the EPA Project document), but to make environmental information more readily available for the general public, hence providing a platform for popular demand as regards the local environment, such as air and water quality in the neighbourhoods. The way the project is organised, through a network of environmental related organisations, may also enhance the openness around environmental issues.

[12] As expressed in the Policy for Global Development, PGU

As mentioned previously, there is also a strong Swedish self interest in the programme, particularly with reference to the Baltic Sea. There is also, however, a global responsibility for the biodiversity aspects in the Barents region. The question to raise here is to what extent these issues should guide the future programme? In such a case, a relevant question may for instance be what the balance is between funding actions in Russia and actions to reduce our own discharges to the Baltic Sea.

The cost effectiveness of the programme was assessed as fair in the above mentioned review of the administrative and financial management of the programme. The team has found no evidence that challenges this finding, as regards project implementation. However, if the concept is broadened to include the generated results and effects of the cooperation (in a cost-benefit analysis) then the assessment is less favourable, both assessed as cost for improved environmental management capacity and as cost for environmental improvements.

The issue of programme sustainability has been touched upon at several occasions above in the text. Again, considering the low replicability and the low political commitment from the Russian authorities the sustainability of the provided services is limited. There is still scope that the BAT project as well as the biodiversity and TBW projects will become highly sustainable, also from an environmental perspective. But this depends, at the end of the day, on the Russian willingness to provide the legal, financial and administrative platform.

5 Lessons learned

There are several lessons to be learnt by this evaluation. The first one is that the strategies that were developed to guide the programmes were well developed and included relevant backgrounds, but lacked two important components: (i) the analytical link between the overall objective of the cooperation and the selection of most relevant interventions, and (ii) the risk analysis. The five cooperation areas were defined already in 1993 and there has not, as far as we understand, been a deliberate discussion about their likely contribution to the overall objective of improved capacity of the Russian environmental administration, which was defined later. Two of the areas were included in the programme from a previous cooperation within the Barents framework (protection of biodiversity and water management, i.e. KREP) and the other three areas (environmental protection, environmental training and environmental information) were selected on different, but not apparent grounds[13].
The training project, which represents the bulk of the training, was highly justified, but lacked a joint Swedish-Russian commitment on the ways to make it sustainable. The BAT project is tightly connected to HELCOM and Russian and Swedish priorities and was developed in a way that makes it likely to be replicated and sustainable, although with requirements of extended funding. The environmental information project is also well justified but has little bearing on the overall objective of the cooperation, as its focus is more on provision of information than on establishing capacity within the administration to provide that. In general, it must be concluded that the cooperation programme has not proven that the selection of the five areas was the most effective way of transforming available resources into results.

As mentioned before, the insight that the cooperation was subject to rather high risk was included in the strategy for NW Russia, but the conclusions were not presented in a way that allowed for management responses if and when the risks started to influence negatively on the path of the cooperation.
They could of course be taken for granted, as a kind of pre-condition for the cooperation, but in such a case the objectives and expected results of the cooperation programme should be more modest.

[13] The TBW project has its separate history, following the UN-ECE Convention and EU framework.

Another lesson concerns the development path and how it has been applied in the project documents. In general there is a clear logic in the development of the steps from inputs to outputs, and the identified outputs have in general been accomplished. This means that the internal project planning in terms of resources and activities has served well and that project services delivered by Swedish EPA or other implementing partners have been effective. The problem arises when the outputs are transformed into objectives, both project objectives and development objectives. It is quite obvious that the application of for instance LFA methodology or similar logframe applications have not been used in the development of the upper levels of the development path. The problem is partly one of misconception the content of an objective as an expression of the intended effect (many of the objectives in the project documents are defined as "activities" rather than as "intended effects"), partly one of a lacking logical relations between outputs and objectives. A stricter application of LFA methodology, for instance in strategic planning workshops with the Russian counterparts, would resolve this weakness.

A similar lesson to be learned is that it is important to assess and apply more generally project design factors that may explain success and failure. For instance, it is beyond doubt that the design of the BAT project showed such a strong demonstration effect that the learning impact was quite high. This may prove to be a good methodology of reducing risk, and the way the project implied a concentrated effort with strong technical assistance quality in a core subject area may serve as model for future project design. It should be weighed against the risk aversion methodology applied in the biodiversity project where a rather different approach was tried, one of spreading the risks over many smaller projects and activities. There may be situations where one design is more suitable than the other and it is important that EPA build knowledge around these issues. This should be an exciting discussion for EPA.

Finally, it should also be mentioned that in case the risks cannot be managed, it is better to lower the ambition level and formulate more modest objectives than aiming at the moon and be happy to reach the tree tops.

6 Recommendations

For the future cooperation the team wants to make three recommendations.

Firstly, the evaluation has found that the overall objective – increased capacity of Russian environmental federal, regional and local administration – is only marginally improved as a result of the programme. It can rather bluntly be claimed that this objective has not been functional. The administrative reorganisation and reform in Russia has crated a turbulent situation in terms of functions and positions, making the administration less prone to capacity building and learning. Moreover, there is an obvious lack of political commitment from Moscow behind the programme.

However, the cooperation addresses vital and shared interests between Russia and Sweden. It is therefore important to find ways and methods to make it more effective, targeting areas of such shared interests. This fundamental justification for an environmental cooperation, and the weaknesses mentioned here, motivates a modification of the overall objective and methodology to focus on environmental problems – current or potential – that have consequences for the two countries jointly. Rather than aiming at long term capacity building of Russian environmental administrations, the programme should be more action oriented, solving or reducing environmental risks at the same time as capacity is built among Russian professionals, institutions or organisations in the civil society. For instance, such actions could focus on addressing important commitments made under international agreements and conventions in the environmental field, such as the Barents cooperation, Helcom and so forth. Another consequence of such a shift would be a concentration on larger interventions, where the provided

resources would generate strong impact on the environmental situation as well as the institutions involved. Linkages and synergies with other environmental investments and programmes would serve as an important guideline.

These interventions would be jointly prepared and formulated, in strategic project planning workshops with application of state-of-the-art planning tools, such as logframe/LFA, emanating in clear and shared objectives specified with indicators for easy monitoring and management. Risk analysis and risk management is an essential component of these instruments. Hopefully, such preparations would also increase the Russian commitment to provide resources, and in case these are not forthcoming, Sweden and SEPA and Sida would be able to resort to a more formal justification to raise the question to the political level.

The on-going discussion on a possible support to the environmental management of the Neva-Ladoga river basin or bringing the BAT-project into new sectors, reducing the pollution into the Baltic Sea, represent interventions that would be well in tune with such policy guidelines.

Secondly, the cooperation should be seen as the doorstep for a broader and regular cooperation between environmental authorities. This, and the quest for concentrated interventions in core areas, suggests that the continued cooperation should be implemented by technical department in Swedish EPAs and related regional bodies. Consultants and other external resources may well be contracted for various services, but overall responsibility for implementation would remain with EPA. This could also lay a foundation for twinning arrangements in the future, both at national and regional level. It is true that this is the ambition of the present cooperation, and a cooperation focusing on more jointly shared environmental issues would provide a stronger platform for this to happen.

Thirdly, cooperation strategies are a good instrument for discussion of the guidelines for the future cooperation. Here the justifications for project selection and design, based on the programme objective, as well as risk and risk management that may influence the possibilities of achieving the programme objective, should be presented. Swedish EPA is presently reviewing the guidelines for project preparations, which is good, but further staff training in LFA and, equally important, use of external resource persons as moderators in strategic planning workshops for joint Swedish-Russia project formulations and preparations would further contribute to the quality of the future cooperation.

Annex 1 Terms of Reference

Evaluation of Sida's support to the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency's co-operation with environmental authorities in North West Russia and transboundary water issues, 1999–2004

1 Background

The Swedish Environmental Protection Agency (Swedish EPA) has since 1999, with Sida funding, been responsible for the co-operation with environmental authorities in North West Russia and for the co-operation on transboundary water management in the Baltic Sea Region (involving also the Baltic States, Belarus, the Ukraine and Poland). In 1999 30 MSEK was allocated for the co-operation over a three-year period, subsequently prolonged a fourth year (June 2003) with a financial addition of 7 MSEK.

The overarching goal for the bi-lateral co-operation with the environmental authorities in North West Russia has been to support the development of effective environmental systems and authorities in the different countries of co-operation and for them to be able to fulfil the international undertakings entered into in the environmental arena in particular commitment related to improving the Baltic Sea environment. A governmental agreement Sweden-Russia constitutes an important framework for the co-operation.

The co-operation has focused five main areas;

1) Environmental information and communication training,
2) Education/training of environmental administrators
3) Biological diversity and nature resources,
4) Water management and
5) Environmental protection, permitting and control

The main aim for the transboundary co-operation has been to establish regional co-operation on the sustainable use of common water resources. The co-operation so far has involved Lake Peipsi, Nemunas and Daugava River. The work has contributed to the implementation of UN-ECE Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes

The overall co-operation has emphasised institutional capacity building both on the regional and the national level. Swedish EPA has in many cases been the sole project implementer but has also arranged for other Swedish bodies, like the National Chemical Inspectorate and the county administrative boards, to manage the projects from the Swedish side. An agreement between Sida and Swedish EPA governs the co-operation and gives Swedish EPA the responsibility for assessment, approval, implementation and follow-up of projects and reporting back to Sida. Projects are developed in dialogue after a proposal from the counterpart country. There is further a strategy with guidelines and criteria for the selection of projects etc. In the guidelines it is stated important for selected projects to be, as far as possible, model projects for the development of general knowledge applicable to a whole country or a region. An increased co-operation between stakeholders (authorities, industry etc) is another important guideline.

During the last 10-year period the environmental administration in Russia (the country which has constituted the main part of the support) has been re-organised a number of times. This has resulted in a weaker administration with less available resources for environmental work. High staff turnover and competent staff leaving for "greener pastures" are other negative effects experienced. Lack of sharing

of information between and within authorities/organisations has also been an obstacle. The present environmental regulation is often very strict and detailed but in practice ineffective since industries and others can not live up to the demands and rather choose to pay the fines involved.

2 Aim and objectives

The overall aim of the evaluation is to draw on the experiences gained over the last four-five years (1999-2004) and, if needed, make recommendations on changes or adjustments to be introduced during the current phase.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are:

1. To establish the extent to which the programme objectives and expected results have been achieved and whether Swedish EPA's programme strategy has been adhered to (see attached). This pertains to both the programme and project levels. To study the relevance and impact which the programme has had on sector reform.
2. To assess the impact and relative effectiveness of various methods for knowledge exchange/transfer which were part of the co-operation, including workshops, study visits, training of young administrators, regional activities etc.
3. To assess the degree of local ownership and the quality of the participatory process in project planning and implementation.
4. To establish the relevance, cost-effectiveness and sustainability of the support in a Russian and regional context, including Sida's country strategy for Russia.

3 Method of work

Sida wants to employ a team of consultants whose assignment would include the following tasks:

– Selection of a number of projects to be evaluated, which should fairly represent the diversity of the co-operation,

– Interviewing the various key actors in order to establish their role, motivation and involvement in the programme. Identify the results and benefits that have been accrued to them, their departments and/or the citizens of their county/country. The involved environmental authorities are the main key actors but also politicians, industry and NGOs are considered important actors in specific projects,

– Reviewing key documents that were produced,

– Relating Sida's support to what others are doing in the region regarding institutional co-operation within the environmental field.

4 Expected results

The assignment is expected to result in the following:

– An assessment according to what is outlined in § 2 above,

– A set of recommendations with a focus on the improvement of the on-going co-operation, which e g could involve selection of projects, design and implementation of the programme/ projects,

– Identified projects and activities that where successful and activities which have been least successful (with an explanation why),

– An assessment regarding the programme's general relevance to a) poverty alleviation (Sida's overarching aim) and b) the increased engagement of Swedish actors in development co-operation (according to "Policy för Global Utveckling"),

– An inception report, a draft and a final report.

5 Organisation, work plan and reporting

The assignment is estimated to require the services of at least two consultants of which one shall be familiar with evaluation methodology (team leader) and the other shall have experience from institutional co-operation within the environmental field. Experience, within the team, from working in the region is also required. The consultants should be able to read Swedish documentation. The inclusion of a Russian sub-consultant in the team is considered positive.

The evaluation is to be carried out in Russia and in one or more of the Baltic States. The assignment is estimated to require approximately 8 man weeks, of which 4-6 weeks in the region, including report writing. The consultants shall provide Sida with a detailed time and work plan with a budget for carrying out the assignment. Briefing and discussion sessions will be held at Sida Stockholm, where also Swedish EPA will take part, at the time of the inception report, draft and final report. The consultant shall present the draft report at an early stage allowing for substantial comments to be incorporated. The final report should be presented by the consultants at a Sida seminar.

A draft report, written in English, is submitted electronically to Sida and SEPA after the assignment. The final report shall be submitted in 10 copies not later than three weeks after receipt of comments from Sida and Swedish EPA. The report shall be written according to "Sida Evaluation Report – A standardised mode". The consultants shall also complete the "Sida Evaluation Data Worksheet" (attached).

List of documents

Listed below are some key documents deemed relevant to the mission:

- "Strategi för Naturvårdsverkets Östeuropaprogram 2002–2004", Fastställd av Naturvårdsverket 2002-10-31
- "Reviderad strategi för Naturvårdsverkets miljöinsatser I nordvästra Ryssland 1999–2003", Fastställd av Naturvårdsverket 2002-10-31
- "Reviderad strategi för Naturvårdsverkets program för gränsöverskridande vatten 1999–2003", Fastställd av Naturvårdsverket 2002-10-31
- "Systemrevision av Naturvårdsverkets utvecklingssamarbete i central- och östeuropa", 2003-01-24
- Naturvårdsverkets års- och halvårsrapporter
- Swedish EPA's own evaluations and "final comments"

Annex 2 Evaluation of Swedish EPA co-operation in NW Russia and Transboundary water issues.

Rough travel schedule

Week 11

Sunday 13 of March Arrival at St Petersburg around 10 pm

Mon–Wed 14-16 Interviews and visits in St Petersburg, to be scheduled in detail.

Wed night (if possible) travel to Archangelsk by flight.

Thur–Fri Interviews and visits in Archangelsk

Friday 3 pm leave for Sweden from St Petersburg

Week 14

Monday 4 Arrival Moscow, time?

Monday–Wednesday meetings in Moscow

Wednesday Flight to Minsk

Thur–Fri Meeting Minsk

Fri 8 Flight Minsk-Stockholm

List of organisations and persons to be visited

Moscow

1. Federal Water Authority (former Ministry of Natural Resources)

Sergei Koskin (probably the boss)

Ivan Temnov

2. Ministry of Natural Resources, international unit

Jurij Alexandrovskij

3. Evgeni Zybin, retired, formerly Ministry of Natural Resources, Water Resources Administration

St Petersburg

1. Neva-Ladoga Water Basin Authority (Projects CEE 001, CEE 307)

Alexander Tkachenko, Head

Alla Sedova (former employer)

Vladimir Budarin (former employer)

2. Head Administration of the Federal Service on Supervision of Nature Management in the Northwest Russia Federal District(ROSPRIRODNADZOR) (Projects CEE 001, 204, 124)

Alexander Obukhovsky, Head

Roman Baluyev, Deputy Head

Nikolai Ivanov, Head of department

Alexei Frolov

3. NGO "Ecology and Business" (CEE 001)
Leonid Korovin

4. Baltic Marine Inspection (CEE 001)
Valery Zaitsev, Head
Irina Markovets

5. Environmental Training Centre
Tatiana Kurysheva, Director

6. Environmental Information Center (CEE 401)
Contact person:

8. Ev. Participant from education (CEE 124)

9. Committee of Environmental Protection, City of St Petersburg (CEE 207?)
Dimitry Golubev

Archangelsk

1. Dvina-Pechora Water Basin Authority(CEE 306)
Nikolai Manakov, Head
Gennagiy Molokov, Deputy Head

2. Committee of Natural Resources, Archangelsk
Viktor Kouznetsov, former employee (CEE 207)

4. Municipality of Mezen
Igor Zaborsky, Mayor (CEE 207, project on Belomorsko-Kulloiskoje Plateau)

5. Institute for Ecoligical Problems of the North?
Alexander Davydov, Head of laboratory (CEE 207, project on Belomorsko-Kulloiskoje Plateau, inventory on biodiversity)

6. Sojana
Tatiana Nechaeva, teacher of biology

4. Environmental Information Center in Archangelsk (CEE 401)
Contact person:

5. Ev. Participant from education

Minsk

1. Ministry of Natural Resources
Alexander Ratjevsky (international unit)
Ludmilla Skripnitjenko (laboratory issues)

2. Institute for Water Resources
Michail Kalinin (education/training)

Annex 3 Contact Persons Environment and Transboundary Water (050204)

Namn	telefon	fax	e-mail
Ryssland, Moskva			
Koskin Sergej, Federala Vattenmyndigheten (tidigare Naturresursministeriet)	+ 7 095 125 56 65	+ 7 095 125 22 36	skoskin@mnr.gov.ru (endast ryska)
Temnov, Ivan, Federala Vattenmyndigheten (tidigare Naturresursministeriet)	+ 7 095 124 28 88	+ 7 095 124 28 88	Temnov@mnr.gov.ru (engelska, ryska)
Alexandrovskij, Jurij Naturresursministeriet, Internationella avdelningen (internationell koordinator för samarbetet med Sverige + Barents)	+ 7 095 254 56 61	+ 7 095 943 00 13	yalex@mnr.gov.ru (ryska, engelska)
Evgeni Zybin former NRM RF WRA Moscow	+ 7 095 756 12 25 (home)		
Ryssland, St. Petersburg			
Alexander Tkachenko Head of Neva-Ladoga WBA Sredny pr. 26	+7 812 3237328		
Alla Anatolievna Sedova Former Neva-Ladoga WBA	+7 812 584 3758 (home)		sedova@NS8057.spb.edu
Vladimir Feodorovich Budarin Former Neva-Ladoga WBA	+7 812 3559701 (home) +7 812 9523091 (mobile) +7 812 9279701 (mobile Natasja)	+7 812 4490555	Natasha@lake-peipus.ru
Obutjovskij Alexander Feodorovich Head of Rosprirodnadzor in N-W region ul. Odoevskogo 24/1	+ 7 812 3518805	+ 7 812 3509533	dsc@dsc.nw.ru nwinfo@geoinform.spb.ru
Roman Viktorovich Baluev Deputy head of Rosprirodnadzor in N-W region (successor of Frolov)	+7 812 3518805	+7 812 3509523	dsc@dsc.nw.ru manager@manager.ecolog.spb.ru
Nikolai Semenovich Ivanov Rosprirodnadzor in N-W region, Head of department	+7 812 3518805	+7 812 3509523	dsc@dsc.nw.ru
Alexei Konstantinovich Frolov Rosprirodnadzor in N-W region (position uncertain)	+7 812 3518805 +7 812 3516696 (home)		
Tatiana Vasilievna Kurysheva Director of NGO “Environmental training centre” Liteyny 39	+7 8123273795	+7 8123273795	
Zaitsev Valerij Mikhailovich Head of Baltic Marine Inspection/ Специализированная балтийская морская инспкция МПР РФ Vilensky per. 17/5 (во дворе налево 1 этаж)	+ 7 8121197034	+ 7 812 1197035	smorin@mail.ru On vacation until March 23
Irina Mikhailovna Markovets Baltic Marine Inspection	+ 7 812 1197035	+ 7 812 1197035	smorin@mail.ru
Korovin Leonid Konstantinovich ”Ecology and Business” (BAT-projektet)	+ 7 8124306860	+ 7 8124309305	korovin@sovintel.spb.ru (ryska, engelska)
Golubev Dmitrij, Комитет по природопользованию	+ 7 8122328369	+ 7 8122328327	ecatsp@mail.lank.ru (ryska, ev. engelska)

Ev. participants Env. Training/education (Barbara Hessel)			
Env. Information centers in Arch and SPb			
Hotel “Pulkovskaya”	+7 812 1403911	+7 812 1403913	
Hotel ”Oktyabrskaya”	+7 812 2776330	+7 812 3157501	2 600
Hotel ”Moskva”	+7 812 2740022	+7 812 2744001	2 410
Vitryssland, Minsk			
Ratjevskij, Alexandr, Naturresursministeriet, Internationella avdelningen (samtliga projekt)	+ 375 172 200 43 28	+ 375 172 200 55 83	ngolovko@minpriroda.by Skriv eller ring till Natalia Golovko (engelsktalande) (Ratjevskij: endast ryska)
Skripnitjenko, Ludmila, Naturresursministeriet, (laboratorieprojektet)	+ 375 172 89 87 62	+ 375 172 00 55 83	Mpr-lab@yandex.ru (endast ryska)
Kalinin, Michail Institutet för vattenresurser (vattenutbildningen)	+ 375 172 64 65 22	+ 375 172 64 27 34	Kamu@tut.b (ryska, endast lite engelska)
Archangelsk			
Manakov Nikolaj Alexandrovich, Head of Dvina-Petjora Water Basin Authority Начальник Двинско-Печорского Бассейнового Водного управления	+7 8182 20 45 36	+ 7 8182 20 61 24	(endast ryska)
Gennagiy Konstantinovich Molokov, Deputy Head of Dvina-Petjora Water Basin Authority Зам. начальника Двинско-Печорского Бассейнового Водного управления	+ 7 81812 20 56 76/21 13 60		molokov@arhlesa.atnet.ru
Viktor Kouznetsov, former Committe of Natural Resources, Archangelsk Кузнецов Виктор Сергеевич Зам. начальника Главного управления природных ресурсов по Архангельской области	+7 8182 226507 (home) +7 921 480 80 47 (mobile)		kvs@ecolog.atnet.ru
Igor Leonidovich Zaborsky, Mayor of Mezen, Archangelsk oblast	+7 81848 43 162 (office) +7 902 285 15 85 (mobile)	+7 81848 43168	
Tatiana Nechaeva, teacher of Biology	+7 81848 55695 (home)		
Alexander Nikonovich Davydov, Institute for Environmental Problems of the North/ Институт экологических проблем Севера Head of laboratory Наб. Северной Двины 109 (каб. 30)	+7 8182 20 6725		davidov@arh.ru 13.00/14.03.05
Env. Information centers in Arch and SPb Contact person:			
Ev. participants Env. Training/education (Barbara Hessel)			
Natalia Komarova, Natural Resources Committee Troitsky prospect 135	+7 8182 204130/654120	+7 8182 210340	
Ekaterina Koshel’, Natural Resources Committee Troitsky prospect 135	+7 8182 204130/654120	+7 8182 210340	
Ivan Popov, Natural Resources Committee Troitsky prospect 24a	+7 8182 204130/654120	+7 8182 448465	
Hotel “Purnavolok”	8 8182 217206	8 8182 217202	

Recent Sida Evaluations

05/03 El Apoyo Institucional a la Defensoría del Pueblo de Colombia 2003–2004
Kimberly Inksater, Carmen Beatriz Ruiz
Department for Democracy and Social Development

05/04 Regional Training Programme in Environment Journalism and Communication in the Eastern African Region
Gustav Böklin
Department for Democracy and Social Development

05/05 Sida Support to Teacher Education in Tanzania 1997–2002
Valdy Lindhe, Kristina Malmberg, Elisei Basil Temu
Department for Democracy and Social Development

05/06 Phasing out Ozone Depleting Substances in the Solvent Sector in China
Darrel Staley, Ann Jennervik
Department for Infrastracture and Economic Co-operation

05/07 Swedish Support to Urban Development and Housing in South Africa
Steve Topham, Ingrid Obery, Hans Hede
Department for Africa

05/08 District Heating Projects in Latvia and Russia
Anders Grettve, Tord Holmström, Christofer Hök, Karl-Erik Ramström
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Co-operation

05/09 Gender Projects in Estonia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Russia and Ukraine – Projekt Implemented by Språngbrädan
Thomas Bjørnkilde, Karin Attström, Alexandra Wynn
Department for Europe

05/10 The World Bank Programmes "Emergency Services Support Project" (ESSP) and "Reform Trust Fund" – West Bank and Gaza
Carl-Johan Belfrage
Asia Department

05/11 Political parties and assistance
Magnus Öhman, Shirin Ahlbäck Öberg, Barry Holmström, Helena Wockelberg, Viktoria Åberg
Department for Democracy and Social Development

05/12 The Farmer Group Empowerment (FGE) Component of the Land Management and Conservation Farming Programme in Zambia
Patrick M. Chibbamulilo
Department for Africa

05/13 Integrating Natural Resource Management Capacity in Southeast Asia (Indonesia, Laos, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam)
Bo Tengnäs, Tara N. Bhattarai, Upik R. Wasrin, with contribution by Yu Miao and Han Deng
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment

05/14 What difference has it made? Review of the Development Cooperation Programme between the South African Police Service and the Swedish National Police Board
Finn Hedvall, Busisiwe Mazibuko
Department for Africa

Sida Evaluations may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida
SE-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0)8 779 96 50
Fax: +46 (0)8 779 96 10
sida@sida.se

A complete backlist of earlier evaluation reports may be ordered from:

Sida, UTV, SE-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0) 8 698 51 63
Fax: +46 (0) 8 698 56 10
Homepage: http://www.sida.se

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden
Tel: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: sida@sida.se. Homepage: http://www.sida.se