



The European Union's ENPI Programme

**Framework Contract COM 2011
Lot 1: Studies and Technical Assistance in all sectors**

Specific Contract N° 2013/317057

**Mid-Term evaluation of EU support to the Northern
Dimension partnership**

Mid-term Evaluation Report

January 2014



The project is financed by
the European Union

COWI

The project is implemented by COWI A/S
SACO Consortium (SAFEGE/COWI)

The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the contractor and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.

Framework Contract Commission 2011
Lot 1: Studies and technical assistance in all sectors

Specific Contract N° 2013/317057

**Mid-term evaluation of the EU support to the Northern
Dimension partnership**

Mid-term Evaluation Report

January 2014

Document drafted by:

Mrs. Bettina Rafaelsen, Team Leader/Evaluator

In cooperation with:

Mrs. Elina KUZJUKEVIKA, Evaluator

Project Implemented by:

COWI A/S, Member of SACO Consortium

Report Control Path

Project Title:	Mid-term evaluation of the EU support to the Northern Dimension partnership
Specific Contract No:	2013/317057
Framework Contract No.:	EuropeAid/129783/C/SER/multi (COM 2011) Lot 1: Studies and Technical Assistance in all sectors
Framework Contractor:	SACO Consortium (SAFEGE/COWI)
Address:	Gulledelle 92 – B-1200 Brussels Belgium
Tel Number:	+32-2-739.46.90
Fax Number:	+32-2-742.38.91
E-mail:	fwc@saco2011.eu
Contract Implementing Party:	SACO (SAFEGE-COWI)
Address:	Gulledelle 92 – B-1200 Brussels Belgium
Tel Number:	+32-2-739.46.90
Fax Number:	+32-2-742.38.91
E-mail:	stefano.guerra@saco2011.eu
Date of the Report:	January 2014

Author of Report:

Bettina RAFAELSEN

20/01/2014

Quality Controller – Responsible Person:

Niels E. OLESEN

21/01/2014

Specific Contract Implementing Party – Responsible Person:

Stefano GUERRA

21/01/2014

Framework Contractor:

Date: 21/01/2014

CONTENTS

	Table of abbreviations	7
	Executive summary	9
1	Introduction	14
2	Overall Background	17
3	Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership (NDEP)	20
3.1	Environmental/non-nuclear window	21
3.1.1	EU co-funding projects	23
3.1.2	Assessment and key findings	24
3.1.3	Conclusion and recommendation	27
3.2	Nuclear window	28
3.2.1	EU co-funding	31
3.2.2	Assessment and key findings	32
3.2.3	Conclusions and recommendations	34
4	Northern Dimension Partnership on Transport and Logistics (NDPTL)	36
4.1	Description of partnership	36
4.2	EU funding	40
4.3	Assessment of EU funding	41
4.4	Conclusions and recommendations for the NDPTL	44
5	Northern Dimension Partnership Health and Social Well-being (NDPHS)	46
5.1	Description	46
5.2	EU funding	51

5.3	Assessment and key findings	52
5.4	Conclusions and recommendation	55
6	Northern Dimension Partnership on Culture (NDPC)	57
6.1	Description of partnership	57
6.2	EU funding for the NDPC	59
6.3	Assessment and key findings	60
6.4	Conclusions and recommendations	63
7	Overall conclusions and lessons learned	65

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Evaluation questions and Judgement Criteria	69
Appendix B	List of partnerships, participants and contributors	70
Appendix C	List of people interviewed	71
Appendix D	NDEP-non-nuclear – documentation and sources	74
Appendix E	Appendix C NDEP- nuclear – documentation and sources	79
Appendix F	NDPTL - documentation and sources	83
Appendix G	NDPHS - documentation and sources	87
Appendix H	NDPC - documentation and sources	92
Appendix I	General background documents	98

Table of abbreviations

Abbreviation	Full title
BCP	Business Culture Partnership
BDF	Baltic Development Forum
BEAC	Barents Euro Arctic Cooperation
BSAP	Baltic Sea Action Plan
BSR	Baltic Sea Region
CBC	Cross-border cooperation
CBSS	Council of Baltic Sea States
CCI	Cultural and creative industries
CCIP	Cultural and Creative Industries Platform Programme
CF	Cultural Forum
CSR	Committee of Senior Officials (NDPHS)
DG SANCO	Directorate General for Health and Consumers
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
EEAS	European External Action Service
ENPI	European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument
EUCOM	European Commission
EUD	Delegation of the European Union
EUSBSR	European Union Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region
FWC	Framework Contract
HELCOM	Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission – Helsinki Commission
HLM	High Level Meeting
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IBM	Integrated Border Management
IFI	International Financing Institute
IFT	International Transport Forum

ImPrim	Improvement of public health by promotion of equitably distributed high quality primary health care systems
JCP	Joint Comprehensive Environmental Action Programme
MNEPR	Multi-Lateral Nuclear Environmental Programme in Russia
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NIF	Neighbourhood Investment Facility
NCM	Nordic Council of Ministers
ND	Northern Dimension
NDBC	Northern Dimension Business Council
NDEP	Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership
NDPC	Northern Dimension Partnership on Culture
NDPHS	Northern Dimension Partnership on Health and Social Well-being
NDPTL	Northern Dimension Partnership on Transport and Logistics
NEFCO	Nordic Environment Finance Corporation
NEPTL	Northern Dimension Partnership on Transport and Logistics
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NIB	Nordic Investment Bank
NOC	Nuclear operating committee
PA	Priority Area (EUSBSR)
PAC	Priority Area Coordinator (EUSBSR)
PIU	Project implementation unit
ROM	Results-oriented monitoring
RW	Radioactive waste
SC	Steering committee
SMP	Strategic master plan
SNF	Spent nuclear fuel
TA	Technical assistance
TACIS	Technical Aid to the Commonwealth of Independent States
TEN-T	Trans-European Transport Networks
TI	Transparency International
TW	Toxic waste

Executive summary

Introduction to the evaluation

The **Mid-term evaluation of the EU support to the Northern Dimension (ND) Partnerships** took place during July to November 2013 and focused on the relevance, EU value added, impact and sustainability of the projects implemented up until November 2013 with EU financing, or co-financing. The aim of the evaluation was to collect and assess lessons learned from EU support to the partnerships' operation, in order to improve the design, programming and implementation of future interventions.

ND policy and partnerships

The Northern Dimension (ND) policy is a joint policy, comprising the EU, Russia, Norway and Iceland, based on the principles of equality and co-financing. The ND policy provides a framework for economic cooperation and sustainable development in Northern Europe. The policy is operationalised through four partnerships: Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership (NDEP), Northern Dimension Partnership on Transport and Logistics (NDPTL), Northern Dimension Partnership Health and Social Issues (NDPHS) and Northern Dimension Partnership on Culture (NDPC).

Scope of the evaluation

It was not within the mandate of the evaluation's terms of reference to assess the ND Partnership as such, however, assessment of aspects of the partnerships is included as it is difficult to separate the EU funding activities from the work carried out under the partnerships. The evaluation is based on case projects in all four partnerships, however, it does not evaluate individual projects or interventions, but use findings from selected cases to draw conclusions relating to EU funding of the four partnerships.

Differences structures and age

The four partnerships, subject to the evaluation, cover very different subject matter and operate differently to one another. Management and funding sources range from a grants fund, used to leverage funding from the IFIs, to policy cooperation based funding, for common grant project implementation. Furthermore, the age and implementation stages of the four partnerships vary markedly. Some partnerships are implemented by large professional banks others are hosted by international organisations, partly with their own legal status. EU contribution goes into a common fund in two of the partnerships and in the others projects are funded individually by the EU. Nevertheless, the evaluation tries to provide a common

framework to understand how the EU funding contributes to the work/activities of all of the four ND partnerships.

NDEP

Supporting environmental and nuclear projects, the **Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership (NDEP)** is the first and oldest of the ND partnerships. Established in 2002, the NDEP Support Fund is a multi-donor trust fund with the European Union and partner governments, including Russia. The grants fund has the purpose of leveraging environmental and nuclear investment for projects. The NDEP Support Fund is envisaged to be operational until 2017.

The importance of EU funding for NDEP

The EU has been one among a number of donors – albeit a very important one. Stakeholders have assessed that without the financial contribution and the political legitimacy lent by the EU, the NDEP would not have achieved its present level of funding and influence.

NDEP – environment

The NDEP environment window has, till now, focused on the major wastewater issues in the Baltic Sea Region. HELCOM provides the strategic framework for the NDEP, and the NDEP is largely responsible for implementing the Baltic Sea Action Plan (BSAP). From the outset, the NDEP has drawn on the work of HELCOM and its Baltic Sea Joint Comprehensive Environmental Action Programme (JCP), which focused on tackling environmental ‘hot spots’ in order to restore the ecological balance of the Baltic Sea.

The NDEP funds municipal infrastructure projects where grants complement loan funding from IFIs and help leverage additional local and donor grant resources, typically from other donors in the region. The NDEP has in particular addressed important wastewater projects, such as, the St. Petersburg wastewater (Neva Programme) which has had a considerable positive impact on the Baltic Sea. The NDEP has also funded a smaller number of solid waste and district heating projects.

The NDEP environment window has, to date, provided grants for 123 million EUR (29 projects) leveraging investment projects 3.3 billion EUR. The next step will, inter alia, be to tackle the second tier projects, i.e. small municipalities where the NDEP grants, in particular, offer an incentive for environmental projects which may not otherwise be financially viable.

NDEP - Nuclear

The NDEP nuclear window has been important in addressing the considerable nuclear waste problems in NW Russia. This was a priority for many countries in the region (at the end of the 1990’s), to clean up difficult nuclear projects left from the Soviet area. The nuclear part was an important element in the *raison d’être* of the NDEP and, as such, a key reason why many countries support the fund. The latest ministerial meeting in October 2013 confirmed the commitment to the policy.

The first project funded by the nuclear window helped develop a strategic master plan to address nuclear issues. Radiation monitoring and emergency systems have also been developed, set up and assessed externally by the IAEA. The problematic nuclear submarines have now, for the most part, been dealt with, spent nuclear fuel (SNF) has been removed, the submarines have been dismantled and the reactor units have been placed in storage.

NDEP nuclear grants (159 million EUR) cover the investment costs (no loans) in full, with local co-financing from Russia. The projects are developed in close cooperation with the Russian authorities, by Russian and international experts. EU involvement is considered important in this complex and costly exercise, which is further complicated due to sensitivity in terms of information. There are still uncommitted funds in the nuclear window and, at present, it is not expected that additional funding will be needed within the current mandate.

NDPTL

The **Northern Dimension Partnership on Transport and Logistics (NDPTL)** is one of the younger partnerships and has recently developed a fund. The fund will provide support to the preparation of infrastructure projects relevant to the ND region. Since the establishment of the NDPTL in 2009, efforts have been made to establish an agreed framework and methods. The NDPTL is based within the Nordic Investment Bank (NIB) and has its own secretariat.

The EU has, to date, provided support to approximately eight projects of a strategic and framework character (completed are Core Transport Network as an extension of the TEN-T Core Network and Border Crossing Point Management). These studies have helped set-up the fund, and its operation, as well as its strategic direction in selecting projects for funding. The first projects of the fund were selected in November 2013.

As with the other partnerships, it has taken considerable time agree and develop their structure and strategic direction. For the NDPTL this reflects the national character of transport projects and various interests within the region. The EU therefore has a key role to play, both in supporting the NDPTL with its policy coordination and as a source of finance.

The EU has been the largest donor, and with the additional commitment to the NDPTL Fund, it will continue to be. There are expectations (from stakeholders) that the EU will commit additional (substantial) funding in order to trigger the interest and additional funding from other donors.

NDPHS

For the **Northern Dimension Partnership Health and Social Issues (NDPHS)**, the overall focus for the cooperation as the key strategic document is the EUSBSR. The NDPHS has been instrumental in promoting its health strategy, successfully advocating its inclusion as a separate priority area in the renewed Action Plan. The NDPHS Secretariat has taken on the role of the PAC for Health, ensuring a close coordination within the sector. Several of the NDPHS projects are EUSBSR Flagships.

The three EU-funded projects are in line with the NDPHS strategic priorities and reflect the interests and needs of the ND area: alcohol and drug use, prevention of HIV and associated illnesses among young people in the project countries. Contributions from the member countries mainly, but not exclusively, fund the secretariat and participation in the expert and task group work. The NDPHS project activities are primarily funded through EU financing sources, both those provided directly to the NDPHS and those of other EU programmes. The NDPHS has been efficient and effective in activating and applying for other EU funding - using one source to leverage another.

The strength of the NDPHS lies in its combination of policy and project work, by providing expertise and initiating projects which influence policy in the participating countries. The NNPHS will need to strengthen its strategy so that it becomes more focused and more effective in achieving its goals. This, combined with a strong secretariat which can support this development, both technically and financially (attracting funding from various sources), will provide the NDPHS with a sound basis for the future.

NDPC

The **Northern Dimension Partnership on Culture (NDPC)** is the youngest of the four partnerships (established in 2010) in the Northern Dimension Policy. The focus of the partnership is on Cultural and Creative Industries (CCI). The secretariat is placed with the Nordic Council of Ministers. The NDPC Secretariat has limited resources, and needs to focus on achieving the largest possible impact on the sector, and in the ND area. Its legal status, strategic direction and financing are all still key issues which need to be solved.

The EU has funded a number of studies, and the project “Northern Dimension cooperation for cultural and creative industries’ development” (CCIP) has also been partly funded by the EU, additional funding was provided by the NDPC members for the implementation of the 12 mini-projects. The studies were initiated before the establishment of the secretariat and have had little follow-up.

EU funding has been crucial for the NDPC. While the participating countries provide financing for the running of the secretariat, it is primarily the funding channelled through the EUD in Moscow that finances projects and operations. A key issue in the future will be the secretariat ability to attract funding for its operations. At the moment, the secretariat and all its many functions are being manned by one person.

Overall conclusions and lessons learned

In summary, the **overall conclusion** is that the EU funding of the ND partnerships has worked **well** and there are a number of **lessons learned** for use/application in the future:

Relevance

The assessment has found that the EU funding, as such, has supported relevant initiatives, in relation to ND policies and needs, in the region. EU funding for the ND partnerships has been used, either as co-funding (NDEP), or as funding for preparatory work of the partnerships (NDPTL and NDPC), or partnership projects (NDPHS). A prerequisite for good allocation of EU funds has been the presence of agreed goals and objectives, strategy framework and directions.

Stakeholders find that the ND partnerships cover an important part of the cooperation structure. The partnerships support coordination in the region and provide an implementation level/platform where projects are conceived and developed. The strategic frameworks have also ensured a coordination of EU funds with other funds, as well as other EU funds.

EU Value added

Overall, EU funding makes projects possible or provides leverage (increasing) to funding from other sources. However, stakeholders do consider that the EU's involvement in the ND cooperation is very important, not just as a means of

funding. The EU's role in coordination, arbitration, as discussion partner and policy developer is appreciated.

EU-Russian Cooperation

The presence of the EU is very important for Russia as the largest partner in the group. Cooperation is at a practical and concrete level this works also when other cooperation forms are less effective. The fact that the cooperation is based on an equal footing is very important to Russia, and Russia actively supports the NDEP, the NDPHS, and the NDPC. In the case of NDPTL, Russia seems to take a wait-and-see position. If the EU finds it important and commits funding, Russia will do likewise.

Impact

When it comes to impact, the projects funded by the EU have achieved very clear and measurable impacts in the NDEP (particularly in the environmental sector but also in the nuclear window). The NDPHS projects have also had impact on policy even though this is more difficult to assess, there are good examples to be found. For the NDPC and the NDPTL, it is too early to measure the impact of the EU funded projects. NDPTL funded projects (recently begun) will contribute to the intended impact.

Sustainability

EU funded or co-funded projects differ markedly and so does the sustainability of these projects, within the four partnerships. It would be difficult to generalise or transfer experience from one partnership to another. Only few of the projects supported in the NDPC and the NDPHS will be sustainable in their own right but the methods and policy cooperation will be continued in other contexts. For the large infrastructure projects, sustainability has different dimensions. The commitment in terms of providing co-financing and obligations to repay the loans for infrastructural investment projects often establishes strong ownership and thereby the preconditions for sustainability.

A key issue is stabilising (strengthening) the implementation structure of some of the partnerships. Lack of resources and uncertain future prospects do not contribute towards enhancing performance. The more established the partnership, and the better and the more professional the manager/secretariat, the better the implementation and the use of results and, thereby, the greater the impact. When the limited human resources are not utilised optimally and much time and energy is spent on survival instead of development. EU funding could be spent on strengthen the work of the secretariats of the partnerships enabling them to be more self-reliant, better able to attract funding in future.

Effectiveness and efficiency

Effectiveness and efficiency has not been a key focus of this evaluation and, as there are many different implementation models, it is difficult to draw general conclusions. Using existing structures, to which funding is transferred (as long as they comply with the requirements) should be preferred. It would be time consuming and costly to establish new implementation structures, which would satisfy the donors. This is probably why the EBRD approach has proven successful. Supporting this kind of cooperation through framework contracts is probably not optimal. Direct contact with organisations seems to have worked better. Monitoring and evaluation should be increase in almost all partnerships, especially to be able to communicate results and progress in a more transparent manner.

1 Introduction

The EU Delegation in Moscow has commissioned a midterm-evaluation of the Northern Dimension partnership. The mid-term evaluation took place in the period July to November 2013¹ and was carried out by a team of evaluation consultants (Bettina Rafaelsen, Team Leader and Elina Kuzjukevica, consultant) under the SACO framework consortium.

Evaluation Focus	The mid-term evaluation focuses on the relevance, EU value added, impact and sustainability of the projects implemented to date with EU financing. It is not within the mandate to evaluate the ND Partnership as such but the partnership will be described in order to provide a framework for the analysis of the EU funding. Insofar as it is relevant to the assessment of the EU funding, issues concerning the working of the partnership (secretariats or implementation structure) will also be discussed.
Aim of evaluation	<p>The aim of the evaluation was to collect the lessons learned from the partnerships' operation in order to use them to improve the design, programming and implementation of future interventions. Specifically, the evaluation looks at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">› the impact of projects already implemented› the wider relevance and impact of the projects› the importance of the EU funding› understanding of EU interventions, why they have worked well and less well› sustainability of the results, what have the partners and other stakeholders done with the project results after project completion?
Scope	The evaluation concentrated on the four partnerships under the Northern Dimension: Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership (NDEP), Northern Dimension Partnership on Transport and Logistics (NEPTL), Northern Dimension Partnership Health and Social Issues (NDPHS) and Northern Dimension

¹ A few interviews were carried out and some additional information gathered in December 2013 and January 2014.

Partnership on Culture (NDPC) and EU interventions with respect to these four funds.

Not an evaluation of individual projects	The four partnerships operate in different manners and are at different implementation stages. The evaluation will therefore not evaluate individual projects or interventions as such but use findings on case projects to draw conclusions with regard to the four partnerships. For each of the partnerships, a number of projects have been selected as case projects on which to focus the assessment. For some partnerships, this meant that all EU-funded projects or supported interventions have been included in the assessment, for others a selection of completed projects has been included.
Intervention logic	Intervention logics for all project assessed are included in the annexes to provide an overview of the projects, the challenges they were set up to address, the inputs, results and impacts or possible impacts. The lists of projects and intervention logics are included in the chapters of the report and the annexes (D-H).
Standardised presentation	In spite of the differences in the partnerships, their structure and operations, the report will attempt to present the information in a standardised manner for each of the partnerships. Each partnership description includes the background of the partnership, governance structures, working methods, strategic and operational frameworks and activities of the partnership thus providing a framework for understanding how the EU funding contributes to the work/activities of the partnership.
Assessment and evaluation criteria	Each partnership chapter includes a description of the EU funded and co-funded projects assessed. This is then followed by the assessment itself according to the evaluation criteria: relevance, EU value added, impacts and sustainability (to a lesser extent efficiency and effectiveness) and brief conclusions and recommendation. Chapter 7 includes the overall assessment of the partnerships, key lessons learned and recommendations.
Evaluation questions and judgement criteria	The assessment is based on a set of evaluation questions and judgement criteria (Appendix A). These criteria have been used for the assessment of documents as well as to structure the interview guide. The report follows structurally the judgement criteria.
Availability of data	Attention is drawn to the fact that there will be differences in the analysis in terms of both quantity and quality, depending on the availability data. For the EU-funded projects (in NDPTL, NDPHS and NDPC), there is considerably more reports and especially external independent monitoring available (there may be more data available than what has been made available to the evaluators), than for the investment projects of the NDEP.
Data collection	<p>This the draft report for the mid-term evaluation of the Northern Dimension partnerships has been based on the findings during the interviews and the assessment of writing materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Written (data) documentation from the ND partnerships; progress reports, websites, governance documents (MoUs, fund rules, etc.), project

documentation (description, reports), monitoring information, strategic documentation, documentation from various organisations (CBSS, HELCOM, etc.). Documents and written sources are listed per partnership in the specific partnership annexes as well as in the general list are (see Appendices D-H).

- Interviews (face-to-face) in Brussels, Moscow, Helsinki, Stockholm, Copenhagen and Berlin and telephone interviews with stakeholders (steering committee members, secretariats/funds managers, beneficiaries, hosting organisation representatives, EUD Moscow, EEAS, and various EU Commission services) in inter alia Oslo, Tallinn, Riga, London, etc. The original list provided by the EUD in Moscow has been extended to include a number of additional interviews (Appendix A)².

Comments on report The draft of this report was sent to the EUD in Moscow for further comments. This final version includes the changes made to the report following the comments. A table of comments was made for the EUD, including a description of the response made to the comments (separate document).

Funding vs. co-funding Due to the different ways in which EU funding is being channelled to the partnerships, slightly different terms are being used. For the NDEP, the EU contribution goes into a common fund. For most of the other partnerships, EU funding is provided through individual projects. For the NDEP, the term co-funding is used in order to signal that the EU funding cannot be isolated from other donor funding, whereas for the NDPTL (until now) and the NDPHS and NDPC, the EU funding is very clearly identifiable in individual EU-funded projects.

Report content This report includes the following chapters:

- Chapter 2 Background information on the Northern Dimension, the Northern Dimension Partnerships, relation with other regional cooperation programmes, and financing of the Northern Dimension Partnerships
- Chapter 3 NDEP – Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership (non-nuclear and nuclear window)
- Chapter 4 NDPTL - Northern Dimension Partnership on Transport and Logistics
- Chapter 5 NDPHS - Northern Dimension Partnership on Health and Social Well-being
- Chapter 6 NDPC - Northern Dimension Partnership on Culture
- Chapter 7 Overall conclusions and lessons learned
- Appendixes Judgement criteria (A), list of partnerships (B), list of persons interviewed (C), list of projects, list of documentation and log-frames (D-H) and a general list of documents (I).

² Almost all requests for interviews have been met. A few did not answer or were not available.

2 Overall Background

Joint policy framework	The Northern Dimension (ND) policy is a joint policy of the EU, Russia, Norway and Iceland based on the principles of equality and co-financing. It was initially established in 1999, but renewed in 2006, when a policy declaration and policy framework documents were adopted ³ .
Purpose	The ND policy provides a framework for economic cooperation and sustainable development in Northern Europe. The ND policy focuses on areas of cooperation where a regional and sub-regional emphasis brings added value. The priority sectors are economic cooperation, freedom, security and justice, external security, research, education and culture, environment, nuclear safety and natural resources and social welfare and healthcare.
ND Structure	The four ND partners have an equal voice in decision-making. The partners meet three times annually in ND Steering group meetings, as well as in bi-annual ministerial meetings and bi-annual meetings of senior officials. Cooperation in the framework of the ND Dimension is based on equal partnership, which offers a way to engage non-EU members (in particular Russia, Belarus and Iceland) in the already existing Nordic and Nordic-Baltic cooperation in the Baltic Sea Region. CBSS, HELCOM, BDF, Artic Council. Appendix B provides an overview over the participants in each of the partnerships.
Partnerships	Practical cooperation, including implementation of joint projects, takes place within the framework of the four ND partnerships. Although the ND has four main partners, the individual partnerships have a number of participants, including most of the countries in the region and for some also a number of international organisations. The partnerships are all jointly established and jointly financed. Participation in the partnerships is based on financial contributions.
The four partnerships	The four partnerships differ in many ways. The NDEP was established first, and the newest partnership is the NDPC. The partnerships are also of very different nature. While the NDEP is a grants fund used to leverage funding from the IFIs, the NDPHS is rather a policy cooperation based on common grant project implementation. As the partnerships are of different age, their experiences and

³ Northern Dimension Policy Framework Document. Helsinki Summit. 2006.

development so far are also very different. An overview of these features is provided Table 2-2.

A key difference between the partnerships is the implementation structure. The NDEP, and now also the NDPTL, are implemented as grants funds by large professional banks with all the resource, control systems and governance structures these entail and are an integral part of these structures. The NDPHS and the NDPC secretariats are hosted by international organisations, partly with their own legal status. The resources provided to the partnerships are at different levels and for the NDPHS and NDPC at a lower level than the funding outlined for NDEP and NDPTL.

Funding of the partnerships – bilateral funding

Each of the partnerships cooperates with a number of programmes and funding sources. Especially bilateral donor funding from participating countries is a key source of funding alongside EU funding. The secretariats of the NDPTL, NDPHS and the NDPC are funded primarily by the participating countries. In addition, all of the partnerships received funding to specific projects from bilateral sources.

Table 2-1 Overview of the four partnerships

Partner-ship	Purpose	Year of MoU	EU Financing MEUR	Other donor financing MEUR
NDEP	Environment and nuclear projects Investments in infrastructure and preparation works	2002	84 (40 + 44) ⁴	1 Billion ⁵ in other grant and loans ⁶ :
NDPTL	Transport and logistic projects Grants for preparation of investments in transport and logistics infrastructure	2006	1 1,4 (new)	Support to the secretariat is approximately 300.000 EUR/per year. Other bilateral support to specific project or activities (amount not specified)
NDPHS	Health and Social projects Running of expert groups Grants for projects	2003	2011: 76,126 2012: 300,000 2013: 300,000	Funding to specific project or activities of expert groups, stakeholders. Participants contributions to NDPHS: 2011: 331,726 2012: 331,505 2013: 344,262
NDPC	Creative industries Grants for projects Running of platform	2010	1 2011: 272,498 2012: 300,000	Support to the secretariat 300.000 EUR/per year) Other bilateral support to specific project or activities
	Total		87	

⁴ Total EU funding since 2002

⁵ According to NDEP News – November 2013, the NDEP grant of 123 million EUR has leveraged 3.3 billion total cost.

⁶ The EBRD receives 2% of the funding paid into the fund to manage it for the non-nuclear area and will be reimbursed for costs incurred in connection with management of nuclear projects.

Table 2.2 provides an overview of key features of the four partnerships and their funding – only for the NDEP, the figures reflect the full amount. For the other partnerships, additional grant funding is provided by bilateral donors, but this is not necessarily directly managed by the partnership. Projects directly financed by other grant donors are therefore not always included in overviews of partnership funding.

Other EU programmes

Other sources of EU funding (than directly to the partnerships) is available to the partnerships from inter alia cross-border and transnational programmes as well as programmes for non-state actors.

EU funding

The EU has provided funding (since renewals of the ND Policy) to the four partnerships as listed below in Table 2.1. As mentioned above, this is the direct funding provided to the partnerships. The EU funding originates from TACIS and now ENPI programmes. Other EU funding from programmes such as ETC or non-state actions is not included in the overview below as specific figures are not known. These projects or funding will be mentioned under the description of each partnership.

Table 2-2 EU funding to the ND partnerships⁷

Year	Funding instrument	Project	ND Partnerships supported	EU commitment
2006	TACIS	EU contribution to the Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership	NDEP	10 M€
2010	ENPI	Baltic Sea Strategy for the Russian Federation" (EU contribution to NDEP)	NDEP	14 M€
2010-2012	ENPI	Support to ND Partnerships" (ENPI Regional East)	NDPTL, NDPC, NDPHS	3 M€
		TOTAL		27 M€

⁷ EU Financing for Northern Dimension activities since the renewal of the ND policy. Brussels, 4 December 2012

3 Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership (NDEP)⁸

Aim of the NDEP

Some transition countries in the ND area lacked the resources and the expertise to address the considerable environmental problems in their regions. To cater for this need, the NDEP was developed to provide a cooperation facility between partner governments, the European Commission, donors and international financial institutions (IFIs) to facilitate financing structures that could combine loans, grants and local budget funding for the implementation of environmental investments. Supporting environmental and nuclear projects, the NDEP is the first and oldest of the ND partnerships.

NDEP support fund

Established in 2002, the NDEP Support Fund includes financial contributions from the European Union and partner governments, including Russia as illustrated in Table 3-1. It is a multi-donor trust fund. The grants fund has the purpose of leveraging environmental investment for projects. The NDEP Support Fund is envisaged to be operational until 2017.

Table 3-1 NDEP financing (Million EUR)⁹

Environment	Country	Nuclear
44	EU	40
40	Russia	
	France	40
25,9	Sweden	
	UK	15,6
	Canada	20
10	Germany	10
16	Finland	2
2,1	Norway	10
10	Denmark	1
	Netherlands	10
1	Belarus	
	Belgium	0,5
149	Total	159

⁸ Information for 3.0 is partly provided by <http://ndep.org/>

⁹ The Northern Environmental Partnership, EBRC.

Russian funding to NDEP nuclear projects	With regard to Russian funding of the nuclear projects, the co-funding is not included in NDEP fund – nuclear window. It is estimated that the Russian funding for the nuclear projects by 2015 amounts to RUB 6 billion across the NW region ¹⁰ .
Fund manager	The NDEP Support Fund is managed by the EBRD. The fund manager is responsible for funding agreements with contributors, annual financial statements, meetings of the Assembly, programme of activities and concluding agreements with the implementation agencies. The international financial institutions (IFIs) are the core members of the NDEP Steering Group - EIB, EBRD, NIB, NEFCO and the World Bank Group and act as Implementing Agencies of the NDEP Fund. Projects are currently implemented by EBRD, NIB and NEFCO (See Appendix D).
Fund rules	The Fund is governed by the Rules of the NDEP Support Fund as agreed upon by the EBRD Board of Directors. Projects are presented by the NDEP Steering Group and the Nuclear Operating Committee and approved by the NDEP Assembly of Contributors.
Assembly of contributors	The NDEP Assembly of Contributors is the governing body of the NDEP Support Fund responsible for the overall policy of the Fund and for deciding on grant allocations from the fund based on proposals submitted by the Steering Group and the Nuclear Operating Committee. The contributors to the Fund make up the members of the Assembly, and IFIs attend the Assembly meetings as observers. The Assembly meets once a year.

The environmental (3.1) and nuclear windows (3.2) of the NDEP are presented in two different sections below.

3.1 Environmental/non-nuclear window¹¹

Background	Over the years, the Baltic Sea has changed from a clear water marine environment to a sea with noxious algal growth in most parts. The Gulf of Finland - shared by Finland, Estonia and Russia – is particularly affected. Eutrophication is threatening the Baltic Sea, damaging the health and diversity of indigenous fish, plant and animal populations and causing the spread of marine dead zones. Poorly treated wastewater and agricultural waste containing high levels of phosphorus and nitrogen are discharged into the Baltic Sea resulting in excessive algae growth in the sea waters.
Steering of fund	The NDEP support fund Steering Committee meets twice a year (spring and autumn). The NDEP Steering Committee is composed of representatives from the European Commission, the Russian Federation and IFIs operating in NW Russia, namely the EBRD, NIB, EIB, NEFCO and the World Bank. The Chair of the NDEP Steering Group rotates among the IFIs each year. The Group deliberates new funding requests for project, which are subsequently developed as project

¹⁰ Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership Support Fund. Minutes of the 10th Assembly meeting. 2.12.11.

¹¹ Information for 6.1 is partly provided by <http://ndep.org/>

proposals to the Assembly for grant allocations. The Steering Group monitors the progress achieved by on-going projects and discusses policy and strategy issues.

Municipal infrastructure projects

The NDEP funds municipal infrastructure projects where grants complement loan funding from IFIs and help leverage additional local and donor grant resources, typically from other donors in the region. The grants offer an incentive for environmental projects that may not otherwise be financially viable. In general, a small part of the projects is financed as grant funding from the NDEP support fund, and the remaining amount is provided by one of the participating financial institutions (EBRD, NEFCO, NIB, EIB) as a loan.

Project selection

Although improvements to wastewater treatment are of primary concern to the environmental window of the NDEP, other challenges regarding low energy efficiency and poor management of municipal and agricultural waste are also included in the NDEP programme. The selection of projects is based on the criteria of: sources' environmental effects, the direct cross-border impacts, and local and regional priorities. IFIs and local authorities are the key actors in identifying these potential investments. The projects are assessed based on their environmental effect, priority and financing capacities.

Table 3-2 Overview of NDEP Environmental projects

Sub-sector	Number	IFI			Russia	Belarus
		EBRD	NIB	NEFCO		
Waste water	20	10	6	4	17	3
District heating	5	4		1	5	
Solid waste	2			2	2	
Other	1	1			1	
Total	28	15	6	7	25	3

Focus of fund

The fund has primarily been used to finance priority municipal infrastructure projects in NW Russia. Since 2012, Belarus has participated in the NDEP, and the first projects have already been funded. Implementation of projects to achieve compliance with HELCOM standards and to reduce cross-border pollution started in 2013. Almost half of the territory of Belarus lies in the Baltic Sea basin area. Most of the pollution from Belarus comes from its trans-boundary rivers: Bug, flowing through Poland, Daugava which discharges into Latvia and Nemunas, which empties into Lithuania.

Strategic framework

Overall, HELCOM provides the strategic framework for the NDEP, and the NDEP is largely implementing the Baltic Sea Action Plan (BSAP). From the outset, the NDEP has been drawing on the work of HELCOM and its Baltic Sea Joint Comprehensive Environmental Action Programme (JCP), which focused on tackling environmental 'hot spots' to restore the ecological balance of the Baltic Sea. HELCOM is leading the BSAP. Adopted in 2007, the programme strives to restore the 'clear water' status of the Baltic Sea by 2021 through a coordinated

approach of all stakeholder countries signing up to their own national commitment plans.

Progress report NDEP progress reports are issued on an annual basis for the donor assembly meeting. The annual reports describe the progress of each project in terms of implementation and raises particular issues.

3.1.1 EU co-funding projects

Priority projects The fund has been able to co-finance environmental projects. As all contributions are pooled in the fund, it is not possible to separate the EU-financed parts from the others, but the EU share can be considered a part of the total. Currently, 29 projects are approved in the environmental window. Four projects were analysed in more detail for this assessment as outlined below:

Neva Programme Two projects in St. Petersburg, namely the Neva Closure of Discharges of Untreated Waste Water and the South West Waste Water Treatment Plant as part of the Neva Programme have been funded. The projects are part of the overall improvement of the wastewater treatment (Neva Programme) of the largest city on the Baltic Sea and therefore a very significant investment with major impacts on the Baltic Sea.

Kaliningrad District Heating Project The Kaliningrad District Heating Project includes an upgrading and rehabilitation of district heating infrastructure to enable Kaliningrad to reduce gas consumption as well as to minimise water and heat losses. The project is still under implementation although close to completion. As a result, the old, coal-fired boiler houses will be closed down.

Table 3-3 Case project NDEP Non-nuclear window¹²

	Title	Short description	NDEP (MEURO)	Total (MEURO)
1	(EBRD) Kaliningrad District Heating Project	Modernisation of district heating infrastructure to reduce energy consumption and CO2 emissions	7,3	21,8
2	(NIB) ST. PETERSBURG NEVA CLOSURE OF DISCHARGES OF UNTREATED WASTEWATER	The construction of the Northern Tunnel Collector in St Petersburg is set for October 2013. This complex investment is part of the overall Neva Programme co-financed by a EUR 24 million NDEP Grant and 60 million IFI loans from the NIB, EIB and EBRD. The tunnel will connect the remaining points of direct discharges of untreated waste water from the city centre. Once put into operation, St Petersburg will achieve full compliance with the EU and HELCOM standard and will treat 98.4 of its waste water.	24,0	562,6
3	(NEFCO) SOSNOVY BOR WATER AND WASTEWATER REHABILITATION	Improving water and wastewater facilities to reduce nutrient load to the Baltic Sea	0,5	5,1
4	ST. PETERSBURG SOUTHWEST WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	Construction of the wastewater treatment plant, the project included two independent components: the Sludge Incineration Plant,	5,8	192,7

¹² Description adapted from progress report and project sheets.

Sosnovy Bor Water and Wastewater Rehabilitation

A small project focusing on the upgrading the wastewater infrastructure in the City of Sosnovy Bor has been funded by NDEP. The project is financed by a mix of loans, budget funding and grants from the NDEP and the Finnish Government. The project was delayed due to the difficulties in securing guarantee for the NEFCO loan (guarantee by a commercial bank) 2010. Almost all locally financed project components have been completed.

A list of projects with budget allocations and intervention logic (Log frame) for these projects is included in Appendix D.

3.1.2 Assessment and key findings

As stated above, EU contributions cannot be separated from other sources of funding as all funding is gathered in the same fund. The assessment of EU funding made below is therefore also the assessment of the NDEP fund as such. In the cases where a specific observation or finding relates to EU funding alone, this will be emphasised. This will in particular be the case under the heading ‘EU Value Added’.

Relevance

Interventions in accordance with EU and ND policies

The NDEP is established within the framework of the HELCOM and the priorities set by HELCOM – in that manner the funded projects of the NDEP are within the policies of the region. For the NDEP, this is particularly clear, as there is a regional policy on environment expressed through the HELCOM action plans¹³. The latest ministerial meeting in October 2013 confirmed the commitment to the policy.

Needs reflect the priorities of the region

As such, there is no specific priority list or strategy of the NDEP. However, indirectly there has been a wish to address the largest environment hotspots around the Baltic Sea first. As mentioned above, the NDEP is oriented and steered by the priorities of the HELCOM, in terms of which projects are to be addressed first, namely the large polluters. In addition, priorities are set by the relevant authorities in Russia and lately also in Belarus.

The IFIs assess the projects in accordance with their criteria credit (bankability), environmental, anti-corruption and procurement. This means that projects to be proposed to the board have already been assessed by the IFIs in terms of their suitability for funding.

Correspondence with needs of beneficiaries

The funding for the NDEP is important for the municipalities in the region as many of these projects would not be bankable without a grant component. Many of the large projects have been already initiated and completed. The fund responds to a need of local governments of the region, who have strained budgets and difficulties in finding financing and loans in the private sector on terms, which would be repayable for them. For small municipalities, the grant financing from the NDEP and additional grant financing in connection with IFI loans, make projects possible

¹³ EUSBSR Action Plan 2013 Update

in the first place. It is noted that even with the possibility of NDEP grant financing some municipalities are not able or willing to take a loan due to uncertainties with regard to their future repayment capability. The freeze of municipal tariffs by Russian federal authorities, limits the possibilities of municipalities to fund the repayment of loans through the tariffs, and thereby future debt servicing. One smaller project has, therefore, been cancelled even though loan conditions have been the same as for other NDEP projects¹⁴.

EU Value added

Coordination
between donors and
partner is
functioning

As the EU funds are pooled with other funds, it can be confirmed that the EU funding is coherent and coordinated with other funding within the NDEP. All funding is managed through the fund manager. The sectoral coordination is done through HELCOM as mentioned above and the EUSBSR.

EUSBSR

In the EUSBSR, 'Save the Sea' is one of the key objectives, and in particular the sub-objective Clear Water. Apart from the BSAP the requirement for good environmental status of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and favourable conservation status of the Habitats Directive in accordance with the EU Biodiversity Strategy are key. The EUSBSR also provide an umbrella for the Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership (NDEP), through HELCOM and the Council of Baltic Sea States (CBSS) and new initiatives like the South East Baltic Area (SEBA) and the so-called Turku process. In combination these frameworks are helping to deliver benefits to the environment in water, wastewater, solid waste and energy efficiency,

EU funding function
as catalyst and
multiplier

A key issue, underlined by many stakeholders, is the importance of the EU funding in providing legitimacy and leverage to the NDEP. There is little doubt of the importance of the EU funding in mobilising other donors, especially Russia, to make large contributions. The NDEP had a slow start, and it was only when the EU and Russia made large contributions to NDEP that the fund gained traction and attention. The EU grant funding to the NDEP has leveraged EUR 1 billion¹⁵ in grants and loans, funding 29 important environmental projects.

EU instrument
coherent and
complementary

As mentioned earlier, the NDEP projects consist of a mix of funding. Apart the NDEP grant and the loans from IFIs, many projects also receive considerable, bilateral donor funding from stakeholders in the region. These grants are often used to provide technical assistance or PIU support to manage the investment projects. All in all, this provides a comprehensive support to the beneficiaries and to the environmental investments.

¹⁴ A project concerning a wastewater treatment plant in Tikhvin was cancelled in December 2013.

¹⁵ At the end of 2010, 23 priority projects totalling over 3,3 billion EUR in investments had been included in the NDPE work programme (The Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership. 10 years of successful cooperation for a cleaner and safe environment in Northern Europe. 2013) .

Impact and sustainability

Attributable impacts of interventions can be identified

For most projects, the impacts and probable impacts of the NDEP are transparent and measurable. These impacts can be measured externally through the indicators of HELCOM. In the case of projects, the impacts are beginning to show, and in the area of the Baltic Sea where projects have been finalised, impacts as outlined in the box below are likely to be achieved.

Stakeholders confirm impacts

There are indications that the water in the Gulf of Finland is already cleaner as a result of the investments in improved wastewater infrastructure. Since 2011, the Gulf of Finland is free from eutrophication. Since 2011, St. Petersburg fully complies with HELCOM recommendations with regard to phosphorus and nitrogen concentrations in the discharged effluent not to exceed 0,5 mg/l and 10 mg/l respectively. In 2013, St Petersburg will achieve full compliance with the EU and HELCOM standards and will treat 98 per cent of its wastewater¹⁶. In 2005, only 85% of wastewater was treated.

Box 3-1 The Neva Programme – St. Petersburg Southwest Wastewater Treatment Plant

St Petersburg has been the focus of NDEP since the start. In 2005 the first NDEP co-financed project, Southwest Wastewater Treatment Plant (SWTP), was inaugurated in an official ceremony attended by the Russian and Finnish presidents, the Swedish prime minister and the governor of St Petersburg. This €194 million investment, co-financed by a €5.8 million NDEP grant, helped to raise the city's capacity for wastewater treatment to 85 per cent. The €563 million Neva Programme supported by a €24 million NDEP grant will further cut the amount of direct discharges into the Gulf of Finland.

Local public investments

Sustainability of the projects financed by the NDEP can be measured in two ways: the ability to maintain the loan and the facilities financed through the project. IFIs generally assess the financed facilities to be investments in adequate technology in line with the needs and technological standards of the beneficiaries. The second issue is the ability to maintain the loans. All loans are guaranteed by the sovereign states. A key condition is that the tariffs charged to the users are at an adequate level, reflecting the cost and the principle of use-pay and that these can be used for both repayment of the loan and maintenance of the facilities. Setting the tariffs to meet these criteria has been an issue in Russia and for the projects in Belarus, as the policy has been to lower tariffs as an indirect subsidy.

As discussed above, the issue of sustainability is an important issue to be addressed with the small and financially less robust municipalities, which will increasingly be the target of NDEP projects in the future.

Effectiveness and efficiency

Results contribute to the achievement of the NDEP

There is little doubt that the objectives of the assistance have been met in the case projects and largely also for the other projects. A few projects have suffered from delays and are lagging behind in achieving the results. The preparatory time for projects is often long, due to lengthy loan negotiations, and the disbursement from the fund therefore often takes place years after a project has been approved.

¹⁶ The Baltic Sea: New Level of Responsibility. St. Petersburg Initiative. Anatoly K. Kinebas. SUE "Vodokanal of St. Petersburg"

Monitoring systems in place

Monitoring of the projects is done through the systems of the IFIs which is responsible for implementing the project (Implementing Agency). They follow the projects closely throughout the implementation period and confirm that monitoring continues after the implementation, namely until the end of repayment of the loan. Overall, the EBRD as the fund manager monitors the implementation of the investment project and provides the Steering Committee with the progress reports. The progress report constitutes the monitoring report for the implementation.

Box 3-2 Environmental Benefits of NDEP projects

The current f NDEP projects will deliver the following pollution reductions to the Baltic and Barents Seas area in tonnes per annum (t/a):
Phosphorous by 2,300 t/a (HELCOM target for Russia is 2,500 t/a and for Belarus 1,740 t/a)
Nitrogen by 7,600 t/a (HELCOM target for Russia is 6,970 t/a and for Belarus 29,756 t/a)
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) by 34,600 t/a n CO2 by 318,500 t/a

No evaluations to confirm impacts

No external project evaluations or assessments¹⁷ have been made of the NDEP projects, or of whether the impacts have been achieved.

3.1.3 Conclusion and recommendation

There is little doubt that the NDEP is generally considered a very successful programme/initiative. The NDEP environmental window has:

- › been critical to the implementation of HELCOM priorities
- › promoted a unique cooperation and equal partnership appreciated by all partners
- › showed very good results and impacts
- › established a very interesting cooperative set-up between donors and IFIs – combining grants funding and IFI loans in an optimal manner (affordability and leverage).

Preferable way to channel EU contributions

The EU has been one of the donors – albeit a very important one. It is generally assessed by stakeholders that without the financial contributions and the political legitimacy lent by the EU, the NDEP would not have achieved the present level of funding and the influence.

Relevant for the EU to support NDEP in the future

The NDEP has been focusing on the major wastewater issues in the Baltic Sea Region. The next step will be to tackle the second tier projects, i.e. small municipalities to which grant funds will still play an important role in the future. This is generally considered more difficult due the challenges of capacity in terms of management, and technical and financial issues. It is generally assumed that the

¹⁷ As far as the evaluators understood, there has not been any external or independent evaluation of the effects so far.

second tier projects will be more difficult and lengthy to implement than the ones already implemented.

New focus and Belarus

Furthermore, the NDEP will continue with more district heating projects (also covered by their mandate) as well as water treatment and supply projects. Belarus has joined the environment window of the fund, and projects are now in the pipeline: There are important hotspots in Belarus where untreated wastewater is discharged into the rivers of EU Member States and through these into the Baltic Sea. Important steps have been taken by the NIB in terms of preparing three wastewater treatment plans for financing.

Recommendation

It is recommended that evaluations (generally available) be made of the results and impacts to ensure that they are verified by an independent body for all projects. This would improve the accountability, visibility and the transparency of the projects, especially in a programme which clearly has very convincing results to show and will have significant impacts over the years to come. A number of flyers are currently produced and published.

3.2 Nuclear window¹⁸

Background

Spent nuclear fuel (SNF) and radioactive waste (RW) in NW Russia pose major and dangerous environmental hazards. The Russian Federation had 250 submarines, warships and icebreakers with more than 450 naval nuclear reactors. By now, the naval fleet has been reduced by around 140 submarines as well as ships, which were withdrawn from service. This has resulted in large amounts of spent nuclear fuel and radioactive waste.

Current facilities are not designed to support the gigantic task of decommissioning the Soviet nuclear fleet. The Barents Sea area is the largest repository of nuclear waste in the world. Existing facilities for the management of nuclear waste are old, obsolete and fully utilised and some leak radioactive material into the environment. It is very important that the way waste is managed, is improved and that assistance is provided to the task of decommissioning and de-fuelling nuclear driven vessels.

Operational from 2003

The Nuclear Window became operational in May 2003 following the signing of the Multi-Lateral Nuclear Environmental Programme in Russia (MNEPR). It was further supported by the announcement of the G-8 initiative against the spread of weapons and materials of mass destruction (Kananaskis Summit, Canada, 2002), which gave priority to the safe and secure decommissioning of Russian nuclear submarines.

Multilateral Nuclear Environmental Programme

Signed on 21 May 2003 by Western donors and the Russian Federation, the Multilateral Nuclear Environmental Programme in the Russian Federation (MNEPR) is an official framework for addressing the most important legal questions associated with Western assistance in the Russian Federation. The completion of the MNEPR Agreement was a pre-condition for entering into NDEP

¹⁸ Information for 3.2 is partly provided by <http://ndep.org/>

grant agreements on nuclear waste projects and served as a trigger point to start activities in the nuclear window of the NDEP.

Aim of nuclear window

The objective of the Nuclear Window of the NDEP is to provide funding for projects that will address the environmental hazards of decommission nuclear-powered ships and submarines of the in Russia. For nuclear safety projects, NDEP grants are designed to cover the investment costs in full. The Russian authorities contribute with local costs of all kinds (these are not stated in the NDEP fund overview).

Box 3-3 Criteria for nuclear projects

The NDEP has established key criteria for selecting projects for financing. Projects should:

- be in line with Russian priorities
- be sufficiently funded from the onset
- be selected to fit in an integrated, holistic approach; all steps taken for the eventual disposal of the radioactive material need to be established at the beginning of the process
- build on the experience of existing bilateral programs and the work of the Contact Expert Group under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and
- be in line with international practice and rely on the effective work of locally based Project Management Units (PMUs) with Russian and international experts

Nuclear operating committee

The NDEP Assembly of Contributors decided to establish, in line with the NDEP Rules of the Fund, a Nuclear Operating Committee (NOC) for the nuclear window regulated by the NOC Mandate. The main task of the NOC is to identify, propose and prioritise projects in the nuclear window, which fulfil the objectives of the NDEP Support Fund. It also provides assistance during the implementation of projects and works in close collaboration with the Fund Manager, the Russian Federation and the Steering Group.

Fund manager

The EBRD is the lead bank for managing NDEP's nuclear waste projects. Progress reports are prepared by the EBRD biannually in connection with the meetings of the nuclear operating committee meetings.

Strategic orientation NDEP-nuclear

The initial task of the nuclear window of the NDEP was to develop, along with the Russian Federation Authorities and a group of independent international experts, a Strategic Master Plan (SMP) for the overall decommissioning of nuclear submarines and service vessels, for the management of spent fuel and waste and the environmental rehabilitation of NW Russia.

In 2007, Russia adopted the "Strategic Master Plan for Decommissioning the Retired Russian Nuclear Fleet and Environmental Rehabilitation of Its Supporting Infrastructure in Northwest Russia¹⁹ (SMP)". The SMP is the basis for the management of the entire nuclear legacy programme in NW Russia. The SMP is a long-term strategy, which integrates all Russian decommissioning programmes and plans involving all relevant institutions in Russia. The programme serves to

¹⁹ Foundation for Environmental Safety of Power Engineering (IBRAE RAS) Executive Summary, Moscow, 2007

prioritise the tasks and actions for priority implementation. The Priority programme includes 76 urgent projects to be implemented. The SMP aims to solve the following issues:

- › Complex decommissioning of nuclear submarines and other floating nuclear facilities posing radiation hazard
- › Remediation of coastal nuclear and radiation hazardous infrastructure facilities in an environmentally safe manner, including safe SNF, RW and toxic waste (TW) management;
- › Improvement of the physical protection of nuclear materials including the upgrade of radio ecological monitoring in the NW region.

10 projects for the NDEP

In accordance with the SMP, the Assembly has approved funding for ten priority projects in the nuclear window. Three of these projects have now been completed. A full list of projects is included in in Table 3-4 and in Appendix E.

Table 3-4 Nuclear projects

Number	Title	Description	Status	Funding (MEUR)
001	Strategic Master Plan	The NDEP Strategic Master Plan (SMP) is a comprehensive nuclear legacy decommissioning programme that is supported by a Strategic Environmental Assessment.	Completed	7,0
002 (A)	Urgent projects in Gremikha	1) Feasibility studies for the removal and safe storage of spent nuclear fuel and radioactive waste from the open storage area in Gremikha. 2) Improvement of the physical protection of the Gremikha site.	Completed	7,0
003	Radiation Monitoring and Emergency Response System of the Murmansk region	Enhancement of the radiation monitoring and emergency response system in the Murmansk region	Completed	5,1
004 (A)	Decommissioning of Building No.5 in Andreeva Bay	Phase I and Phase II	On-going	4,25
005 (A)	Decommissioning of the Floating Maintenance Base "Lepse" currently moored in Murmansk	The strategy is for the Lepse to be transferred to Nerpa shipyard and the SNF removed in an on-shore Shelter complex.	On-going	53,0
006 (A)	Defueling of Papa- class nuclear-powered submarine reactors	The SNF will be removed from the reactors using specialised defueling equipment and safely stored on land	On-going	12,54
007 (A)	Spent nuclear fuel management at Andreeva Bay	The strategy is to recover the SNF, repackage and transport it to Mayak. The project will provide the required SNF management infrastructure to enable the safe and secure removal of SNF from the site	On-going	55,0
008	Radiation Monitoring and Emergency Response System of the Arkhangelsk Region	Establish a comprehensive and integrated radiation monitoring and emergency response system in the Arkhangelsk region was completed in September 2011. The recommendations from the IAEA expert mission which took place in July 2011 have been completed.	Completed	5,1
009	Creation of safe conditions for the storage of spent reactor cores from Alfa- class	The strategy is for these reactor cores to be removed from Gremikha in special casks to NIIAR, Dmitrovgrad, for interim	On-going	11,87

	nuclear submarines	storage.		
0010	Lepse Regulatory Support project	This will ensure that the Russian regulators can effectively supervise the innovative solutions to the decommissioning project	On-going	1,54

3.2.1 EU co-funding

Table 3-5 shows the four projects reviewed in connection with this assessment. It should be noted that initially the ToR made no mention of specific projects in the nuclear window. The sector was included after agreement with the EUD and the selection of the projects was made by the evaluator and the EBRD²⁰.

Grant co-funding for projects

For nuclear projects, the NDEP grants are designed to cover the investment costs in full. Nuclear projects are developed in close cooperation with the Russian authorities and Russian and international experts. The nuclear projects are only funded by the grant fund and not in combination with IFI loans. Table 3-4 above provides an overview of the contributions of the fund. Russia does not pay to the fund but covers the local costs of the projects.

NDEP funded projects

The projects under the nuclear window are not as advanced as the environmental projects since implementation of the projects started later and since (in contrast to the environmental window) a strategic master plan had to be developed first. The project described below concerning the Strategic Master Plan was important in order to assess the required action in the very difficult and technically complex area of nuclear clean-up.

The other projects concern the first urgent projects in terms of both the feasibility and the improvement of the physical conditions at Gremikha. Another important project was to establish a comprehensive system for radiation monitoring in a region with high risk.

Table 3-5 Case project NDEP Nuclear window

	Title	Status	Short description	NDEP (MEURO)	Total (MEURO)
001	Strategic Master Plan	Completed	The NDEP Strategic Master Plan (SMP) is a comprehensive nuclear legacy decommissioning programme that is supported by a Strategic Environmental Assessment.	6,97	0,0
002	Urgent projects in Gremikha	Completed	Feasibility studies for the removal and safe storage of spent nuclear fuel and radioactive waste from the open storage area in Gremikha. Improvement of the physical protection of the Gremikha site	5,45	0,0
003	Radiation Monitoring and Emergency Response System of the Murmansk region	Completed	Enhancement of the radiation monitoring system of the Murmansk region.	5,09	0,0
004	Decommissioning of	On-going	The strategy is for the Lepse to be transferred to Nerpa	0,0	192,7

²⁰ In Meeting with the EUD in October and telephone meeting with EBRD November 2013.

the Floating Maintenance Base "Lepse" currently moored in Murmansk.		shipyard and the SNF removed in an on-shore Shelter complex.		
---------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

A list of projects with budget allocations and an intervention logic (Logframe) for these projects is included in Annex D.

3.2.2 Assessment and key findings

Relevance

Interventions in accordance with EU and ND policies

In the NDEP nuclear window, the required action was clear from the outset. The nuclear part was an important element of the *raison d'être* of the NDEP as such and a key reason why many countries supported the fund. The events at the end of the 1990's made nuclear issues a priority for many countries in the region, i.e. cleaning up difficult projects left from the Soviet area. The latest ministerial meeting in October 2013 confirmed the commitment to the policy.

Global policy

The decommissioning of nuclear submarines in Russia is one of the main objectives of international cooperation aimed at eliminating threats of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism. This was recognised by the G8 in 2002 (global leadership).

Priorities of the NDEP-nuclear window

At the beginning of the NDEP-nuclear window there was no consolidated list of projects or prioritisation of locations. Hence, it was decided as one of the first activities to establish a comprehensive strategic master plan (SMP) for the work a head of the nuclear window of the NDEP. The SMP identified ten priority projects to be funded by the NDEP. Some of the key priorities have been the spent nuclear fuel management at Andreeva Bay and decommissioning of nuclear submarines.

Correspondence with needs of beneficiaries

The Russian authorities have made the master plan (SMP) the basis for the whole nuclear legacy programme in NW Russia. This confirms the ownership of the SMP and the correspondence with the needs. It also ensures the relevance of the projects identified under the SMP and funded by the NDEP.

EU Value added

Coordination between donors and partners is functioning

As the EU funds are pooled with other funding, it can be confirmed that the EU funding is coherent and coordinated within the NDEP. All the funding is managed through the fund manager. The sectoral coordination takes place within the SMP. The nuclear issue is much larger than the region and the regional cooperation and has there for also the attention and interest of other actors outside the region. As mentioned above, this issue is a priority of the G8 global leadership and is coordinated at this level as well.

EU funding function as catalyst and multiplier

The participation of the EU is very important, almost even more in relation to the institutional and political aspects, than in relation to the funding (although these are almost inseparable in practice). Counties in the region consider it important that the difficult and complex issue of nuclear waste is tackled through international

cooperation. Some of the countries in the ND are very close to the problem, and the NDEP offers a good opportunity for smaller countries to work together with larger countries to increase the leverage vis-à-vis Russia. This issue would be too difficult to address on a bilateral basis (has been tried in the past). The EU is also seen as a guarantor of professionalism, quality as well as monitoring and control.

A key issue, underlined by many stakeholders, is the importance of the EU funding in providing leverage to the NDEP. There is and was a very large need for nuclear clean up and dealing with nuclear waste and clean-up is very costly. The nuclear window does not have the same leverage as the environmental window, since it is only concerns grants, but there is little doubt that the EU has been an important as leverage for other donors. Russia is not contributing to the NDEP nuclear window directly as to the environmental window. Russia nevertheless co-funds projects and has by 2015 contributed RUB 6 billion across the NW region²¹.

Attributable impacts of interventions can be identified

Impact and sustainability

The three completed projects have already generated a number of impacts of different character (see intervention logic in Appendix E). The SMP project has provided a master plan on which the NDEP work can be based. Further, a monitoring system has been set up and assessed externally by the IAAE as outlined in the box below. The first project on physical installations has also been completed. The legacy of nuclear submarines has now been largely dealt with, nuclear fuel spent (SNF) has been removed, the submarines have been dismantled and the reactor compartment units have been sent for safe interim storage at Sayda Bay in the Kola Peninsula.

Box 3-4 Enhancement of radiation monitoring and emergency response systems in the Archangelsk Regions

Extensive works aimed at decommissioning of a large number of radiation-hazardous naval facilities are being carried out in the Northwest Russia. An important part of these activities is nuclear, radiation, and environmental safety assurance. One of the key elements of the system for safe decommissioning of radiation-hazardous facilities is preparedness to respond to possible radiological incidents and accidents.

Availability of the modern emergency response system in the Murmansk and Archangelsk Regions ensures protection of the population and territories in case of radiological emergencies at facilities related to nuclear submarine decommissioning, spent nuclear fuel and radioactive waste management.

The Projects on enhancement of radiation monitoring and emergency response systems in the Murmansk and Archangelsk Regions were listed as the top priority projects in the Strategic Master Plan for decommissioning of NS and other radiation-hazardous facilities of the Northwest Russia. The Plan was developed in accordance with the initiative of the “Northern Dimension” Environmental Partnership (NDEP) Support Fund.

The project “Enhancement of the radiation monitoring system of the Murmansk Region” was successfully implemented in 2005–2008. The results of the project received a high appraisal of the IAEA Mission on assessment of emergency preparedness in the Region, as well as of Russian and international experts.

²¹ Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership Support Fund. Minutes of the 10th Assembly meeting. 2.12.11.

Institutions and programmes in place

Sustainability of projects is a key issue in terms of whether the facilities will be maintained after project closure. Nuclear safety is seen in a long-term perspective, and one of the central issues is naturally that the measures taken to decommission and provide safe storage of nuclear fuels are maintained in the long run. An issue in this context could be that the objects (contaminated land plots, buildings, etc.) may today belong to authorities that are not involved in nuclear issues and therefore may not have the funds or expertise to clean up sites – a key argument for the NDEP nuclear window.

Plans to enforce effects of interventions

Another aspect mentioned in connection with the IAAE assessment of the monitoring system in Archangelsk is the many authorities involved at all levels of government²². All these authorities are well informed, aware of the issues facing this region and recognise the monitoring system that has been provided them with top of the scale system to make information readily available. However, there are many layers of government and responsibility. This can lead to a dilution of responsibility and decision-making. To this end, it is important to ensure that proper procedures are established, and personnel trained in this set up. An additional project was established to address these findings²³.

Effectiveness and efficiency

Results contribute to the achievements of the NDEP

There is little doubt that the objectives of the projects have been met. Some have very long implementation times such as the Lepse project. Still, it is important that the complexity of the issue of nuclear clean-up is considered. Each situation has to be assessed separately and safety measures have to be put in place before one can commence actual work. Some donors also require that a specific environmental impact assessment is made for the project before commencement.

Monitoring systems in place

The monitoring of the projects is done through the EBRD monitoring and control systems. Externally, the IAAE has been involved in evaluating at least one project, namely the emergency response system. Apart from this, the few completed projects have not been evaluated externally. The monitoring information is included in the progress reports to the steering committee. Some stakeholders point to that it is important to share audit reports more openly. In projects, involving this size of funding the risk of corruption and other irregularities is high, and this should be addressed openly, also considering that Russia is not ranked very high on the Transparency International's Anticorruption index.

3.2.3 Conclusions and recommendations

Funds for important nuclear waste projects

There is little doubt about the relevance of the NDEP nuclear window and its importance for addressing the considerable nuclear waste problems in NW Russia. The involvement of the EU is considered important in this very complex and costly exercise, which is further complicated due to sensitivity in terms of information.

Complex projects

²² Peer Appraisal of the arrangements in Archangelsk Region (Russian Federation) regarding the preparedness for responding to a radiation emergency, IAEA. 2011

²³ NDEP. Minutes of the 10th Assembly Meeting. 2011

Progress is not fast, but some projects have been completed. Projects that have been are a long time under way reflecting the complexity of the issue. It is therefore important to consider that the current mandate of the funds expires in 2017 and that six to seven projects are still under implementation in the nuclear window. Parts of the funding are still not committed.

Relevant for the EU to support the NDEP – nuclear window in the future

Additional funding is unlikely to be relevant or needed under the current mandate of the NDEP. The priority of the NDEP nuclear window must therefore be to finalise on-going projects and to commit the remaining EUR 10 million. Towards the end of the mandate, progress in relation to SMP should be assessed in terms for the progress for the SMP and the future funding needs

Availability of monitoring and financial information

In order to increase visibility of the important achievements of the NDEP nuclear window, provision of information may be an issue to address, as limited structured information is available to the public. There is information available on the NDEP-website and flyers produced by the NDEP provide brief overviews of projects, but it is difficult to find more detailed information about the effects and the impacts. Additional information with regard to monitoring, evaluation and financial information to the donors and contributors is possibly also an issue to address in order to enhance transparency and accountability. It is not the impression that any external /independent evaluations of the results and potential impacts have been carried out till date.

4 Northern Dimension Partnership on Transport and Logistics (NDPTL)²⁴

The decision to establish the Northern Dimension Partnership on Transport and Logistics (NDPTL) was taken in by the ND minister in St. Petersburg on 28 October 2008. The main goals of the NDPTL are to improve, in an environmentally sustainable manner, the major transport connections and logistics in the ND region. This should be done in order to stimulate economic growth at the local, regional and global level by focusing on a limited number of priorities that reflect both regional and national priorities in a balanced way.

MoU 2010

A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for the NDPTL was signed in Naples on 21 October 2009. The partners are listed in Appendix A.

4.1 Description of partnership

Geographical coverage of the NDPTL

It is envisaged that the NDPTL will accelerate the implementation of major infrastructure projects providing assistance at project preparation stage thus stimulating investments in the ND region. The partnership also serves as a regional forum for transport and logistics issues and complements the work of cooperation structures already in place.

The NDPTL has the potential to become a success story similar to that of the NDEP. The difference between environment and transport is, however, that while many environmental issues are truly of joint concern, the issues relating to transport/logistics are more national, and national interests play a bigger role. While in the NDEP projects/investments are made strictly in NW Russia and Belarus, under the NDPTL projects can also take place in other participating countries.

Aim of NDPTL

The overall goal of the NDPTL is to improve major transport connections and logistics to stimulate sustainable economic growth at the local, regional and global level by focusing on a limited number of priorities that reflect both regional and national priorities.

²⁴ Information for 4.1 is partly provided by <http://www.ndptl.org/home>

Box 4-1 Aims of the NDPTL

With the general aim of promoting international trade in the Northern Dimension geographical area, the specific aims of the NDPTL include:

- Facilitating improvements in the major transnational transport connections between the partner countries with the view of stimulating sustainable economic growth at the local/regional and global levels;
- Accelerating the implementation of transport and logistics infrastructure projects along the major transnational connections, and facilitating the approval of projects of mutual interest;
- Accelerating the removal of non-infrastructure related bottlenecks, affecting the flow of transport in and across the region, and facilitating the improvement of logistics in international supply chains;
- Providing effective structures to monitor the implementation of the proposed projects and measures.

High level meeting and steering committee

Structurally, the NDPTL relies on a High Level Meeting for the strategic direction and a Steering Committee, which coordinates the work and follows the implementation of the action plan. The NDPTL Steering Group meets two to three times annually. In addition, there is an Assembly of Donors and working groups can be established to address specific issues.

NIB fund manager

In 2011, the NDPTL secretariat was established at the Nordic Investment Bank (NIB) in Helsinki. After the MoU was agreed on in 2009, it took time to set up the secretariat and to establish the agenda for the NDPTL. By the end of 2012, the Secretariat was fully operational²⁵. The work of the secretariat is described in the annual road map establishing the core activities of the secretariat for the year.

The Fund will operate with Implementing Agencies in the same way as the NDEP does. Apart from the NIB, the IFIs will be the EBRD, the EIB and members of the World Bank Group. Other IFIs can be included as well pending the approval of the Assembly of Donors.

Inputs to the strategic framework

Two important studies were conducted (EU funded) to provide input to the work of the NDPTL: the Definitions of the Core Transport networks and Study on Common Border Crossing Points. These studies have served to inform the selection of the projects (see below) and to provide the methodology for selecting projects.

Other donors have also contributed to the development of the strategic and operational framework of the NDPTL Fund. Norway funded the important Guidebook to Financing Infrastructure for Transport and Logistics within the Northern Dimension²⁶.

Project preparation of the Secretariat

One of the key activities in 2013 has been the work on the project pipeline. A database on the transport infrastructure of the NDPTL was discussed although no funding had been secured at that stage. A key function of the secretariat is to support the development of projects and ensure that TA is provided to develop good quality projects.

²⁵ The annual budget of the Secretariat is EUR 320,000 (2013)

²⁶ April 2013

Support Fund

At the end of 2012, following lengthy preparations and negotiations, an NDPTL support fund was established. To date, only Finland, Norway and Germany have contributed to the fund. The EU has pledged EUR 1.4 million to be transferred in 2014. The EU Commission intends to make the transfers directly to the NIB based on contribution agreements with the NIB. EU funding can only be used for cooperation with Russia and Belarus, as the funding source is the ENPI Regional East programme (the external cooperation instrument).

Box 4-2 Purpose of NDPTL fund

- › technical assistance for institutional support with regard to capacity building for project feasibility, development, preparation and implementation
- › assistance to project development and preparation, in particular with a view to draw upon available financing from international financial institutions, as well as other banks, private initiatives or public parties (including EU funds), or otherwise enhancing the projects' potential to mobilize resources for implementation
- › assistance to improved efficiency and quality in project implementation.

Type of projects to be supported

Projects eligible for grants will mainly include studies bringing projects of common regional interest closer to "bankability", or "financability", or otherwise accelerate their final implementation. The applicant guidelines define the constellations in which applications can be made. According to the guidelines, priority will be given to projects with the following features:

- › Located on the NDPTL Regional Transnational Networks
- › Cross-border impacts.

Fund rules

The methodology for assessing projects and the rules of the fund was agreed on at the end of 2012. This provides the Steering Committee with tools to manage the project pipeline. A comprehensive guidebook on financing transport and logistics projects has also been prepared to support the work of the Fund.

The NDEP support fund rules were used as a reference during the drafting process although the funding rules of the two partnerships differ.

Table 4-1 Funding committed to the NDPTL as of 161013

Country	Amount in EUR
EU	1,400,000
Finland	1,000,000
Norway	545,000
Germany	150,000
Total	3,095,000

First call for projects A first call for projects was launched in 2013. 12 projects were submitted and subsequently screened by the Secretariat. Nine project proposals were discussed in the Steering Committee of which four were selected by the High Level Meeting (marked in Table 4-2).

In total, about EUR 1 million was allocated to support the projects on November 7, 2013. The projects' cross-border impacts have been a key factor in the selection process.

Table 4-2 Projects submitted to the NDPTL fund and discussed in the SC²⁷

Project number	Project title	Sub. By	Scope	Value EUR
001-2013	Oulu-Kajaani-Vartius Road Section	FI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Detailed design of roads ✓ Light study 	1,777,777
002-2013	Eco-port - Pier for Small Vessels in Ust-Luga	RU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Exploration works ✓ Pre-design ✓ Design 	200,000
003-2013	Dry port in Gdansk/Gdynia Intermodal Container Yard in Zajanczkowo	PL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Feasibility study ✓ EIA ✓ Design 	196,429
004-2013	Wroclaw Airport Development	PL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Market potential analysis ✓ Feasibility study ✓ Analysis of bottlenecks ✓ Development of GIDS 	60,000
005-2013	Krakow Airport Runway	PL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Tender documentation ✓ Tender procedure ✓ Feasibility study 	462,931
006-2013	Gdansk Deep-Water Container Terminal	PL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Studies ✓ Design ✓ Geographical/geotechnical study ✓ TA for investment period 	1,500,000
007-2013	Chopin Airport Development	PL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Concept for road system ✓ Business model ✓ Marketing research 	211,338
008-2013	Saima Canal	FI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Detailed design (electrical, canal lighting, mechanical structures, machine rooms) 	124,000
011-2013	Road from "Brusnichnoye" BCP to Vyborg bypass	FI/RU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Feasibility study ✓ Designs for repair of canal ✓ Design for new road ✓ Preparing maintenance of road 	200,000 2,500,000

Cooperation with other programmes As with the other partnerships, the NDPTL cooperates with other programmes especially the CBSS, Barents Euro Arctic Cooperation (BEAC), the EUSBSR

²⁷ The table is based on information provided by the NDPTL Secretariat

Priority areas Maritime Safety and security and PA Transport. The Secretariat participates in various networking activities within its operational budget.

4.2 EU funding

EU Project support

In 2011 and 2012, before the NDPTL support fund, the only possible way for the EU to support the NDPTL was through the FWC procedure. In both years, four projects were initiated, mainly to carry out studies on topics, requested by the NDPTL secretariat and Steering Group, but also to organise conferences. Eight projects in total were funded with EU support – four completed projects are included in the list below and have been analysed for the assessment.

Table 4-3 Overview of EU-funded projects to the NDPTL

	Title	Short description
1	Study on Common Border Crossing Points (Phase I)	<p>The overall objective of this action is to develop a regional model of integrated BCP management between the Schengen area and Russian Federation and Belarus.</p> <p>The specific objectives of the action are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to develop recommendations and practical guidelines for the improvement of border crossing issues at the borders between the Schengen area and Russian Federation and Belorussia through integration of BCP management; - to propose a regional model for implementation of Integrated Border Management (IBM) for road and rail BCPs in the Northern Dimension region; <p>Outputs: final report with guidelines and recommendations</p>
2	Study on Integrated Border Crossing Points (Phase II)	<p>The overall objective of this action is to carry out a study of opportunities for integrated BCP management between the Schengen area and Russia/Belarus.</p> <p>The specific objectives of the action are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to analyse the current situation of traffic flows and border management rules, methodologies and practices at selected BCPs between the Schengen area and Russian Federation and Belarus; -to assess the opportunities for integrated BCP management between the Schengen area and Russia/Belarus; - to identify a list of road BCPs on the Schengen countries - Russia/Belarus border that are vitally requiring improvements. <p>Outputs final report.</p>
3	Definitions of the Core Transport networks	<p>Based on planning policies in the different NDPTL countries, the overall objective of this study is to outline and suggest to the NDPTL the Core Transport Network as an extension of the TEN-T Core Network in the neighbourhood countries, in particular Russia and Belorussia.</p> <p>The specific objectives of this assignment are to analyse the multimodal transport system in the ND area and to map its main transport modes; to elaborate guidelines able to define the NDPTL Core Network and to propose the NDPTL Core Network.</p> <p>Outputs: Proposal for the NDPTL regional Transport network; guidelines for the definition; Socio economic study; maps of networks. The Study was updated in October 12 (why??)</p>
4	Two coordination conferences	<p>Organisation of conferences – in the end only one conference in Murmansk with 63 participants.</p>

Border Crossing Point Management

The overall objective of the project “Border Crossing Point Management” was to develop a regional model of integrated BCP management between the Schengen area and the Russian Federation and Belarus. The specific objectives of the project were to develop recommendations and practical guidelines for the improvement of border crossing issues at the borders between the Schengen area and the Russian

Federation and Belarus through integration of BCP management; and to propose a regional model for implementation of Integrated Border Management (IBM) for road and rail BCPs in the ND region.

Definitions of the Core Transport networks

The aim of the Core Transport Network study was to develop an extension of the TEN-T Core Network in the neighbourhood countries, in particular Russia and Belarus. The output was an analysis of the multimodal transport system in the ND area and a map of main transport modes. Furthermore, the project had to elaborate guidelines that could define the NDPTL Core Network to be used for the NDPTL fund project selection.

Conference in Murmansk 23-24 October 2012

The conference discussed connections of the European transport system with the neighbouring non-EU countries transport systems. Achieving closer transport market integration within the Northern Dimension (ND) area is one of the most important aims of the NDPTL in order to improve connectivity within the ND region to reduce remoteness. 63 persons participated in Murmansk

A list of projects with budget allocations and intervention logics (Logframe) for these projects is included in Appendix D.

4.3 Assessment of EU funding

The EU funding to the NDPTL, till now, has primarily been directed to projects, as depicted above. This means that in the case of the NDPTL, the EU funding can be assessed separately from the other funding to the NDPTL. The assessment below primarily focuses on the completed projects. As in the other assessments, the assessment focuses on the EU funding and not on the NDPTL itself. There are, however issues which concern the NDPTL and its structure as such, which has relevance to the assessment of the EU funding, why this has been included as well.

It is too early to assess the NDPTL funded project as the first projects have only very recently been selected and therefore not initiated yet. These are therefore not considered below.

Relevance

Interventions in accordance with EU and ND policies

The EU funding (completed) to the NDPTL has to date primarily been to two groups of studies 1) outline and suggest to the NDPTL the Core Transport Network as an extension of the TEN-T Core Network in the neighbourhood countries, in particular Russia and Belarus 2) regional model of integrated BCP management between the Schengen area and Russian Federation and Belarus (two projects). The fourth project has been the funding of a conference to discuss key NDPTL issues with stakeholders.

Priorities of the NDPTL

These studies had the purpose of defining the scope of the NDPTL for the future and provide inputs to the criteria of the fund thereby indicating the priorities of the NDPTL. In contrast to the NDEP, which has an overall strategic framework in the HELCOM, the aims of transport is more unclear, and an overall strategy and focus do not exist. These studies therefore seem very relevant in terms of providing the background analysis and framework for the work of the NDPTL.

Projects reflect needs	There are, however, diverging opinion about the relevance of the studies. Some stakeholders think that the studies corresponded to the needs at the time (definition phase for the fund), others that the focus of the studies was not right (other priorities), and a third group stated that parts of the EU funds should rather have been given directly to the running of the secretariat (it is noted that this in general is not possible for the EU to fund running costs). The latter may partly reflect the fact that some partners are not paying their contribution and that there is a “gap” in the financing of secretariat budget.
NDPTL focus not shared by all	<p>This may also reflect that there has been disagreement among the participants about the focus areas of the NDPTL. Protracted discussions in the steering group have taken place, and according to some stakeholders this resulted in serious delays in getting the fund launched. Not all of the stakeholders agree on the focus and thereby the relevance of the studies carried out. For some countries, the TEN-T extension is by far the most important and the border issues of less relevance and, vice versa for other stakeholders. There are also stakeholders who want to see more focus on logistics altogether.</p> <p>It may also here be added that some stakeholders find that the partnership is not going in the right direction, both with regard to focus as well as type of projects to be funded under the fund. One of the participants is considering reducing its partition by no longer funding the secretariat and by not participating in the NDPTL fund. This has raised great concern among other participants. The fear is that the focus of the NDPTL is too narrow (mostly focus on the concerns of a few partners) and that this may eventually damage the partnership.</p>
Closer integration with strategies in the region	Some stakeholders are of the opinion that there is a need for an overall strategy and that the work done until know only constitutes a step in the right direction. This strategy should not be the responsibility of the NDPTL itself as the NDPTL should focus on implementation of projects. A closer link to the EUSBSR and/or to the CBSS is required (in line with the NDPHS).
Relevant for relation to EU-Russia cooperation	Many stakeholders think that this is an important way of cooperating with Russia, keeping focus on practical and concrete projects and initiatives. According to stakeholders, it is important that cooperation is kept at this practical and concrete level and leave major political issues to other fora. Albeit there are differences between the wishes of the participants and members, in terms of whether to discuss “political issues” with Russia in the NDPTL.
Coordination between donors and partners is functioning	<p>EU Value added</p> <p>In the area of transport, there is less coordination in the ND area than in e.g. the environmental sector. As mentioned above, there also seems to be much less agreement on the way forward and the focus of the NDPTL. This has resulted in a delay in establishing the funds facility and now also in partners considering reducing their engagement in the partnership.</p>
EU funding function as catalyst and multiplier	A key issue, underlined by many stakeholders, is the importance of the EU funding in providing legitimacy and leverage to the NDPTL. Although the EU has committed funding to the NDPTL fund (eventually to be transferred to the NIB),

the amount is, by stakeholders, considered very limited and insufficient to leverage serious funding from other donors. The funding provided to date to studies and conferences does not seem to satisfy a number of stakeholders. In comparison with the NDEP, it is noted that the NDEP also had a slow start, and it was only when the EU and Russia made large contributions to NDEP that the fund gained traction and attention. Some think that the same will be the case with the NDPTL. However, the strategic focus issues mentioned above are considerable barriers to this.

EU to arbitrate
views/approaches

A number of stakeholders state that they would like to see more involvement on the part of the EU (EEAS and EUCOM). It is felt that the EU has lost interest and was much more involved earlier on – in the initial start-up phase of the NDPTL. It may also reflect that there is concern that the many partners have very different views and that the EU is seen a possible arbitrator in this process.

EU instrument
coherent and
complementary

Coordination with other programmes, especially with the EUSBSR, does not seem to be as intense as for example the coordination activities of the NDPHS. Some stakeholders indicate that transport is not a high priority of the BSR Programme (ETC Transnational Programme) and that it has been more difficult to have priority transport projects funded under the programme - in contrast to environmental projects. Stakeholders mention close cooperation with the Barents Cooperation as important.

Whereas the financing possibilities of the IFIs are discussed in the Guidelines for the NDPTL as well as the EU Cohesion and ERDF funds for EU member states. Exploring possibilities within the Neighbourhood Investment Facility (NIF)²⁸ in relation of the NDPTL does not seem to play a major role yet. This may reflect that only now, the first NDPTL fund projects have been selected for funding for studies and other preparatory work.

Attributable impacts
of interventions can
be identified

Impact and sustainability

The background studies (funded by the EU and other donors) for establishing and preparing the fund funded have been important input to the development of the orientation and the guidelines for the NDPTL Fund.

Institutions and
programmes in place

In spite of the disagreements of the steering group about the relevance, it is assessed that these studies have provided the NDPTL with relevant background and analysis and thereby made it possible for the NDPTL to develop and advance its work. The fact that the fund is now established and working could be seen as one of the impacts of the EU investments in projects under the NDPTL.

Results have been
shared

The results the EU funded studies (as well as those of other donors) of the NDPTL have been shared with stakeholders both in general on the website of the NDPTL where these are available and at the stakeholder conference held in Murmansk where the studies were presented and discussed. It is, however, noted that the studies are not widely used elsewhere, and no reference has been made to them in the EUSBSR.

²⁸ No reference is made to the NIF in most of the studies for the NDPTL – both those support by the EU and other donors.

Public investments agreed	The real sustainability of the studies and conferences is always difficult to assess. The sustainability of the projects financed by NDPTL will materialise when the fund becomes operational and able to fund projects based on the inputs that the studies provided. The NDPTL fund primarily finances preparatory work for projects (feasibility studies), etc., which may develop into bankable projects to be finance by donors and the IFIs. As the first projects have been selected only very recently, the sustainability of these projects will be the subject of another assessment.
Results contribute to the achievement of NDPTL	Effectiveness and efficiency The EU assistance has achieved its objectives in terms of providing the results (reports, mapping, etc.). However, some beneficiaries (the secretariat in particular) are not satisfied with the deliverables and feel that they have had to compensate for the deficiencies of the deliverables (contactors). The secretariat also feels that some of the recommendations of the reporting cannot be followed up. Some stakeholders signalled that the funding available so far has been very limited with a view to funding large infrastructure studies of the type needed for the NDPTL fund. For this reason, some stakeholders do not regard the studies comprehensive (good) enough.
Procurement methods not efficient for this type of projects	The use of framework contactors seems to have caused problems. Especially the secretariat feels that the right type of consultants with the relevant experience has not been made available to the carry out the studies. This meant that the secretariat had to spend a lot of time briefing and debriefing the consultants. Time and resources, they feel, they do not have. Other donors have in connection with donated studies also given them funds to manage projects. The arm's length contacting type, where the contactor is the EUD and the "beneficiary/recipient" of the contact is the secretariat also seems to have been a particular problem in the case of the NDPTL, resulting in lack of ownership.
Monitoring systems in place	To the knowledge of the evaluators, the EU projects have not been monitored through the ROM system. It is suggested to consider to ROM monitor the on-going projects – also to be able to identify some of the issues so these can be addressed in time.

4.4 Conclusions and recommendations for the NDPTL

Enhancing the regional perspective	According to stakeholders, the regional perspective in the transport sector is still largely missing. As transport is more a national concern and since countries are unlikely to finance or co-finance transport infrastructure in other countries - making transport a regional concern is a difficult and long-term process. Nevertheless, many see this as important for the ND area. Some stakeholders state that the transport sector and the environmental sector need the grant financing to unlock loans compensating for un-priced externalities. The NDPTL is one of the younger partnerships and it is only at a very early stage of developing into a fund. As with the other partnerships, it has taken considerable
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

time to develop the structure and framework and work is still outstanding. The key problems that have been confronting the NDPTL (and to some extent still) are:

- › Lack of (agreed) strategic framework/vision
- › Lack of shared focus and approach among partners
- › Organisational issues
- › Lack of funding
- › Lack of cooperation with other funding possibilities.

Preferably way to channel EU contributions

To date, the EU has probably been the largest donor, and with the additional commitment to be given to the NDPTL Fund, it definitely is. There is expectation that the EU commits additional (substantial) funds in order to trigger funding by other donors. Only with these contributions will the fund be able to leverage more funding from other donors and possibly with the IFIs according to stakeholders.

Correspondence of NDPTL Fund with needs

As the NDPTL fund has only very recently approved its first projects, it is not possible to assess the relevance of these projects in this evaluation. It is also likely that it will take time for the Fund to develop the demand of stakeholders (awareness) and ability (capacity) to develop the type of projects which will be relevant for funding. The involvement anticipated for the IFIs, i.e. whether there will be projects which the IFIs can and will fund, needs to be tested. Drawing on the lessons learned from the NDEP, it will take time to develop the NDPTL and the question is whether the stakeholders have the patience and at the end of the day, the commitment for a “long haul” exercise.

More cooperation with regional players

Another important aspect is that cooperation with other funds and funding possibilities seems to have been limited in the ND area. Specially, knowledge of and involvement with the various cross-border and transnational programmes in the region seems limited. This being said, the NDPTL may join in as partner (lead) in a project in Kola-Arctic programme. Cooperation with the BSR programme seems to be negligible. Knowledge of the functioning of the cross-border and transnational programmes also seems to be limited with the NDPTL. There are also stakeholders who would like to see much closer cooperation with the CBSS. It is recommended that the NDPTL elaborate existing cooperation and policy structures in order to become part of the overall cooperation structures.

Agreed focus needs to be found

The NDPTL needs to make sure that its' strategic focus aligns with that of the partnership. There is a feeling among some participants that the NDPTL has fully or partly a wrong focus. The secretariat (and the steering committee) has spent a lot of time on procedures and strategy development, which some participants do not see as their task. The main focus should be on developing projects. One participant is considering reducing its involvement in the NDPTL²⁹.

Including Belarus

There also seem to be sensibilities in terms of including Belarus in this partnership. Some partners do not favour the inclusion of Belarus.

²⁹ According to several stakeholders, including the Danish Ministry of Transport, Denmark will reduce its engagement with the NDPTL by the end of 2013.

5 Northern Dimension Partnership Health and Social Well-being (NDPHS)³⁰

Established in 2003, the NDPHS is a partnership of 10 governments (Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Russia and Sweden), the European Commission and eight intergovernmental organizations (see Annex A for a full list).

Oslo Declaration At the Partnership level, the Declaration on the establishment of the NDPHS (the Oslo Declaration), adopted in 2003, outlines the aims and priorities, structure and financing framework of the Partnership³¹.

5.1 Description³²

Background There are significant disparities in the levels of health and living standards in the ND area. Communicable diseases, drug abuse and pollution-related health problems, in particular, require strengthening of public health systems, significant improvements in the delivery of health services and information exchange and contacts between relevant national, regional and sub-regional administrations.

Aim NDPHS The aim of the NDPHS is to promote sustainable development of the ND area by improving health and social well-being. The partnership focus is on increasing political and administrative coherence between the countries in the ND area, narrowing their social and economic disparities, and improving overall quality of life. The NDPHS aims to intensify cooperation, assisting the partners and participants in capacity building, and enhancing the extent of coordination between international activities within the ND area.

Priorities The strategic direction of the NDPHS is defined both at the ND and NDPHS level³³. The Partnership has two main priority fields to support cooperation and coordination:

³⁰ See NDPHS website: www.ndphs.org for a good overview of the partnership.

³¹ Declaration concerning the establishment of a Northern Dimension Partnership in Public Health and Social Wellbeing, adopted in Oslo, 27.10.2003.

³² The description is on the information from the website, NDPHS documentation and interviews.

- › reducing the spread of major communicable diseases and preventing life-style related non-communicable diseases
- › enhancing levels of social well-being and promoting socially rewarding lifestyles.

NDPHS Structure	The NDPHS structure consists of the Partnership Annual Conference, the Committee of Senior Officials (CSR), the Expert and Task Groups and the NDPHS Secretariat:
Partnership Annual Conference	The Partnership Annual Conference is the main decision-making body of NDPHS. It convenes once a year, holding its meetings at the ministerial level every alternating year. Being the overall mechanism for steering the NDPHS, the Partnership Annual Conference formulates NDPHS policies, reviews progress made and provides high-level guidance to the NDPHS. To this date, nine conferences have taken place, with the next Partnership Annual Conference/ministerial conference scheduled for November 2013.
Committee of Senior Officials – CSR	The CSR meets twice a year, or when required, and serves as the main coordinating body of the NDPHS, ensuring that decisions and recommendations are carried out. The CSR consists of senior-level representatives that are appointed by the Partners. Iceland recently hosted the Partnership’s 22 nd CSR meeting (October 2013 in Reykjavik).
Expert and Task Groups	<p>NDPHS executive-level structures include expert groups (broad mandate) and task groups (specific tasks)³⁴ where high-level experts representing national ministries and agencies of member countries and organisations, the research community and NGOs cooperate on topics linked to the NDPHS’s priorities. The role of these bodies is to support the CSR in the preparation and implementation of joint activities carried out within the framework of the NDPHS, including the development and implementation of projects, review of policies, good practices, exchange of experience, etc. New expert and task groups will be formed to mirror the priorities defined for the forthcoming strategy period.</p> <p>Today, NDPHS has four “core” expert groups and four task groups.</p>

³³ Renewed ND Policy Framework Document of 2006

³⁴ The work of the Chairs, International Technical Advisers and Coordinators of the expert and task groups is financed by the chairing country, while the expert participation is funded by the respective countries they represent. Meeting expenses are paid by the hosting country, which rotates among the expert and task group members. The chairing countries are Sweden (one expert group, two task groups), Finland (two expert groups), Norway (one expert group), ILO (one task group).

Box 5.1. Expert and task groups

Expert groups on:

- 1) HIV and associated infections;
- 2) Primary health and prison health systems;
- 3) Alcohol and substance abuse;
- 4) Non-communicable diseases.

Task groups on:

- 1) Antimicrobial resistance;
- 2) Indigenous mental health, addictions and parenting;
- 3) Alcohol and drug prevention among youth;
- 4) Occupational safety and health.

Secretariat

Established in 2004, the Secretariat of the NDPHS is hosted by the CBSS in Stockholm. The secretariat has two full-time and one part-time permanent staff members, as well as two temporary positions (EUSBSR coordinator and an intern). Following the agreement in November 2011 about the establishment of the NDPHS Secretariat, the secretariat has had its own legal capacity since July 2013³⁵.

EUSBSR PAC

During the development of the EUSBSR, the NDPHS advocated for a stronger focus on health in the Baltic Sea Region, arguing that the prosperity of a macro-region is based on its human capital; a healthy population is a critical factor behind sustainable economic development of enterprises and societies. The actions under the PA Health of the EUSBSR are closely linked to the goals and operational targets included in the NDPHS Strategy.

Box 5.2. Actions of EUSBSR PA Health

- 1) Contain the spread of HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis
- 2) Fight health inequalities through the improvement of primary healthcare
- 3) Prevent lifestyle-related non-communicable diseases and ensure good social and work environments

Based on the Partnership's network, standing and experience in the region, the NDPHS became the Priority Area Coordinator (PAC), assuming the overall leadership for the PA Health. The NDPHS Secretariat is also in charge of implementation of two³⁶ of the EUSBSR's Flagship Projects in the field of health (see Overview of EU funded projects in section 5.2.)³⁷. As PAC, in 2013 the NDPHS has been able to set up a temporary position of EUSBSR coordinator at its Secretariat (financed by the Technical Assistance grant for the implementation of EUSBSR). It is anticipated that the position will be prolonged in 2014.

³⁵ Agreement on the Establishment of the Secretariat of the Northern Dimension Partnership in Public Health and Social Well-Being, signed in St. Petersburg on 25.11.2011.

³⁶ Status of the project "Building capacity in prevention of HIV and associated infections among youth at risk in the Northern Dimension area" as EUSBSR Flagship Project is pending approval by the European Commission.

³⁷ Action Plan of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (February 2013).

NDPHS Strategy

In late 2009, the NDPHS developed a strategy in response to the recommendations proposed in the evaluation of the NDPHS that was carried out in 2008. The strategy has guided the work of the NDPHS from 2010 onwards. The strategy included five focus points as outlined below. The strategy also proposed several changes to the partner and participant status in the NDPHS, events and included a five-year evaluation cycle.

Box 5.3. NDPHS Strategy focus

- 1) NDPHS should primarily serve as a forum for development of strategies and policies, however, the Partnership should also facilitate project activity to address concrete problems in the ND region, nevertheless limiting its direct involvement;
- 2) The social well-being facet within the NDPHS should be strengthened;
- 3) The overall goal for 2010-2013 is related to the organisation and structuring of the Partnership's work, while the thematic goals are structured according to the three action areas of the EUSBSR, which are also consistent with the Oslo Declaration on the establishment of the NDPHS;
- 4) Establishment of NDPHS expert groups should be flexible to adapt to arising needs. The Strategy includes criteria and procedures for establishing and dissolving expert groups;
- 5) Enable micro-financing to initiate NDPHS projects, seek funding for the implementation of the projects outside the partnership.

The goals and operational targets of the strategy were revised in 2011 and 2012 in response to changing circumstances and to ensure that the NDPHS remains relevant for the needs of the region.

NDPHS Evaluation 2013 & strategy revision

In 2013, an evaluation of the NDPHS activities over the last five years was carried out. The evaluation looked both at the achievements vis-à-vis the targets set in the 2010-2013 period and at lessons learned to be used in the development of the new strategy. The report concluded that only about 50% of the targets would be fulfilled by the end of 2013; and many of the NDPHS activities are not reflected e.g. NDPHS' involvement with the EUSBSR and procedural improvements. With regard to expert structures the report points to the need to improve the annual reports and to clarify the roles between the task and expert groups.

In developing a new NDPHS Strategy in 2014 efforts will be made to develop the strategy in a more inclusive way, mixing bottom-up and top-down approaches, and setting specific targets to improve ownership.

NDPHS Work Plans and progress reports

The NDPHS Work Plan is an annually renewed document that gives an overview of the actions to be launched, continued or completed by the NDPHS any given year. The work plans also includes the annual programmes of the NDPHS expert groups and task groups. The Work Plan of 2013 focuses on the implementation of the strategy and the PA Health of the EUSBSR Action Plan. The NDPHS also prepares a yearly progress report presenting the main activities implemented.

Box 5.4. Action lines of the NDPHS Work Plan 2013

Action Line 1: Working toward the NDPHS goals and taking actions to implement mid-term operational targets;
 Action Line 2: Leading and coordinating the PA Health in the EUSBSR Action Plan;
 Action Line 3: Continuing efforts to increase the profile of health and social well-being among the priorities of the funding programmes operating in the Northern Dimension region;
 Action Line 4: Providing adequate funding for the NDPHS and Partnership-relevant activities and projects;
 Action Line 5: Increasing the Partnership's visibility;
 Action Line 6: Establishing the NDPHS Secretariat with its own legal capacity;
 Action Line 7: Evaluating the Partnership.

NDPHS financing	The NDPHS is financed by the participating governments on the basis of a legally binding agreement, which sets the exact amounts due to be paid by each partner (the EU does not make direct contributions to the secretariat). The budget in 2013 was EUR 344,000 funded by more or less equal contribution from participating countries. It is an issue that not sufficient resources are allocated to the secretariat budget by some partners (and fully missing financial contributions by one partner) as highlighted in the progress report.
NDPHS project work	The NDPHS works with projects at three levels: 1) own projects where the NDPHS secretariat acts as the coordinating body (incl. the three EU-funded projects reviewed in this evaluation report); 2) member projects – proposed and developed in expert and task groups ³⁸ ; 3) platform projects that are linked to the strategic objectives of the NDPHS. These are funded through the Project Pipeline and/or registered in the NDPHS Database.
Project Pipeline	The NDPHS Project Pipeline is an on-line project funding coordination tool for both member and platform projects, used during the application and implementation phases. It has one financial contributor – the Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care Services, which provides funding for two calls for proposals annually. Since 2008, 44 (lead) partners of the projects funded through the NDPHS project pipeline have registered their projects in the NDPHS Database ³⁹ .
Database	The NDPHS Database collects information and data in the Baltic Sea Region on 1) on-going and implemented projects, 2) organisations, 3), persons and 4) documents of relevance to the field of public health and social well-being. It is used as one-stop-shop for information and partner search.
NDPHS label for projects	In 2010 the NDPHS introduced the “NDPHS labelled project” to promote quality projects addressing regional challenges and producing tangible results. The label

³⁸ While the expert or task groups may be actively involved in the development of projects, they are not always responsible for their further implementation.

³⁹ According to the Secretariat, it is likely that not all projects have registered in the Database and they could not provide a specific number of projects approved through the Pipeline.

has so far been awarded to nine projects that meet a set of special quality criteria. The label is a result of the first evaluation of the NDPHS activities in 2008.

5.2 EU funding

Contributions to the NDPHS

In 2010, the first year when EU financing was provided, EUR 100,000 was allocated to the NDPHS using the FWC procurement method, i.e. recruitment of external consultants to carry out a given task for the NDPHS. In order to decide how this could be used in the most useful way, a series of meetings of the experts groups were organised.

EU support for expert groups

In the following years, it became possible to conclude Direct Award Grant contracts directly with the NDPHS secretariat, and the allocations available to the NDPHS were also larger. In 2012, a project was launched in support of the Expert Group on Alcohol and Substance Abuse (with an EU contribution of EUR 300,000). In 2013, another new project was launched in September (EUR 300,000) supporting the Expert Group on HIV/AIDS and Associated Infections.

It is important to note that the NDPHS Secretariat acts as the lead partner in the projects below, coordinating their implementation and ensuring the administration. This is quite unique with respect to other ND Partnerships and it has allowed the secretariat to develop strong competencies in working with EU projects.

Table 5.1 Overview of EU-funded projects:

	Title	Status	Short description
1	Providing support to meetings aimed to develop NDPHS projects	Completed (February 2011 – June 2012)	Objective: logistical assistance to meetings with an aim of facilitating the development of project proposals for submission to a donor community for funding in the four thematic areas of the NDPHS Strategy and the EUSBSR. Outputs: 15 meetings of NDPHS expert groups, expert group chairs and international technical advisors. Experts worked on project ideas and proposals, of which some have already been funded.
2	Alcohol and drug prevention among young people (ADPY) in Baltic Sea region communities; situation analysis for evidence based policies <i>Flagship Project of the EUSBSR.</i>	On-going (October 2012 – December 2013)	Objective: create a well-functioning and coordinated policy-making and implementation mechanisms and infrastructure aimed at counteracting the high level of alcohol and drug use among youth in selected local communities (Klaipeda Region, Lithuania, Kaliningrad Oblast (Sovjetsk City and Svetloje district), Russia, and Stockholm County, Sweden). Activities: (1) Situation analysis on alcohol and drug use among young people, (2) ADPY manuals and recommendations for local work based on good practices, (3) Mobilisation of local and international ADPY networks, (4) Development of an ADPY cooperation model, also with primary healthcare professionals.
3	Building capacity in prevention of HIV and associated infections among youth at risk in the Northern Dimension area <i>Flagship Project of the EUSBSR.</i>	Starting (September 2013)	Objective and activities: support the work of the NDPHS Expert Group on HIV/AIDS and Associated Infections by mapping best practices in HIV prevention among youth at high risk of HIV/AI in NW Russia and other countries in the ND area, disseminating those best practices among the participating countries and training professionals in Northwest Russia to implement the best practices. The project will be implemented in Finland, Germany, Latvia, Poland and NW Russia.

A list of projects with budget allocations and an intervention logic (Logframe) for these projects is included in Annex E.

5.3 Assessment and key findings

EU funding to the NDPHS has primarily been allocated to projects as depicted above. This means that in the case of the NDPHS, the EU funding can be assessed separately from other funding sources, which have so far gone to the NDPHS. The assessment below primarily focuses on the completed projects and not on the NDPHS itself – there are, however, issues concerning the NDPHS and its structure which have relevance for the assessment of the EU funding that have been included as well.

Relevance

Interventions in accordance with EU and ND policies

The overall focus for the cooperation as the key strategic document is the EUSBSR, at the level of the Baltic Sea Region. The NDPHS has played an instrumental role in promoting the profile of health in the strategy, successfully advocating for its inclusion as a separate priority area in the renewed Action Plan. The NDPHS Secretariat has taken the role of the PAC for Health securing close coordination of the sector. Several of the NDPHS projects are EUSBSR Flagships, including two of the three projects assessed in this evaluation.

Needs reflect the priorities of the region

The three EU-funded projects, along with other initiatives of the NDPHS are in line with the NDPHS strategic priorities that reflect the interests and needs of the ND area: alcohol and drug use, prevention of HIV and associated illnesses among young people in the project countries.

Correspondence with needs of beneficiaries

The project ideas are developed through the cooperation of experts from different countries thus ensuring that national interests and relevance are taken into consideration. The member countries, in turn, make a decision if a project or initiative corresponds to their needs before their experts get involved in the development and implementation process.

Importance of EU funding for NGOs

In Russia, the availability of EU funding for project activities is likely to become an increasing issue since Russia no longer receives financing from the Global Fund to fight HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis, and this has created a funding gap, especially for the NGOs. There is a need to fill this funding gap for non-state actors since their involvement in the NDPHS projects and activities is important and has decreased (from the part of Russia).

EU Value added

EU funding functions as catalyst and multiplier

EU funding plays a specific role in the financing structure of the NDPHS. While the contributions of the member countries are mainly for the upkeep of the secretariat⁴⁰ and their participation in the expert and task group work, NDPHS project activities are primarily funded through EU financing sources.

⁴⁰ It is noted that not all countries pay their annual fees on time thus impeding smooth functioning of the Secretariat.

EU instrument coherent and complementary

Complementarity with other programmes is significant as project work constitutes approximately half of the activities of expert and task groups, depending on the group. Project funding, with the help of the NDPHS secretariat, is primarily obtained through application to programmes such as the Non-state Actor Programme, the CBC programmes, the BSR 2007-2013 Programme. Some stakeholders have, however, mentioned that the number of EU funding programmes for health projects is limited (health being a national competence rather than an EU competence).

Involvement of EU institutions

The NDPHS partners appreciate the financing provided by the EU, but would like to see more involvement of the relevant EU institutions in the work of NDPHS. Recently the EEAS has taken a more active interest in the work of the ND partnerships and the NDPHS stakeholders express that a similar involvement on the part of DG SANCO would improve the flow of information and direct dialogue.

Cooperation with other organisations in the BSR

Cooperation with other important players in the ND area is part of the set-up of the NDPHS as the key public health organisations of the region are members. The role of the NDPHS as the coordinator of the PA Health of the EUSBSR puts it at the centre of common efforts in the region.

Partnership for Modernisation

Synergies concerning public health are found where the NDPHS can contribute to implement some of the Partnership for Modernisation⁴¹ objectives in the field of public health⁴². This is the case for cooperation in the field of prevention of non-communicable diseases (related to lifestyle and alcohol abuse), infectious diseases (HIV/AIDS and associated infections) and strengthening the primary health system.

Attributable impacts of interventions can be identified

Impact and sustainability

The issues addressed by the NDPHS are long-term processes that exceed the budgeting timeframe, and since the partnership has only implemented a few projects, their direct impact on the sector may be limited. At the same time, the results of the EU projects have had a direct positive impact on the NDPHS. As a result of the Expert and Task Group meetings, practical project ideas have been developed, several of which have already been funded while others are pending available funding possibilities.

Stakeholders confirm impacts

As several stakeholders have noted – disease knows no borders and therefore many see the involvement of Russian institutions in these projects and NDPHS activities in general as an achievement in itself. In fact, Russia is currently increasing its

⁴¹ The Partnership for Modernisation is a joint EU-Russia initiative for mutual benefit of their citizens, launched at the 25th EU-Russia Summit in 2010.

⁴² According to the “Progress report submitted to the Third Ministerial meeting of the Renewed Northern Dimension Policy”, 18.02.2003.

attention towards the NDPHS and is looking at ways how to increase its financial contribution to the Partnership's activities, hoping that the EU will follow suit⁴³.

Sustainability –
project impact on
national policies

As mentioned earlier, NDPHS project activities have a direct link with the national needs of the member countries; i.e. the projects should produce results that enable improvement of policies and practices. The finalised EUSBSR Flagship project ImPrim⁴⁴ is a good example of how NDPHS projects work.

Box 5.5 ImPrim project

The Expert Group on Primary Health Care developed the idea and with the help of the Secretariat prepared the project proposal; the project was successfully funded by the BSR Programme 2007-2013; the implementation of the project was monitored by the Secretariat and the Expert Group whereby the results of the project were fed back into the work of the expert group and some members (namely, Lithuania and Latvia) used these results to alter their policy.

Cross-partnership
projects

It has, according to interviewees on then NDPHS, been discussed how to increase synergies across partnership. One possible way of enhancing impacts across several sectors in the future, would be to develop cross-partnership projects e.g. combining water supply and health issues (i.e. NDEP and NDPHS). Water quality is by many regarded as an important factor in order to improve health standards.

Effectiveness and efficiency

Results contribute to
the achievements of
the NDEP

Only one of the three projects assessed in this report is finalised, and its objectives were fully met. The project on alcohol and drug prevention among young people is moving towards its goals, however, it has experienced some setbacks in the implementation process. Nevertheless, stakeholders seem to be satisfied with the results achieved. Implementation of the project on prevention of HIV and associated illnesses only started in September 2013.

Monitoring systems
in place

One of the three projects ("Alcohol and drug prevention among young people (ADPY); situation analysis for evidence based policies") has also undergone results-oriented monitoring (ROM) process. The monitoring concludes that the project is in line with the context and responds to the needs of the stakeholders; its management being clear and transparent.

Implementation
modalities relevant
and efficient

Application for EU funding is a lengthy procedure requiring specific knowledge of where to seek funding, how to structure and "package" the project such that NDPHS experts need support from project experts. The NDPHS secretariat has developed strong competencies in this field and could provide more assistance in this field to the expert and tasks groups or attract external experts for carrying out this support task. This, however, requires larger financial resources.

⁴³ This was mentioned by the Russian MFA as well partners.

⁴⁴ "Improvement of public health by promotion of equitably distributed high-quality primary health care systems", funded through the BSR Programme 2007-2013, finalized in December 2013.

The projects have been implemented in an efficient manner

Overall, the NDPHS Secretariat is one of the most hands-on ND secretariats when it comes to EU funding attraction and management – this has had a positive effect on efficiency. At the same time, project activity is taking up a lot of the Secretariat's time that could be devoted to other activities. This is also reflected in the recent NDPHS evaluation, highlighting that the balance between projects and networking and policy development activities is an area of continuous disagreement. The NDPHS has been successful in linking its activities with the EUSBSR implementation and in getting funding from some other sources, including other EU programmes.

5.4 Conclusions and recommendation

Strategic focus of Partnership

The projects implemented in the framework of the NDPHS appear to be well coordinated with the role of the NDPHS as the PAC of the PA Health of EUSBSR, the NDPHS Strategy and member country interests and needs.

EU added value

EU funding (both direct awards through the EUD in Moscow, as well as that of other EU programmes) is instrumental for fuelling NDPHS activity. At the same time, NDPHS stakeholders would like to see a more active involvement by DG SANCO in the meetings for a direct dialogue. The EU has a diverse role, in terms of providing information, discussion and visionary policy.

Russian involvement

As a result of joint projects and activities, Russia has become increasingly involved in the NDPHS, considering it a politically important partnership that can play a significant role in the regional cooperation. Russia actively participates in the work of expert and task groups, being the co-lead partner in two expert groups and one task group, and is engaged in the running of NDPHS projects. It also contributes financially – until now the contribution is limited to the secretariat budget, but it is prepared to increase its financial participation⁴⁵.

Impacts

The strength of the NDPHS lies in its combination of policy and project work – it is a unique mix of expertise, approaches and knowledge – and in the possibility of the NDPHS expertise and projects to influence policies in the participating countries. Cooperation forums serve as a platform for development of project ideas and proposals; project results are used to improve national policies.

Sustainability of the NDPHS

The issues addressed by the NDPHS require a long-term approach. Considering the resource constraints faced by the NDPHS, it is crucial to focus NDPHS efforts. The new strategy could become a useful tool for prioritisation as it will ensure that the revised NDPHS goals and targets correspond to the needs of member countries. Input from expert groups should be in line with strategic direction of the ND area (through EUSBSR, Russian strategies and other) and linked with resources for their implementation.

Way of channelling EU funding

The NDPHS Secretariat has developed considerable expertise and is considered the strongest among all ND secretariats tapping into EU funding (CBC, and others); it would like to continue assisting expert and task groups in attracting EU funding for

⁴⁵ This was mentioned by the Russian MFA as well other interviewees/stakeholders

their projects. The secretariat could reduce its direct involvement in hands-on project management and thereby use free resources and its experience assisting NDPHS stakeholders in attracting project funding from external sources (attracting more donors/funding for the project pipeline). Financing expertise to expert and tasks groups to attract external help on a project-by-project basis could also be considered (project seed money).

Expanding the
geography

Considering the successful cooperation with Russia and the increased Russian attention to the cooperation in the field of health, it could also be considered to involve Belarus in the NDPHS projects.

6 Northern Dimension Partnership on Culture (NDPC)⁴⁶

Established in 2010, the NDPC is the youngest of the four partnerships in the Northern Dimension Policy. Current participants in the NDPC are the European Commission and the 11 member countries of the ND – Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, the Russian Federation and Sweden, represented by the ministries responsible for culture.

Memorandum of Understanding 2010

Following the decision by the ND Senior Officials in November 2009, in 2010, members signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) effective until May 2015. The MoU sets out the modalities of establishing the NDPC, defines its aims and cooperation structure within the partnership as well as with external bodies. The NDPC is working towards a legally binding agreement that would replace the MoU in 2015, setting out binding contributions for the member countries and establishment of the secretariat as a legal entity.

After several years of discussions of the NDPC strategic direction, from 2011, the NDPC's work focused on establishing its secretariat, currently located in the premises of the in Copenhagen. In 2014, the Secretariat will move to the Nordic Council of Ministers in Riga.

6.1 Description of partnership

Background

Northern Europe has an interesting cultural heritage and history, cultural and linguistic diversity, a versatile cultural and artistic production, long-lasting experience in cultural cooperation and exchange, and many of professional networks in all sectors of society. Cultural production and culture-based services and innovations are used to promote Northern Europe and its culture to the people in the region and to international consumers.

Aim of NDPC

The aim of the NDPC is to contribute to the social and economic development in the ND area by focusing on culture-based creativity cooperation, promoting the operating conditions for cultural and creative industries (CCI), by bridging the gap

⁴⁶ Information for 6.1 is partly provided by www.ndpculture.org.

between public and private funding and strengthening cooperation between the cultural and creative industries and the business community throughout the entire ND area. Furthermore, culture is seen as the driving force in regional and international development and an important part of cooperation in all other sectors across the ND area.

NDPC role in the region

The NDPC aims at functioning as a complement to national and international institutions working with cultural cooperation and exchange. The NDPC should provide a platform to facilitate dialogue and exchange of best practices, connect stakeholders such as cultural and creative entrepreneurs, funding and financing institutions and agencies. It should also commission studies and research on relevant topics or/and sectors in the ND area.

High Level Meeting and Steering Committee

The High Level Meeting (HLM) is to be the platform for decision-making and strategic orientation of the NDPC work. NDPC members are represented at the level of ministers responsible for culture. The first HLM is planned for 2014. The coordination of NDPC's work is carried out by a SC, comprising representatives of all NDPC participants, meeting three times annually. Till date 16 SC meetings have taken place. The SC chair is selected for a one-year period (renewable). The current chair of the SC is Finland, represented by the Finnish Institute in Estonia.

Secretariat

Since 2011, the NDPC has had an operational secretariat with one permanent staff member. The secretariat is not a legal entity on its own but responsible for the day-to-day running of the NDPC activities (see below).

NDPC Strategic framework

The NDPC's strategy document for 2012-2016 defines the NDPC's work for CCI in the three focus areas (see Box 6.1). The NDPC also has its own communication strategy, which aims to raise public awareness of the partnership as well as to strengthen collaboration with media and stakeholders. One of the main tools is the NDPC website created in 2012 providing regularly updated information.

Box 6.1 Focus areas of the NDPC

- Serve as a focal point for networks, projects and other cultural activities in the ND area: exchange of best practices, dialogue between public and private actors, as well as cultural and business sectors, facilitating cooperation in the field of culture among CBSS, BEAC, AC and NCM to promote synergies, act as a point of information on plans and activities;
- Support priority projects that highlight the goals of the partnership: present ND cultural products and services to internal and external audiences, develop tailor-made cultural tourism products, promote cultural activities with a people-to-people focus, strengthen capacity in the field of marketing and business for cultural actors;
- Facilitate access to financing, including public-private funding for collaboration projects.

EUSBSR

The renewed Action Plan of the EUSBSR now has its own Priority Area Culture, which focuses on developing and promoting the common culture and cultural identity. CCI features are seen as an important resource of the region, and the EUSBSR aims to support the sector along with the promotion of cultural heritage and cooperation. While the NDPC has not been directly involved in the development of the new EUSBSR Action Plan, one project idea with the NDPC as the Lead Partner is included as a potential Flagship Project under Action 3: "Building up a network of creative industries in the BSR" (without specific deadline).

Box 6.1. Actions of EUSBSR PA Culture

- 1) Joint promotion and presentation of BSR culture and cultural heritage
- 2) Cooperation on cultural heritage
- 3) Joint promotion and presentation of BSR creative industries
- 4) Developing a common BSR cultural identity
- 5) Developing an efficient framework for BSR cultural cooperation

Action Plan and Progress Report

The NDPC Action Plan is renewed annually, and includes a list of activities to be implemented during the year. A progress report on activities is published at the end of the year and gives a brief summary of the NDPC's main activities and achievements during 2011 and 2012 in the three focus areas. 2012 was the first full calendar year of the NDPC's work with an operational Secretariat.

Activities of the NDPC

The following activities have taken place in the framework of the NDPC:

- Four international Cultural Forums (CF) – Helsinki 2009, St. Petersburg 2010, Tampere 2011 and Warsaw 2012. The latest CF was dedicated to financing possibilities for CCI in the ND area. The next CF is scheduled to take place in St. Petersburg in 2014.
- Two studies in the field of cultural tourism and music (2011; see Chapter 6.2. "EU funding"); final results discussed in two dissemination seminars.
- Launch of the Cultural and Creative Industries Platforms Programme (CCIP; 2012) – an open call financing mechanism for projects supporting the CCI sector. More calls to be organised, subject to funding.
- Creation of a comprehensive overview of financing sources for the CCI in the region; published on the NDPC website.
- Creation of a regional cooperation model, bringing together stakeholders in the ND area such as Creative Estonia, Creative Finland as the gatekeeper organisations (roundtable and bilateral meetings).

Financing through voluntary contributions

The costs of the partnership are currently financed through voluntary contributions from its participants. Not all countries have been able to make contributions (for various reasons), and contributors vary from year to year. This situation is expected to improve once the NDPC concludes a legally binding agreement with binding co-financing shares. The current budget is sufficient to maintain the secretariat and to run limited activities. The participating countries contributed 133,675 to the NDPC budget in 2013.

6.2 EU funding for the NDPC

EU Funds projects

The EU cannot channel its financing in the form of a "voluntary contribution" and in addition it will not be able to participate in the legally binding agreement as of 2015. Therefore, as formal partner in the ND, the EU has been channelling contributions in the form of projects.

Contributions to NDPC

In 2010, the first year when EU financing was provided, EUR 300,000 were allocated to the NDPC using the FWC procurement method, i.e. recruitment of

external consultants to carry out a given task for the partnership. This was used for two studies and two dissemination seminars. Later, Direct Award Grant contracts were concluded directly with the NDPC Secretariat (represented by the NCM) and in 2012, the NDPC launched a project (with an EU contribution of EUR 300,000) to develop the CCI in the ND area and implement the NDPC Communication Strategy.

Table 6.1 Overview of EU funded projects

	Title	Status	Short description
1	A study on the Viking route heritage sites in Russia	Completed (April 2011 – March 2012)	Objective: map Viking Route heritage sites in Russia and analyse what would be needed to develop the Viking Route for international cultural tourism. Output: A study (also published as a book) that summarises Viking history in Russia and identifies eight major Viking heritage sites, analyses their state, visibility, as well as lists tourist attractions and accessibility.
2	Mapping study of music industry operators in North West Russia	Completed (June – November 2011)	Objective: facilitate networking of NW Russian music export operators with operators and Music Export Agencies from the Nordic and Baltic countries. Outputs: A study that summarises information on key music industry professionals; provides information on the networks that these professionals have already established (and are potentially able to establish in the future); as well as furnishes a list of the most relevant music companies / individual professionals.
3	Presentation of the results of the studies on Viking route heritage sites and music industry in Russia	Completed (December 2011 – June 2012)	Two seminars to disseminate the results of the above studies: Seminar #1 “Viking Route heritage sites and cultural tourism in Russia” (St. Petersburg, 25.04.2012, 56 participants). Seminar #2 “Music Industry in the North West Russia” (St. Petersburg, 26.04.2012, 49 participants).
4	Northern Dimension cooperation for cultural and creative industries’ development	On-going (December 2012 – April 2014)	Objective: support the NDPC by enhancing NDPC’s communication with its target groups for the benefit of CCI operators in the ND area and by implementing a limited number of NDPC flagship projects with the involvement of NW Russian partners. Activities: launch of the Cultural and Creative Industries Platform Program (CCIP) in the framework of which 12 mini- projects were chosen from the 56 proposed projects and implementation of the communication strategy (publication of news on the NDPC website, e-newsletter).

A list of projects with budget allocations and intervention logics (Logframe) for these projects is included in Annex F.

6.3 Assessment and key findings

The EU funding to the NDPC has been allocated to projects as depicted above. This means that in the case of the NDPC, the EU funding can be assessed separately from other sources of funding to the NDPC. The assessment below focuses primarily on the completed projects and not on the NDPC itself – however, some issues concerning the NDPC and its structures are of relevance to the assessment of the EU funding and have thus been included.

Interventions in accordance with EU and ND policies	<p>Relevance</p> <p>The cultural and creative industry (CCI) is a fast developing sector in Europe, and it has attracted increasing attention over the last decade. In the ND area, the Nordic countries are frontrunners in developing their CCI sectors; At the EU level, the CCI became a policy target with the launch of the European Commission Green Paper “Unlocking the potential of cultural and creative industries” in 2010⁴⁷.</p>
Needs reflect the priorities in the region	<p>In Russia, the CCI is still new as sector with no national policy or ministry responsible for its development while in Latvia, Lithuania and Poland, the development of the CCI is gathering pace. It is only recently that Poland and Russia have taken an interest in the sector and its contribution to economic development. This allows for an exchange of experiences and offers possibilities for international collaboration in the ND area, which has been especially supported by the CCIP project.</p> <p>It should be mentioned that not all stakeholders are convinced that the CCI belongs to the cultural area and therefore question the current focus of the NDPC. The fact that it is the ministries of culture that participate in the NDPC is also questioned, as some countries see CCI as part of economic development. There may be a need to review this.</p>
Correspondence to needs of beneficiaries	<p>The choice of the topics for the studies was apparently guided by common interests of the NDPC member countries and the readiness of the two sectors (cultural tourism and music) for joint activities. The studies were undertaken before the NDPC had matured in terms of its strategic direction and also before the establishment of the secretariat. The CCIP project, on the other hand, fits well with the CCI sector in the ND area by facilitating international networking, experience exchange and cooperation of the CCI actors. It was noted that the 50% co-financing rate for the CCIP mini-projects is rather high, especially for organisations in Russia, which may limit the participation of NGOs and associations in CCIP calls.</p>
Coordination between donors and partners is functioning	<p>EU Value added</p> <p>EU funding has been important to the NDPC. While the participating countries provide financing for the running of the Secretariat, it is primarily the funding channelled through the EUD in Moscow that financed projects. The project “Northern Dimension cooperation for cultural and creative industries’ development” (CCIP) has also been partly funded the Secretariat, additional funding was provided by the NDPC members for the implementation of the 12 mini-projects.</p>
Possible relation/integration to EUSBSR	<p>The development in the CCI contribution towards the development of the Baltic Sea Region is also reflected in the renewed Action Plan of the EUSBSR, which now has its own PA Culture. While none of the EU financed projects are Flagships</p>

⁴⁷ The definition used in this Green Paper has been adopted by the NDPC in its Strategy document.

of the EUSBSR, they are in line with its priorities – promotion of cultural heritage and creative industries.

More EU involvement

The NDPC would like to see the relevant EU institutions (DG Education and Culture) take an active role in the NDPC work through participation in the meetings and dialogue with other NDPC partners. There is also a feeling that information to the NDPC regarding the funding and co-funding opportunities for NDPC projects is needed.

Attributable impacts of interventions can be identified

Impact and sustainability

The NDPC is the youngest of the four partnerships, and it has only implemented a few projects making it difficult, at this stage, to assess its impact on the CCI sector in the ND area. As one-off-events, the projects are not likely to make impacts on the sector. There is a need for both critical mass and a common approach through the projects.

Impacts of EU funded studies

While interesting in their own right, there has been little follow-up and impact of the two studies (cultural tourism based on the Viking heritage and music industry in NW Russia), due to the fact the studies were carried out before the establishment of the NDPC Secretariat.

Impacts of the EU CCIP

According to stakeholders, at least one of the mini-projects of the CCIP was created as a result of the music industry mapping. Finland is interested in developing cooperation in the field of cultural tourism and will be organising a seminar in the framework of the meeting of the CBSS Workgroup on Education and Culture in April 2014⁴⁸. Even though it is still too early to assess the impact of the CCIP, it is clear that the implementation of the mini-projects has created new contacts among actors in the ND area, giving them the opportunity to do something right away, as well as to explore future cooperation possibilities. The CCIP call has also been useful for establishing an overview of the CCI field in the region – this information is not readily available otherwise. The expected longer-term impact of the CCIP mini-projects is increased growth and internationalisation (through networks) of the sector.

Stakeholders confirm impacts

The “Nërd Camp” project lead by Gamechangers is a St. Petersburg based education programme (two years) for students (in St. Petersburg), with interdisciplinary backgrounds in new technologies, creative industries and business.

Box 6.2 Nërd Camp project

“Nërd Camp” unites 26 different programmes and organisations around Europe working with experimental education methodologies. It has given these organisations an opportunity to meet, get to know each other both on a people-to-people level, as well as learn about each other’s work, discuss possible future cooperation possibilities such joint projects, summer schools for the students, establishment of an information bank of good practices.

⁴⁸ First CBSS Workgroup on Education and Culture and NDP back-to-back meeting for synergy effects and increased collaboration.

Plans to enforce effects of interventions	The NDPC is considering how to further support the CCIP projects – a seminar on financing models for the CCI was organised in September 2013 for all the projects, they may also be invited to the ND Forum (April 2014) and/or Culture Forum in St. Petersburg (December 2014). Any funding for the follow-up activities will have to be obtained by the networks themselves as it is unclear when there could be the next call for proposals of CCIP and if follow-up activities would be supported.
Involvement of Russia	Several stakeholders have emphasised the positive impact of involving Russia in the activities of the partnership – all CCIP mini-projects have Russian partners, Russia is interested in hosting and financing the Cultural Forum, and it is promoting the idea of a new agreement for the NDPC partners to replace the MoU. The Northern Dimension Business Council (NDBC), whose work is co-financed by a private company Severstal, has created a working group on CCI.
Results contribute to the achievements of the NDPC	Effectiveness and efficiency The EU assistance to the three completed projects has achieved its objectives in terms of delivering the results (studies, seminars). It appears, however, that there is little ownership of the results of these projects, especially in the secretariat, which has resulted in very few follow-up activities. Thus on a larger scale, these projects have not created the desirable momentum for cooperation among the actors in the ND area.
Monitoring systems in place	The still on-going project – “Northern Dimension cooperation for cultural and creative industries’ development” – has undergone a monitoring (ROM) process. The report concludes that the project is line with the context and the needs of the stakeholders. While noting that project results will most likely be achieved, the report also encourages more detailed planning of the project implementation and provision of more support to the mini-projects. This may be the indication of a lack of project management competence/resources in the NDPC.
Management of EU funded projects	The NDPC secretariat has not been involved in the management of most of the EU funded projects – mainly because these were initiated before the establishment of the secretariat, but also due to its limited resources. The NDPC has the smallest ND secretariat with only one full-time employee. The regular secretariat activities (meeting organisation, planning and communication activities), coordinating the CCIP project in general as well as the 12 mini-projects and applying for funding (incl. funding for the CCIP project) put a considerable strain on the human resources of the Secretariat.

6.4 Conclusions and recommendations

Sustainability of the NDPC	The NDPC is the youngest of ND partnerships, still, in its launching phase; 2012 was the first year with a fully operational, yet not independent, Secretariat. The commitment and financial contributions from the partners to the NDPC’s work and development of financial for supporting CCI projects are still issues. To achieve long-lasting results, the NDPC will require funding that is both more predictable and more ample. Considering the dual nature of the CCI (a cross-over between
----------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

economic development and culture), the funding could originate from both public (EU, national funding and other organisations) and private sources.

EU added value & sustainability

EU financing has been instrumental for the NDPC's project activities however, it appears to have been less of a catalyst for attracting funding from other sources (public or private) in comparisons with other partnerships. The NDPC partners would like to see dialogue with the European Commission DG Education and Culture in form of a strengthened dialogue and information regarding available funding opportunities from the EU funds.

Effectiveness and efficiency

The NDPC secretariat has very limited resources, and it is therefore crucial that its activities are focused to achieve the best possible impact on the CCI sector in the ND area. Thus the NDPC Secretariat should be aided in this process strengthening of its human resources. External consultant(s) could be involved in the stages of planning, applications, and administration. Important capacity has to be developed in the NDPC to identify potential funding sources, negotiations with funding organisations and private actors in NDPC countries, and application for funding. With the limited budget for the secretariat, participating countries should consider providing assistance in attracting funding.

Future funding of NDPC

A continuation of the CCIP (funding of mini-projects) in order to fostering cooperation between the CCI companies and organisations in the ND area could include a seed funding facility to develop applications for further funding for larger projects from the CBC, regional (BSR Programme 2014-2020) and sectoral programmes (e.g. Creative Europe Programme 2014-2020), as well as the private sector.

7 Overall conclusions and lessons learned

The preceding assessment has analysed primarily EU funding in the context of the four ND partnerships in terms of relevance, EU value added, impact and sustainability. To a lesser extent, efficiency and effectiveness have also been addressed. This chapter provides an overall assessment of the four partnerships gathering key findings common to all partnerships or lessons learned from one or more partnerships with potential of replication.

Time is a factor

Many stakeholders emphasise that a key factor in this type of cooperation is time. One has to be patient as many of the effects will only be measurable after a number of years. This goes for the cooperation/projects – and partnerships as such - in some cases, these need time to develop and find the right way of cooperation. Some stakeholders emphasise that patience with the cooperation structures is paramount and in order not to abandon potentially well-functioning cooperation too early. One may not be able to revive the structures again, especially in a climate of financial constraints.

Relevance

In all partnerships, the assessment has found that the EU funding and/or the founding as such has supported relevant initiatives in relation to ND policies and needs in the region. The EU funding has been used either as co-funding (NDEP) or as funding for preparatory work of the partnerships (NDPTL and NDPC), or partnership projects (NDPHS). Although the funding of the projects is deemed relevant, some of the partnerships have experienced timing and/or ownership issues – making the supported projects less relevant at the time of implementation.

The importance of a strategic framework

If a policy framework has been developed that can guide the use of the funding and that meets agreed goals and objectives, the assessment found that it is possible to direct the EU funding to generally agreed and relevant needs. For the NDEP, HELCOM provided a strategy framework for the environment window, for the nuclear window, it was necessary, as a first step, to develop a master plan with priority projects. The NDPHS has also been working in the framework of a specifically developed strategy. The NDPTL has developed a framework (core network), which will guide the selection of the projects – it is too early to assess how it is working, since the first project in the framework has just been selected (until now the NDPTL has had problems agreeing on the direction). For the NDPC, which is one of the younger partnerships, there seems to be more uncertainty about

the strategic direction. The lack of overall strategy or direction sometime resulted in that projects have been deemed as not relevant by stakeholders in some of the partnerships.

Strategic framework ensured the coordination

The strategic frameworks are also important to secure a consensus, not only with regard to the strategic direction but also with regard to the kind of projects/activities to support. The use of a strategic framework, be it external or internal, also secures coordination between policies and well as funding. There are indications that the strategic framework also improves sectoral coordination with other strategies and cooperation partners.

Coordination with non-EU strategies

Some stakeholders view the ND as the external dimension of the EUSBSR. However, balancing the ND focus on the EUSBSR and the interests of the other founding partners – Russia, Norway, Iceland – is an important issue when it comes to the role of the partnerships. For example, Russia has its own strategy for social and economic development of the North-West Federal District. Recently, an EU-Russia working group with the participation of DG REGIO, Russian Ministries of Foreign Affairs and of Regional Development was set up to compare the two strategies and identify common priorities in the different sectors.

Cooperation/coordination in the BSR

Even though the many players and organisation in the Baltic Sea Region are seen as a blessing (in particular in regions which have less), they are considered to overlap each other and duplicate work. Most are however of the opinion that the ND adds an additional dimension to the overall governance structure in the ND area. Some stakeholders find that the ND partnership covers a part of the structure where there are few other relevant institutions, focusing on an intermediate level between the overall policy/regional cooperation structure and the more specific project, as a sort of “tactical” implementation level/platform where projects are conceived and developed.

EU value added

Overall, the EU value added is often emphasised, as EU funding serves to make projects possible or to leverage (increasing) funding from other sources. However, this seems to be a limited view of the EU value added. There is little doubt that stakeholders consider the EU presence in the ND cooperation very important, both in general and specifically in the different partnerships. The role(s) of the EU is manifold and spans from coordination of EU positions/and arbitration between positions, discussion partner and policy developer. There is little doubt that to Russia, the presence of the EU is very important as the larger partner who coordinates a number of smaller partners. There is generally a wish for increased presence of EU institutions in the work of the partnerships.

Cooperation with Russia

The ND, on the other hand, is an important platform for the EU to enhance cooperation with Russia. As the cooperation is at a practical and concrete level this works also when other types of cooperation is less effective. This also is supported by the fact that Russia has intensified its cooperation in the ND in the last three to four years. The fact that the parties are equals is very important to Russia, and Russia actively supports the NDEP, the NDPHS, and the NDPC. In the case of NDPTL, Russia seems to take a wait-and-see position. If the EU finds it important and commits funding, Russia will do it as well.

Coordination with EU funding programmes	<p>A key issue in particularly in the newer ND partnerships (NDPHS, NDPTL and NDPC) is the issue of funding. In the initial phase of these partnerships, it has been difficult to get commitment to large and predictable funding. The EU is seen as a key source to this funding. However, there are other funding sources in the area, which can be used to fund projects or the activities of the partnerships. Some of the partnerships have been effective in attracting additional funding, either as grants or as loans in the case of NDEP, or in the case of NDPHS, where partnerships have been able to develop projects that are funded by other EU funding programmes. Thus, the EU funding is leveraging either other donors or itself. The case of the NDPHS is an important example on how EU funding (in this case to project generation) can be instrumental in attracting money from ETC programmes and programmes for non-state actors.</p>
Attributable impacts	<p>When it comes to impacts, the projects funded by the EU have achieved very clear and measurable impacts in the NDEP (especially in the environmental sector but also in the nuclear window). The NDPHS projects have also had impacts in terms of policy impacts and even though they are more difficult to grasp, there are good examples. For the NDPC and the NDPTL, it is too early to measure impacts of the EU funded projects. NDPTL fund projects (recently begun) as such but it is likely that the NDPTL will generate some of the intended impact. The EU funding projects to the NDPTL have provided impacts in terms of supporting the strategic framework developed which has been so important in this partnership. The NDPC works with rather small projects, and it has still to be seen if these will have the intended impacts. The NDPC studies funded by the EU have had limited impact as these probably were implemented too early.</p>
Sustainability	<p>The type of sustainability is different for projects in the four partnerships, and it will be difficult to generalise or transfer lessons from one partnership to the other (except for between NDEP and NDPTL). The sustainability issues differ much between a large investment project with a loan component and a small creative industries project. Only few of the latter undertaken in the NDPC and the NDPHS will be sustainable in their own right, but the methods and policies, cooperation will be continued in other contexts. For the large infrastructure projects sustainability has different dimensions. The commitment (own financing) in infrastructure investment projects provides a different basis for ownership. This combined with the long-term engagement and monitoring of the IFIs of the implementation (to secure the repayment of the loans) supports the sustainability of these types of projects/interventions.</p> <p>Stabilising (strengthening) the implementation structure of the NDPTL (is in the pipeline), and the NDPC seems to be very important in order to improve the functioning of these structures. Structures struggling without sufficient resources or uncertain resources perform poorly, as too much time is spent on survival. The NDPHS seem to have found its own way within the framework of the CBSS.</p>
Visibility of the EU funding	<p>Visibility of the EU funding is low in some of the partnerships – the steering committees do not exactly know what has been funded by the EU. Still, there is general agreement that the partnerships share the results of the projects to a wider audience - either through the partnership or through the website. Some are also active in terms of presenting the results more widely (NDEP).</p>

Efficiency & effectiveness	Effectiveness and efficiency has not been a key focus of this evaluation, and as there are many different implementation models, it is difficult to draw general conclusions. However, it is the perception that the NDEP run by the EBRD is well run and stakeholders appreciate the professionalism of a large and professional organisation with sectoral and local knowledge. The control systems are highly appreciated.
Other implementation methods	However, supporting this kind of cooperation through framework contracts is probably not optimal, but it has been the only viable choice at the time. Generally, this gives an arm's length feeling – nobody is really responsible when the contracting and beneficiary authority is not the same. It is also time and resource consuming for both beneficiaries and the EU Commission. Direct contacts with organisations seem to have worked better. Using existing structures, to which funding is transferred (as long as they comply with the requirements) should be preferred. It is time consuming and costly to establish new implementation structures, which will satisfy the donors. This is probably why the EBRD approach has proven successful.
Monitoring and evaluation	A number of the EU-funded projects (NDPHS and NDPC) are under ROM (monitoring). There are practically no monitoring results or evaluations available, (apart from project descriptions) or evaluation available with regard to the NDEP or NDPTL. It is therefore difficult to find assessments of the effects from independent sources. Overall, stakeholders reflect that more monitoring or transparency of monitoring would improve the visibility of activities. This is somewhat in contrast to the fact that stakeholders believe that some of the programme secretariats spend too much time on informing at detail level instead of the larger picture. Many of the participants in the various steering committees are busy representing sectoral ministries and do not have the resources to participate in direct contact management but would appreciate more overall monitoring information.
Professional and effective implementation structures are important	In conclusion, the EU funding provided to the partnerships seems to have worked well. It is important to remember that the partnerships are of very different character, age and size. Some have an external policy framework, which justifies their existence and the funding, while others have had to develop this. The more established the partnership, and the better and the more professional the manager/secretariat, the better the implementation and the use of results and thereby impacts. Generally, the policy or the needs to be addressed by the partnerships should be agreed on outside the partnership structure as such – the partnerships should not do both policy and the project work.
Future EU funding to the ND partnerships	In the short term, additional funding (EU and/or other) seems to be most important for the NDPHS, NDPTL and the NDPC. The NDEP has sufficient funds to carry out its current mandate. If the three other ND partnerships are to be sustainable the long term – additional, stable sources (or methods of attaching) need to be in place. EU funding could well be spent on this in order to strengthen the partnerships and enable them to attract alternative and or additional funding in the future.

Appendix A Evaluation questions and Judgement Criteria

Overall Questions	Judgement criteria and indicators
<p><u>Relevance:</u></p> <p>Are the EU financed projects relevant for the overall objectives of the ND and the development of the Region?</p> <p>Is it relevant for the EU to continue supporting the ND partnerships;</p> <p>Is this a relevant way to advance EU-Russia cooperation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs reflect priorities in the region (based on strategies/ policies). Projects interventions reflects needs assessment of stakeholders The interventions reflect key EU policies in the region Project interventions coordination with other programmes, donors, Key stakeholders reflect that this is a relevant manner to reflect EU-Russia cooperation
<p><u>Coherence/complementarity/added value:</u></p> <p>What is the added value of the EU financed projects?</p> <p>Are the EU financed projects in coherence with the actions financed by other institutions, including other ND partner?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EU funding functions as catalyst and multiplier Coordination between donors and partners is functioning and securing funding of the partnership. EC instruments coherent and complementary
<p><u>Impact:</u></p> <p>Did the projects/interventions lead to any wider impacts (negative or positive, foreseen or unforeseen)?</p> <p>What are key reasons for not resulting in impacts?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attributable impacts can be identified Stakeholders confirm impacts Evaluation and monitoring confirms impacts Results implemented and shared
<p><u>Sustainability:</u></p> <p>How are the results/outputs of the projects being used today/in the future?</p> <p>Results are/or will be sustainable, and if not why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies and coordination is being developed Plans to enforce effects of interventions Public investments agreed Elements which could hamper the sustainability of assistance
<p><u>Effectiveness:</u></p> <p>To what extend were the objectives of the EU funded projects met?</p> <p>Did the project outputs meet the needs and expectations of the partnership?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results contribute to the achievement of partnership objectives Strategies, models etc. prepared and adopted, Institutional set-ups have been prepared, Cooperation methods and procedures developed Where there factors which hampered the achievements?
<p><u>Efficiency:</u></p> <p>How economically did were the results of the projects achieved (ratio/inputs outputs)?</p> <p>To which extend did this depend on the type of contract (framework contract, grant contract, contribution agreement)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation modalities relevant and efficient? Implementation rate (progress/to plan) The projects have been implemented in a timely manner Use of TA and supply contacts, twinning, grant agreements etc. Monitoring systems in place to detect lacking outputs

Appendix B List of partnerships, participants and contributors

	NDEP E	NDEP N	NDPTL	NDPHS	NDPC
Belarus	X		X		
Denmark	X	X	X	(x)	X
Estonia			X	X	X
Finland	X	X	X	X	X
Germany	X	X	X	X	X
Iceland (ND Partner)			X	X	X
Latvia			X	X	X
Lithuania			X	X	X
Norway (ND Partner)	X	X	X	X	X
Poland			X	X	X
Russia (ND Partner)	X	X	X	X	X
Sweden	X		X	X	X
European Commission (ND Partner)	X	X	X	X	X
Baltic Sea States Sub-regional Co-operation				X	
Barents Euro-Arctic Council				X	
Council of the Baltic Sea States				X	
International Labour Organisation				X	
International Organisation for Migration				X	
Nordic Council of Ministers				X	
Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS				X	
World Health Organisation				X	
France		X			
UK		X			
Canada		X			
Netherlands		X			
Belgium		X			

(x) = as a Participant

Appendix C List of people interviewed

	Name of institution	Contact	Venue	Date
European Commission Services	DEVCO	Henno Putnik (project manager)	Telephone	20.09.13
		Philip Mikos Head of Unit Regional Programmes I Neighbourhood East)	Brussels	26.09.13
		Lea Vuori (Desk Officer Russia)	Brussels	26.09.13
		Carmen Falkenberg	Brussels	26.09.13
		Bodil Persson	Brussels	26.09.13
		Martin Andersen (NDEP Nuclear window)	Telephone interview	01.10.13
	EEAS (Division III.B.1)	Kalle Kankaanpaa (responsible for ND)	Helsinki	14.10.13
		Marko Mantyla (will replace above)	Brussels	23.09.13
		Richard Tibbels (Head of Division for Eastern Partnership and Reional Cooperation)	Brussels	23.09.13
		Sven-Olov Carlsson (Dpt. Head of Division with Russia)	Brussels	23.09.13
		Wolfgang Behrent	Brussels	23.09.13
	DG MOVE	Alain Baron (International relations Office Russia)	Telephone	20.09.13
	DG SANCO	Canice NOLAN (canice.nolan@ec.europa.eu).	Brussels	25.09.13
		Wolfgang Philipp (former responsible for HIV/AIDS)	Telephone interview	04.10.13
	DG ENV	Jaime Reynolds (Policy office Russia and Northern Issues)	Brussels	25.09.13
	DG REGIO	Jean-Marc VENINEAUX	Telephone	01.10.13
	EUD Moscow	Alexis Loeber (Head of Operations) Vladimir Korneev (replacing Outa) Outa Hermalaiti (Maternity Leave)	Moscow	07.10.13
Russia	MFA	Andrei Kolesnikov (Acting Head of Unit, Common European Cooperation) <u>Valsilav Kurbatsky</u> (Desk Officer Northern Dimension) Olga Batanova (assistant)	Moscow	07.10.13

	MoT	<u>Arthur Vladimirovich</u> (Desk for NDPTL, International Cooperation)	In writing	22.10.13
	MoC	Pavel Kartashev Represented by A. Kolesnikov, MFA.	Moscow	See above
	MoF	<u>Maria Smirnova</u> (International relation, EU programmes, CBC)	Moscow	08.10.13
NDEP - Environment	Secretariat	<u>Jaako Henttonen</u> (NDEP Fund Manager) <u>Ewa Manik</u> (assistant)	Telephone	31.10
	SG Member	Alistair Clark, Managing Director, Environment and Sustainability Department, EBRD	Telephone	04.11
	SG Member	Kari Homanen, NEFCO Vice President	Helsinki	14.10.13
	SG Member	Maria Smirnova, First Specialist, Ministry of Finance of the Russian Federation	Moscow (see above)	See above
	EBRD – nuclear	Balthasar Lindauer Jane Briggs	Telephone	01.11.13
	Nuclear Operating Committee member	Joanny Almestad	Telephone	26.11.13
NDPTL	Secretariat	<u>Oddgier Danielsen</u> (Director NDPTL Secretariat) <u>Olga Gurikova</u> (Assistant)	Helsinki	15.10.13
	SG Member	Simo-Pekka Parviainen, Finland MFA	Helsinki	15.10.13
	SG Member	Tuija Maanoja, Finland MT	Helsinki	15.10.13
	SG Member	Paal Iversen, Norway MT	Telephone	22.11.13
	SG Member	Arthur Karlov, Russia MT	Moscow (See above)	See above
	SG Member	Jon Kellberg	Copenhagen	10.01.14
	SG Member	Kajsa Lindström	Telephone interview	21.11.13
NDPHS	Secretariat	<u>Marek Maciejowski</u> (Head of NDPHS secretariat) <u>Silvija Juscenko</u> (Assistant)	Stockholm	06.11.13
	CSR member	Chairperson Ms. Liisa Ollila Deputy Director-General Ministry of Social Affairs and Health	Helsinki	14.10.13
	CSR member	Co-Chairperson Mr. Thomas Ifland Senior adviser Federal Ministry of Health	Telephone interview	08.11.13
	CSR member	Mrs. Karin Berlin Head of Section Ministry of Health and Social Affairs	Stockholm	07.11.13
	CSR member	Dr. Eduard Salakhov Head of Unit for International Cooperation in Public Health	Telephone interview	09.10.13

		Ministry of Health		
	CSR member	Ms Agnese Rabovica Director Ministry of Health	Telephone interview	05.11.13
NDCP	Secretariat	<u>Elena Khoroshina</u> (Senior Advisor NDPC Secretariat)	Copenhagen	24.10.13
	SG member	Riitta Heinämaa, Chair (Estonia)	Telephone	05.11.2013
	SG member	Pavel Kartashev, Russia	Moscow	See Above
	SG member	Lummepuro Maija	Helsinki	14.10.13
	Beneficiary	Aliona Markovich (Gamechangers)	Telephone interview	05.11.13
Norway	MFA	Dag Stangnes (Senior Adviser, Russia)	Telephone	12.11.13
Denmark	MFA	Kim Vinthen	Copenhagen	29.10.13
Sweden	MFA	Hans Olsson (Ambassador)	Stockholm	06.11.13
Finland	MFA	Hanna Lehtinen (Deputy Director)	Helsinki	15.10.13
Estonia	MFA	Tiina Maiberg (Desk Officer Northern Dimension)	Writing	21.11.13
Germany	MFA	Karsten Steinig (Head of Northern European Division)	Berlin	15.11.13
Nordic Council		Maria-Pia de Palo	Telephone interview n	19.11.13
Helcom		Mikael Durkin	Helsinki	15.10.13
CBSS		Jan Lunding (Director)	Stockholm	6. 11.13
Baltic Development Forum		Hans Brask	Telephone	29.10.13
NIB		Kersti Talving	Helsinki	14.10.13
NIB		Harro Pitkänen	Helsinki	In writing
SWP		Tobias Etzold	Berlin	20.11.13

Appendix D NDEP-non-nuclear – documentation and sources

Table D.1 List of NDEP environment projects

	Title	Sector	IFI	Status	Funding Loans	NDEP grant
1	Sosnovy Bor Water and Wastewater Rehabilitation	WW	NEFCO	Completed	0.75	0.5
2	Lomonosov District Heating Rehabilitation	DH	EBRD	PREP	10	2.5
3	Gatchina District Heating Rehabilitation	DH	NEFCO	PREP	3	0.5
4	Gatchina Wastewater Treatment	WW		PREP	0.78	0.39
5	Novgorod District Heating Infrastructure Rehabilitation	DH	EBRD	PREP	11.3	1
6	Vyborg Wastewater Treatment	WW	NEFCO	PREP	2.5	1.25
7	Vologda District Heating Rehabilitation	DH	EBRD	On-going/ completed	11.7	2
8	Pskov Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Rehabilitation	WW	EBRD	On-going	13	6.5
9	Murmansk Water and Wastewater Rehabilitation	WW	EBRD	PREP	15.4	6
10	Ten Suburban Wastewater Treatment Plants Rehabilitation	WW	NEFCO	IMP	5	3.75
11	PIU for Agricultural Waste Management in Leningrad Oblast	SW	NEFCO	IMP	1.5	2
12	Petrozavodsk Water and Wastewater Rehabilitation	WW	NEFRO	PREP	3	1.5
13	Petrozavodsk Solid Waste Management	SW	NEFRO	PREP	11	5
14	St Petersburg Neva Direct Discharge Closure	WW	NIB	IMP	60	24
15	Novgorod Water and Wastewater Services Rehabilitation	WW	NIB	IMP	4	3
16	Vologda Municipal Water Services	WW	EBRD	?	10.6	5.18
17	Kaliningrad Water and Environmental Services Rehabilitation	WW	EBRD	IMP	23.5	10
18	Kaliningrad Project Implementation Unit – Northern Dimension Foundation	WW	EBRD	IMP	?	2
19	Archangelsk Municipal Water Services	WW	EBRD	IMP	10	8.2
20	St Petersburg South West Wastewater Treatment Plant	WW	NIB	IMP	58.2	5.8
21	St Petersburg Flood Protection Barrier	Other	EBRD	IMP	277.5	1
22	St Petersburg Northern Waste Water Treatment Plant Sludge Incinerator	WW	EBRD	IMP	58.2	6.35
23	Komi Syktyvkar Municipal Water Services Improvement	WW	EBRD	IMP	15	6.04
24	Kaliningrad District Heating Rehabilitation	DH	EBRD	IMP	12	7.3
	Leningrad Oblast Municipal Environment Investment Programme	WW	NIB	IMP	5.25	4
BELARUS						
25	Grodno Wastewater Treatment Rehabilitation	WW	NIB	PREP	11	2
26	Vitebsk Wastewater Treatment Rehabilitation	WW	EBRD	PREP	12.5	2
27	Brest Wastewater Treatment Rehabilitation	WW	NIB	PREP	10	2

Table D.2 List of documentation

Title	Author/Publishing institutions	Date
Rules of the Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership fund.	NDEP	03.2010
10 years of Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership. 10 years of successful cooperation for a cleaner and safer environment in northern Europa	NDEP/EBRD	2012 (assumed - not dated)
Successful Partnership delivering concrete results for the Northern Dimension Policy. 2013 Update	NDEP/EBRD	2013
Memorandum of understanding for NDEP	NDEP	2002
NDEP-02-66-1211 - Minutes of the 10th Assembly of Contributors	NDEP	02.12.11
NDEP-02-42-1112 – Financial Status of the NDEP Support Fund	NDEP	30.11.12
NDEP-02-48-1112 – New Contribution Agreements	NDEP	30.11.12
NDEP-02-71-1112 - Record of Proceedings on the written approval procedure to the Assembly	NDEP	30.11.12
NDEP-02-55-2011 – NDEP Support Fund Financial Report up to 31.12.2011	NDEP	30.11.12
NDEP-02-43-1112 – Steering Group Chair’s Report on the activities of the Steering Group	NDEP	30.11.12
NDEP-02-45-1112 – Non Nuclear Work Programme	NDEP	30.11.12
NDEP-02-47-1112 – Progress Report NDEP Non Nuclear	NDEP	30.11.12
NDEP-02-51-2011 – EBRD Progress Report on the NDEP projects in Kaliningrad	NDEP	30.11.12
NDEP-02-60-2011 – NIB Progress Report on the St Petersburg Neva Programme	NDEP	30.11.12
NDEP NW-12/01 – Progress Report	NDEP	30.11.12
NDEP NW-12/02 – 2013 Administrative Budget	NDEP	30.11.12
NDEP NW-12/03 – 2011 Actual Expenses	NDEP	30.11.12
The Baltic Sea: New Level of Responsibility. St. Petersburg Initiative. (presentation at the Baltic Sea Conference September 2013.	Anatoly K. Kinebas. SUE “Vodokanal of St. Petersburg”	September 2013

Table D.3 *Intervention logic – environmental projects*

Challenges	Objectives	Outputs	Results	Impacts
What challenges / needs are identified in the partnerships	What are the objectives of the EU assistance (or the ND)	Meetings, Studies, etc.	What are the results	Effects?
<p>Name: Kaliningrad District Heating Project (EBRD) Implementation status: 2009-On-going Investment: MEUR 12 Grant: MEUR 7,3 Other grants: MEUR 0,5 Own financing: MEUR 2</p>				
Inefficient district heating networks consume energy that could be channelled to other productive uses, such as manufacturing or commerce. This project aims to rehabilitate the city of Kaliningrad's district heating network through the introduction of commercially-viable energy efficient practices and infrastructure. The project will have significant environmental benefits, particularly in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and heat loss.	Service levels – and the service's long-term commercial viability – will improve. Tariffs will be set at cost-reflective levels and the subsidy system will be reformed. A social safety net scheme will be introduced for lower income groups.	The project's investment programme will introduce metering mechanisms which will allow consumers to control their consumption and permit billing in line with actual consumption.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacing network sections where water and thermal losses are excessive with pre-insulated pipes. Upgrading existing heat-only boilers by installing control and automation systems. Replacing large, wasteful central heat sub-stations with individual compact sub-stations and converting the current four-pipe network systems to a two-pipe one. Decommissioning several inefficient coal-fired boilers and installing gas-fired boilers or merging them with the centralised district heating networks instead. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CO2 emissions will be reduced by minimum 40,000 tonnes/year. SO2 emissions will be reduced by 400 tonnes/year. NOx emissions will be reduced by 140 tonnes/year. Ambient air quality in Kaliningrad will be improved by 5-10 per cent. All investment will aid in reducing greenhouse gas emissions associated with excessive fuel consumption.
<p>Name: St Petersburg Neva Direct Discharge Closure Implementation status: 2009-2013 Investment: MEUR 60 Grant: MEUR 24 Other grants: MEUR 17,5 Own financing: MEUR 461,2</p>				

Challenges	Objectives	Outputs	Results	Impacts
When the St Petersburg South West Wastewater Treatment Plant (SWWWTP) was completed in 2005 the city's capacity for treating wastewater increased to 85 per cent. Yet without collectors to receive sewage from around 400 municipal and industrial sewers it was not possible to stop the pollution of the city's water bodies and the Baltic Sea.	The project aims to eliminate these discharges and enable the City to deliver on its pledge to treat 98 per cent of wastewater in compliance with EU and HELCOM directives.	The investment programme includes: 1.completion of the Northern Tunnel Collector; 2.connection of direct discharge sewers to the new sewer network; 3.construction of the URS-422 Pumping Station and 4.partial reconstruction of existing Northern and Central wastewater treatment plants.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.completion of the Northern Tunnel Collector; 2.connection of direct discharge sewers to the new sewer network; 3.construction of the URS-422 Pumping Station and 4.partial reconstruction of existing Northern and Central wastewater treatment plants. 	The Collector enabled 76 direct discharges to be closed and stopped 334 000 m3 of untreated wastewater from draining into the River Neva every day. St Petersburg is now able to treat 98.4 per cent of its wastewater and Vodokanal is committed to continue to improve its performance in coming years.
<p>Name: Sosnovy Bor Water and Wastewater Rehabilitation</p> <p>Implementation status: Under implementation</p> <p>Investment: MEUR 0,75</p> <p>Grant: MEUR 0,5</p> <p>Other grants: MEUR 0,75</p> <p>Own financing: MEUR 3,1</p>				
Sosnovy Bor is a small town some 80 kilometres west from St Petersburg. Wastewater treatment facilities in major towns around the Baltic Sea have by and large been upgraded to comply with EU standards and HELCOM recommendations. Small municipalities, such Sosnovy Bor, and their combined effect need to be addressed next in order to reduce eutrophication of the Baltic Sea.	With the proposed investment, Sosnovy Bor will be the first municipality in northwest Russia outside of St Petersburg to implement enhanced phosphorus removal using chemical treatment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.installing new air blowers, compressors and pumps to improve energy efficiency; 2.constructing a sludge drying unit to handle solid waste and 3.adding phosphorus removal facilities for improved chemical treatment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The wastewater treatment plant is operational and efficient. Lower energy consumption chemical treatment of wastewater and sludge disposal system. T 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduction of phosphorus load to the Baltic Sea by 22 000 t/a; energy efficiency improvements that will reduce CO2 emissions and a sustainable solution for disposing sludge from treated wastewater.
<p>Name: St Petersburg South West Wastewater Treatment Plant</p> <p>Implementation status: Completed</p> <p>Investment: MEUR 96,7 (other loans MEUR 27)</p> <p>Grant: MEUR 5,8</p> <p>Other grants: MEUR 45</p> <p>Own financing: MEUR 18,7</p>				
Construction originally started in 1987	The South West Wastewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of the wastewater 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with HELCOM 	The city's capacity for treating wastewater

Challenges	Objectives	Outputs	Results	Impacts
but works were suspended and did not recommence until beginning of the 1990s, only to be discontinued very soon thereafter due to financial difficulties, by which time approximately 40-45 per cent of the facility had been completed.	Treatment Plant (SWWTP) was been categorised as one of the highest priority projects in the region as in recent years about 1,220,000 m ³ per day of untreated waste water has been discharged directly into the sea.	treatment plant, the project included two independent components: the Sludge Incineration Plant, funded by the European Commission and the EIB, and associated civil works in the plant area, financed by Vodokanal and St Petersburg.	standards and treats 330,000 cubic meters of wastewater, , per day and removes 90 per cent of phosphorus and 70-80 per cent of nitrogen from the wastewater load.	has increased to 85 per cent.

Appendix E Appendix C NDEP- nuclear – documentation and sources

Table E.1 List of EU funded projects NDEP-nuclear

	Title	Status	Funding
001	Strategic Master Plan	Completed	7,0
002 (A)	Urgent projects in Gremikha	Completed	7,0
003	Radiation Monitoring and Emergency Response System of the Murmansk region	Completed	5,1
004 (A)	Decommissioning of Building No.5 in Andreeva Bay.	On-going	4,25
005 (A)	Decommissioning of the Floating Maintenance Base “Lepse” currently moored in Murmansk.	On-going	53,0
006 (A)	Defueling of Papa- class nuclear-powered submarine reactors.	On-going	12,54
007 (A)	Spent nuclear fuel management at Andreeva Bay.	On-going	55,0
008	Radiation Monitoring and Emergency Response System of the Arkhangelsk Region	Completed	5,1
009	Creation of safe conditions for the storage of spent reactor cores from Alfa- class nuclear submarines.	On-going	11,87
0010	Lepse Regulatory Support project.	On-going	1,54

Table E.2 List of Document used for the assessment for NDEP – nuclear

Title	Author/Publishing institutions	Date
Strategic Master Plan for Decommissioning the Retired Russian Nuclear Fleet and Environmental Rehabilitation of Its Supporting Infrastructure in Northwest Russia (SMP)”	Foundation for Environmental Safety of Power engineering (IBRAE RAS)	2007
Project Completion Report: Implementation of Urgent Projects in Gremikha GIA 002	N/A	Not dated
Description of project. Radiation Monitoring and Emergency Response System of the Murmansk region GIA 003	N/A	Not dated
Enhancement of the Radiation Monitoring and Emergency Response System in the Archangelsk Region	Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Russian Federation	2012
Accelerating Hazardous Reduction in Northwest Russia	Rosatom/EBRD	2007
Peer Appraisal of the arrangements in Archangelsk Region (Russian Federation) regarding the preparedness for responding to a radiation emergency	IAEA	July 2011
NORTHERN DIMENSIONS ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERSHIP NUCLEAR WINDOW; PROGRESS REPORT	NUCLEAR OPERATING COMMITTEE	26 March 2010

Table E.3 Intervention logic – nuclear projects

Challenges	Objectives	Outputs	Results	Impacts
What challenges / needs are identified in the partnerships	What are the objectives of the EU assistance (or the ND)	Meetings, Studies, etc.	What are the results	Work of the ND improved?
Name: Grant Implementing Agreement No. 001: Strategic Master Plan (SMP) Implementation status: Completed Grant: MEUR 7				
The decommissioning of submarines and service ships, management of spent nuclear fuel and waste and environmental rehabilitation of contaminated sites in north-west Russia is an extremely complex undertaking. A need for a comprehensive and holistic approach to the challenges of dealing with the decommissioning of nuclear submarines and service vessels, spent nuclear fuel and waste and the environmental rehabilitation in this region has been recognised by many parties involved in CEG and other co-operative processes. The EBRD also considered that an overall plan for the region, taking into account all the external parameters which influence decisions for the region, should be the top priority preceding financing decisions on individual projects.	To provide a mechanism for every day monitoring and co-ordination of projects implemented in the framework of the Comprehensive Decommissioning Programme (CDP) the Project Management Information System (PMIS) has been developed under an amendment to the contract between Rosatom and IBRAE	Development of software, collection and input of data, training Rosatom authorised personnel (including FCNRS) on the use of PMIS and setting up a team for the system operation in the future	SMP: The PMIS now covers all existing projects, tracks current state of their implementation, identifies bottlenecks and support decision-making process. Pilot operation of the system demonstrates its capabilities and now organisation arrangements are being made by Rosatom to maintain its permanent operation in the future.	The SMP made the basis for the priority project selection. Improved coordination Recognising this ground-breaking achievement, Russia adopted the SMP as the basis for the management of the whole nuclear programme in north- west Russia. The SMP is now employed on a daily basis by Rosatom to monitor the progress and to coordinate remediation activities in the region.
Name: Urgent Projects in Gremikhha Implementation status: Completed Grant: MEUR 7				
The main challenges for the Gemikha site where the substantial amounts of spent nuclear fuels and radioactive waste that had been accumulated	Main objective of the projects was the development and installation of the comprehensive system to monitor environmental	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first project was for the creation of safe storage conditions and unloading of spent nuclear fuel (SNF) from Alfa-class nuclear submarines. 	Significantly improvement of the safely and security of storage conditions of SNF and RW in Gremikhha.	The results contribute to the general programme for remediation of the Gremikha site implemented by the Russian Federation

Challenges	Objectives	Outputs	Results	Impacts
during decades of Nuclear fleet operations stored in unsafe conditions that required urgent improvements.t	conditions in the storage facility for spent reactor cores (SRC) discharged from reactions of the Alfa class submarines. In total 9 were stored in the Gremikha facility.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second project was to carry out feasibility studies for removal of SNF and waste from the Open Storage Area and for provisions for safe storage of WWR type SNF in existing storage facilities in Gremikha The third project entailed the improvement of physical protection in Gremikha. 		
Name: Radiation Monitoring and Emergency Response System of the Archangelsk Region Implementation status: Completed Grant: 5.1				
Nuclear hazards are located close to Archangelsk and Severodvinsk but with no emergency response system in place and only a few elements of radiation monitoring available, accidents at storage facilities would cause an immediate threat to the adjacent populations.	The overall objective of the project is establishment of the elements of early warning system for personal and population in case of radiation accidents on site where decontamination and environmental rehabilitation are to be undertaken as well as effective emergency response to manage emergencies and mitigate consequences of accidents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment of crisis centre Enhancement and integration of the radiation monitoring system Provision of mobile laboratories Provision of communication links and technical support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work to establish a comprehensive and integrated radiation monitoring and emergency response system in the Arkhangelsk region was completed in September 2011 in accordance with the initial programme and on budget. The work was concluded in September 2012 and the Grant Implementing Agreement will be formally closed out. 	The recommendations from the IAEA expert mission were included in a contract extension and this additional work has now been completed. The scope of work included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Detail review of the IAEA mission report. •Advanced training of key personnel. •Additional equipment for the Training Centre for specialised training. •Prepare and conduct an emergency exercise to test the interaction between participants of the emergency response system (which took place in July 2012).
Name: Decommissioning of the Floating Maintenance Base “Lepse” currently moored in Murmansk. Implementation status: On-going Grant: 53 MEUR				
Lepse ship was built more than 70	The decommissioning of Lepse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unloading and transporting of 	The approved concept design for	Considerable progress has been made in

Challenges	Objectives	Outputs	Results	Impacts
<p>years ago to carry cargo, but in 1958 it was rebuilt as a service ship, or Floating Technical Base, for refuelling the first nuclear powered icebreaker – Lenin – and later for the next generation of icebreakers: Arktika and Sibir. In 1988 it was taken out of service and in 1990 Lapse was officially declared as a ‘laid-up’ vessel although its storage compartments still contained spent fuel and radioactive waste.</p> <p>The vessel, laid up in the Kola Bay near Murmansk, contains two storage tanks for spent nuclear fuel (SNF) from the icebreakers with 639 spent fuel assemblies (SFAs) on board. A considerable amount of high and intermediate-level liquid radwaste (LRW) is stored in the SNF storage tank tubes, in special tanks and in the cooling circuit.</p>	<p>was identified as an important task 20 years ago and the work was initiated by the Murmansk Shipping Company (MSCo) but was abandoned in 1994 when funds ran out. Lapse was then brought to the attention of the international community and received great support from the European Commission, NEFCO and the governments of Norway and France.</p>	<p>radioactive waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety system for removal • Repairs of floating dock <p>The majority of the SFAs stored in the Lapse are categorised as damaged and the use of regular procedures and practices for defueling is impossible in its current state. Therefore the unloading of the SFAs from the storage facility on the ship requires the use of specialised equipment and procedures which need to be developed.</p>	<p>the dismantling of Lapse requires that the ship is transported to Nerpa shipyard where the specialist infrastructure will be constructed and equipment installed.</p> <p>The preparation for transportation included the removal of radioactive waste, decontamination of the vessel and the provision of radiation protection and ventilation systems.</p> <p>Lapse also underwent repairs in the floating dock to close or seal all the openings in the hull and the deck prior to transportation and on 14 September 2012 she was towed to Nerpa shipyard.</p>	<p>the design development of the SNF and RW management processes and associated infrastructure. Procurement activities are under way for Nerpa shipyard infrastructure requirements which will allow placement of Lapse on the slipway in late 2013 and for the detailed design and manufacture of the specialised equipment</p> <p>This NDEP project continues to build on the extensive joint cooperation of the international community and the Russian experts from Rosatom, MSCo and the Russian Ministry of Transport and on the results of the ongoing TACIS funded project.</p>

Appendix F NDPTL - documentation and sources

Table D.1 List of EU funded projects

	Title	Status	Funding (EUR)
1	Study on Common Border Crossing Points (Phase I)	Completed	180,000
2	Study on Integrated Border Crossing Points (Phase II)	Completed	160,000
3	Definitions of the Core Transport networks	Completed	150,000
4	Two coordination conferences	Completed	70,000
5	Financial model for an electronic queuing system	On-going	70,000
6	Inter-model (piggyback)	On-going	95,000
7	Conference on mainstreaming alternative fuel	On-going/ completed	40,000
8	Feasibility study on highways	On-going	195,000

Table D.2 List of Document used for the assessment

Title	Author/Publishing institutions	Date
Memorandum of understanding for NDPTL	NDPTL	2010
NDPTL Fund Presentation	NDPTL	2013
NDPTL Fund Rules	NDPTL	November 2012
High Level Meeting		November 2012
Draft Road Map for the NDPRL Secretariat	NDPTL	2013-2014
Agreed Conclusions	The High Level Meeting NDPTL	November, 21, 2012
Study on Common Border Crossing Points Management between Schengen Area and Russia/Belarus - Comments on final report	NDPTL	Not dated
Study on Common Border Crossing Points Management between Schengen Area and Russia/Belarus - Final report	HTSPE	07.2012
Study on Common Border Crossing Points Management between Schengen Area and Russia/Belarus - Management report	HTSPE	06.2012
Specific Terms of Reference A Study on Common Border Crossing Points Management between Schengen Area and Russia/Belarus.	N/A	2011
Study on Integrated Border Crossing Points Management between Schengen Area and Russia/Belarus - Final report	HTSPE	04.2013
Study on Integrated Border Crossing Points Management between Schengen Area and Russia/Belarus - Inception report	HTSPE	07.2012
Study on Integrated Border Crossing Points Management between Schengen Area and Russia/Belarus - Terms of references	HTSPE	2011

Definition of the Core Transport Network in the Northern Dimension area - Annex 1,2 to final report	B&S Europe	13.06.12
Definition of the Core Transport Network in the Northern Dimension area - Draft final report	B&S Europe	13.06.12
Proposal for NDPTL Regional Transport Network and the Guidelines for its Definitions – update October 2012	B&S Europe	October 2012
SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE Definition of the Core Transport Network in the Northern Dimension area	N/A	Not dated
Two coordination conferences on transport systems development in the ND area (Murmansk, Minsk)	Final report	
Two coordination conferences on transport systems development in the ND area (Murmansk, Minsk) - SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE	N/A	Not dated
Mid-term evaluation of the Neighbourhood Investment Facility under the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) 2007-2013	DRN-ECOPM-ECORYS-PARTICIP	May 2013
Preparing the NDPTL Final Report Update (NORDIM)	WSP Finland	June 2011
Guidebook to financing infrastructure for transport and logistics within the Northern Dimension (FIND)	NDI	April 2013

Table D.3 Intervention logic for the EU funded projects of the NDPTL

Challenges	Objectives	Outputs	Results	Impacts
What challenges/needs are identified in the partnerships	What are the objectives of the EU assistance (or the ND)	Meetings, Studies, Etc.	What are the results	Work of the ND improved?
	Study on Common Border Crossing Points (Phase I)			
	<p>The overall objective of this action is to develop a regional model of integrated BCP management between the Schengen area and Russian Federation and Belarus.</p> <p>The specific objectives of the action are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to develop recommendations and practical guidelines for the improvement of border crossing issues at the borders between the Schengen area and Russian Federation and Belorussia through integration of BCP management; - to propose a regional model for implementation of Integrated Border Management (IBM) for road and rail BCPs in the Northern Dimension region; 	Final report with guidelines and recommendations		
	Study on Integrated Border Crossing Points (Phase II)			
	<p>Based on planning policies in the different NDPTL countries, the overall objective of this study is to outline and suggest to the NDPTL the Core Transport Network as an extension of the TEN-T Core Network in the neighbourhood countries, in particular Russia and Belorussia.</p> <p>The specific objectives of this assignment are to analyse the multimodal transport system in the ND area and to map its main transport modes; to elaborate guidelines able to define the NDPTL Core Network and to propose the NDPTL Core Network.</p>	Outputs: Proposal for the NDPTL regional Transport network; guidelines for the definition; Socio economic study; maps of networks. The Study was updated in October 12 (why??)		
	Definitions of the Core Transport networks			

Challenges	Objectives	Outputs	Results	Impacts
	<p>Based on planning policies in the different NDPTL countries, the overall objective of this study is to outline and suggest to the NDPTL the Core Transport Network as an extension of the TEN-T Core Network in the neighbourhood countries, in particular Russia and Belorussia.</p> <p>The specific objectives of this assignment are to analyse the multimodal transport system in the ND area and to map its main transport modes; to elaborate guidelines able to define the NDPTL Core Network and to propose the NDPTL Core Network.</p>	<p>Outputs: Proposal for the NDPTL regional Transport network; guidelines for the definition; Socio economic study; maps of networks. The Study was updated in October 12 (why??)</p>		
	Two coordination conferences			
	<p>Organisation of conferences – in the end only one conference in Murmansk with 63 participants.</p>			

Appendix G NDPHS - documentation and sources

Table E.1 List of EU funded projects for NDPHS

	Title	Status	Funding, EUR
1	Providing support to meetings aimed to develop NDPHS projects	Completed	76,126 (final amount)
2	Alcohol and drug prevention among young people (ADPY) in Baltic Sea region communities; situation analysis for evidence based policies	On-going	300,000 (budgeted)
3	Building capacity in prevention of HIV and associated infections among youth at risk in the Northern Dimension area	On-going	300,000 (budgeted)
		Total	676,126

Table E.2 List of documents used for the assessment for NDPHS

Title	Author/Publishing institutions	Date
Declaration concerning the establishment of a Northern Dimension Partnership in Public Health and Social Wellbeing (Oslo Declaration)	NDPHS	27.10.2003
Political Declaration on the Northern Dimension Policy	ND founding partners	24.11.2006
Northern Dimension Policy Framework Document	ND founding partners	24.11.2006
Action Plan for the Northern Dimension in the external and cross-border policies of the European Union 2000-2003	Council of the EU	14.06.2000
Agreement on the Establishment of the Secretariat of the Northern Dimension Partnership in Public Health and Social Well-Being	NDPHS	25.11.2011
Actions proposed as the follow-up of the NDPHS evaluation of 2008 (NDPHS Strategy)	NDPHS Strategy Working Group (<i>ad hoc</i>)	25.11.2009 (with revisions in 2011, 2012)
Independent Evaluation of the NDPHS 2013	Prof. Dr. Dirk van den Boom, CEval GmbH	16-17.10.2013
NDPHS Work Plan for 2013	NDPHS (Secretariat)	30.10.2012
NDPHS Annual Progress Report for 2012	NDPHS (Secretariat)	30.10.2012
Actual and projected contributions to and expenditures from the NDPHS main budget during 2011-2013 (for 20 th CSR meeting)	NDPHS (Secretariat)	19-20.04.2012
Progress report submitted to the Third Ministerial meeting of the Renewed Northern Dimension Policy	ND	18.02.2013
Joint Statement of the Third Ministerial meeting of the Renewed Northern Dimension Policy	ND	18.02.2013
Action Plan of the European Union Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (renewed)	European Commission	February 2013
Specific Terms of Reference for "Providing support to meetings aimed to develop NDPHS projects addressing the HIV/AIDS and TB,	EU Delegation, Russia	25.11.2010

non-communicable diseases and healthy life-styles within the framework of the NDPHS Strategy”		
Technical Report for “Providing support to meetings aimed to develop NDPHS projects addressing the HIV/AIDS and TB, non-communicable diseases and healthy life-styles within the framework of the NDPHS Strategy”	LDK Consultants Engineers and Planners S.A.	21.06.2013
Description of the Action for “Alcohol and Drug Prevention among Youth (ADPY) in Baltic Sea region communities; situation analysis for evidence based policies”	NDPHS (Secretariat)	04.09.2012
Logical Framework for “Alcohol and Drug Prevention among Youth (ADPY) in Baltic Sea region communities; situation analysis for evidence based policies”	NDPHS (Secretariat)	21.08.2012
Interim Internal Evaluation Report for “Alcohol and Drug Prevention among Youth (ADPY) in Baltic Sea region communities; situation analysis for evidence based policies”	NDPHS (Secretariat)	10.10.2013
Project Synopsis and Monitoring Report for “Alcohol and Drug Prevention among Youth (ADPY) in Baltic Sea region communities; situation analysis for evidence based policies”	EC	18.06.2013
Description of the Action for “Building capacity in prevention of HIV and associated infections among youth at high risk”	NDPHS (Secretariat)	17.06.2013
Logical Framework for “Building capacity in prevention of HIV and associated infections among youth at high risk”	NDPHS (Secretariat)	17.06.2013

Table E.3 Intervention logic for the EU funded projects of the NDPHS

Challenges	Objectives	Outputs	Results	Impacts
What challenges / needs are identified in the partnerships	What are the objectives of the EU assistance (or the ND)	Meetings, Studies, etc.	What are the results	Work of the ND improved?
<p>Challenges: There are significant differences in levels of health and living standards in the northern regions bordering the EU. Communicable diseases, drug abuse and pollution-related health problems in particular require the strengthening of public health systems, significant improvements in the delivery of health services and information exchange and contacts between relevant national, regional and sub-regional administrations⁴⁹.</p> <p>The mission of the NDPHS is to promote the sustainable development of the Northern Dimension area by improving peoples' health and social</p>	<p>Name: Providing support to meetings aimed to develop NDPHS projects Implementation status: Completed (February 2011 – June 2012) Funding type: Framework Contract</p>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide assistance to the EUD in Moscow and the beneficiary NDPHS Secretariat in the logistical arrangements of the meetings. Facilitate the development of the project proposals for submission to a donor community for funding, covering the four thematic areas within the framework of the NDPHS Strategy and the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region 	<p>Altogether, 15 meetings of NDPHS expert groups took place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HIV/AIDS & associated infections – 3 meetings; Non-Communicable Diseases – 3 meetings; Alcohol and Substance Abuse – 4 meetings; Occupational Safety and Health – 4 meetings; Meetings of the EG Chairs and international technical advisors – 1 meeting. 	<p>During these meetings, experts worked together to develop project ideas and in some cases also full project proposals. Not all of the ideas have been funded – some are awaiting financing decisions, some are put aside for when the new funding programmes of the European Union (2014-2020) will become available.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The meetings have enabled the cooperation of NDPHS experts in the Partnership's priority fields, develop joint project ideas and seek funding for their implementation. Russia's more active involvement with the NDPHS has coincided with the implementation of this project and, according to the Secretariat, could be attributed as one of its impacts.

⁴⁹ Defined in the 1st Action Plan of Northern Dimension 2000 – 2003.

Challenges	Objectives	Outputs	Results	Impacts
wellbeing by intensifying cooperation, assisting the Partners and Participants in capacity building, and by enhancing the extent of coordination between international activities within the Northern Dimension area. Partnership priorities : <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce the spread of major communicable diseases and prevent life-style related non-communicable diseases;• Enhance peoples’ levels of social well-being and promote socially rewarding lifestyles.	Name: Alcohol and drug prevention among young people (ADPY); situation analysis for evidence based policies (EUSBSR Flagship Project) Implementation status: On-going (October 2012 – December 2013) Funding type: Direct Award Grant			
	Overall objective: To support the NDPHS in its cooperation with Russia in areas falling under the priorities of the NDPHS. Specific objective: To help achieve the strategic objective of well-functioning and sustainable coordinated policy-making and implementation mechanisms and infrastructure aimed to counteract the high level of alcohol and drug use among youth in selected local communities and, more generally, beyond them. The project is implemented in four communities: Klaipeda region (Lithuania), Sovjetsk city and Svetloje district (Russia), Stockholm region (Sweden).	Outputs to date: Each community has carried out two surveys to establish alcohol and drug use among young people and to make an inventory of the structures and practices of local prevention. The results are being analysed and will be used to create a comprehensive situation analysis for each community. Work in progress: Based on the mapping results, ADPY manuals and recommendations will be prepared for preventive work in each community. The project is also meant to facilitate the establishment of local networks (with a link to policy makers) and international operation (NDPHS Task Group on ADPY), as well as put in place a permanent ADPY cooperation model in the region.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The capacity of the local alcohol and drug prevention infrastructure in the participating communities is strengthened and committed to work in a sustainable manner;• Primary health care professionals, schools’ public health specialists apply during preventive check-ups more holistic, client-centred approach and specific tools for identification and modification of alcohol abuse among adolescents in a pilot district in Lithuania and the Kaliningrad Region, one each.	Alcohol and drug prevention among young people is one of the NDPHS priorities; furthermore it is also a priority of the EUSBSR – it is one of the Flagship Projects of the EUSBSR under PA Health.

Challenges	Objectives	Outputs	Results	Impacts
	<p>Name: Building capacity in prevention of HIV and associated infections among youth at risk in the Northern Dimension area (EUSBSR Flagship Project)</p> <p>Implementation status: Starting up (September 2013 – August 2015)</p> <p>Funding type: Direct Award Grant</p>			
	<p>The objective of this project is to support the work of the NDPHS Expert Group on HIV/AIDS and Associated Infections (AI) in mapping best practices in HIV prevention among youth at high risk of HIV/AI in NW Russia and other ND countries, disseminating those best practices among the participating countries and training professionals in Northwest Russia to implement the best practices.</p> <p>The project will be implemented in Finland, Germany, Latvia, Poland and the Russian Federation (North-Western Federal District).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protocol for gathering national statistics and research data, identifying best practices executed in the partner countries; • Report summarising the results of the needs assessment of the target groups; • Best practices identified, described and discussed by the working group to identify which ones can be extended to other areas / risk groups; • Three-day training programme for 25 professionals; • Best practices piloted by professionals from Kaliningrad and St. Petersburg; • Guidelines to raise awareness among decision-makers and stakeholders on the evidence-based HIV and AI prevention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased awareness of the needs of children and young people at risk of getting HIV & associated illnesses; • Increased awareness of existing good practices of HIV prevention identified, some piloted; • Number of trained professionals working with the target group on HIV prevention increased; • Decision-makers and stakeholders better informed of HIV prevention measures. 	<p>HIV & AI prevention is one of the NDPHS priorities; furthermore it is also a priority of the EUSBSR – it is one of the Flagship Projects of the EUSBSR under PA Health.</p>

Appendix H NDPC - documentation and sources

Table F.1 List of EU funded projects for NDPC

	Title	Status	Funding, EUR
1	Study on Viking route heritage sites in Russia	Completed	170.874 (final amount)
2	Mapping study of music industry operators in North West Russia	Completed	51.232 (final amount)
3	Seminars to discuss the results and follow-up of the two studies with stakeholders	Completed	50.392 (final amount)
4	Northern Dimension cooperation for cultural and creative industries development	On-going	300,000 (budgeted)
		Total	572,498

Table F.2 List of documents used for the assessment for NDPC

Title	Author/Publishing institutions	Date
Memorandum of Understanding setting out the modalities of establishing the Northern Dimension Partnership on Culture	NDPC founding partners	20.05.2010
Political Declaration on the Northern Dimension Policy	ND founding partners	24.11.2006
Northern Dimension Policy Framework Document	ND founding partners	24.11.2006
Northern Dimension Partnership on Culture Strategy 2012-2016	NDPC	22.06.2012
Northern Dimension Partnership on Culture Report 2012	NDPC	22.05.2013
Northern Dimension Partnership on Culture Action Plan 2013	NDPC	21.05.2013
Progress report submitted to the Third Ministerial meeting of the Renewed Northern Dimension Policy	ND	18.02.2013
Joint Statement of the Third Ministerial meeting of the Renewed Northern Dimension Policy	ND	18.02.2013
Action Plan of the European Union Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (renewed)	European Commission	February 2013
Specific Terms of Reference for "A study on the Viking route heritage sites in Russia"	EU Delegation, Russia	11.02.2011
Final Report "A study on the Viking route heritage sites in Russia"	Dan Carlsson and Adrian Selin, NDPC	2012
Book "In the Footsteps of Rurik: A guide to the Viking History of Northwest Russia" (based on the study)	Dan Carlsson and Adrian Selin, NDPC	2012
Specific Terms of Reference for "Mapping Music Industry in North-West Russia"	EU Delegation, Russia	14.04.2011
Final Report "Mapping Music Industry in North-West Russia"	Greg Goldenzwaig, Goldenzwaig Creative Solutions	27.02.2012
Specific Terms of Reference for "Presentation of the results of the studies on Viking route heritage sites and music industry in Russia"	EU Delegation, Russia	27.10.2011
Technical Report for "Presentation of the results of the studies on Viking	Downtown Europe	05.07.2012

route heritage sites and music industry in Russia"		
Description of the Action for "Northern Dimension cooperation for cultural and creative industries development"	NDPC	21.11.2012
Budget for "Northern Dimension cooperation for cultural and creative industries development"	NDPC	11.12.2012
Inception Report for "Northern Dimension cooperation for cultural and creative industries development"	NDPC	May 2013
Project Summary and Monitoring Report for "Northern Dimension cooperation for cultural and creative industries development"	EC	19.06.2013

Table F.3 Intervention logic for the EU funded projects of the NDPC

Challenges	Objectives	Outputs	Results	Impacts
What challenges / needs are identified in the partnerships	What are the objectives of the EU assistance (or the ND)	Meetings, Studies, etc.	What are the results	Work of the ND improved?
NDPC strategy 2012-2016 identifies that there are many opportunities linked to the development of creative and cultural industries in the region (strong sector, great potential for development, strong digital infrastructure and new technologies), while taking note of the following challenges : <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tomorrow’s ideas, yesterday’s support systems;• Lack of awareness about the potential of creative industries;• Culture-based creativity being an input for businesses;• Lack of cross-border cooperation at the entire Northern Dimension level;• Differences in national approaches to creative industries;• Lack of available funds and financial instruments.	Name: A study on the Viking route heritage sites in Russia Implementation status: Completed (April 2011 – March 2012) Funding type: Framework Contract			
	NDPC had identified Viking heritage as a topic of common interest for the participating countries. The Viking Route is an important European cultural route that offers potential for the development of cultural tourism across the borders in the Northern Dimension area. The aim of this study was to map the Viking Route heritage sites located in Russia and to analyse what would be needed in order to develop the Viking Route’s potential for international cultural tourism.	Main output of the project is a study, published in 2012 (later also edited as a book “In the footsteps of Rurik: A guide to the Viking history of Northwest Russia) that summarises Viking history in Russia and identifies eight major Viking heritage sites giving a short description of the area, its history and importance, analyses their status in terms of maintenance, visibility, as well as lists tourist attractions and accessibility.	The study can be used to develop and brand the identified Viking sites as cultural tourism objects in NW Russia.	So far the study appears to have produced little impact, as there have not really been any significant follow-up activities. According to the NDPC Secretariat, the project “Promoting event management training programme as a resource for development of cultural industries and tourism in the NW Russia”, funded by the Non-state actors and local authorities programme for the Baltic Sea Region, could be regarded as a follow-up to the study, however, it involves actors that did not participate in the original study. Furthermore, a seminar on cultural tourism will be organised during the next meeting of the CBSS working group on Culture and Education.

Challenges	Objectives	Outputs	Results	Impacts
<p>Three focus areas of intervention are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDPC as focal point for experience exchange and cooperation (public/private, culture/business – incl. development of tailors cultural tourism projects, councils operating in the ND area); • Support to priority projects; • Facilitate access to project financing, incl. public private. 	<p>Name: Mapping study of music industry operators in North West Russia</p> <p>Implementation status: Completed (June – November 2011)</p> <p>Funding type: Framework Contract</p>			
	<p>The aim of this contract was to facilitate networking of Russian music export operators with operators and Music Export Agencies from the Nordic and Baltic countries.</p> <p>The study was launched by NDPC to map music industry operators in the North West Russia and to assess their interests of cooperation.</p>	<p>The main output of the contract is a study, published in 2011, which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • summarises information on key music industry professionals, including industry organisations, promoters, venues, festivals, ticket sellers, record labels and distribution, media, artists, operational and strategic networks; • provides information on the networks that these professionals have established (or can establish in the future) with similar companies / individuals in other countries participating in the Northern Dimension; • provides a list of the most relevant music companies / individual professionals with contact information. 	<p>The study has helped to summarise information about the music industry in Russia that previously was not available.</p> <p>NDPC has attempted to initiate some networking among the actors, including suggestions for conferences to attend. There has not been any funding available to finance any follow-up activities.</p>	<p>So far the study appears to have produced little impact, as there have not really been any significant follow-up activities.</p> <p>One of the mini-projects under the CCIP “Estonia-Finland-Russia Music Industry Platform Partnership” appears to be a result of the contacts established through the study.</p>

Challenges	Objectives	Outputs	Results	Impacts
	<p>Name: Seminars to discuss the results and follow-up of the two studies with stakeholders</p> <p>Implementation status: Completed (December 2011 – June 2012)</p> <p>Funding type: Framework Contract</p>			
	<p>The global objective of the assignment was to facilitate cooperation among the EU, Russia, Norway and Iceland in the framework of the Northern Dimension Partnership on Culture.</p> <p>The specific objective of the contract was to organise two seminars that would bring together the consultants who carried out the studies with key target groups and other stakeholders (NDPC SC members, representatives of related projects, international organisations and regional councils active in the cultural field, representatives of museums, heritage sites and music industry operators in the region).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seminar #1 “Viking Route heritage sites and cultural tourism in Russia” took place in St. Petersburg (Russia) on 25 April 2012 with 56 international participants, representing museums, educational and research institutions, public sector institutions, diplomatic representations. • Seminar #2 “Music Industry in the North West Russia” took place in St. Petersburg (Russia) on 26 April 2012 with 49 international participants, representing festivals, promoting companies, cultural centres, educational and research institutions, public sector institutions, diplomatic representations. 	<p>The seminars have served as a platform for dissemination of the results of the studies and common discussions, as well as an opportunity for the involved actors to network.</p>	<p>The seminars appear to have created little impact, apart from that already described for each of the studies, where it is possible that the seminars played a certain role in bring people together.</p>

Challenges	Objectives	Outputs	Results	Impacts
	<p>Name: Northern Dimension cooperation for cultural and creative industries' development</p> <p>Implementation status: On-going (December 2012 – April 2014)</p> <p>Funding type: Direct Award grant</p>			
	<p>The overall objective of the project is to support the NDPC by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> improving and implementing communication activities of the NDPC; enhancing its communication with its target groups for the benefit of cultural and creative industries operators in the Northern Dimension area, in particular North-West Russia; developing and implementing a limited number of NDPC flagship projects with the involvement of Russian partners, in particular in North-West Russia. 	<p>To date, the key outputs of the project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultural and Creative Industries Platform (CCIP) launched in December 2012; first round of calls proposals (deadline – January 2013), using a specially designed electronic application/ administration system for project applicants, whereby 12 mini-projects were chosen from the 56 proposed projects; communication activities, including regular updates on www.ndpculture.org, distribution of an e-newsletter four times per year (350 subscribers), presentation on the NDPC, its working methods, and CCIP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of the 12 mini-projects has enabled the establishment of cross-border cooperation networks that previously did not exist. It has led to the promotion of activities in the CCI sector of the ND area with a focus on NW Russia; The initially submitted projects (56) have given NDPC a good overview of CCI activities and needs in the region; Cooperation with the Russian authorities in the framework of this projects has highlighted both the lack of policy for CCI as well as has brought the importance of CCI to their attention; Information flow about NDPC activities is improved. 	<p>Project is on-going. The mid-term report will be prepared in December 2013.</p>

Appendix I General background documents

Title	Author/Publishing institutions	Date
Northern Dimension Policy Framework Document	ND founding partners	24.11.2006
Action Plan for the Northern Dimension in the external and cross-border policies of the European Union 2000-2003	Council of the EU	14.06.2000
Progress report submitted to the Third Ministerial meeting of the Renewed Northern Dimension Policy	ND	18.02.2013
Joint Statement of the Third Ministerial meeting of the Renewed Northern Dimension Policy	ND	18.02.2013
Action Plan of the European Union Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (renewed)	European Commission	02.2013
Report from the European Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions concerning the added value of macro-regional strategies.	European Commission	27.06.2013
Political State of the Region Report	Nordic Council of Ministers, Baltic Development Forum	2013