

USAID/RUSSIA

RESULTS REVIEW AND RESOURCE REQUEST (R4)

2001-04-10

Please Note:

The attached FY 2002 Results Review and Resource Request ("R4") was assembled and analyzed by the country or USAID operating unit identified on this cover page.

The R4 is a "pre-decisional" USAID document and does not reflect results stemming from formal USAID review(s) of this document.

Related document information can be obtained from:

USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse
1611 N. Kent Street, Suite 200
Arlington, VA 22209-2111
Telephone: 703/351-4006 Ext. 106
Fax: 703/351-4039
Email: docorder@dec.cdie.org
Internet: <http://www.dec.org>

Released on or after Oct. 1, 2003

MEMORANDUM

To: Acting AA/E&E, Linda Morse

From: USAID/Russia, Director, Carol Peasley

Subject: Results Review and Resources Request for FY 2003

USAID/Russia is pleased to submit the Results Review and Resources Request for FY 2000.

We believe the attached document tells a positive story about significant results being achieved by USAID's Russia program. But we are also keenly aware of the need to review and adjust our results frameworks, including indicators, to sharpen the program's strategic focus and tighten the linkage between activities and intended results. This process will lead to changes in intermediate results and indicators, and likely to some changes in strategic objectives. The social sector reform objective is an example of why such a review is needed.

The social sector reform strategic objective (118-0320) was intended to be an integrated approach to strengthening social service delivery at the local level while providing models for national replication. Over the years this strategic objective has evolved – in response to Russia's priority needs, Congressional earmarks and different technical approaches – into two distinct program areas in health and local governance. The health portfolio combines efforts to combat infectious diseases – such as HIV/AIDS, sexually transmitted diseases and tuberculosis – with community-based preventive health and assistance to orphans. The local governance program emphasizes strengthening the capacity of local governments and communities to address the public service needs of their constituents.

Keeping these two program areas under one objective implies a synergistic approach that is not being pursued and is not realistic or necessarily desirable. It also complicates measurement and reporting, overstates the mission's manageable interests, and hinders collaboration with other mission objectives. Therefore, we anticipate proposing that the current objective be split into two objectives: health and local governance.

We expect that there will be other changes to the frameworks. Therefore, rather than request approval for these changes in a piecemeal fashion, we feel it makes more sense to submit all of our proposed changes to the Bureau for review at one time. We will prepare a schedule for the revision of the frameworks for discussion and approval in the scheduled intensive review.

Table of Contents

MEMORANDUM.....	2
Please Note:.....	3
Table of Contents.....	4
Glossary.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Overview Factors Affecting Program Performance.....	5
SO Text for SO: 118-013 Accelerated development and growth of private enterprises.....	9
SO Text for SO: 118-014 Improved economic infrastructure to support market-oriented growth.....	19
SO Text for SO: 118-016 Increased environmental management capacity to support sustainable economic growth.....	30
SO Text for SO: 118-021 Increased, better informed citizens' participation in political and economic decision-making.....	38
SO Text for SO: 118-022 Strengthened rule of law and respect for human rights.....	47
SO Text for SO: 118-032 Improved effectiveness of selected social benefits and services....	55
SO Text for SO: 118-041 Special initiatives.....	66
SO Text for SO: 118-042 Cross-cutting initiatives.....	69
R4 Part III: Resource Request.....	73
Information Annex Topic: Environmental Impact.....	76
Information Annex Topic: E&E R4 Detailed Budget Information.....	77
Information Annex Topic: Global Climate Change	78
Information Annex Topic: Greater Horn of Africa Initiative	80
Information Annex Topic: Non-presence Countries (npcs).....	81
Information Annex Topic: Success Stories.....	82
Information Annex Topic: Supplemental Information.....	83
Information Annex Topic: Updated Results Framework Annex.....	92

Overview Factors Affecting Program Performance

International media reports from Russia during the past year have tended to focus on the negative: the worsened health and demographic issues, the threats against Media-Most and the country's only nationwide independent TV station (NTV), widespread corruption, increased centralization and human rights abuses in Chechnya.

But behind the headlines there has been much good news. Russia has made significant progress in its economic, democratic and social transition. Solid economic growth and advances on economic reforms underpinned vibrant small and medium business growth and improvements in living standards. A burgeoning civil society, greater judicial independence and the second presidential election since the fall of the Soviet Union provide optimism for Russia's democratic transition. The transformation of Russia's social service delivery systems and efforts to combat infectious diseases gained momentum with proposed national reforms and programs based on successful regional models. Many of these achievements in 2000 were the realization of past USAID interventions and reaffirmed changes in USAID's approach in recent years, adapting to changing needs and improving program effectiveness.

Both rising oil prices and good government economic policy, including a strong commitment to macroeconomic management, have fostered a positive environment for economic growth. More specifically, the continuing effects of the 1998 devaluation of the ruble combined with sharp increases in average oil export prices boosted the GDP growth rate to an estimated 7.7% during 2000. This figure compares favorably to the 1999 GDP growth rate of 3.2%. Inflation fell to approximately 20% during 2000, a substantial decline from 36.5% in 1999.

The positive impact of this economic growth on average Russians is evident. In October 2000, according to a multi-year survey, poverty rates had reached their lowest level since before 1995. Nationally, per capita purchasing power continued to recover from the low of the 1998 financial crisis – although it remains well below levels in the early 1990s – according to another survey. Pronounced improvements at the regional level, realized where market-based reforms were pursued, coincided with regions where USAID's program was focused.

Against this backdrop, the Putin Government launched an ambitious reform program, as reflected in the highly regarded "Action Plan of the Government of the Russian Federation in the Area of Social Policy and Economic Modernization for the Years 2000-2001" (the Gref Plan.) The plan focuses on structural reforms across the economy, including budget, pension and protection of property rights, as well as major changes in social policy. Fully implemented, the plan would mean a leap forward for economic and social reform in Russia. Some successes have already taken root. For instance, a new tax code established a 13% flat income tax, to improve the efficiency and increase voluntary compliance with tax collection, and improved the value-added tax, excise taxes and the payroll tax.

Based on its direct technical assistance in past years, USAID has played a major role in shaping and informing this plan and subsequent legislation. Some measures, such as the tax code and numerous budgetary finance provisions, have already been enacted. With support from USAID and other donors, the GOR prepared legislative packages on pension reform, deregulation, social sector reform, and health reform and submitted them to the Duma. USAID will continue to press for these and other elements essential to a vibrant market

economy: competition policy and regulation, land codes, simpler land transactions, transparent licensing, and other pension and health reforms.

USAID is no longer as intensively involved in policy reform, but remains engaged by responding to Russian initiatives through support for Russian non-governmental policy institutes which are frequently called on by the government and Duma for their expertise. One of these institutes, the Fiscal Policy Center, was instrumental in the development of provisions incorporated into the Federal Budget Code pertaining to inter-budgetary finances and the transfer of revenue from the central government to the regions. The Center's advice and assistance continues to be in high demand from federal and regional governments.

Micro, small and medium enterprises benefited from opportunities for import substitution due to the weak ruble. While this growth is not reflected in official statistics of registered businesses, the number of registered sole proprietorships (entrepreneurs) grew to approximately 3 million. Russian and international observers have noted this dramatic growth in small and medium enterprises across the country. USAID's programs have played a critical catalytic role through business-level interventions, nationwide replication of natural resource protection models, and focused policy reform. Building on work by the bilateral Small Business Working Group, the government promulgated laws to facilitate microlending and provide funding for small businesses and modified an existing law to reduce registration and licensing barriers. As a direct result of Working Group programs, the government is preparing legislation to provide tax relief to small and microenterprises and to launch a microcredit program through Sberbank, which commands over 2,000 branch offices throughout Russia .

Vladimir Putin's election to the presidency in largely free and fair elections was a defining event this year. Putin's high public approval ratings and support in the Duma have translated into exceptional executive-legislative collaboration, a balanced budget, passage of reform legislation mentioned above, and significant progress on other thorny issues such as land tenure, built in large measure on USAID's policy advocacy and pilot programs.

The Putin administration has also pledged and demonstrated support for the judiciary and the rule of law. The creation of the Academy of Justice for training justices and the Judicial Department, the administrative arm of the judiciary, demonstrate government's political will for judicial reform and build on substantial support from USAID. The creation of the Judicial Department, which played a key role in securing full funding for the judicial budget in 2000, was also a major step toward judicial independence. The president has indicated his support for further reforms, including national implementation of jury trials that were piloted in two regions under a USAID-financed activity in the mid-1990s.

Civil society is flourishing in Russia, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and NGO networks, are becoming increasingly effective as advocates for citizen views. In 2000, NGOs in USAID-targeted regions submitted over 231 expert commentaries on policy issues to local authorities. Environmental NGOs from across the country – many of which had received support from USAID – came together to oppose a government decision to merge the State Committee for Environmental Protection into the Ministry of Natural Resources. While the group failed to force the decision onto a referendum, they did succeed in obtaining over 2.5 million signatures on a petition and in building an environmental NGO network that outlives the petition drive. Despite recent attacks by the government on some independent media

outlets, an estimated 60% of the Russian population now has access to independent television (including NTV), a direct result of USAID's efforts to strengthen those organizations and support them through the aftermath of the 1998 financial crisis. Finally, business associations are playing a growing role in advocating for their constituents' interests and, in some locations, have formed partnerships with local governments to address critical problems and curtail government corruption.

The role of NGOs is also evolving as they play a larger part in the delivery of social services, and as local and federal government authorities look to them to fill that role. In 2000, NGOs in USAID-targeted areas initiated 346 projects with government and business support. Sergei Kirienko, the President's representative in the Volga Federal District, sponsored the first-ever NGO conference to emphasize his vision that NGOs can channel citizen innovations and creativity to develop Russia's technological and economic competitive edge in a world economy. During the fair, NGOs presented more than 120 projects, of which 60 were approved for funding on a cost-shared basis.

USAID's efforts to strengthen municipal capacity to deliver social services are also making headway and complement the changing role of NGOs in delivering those services. In four pilot cities, USAID is supporting public-private partnerships to guide the decision-making on municipal investments, policies and public services. USAID has also fostered efficient and transparent use of municipal resources by introducing budget planning and monitoring models and analytical tools, an internet-based municipal purchasing system, and a pilot activity in four cities to improve means-testing for social services by private organizations.

While these tools and models are being developed for targeted regions, they will have a far-reaching impact across the country through replication in other cities and adoption in national programs and legislation. USAID-supported models for local reforms directly influenced the Gref Plan's components on housing, communal services, land, real estate and social services. USAID's efforts at lateral replication, among regions and cities, will benefit from collaboration with Kirienko to replicate successful models throughout the Volga Federal District.

Similarly, USAID's models and pilot activities in the health and environment sectors are making an impact at the national level. In a major breakthrough, the Russian government has adopted international protocols for tuberculosis treatment based on a USAID-financed pilot activity in three regions. The government also adopted and is expanding on USAID's efforts in the social marketing of condoms and, based on USAID-supported studies by the Centers for Disease Control, will implement policies for prenatal care to address congenital syphilis. In addition, USAID's models for tuberculosis-control, HIV/AIDS and sexually transmitted diseases will be used in designing an anticipated \$150 million World Bank loan. An environmental health risk assessment methodology introduced by USAID has been implemented in 26 cities, reducing the threat to public health from environmental pollution.

The progress in Russia's transitions over the past year have been significant, but the challenges remaining should not be minimized. The economic surge from world oil prices will be temporary, exposing still incomplete economic and financial reforms, most notably in the banking sector. The continuing human rights violations in Chechnya, government efforts to control the independent media and silence NGOs critical of government policy, and the tendency towards greater centralization of power raise questions about the government's

commitment to the democratic transition. Health and demographic statistics for 2000 paint an alarming picture: life expectancy continued its decades-long decline, with the gap between men and women widening; the HIV infection rate was the highest in world; and sexually transmitted diseases were epidemic.

These challenges suggest that USAID continues to have an important role to play in Russia: supporting Russian efforts to build a broad-based, market-oriented economy, build a strong civil society to protect human rights and serve as a counterbalance to centralized control, and transform Russia's health care system to better serve its citizens and stem the spread of infectious diseases. In pursuing these objectives, USAID will continue to focus on regions outside of Moscow, develop models and support their replication and seize opportunities to work with reform-minded governments at the national and local level to broaden the impact of U.S. assistance. The interagency assistance strategy for the Far East is an important new initiative to spread the benefits of USAID's prior achievements, while initiatives to curb human trafficking and domestic violence reflect the program's focus on U.S. foreign policy priorities and issues critical to Russians.

SO Text for SO: 118-013 Accelerated development and growth of private enterprises

Country/Organization: USAID Russia

Objective ID: 118-013

Objective Name: Accelerated development and growth of private enterprises

Self Assessment: Meeting Expectations

Primary Links to Agency Strategic Framework: **(Please Assign Percentages, Total Equals 100):**

- 40% 1.1 Critical private markets expanded and strengthened
- 10% 1.2 More rapid and enhanced agricultural development and food security encouraged
- 40% 1.3 Access to economic opportunity for the rural and urban poor expanded and made more equitable
- 5% 2.1 Rule of law and respect for human rights of women as well as men strengthened
- 0% 2.2 Credible and competitive political processes encouraged
- 0% 2.3 The development of politically active civil society promoted
- 0% 2.4 More transparent and accountable government institutions encouraged
- 0% 3.1 Access to quality basic education for under-served populations, especially for girls and women, expanded
- 5% 3.2 The contribution of host-country institutions of higher education to sustainable development increased
- 0% 4.1 Unintended and mistimed pregnancies reduced
- 0% 4.2 Infant and child health and nutrition improved and infant and child mortality reduced
- 0% 4.3 Deaths, nutrition insecurity, and adverse health outcomes to women as a result of pregnancy and childbirth reduced
- 0% 4.4 HIV transmission and the impact of the HIV/AIDS pandemic in developing countries reduced
- 0% 4.5 The threat of infectious diseases of major public health importance reduced
- 0% 5.1 Threat of global climate change reduced
- 0% 5.2 Biological diversity conserved
- 0% 5.3 Sustainable urbanization including pollution management promoted
- 0% 5.4 Use of environmentally sound energy services increased
- 0% 5.5 Sustainable management of natural resources increased
- 0% 6.1 Urgent needs in times of crisis met
- 0% 6.2 Personal security and basic institutions to meet critical intermediate needs and protect human rights re-established

Link to U.S. National Interests: Economic Prosperity

Primary Link to MPP Goals: Economic Development

Secondary Link to MPP Goals (optional): Open Markets

(Page limitations for narrative begin here):

Summary of the SO:

This objective supports the U.S. Mission's goal of broad-based growth and the U.S. national interests of economic prosperity and national security, as defined in the Mission Performance Plan for FY 1999-2001. Specifically, the activities under this objective promote Russian economic development.

USAID supports the development of a market economy in which all Russian citizens have greater opportunities to improve their standard of living. To do so, activities focus on the development and growth of micro, small, and medium enterprises in Russia. Specifically, they seek to inculcate sound business management practices by training managers in Western management practices and providing on-site client-oriented business consulting. Activities also promote access to credit through support for microfinance programs that provide small credits to entrepreneurs, including small private farmers, and that demonstrate the viability and sustainability of non-bank credit programs. In addition, activities support strengthening Russian investment and business support institutions. Through all these programs, USAID seeks to provide sustainable business services for the small and medium enterprise sector.

This year saw great strides toward a policy agenda for small business. The GOR's executive and legislative branches agree on the importance of SME development and access to credit. USAID played a significant role in bringing about this agreement.

Our customers are Russian entrepreneurs who receive training, technical assistance, and credit, and future entrepreneurs who are reached by USAID's programs while still in school. Other customers are the employees of businesses assisted by USAID. Russian women play an important role in USAID's business programs.

Key Results:

Three key results contribute to achievement of this objective: 1) small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) flourish over time; 2) successful models of private ownership and modern management are widely replicated; and 3) modern management practices are adopted by private firms. The indicator for the first result, tracked by the Russian Resource Center for SMEs, is the number of SMEs in Russia registered by local bodies or departments. The slight decline in this indicator is due to the continuing difficult policy and administrative environment for small businesses in Russia. From a tax standpoint, it is easier to register as an individual entrepreneur than as a registered business. Therefore, the growth of the private sector is moving in the direction of individuals rather than registered businesses. The second result measures the number of actual jobs created or sustained by businesses assisted by USAID; this was estimated to be 138,000 jobs last year. This indicator, tracked by USAID-funded business development partners, shows an encouraging incremental increase. Women received 55% of these jobs. This result also shows the number of loans made by USAID-assisted microfinance organizations. More than 8,700 loans were made, and more than 71% of them went to women. The final result tracks financing of USAID-funded business support institution (BSI) clients. The results are encouraging, as more firms obtained financing this year than last.

Performance and Prospects:

Support to the SME sector remains a key component of USAID's overall program to support economic transformation in Russia. USAID played a significant role as a catalyst of policy reform in the SME. USAID works closely with counterparts in the Small Business Working Group and related private sector policy stakeholders (the Academy of Management and Market, and the Russian Agency for SME Support). The discussion of the SME agenda has been raised to the level of the Prime Minister and President and has brought about policies that reinforce development of the SME sector. As a result, the GOR is making and implementing concrete plans to lower administrative barriers, especially the burdensome tax regime, for SMEs

Through its policy work and research, USAID has helped design the SME support program and draft SME laws. In particular, USAID through its IRIS think tank project played a significant role in designing the deregulation law introduced by the Ministry of Economy to the Duma. USAID also made a strong contribution to the work of the Ministry of Antimonopoly Policy and the Federal Fund for SME Support in designing a strategy to improve SMEs' access to finance. As a result, the Ministry and the Fund have worked out a plan to support development of new microfinance technologies and have introduced a new credit cooperative law.

Our programs in management training and consulting to SMEs, microfinance, and investment linkages in the regions continue to reach individual entrepreneurs, help create employment opportunities, and strengthen Russian institutions that provide services to the SME sector. Most important, the efforts of the SME owners -- our direct beneficiaries -- show that successful businesses can be created and prosper in Russia.

During FY 2000, USAID-funded SME business programs provided business development assistance, including hands-on U.S. expertise and management training. Three thousand firms received direct assistance to improve and expand their businesses. In addition, USAID's support sustained and created more than 138,000 jobs during the year. USAID also trained over 6,000 entrepreneurs in management and marketing skills. On a cumulative basis, USAID strengthened more than 326 Russian business support institutions and associations to provide services to Russian entrepreneurs and advocate for policy change at the regional level.

During the year, an evaluation of principal SME activities was completed. Based upon its findings, as well as on consultations with SMEs, business support institutions, business associations, and our implementing partners, USAID developed a three-year SME activity. This activity considers the results of a business climate survey conducted this past year. The new activity emphasizes Russian ownership of our SME program after two years of implementation. The USAID-sponsored network of business support institutions, business training programs, client-focused business volunteer assignments and business advocacy will continue to supply Russian enterprises with tools to expand private sector growth. A key focus will remain the acceleration of the development of Russian institutions to provide business services. USAID will also actively support business education for school-aged children.

In microenterprise credit, over 8,700 microcredit loans were made last year, totaling over \$7 million. The average loan size was \$1,050, and 71% of the recipients were women.

Repayment rates exceeded 97%. Policy dialog to complement ongoing microfinance programs is also having a positive impact; the success of USAID-supported programs has led other donors to support the expansion of the microfinance sector. During the next fiscal year, USAID will add a component to strengthen Russian indigenous microfinance institutions and encourage them to adopt microfinance methodologies that promote their long-term sustainability.

Agribusiness investment expanded through a joint USAID-USDA activity working with USAID's business support institutions. Under the agricultural credit program, USAID provided technical assistance and on-site expertise to 26 credit cooperatives. More than 500 loans, totaling more than \$1.1 million, were disbursed to private farmers, through these 26 regional cooperatives. In addition to this credit program, a pilot agribusiness investment activity promotes reforms and investment in the same regions.

USAID carries out several other well-targeted policy initiatives in business development and investment promotion. These activities emphasize the importance of reducing administrative and regulatory constraints to Russian businesses and investment (both domestic and international). On a federal level, USAID will continue a dialogue through its membership in the U.S.-Russia Small Business Working Group. This group advocates policy changes in legislation, access to finance, regional development, and management training to develop Russian small businesses. Also at the federal level, a pilot e-commerce initiative will be undertaken in FY 2001 to promote greater access to, and appropriate privacy safeguards for, e-commerce channels by Russian entrepreneurs. Finally, USAID will implement a regional policy advocacy initiative. This program will mobilize grassroots regional support for business development and investment. It will use indigenous Russian business associations to enter into dialogue with local government on reducing key policy and administrative barriers to SME growth and will foster legislation that facilitates the growth of small business.

Possible Adjustments to Plans:

Two new activities are planned for FY 2001. The integrated Russian business services activity will have two components: strengthening Russian business support institutions and regional policy advocacy. USAID will work through U.S. NGOs to further strengthen business support institutions and proposes to work with indigenous Russian organizations to strengthen private-public policy dialogue through regional business associations. The second new activity is our microfinance activity. Both activities address the basic constraints to this sector. They will strengthen Russian program ownership by using Russian grantees to implement these activities.

Other Donor Programs:

Other donors utilize USAID models extensively and coordinate with USAID to ensure that no activity overlap or duplication occurs. For instance, technical assistance from the European Union (EU-TACIS) complements USAID-funded private enterprise development programs through the Small and Medium Enterprise Development Agency initiative. EU-TACIS is continuing this program and has asked some USAID business support institutions to provide greater geographical coverage. The United Nations Development Program works actively in small business support and has expressed a willingness to work with our business support institutions in the regions. The Eurasia Foundation, which places programmatic priority on small business, continues to fund discrete activities to develop this sector. The

United States-Russian Investment Fund provides loans and equity investments and has launched an aggressive leasing program. The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development continues to lend to small businesses and make equity investments. The British Department for International Development (DFID) is designing a large microcredit program, modeled on USAID-supported programs.

Major Contractors and Grantees:

Major grantees and contractors are Opportunity International, FINCA, Counterpart International and ACDI/VOCA for microenterprise loans; Citizen's Democracy Corps and ACDI/VOCA for the business volunteer program; the Academy of Management and the Market for the Business Educational Centers; University of Alaska, Anchorage for Russian Far East Business Programs; Carana Corporation, Abt Associates, and IFC for investment promotion; Junior Achievement Russia for school-aged entrepreneurial education, and the University of Maryland's IRIS center for the think tank project. USAID will also work with the American Chamber of Commerce in e-commerce.

**Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003**

Objective Name: Accelerated development and growth of private enterprises

Objective ID: 118-013

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: . SO-level indicator

Indicator: Number of firms registered by local government registration bodies or departments

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Number of Firms

Year	Planned	Actual
1992 (B)		560,000
1993		865,000
1994		896,900
1995		877,400
1996		841,700
1997		861,063
1998		868,008
1999	900,000	890,800
2000	900,000	875,496
2001	910,000	NA
2002	950,000	
2003	1,000,000	

Source:

SME Statistics provided by the Russian Resource Center for SMEs

Indicator/Description:

Gross number of SMEs in Russia registered by local government registration bodies or departments as of end of the year.

Comments:

1992-1994 actual numbers are taken from "Small Business in Russia," Business Thesaurus Series (reference books for Russian business), Moscow: CONSECO, 1998, table 1.9

This indicator shows a slight decline, due to the continuing difficult policy and administrative environment for small businesses in Russia. From a tax standpoint, it is easier to register as an individual entrepreneur without forming a registered business. Therefore, the growth of the private sector is moving in the direction of individuals rather than registered businesses.

(B) Baseline

**Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003**

Objective Name: Accelerated development and growth of private enterprises

Objective ID: 118-013

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: 1.3.2 Successful models of private ownership and modern management widely replicated

Indicator: Number of jobs created and/or sustained

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Number of jobs

Year	Planned	Actual
1998 (B)		81,812
1999	91,012	101,842
2000	121,012	138,772
2001	151,012	
2002	191,012	

Source:

Final and Quarterly reports of SUNY/Volkhov, CCI/RISE, JAR, OI, UAA, Morozov, URSBF, Counterpart, FINCA, ACDI/VOCA, CDC, IRIS, MAC, PRARI, Eurasia Foundation, and USEA.

Indicator/Description:

The actual numbers are derived from a year-end survey of SO 1.3 contractors measuring the number of people in the workforce.

Comments:

These numbers reflect only statistics from SO1.3 contractors. Jobs created and/or sustained by other SO contractors are not included.

(B) Baseline

**Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003**

Objective Name: Accelerated development and growth of private enterprises

Objective ID: 118-013

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: 1.3.2 Successful models of private ownership and modern management widely replicated

Indicator: Number of loans made by USAID-supported microfinance organizations

Disaggregated By: Gender (see bellow)

Unit of Measure: Number of loans

Year	Planned	Actual
1999 (B)		7,098*
2000	10,000	16,417**
2001	15,000	NA
2002	20,000	
2003	25,000	

Source:

Final and quarterly reports of CCI/RISE, OI, Vozmozhnost, Counterpart, FINCA, SUNY/AARW and ACDI/VOCA.

Indicator/Description:

Number of microenterprise loans made by assisted organizations, cumulative.

Comments:

This indicator tracks the success of our program in reaching small and micro entrepreneurs.

* women - 5,007 (71%), men - 2,091 (29%)

** women - 11,862 (72%), men - 4,531 (28%)

(B) Baseline

**Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003**

Objective Name: Accelerated development and growth of private enterprises

Objective ID: 118-013

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: 1.3.2.1 Workable models for new and restructured firms to compete in a market economy are created

Indicator: Amount of external financing and/or investment obtained by client firms of USAID Business Support Institutions (BSIs)

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: \$ million

Year	Planned	Actual
1995 (B)		8
1996	10	10
1997	15	20
1998	20	29.2
1999	40	36.9
2000	50	69.7*
2001	75	
2002	100	

Source:

BDI/BD and BDI/MMT contractors' and grantees' reports

Indicator/Description:

Cumulative dollar amount of external financing and equity financing obtained by client firms of USAID-financed Business Support Institutions (US \$ million).

Comments:

* Cumulative for year 2000 for OI, AMM/Morozov, AMM/INTECH, UAA, ACDI/VOCA, CDC yielded \$32.8 million. This number was added to previous cumulative amount. This will be the last reporting year for this IR as this indicator cannot be adequately tracked. This is sensitive information for the client companies and as a result they are either reluctant to give accurate information or do not disclose this information at all. We will replace this indicator with “sustainable network of BSIs rendering services to entrepreneurs and enterprises,” as it reflects BSI sustainability, an ultimate goal of our work.

(B) Baseline

Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year:

Objective Name: Accelerated development and growth of private enterprises
 Objective ID: 118-013
 Approved: 1999-04 Country/Organization: USAID/Russia
 Result Name: 1.3.3 Sustainable network of business support institutions (BSIs) rendering services to entrepreneurs and enterprises
 Indicator: Number of self-sufficient business support institutions
 Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Cumulative number of BSIs

Year	Planned	Actual
1995		0
1996		48
1997		55
1998	75	132
1999	165	263
2000	280	326
2001	345	
2002	360	
2003	380	

Source:
 USAID/Moscow BDI/MMT and BDI/BD contractors' and grantees' reports

Indicator/Description:
 BSIs financially self-sufficient (revenues cover costs) without USAID support of any kind.

Comments:
 These numbers reflect statistics from business development activities only (SO 1.3.)* including the area of agriculture. Considerable increase in the number of sustainable BSIs in 1998 is attributed to Morozov centers (approx.70%). Planned objectives for years 2001-2003 scaled to reflect expected program size.

*AMM/INTECH, CDC, ACDI/VOCA, AMM/Morozov, SUNY/Volkhov, Opportunity International.

We will report on this IR in the future as we think it better represents the intended results of our work with BSIs in Russia. It will replace IR 1.3.2.1.

(B) Baseline

SO Text for SO: 118-014 Improved economic infrastructure to support market-oriented growth

Country/Organization: USAID Russia

Objective ID: 118-014

Objective Name: Improved economic infrastructure to support market-oriented growth

Self Assessment: Meeting Expectations

Primary Links to Agency Strategic Framework: **(Please Assign Percentages, Total Equals 100):**

- 100% 1.1 Critical private markets expanded and strengthened
- 0% 1.2 More rapid and enhanced agricultural development and food security encouraged
- 0% 1.3 Access to economic opportunity for the rural and urban poor expanded and made more equitable
- 0% 2.1 Rule of law and respect for human rights of women as well as men strengthened
- 0% 2.2 Credible and competitive political processes encouraged
- 0% 2.3 The development of politically active civil society promoted
- 0% 2.4 More transparent and accountable government institutions encouraged
- 0% 3.1 Access to quality basic education for under-served populations, especially for girls and women, expanded
- 0% 3.2 The contribution of host-country institutions of higher education to sustainable development increased
- 0% 4.1 Unintended and mistimed pregnancies reduced
- 0% 4.2 Infant and child health and nutrition improved and infant and child mortality reduced
- 0% 4.3 Deaths, nutrition insecurity, and adverse health outcomes to women as a result of pregnancy and childbirth reduced
- 0% 4.4 HIV transmission and the impact of the HIV/AIDS pandemic in developing countries reduced
- 0% 4.5 The threat of infectious diseases of major public health importance reduced
- 0% 5.1 Threat of global climate change reduced
- 0% 5.2 Biological diversity conserved
- 0% 5.3 Sustainable urbanization including pollution management promoted
- 0% 5.4 Use of environmentally sound energy services increased
- 0% 5.5 Sustainable management of natural resources increased
- 0% 6.1 Urgent needs in times of crisis met
- 0% 6.2 Personal security and basic institutions to meet critical intermediate needs and protect human rights re-established

Link to U.S. National Interests: Economic Prosperity

Primary Link to MPP Goals: Open Markets

Secondary Link to MPP Goals (optional): Economic Development

(Page limitations for narrative begin here):

Summary of the SO:

This objective directly supports Agency Objective 1.1, Critical Private Markets Expanded and Strengthened. In addition, this objective supports Embassy/Moscow's goal of Open Markets and the U.S. national interest of economic prosperity, as defined in the U.S. Embassy's Mission Performance Plan for FY 1999-2001. The activities under this objective promote broad-based economic growth in Russia and encourage Russia's progress toward the development of a legal and regulatory infrastructure for private sector growth. Activities are concentrated in three specific strategic areas: support for fiscal reform, economic policy analysis, and financial sector reform.

In 2000, all activities under this objective met or exceeded expectations. Moreover, with the election of a new President and Duma, both committed to economic reform, the year 2000 provided the most productive climate for economic reform in years.

Shortly after President Putin's election, his advisers asked USAID to bring some international experts to Russia to consult on development of their new economic strategies and policies. USAID quickly complied, bringing in several world-renowned economic policy experts to advise the new Government. Their advice is evident in the "Gref plan" ("Action Plan of the Government of the Russian Federation in the Area of Social Policy and Economic Modernization for the Years 2000-2001"). Following the plan, several legislative initiatives developed with USAID's support passed the Duma and were signed into law by President Putin: long-awaited tax reform measures, and numerous provisions on interbudgetary finances passed as part of the year 2000 Russian budget code. In the coming years the outlook remains bright for economic reform. With USAID and other donor support, the Russian Government has prepared legislative packages on pension reform, deregulation, social sector reform, and health reform. All of these initiatives were recently submitted to the Duma. Scholars may well look back and view the year 2000 as the year when economic reform in Russia finally began to take hold and flourish.

Our customers under this objective include Russian Government agencies (at all levels), local banks, think tanks, entrepreneurs, and foreign and domestic investors. Customers also include the Russian public, which benefits from a stronger economy.

Key Results:

Substantial progress has been made towards the achievement of the following key results: 1) objective criteria and system developed for transfer of resources from center to regions and from regions to municipalities; 2) legal and regulatory framework for financial sector established and strengthened; 3) international accounting standards (IAS) properly match revenues and expenses to improve existing operations and make financial reporting transparent for banking sector supervision; and 4) economic think tanks' analytical and policy advisory capabilities strengthened to support sound policy formulation.

USAID's local grantee, the Fiscal Policy Center (FPC) helped the Russian government improve the formula for federal-regional revenue transfers as part of the 2000 federal budget

legislation. This work follows up on improvements made to the revenue transfer formula by the FPC in 1998 and 1999, when staff of the center were part of the Georgia State University contract. Because work on the federal-regional transfer formula has been so successful, USAID and FPC are now focusing on intergovernmental fiscal issues such as unfunded mandates, clarifying revenue and expenditure assignments, and implementing an objective regional-municipal revenue transfer formula in eight pilot regions. This work is proving so successful that over 30 additional regions have requested FPC's assistance.

Consumer confidence in Russian banks has grown as measured by the growth in deposits in Russian banks. In 2000, personal deposits increased by 30% from the previous year. This figure can be attributed to Russia's strong economic growth during 2000 and a sense of relative stability within the banking sector as the shock of the August 1998 financial crisis recedes.

Substantial progress was achieved in promoting IAS. During the past year, USAID worked with staff from the Central Bank of Russia (CBR) to develop 30 new IAS-compliant reporting regulations for use by commercial banks. Eight Russian commercial banks are receiving extensive IAS training and implementing these regulations on a pilot basis. Because IAS is a transparent financial reporting system based on globally accepted accounting standards and financial procedures, development of an IAS-based bank regulatory system is an essential step in improving transparency and confidence in the Russian banking sector.

Russian think tanks shaped the policy debate on many fronts by publishing and disseminating numerous policy proposals and papers. Policy makers in the GOR and Duma increasingly turned to USAID-supported think tanks such as the Institute for Economy in Transition (IET), Club 2015's National Project Institute, the FPC, the Economic Expert Group, and the Bureau for Economic Analysis, for assistance in areas such as pension reform, tax reform, competition and deregulation policy, health reform, and public finance. It is evident that USAID's support for Russian think tanks is having a profound impact.

Performance and Prospects:

Given the improved climate for economic reform within the Russian Government and Duma, this strategic objective demonstrates substantial promise for success through FY 2003 and over the long term.

Expectations for intergovernmental finance reform were exceeded in 2000. Under a new fiscal reform program, USAID is helping a local grantee, the Fiscal Policy Center (FPC), become the first fully sustainable Russian organization specializing in public finance and intergovernmental fiscal issues. FPC developed legislative provisions on interbudgetary finances and the transfer of revenue from the central to regional governments, which were incorporated into the Federal Budget Code. FPC also helped six regional governments to implement an objective formula to determine regional budget transfers to local governments. In addition, following a recent request from the Ministry of Finance, FPC agreed to assist the Russian Government in preparing the 2002 federal budget by conducting a number of expenditure reviews within various public sectors.

In economic policy analysis, expectations were also exceeded during the past year. The contributions of one USAID grantee, the Institute for Economy in Transition (IET), were

particularly visible. At the request of Russian counterparts in the GOR, IET developed proposals on tax reform, social sector reform, customs duties, corporate governance, and agricultural policy. The Duma passed four critical pieces of tax reform legislation drafted by IET, changing the value-added tax, excise taxes, individual income taxes, and the social tax, which President Putin then signed into law. USAID awarded grants for institutional strengthening and research to 42 other Russian think tanks and analysts in regions across Russia. In FY 2000 alone these experts presented Russian government officials with 120 policy papers and proposals.

Expectations for both the financial sector and accounting reform were met. USAID helped the Central Bank of Russia (CBR) draft 30 IAS-compliant bank reporting regulations and provided training to over 100 auditors and accountants with the CBR and the Agency for Restructuring Credit Organizations (ARKO). In addition, USAID grantee, the Financial Services Volunteer Corp (FSVC), is strengthening regional offices of the Central Bank, and commercial banks across the country, by providing training in areas such as payment processing, internal and external auditing, risk management, mortgage lending, and bank reporting. In the Russian Far East, USAID is working with the Alaska Sakhalin Working Group to assist the Sakhalin Regional Administration to create a financial institution modeled after the Alaska Industrial Development and Export Authority. Known as the Sakhalin Development Authority (SDA), this institution will provide financing for infrastructure development on Sakhalin Island and small business loans to Sakhalin entrepreneurs. Within the accounting reform sector, USAID's grantee the International Center for Accounting Reform (ICAR) completed an updated Russian translation of IAS and developed the first authoritative Russian translation of International Audit Standards. Finally, under the Regional Initiative Accounting Reform program, USAID helped 25 private enterprises in Samara and Novgorod convert their financial records from Russian Accounting Standards to IAS.

Possible Adjustments to Plans:

At the present time, congressional restrictions prohibit USAID/Russia from using more than 40% of its overall FY01 budget for activities that provide assistance to the federal government. Any further congressional limitations on work with the Russian government, would crimp USAID's ability to take advantage of opportunities for reform that currently exist at the federal level.

Other Donor Programs:

The World Bank and International Monetary Fund are the principal donors in the financial sector field. USAID and other bilateral donors such as DFID and TACIS play a coordinated supporting role by offering targeted TA programs. USAID is also a member of the Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee for Banking Reform, comprising Russian and donor institutions. USAID collaborates with the World Bank, TACIS, DFID and CIDA on fiscal reform, but within the specific area of intergovernmental fiscal relations USAID is the principal donor. In accounting reform USAID works closely with donors such as the European Union and the British DFID.

Major Contractors and Grantees:

USAID's major contractors and grantees include: the Financial Services Volunteer Corps and Development Alternatives Incorporated for banking reform; Deloitte & Touche and the Fiscal Policy Center for public finance; the Institute for Economic Transition and the Moscow

Public Science Foundation in economic policy development and think tank support; and Carana Coproration and the American Chamber of Commerce for accounting reform.

**Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003**

Objective Name: Improved economic infrastructure to support market-oriented growth

Objective ID: 118-014

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: IR 1.4.1.3 Objective criteria and system developed for transfer of resources from center to regions and from regions to municipalities

Indicator: Transparent formula adopted by regional governments for distribution of regional funds to municipal governments

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Percentage of Russia's regions adopting transparent formula to distribute regional funds to municipalities

Year	Planned	Actual
1999 (B)	0	0
2000	5%	8%
2001	10%	
2002	15%	
2003	25%	
2004	35%	
2005	50%	

Source:

The Fiscal Policy Center (FPC), USAID's local grantee for fiscal policy reform

Indicator/Description:

Percentage of regions adopting and implementing objective and transparent formula to distribute regional funds to municipalities.

Comments:

Previous indicator (transparent criteria for distribution of federal funds to regions) retired. New indicator reflects the current emphasis on improving transparency and objectivity in intergovernmental fiscal relations at the regional-municipal level of government.

(B) Baseline

**Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003**

Objective Name: Accelerated development and growth of private enterprises

Objective ID: 118-013

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID /ussia

Result Name: 1.3.2 Successful models of private ownership and modern management widely replicated

Indicator: Number of jobs created and/or sustained

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Number of jobs

Year	Planned	Actual
1998 (B)		81,812
1999	91,012	101,842
2000	121,012	138,772
2001	151,012	
2002	191,012	

Source:

Final and Quarterly reports of SUNY/Volkhov, CCI/RISE, JAR, OI, UAA, Morozov, URSBF, Counterpart, FINCA, ACDI/VOCA, CDC, IRIS, MAC, PRARI, Eurasia Foundation, and USEA.

Indicator/Description:

The actual numbers are derived from a year-end survey of SO 1.3 contractors measuring the number of people in the workforce.

Comments:

These numbers reflect only statistics from SO1.3 contractors. Jobs created and/or sustained by other SO contractors are not included.

(B) Baseline

Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003

Objective Name: Improved economic infrastructure to support market-oriented growth

Objective ID: 118-014

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: IR 1.4.3.3 International Accounting Standards properly match revenues and expenses to improve existing operations and make financial reporting transparent for banking sector supervision

Indicator: International Accounting Standards adopted by banks

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Number of banks adopt IAS as required by the Central Bank of Russia

Year	Planned	Actual
1999 (B)	0	0
2000	2	0
2001	100	
2002	500	
2003	1,000	

Source:

Central Bank of Russia (CBR)

Indicator/Description:

International Accounting Standards used by banks for reporting to the CBR.

Comments:

New Indicator devised to more accurately reflect USAID efforts to promote IAS as the cornerstone of the Russia's commercial bank regulatory system.

(B) Baseline

Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003

Objective Name: Improved economic infrastructure to support market-oriented growth

Objective ID: 118-014

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

RESULT NAME: IR 1.4.4 ECONOMIC THINK TANKS ANALYTICAL AND POLICY ADVICE
CAPABILITIES STRENGTHENED TO SUPPORT SOUND POLICY FORMULATION

Indicator: Wider dissemination of policy advice and publications

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Number of publications presented to government officials

Year	Planned	Actual
1998 (B)	1	1
1999	5	27
2000	100	120
2001	150	
2002	200	
2003	250	

Source:

Indicator data obtained from The Institute for Economy in Transition (IET) and the Moscow Public Science Foundation.

Indicator/Description:

Improved efficiency of results dissemination.

Comments:

Through cooperative agreements with the IET and the Moscow Public Science Foundation USAID provides support for economic policy formulation and publications.

(B) Baseline

Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: 2003

Objective Name: Improved economic infrastructure to support market-oriented growth

Objective ID: 118-014

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: 1.4.1.3 Objective criteria and system developed for transfer of resources from center to regions and from regions to municipalities

Indicator: Transparent criteria for distribution of federal funds to regions by formula

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Formula Changed (FC)

Year	Planned	Actual
1995 (B)	NA	NA
1996	FC	No
1997	FC	No
1998	FC	YES
1999	FC	YES
2000	FC	YES
2001	FC	Indicator Retired

Source:

The Fiscal Policy Center (FPC), USAID's local grantee for fiscal policy reform

Indicator/Description:

Federal Funds to support the regions' formula in place and operational.

Comments:

Federal Funds transfer formula changed and improved from 1998-2000. Therefore result achieved and indicator retired.

(B) Baseline

Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: 2003

Objective Name: Improved economic infrastructure to support market-oriented growth

Objective ID: 118-014

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: 1.4.3 International Accounting Standards properly match revenues and expenses to improve existing operations and make financial reporting transparent for banking sector supervision

Indicator: The Central Bank of Russia (CBR) develops and implements commercial bank regulatory system based on IAS

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Number of IAS compliant reporting regulations developed by the CBR

Year	Planned	Actual
1999 (B)	0	NA
2000	25	30
2001	50	
2002	75	
2003	100	

Source:

Indicator information obtained from the CBR and Development Alternatives Incorporated (DAI), USAID/Russia's contractor responsible for implementing accounting reform program with the Central Bank of Russia.

Indicator/Description:

IAS-based commercial bank reporting system developed and implemented by CBR.

Comments:

Indicator modified to more accurately reflect USAID efforts to promote IAS as the cornerstone of the Russia's commercial bank regulatory system.

(B) Baseline

SO Text for SO: 118-016 Increased environmental management capacity to support sustainable economic growth

Country/Organization: USAID Russia

Objective ID: 118-016

Objective Name: SO 1.6: Increased Environmental Management Capacity to Support Sustainable Economic Growth

Self Assessment: Exceeding Expectations

Primary Links to Agency Strategic Framework: **(Please Assign Percentages, Total Equals 100):**

- 0% 1.1 Critical private markets expanded and strengthened
- 0% 1.2 More rapid and enhanced agricultural development and food security encouraged
- 0% 1.3 Access to economic opportunity for the rural and urban poor expanded and made more equitable
- 0% 2.1 Rule of law and respect for human rights of women as well as men strengthened
- 0% 2.2 Credible and competitive political processes encouraged
- 0% 2.3 The development of politically active civil society promoted
- 0% 2.4 More transparent and accountable government institutions encouraged
- 0% 3.1 Access to quality basic education for under-served populations, especially for girls and women, expanded
- 0% 3.2 The contribution of host-country institutions of higher education to sustainable development increased
- 0% 4.1 Unintended and mistimed pregnancies reduced
- 0% 4.2 Infant and child health and nutrition improved and infant and child mortality reduced
- 0% 4.3 Deaths, nutrition insecurity, and adverse health outcomes to women as a result of pregnancy and childbirth reduced
- 0% 4.4 HIV transmission and the impact of the HIV/AIDS pandemic in developing countries reduced
- 0% 4.5 The threat of infectious diseases of major public health importance reduced
- 40% 5.1 Threat of global climate change reduced
- 10% 5.2 Biological diversity conserved
- 30% 5.3 Sustainable urbanization including pollution management promoted
- 5% 5.4 Use of environmentally sound energy services increased
- 15% 5.5 Sustainable management of natural resources increased
- 0% 6.1 Urgent needs in times of crisis met
- 0% 6.2 Personal security and basic institutions to meet critical intermediate needs and protect human rights re-established

Link to U.S. National Interests: Global Issues: Environment, Population, Health

Primary Link to MPP Goals: Environment

Secondary Link to MPP Goals (optional): Economic Development

(Page limitations for narrative begin here):

Summary of the SO:

This strategic objective directly supports the U.S. Mission's goal of environment and the U.S. national interest in global issues, as defined in the Mission Performance Plan for FY 1999-2001. Specifically, the activities under this strategic objective promote environmental and natural resource protection, which is a key global issue.

USAID's program in this sector comprises a set of activities that support sustainable economic growth through improved capacity in environmental and natural resource management. Key Russian institutions are being strengthened to greatly improve their capability to manage natural resources and protect the environment. Through innovative eco-business and community development programs, USAID's activities help improve Russia's environment, create employment, and promote democracy. Technical assistance strengthens partnerships among Russian institutions to promote best practices in the areas of pollution control, land use and development, and environmental education. USAID's program helps to reduce the effects of global climate change by promoting forest fire prevention, reforestation, protected areas management, and sustainable use of timber and non-timber forest products. The program also builds trade linkages between the U.S. and Russia, increases employment opportunities for indigenous peoples, and helps to provide healthier living conditions for Russia's citizens.

USAID's customers include Russian private and public sector organizations, regional governments, local businesses, schools, libraries, and hospitals. Other customers are Russian citizens who will benefit from a better-maintained natural resource base and improved health. Special attention continues to be paid to Regional Initiative sites; the Russian Far East (RFE) in particular benefits from the forestry activities under this strategic objective.

Key Results:

Three key results help improve environmental management practices: 1) increased capacity to deal with environmental pollution as a threat to public health; 2) improved management of natural resources and biodiversity protection; and 3) improved economic mechanisms for natural resources management and environmental protection.

USAID again exceeded its planned targets for the three results. Overall, improved environmental management practices were replicated in approximately half of Russia's oblasts in most regions of the RF. This includes: 49 percent of oblasts implementing environmental management activities; 51 percent of oblasts implementing natural resources activities; and 37 eco-business organizations developed and strengthened (note: more than one activity may be implemented in the same oblast). The number of eco-businesses strengthened exceeded the target, but was lower than the number reported in FY99, due to the closure of one of USAID's business support programs in the RFE. This number can be expected to increase again with the launch of the new non-timber forest products component of the FOREST project (see Performance and Prospects, below).

These indicators capture one of the most important results at the SO level: the extent to which environmental best practices are being replicated and implemented throughout this enormous country. To ensure that improvements in the environment and natural resource management are sustainable, they must be promoted by Russians to other Russians and embraced throughout the RF.

Although the indicators are not disaggregated by gender, women have in many places become the champions of environmental education, and are integrating USAID-sponsored programs into curricula throughout Russia. Women are also benefiting from support to small and medium sized eco-businesses.

Performance and Prospects:

Outstanding performance is expected under this strategic objective through FY 2003.

There are significant examples of successful implementation for all three key results. Under the Replications of Lessons Learned (ROLL) Project, which contributes to each result, Russians are broadly replicating environmental management activities and adopting local initiatives at the national level. As a result, Russian businesses are operating more efficiently, NGO's are learning how to work effectively with both the public and private sector, and the economic value of natural resources is being factored into business decisions. In the area of pollution prevention, harmful emissions and discharges from enterprises of various branches of industry were reduced in such highly polluted areas as Moscow and Sverdlovsk oblasts, and the cities of Volgograd, Nizhniy Tagil and Novokuznetsk. For example, the introduction of a new fuel combustion technology in Novokuznetsk decreased emissions of solid particles from boilers by almost two times. In several cities ROLL helped develop systems to monitor air quality, which were subsequently adopted at the federal level. The environmental health risk assessment methodology introduced by USAID has now been implemented in 26 cities, reducing the threat to public health from environmental pollution. A new method to monitor and reduce lead in children's blood has also been tested and introduced. Over 600 professionals have been trained in the use of Health Risk Assessment methodology throughout the country and a new curriculum has been developed and introduced in Russia's top medical universities. A total of 41 environmental education projects have introduced environmental curricula into schools and trained teachers. For example, ROLL established a network of children using the internet to share environmental experiences in 140 cities across Russia.

In the forestry sector, USAID continues to be a leader in sustainable forestry management. Officials in Khabarovsk Krai report that, in the past year, out-of-control forest fires have been reduced by 25% because radio equipment purchased last year by USAID enables them to detect the fires within the first 24 hours and quickly contain them. Khabarovsk also reports that the amount of timber reforested now exceeds the amount cut in the region. USAID-sponsored greenhouses are now producing 2.5 million seedlings per year.

In the RFE and Siberia, USAID recognized the need to help boost the economy, maximize the value of forest resources, and help to move the forest industries from extractive to value-added resource use. In FY 2000, USAID designed and launched the Forestry Resources and Technologies Project (FOREST) in cooperation with Russian partners. The major components of FOREST are forest fire prevention, forest pest monitoring, effective use of timber and non-timber products and secondary wood processing, renewable energy

alternatives, forest policy reform, applied forestry research, and small grants. The project is initiating a broad public awareness campaign for fire prevention, introducing a new system of forest pest monitoring, increasing capacity of local business associations, and promoting U.S. technological solutions for biomass energy projects in Russia.

USAID also focuses on eco-tourism activities aimed at educating the public, creating new jobs for the local population, and generating revenues to better protect Russia's nature reserves and endangered species. In the RFE, 13 grants totaling \$346,000 were provided to nature reserves and other entities to improve the basic infrastructure for hosting a modest number of eco-tourists, as well as for marketing, training, and developing educational materials for eco-tourism development. A conference was conducted to share experience and educate nature reserve directors on implementing low-impact eco-tourism activities. In cooperation with the World Wildlife Fund, USAID continued a small grants program and provided grants averaging \$4,000 to 30 organizations to strengthen the protected areas network and preserve biodiversity in the RFE.

What might have been a major constraint affecting progress instead proved to be an opportunity for continued close collaboration with counterparts. In May, President Putin reorganized the Russian government environmental and forestry services, moving their functions to the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR). The transition was smooth, and there was no negative impact on our programs. USAID works closely with the reorganized MNR, which has expressed great interest in continuing to receive USAID's support. Senior Ministry officials chair the Advisory Committees for both the ROLL and the FOREST projects. At the same time our strong NGO community, galvanized by its concern that Russia is sliding backwards in its commitment to the environment, collected more than 2.5 million signatures requesting a referendum on the reorganization and on Russia's intention to import nuclear waste. Though the referendum movement failed, the NGOs have renewed confidence in their ability to direct attention to environmental causes.

USAID will continue to support Russian-to-Russian partnerships to promote environmental protection under ROLL 2000 and other activities. USAID will address climate change issues through activities to preserve and expand Russia's globally important carbon sink and protect its endangered biodiversity, such as fire prevention, forest policy, and reforestation.

Possible Adjustments to Plans:

USAID/Russia is developing a new indicator that will create a bridge between SO 1.3 and SO 1.6 and expect to be able to report on it in FY 01. We also recognize that environmental activities cross-cut most of the other Mission programs, and we are identifying additional linkages, particularly with health and urban programs.

Other Donor Programs:

USAID actively coordinates with other donor governments, NGOs, and international financial institutions. USAID continues to work closely with the World Bank on forestry issues, and a Bank representative sits on the Advisory Committee for the FOREST project. USAID also contributed to a multi-donor effort with European Governments and Japan to phase out the production of ozone depleting substances in the Russian Federation. USAID attends meetings of the donor coordinating council, and of the TACIS environment program.

Major Contractors and Grantees:

Key contractors and grantees include: Institute for Sustainable Communities for the ROLL Project and eco-business grants; Winrock International and the members of its consortium for the FOREST project; World Wildlife Fund for eco-tourism and forestry; Institute for International Education for environmental partnerships; and the U.S. Forest Service for forestry management. USAID also works closely with the U.S. Departments of State, Agriculture, and Energy, and the Environmental Protection Agency, especially on Global Climate Change issues.

**Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003**

Objective Name: Increased environmental management capacity to support sustainable economic growth

Objective ID: 118-016

Approved: 1999-05

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: IR 1.6.1 Increased capacity to deal with environmental pollution as a threat to public health

Indicator: New approaches/techniques/technologies/actions to prevent and reduce industrial pollution are introduced and implemented throughout the Russian Federation

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Percent of oblasts

Year	Planned	Actual
1992 (B)	NA	0
1996	4	4
1997	10	33
1998	20	35
1999	40	45
2000	45	49
2001	50	
2002	60	
2003	70	

Source:

Project Officer/Contractor

Indicator/Description:

Percent of oblasts (cumulative) using new approaches/techniques/ technologies/actions.

Comments:

(B) Baseline

**Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003**

Objective Name: Increased environmental management capacity to support sustainable economic growth

Objective ID: 118-016

Approved: 1999-05

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: IR 1.6.2 Improved management of natural resources and biodiversity protection

Indicator: New approaches/actions to improve management of natural resources and protect biodiversity are implemented throughout the Russian Federation

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Percent of oblasts

Year	Planned	Actual
1993 (B)	NA	NA*
1996	5	7
1997	8	15
1998	10	34
1999	40	44
2000	45	51
2001	50	
2002	55	
2003	60	

Source:

Project Officer/Contractor

Indicator/Description:

Percent of oblasts implementing new approaches/actions.

Comments:

*Value unknown.

(B) Baseline

Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003

Objective Name: Increased environmental management capacity to support sustainable economic growth

Objective ID: 118-016

Approved: 1999-05

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: IR 1.6.3 Improved economic mechanisms for natural resources management and environmental protection

Indicator: Eco-business organizations developed and strengthened

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Number of organizations

Year	Planned	Actual
1992 (B)	NA	0
1996	20	26
1997	15	18
1998	5	12
1999	25	210
2000	30	37
2001	35	
2002	40	
2003	50	

Source:

Project Officer/Contractors

Indicator/Description:

Eco-business organizations implementing environmentally friendly activities.

Comments:

(B) Baseline

SO Text for SO: 118-021 Increased, better informed citizens' participation in political and economic decision-making

Country/Organization: USAID Russia

Objective ID: 118-021

Objective Name: Increased, better informed citizens' participation in political and economic decision-making

Self Assessment: Meeting Expectations

Primary Links to Agency Strategic Framework: **(Please Assign Percentages, Total Equals 100):**

- 0% 1.1 Critical private markets expanded and strengthened
- 0% 1.2 More rapid and enhanced agricultural development and food security encouraged
- 0% 1.3 Access to economic opportunity for the rural and urban poor expanded and made more equitable
- 0% 2.1 Rule of law and respect for human rights of women as well as men strengthened
- 40% 2.2 Credible and competitive political processes encouraged
- 60% 2.3 The development of politically active civil society promoted
- 0% 2.4 More transparent and accountable government institutions encouraged
- 0% 3.1 Access to quality basic education for under-served populations, especially for girls and women, expanded
- 0% 3.2 The contribution of host-country institutions of higher education to sustainable development increased
- 0% 4.1 Unintended and mistimed pregnancies reduced
- 0% 4.2 Infant and child health and nutrition improved and infant and child mortality reduced
- 0% 4.3 Deaths, nutrition insecurity, and adverse health outcomes to women as a result of pregnancy and childbirth reduced
- 0% 4.4 HIV transmission and the impact of the HIV/AIDS pandemic in developing countries reduced
- 0% 4.5 The threat of infectious diseases of major public health importance reduced
- 0% 5.1 Threat of global climate change reduced
- 0% 5.2 Biological diversity conserved
- 0% 5.3 Sustainable urbanization including pollution management promoted
- 0% 5.4 Use of environmentally sound energy services increased
- 0% 5.5 Sustainable management of natural resources increased
- 0% 6.1 Urgent needs in times of crisis met
- 0% 6.2 Personal security and basic institutions to meet critical intermediate needs and protect human rights re-established

Link to U.S. National Interests: Democracy

Primary Link to MPP Goals: Democracy and Human Rights

Secondary Link to MPP Goals (optional):

(Page limitations for narrative begin here):

Summary of the SO:

This objective directly supports two Agency goals -- credible and competitive political processes encouraged, and the development of politically active civil society promoted. It also supports the U.S. Mission's goal of democracy and the U.S. national interest of democracy and human rights, as defined in the Mission Performance Plan for FY 1999-2001.

By the end of the strategy period in 2003, USAID's support to Russia's democratic transition will have fostered an environment where citizens have a greater voice at all levels. Because building a democracy takes far longer than five or ten years, USAID has identified certain intermediate results to show progress in the nearer term. By 2003, USAID will have made progress toward a number of results, such as the administration of free and fair elections both nationally and locally, increased public access to information that is needed for informed choices, and participation in the NGO sector as an alternative to the ballot box for making economic and political decisions. Customers include NGOs, public officials, independent television and radio stations, independent print media, and political parties. In a broader sense, customers include virtually all Russians, who will benefit from stronger mechanisms for substantive participation in civil society.

In 2000, all activities were on track or exceeded expectations. The 2000 Presidential Election was certified by international observers as generally free and fair, and a meaningful competition of candidates represented a range of political views. However, international observers noted that media coverage of the election was not as balanced or objective as had been hoped. Subsequent to the elections, media also alleged other improprieties. Despite recent challenges to press freedoms, the reach of the independent media is continuously expanding, providing the public with access to a range of information needed to make informed political and economic choices. Russians are not only using this information at the ballot box, but also are working through NGOs to influence policy making, and NGOs in turn are focusing more and more on advocacy and policy input, often at the local level where citizen needs are most efficiently addressed. In terms of labor, Russian workers are paid on a more timely basis and are working under safer conditions with the support of their unions. In summary, progress was made in 2000 in helping media, NGOs, labor unions, and political parties to voice citizen interests and concerns.

Key Results:

Key intermediate results are: 1) free and fair elections administered nationally and locally; 2) more programming produced and broadcast by independent stations in the regions; and 3) NGOs advocate more effectively for members' interests. Solid progress toward all three results show that programs are on track. International election observers certified the presidential election as generally free and fair. The reach of independent media expanded and exceeded expectations in 2000, with approximately 60% of viewers in the regions watching independently produced news programming, an increase of 20% over 1999. More cities in target regions established and used mechanisms for NGO-local government

interaction (48 cities compared with 22 the year before). The particularly challenging context in which these results were achieved is detailed below.

Performance and Prospects:

In terms of elections, the free and fair nature of the local, regional and national elections conducted in 1999 and 2000 may be attributed, in part, to several USAID activities. USAID supported international observation missions, and trained domestic observers from various NGOs. USAID also supported the creation of a coalition of NGOs (VOICE) which is now active in providing observers for local elections. The International Republican Institute (IRI) and the National Democratic Institute (NDI), with USAID support, provided pollwatcher training in 23 regions for more than 2,000 representatives of parties, political movements, and independent candidates. IRI trained non-voting members of local election commissions. The International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES), working with a local NGO, the Institute for Election Systems Development (IESD), supported the Central Election Commission of the Russian Federation (CEC) and together with the National Press Institute, brought together journalists and local election commissioners -- 450 in 12 seminars -- to discuss the media's role during the election period. USAID's assistance to the Central Election Commission of the Russian Federation was made more sustainable, with the U.S.-based IFES departing Russia after having strengthened Moscow-based IESD to continue the work.

Although the 2,000 elections were free and fair, the lack of a vibrant political party system thwarts citizen participation in the political process. A four-year Democratic Institutions Strengthening activity will begin in May 2001, and will strengthen political parties at the grassroots level, increase the link between political parties and constituents through support to non-governmental organizations, educate legislators at the State Duma, and develop linkages between citizens and government in the regions. USAID's program, and the country's political landscape will be influenced significantly by new political party legislation forthcoming this year, which is expected to reduce the number of political parties through stricter requirements for parties running candidates in national elections.

In terms of media, the share of viewers in Russia's vast regions that watch private, non-state broadcasting jumped from 0% in 1991 to an estimated reach of 60% by 2000, exceeding anticipated targets. Regional media outlets are more financially sound, and therefore more editorially independent, thanks to USAID training in business' development and production support to over 500 regional non-state television stations that operate in 81 of 89 regions. In the non-state print sector, USAID provided professional business management consulting to over 60 non-state regional newspapers in 40 regions since 1997.

At the same time, freedom of the press was constrained this past year in several new ways, including new centralization policies, the introduction of a new information security doctrine, attacks on NTV (the largest non-state national television network in Russia with national reach), the arrest of journalists critical of the Russian government's Chechnya policies, and continued pressure on privately owned media outlets. USAID is responding with activities aimed at the defense of media legal rights, informational freedom, management training, and small grants.

The role of NGOs is also evolving. NGOs not only advocate more effectively for members' needs and serve as an important avenue for participation in political and economic decision-

making, they also channel the innovation and creativity of citizens in solving problems like service delivery at the local level. This view of NGO-citizen relations was recently put forth by Sergei Kirienko, the President's Representative in Volga. A changing role for NGOs is evidenced by their activities. In 2000, NGOs in USAID-target regions submitted over 231 expert commentaries to local authorities on policy issues, up from 221 in 1999 (baseline), and USAID-assisted NGOs initiated 346 projects that had support from local government and business. Overall, USAID supports 5,000 NGOs in 37 regions -- over two-thirds of Russia's territory -- through 48 Russian NGO resource centers, and provides information to thousands more. A new NGO activity that began in October 2000, seeks to stimulate grassroots involvement in the delivery of services and is targeting youth in particular, to get greater involvement in political, economic and social life of the community.

Tangible results are also evident from USAID's work in strengthening free trade unions. Russian workers are on a more timely basis and are working under safer conditions as a result of training for over 2,000 trade unionists last year in organization skills, collective bargaining, dispute resolution, and health and safety. Nearly half of the unionists receiving this training were women. Additionally, three new Public Interest Law Centers, which give workers access to legal assistance and a mechanism to sue for nonpayment of wages, were opened. The centers' staff provided approximately 6,000 consultations on wage issues, trade union rights, labor disputes resolution; they represented the interests of 6,600 people in 1,920 court hearings.

Possible Adjustments to Plans:

An assessment by Management Systems International of USAID's political party building and related activities recommended continued funding for programs aimed at working to strengthen democratic systems and norms for at least four years, through the next election cycle. The assessment also recommended a reorientation of our program toward strengthening political parties at the grassroots level, increasing the link between political parties and constituents through support to non-governmental organizations, educating State Duma deputies, and developing linkages between citizens and government in the regions. USAID has incorporated these recommendations into its political process activities.

Over the next year, an anti-trafficking initiative will be a new priority for USAID. USAID expects the program to focus on prevention, information dissemination, and direct services for trafficking victims.

Other Donor Programs:

USAID is the primary provider of election systems development assistance. USAID is one of the largest donors in the media sector along with the Open Society Institute. Assistance to media is also provided by the British Know-How Fund, the World Bank, the Media Viability Fund (Eurasia Foundation and Media Development Loan Fund), Ford Foundation, Canadian International Development Agency and the Swedish, Swiss, and Finnish embassies. Other donors strengthening the NGO sector include the European Union, Canadian Cooperation Program, the Mott Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Soros Foundation.

Major Contractors and Grantees:

USAID's civil society activities are implemented by the International Research & Exchanges Board, the Initiative for Social Action and Renewal, and the Women's Consortium. The

American Center for International Labor Solidarity is implementing USAID's labor program. Support for independent media is provided by Internews and the Press Development Institute. The Moscow School of Political Studies, Institute for Election System Development, International Republican Institute, and the National Democratic Institute implement programs in support of the political process. USAID also funds the Eurasia Foundation's small grants program for Russian organizations.

**Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003**

Objective Name: Increased, better informed citizens' participation in political and economic decision-making

Objective ID: 118-021

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: IR 2.1.1 Free and fair elections administered nationally and locally

Indicator: Participation in national and local elections is certified free and fair by observers

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Yes/no

Year	Planned	Actual
1995 (B)	NA	NA
1999	YES	YES
2000	YES	YES
2001	YES	
2002	YES	
2003	TBD	

Source:

Reports of international observation missions of Russian national elections, USAID partners (IFES, IRI, NDI) and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Indicator/Description:

International observers certify elections to be generally free of systemic fraud and vote manipulation.

Comments:

This indicator will be revised within the framework of a program anticipated to start in May 2001.

(B) Baseline

**Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003**

Objective Name: Increased, better informed citizens' participation in political and economic decision-making

Objective ID: 118-021

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: IR 2.1.2.2 More programming produced and broadcast by independent TV stations in the regions

Indicator: Regional independent TV stations are the primary source of local news for viewers

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Percentage of viewership watching non-state regional TV

Year	Planned	Actual
1991 (B)	NA	0
1996	12	12
1997	15	25
1998	35	40
1999	40	42
2000	45	60
2001	50	
2002	50	
2003	TBD	

Source:

Averaged among major media ratings services, including Mediamar; Nezavisimaya Media, and Izvestya, published by Aгенstvo Issledovaniy Sotsialnoy I Teleradioveschaniya.

Indicator/Description:

Averaged regional rating of non-state broadcasters (without NTV) in principal regional TV markets. If the national private network NTV is included, non-state TV ratings share increases by approximately 20%.

Comments:

(B) Baseline

**Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003**

Objective Name: Increased, better informed citizens' participation in political and economic decision-making

Objective ID: 118-021

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: IR 2.1.3 NGO sector provides alternative to ballot box for participating in economic and political decision making

Indicator: Number of cities in target regions that have established and are using mechanisms for NGO-local government

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Number of cities

Year	Planned	Actual
1994 (B)	NA	0
1996	5	6
1997	10	18
1998	20	22
1999	25	48
2000	35	
2001	40	
2002	50	
2003	TBD	

Source:

Reports from implementers

Indicator/Description:

Increase in interaction between NGOs and local government.

Comments:

As reported in last year's R4, USAID/Russia had nearly achieved the goal of mechanisms for government-NGO interaction in all target cities in 2000, and hence this was no longer a useful indicator. It was replaced by IR 2.1.3.1, which more directly tracks USAID's current NGO program.

(B) Baseline

**Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: 2003**

Objective Name: Increased, better informed citizens' participation in political and economic decision-making

Objective ID: 118-021

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: 2.1.3.1. NGOs advocate more effectively for members needs/interests

Indicator: In targeted regions, number of NGOs that provide input to legislative process on issues affecting their needs/interests

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Number of expert commentaries submitted to local authorities on policy issues.

Year	Planned	Actual
1999 (B)	NA	221
2000	230	231
2001	250	
2002	270	
2003	280	

Source:

Pro NGO program reports submitted by International Research and Exchange Board (IREX) including information gathered by NGO resource centers.

Indicator/Description:

Increase in level of activity and number of NGOs engaging in civic advocacy.

Comments:

This replaced last year's indicator, which was no longer a useful indicator of achievement since targets were already fully met, this target directly responds to USAID's current NGO program.

(B) Baseline

SO Text for SO: 118-022 Strengthened rule of law and respect for human rights

Country/Organization: USAID Russia

Objective ID: 118-022

Objective Name: Strengthened rule of law and respect for human rights

Self Assessment: Meeting Expectations

Primary Links to Agency Strategic Framework: **(Please Assign Percentages, Total Equals 100):**

- 0% 1.1 Critical private markets expanded and strengthened
- 0% 1.2 More rapid and enhanced agricultural development and food security encouraged
- 0% 1.3 Access to economic opportunity for the rural and urban poor expanded and made more equitable
- 100% 2.1 Rule of law and respect for human rights of women as well as men strengthened
- 0% 2.2 Credible and competitive political processes encouraged
- 0% 2.3 The development of politically active civil society promoted
- 0% 2.4 More transparent and accountable government institutions encouraged
- 0% 3.1 Access to quality basic education for under-served populations, especially for girls and women, expanded
- 0% 3.2 The contribution of host-country institutions of higher education to sustainable development increased
- 0% 4.1 Unintended and mistimed pregnancies reduced
- 0% 4.2 Infant and child health and nutrition improved and infant and child mortality reduced
- 0% 4.3 Deaths, nutrition insecurity, and adverse health outcomes to women as a result of pregnancy and childbirth reduced
- 0% 4.4 HIV transmission and the impact of the HIV/AIDS pandemic in developing countries reduced
- 0% 4.5 The threat of infectious diseases of major public health importance reduced
- 0% 5.1 Threat of global climate change reduced
- 0% 5.2 Biological diversity conserved
- 0% 5.3 Sustainable urbanization including pollution management promoted
- 0% 5.4 Use of environmentally sound energy services increased
- 0% 5.5 Sustainable management of natural resources increased
- 0% 6.1 Urgent needs in times of crisis met
- 0% 6.2 Personal security and basic institutions to meet critical intermediate needs and protect human rights re-established

Link to U.S. National Interests: Democracy

Primary Link to MPP Goals: Democracy and Human Rights

Secondary Link to MPP Goals (optional):

(Page limitations for narrative begin here):

Summary of the SO:

This objective directly supports the Agency's goal of strengthening the rule of law and respect for the human rights of women and men. It also supports the U.S. Mission's goal of democracy and the U.S. national interest of democracy and human rights, as defined in the Mission Performance Plan for FY 1999-2001.

USAID has been working with the GOR on democracy initiatives since 1992, or almost since the Russian Federation's founding. While it is unrealistic to expect that the rule of law will take hold in the near term, certain changes can be expected by the end of the present strategy period in 2003: strengthening the independence and competence of the judiciary, advocating respect for human rights and expanding anti-corruption activities.

In 2000, all activities either met or exceeded expectations, but enforcement of judgments remains problematic, and due to funding limitations USAID decided to cease its assistance to the Bailiff's Service after early 2001. The uncertain status of human rights compels continued US involvement in this sphere. USAID also supports NGOs and local governments initiating efforts to combat corruption.

Our customers under this SO include judges, bailiffs, lawyers, human rights NGOs and anti-corruption NGOs.

Key Results:

Significant progress was made towards achieving four key results: 1) the legal framework provides judicial independence; 2) the Judicial Department functions as intended by legislation; 3) the presence of enforcement service induces better execution of civil judgments; and 4) effective advocacy for adherence to international human rights commitments is increased.

Russia's legal framework now provides for greater judicial independence. A law that provides a better mechanism for funding the judiciary was implemented in 2000. Unlike some prior years when the Ministry of Finance failed to provide appropriated funds, in 2000 the entire budget appropriated for the judiciary was transferred.

USAID helped create a Judicial Department in 1998, which is contributing to judicial reform. In 2000 the department made progress in functioning as intended by legislation. Specifically, the Department played a critical role in securing increased financing for the courts in the 2000 budget, and continued to hire and train court administrators (2500 hired in the year 2000).

With respect to enforcement of civil judgements, the Bailiff's Service of the Ministry of Justice exceeded the anticipated target in executing its caseload. The Service's mere existence is significant, as are the improvements to timely resolution of cases. However, Russian media allege corruption within the Service, and inefficiency in enforcing judgements remains a problem.

Finally, the monitoring of human rights abuses has improved over the last several years, but abuses are still pervasive and threaten further development of democratic institutions and the rule of law. Documenting and publicizing abuse are critical to improvement. With USAID's support, human rights NGOs professionally monitor and document human rights violations in all 89 regions in Russia, and contribute to the Moscow Helsinki Group's human rights report.

Performance and Prospects:

Current performance is meeting all targets. USAID made considerable progress toward its goals, concentrating during the last year on work with judicial institutions, the Bailiff's Service, and NGOs monitoring human rights and addressing corruption at the grassroots level. Although challenges continue to be great, performance through 2003 is expected to continue on track.

Improvements in the Law on the Financing of Courts were the product of lobbying by the USAID-supported Council of Judges. The Judicial Department's role in formulating the courts' budget made it possible for the courts to influence the budget; and . the department has asked USAID to continue its assistance in some areas.

USAID customers confirmed that the judiciary is now more independent and strong, as noted by delegates to the Fifth All-Russian Congress of Judges held in November 2000. The budget for the courts of general jurisdiction has tripled in three years, and the Judicial Department -- whose creation and strengthening USAID has supported -- is generally believed to have played a major role in this budget increase. Moreover, judicial leaders and the new Russian presidential administration demonstrated strong interest in instituting further reforms. In his address to the Congress of Judges, President Putin acknowledged the judiciary's problems, and pledged to increase numbers and funding for judges. Subsequently, judicial salaries were raised by 20% effective December 1, 2000. Putin also formed a consultative committee, which is formulating a new phase of judicial reform, considering wide-ranging, progressive changes to the judiciary. For example, they propose to establish a public presence on the collegiums that select and discipline judges, and to change the criminal procedure code to give the judiciary the right to approve arrest and search warrants).

Despite recent progress, serious problems with the court system remain. It is still underfunded. It is getting stronger and more independent, but citizens generally lack confidence in it. Precisely because of these remaining challenges, USAID plans to award a three-year, follow-on contract to strengthen judicial administration and training. A likely future partner is the Academy of Justice, the first judicial branch training institution for judges, which began in 2000. To date, USAID's support to the Academy has been limited to study tours and exchanges with the U.S. Federal Judicial Center.

USAID contributed significantly to the establishment of the Bailiff's Service and to improving the execution of its caseload. Last year, USAID sponsored bailiffs' training and published a comprehensive handbook on enforcement of judgments. The contract to support this activity has ended, and USAID instead will devote scarce resources to working with the judiciary.

USAID's support has increased the number of human rights NGOs professionally monitoring and documenting human rights violations. With 29 more oblasts covered last year, monitoring now takes place in all of Russia's 89 oblasts, and monitoring groups contribute to

the Moscow Helsinki Group's (MHG) human rights report. Two MHG reports were completed and published in both Russian and English in September 2000. An All-Russia Human Rights Congress in January 2001, involving many of USAID's NGO partners, drew attention to the human rights environment. In the coming year, USAID plans to develop a Mission Strategy for Human Rights, re-examining our work with human rights NGOs and determining how to collaborate better with other donors.

A final threat to the rule of law in Russia is pervasive corruption. NGOs, scholars, journalists, and some public officials and businesspeople have begun organizing and publicizing their efforts to combat corruption in recent years, according a higher profile to the issue. USAID supports some of these activists through a grassroots program of small grants administered by the Eurasia Foundation. In the future, USAID plans to strengthen public-private partnerships in fighting corruption and to support Russian NGOs that have begun to combat corruption.

Possible Adjustments to Plans:

Adjustments to plans are likely for USAID's support to the judiciary. Pending and draft laws could seriously alter many aspects of the courts' work and change our program. USAID's ability to support the judiciary is constrained by limitations on the levels of assistance to the GOR. If additional judicial reforms were passed, USAID's ability to support their implementation would be limited. Adjustments may also be necessary in the human rights program, depending on the results of the Mission's human rights assessment and strategy.

Other Donor Programs:

The World Bank, European Union, various embassies (e.g. Great Britain, Canada, etc.), and private foundations conduct programs in many aspects of rule of law. The World Bank, through the Russian Foundation for Legal Reform, was active in judicial training and legal education, but results of its work have not yet been notable in most areas. The British DFID launched its program to support judicial administration and education in two pilot regions. Still the USG, through USAID and the US Department of Justice (DOJ), was the most active donor working with the Russian judiciary in 2000. The DOJ conducts programs on criminal law, corruption and law enforcement issues for Russian prosecutors, various law enforcement officials, and some judges.

Major Contractors and Grantees:

Chemonics implements most of USAID's rule of law activities in working with the Russian judiciary. The American Bar Association trains legal professionals and legal educators and addresses women's legal issues. The University of Maryland's IRIS Center works with the Bailiff's Office. The Moscow Helsinki Group monitors human rights, and the Andrey Sakharov Museum and Public Center delivers human rights education.

Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003

Objective Name: Strengthened rule of law and respect for human rights

Objective ID: 118-022

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID Russia

Result Name: IR 22.2 Judicial decisions are uniform, predictable and made without delay

Indicator: Survey results on uniformity, predictability and fairness of commercial court decisions

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Uniformity, predictability and fairness of commercial court decisions

Year	Planned	Actual
1998 (B)	1.7*	1.8*
1999	1.8*	1.8*
2000	1.8	1.8
2001	1.9	NA

Source:

ABA/ CEELI annual survey

Indicator/Description:

Results of survey are shown on a 1-4 scale, with 4 representing excellent and 1 poor performance.

Comments:

A change in survey methodology negates the old baseline figure and necessitated a recalculation of results for 1998 and 1999 to reflect data from the same cities as were surveyed in 2000. We will develop a new indicator this summer after consultations with Price Waterhouse Coopers, which has been contracted to assist the mission with the development of new indicators.

(B) Baseline

Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003

Objective Name: Strengthened rule of law and respect for human rights

Objective ID: 118-022

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: IR 2.2.1.2 Judicial department functions as intended by legislation

Indicator: Judicial department formulates the annual budget of the courts of general jurisdiction

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Yes/No

Year	Planned	Actual
1997 (B)	NO	NO
1998	NO	NO
1999	YES	YES
2000	YES	YES
2001	YES	NA

Source:

Judicial department, Council of Judges

Indicator/Description:

Judicial department formulates the annual budget of the courts of general jurisdiction.

Comments:

We will develop a new indicator this summer after consultations with Price Waterhouse Coopers, which has been contracted to assist the mission with the development of new indicators.

(B) Baseline

Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003

Objective Name: Strengthened rule of law and respect for human rights

Objective ID: 118-022

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: IR 2.2.4 Presence of the enforcement service induces better execution of civil judgments

Indicator: Percentage of overall value of Bailiffs Service civil judgments caseload that is executed

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Overall value of Bailiffs Service civil judgements caseload (percent)

Year	Planned	Actual
1997 (B)	30	30
1998	40	54
1999	50	60
2000	60	70
2001	NA	NA

Source:

Official statistics of the Ministry of Justice

Indicator/Description:

Percentage of overall value of Bailiffs Service civil judgements caseload that is executed.

Comments:

The statistics maintained by the Ministry of Justice are the only source of information available for this indicator. However, they do not provide fully reliable and complete data sufficient to measure the effectiveness of the Bailiffs Service and justify that achievement of indicator targets is being achieved.

This activity is concluding this year and will not be extended due to lack of funding; thus there are no targets for 2001. We will develop a new indicator this summer after consultations with Price Waterhouse Coopers, which has been contracted to assist the mission with the development of new indicators.

(B) Baseline

Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003

Objective Name: Strengthened rule of law and respect for human rights

Objective ID: 118-022

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: IR 2.2.5 Effective advocacy for adherence to international human rights commitments increased

Indicator: Number of regions with human rights monitors trained increases

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Number of regions with human rights monitors trained and active in monitoring and reporting on human rights violations.

Year	Planned	Actual
1998 (B)	30	30
1999	60	60
2000	70	89
2001	89	NA
2002	NA	

Source:

Moscow Helsinki Group

Indicator/Description:

Only independent (non-government) monitors are considered.

Comments:

Once the human rights monitoring network is functioning and monitors are trained and become more active and effective, the number of human rights violations reported may increase. This activity met all targets and is concluding, thus there are no targets for 2002. We will develop a new indicator this summer after consultations with Price Waterhouse Coopers, which has been contracted to assist the mission with the development of new indicators.

(B) Baseline

SO Text for SO: 118-032 Improved effectiveness of selected social benefits and services

Country/Organization: USAID Russia

Objective ID: 118-032

Objective Name: Improved effectiveness of selected social benefits and services

Self Assessment: Meeting Expectations

Primary Links to Agency Strategic Framework: **(Please Assign Percentages, Total Equals 100):**

- 0% 1.1 Critical private markets expanded and strengthened
- 0% 1.2 More rapid and enhanced agricultural development and food security encouraged
- 5% 1.3 Access to economic opportunity for the rural and urban poor expanded and made more equitable
- 0% 2.1 Rule of law and respect for human rights of women as well as men strengthened
- 0% 2.2 Credible and competitive political processes encouraged
- 3% 2.3 The development of politically active civil society promoted
- 15% 2.4 More transparent and accountable government institutions encouraged
- 0% 3.1 Access to quality basic education for under-served populations, especially for girls and women, expanded
- 0% 3.2 The contribution of host-country institutions of higher education to sustainable development increased
- 10% 4.1 Unintended and mistimed pregnancies reduced
- 10% 4.2 Infant and child health and nutrition improved and infant and child mortality reduced
- 15% 4.3 Deaths, nutrition insecurity, and adverse health outcomes to women as a result of pregnancy and childbirth reduced
- 15% 4.4 HIV transmission and the impact of the HIV/AIDS pandemic in developing countries reduced
- 15% 4.5 The threat of infectious diseases of major public health importance reduced
- 5% 5.1 Threat of global climate change reduced
- 0% 5.2 Biological diversity conserved
- 5% 5.3 Sustainable urbanization including pollution management promoted
- 0% 5.4 Use of environmentally sound energy services increased
- 0% 5.5 Sustainable management of natural resources increased
- 0% 6.1 Urgent needs in times of crisis met
- 2% 6.2 Personal security and basic institutions to meet critical intermediate needs and protect human rights re-established

Link to U.S. National Interests: Global Issues: Environment, Population, Health

Primary Link to MPP Goals: Health

Secondary Link to MPP Goals (optional): Economic Development

(Page limitations for narrative begin here):

Summary of the SO:

A decade into the transition from communism, many Russians equate democratic and economic change with deteriorating health and social services and a collapse of the social safety net. To help change that equation, USAID provides models of effective and efficient health and other essential community-level services that reach the truly needy. USAID promotes new approaches to service delivery at various levels, from health facilities to NGOs to local administration, and fosters change in corresponding federal policies.

USAID/Russia focuses its efforts on selected social benefits and services in health and urban development sectors in key regions. Ultimate customers are women of reproductive age, newborns, youth, tuberculosis patients, and poor families closed out of present benefit systems. Training and technical assistance benefit NGOs, social service and health professionals and local decision-makers. Significant achievements during 2000 show that the program is meeting expectations and that targeted interventions can have broad, lasting impact.

The Mission Performance Plan for FY 1999-2001 describes the health and population goals of the U.S. Mission. This strategic objective supports those goals, which reflect the U.S. national interest in global issues of health and population.

Key Results:

USAID pursues three results to achieve this strategic objective: 1) new approaches to service delivery adopted; 2) improved responses to infectious disease; and 3) improved cost recovery/equity in social service delivery. As stated in last year's R4, the indicators have been modified to more accurately reflect results achievable within the current program. The increased emphasis on infectious diseases and new emphasis on maternal and infant health, primary health care partnerships, orphans and small cities has not figured in past indicators.

To improve the quality of health care, more than 500 service providers were trained this year in family-centered maternity care, prenatal care, essential care of newborns, neonatal resuscitation, exclusive breastfeeding, and contraceptive use. As a result, Russians have adapted international guidelines and improved counseling skills to increase the use of science instead of tradition or habit to determine medical practices. USAID's pilot programs show that modern patient-oriented approaches work in Russia, and can be replicated at the national level.

USAID's exclusive breastfeeding campaign is one example. One hospital used thousands of dollars, previously spent on formula, to finance a revenue-generating maternity ward. Other international health practices provide immediate improvements in health and lead to policy changes and cost-savings.

USAID has had particular success in treating and controlling tuberculosis (TB). With its partners -- the World Health Organization/Moscow (WHO), the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and Russian counterparts -- USAID demonstrated for the first

time that international protocols on TB can work in Russia. Two groups of patients treated using a protocol adapted for Russia exceeded WHO's regional standard for treatment success. USAID's vigorous leadership has led to increased political will and commitment to reform in the previously intractable arena of TB science in Russia, paving the way for improved services. During FY 2000, governors from all three USAID TB program regions issued declarations supporting the program's approach. Regional and federal authorities provided considerable in-kind contributions, and experience from the program will shape the design of a \$100 million World Bank loan on TB, expected to be finalized in early 2002.

Russia is on the verge of a HIV/AIDS epidemic, according to UNAIDS, with the most rapid rate of HIV increase in the world. USAID's HIV/AIDS/STI (sexually transmitted infections) prevention strategy promotes behavior change, condom use, and research in STI treatment and prevention. Interventions focus on 18- to 30-year-old injecting drug users, who account for the bulk of new HIV infection, and other high-risk groups such as heterosexuals, whose rate of infection is also increasing alarmingly. Similarly, STIs are epidemic. Syphilis rates in Russia are several hundred times higher than in Western Europe, increasing almost 100-fold among 15-17-year-olds between 1988 and 1996. Innovative ways to reach youth-- concerts, street festivals, nightclub tours, radio shows, and public service announcements--reached an estimated 20,000 youth during the past year, while thousands more are reached with brochures and mass media campaigns. Commercial sex workers and other high-risk behavior groups are targeted through US-Russia NGO partnerships that increase outreach and counseling skills.

FY 2000 saw renewed opportunity for socio-economic programs in Russia. President Putin re-energized policy development across a wide range of social and economic topics that directly affect Russia's urban areas. USAID provided numerous models of local reforms that directly shaped the development of the housing, communal services, land, real estate, and social components of the Gref Plan. Input was also provided for a new Housing Code, as well as for the next generation of housing, mortgage lending, real estate registration, and land use and zoning laws. At the local level, USAID's assistance supported the introduction of means-tested social assistance and competitive procurement of social services in four pilot cities. In the four Regional Initiative sites, USAID's Regional Public Finance activity worked with more than ten local administrations to introduce replicable models for modern, transparent budget analysis and implementation, as well as with examples of local treasury systems and transparent internet-based purchasing of municipal goods and services.

USAID currently supports 42 Russian NGOs that provide innovative services to prevent institutionalization of orphans and other at-risk children; almost 2,000 children and an equal number of families have been served by these NGOs. Community-based services enable such children to remain in families or learn skills for independent living. An example comes from Novgorod region, where a new Early Intervention Program trains parents of newborns to three-year-olds with developmental delays and disabilities, enabling them to keep these children with special needs at home. In this program, as in others, linkages to regional and municipal governments promote sustainability and broader child welfare policy reform.

Performance and Prospects:

Performance under this SO is meeting expectations; there are no significant differences between planned and actual performance. A year into implementation, several new activities

demonstrated considerable progress, demonstrating the appropriateness of USAID's strategies.

Greater opportunity exists to replicate successful models in women and infant's health and the orphans' program because of increasing global attention to the Russian population's basic needs and declining health, the demonstration value of successful programs, and greater receptivity of leaders and increased participation of civil society at the local level.

In early 2001, USAID's TB program expanded into the penitentiary systems in two of its three regions. The models will demonstrate a comprehensive approach needed for effective control of TB. This expansion doubled the case load of patients to be treated and monitored, and led USAID to engage with the Ministry of Justice in addition to the Ministry of Health. Treatment of multi-drug-resistant TB in one region will provide another crucial implementation model. That region will be a training site for TB authorities from other regions.

A 2000 assessment by a team of in-house and outside consultants of USAID's HIV/AIDS prevention strategy recommended that current activities be intensified. Success in persuading the Ministry of Health of the benefits of social marketing of condoms will pave the way for expanded activities in an additional region. CDC's Laboratory and Integrated Behavioral Risk Assessment for STIs/HIV in Various Groups of Population in Moscow will form the basis for outreach programs and clinical services for targeted populations. Recommendations from CDC on congenital syphilis engendered policy changes important for prenatal care in Russia.

As the principal bilateral donor in infectious disease, USAID expects its models for TB and HIV/AIDS/STI to be used in the design of a \$150 million World Bank loan. Under current projections, funds should be available in January 2002. USAID provided financial and technical inputs this year to ensure that the loan comes through. FY 2001 CSD funds, along with funds leveraged from other donors, will support implementation of this loan. Delays in this loan, however, have compounded concerns about the lack of high-level political leadership on HIV. USAID will continue to encourage stronger government commitment and will continue its support to NGOs. The leverage provided by the US-Russia Health Committee has been helpful on this and other issues, and USAID/Russia is urging the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to continue this bilateral mechanism for coordination and collaboration despite dissolution of the Binational Commission.

The economic transition of the 1990's resulted in steep declines in local budget revenue sources for Russian municipalities, making it difficult for cities to deliver services. The effectiveness of local government social goods and services depends to a great extent on the strength of its administrative capacity and on the effective use of its jurisdiction's resources. Since 1992, USAID has helped develop capacity by teaching cities to better assess and develop local resources and to find areas where efficiency can be improved. In FY 2000, USAID began a pilot project to help four municipalities change to a system of means-tested social services provided by private sector organizations. A baseline report, "Social Safety Nets at the Local Level in Russia: Case Studies of Four Cities," published in July 2000, was the first in-depth analysis of local social services in Russia. The World Bank and other donors are using this report to shape technical assistance.

As they struggle to prioritize the use of limited resources against far greater needs, local governments realize that the local population can play an active, productive role in the process. Up to 70% of Russian cities now publicize their budgets in the local media. More than 75% have adopted city charters in which formal procedures are established for public budget hearings. Roughly 15% have established public-private committees of citizens to discuss key urban issues. More than 7%, primarily capital or key industrial cities, are opening up detailed local financial plans and fiscal information to the public. This expanding participatory environment creates important new opportunities for USAID's urban socio-economic program.

USAID's Municipal Budgeting and Finance activities have supported replicable models of local fiscal reform. In FY 2000, we helped increase budget transparency through the design of improved budget planning and monitoring models, as well as new models of local treasury operations. USAID developed and tested a comprehensive analytical budget tool for the city of Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, now being replicated in more than ten cities in Tomsk and Samara, and an Internet-based municipal purchasing system to promote transparent, competitive procurements for public services.

A 1999 evaluation by a team of in-house and outside consultants of USAID's housing sector reform activities influenced USAID's strategy for 2001-2004. The strategy builds upon success in creating a consolidated approach for replicating programs in the Volga Federal District. This new approach takes advantage of synergies that exist across Mission activities, such as NGO support and business development, providing opportunities for more comprehensive implementation of reforms at the local level.

In FY 2001, USAID will help strengthen policy development skills in three Russian localities. Workshops will teach methods of policy analysis, evaluation, and development. USAID's expansion of activities in many smaller cities of the Volga River regions is a growing priority. These regions, with reform-minded administrations and strong potential for economic growth, present a great opportunity for large-scale demonstration of urban reform. USAID will create a Volga Region Urban Development Center to disseminate urban management and development models throughout Central Russia.

Possible Adjustments to Plans:

During FY 2000, USAID modified its results in response to program successes and potential areas of collaboration with Russian municipalities. During the coming year, USAID intends to modify its social sector results framework to more accurately capture the program's focus. USAID's current strategic planning introduces three new results that better fit our program's aims: strengthened local government capacity to develop and manage financial, human, and physical resources; increased willingness of local governments to operate transparently and in sustained partnership with their communities; and increased efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of social and communal goods and services. These results will increase local governments' capacity to mobilize resources and provide goods and services sustainably. To more accurately reflect the program's impact, we propose to report results in future R4s under two strategic objectives, one for health and another for local governance.

Several planned evaluations in FY 2001, including assessments of ARO, WIN, and a Continuing Evaluation Panel report on the health partnerships, will further guide programs.

Other Donor Programs:

In the Health sector, other U.S. Government agencies active under the Health Committee contribute both resources and results to this objective. The World Bank will become a major source of funding for infectious disease work and health sector reform; DFID and the Open Society Institute (OSI) are the other donors with significant programs in Health. UN agencies, such as World Health Organization, UNAIDS, UNICEF, and UNFPA are active in Russia, but do not command significant resources. USAID coordinates closely with these and other international implementers, often leveraging resources through joint efforts. In the Urban Socio-economic field, USAID maintains linkages with the World Bank, European Union (TACIS), United Nations Development Program, OSI, DFID, and International Labor Organization, which are active in local governance, social protection, public finance, communal service reform, environment, education, NGO support and small community development. While other donors focus on one, or several, of these issues, USAID is the only donor that is addressing urban-centered socio-economic reforms comprehensively by working with local governments to address all of the issues as a consolidated, strategic whole.

Major Contractors and Grantees:

USAID's major contractors and grantees remain John Snow Inc. for Women's and Infant's Health Project (WIN); the American International Health Alliance for health partnerships; WHO and CDC on TB; Population Services International on HIV/AIDS; Holt International Children's Services and Mercy Corps International for Assistance to Russian Orphans (ARO); and the Institute for Urban Economics and the Urban Institute on Community Socio-Economic Development activities.

**Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003**

Objective Name: Improved effectiveness of selected social benefits and services
 Objective ID: 118-032
 Approved: 1999-04 Country/Organization: USAID/Russia
 Result Name: . SO-level indicator
 Indicator: Tuberculosis treatment success rates in pilot sites
 Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Treatment success rate = (patients cured + patients completing treatment)/Total number of patients starting the treatment course

Year	Planned	Actual
1998(B)		Orel: 70% (B) Ivanovo:NA Vladimir: N/A
1999		Orel: 75% Ivanovo:~58% (B) Vladimir: N/A
2000	Orel:75%; Ivanovo:70%; Vladimir: TBD	TBD
2001	Orel: 75%; I vanovo: 75%; Vladimir: 70%	
2002	Orel: 80%; Ivanovo:75%; Vladimir: 75%	
2003	Orel: 80%; Ivanovo: 80%; Vladimir: 75%	

Source:

World Health Organization (WHO) and U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention program reports. Outcome data are only available six to nine months after treatment begins. 2000 results will be available in mid-2001.

Indicator/Description:

Based on current WHO definitions, the gold standard for treatment success rates in programs implemented in the former Soviet Union is 75%. Results and targets include only civilian portion of TB program, except for the Orel results, which include both civilian and prison populations.

Comments:

Approximately 80% of new infectious TB cases in Russia are men (WHO). Research on reasons for treatment default found no significant variance due to gender. Treatment success rates presented here do not differ based on gender.

(B) Baseline

**Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003**

Objective Name: Improved effectiveness of selected social benefits and services

Objective ID: 118-032

Approved: 1999-04

Country/Organization: USAID/Russia

Result Name: . SO-level indicator

Indicator: Reductions in repeat abortions in selected sites

Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Percentage of abortion clients who terminated a prior pregnancy by abortion within the last two years

Year	Planned	Actual
1999 (B)		41% (B)
2000	39%	TBD
2001	37%	
2002	35%	
2003	33%	

Source:

Women and Infant Health (WIN) program baseline facility surveys; program monitoring data from selected sites as interim measures prior to final impact surveys. Baseline survey data were finalized and published in late 2000. 2000 interim data will be available in the second quarter of 2001, given the lags in facility reporting, data analysis, and monitoring results.

Indicator/Description:

Percentage of repeat abortion clients who terminated a pregnancy by abortion within the previous two years. Although WIN does not conduct any abortion-related services, its interventions seek to reduce the use of abortions, particularly repeat abortions.

Comments:

Repeat abortions comprise a large percentage of the abortions conducted each year in Russia. Health risks to women increase with each abortion. The WIN program will focus on provision of family planning information and services to post-abortion clients in order to reduce the numbers of repeat abortions. Sites include WIN project sites in Novgorod and Perm.

(B) Baseline

**Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003**

Objective Name: Improved effectiveness of selected social benefits and services
 Objective ID: 118-032
 Approved: 1999-04 Country/Organization: USAID/Russia
 Result Name: 3.2.1 New approaches to service delivery adopted
 Indicator: Increased exclusive breastfeeding rate (0-3 month olds) in selected sites
 Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Number of infants 0 -3 months of age completed months of exclusive breastfeeding

Year	Planned	Actual
1999 (B)		3% (B)
2000	30%	TBD
2001	40%	
2002	50%	
2003	55%	

Source:

Women and Infant Health (WIN) program baseline facility surveys; program monitoring data from selected sites as interim measures prior to final impact surveys. Baseline survey data were finalized and published in late 2000. 2000 interim data will be available in the second quarter of 2001, given the lags in facility reporting, data analysis, and monitoring results.

Indicator/Description:

Exclusive breastfeeding reduces infant morbidity and mortality and reflects policy, organizational, and service delivery changes required to promote the practice addressed by WIN, including prenatal education on the benefits of breastfeeding, rooming-in, family-centered maternity care, and adaptation of evidence-based practices.

Comments:

Sites include WIN project sites in Novgorod and Perm.

(B) Baseline

**Performance Data Table
Fiscal Year: FY2003**

Objective Name: Improved effectiveness of selected social benefits and services
 Objective ID: 118-032
 Approved: 1999-04 Country/Organization: USAID/Russia
 Result Name: 3.2.3 Increased capacity of local governments to mobilize resources and provide goods and services on a sustainable basis
 Indicator: Number of communities with improved social assistance programs
 Disaggregated By:

Unit of Measure: Increase in the number of cities that have adopted means-testing and competitive procurement practices in the delivery of social benefits and/or communal services

Year	Planned	Actual
1999 (B)		0 (B)
2000	4	4
2001	8	
2002	20	
2003	45	

Source:
Monitoring surveys and evaluation reports from activity sites.

Indicator/Description:
Monitoring and evaluation exercise will test whether or not cities have been successful in introducing means-tested targeting of any social services beyond the currently tested housing subsidies, and whether or not cities have implemented competitive procurement practices for delivery of selected social services by local NGOs.

Comments:
Current sites comprising of “Improving Social Services Delivery Systems” activities in Novgorod, Tomsk, Arzamas, and Perm.

(B) Baseline

SO Text for SO: 118-041 Special initiatives

Country/Organization: USAID Russia

Objective ID: 118-041

Objective Name: Special initiatives

Self Assessment: Meeting Expectations

Primary Links to Agency Strategic Framework: **(Please Assign Percentages, Total Equals 100):**

- 100% 1.1 Critical private markets expanded and strengthened
- 0% 1.2 More rapid and enhanced agricultural development and food security encouraged
- 0% 1.3 Access to economic opportunity for the rural and urban poor expanded and made more equitable
- 0% 2.1 Rule of law and respect for human rights of women as well as men strengthened
- 0% 2.2 Credible and competitive political processes encouraged
- 0% 2.3 The development of politically active civil society promoted
- 0% 2.4 More transparent and accountable government institutions encouraged
- 0% 3.1 Access to quality basic education for under-served populations, especially for girls and women, expanded
- 0% 3.2 The contribution of host-country institutions of higher education to sustainable development increased
- 0% 4.1 Unintended and mistimed pregnancies reduced
- 0% 4.2 Infant and child health and nutrition improved and infant and child mortality reduced
- 0% 4.3 Deaths, nutrition insecurity, and adverse health outcomes to women as a result of pregnancy and childbirth reduced
- 0% 4.4 HIV transmission and the impact of the HIV/AIDS pandemic in developing countries reduced
- 0% 4.5 The threat of infectious diseases of major public health importance reduced
- 0% 5.1 Threat of global climate change reduced
- 0% 5.2 Biological diversity conserved
- 0% 5.3 Sustainable urbanization including pollution management promoted
- 0% 5.4 Use of environmentally sound energy services increased
- 0% 5.5 Sustainable management of natural resources increased
- 0% 6.1 Urgent needs in times of crisis met
- 0% 6.2 Personal security and basic institutions to meet critical intermediate needs and protect human rights re-established

Link to U.S. National Interests: Economic Prosperity

Primary Link to MPP Goals: Economic Development

Secondary Link to MPP Goals (optional):

(Page limitations for narrative begin here):

Summary of the SO:

Although not managed by USAID/Russia, this activity directly supports the U.S. Mission's goal of economic development and the U.S. national interests of economic prosperity and national security, as defined in the Mission's Performance Plan for FY 1999-2001.

The activities under this objective promote Russian economic recovery and strengthen U/S.- Russian commercial relations. The U.S. Russia Investment Fund (TUSRIF) is the only activity under this strategic objective. TUSRIF's programs also complement many of USAID/Russia's other activities. TUSRIF works with large businesses with better credit ratings while USAID/Russia's microfinance programs provide funding and training in basic business skills for very small businesses. Through a referral system, TUSRIF allows businesses in USAID/Russia's Small and Medium Enterprise program access to TUSRIF-supported credit facilities. TUSRIF's \$40 million program in the Russian Far East (RFE) includes \$11.4 million in direct investment and \$6.1 million in loans that complement USAID/Russia's RFE strategy.

TUSRIF was created in April 1995 by merging the Russian American Enterprise Fund (RAEF) and the Fund for Large Enterprises in Russia. In 1999, a private company, Delta Capital Management, was created to manage TUSRIF. In addition to its Moscow headquarters and New York office, Delta Capital has offices in Yekaterinburg (the Ural Mountains), Khabarovsk (the Russian Far East), Rostov-on-Don (southwest Russia), and St. Petersburg (Northwest Russia), and has representatives in Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk and Vladivostok.

Key Results:

As approved by AID/W in Spring 1999, the Mission has not developed an indicator for TUSRIF.

Performance and Prospects:

TUSRIF's objective is to create a more competitive and market-oriented private financial sector. It operates as an enterprise fund that supports the creation and growth of individual micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises.

The Fund's financial services program includes the Bank Partner Program, which makes loans to small businesses and residential mortgages to individuals through 49 branches of Russian partner banks; Delta Leasing, which finances equipment and automobile leases for small- and medium-sized businesses through four offices covering nine regions; and Delta Credit, Russia's first full-service mortgage broker. In August 2000 TUSRIF acquired a Moscow-based commercial bank, the Development and Reconstruction Bank (DRB). DRB's strategy is to attract a robust volume of fee-earning businesses in the corporate and personal sectors and to build a substantial direct loan portfolio.

As of December 31, 2000, TUSRIF had funded \$55 million in loans and mortgages through the Bank Partner Program to 2,500 small businesses and individuals; \$123 million in direct financing to 32 firms; and \$44 million for its financial services program. In addition to

capital, TUSRIF provides technical assistance in management, accounting, information systems, and marketing to the firms in its portfolio.

After the financial crisis of 1998 and throughout FY 1999, TUSRIF primarily made direct equity investments to companies already in its portfolio. In early 2000, with renewed faith in the economy, it began actively seeking new equity investments. Three new direct investments were concluded in 2000 and the pipeline of prospective investments is the best it has been in the history of the Fund. TUSRIF expects to become fully invested within three years by providing a broad spectrum of financial services, primarily to two industry groups: consumer products distribution and telecommunications, media, and technology. TUSRIF has made a credible case to USAID that it will need almost \$60 million in FY 2001 to finance this expected growth.

The Fund has a special mandate to invest \$40 million of its resources in the Russian Far East. As of December 31, 2000, direct investments in that region amounted to \$11.7 million and loans amounted to \$7.6 million. On a proportional basis, this total of \$17.5 million compares favorably to TUSRIF's disbursements to the rest of Russia.

Possible Adjustments to Plans:

None planned at this time.

Other Donor Programs:

Similar programs include the \$53 million Lower Volga Regional Venture Fund, one of 12 European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) Russian regional venture funds. Begun in 1993, this fund is part of an initiative agreed upon by the G-7 governments and the European Union at the Tokyo Summit in July 1993 to support small and medium enterprise development in Russia. The EBRD Russia Small Business Fund also came out of the Tokyo G-7 Summit. It provides small businesses with financial aid and strengthens the capacity of the Russian banking sector to effectively lend to small businesses.

Major Contractors and Grantees:

The U.S.-Russia Investment Fund (TUSRIF)

SO Text for SO: 118-042 Cross-cutting initiatives

Country/Organization: USAID Russia

Objective ID: 118-042

Objective Name: Cross-cutting initiatives

Self Assessment: Meeting Expectations

Primary Links to Agency Strategic Framework: **(Please Assign Percentages, Total Equals 100):**

- 0% 1.1 Critical private markets expanded and strengthened
- 0% 1.2 More rapid and enhanced agricultural development and food security encouraged
- 50% 1.3 Access to economic opportunity for the rural and urban poor expanded and made more equitable
- 25% 2.1 Rule of law and respect for human rights of women as well as men strengthened
- 0% 2.2 Credible and competitive political processes encouraged
- 10% 2.3 The development of politically active civil society promoted
- 0% 2.4 More transparent and accountable government institutions encouraged
- 0% 3.1 Access to quality basic education for under-served populations, especially for girls and women, expanded
- 0% 3.2 The contribution of host-country institutions of higher education to sustainable development increased
- 0% 4.1 Unintended and mistimed pregnancies reduced
- 0% 4.2 Infant and child health and nutrition improved and infant and child mortality reduced
- 0% 4.3 Deaths, nutrition insecurity, and adverse health outcomes to women as a result of pregnancy and childbirth reduced
- 10% 4.4 HIV transmission and the impact of the HIV/AIDS pandemic in developing countries reduced
- 0% 4.5 The threat of infectious diseases of major public health importance reduced
- 0% 5.1 Threat of global climate change reduced
- 0% 5.2 Biological diversity conserved
- 0% 5.3 Sustainable urbanization including pollution management promoted
- 0% 5.4 Use of environmentally sound energy services increased
- 0% 5.5 Sustainable management of natural resources increased
- 0% 6.1 Urgent needs in times of crisis met
- 5% 6.2 Personal security and basic institutions to meet critical intermediate needs and protect human rights re-established

Link to U.S. National Interests: Economic Prosperity

Primary Link to MPP Goals: Economic Development

Secondary Link to MPP Goals (optional):

(Page limitations for narrative begin here):

Summary of the SO:

USAID's cross-cutting initiatives address a wide array of long-term development needs and thus support many of the Mission's Strategic Objectives. Activities include program and project evaluations; socioeconomic surveys; support to Regional Reform Initiatives; training for NGO leaders, private entrepreneurs, and other Russians; and small grants to Russian organizations and their U.S. partners. The majority of this Strategic Objective's funding goes to a grants program administered by the Eurasia Foundation. Direct beneficiaries are NGO leaders, private entrepreneurs, independent media personnel, and other Russian citizens involved in reform.

These initiatives demonstrated tangible results in support to Russian reforms in FY 2000, and in FY 2001. we will continue the program.

Key Results:

Activities under Strategic Objective 4.2 are cross-cutting. Hence, no indicators are required.

Performance and Prospects:

Through participant training and human resource development, this strategic objective equipped Russian leaders and professionals with skills to guide the transition to a free market economy and democratic governance. Approximately 350 Russians (182 women and 168 men) participated in both U.S and in-country courses in economic and democratic reform. Key courses focussed on leadership development for NGOs, small business skills, business leadership, HIV/AIDs, domestic violence, environmental issues, and economic policy. In FY 2001, USAID plans to fund a three-year leadership training program that will feature modules for various organizational levels and will strengthen the capacity of local Russian training institutes.

In civil society/NGO strengthening, the Eurasia Foundation responded rapidly to needs identified by Russian citizens and institutions. The Foundation focuses on private enterprise development, public administration and policy, and civil society. By the end of October, it had awarded 70 grants in private enterprise development, 56 grants in public administration, and 192 grants in civil society. The grants are an effective way to help small projects in a timely way. For example, the Tomsk Business Support Partnership, together with a regional entrepreneurship fund, created a new loan guarantee fund. As a result, 16 projects worth more than \$250,000 received financial support through local commercial banks and regional funds for small business support. This infusion of funds created more than 150 jobs and doubled the volume of sales in the participant companies on average. In FY 2001, USAID will fund the Eurasia Foundation's ongoing program and will add a component of grants to rural credit cooperatives. A second component will be aimed at increasing the efficiency of the Unions of Entrepreneurs and enhancing its role in developing a self-regulating private sector.

In 2000 USAID continued to support Sustaining Partnerships into the Next Century (SPAN) by awarding 11 grants to U.S.-Russian partnership totaling \$1.8 million. SPAN's activities reinforce reform in health, environment, civil society and business development. More than

half of the beneficiaries are women, and according to an independent evaluation more than 80% of SPAN partnerships are sustainable. SPAN has improved the quality of life for average Russians and has fostered development in Russian communities. For example, a waste removal plan for Nizhny Tagil benefited the city's 450,000 residents. More than 9,000 Russians received training, support, or advocacy. Over 100 new hours of curricula and 47 new social work topics were developed. In 2001, USAID's support to SPAN will end.

USAID will launch a three-year, \$1.5 million activity to promote grassroots socioeconomic growth through U.S. and Russian Far East partner organizations. This activity will foster U.S.-RFE partnerships, improve the organizational capacity of RFE institutions, and strengthen relations with U.S. West Coast partners. USAID expects that these partnerships will integrate the RFE more fully into the Pacific Rim. In addition to this activity, several U.S.-Russian partnerships will expand their best practices to the regions of Volga Federal District.

Other activities also delivered solid results. Five USAID evaluations in areas ranging from sustainable partnerships to development of business skills improved ongoing and new programs. During FY 2001, evaluations of microfinance and orphans' assistance will allow USAID to amplify its program impact.

The Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Study makes objective, nationally valid information on economic, health, and other social conditions available to Russia. policymakers so that they can monitor the impact of economic and political reforms on Russian households over time. This ongoing activity will help develop a strong and sustained capacity for reliable data collection and dissemination in Russia. The U.S. Government's Regional Initiative focuses on reform-minded regions in Russia. More than ten other activities of limited duration and funding provide project development expertise, training, financial analysis, and staff support to the Mission's portfolio.

Possible Adjustments to Plans:

This strategic objective includes funds to give USAID the flexibility to respond to unexpected requests for such things as travel, analyses, and other activities of limited duration. Based on an evaluation of the training program conducted in October 2000, the program will have a tighter focus on supporting the Mission strategy and strengthening Russian training capabilities.

Other Donor Programs:

Other donors are actively engaged in participant training and grant-making. Donors that fund training include the British Know-How Fund and a wide range of donors, including Germany, France, Canada, Japan, and the Netherlands, involved in the Presidential Management Training Initiative. Donors that provide small grants include the Mott Foundation (civil rights and ethnic relations), the Ford Foundation (education, civil society, and media), the Soros Foundation (independent media and anti-corruption), EU-TACIS (health, democracy, small business development, economic development, agricultural development, and environment), the Open Society Institute (HIV/AIDs, child welfare, and primary health care), and the Canadian Embassy (fiscal reform). Finally, the Foreign Commercial Service and the State Department, as well as other U.S. government agencies in Russia, are heavily involved in the U.S. Government's Regional Initiative.

Major Contractors and Grantees:

USAID implements its activities under this strategic objective primarily through U.S.-based non-governmental organizations and contractors, including the Academy for Educational Development (Russian Training for Development), the Eurasia Foundation, and the University of North Carolina (Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey).

R4 Part III: Resource Request

Each year, the State Department's Coordinator for Assistance to the Newly Independent States and USAID management from the Europe and Eurasia Bureau review the Mission's entire program to ensure that USAID/Russia's activities are fully supportive of U.S. foreign policy goals. A key part of this process during FY 2001 was an intensive discussion of the current fiscal year budget, which was approved in late fall 2000. This approved budget often differs from prior R4 levels due to activity completions, strategy refinements, and unexpected developments in the Russian economic and political arenas. However, like the prior year R4 budgets, the approved budget for fiscal year 2001 encompasses the Mission's seven strategic areas below.

Expansion of the small and medium-sized enterprise sector is key to transformation of Russia into market-led democracy where all citizens have greater opportunities to improve their standard of living. Hence, the Mission continues its strong support in fiscal year 2001 for small and medium-sized businesses under Strategic Objective 1.3. This support reflects the strong performance of the sector, which continues to benefit from opportunities for import substitution due to the 1998 ruble devaluation. If more funds were available for this fiscal year and future years, the Mission would further finance its activity to strengthen Russian business support institutions to provide high quality services to small and medium-sized Russian entrepreneurs, particularly in the Russian Far East. We would also increase funds for microfinance in Russia's regions to enable more Russians entrepreneurs to improve their daily lives through business development.

The Russian government has launched an ambitious economic reform program with strong emphasis on good macroeconomic management. Supporting this initiative, Strategic Objective 1.4 funds key initiatives to improve Russia's economic, legal, and regulatory infrastructure. Solid overall performance had led the Mission to maintain substantive funding levels during fiscal year 2001. However, budget constraints, particularly in fiscal year 2002, required the Mission to eliminate an exciting program on corporate governance with local Russian organizations. This area, which plays a critical role in attracting increased local and foreign investment into the Russian economy, requires serious attention from both donors and the Russian Government.

The natural environment and business development are inextricably linked in Russia as improved capacity in environmental management translates directly into sustainable economic growth. Hence, highly successful environmental activities with local Russian organizations and businesses under Strategic Objective 1.6, particularly in the Russian Far East and Siberia, receive full Mission support during this fiscal year and following years. If more funding were available, particularly in fiscal year 2002, the Mission would provide greater funding for Russian-to-Russian environmental partnerships to promote environmental protection and fuel economic growth.

Civil society continues to be of paramount concern in Russia to many donors, with citizen participation in economic and political decision-making on the rise. Under Strategic Objective 2.1, USAID/Russia supports this vital area so critical for Russia's ongoing transition into a market-led democracy. Successful results from Mission activities in increasing NGO involvement in policy development, strengthening independent media, and promoting fair political processes are reflected in continuing strong budget levels through

fiscal year 2003. More funding, particularly in fiscal years 2002 and 2003, would allow for increased support to independent broadcast media, an area of increasing concern on the part of donors and the international community in Russia and abroad.

Rule of law is essential to increasing investor confidence in Russia. While it is unrealistic to expect significant progress in this area in the immediate term, the Mission program under Strategic Objective 2.2 has achieved significant progress in judicial reform, human rights, and corruption prevention. Robust funding levels through fiscal year 2003 for these interventions will continue to support U.S. foreign policy in this complex area.

Local level support for Russia's transition to a market-led economy is vital to the sustainability of political and economic reforms. Important Mission activities under Strategic Objective 3.2, which promote adoption of new approaches to resource management and service delivery at the community level, include tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS initiatives as well as regional urban economic development initiatives. The great need for and success of such activities, coupled with congressional earmarks, ensures continued funding for this strategic objective. However, budget constraints forced the Mission to downsize its social service delivery systems work during fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

Strategic Objectives 4.1 and 4.2 cover a wide range of activities. The U.S-Russian Enterprise Fund, which is not managed by the Mission, is the only activity under Strategic Objective 4.1. Under Strategic Objective 4.2, the Mission funds short-term projects, including activity and program evaluations, data collection and surveys, and participant training. The Mission also funds the Eurasia Foundation under Strategic Objective 4.2.

Pipeline analyses directly influence new funding levels. In this connection, the Mission has been conducting an intensive pipeline exercise to close old activities and ensure that budget figures accurately reflect financing requirements. As a result, the MACS portion of the overall Mission pipeline has decreased significantly since September 2000. At that time, the pipeline was approximately \$75 million. By December 2000, the pipeline had decreased to \$52 million, and at the end of March the pipeline was \$48 million, reflecting a 36% total decrease in the MACS pipeline.

The Mission plans to present the results of its ongoing pipeline exercise during the May R4 review in Washington, DC. This presentation based on updated pipeline figures will replace the analysis of pipelines by strategic objective as of September 30, 2000, which was requested in the R4 guidance. No major issues or budget changes are anticipated as most Mission activities are funded for two years or less and, therefore, would have pipelines well within the pipeline limits presented in ADS 602. However, select areas of concern such as the high pipeline for the Development Credit Authority activity will be addressed.

The pipelines on the R4 budget tables entitled "FY 2001 Budget Request by USAID/Russia" deserve special mention. The starting pipeline includes both NMS and MACS pipelines for USAID/Russia. However, the estimated expenditures for each strategic objective generally do not include NMS activities since AID/W performs the accounting for those activities. More specifically, the only NMS estimated expenditures included are: field support activities under Strategic Objective 3.2; The U.S.-Russian Enterprise Fund under Strategic Objective 4.1; and the Eurasia Foundation under Strategic Objective 4.2. This situation means that the

estimated expenditures under some strategic objectives on the R4 budget tables are artificially low, which creates an artificially high pipeline.

ENV Sub-Directive Amounts for FY 2001 Request

COUNTRY:						
S.O. # , Title	Total	Global climate change	Biodiversity	Environmentally sound energy	Urban and pollution prevention	resource management
SO 1:	0					
SO 2:	0					
SO 3:	0					
SO 4:	0					
SO 5:	0					
SO 6:	0					
SO 7:	0					
SO 8:	0					
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0	0	0	0

[List of Objective ID numbers](#)

ENV Sub-Directive Amounts for FY 2002 Request

COUNTRY:						
S.O. # , Title	Total	Global climate change	Biodiversity	Environmentally sound energy	Urban and pollution prevention	resource management
SO 1:	0					
SO 2:	0					
SO 3:	0					
SO 4:	0					
SO 5:	0					
SO 6:	0					
SO 7:	0					
SO 8:	0					
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0	0	0	0

[List of Objective ID numbers](#)

ENV Sub-Directive Amounts for FY 2002 Alternate Request

COUNTRY:						
S.O. # , Title	Total	Global climate change	Biodiversity	Environmentally sound energy	Urban and pollution prevention	resource management
SO 1:	0					
SO 2:	0					
SO 3:	0					
SO 4:	0					
SO 5:	0					
SO 6:	0					
SO 7:	0					
SO 8:	0					
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0	0	0	0

[List of Objective ID numbers](#)

ENV Sub-Directive Amounts for FY 2003 Request

COUNTRY:						
S.O. # , Title	Total	Global climate change	Biodiversity	Environmentally sound energy	Urban and pollution prevention	resource management
SO 1:	0					
SO 2:	0					
SO 3:	0					
SO 4:	0					
SO 5:	0					
SO 6:	0					
SO 7:	0					
SO 8:	0					
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0	0	0	0

[List of Objective ID numbers](#)

CSD Sub-Directive Amounts for FY 2001 Request

COUNTRY:									
S.O. # , Title	Total	Child Survival/Maternal Health			Vulnerable Children		Other Infectious Diseases*		
		Primary causes	Polio	Micronutrient	DCOF	HIV/AIDS	TB	Malaria	"Other"
SO 1:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 2:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 3:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 4:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 5:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 6:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 7:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 8:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
Total CSD	0	0	0				0	0	0
Total Other	0	0	0				0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0				0	0	0

Note: All funding for Malaria should now come from Infectious Diseases

CSD Sub-Directive Amounts for FY 2002 Request

COUNTRY:									
S.O. # , Title	Total	Child Survival/Maternal Health			Vulnerable Children		Other Infectious Diseases*		
		Primary causes	Polio	Micronutrients	DCOF	HIV/AIDS	TB	Malaria	"Other"
SO 1:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 2:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 3:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 4:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 5:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 6:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 7:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 8:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
Total CSD	0	0	0				0	0	0
Total Other	0	0	0				0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0				0	0	0

Note: All funding for Malaria should now come from Infectious Diseases

CSD Sub-Directive Amounts for FY 2002 Alternate Request

COUNTRY:									
S.O. # , Title	Total	Child Survival/Maternal Health			Vulnerable Children		Other Infectious Diseases*		
		Primary causes	Polio	Micronutrient	DCOF	HIV/AIDS	TB	Malaria	"Other"
SO 1:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 2:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 3:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 4:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 5:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 6:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 7:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 8:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
Total CSD	0	0	0				0	0	0
Total Other	0	0	0				0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0				0	0	0

Note: All funding for Malaria should now come from Infectious Diseases

CSD Sub-Directive Amounts for FY 2003 Request

COUNTRY:									
S.O. # , Title	Total	Child Survival/Maternal Health			Vulnerable Children		Other Infectious Diseases*		
		Primary causes	Polio	Micronutrient	DCOF	HIV/AIDS	TB	Malaria	"Other"
SO 1:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 2:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 3:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 4:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 5:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 6:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 7:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
SO 8:									
CSD	0								
Other	0								
	0	0	0				0	0	0
Total CSD	0	0	0				0	0	0
Total Other	0	0	0				0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0				0	0	0

Note: All funding for Malaria should now come from Infectious Diseases

FY 2001 Budget Request by USAID/Russia

Fiscal Year: 2001 Program/Country: USAID/Russia
 Approp: DA/CSD
 Scenario:

FY 2001 Request															
S.O. # , Title	Starting Pipeline	Total	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival & Maternal Health (*)	Other Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Vulnerable Children (*)	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of 2001
SO 118-0130: Accelerated Development and Growth of Private Enterprises															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0140: Improved Economic Infrastructure to Support Economic Growth															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0160: Increased Environmental Management Capacity to Support Sustainable Economic Growth															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0210: Increased Better Informed Citizens' Participation in Political and Economic Decision-Making															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0220: Strengthened Rule of Law and Respect for Human Rights															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0320: Improved Effectiveness of Selected Social Services and Benefits															
Bilateral	0	2,050	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400	650	0	0	0	1,200	850
Field Spt	0	1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	0	0	0	900	600
	0	3,550	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400	2,150	0	0	0	2,100	1,450
SO 118-0410: Special Initiatives															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0420: Cross-Cutting Programs															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral	0	2,050	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400	650	0	0	0	1,200	850
Total Field Support	0	1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	0	0	0	900	600
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	3,550	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400	2,150	0	0	0	2,100	1,450

FY 2001 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	3,550
Environment	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 2001 Account Distribution (DA only)	
DA Program Total	0
CSD Program Total	3,550
TOTAL	3,550

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)
 Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account.

FY 2002 Budget Request by USAID/Russia

Fiscal Year: 2002 Program/Country: USAID/Russia
 Approp: DA/CSD
 Scenario:

FY 2002 Request															
S.O. # , Title	Starting Pipeline	Total	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival & Maternal Health (*)	Other Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Vulnerable Children (*)	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of 2002
SO 118-0130: Accelerated Development and Growth of Private Enterprises															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0140: Improved Economic Infrastructure to Support Economic Growth															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO118-0160: Increased Environmental Management Capacity to Support Sustainable Economic Growth															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0210: Increased Better Informed Citizens' Participation in Political and Economic Decision-Making															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0220: Strengthened Rule of Law and Respect for Human Rights															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0320: Improved Effectiveness of Selected Social Services and Benefits															
Bilateral	850	2,050	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400	650	0	0	0	1,800	1,100
Field Spt	600	1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	0	0	0	1,500	600
	1,450	3,550	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400	2,150	0	0	0	3,300	1,700
SO 118-0410: Special Initiatives															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0420: Cross-Cutting Programs															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral	850	2,050	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400	650	0	0	0	1,800	1,100
Total Field Support	600	1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	0	0	0	1,500	600
TOTAL PROGRAM	1,450	3,550	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400	2,150	0	0	0	3,300	1,700

FY 2002 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	3,550
Environment	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 2002 Account Distribution (DA only)	
DA Program Total	0
CSD Program Total	3,550
TOTAL	3,550

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)
 Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account.

FY 2002 ALT Budget Request by Program/Country

Fiscal Year: 2002 ALT Program/Country:
 Approp: DA/CSD
 Scenario:

FY 2002 ALT Request															
S.O. # , Title	Starting Pipeline	Total	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival & Maternal Health (*)	Other Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Vulnerable Children (*)	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of 2002 ALT
SO 1: Successful Democratic Transition Including Free and Fair Elections															
Bilateral		0						0							0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 2: Successful Transition from Relief to Recovery Through a Community Reintegration Program															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 3:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 4:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 5:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 6:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 7:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 8:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Field Support	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FY 2002 ALT Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 2002 ALT Account Distribution (DA only)	
DA Program Total	0
CSD Program Total	0
TOTAL	0

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)
 Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account.

FY 2003 Budget Request by USAID/Russia

Fiscal Year: 2003 Program/Country: USAID/Russia
 Approp: DA/CSD
 Scenario:

FY 2003 Request															
S.O. # , Title	Starting Pipeline	Total	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival & Maternal Health (*)	Other Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Vulnerable Children (*)	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of 2003
SO 118-0130: Accelerated Development and Growth of Private Enterprises															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0140: Improved Economic Infrastructure to Support Economic Growth															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0160: Increased Environmental Management Capacity to Support Sustainable Economic Growth															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0210: Increased Better Informed Citizens' Participation in Political and Economic Decision-Making															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0220: Strengthened Rule of Law and Respect for Human Rights															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0320: Improved Effectiveness of Selected Social Services and Benefits															
Bilateral	1,100	2,050	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400	650	0	0	0	2,000	1,150
Field Spt	600	1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	0	0	0	1,500	600
	1,700	3,550	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400	2,150	0	0	0	3,500	1,750
SO 118-0410: Special Initiatives															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 118-0420: Cross-Cutting Programs															
Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral	1,100	2,050	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400	650	0	0	0	2,000	1,150
Total Field Support	600	1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	0	0	0	1,500	600
TOTAL PROGRAM	1,700	3,550	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400	2,150	0	0	0	3,500	1,750

FY 2003 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	3,550
Environment	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 2003 Account Distribution (DA only)	
DA Program Total	0
CSD Program Total	3,550
TOTAL	3,550

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)
 Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account.

FY 2001 Budget Request by Program/Country

Fiscal Year: 2001 Program/Country:
 Approp: ESF
 Scenario:

FY 2001 Request															
S.O. # , Title	Starting Pipeline	Total	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival & Maternal Health (*)	Other Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Vulnerable Children (*)	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of 2001
SO 1: Successful Democratic Transition Including Free and Fair Elections															
Bilateral		0						0							0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 2: Successful Transition from Relief to Recovery Through a Community Reintegration Program															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 3:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 4:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 5:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 6:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 7:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 8:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
Total Field Support	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0

FY 2001 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 2001 Account Distribution (DA only)	
DA Program Total	0
CSD Program Total	0
TOTAL	0

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)
 Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account.

FY 2002 Budget Request by Program/Country

Fiscal Year: 2002 Program/Country:
 Approp: ESF
 Scenario:

FY 2002 Request															
S.O. # , Title	Starting Pipeline	Total	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival & Maternal Health (*)	Other Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Vulnerable Children (*)	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of 2002
SO 1: Successful Democratic Transition Including Free and Fair Elections															
Bilateral		0						0							0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 2: Successful Transition from Relief to Recovery Through a Community Reintegration Program															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 3:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 4:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 5:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 6:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 7:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 8:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Field Support	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FY 2002 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 2002 Account Distribution (DA only)	
DA Program Total	0
CSD Program Total	0
TOTAL	0

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)
 Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account.

FY 2002 ALT Budget Request by Program/Country

Fiscal Year: 2002 ALT Program/Country:
 Approp: ESF
 Scenario:

FY 2002 ALT Request															
S.O. # , Title	Starting Pipeline	Total	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival & Maternal Health (*)	Other Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Vulnerable Children (*)	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of 2002 ALT
SO 1: Successful Democratic Transition Including Free and Fair Elections															
Bilateral		0						0							0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 2: Successful Transition from Relief to Recovery Through a Community Reintegration Program															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 3:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 4:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 5:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 6:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 7:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 8:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Field Support	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FY 2002 ALT Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 2002 ALT Account Distribution (DA only)	
DA Program Total	0
CSD Program Total	0
TOTAL	0

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)
 Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account.

FY 2003 Budget Request by Program/Country

Fiscal Year: 2003 Program/Country:
 Approp: ESF
 Scenario:

FY 2003 Request															
S.O. # , Title	Starting Pipeline	Total	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival & Maternal Health (*)	Other Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Vulnerable Children (*)	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of 2003
SO 1: Successful Democratic Transition Including Free and Fair Elections															
Bilateral		0						0							0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 2: Successful Transition from Relief to Recovery Through a Community Reintegration Program															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 3:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 4:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 5:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 6:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 7:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 8:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
Total Field Support	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0

FY 2003 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 2003 Account Distribution (DA only)	
DA Program Total	0
CSD Program Total	0
TOTAL	0

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)
 Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account.

FY 2001 Budget Request by USAID/Russia

Fiscal Year: 2001 Program/Country: USAID/Russia
 Approp: FSA
 Scenario:

FY 2001 Request															
S.O. # , Title	Starting Pipeline	Total	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival & Maternal Health (*)	Other Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Vulnerable Children (*)	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of 2001
SO 118-0130: Accelerated Development and Growth of Private Enterprises															
Bilateral	40,267	10,810	700	10,110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,750	39,327
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	40,267	10,810	700	10,110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,750	39,327
SO 118-0140: Improved Economic Infrastructure to Support Economic Growth															
Bilateral	4,581	8,196	0	8,196	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,900	5,877
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4,581	8,196	0	8,196	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,900	5,877
SO 118-0160: Increased Environmental Management Capacity to Support Sustainable Economic Growth															
Bilateral	5,475	6,960	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,960	0	8,850	3,585
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	5,475	6,960	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,960	0	8,850	3,585
SO 118-0210: Increased Better Informed Citizens' Participation in Political and Economic Decision-Making															
Bilateral	12,230	13,123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13,123	11,370	13,983
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	12,230	13,123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13,123	11,370	13,983
SO 118-0220: Strengthened Rule of Law and Respect for Human Rights															
Bilateral	3,684	2,978	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,978	3,310	3,352
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3,684	2,978	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,978	3,310	3,352
SO 118-0320: Improved Effectiveness of Selected Social Services and Benefits															
Bilateral	16,727	10,879	0	0	0	0	1,530	1,880	1,905	758	1,050	0	3,756	18,321	9,285
Field Spt	1,791	4,000	0	0	0	0	600	900	700	1,800	0	0	0	3,400	2,391
	18,518	14,879	0	0	0	0	2,130	2,780	2,605	2,558	1,050	0	3,756	21,721	11,676
SO 118-0410: Special Initiatives															
Bilateral	24,879	20,000	0	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17,000	27,879
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	24,879	20,000	0	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17,000	27,879
SO 118-0420: Cross-Cutting Programs															
Bilateral	12,859	14,054	0	5,614	0	1,940	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,500	12,010	14,903
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	12,859	14,054	0	5,614	0	1,940	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,500	12,010	14,903
Total Bilateral	120,702	87,000	700	43,920	0	1,940	1,530	1,880	1,905	758	1,050	6,960	26,357	89,511	118,191
Total Field Support	1,791	4,000	0	0	0	0	600	900	700	1,800	0	0	0	3,400	2,391
TOTAL PROGRAM	122,493	91,000	700	43,920	0	1,940	2,130	2,780	2,605	2,558	1,050	6,960	26,357	92,911	120,582

FY 2001 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	44,620
Democracy	26,357
HCD	1,940
PHN	11,123
Environment	6,960
GCC (from all Goals)	4,500

FY 2001 Account Distribution (DA only)	
DA Program Total	0
CSD Program Total	0
TOTAL	0

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)
 Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account.

FY 2002 Budget Request by USAID/Russia

Fiscal Year: 2002 Program/Country: USAID/Russia
 Approp: FSA
 Scenario:

FY 2002 Request															
S.O. # , Title	Starting Pipeline	Total	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival & Maternal Health (*)	Other Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Vulnerable Children (*)	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of 2002
SO 118-0130: Accelerated Development and Growth of Private Enterprises															
Bilateral	39,327	13,650	700	12,950	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,560	36,417
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	39,327	13,650	700	12,950	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,560	36,417
SO 118-0140: Improved Economic Infrastructure to Support Economic Growth															
Bilateral	5,877	7,200	0	7,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,000	4,077
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	5,877	7,200	0	7,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,000	4,077
SO 118-0160: Increased Environmental Management Capacity to Support Sustainable Economic Growth															
Bilateral	3,585	7,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,000	0	8,950	1,635
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3,585	7,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,000	0	8,950	1,635
SO 118-0210: Increased Better Informed Citizens' Participation in Political and Economic Decision-Making															
Bilateral	13,983	13,490	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13,490	14,520	12,953
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	13,983	13,490	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13,490	14,520	12,953
SO 118-0220: Strengthened Rule of Law and Respect for Human Rights															
Bilateral	3,352	3,880	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,880	5,420	1,812
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3,352	3,880	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,880	5,420	1,812
SO 118-0320: Improved Effectiveness of Selected Social Services and Benefits															
Bilateral	9,285	11,750	0	0	0	0	1,735	2,490	1,990	985	1,250	0	3,300	14,940	6,095
Field Spt	2,391	4,550	0	0	0	0	225	625	1,500	2,200	0	0	0	4,150	2,791
	11,676	16,300	0	0	0	0	1,960	3,115	3,490	3,185	1,250	0	3,300	19,090	8,886
SO 118-0410: Special Initiatives															
Bilateral	27,879	22,000	0	22,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,000	29,879
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	27,879	22,000	0	22,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,000	29,879
SO 118-0420: Cross-Cutting Programs															
Bilateral	14,903	13,480	0	5,255	0	1,725	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,500	14,542	13,841
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	14,903	13,480	0	5,255	0	1,725	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,500	14,542	13,841
Total Bilateral	118,191	92,450	700	47,405	0	1,725	1,735	2,490	1,990	985	1,250	7,000	27,170	103,932	106,709
Total Field Support	2,391	4,550	0	0	0	0	225	625	1,500	2,200	0	0	0	4,150	2,791
TOTAL PROGRAM	120,582	97,000	700	47,405	0	1,725	1,960	3,115	3,490	3,185	1,250	7,000	27,170	108,082	109,500

FY 2002 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	48,105
Democracy	27,170
HCD	1,725
PHN	13,000
Environment	7,000
GCC (from all Goals)	4,500

FY 2002 Account Distribution (DA only)	
DA Program Total	0
CSD Program Total	0
TOTAL	0

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)
 Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account.

FY 2002 ALT Budget Request by Program/Country

Fiscal Year: 2002 ALT Program/Country:
 Approp: FSA
 Scenario:

FY 2002 ALT Request															
S.O. # , Title	Starting Pipeline	Total	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival & Maternal Health (*)	Other Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Vulnerable Children (*)	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of 2002 ALT
SO 1: Successful Democratic Transition Including Free and Fair Elections															
Bilateral		0						0							0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 2: Successful Transition from Relief to Recovery Through a Community Reintegration Program															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 3:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 4:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 5:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 6:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 7:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 8:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Field Support	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FY 2002 ALT Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 2002 ALT Account Distribution (DA only)	
DA Program Total	0
CSD Program Total	0
TOTAL	0

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)
 Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account.

FY 2003 Budget Request by USAID/Russia

Fiscal Year: 2003 Program/Country: USAID/Russia
 Approp: FSA
 Scenario:

FY 2003 Request															
S.O. # , Title	Starting Pipeline	Total	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival & Maternal Health (*)	Other Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Vulnerable Children (*)	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of 2003
SO 118-0130: Accelerated Development and Growth of Private Enterprises															
Bilateral	36,417	12,320	700	11,620	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,170	34,567
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	36,417	12,320	700	11,620	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,170	34,567
SO 118-0140: Improved Economic Infrastructure to Support Economic Growth															
Bilateral	4,077	5,900	0	5,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,710	3,267
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4,077	5,900	0	5,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,710	3,267
SO 118-0160: Increased Environmental Management Capacity to Support Sustainable Economic Growth															
Bilateral	1,635	7,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,500	0	8,450	685
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1,635	7,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,500	0	8,450	685
SO 118-0210: Increased Better Informed Citizens' Participation in Political and Economic Decision-Making															
Bilateral	12,953	13,650	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13,650	16,480	10,123
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	12,953	13,650	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13,650	16,480	10,123
SO 118-0220: Strengthened Rule of Law and Respect for Human Rights															
Bilateral	1,812	4,380	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,380	4,450	1,742
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1,812	4,380	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,380	4,450	1,742
SO 118-0320: Improved Effectiveness of Selected Social Services and Benefits															
Bilateral	6,095	12,700	0	0	0	0	1,735	2,490	1,990	985	1,250	0	4,250	15,210	3,585
Field Spt	2,791	4,650	0	0	0	0	325	625	1,500	2,200	0	0	0	3,900	3,541
	8,886	17,350	0	0	0	0	2,060	3,115	3,490	3,185	1,250	0	4,250	19,110	7,126
SO 118-0410: Special Initiatives															
Bilateral	29,879	22,000	0	22,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,000	31,879
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	29,879	22,000	0	22,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,000	31,879
SO 118-0420: Cross-Cutting Programs															
Bilateral	13,841	13,900	0	5,175	0	2,225	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,500	14,088	13,653
Field Spt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	13,841	13,900	0	5,175	0	2,225	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,500	14,088	13,653
Total Bilateral	106,709	92,350	700	44,695	0	2,225	1,735	2,490	1,990	985	1,250	7,500	28,780	99,558	99,501
Total Field Support	2,791	4,650	0	0	0	0	325	625	1,500	2,200	0	0	0	3,900	3,541
TOTAL PROGRAM	109,500	97,000	700	44,695	0	2,225	2,060	3,115	3,490	3,185	1,250	7,500	28,780	103,458	103,042

FY 2003 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	45,395
Democracy	28,780
HCD	2,225
PHN	13,100
Environment	7,500
GCC (from all Goals)	4,500

FY 2003 Account Distribution (DA only)	
DA Program Total	0
CSD Program Total	0
TOTAL	0

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)
 Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account.

FY 2001 Budget Request by Program/Country

Fiscal Year: 2001 Program/Country:
 Approp: AEEB
 Scenario:

FY 2001 Request															
S.O. # , Title	Starting Pipeline	Total	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival & Maternal Health (*)	Other Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Vulnerable Children (*)	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of 2001
SO 1: Successful Democratic Transition Including Free and Fair Elections															
Bilateral		0						0							0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 2: Successful Transition from Relief to Recovery Through a Community Reintegration Program															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 3:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 4:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 5:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 6:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 7:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 8:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
Total Field Support	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0

FY 2001 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 2001 Account Distribution (DA only)	
DA Program Total	0
CSD Program Total	0
TOTAL	0

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)
 Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account.

FY 2002 Budget Request by Program/Country

Fiscal Year: 2002 Program/Country:
 Approp: AEEB
 Scenario:

FY 2002 Request															
S.O. # , Title	Starting Pipeline	Total	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival & Maternal Health (*)	Other Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Vulnerable Children (*)	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of 2002
SO 1: Successful Democratic Transition Including Free and Fair Elections															
Bilateral		0						0							0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 2: Successful Transition from Relief to Recovery Through a Community Reintegration Program															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 3:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 4:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 5:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 6:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 7:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 8:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
Total Field Support	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0

FY 2002 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 2002 Account Distribution (DA only)	
DA Program Total	0
CSD Program Total	0
TOTAL	0

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)
 Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account.

FY 2002 ALT Budget Request by Program/Country

Fiscal Year: 2002 ALT Program/Country:
 Approp: AEEB
 Scenario:

FY 2002 ALT Request															
S.O. # , Title	Starting Pipeline	Total	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival & Maternal Health (*)	Other Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Vulnerable Children (*)	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of 2002 ALT
SO 1: Successful Democratic Transition Including Free and Fair Elections															
Bilateral		0						0							0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 2: Successful Transition from Relief to Recovery Through a Community Reintegration Program															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 3:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 4:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 5:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 6:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 7:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 8:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
Total Field Support	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0

FY 2002 ALT Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 2002 ALT Account Distribution (DA only)	
DA Program Total	0
CSD Program Total	0
TOTAL	0

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)
 Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account.

FY 2003 Budget Request by Program/Country

Fiscal Year: 2003 Program/Country:
 Approp: AEEB
 Scenario:

FY 2003 Request															
S.O. # , Title	Starting Pipeline	Total	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival & Maternal Health (*)	Other Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Vulnerable Children (*)	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of 2003
SO 1: Successful Democratic Transition Including Free and Fair Elections															
Bilateral		0						0							0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 2: Successful Transition from Relief to Recovery Through a Community Reintegration Program															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 3:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 4:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 5:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 6:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 7:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 8:															
Bilateral		0													0
Field Spt		0													0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
Total Field Support	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0

FY 2003 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 2003 Account Distribution (DA only)	
DA Program Total	0
CSD Program Total	0
TOTAL	0

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)
 Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
 Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
 For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account.

Workforce and Operating Narrative and Tables

Introduction:

Total projected operating costs for target as well as request levels are estimated at \$5.5 million for Fiscal Year 01 and \$5.5 million in Fiscal Years 02 and 03. This is the same amount as was obligated in Fiscal Year 00. USAID/Russia feels it is able maintain comparable OE levels for the three years of this submission primarily due to the relatively constant, albeit decreasing, personnel levels and related support costs. Total OE personnel decreased to 73 in Fiscal Year 01 from 78 in Fiscal Year 00.

Analysis:

USPSC salaries will decrease because of the reduction of one off shore hire USPSC in Office of Financial Management. USDH levels are at 16 for Fiscal Year 01 and will be 16 in Fiscal Year 02. The Mission is anticipating a small increase in FSN salaries of about 3 percent in FY 02.

When USAID joined the Interagency Housing Board (IAHB) we anticipated decreased costs as a number of our staff moved into FBO-owned residences. While we have in fact occupied residences that are slated to be FBO owned, the Russian Government has yet to give the Embassy permission to complete the purchase. USAID is direct charged rents for those residences. As a result our average residential lease cost is higher than our average lease costs prior to joining the IAHB. In addition, the Embassy has been notified that rental costs in individual apartments located throughout the city will increase. Utility charges will also increase during the coming fiscal year.

The Post ICASS budget was decreased for this fiscal year resulting in a decreased ICASS payment by USAID. There has been no noticeable change in the services provided to USAID. The Embassy is trying to get an upward adjustment to the ICASS budget. At this time, we are uncertain about the outcome of the Embassy appeal. Therefore, we have left the ICASS budget at the projected level. We anticipate higher ICASS costs in FY 02 and the outlying years.

The Mission computer system is in good condition. Hardware costs are expected to be in line with routine replacement requirements unless we are required to make purchases for new Agency wide programs such as Phoenix. We will have to make some additional software purchases during the year. As for other NXP requirements, we will continue to replace residential furniture during the next fiscal year. Replacements for the motor pool will be limited in line with plans to reduce the size of the motorpool.

Washington and Overseas Workforce Tables

Org Russia (118) End of year On-Board								Total	Org.	Fin.	Admin.	Con-	All	Total	Total		
FY 2001 Estimate	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SpO1	SpO2	SO/SpO	Mgmt.	Mgmt	Mgmt	tract	Legal	Other	Mgmt.	Staff	
OE Funded: 1/																	
U.S. Direct Hire	4	1	2					7	4	1	1	1	1		8	15	
Other U.S. Citizens								0		2	1				3	3	
FSN/TCN Direct Hire								0							0	0	
Other FSN/TCN	2	1	1	2				6	3	11	32	1	1		48	54	
Subtotal	6	2	3	2	0	0	0	13	7	14	34	2	2	0	59	72	
Program Funded 1/																	
U.S. Citizens								7	2						2	9	
FSNs/TCNs	18	9	11	1				39	2	4	1				7	46	
Subtotal	20	12	13	1	0	0	0	46	4	4	1	0	0	0	9	55	
Total Direct Workforce	26	14	16	3	0	0	0	59	11	18	35	2	2	0	68	127	
TAACS								0								0	0
Fellows								0								0	0
NEPs								0								0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL WORKFORCE	26	14	16	3	0	0	0	59	11	18	35	2	2	0	68	127	

1/ Excludes TAACS, Fellows, and NEPs

Washington and Overseas Workforce Tables

Org Russia (118) End of year On-Board								Total SO/SpO	Org. Mgmt.	Fin. Mgmt	Admin. Mgmt	Con- tract	Legal	All Other	Total Mgmt.	Total Staff	
FY 2002 Target	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SpO1	SpO2										
OE Funded: 1/																	
U.S. Direct Hire	4	2	2					8	4	1	1	1	1		8	16	
Other U.S. Citizens								0		1	1				2	2	
FSN/TCN Direct Hire								0							0	0	
Other FSN/TCN	2	1	1	2				6	3	11	32	1	1		48	54	
Subtotal	6	3	3	2	0	0	0	14	7	13	34	2	2	0	58	72	
Program Funded 1/																	
U.S. Citizens	2	3	2					7	2						2	9	
FSNs/TCNs	18	9	11	1				39	2	4	1				7	46	
Subtotal	20	12	13	1	0	0	0	46	4	4	1	0	0	0	9	55	
Total Direct Workforce	26	15	16	3	0	0	0	60	11	17	35	2	2	0	67	127	
TAACS								0							0	0	
Fellows								0							0	0	
IDIs								0							0	0	
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL WORKFORCE	26	15	16	3	0	0	0	60	11	17	35	2	2	0	67	127	

1/ Excludes TAACS, Fellows, and NEPs

Washington and Overseas Workforce Tables

Org Russia (118) End of year On-Board FY 2003 Target	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SpO1	SpO2	Total SO/SpO Staff	Org. Mgmt.	Fin. Mgmt	Admin. Mgmt	Con- tract	Legal	All Other	Total Mgmt.	Total Staff
OE Funded: 1/																
U.S. Direct Hire	4	2	2					8	4	1	1	1	1		8	16
Other U.S. Citizens								0		1	1				2	2
FSN/TCN Direct Hire								0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN	2	1	1	2				6	3	11	32	1	1		48	54
Subtotal	6	3	3	2	0	0	0	14	7	13	34	2	2	0	58	72
Program Funded 1/																
U.S. Citizens	2	3	2					7	2						2	9
FSNs/TCNs	18	9	11	1				39	2	4	1				7	46
Subtotal	20	12	13	1	0	0	0	46	4	4	1	0	0	0	9	55
Total Direct Workforce	26	15	16	3	0	0	0	60	11	17	35	2	2	0	67	127
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows								0							0	0
IDIs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL WORKFORCE	26	15	16	3	0	0	0	60	11	17	35	2	2	0	67	127

1/ Excludes TAACS, Fellows, and NEPs

Washington and Overseas Workforce Tables

Org Russia (118) End of year On-Board FY 2003 Request	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SpO1	SpO2	Total SO/SpO Staff	Org. Mgmt.	Fin. Mgmt	Admin. Mgmt	Con- tract	Legal	All Other	Total Mgmt.	Total Staff
OE Funded: 1/																
U.S. Direct Hire	4	2	2					8	4	1	1	1	1		8	16
Other U.S. Citizens								0		1	1				2	2
FSN/TCN Direct Hire								0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN	2	1	1	2				6	3	11	32	1	1		48	54
Subtotal	6	3	3	2	0	0	0	14	7	13	34	2	2	0	58	72
Program Funded 1/																
U.S. Citizens	2	3	2					7	2						2	9
FSNs/TCNs	18	9	11	1				39	2	4	1				7	46
Subtotal	20	12	13	1	0	0	0	46	4	4	1	0	0	0	9	55
Total Direct Workforce	26	15	16	3	0	0	0	60	11	17	35	2	2	0	67	127
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows								0							0	0
IDIs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL WORKFORCE	26	15	16	3	0	0	0	60	11	17	35	2	2	0	67	127

1/ Excludes TAACS, Fellows, and NEPs

USDH Staffing Requirements by Backstop, FY 2001 - FY 2004

Mission: Russia (118)

please fill in mission name

Occupational Backstop (BS)	Number of USDH Employees in Backstop in:			
	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004

Senior Management				
SMG - 01	2	2	2	2

Program Management				
Program Mgt - 02	2	2	2	2
Project Dvpm Officer - 94				

Support Management				
EXO - 03	1	1	1	1
Controller - 04	1	1	1	1
Legal - 85	1	1	1	1
Commodity Mgt. - 92				
Contract Mgt. - 93	1	1	1	1

Sector Management				
Agriculture - 10 & 14				
Economics - 11	1	1	1	1
Democracy - 12	1	2	2	2
Food for Peace - 15				
Private Enterprise - 21	3	3	3	3
Engineering - 25				
Environment - 40 & 75				
Health/Pop. - 50	2	2	2	2
Education - 60				

Total	15	16	16	16
--------------	----	----	----	----

GDOs: If you have a position that is currently designated a BS-12 GDO, list that position under the occupational backstop that most closely reflects the skills needed for the position.
RUDOs: do not forget to include those who were in UE-funded RUDO positions.
 remaining **IDIs:** list under the occupational Backstop for the work they do.

Please e-mail this worksheet in Excel to: Maribeth Zankowski@HR.PPIM@aidw and to M. Cary Kauffman@HR.PPIM@aidw as well as include it with your R4 submission.

OPERATING EXPENSES

Org. Title: Russia		FY 2001 Estimate			FY 2002 Target			FY 2003 Target			FY 2003 Request		
Org. No: 118		Dollars	TF	Total									
OC													
11.1	Personnel compensation, full-time permanent	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.1	Base Pay & pymt. for annual leave balances - FNDH	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
	Subtotal OC 11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11.3	Personnel comp. - other than full-time permanent	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.3	Base Pay & pymt. for annual leave balances - FNDH	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
	Subtotal OC 11.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11.5	Other personnel compensation	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.5	USDH	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
11.5	FNDH	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
	Subtotal OC 11.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11.8	Special personal services payments	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.8	USPSC Salaries	307.2		307.2	124.6		124.6	126.6		126.6	126.6		126.6
11.8	FN PSC Salaries	1,091.2		1,091.2	1,122.9		1,122.9	1,173.2		1,173.2	1,173.2		1,173.2
11.8	IPA/Details-In/PASAs/RSSAs Salaries	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
	Subtotal OC 11.8	1,398.4	0.0	1,398.4	1,247.5	0.0	1,247.5	1,299.8	0.0	1,299.8	1,299.8	0.0	1,299.8
12.1	Personnel benefits	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	USDH benefits	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	Educational Allowances	263.9		263.9	303.6		303.6	415.2		415.2	415.2		415.2
12.1	Cost of Living Allowances	97.9		97.9	104.7		104.7	106.6		106.6	106.6		106.6
12.1	Home Service Transfer Allowances	1.9		1.9	5.1		5.1	7.1		7.1	7.1		7.1
12.1	Quarters Allowances	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
12.1	Other Misc. USDH Benefits	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0
12.1	FNDH Benefits	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	* Payments to FSN Voluntary Separation Fund - FNDH	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
12.1	Other FNDH Benefits	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
12.1	US PSC Benefits	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
12.1	FN PSC Benefits	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	* Payments to FSN Voluntary Separation Fund - FN PSC	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
12.1	Other FN PSC Benefits	301.9		301.9	304.3		304.3	318.0		318.0	318.0		318.0
12.1	IPA/Detail-In/PASA/RSSA Benefits	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
	Subtotal OC 12.1	675.6	0.0	675.6	727.7	0.0	727.7	856.9	0.0	856.9	856.9	0.0	856.9
13.0	Benefits for former personnel	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
13.0	FNDH	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
13.0	Severance Payments for FNDH	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
13.0	Other Benefits for Former Personnel - FNDH	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0

OPERATING EXPENSES

Org. Title: Russia		FY 2001 Estimate			FY 2002 Target			FY 2003 Target			FY 2003 Request		
Org. No: 118		Dollars	TF	Total									
OC													
13.0	FN PSCs	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
13.0	Severance Payments for FN PSCs	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
13.0	Other Benefits for Former Personnel - FN PSCs	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
	Subtotal OC 13.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21.0	Travel and transportation of persons	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21.0	Training Travel	30.0		30.0	30.0		30.0	30.0		30.0	30.0		30.0
21.0	Mandatory/Statutory Travel	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21.0	Post Assignment Travel - to field	10.5		10.5	10.5		10.5	18.0		18.0	18.0		18.0
21.0	Assignment to Washington Travel	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
21.0	Home Leave Travel	68.9		68.9	19.2		19.2	50.6		50.6	50.6		50.6
21.0	R & R Travel	26.5		26.5	29.8		29.8	19.2		19.2	19.2		19.2
21.0	Education Travel	4.2		4.2	2.2		2.2	2.2		2.2	2.2		2.2
21.0	Evacuation Travel	45.0		45.0	45.0		45.0	45.0		45.0	45.0		45.0
21.0	Retirement Travel	0.5		0.5	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
21.0	Pre-Employment Invitational Travel	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
21.0	Other Mandatory/Statutory Travel	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
21.0	Operational Travel	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21.0	Site Visits - Headquarters Personnel	30.0		30.0	30.0		30.0	30.0		30.0	30.0		30.0
21.0	Site Visits - Mission Personnel	60.0		60.0	60.0		60.0	50.0		50.0	50.0		50.0
21.0	Conferences/Seminars/Meetings/Retreats	30.0		30.0	30.0		30.0	30.0		30.0	30.0		30.0
21.0	Assessment Travel	1.8		1.8	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
21.0	Impact Evaluation Travel	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
21.0	Disaster Travel (to respond to specific disasters)	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
21.0	Recruitment Travel	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
21.0	Other Operational Travel	20.0		20.0	20.0		20.0	20.0		20.0	20.0		20.0
	Subtotal OC 21.0	327.4	0.0	327.4	276.7	0.0	276.7	295.0	0.0	295.0	295.0	0.0	295.0
22.0	Transportation of things	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
22.0	Post assignment freight	60.0		60.0	60.0		60.0	100.0		100.0	100.0		100.0
22.0	Home Leave Freight	40.4		40.4	20.2		20.2	30.0		30.0	30.0		30.0
22.0	Retirement Freight	19.6		19.6	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
22.0	Transportation/Freight for Office Furniture/Equip.	15.0		15.0	15.0		15.0	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0
22.0	Transportation/Freight for Res. Furniture/Equip.	3.5		3.5	3.5		3.5	3.5		3.5	3.5		3.5
	Subtotal OC 22.0	138.5	0.0	138.5	98.7	0.0	98.7	143.5	0.0	143.5	143.5	0.0	143.5
23.2	Rental payments to others	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Office Space	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Warehouse Space	41.4		41.4	41.4		41.4	41.4		41.4	41.4		41.4
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Residences	959.4		959.4	1,171.3		1,171.3	1,171.0		1,171.0	1,171.0		1,171.0

OPERATING EXPENSES

Org. Title: Russia Org. No: 118 OC												
	FY 2001 Estimate			FY 2002 Target			FY 2003 Target			FY 2003 Request		
	Dollars	TF	Total									
Subtotal OC 23.2	1,000.8	0.0	1,000.8	1,212.7	0.0	1,212.7	1,212.4	0.0	1,212.4	1,212.4	0.0	1,212.4
23.3 Communications, utilities, and miscellaneous charges	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
23.3 Office Utilities	4.0		4.0	9.0		9.0	9.0		9.0	9.0		9.0
23.3 Residential Utilities	189.0		189.0	180.0		180.0	180.0		180.0	180.0		180.0
23.3 Telephone Costs	81.0		81.0	83.5		83.5	81.0		81.0	81.0		81.0
23.3 IT Software Leases	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
23.3 IT Hardware Lease	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
23.3 Commercial Time Sharing	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
23.3 Postal Fees (Other than APO Mail)	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
23.3 Other Mail Service Costs	0.4		0.4	0.4		0.4	0.4		0.4	0.4		0.4
23.3 Courier Services	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0
Subtotal OC 23.3	284.4	0.0	284.4	282.9	0.0	282.9	280.4	0.0	280.4	280.4	0.0	280.4
24.0 Printing and Reproduction	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0
Subtotal OC 24.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	5.0
25.1 Advisory and assistance services	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.1 Studies, Analyses, & Evaluations	100.0		100.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.1 Management & Professional Support Services	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.1 Engineering & Technical Services	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
Subtotal OC 25.1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.2 Other services	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.2 Office Security Guards	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Residential Security Guard Services	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Official Residential Expenses	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Representation Allowances	2.4		2.4	2.4		2.4	2.4		2.4	2.4		2.4
25.2 Non-Federal Audits	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Grievances/Investigations	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Insurance and Vehicle Registration Fees	4.0		4.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0
25.2 Vehicle Rental	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Manpower Contracts	15.0		15.0	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0
25.2 Records Declassification & Other Records Services	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Recruiting activities	1.0		1.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Penalty Interest Payments	0.1		0.1	0.1		0.1	0.1		0.1	0.1		0.1
25.2 Other Miscellaneous Services	80.2		80.2	80.8		80.8	76.0		76.0	76.0		76.0
25.2 Staff training contracts	40.0		40.0	45.5		45.5	35.0		35.0	35.0		35.0
25.2 IT related contracts	38.0		38.0	40.0		40.0	30.0		30.0	30.0		30.0
Subtotal OC 25.2	180.7	0.0	180.7	176.8	0.0	176.8	151.5	0.0	151.5	151.5	0.0	151.5

OPERATING EXPENSES

Org. Title: Russia													
Org. No: 118													
OC	FY 2001 Estimate			FY 2002 Target			FY 2003 Target			FY 2003 Request			
	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	
25.3	Purchase of goods and services from Government accounts	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.3	ICASS	1,010.0		1,010.0		1,010.0	1,000.0		1,000.0	1,000.0		1,000.0	
25.3	All Other Services from Other Gov't. accounts	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
	Subtotal OC 25.3	1,010.0	0.0	1,010.0	1,010.0	0.0	1,010.0	1,000.0	0.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	0.0	1,000.0
25.4	Operation and maintenance of facilities	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.4	Office building Maintenance	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
25.4	Residential Building Maintenance	10.0		10.0	15.0		15.0	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0
	Subtotal OC 25.4	10.0	0.0	10.0	15.0	0.0	15.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	5.0
25.6	Medical Care	0.0		0.0		0.0							
	Subtotal OC 25.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.7	Operation/maintenance of equipment & storage of goods	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.7	IT and telephone operation and maintenance costs	0.0		0.0		0.0				0.0		0.0	
25.7	Storage Services	0.0		0.0		0.0				0.0		0.0	
25.7	Office Furniture/Equip. Repair and Maintenance	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0
25.7	Vehicle Repair and Maintenance	17.0		17.0	15.0		15.0	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0
25.7	Residential Furniture/Equip. Repair and Maintenance	0.2		0.2	1.0		1.0	0.5		0.5	0.5		0.5
	Subtotal OC 25.7	27.2	0.0	27.2	26.0	0.0	26.0	20.5	0.0	20.5	20.5	0.0	20.5
25.8	Substance & spt. of persons (by contract or Gov't.)	0.0		0.0		0.0				0.0		0.0	
	Subtotal OC 25.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
26.0	Supplies and materials	148.8		148.8	150.0		150.0	100.0		100.0	100.0		100.0
	Subtotal OC 26.0	148.8	0.0	148.8	150.0	0.0	150.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
31.0	Equipment	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
31.0	Purchase of Residential Furniture/Equip.	70.0		70.0	125.0		125.0	50.0		50.0	50.0		50.0
31.0	Purchase of Office Furniture/Equip.	36.2		36.2	36.0		36.0	20.0		20.0	20.0		20.0
31.0	Purchase of Vehicles	0.0		0.0	23.0		23.0	12.0		12.0	12.0		12.0
31.0	Armoring of Vehicles	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
31.0	Purchase of Printing/Graphics Equipment	12.0		12.0	12.0		12.0	8.0		8.0	8.0		8.0
31.0	IT Hardware purchases	50.0		50.0	50.0		50.0	30.0		30.0	30.0		30.0
31.0	IT Software purchases	25.0		25.0	25.0		25.0	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0
	Subtotal OC 31.0	193.2	0.0	193.2	271.0	0.0	271.0	130.0	0.0	130.0	130.0	0.0	130.0
32.0	Lands and structures	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		

Organization: Russia (118)

Foreign National Voluntary Separation Account									
Action	FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
	OE	Program	Total	OE	Program	Total	OE	Program	Total
Deposits			0.0			0.0			0.0
Withdrawals			0.0			0.0			0.0

Local Currency Trust Funds - Regular				
	FY 2001 Estimate	FY 2002 Target	FY 2003 Target	FY 2003 Request
Balance Start of Year				
Obligations				
Deposits				
Balance End of Year	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Exchange Rate _____

Local Currency Trust Funds - Real Property				
	FY 2001 Estimate	FY 2002 Target	FY 2003 Target	FY 2003 Request
Balance Start of Year				
Obligations				
Deposits				
Balance End of Year	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Exchange Rate _____

Cost of Controller Operations

Org. Title: Russia		FY 2001 Estimate			FY 2002 Target			FY 2003 Target			FY 2003 Request		
Org. No: 118		Dollars	TF	Total									
OC													
11.1	Personnel compensation, full-time permanent	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.1	Base Pay & pymt. for annual leave balances - FNDH	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0
	Subtotal OC 11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11.3	Personnel comp. - other than full-time permanent	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.3	Base Pay & pymt. for annual leave balances - FNDH	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0
	Subtotal OC 11.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11.5	Other personnel compensation	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.5	USDH	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0
11.5	FNDH	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0
	Subtotal OC 11.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11.8	Special personal services payments	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.8	USPSC Salaries	158.9		158.9	59.3		59.3	61.2		61.2	61.2		61.2
11.8	FN PSC Salaries	255.9		255.9	261.3		261.3	267.9		267.9	267.9		267.9
11.8	IPA/Details-In/PASAs/RSSAs Salaries	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
	Subtotal OC 11.8	414.8	0.0	414.8	320.6	0.0	320.6	329.1	0.0	329.1	329.1	0.0	329.1
12.1	Personnel benefits	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	USDH benefits	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	Educational Allowances	17.9		17.9	35.8		35.8	36.5		36.5	36.5		36.5
12.1	Cost of Living Allowances	8.6		12.8	8.8		8.8	8.8		8.8	8.8		8.8
12.1	Home Service Transfer Allowances	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
12.1	Quarters Allowances	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
12.1	Other Misc. USDH Benefits	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
12.1	FNDH Benefits	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	* Payments to FSN Voluntary Separation Fund - FNDH	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
12.1	Other FNDH Benefits	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
12.1	US PSC Benefits	10.8		10.8	4.5		4.5	4.7		4.7	4.7		4.7
12.1	FN PSC Benefits	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	* Payments to FSN Voluntary Separation Fund - FN PSC	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
12.1	Other FN PSC Benefits	76.5		76.5	78.0		78.0	79.7		79.7	79.7		79.7
12.1	IPA/Detail-In/PASA/RSSA Benefits	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
	Subtotal OC 12.1	113.8	0.0	118.0	127.1	0.0	127.1	129.7	0.0	129.7	129.7	0.0	129.7
13.0	Benefits for former personnel	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
13.0	FNDH	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
13.0	Severance Payments for FNDH	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
13.0	Other Benefits for Former Personnel - FNDH	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0

Cost of Controller Operations

Org. Title: Russia		FY 2001 Estimate			FY 2002 Target			FY 2003 Target			FY 2003 Request		
Org. No: 118		Dollars	TF	Total									
OC													
13.0	FN PSCs	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
13.0	Severance Payments for FN PSCs	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
13.0	Other Benefits for Former Personnel - FN PSCs	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
	Subtotal OC 13.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21.0	Travel and transportation of persons	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21.0	Training Travel	7.0		10.0	15.0		15.0		15.0		15.0		15.0
21.0	Mandatory/Statutory Travel	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21.0	Post Assignment Travel - to field	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
21.0	Assignment to Washington Travel	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
21.0	Home Leave Travel	22.2		22.2	0.0		0.0		6.0		6.0		6.0
21.0	R & R Travel	0.0		0.0	4.0		4.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
21.0	Education Travel	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
21.0	Evacuation Travel	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
21.0	Retirement Travel	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
21.0	Pre-Employment Invitational Travel	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
21.0	Other Mandatory/Statutory Travel	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
21.0	Operational Travel	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21.0	Site Visits - Headquarters Personnel	12.0		12.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
21.0	Site Visits - Mission Personnel	1.0		1.0	1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0
21.0	Conferences/Seminars/Meetings/Retreats	8.2		8.2	8.0		8.0		8.0		8.0		8.0
21.0	Assessment Travel	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
21.0	Impact Evaluation Travel	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
21.0	Disaster Travel (to respond to specific disasters)	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
21.0	Recruitment Travel	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
21.0	Other Operational Travel	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
	Subtotal OC 21.0	50.4	0.0	53.4	28.0	0.0	28.0	30.0	0.0	30.0	30.0	0.0	30.0
22.0	Transportation of things	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
22.0	Post assignment freight	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
22.0	Home Leave Freight	11.5		11.5	0.0		0.0		5.0		5.0		5.0
22.0	Retirement Freight	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
22.0	Transportation/Freight for Office Furniture/Equip.	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
22.0	Transportation/Freight for Res. Furniture/Equip.	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
	Subtotal OC 22.0	11.5	0.0	11.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	5.0
23.2	Rental payments to others	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Office Space	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Warehouse Space	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Residences	143.6		143.6	95.6		95.6		95.6		95.6		95.6

Cost of Controller Operations

Org. Title: Russia Org. No: 118 OC												
	FY 2001 Estimate			FY 2002 Target			FY 2003 Target			FY 2003 Request		
	Dollars	TF	Total									
Subtotal OC 23.2	143.6	0.0	143.6	95.6	0.0	95.6	95.6	0.0	95.6	95.6	0.0	95.6
23.3 Communications, utilities, and miscellaneous charges	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
23.3 Office Utilities	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
23.3 Residential Utilities	11.5		11.5	11.5		11.5	11.5		11.5	11.5		11.5
23.3 Telephone Costs	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
23.3 IT Software Leases	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
23.3 IT Hardware Lease	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
23.3 Commercial Time Sharing	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
23.3 Postal Fees (Other than APO Mail)	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
23.3 Other Mail Service Costs	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
23.3 Courier Services	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
Subtotal OC 23.3	11.5	0.0	11.5	11.5	0.0	11.5	11.5	0.0	11.5	11.5	0.0	11.5
24.0 Printing and Reproduction			0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
Subtotal OC 24.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.1 Advisory and assistance services	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.1 Studies, Analyses, & Evaluations	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.1 Management & Professional Support Services	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.1 Engineering & Technical Services	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
Subtotal OC 25.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.2 Other services	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.2 Office Security Guards	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Residential Security Guard Services	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Official Residential Expenses	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Representation Allowances	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Non-Federal Audits	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Grievances/Investigations	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Insurance and Vehicle Registration Fees	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Vehicle Rental	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Manpower Contracts	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Records Declassification & Other Records Services	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Recruiting activities	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Penalty Interest Payments	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Other Miscellaneous Services	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 Staff training contracts	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
25.2 IT related contracts	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
Subtotal OC 25.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Cost of Controller Operations

Org. Title: Russia Org. No: 118 OC		FY 2001 Estimate			FY 2002 Target			FY 2003 Target			FY 2003 Request		
		Dollars	TF	Total									
25.3	Purchase of goods and services from Government accounts	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.3	ICASS	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
25.3	All Other Services from Other Gov't. accounts	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
	Subtotal OC 25.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
25.4	Operation and maintenance of facilities	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.4	Office building Maintenance	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
25.4	Residential Building Maintenance	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
	Subtotal OC 25.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
25.6	Medical Care	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
	Subtotal OC 25.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
25.7	Operation/maintenance of equipment & storage of goods	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.7	IT and telephone operation and maintenance costs	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
25.7	Storage Services	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
25.7	Office Furniture/Equip. Repair and Maintenance	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
25.7	Vehicle Repair and Maintenance	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
25.7	Residential Furniture/Equip. Repair and Maintenance	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
	Subtotal OC 25.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
25.8	Substance & spt. of persons (by contract or Gov't.)	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
	Subtotal OC 25.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
26.0	Supplies and materials	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
	Subtotal OC 26.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
31.0	Equipment	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
31.0	Purchase of Residential Furniture/Equip.	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
31.0	Purchase of Office Furniture/Equip.	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
31.0	Purchase of Vehicles	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
31.0	Armoring of Vehicles	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
31.0	Purchase of Printing/Graphics Equipment	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
31.0	IT Hardware purchases	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
31.0	IT Software purchases	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
	Subtotal OC 31.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
32.0	Lands and structures	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		

Accessing Global Bureau Services Through Field Support and Buy-Ins

Objective Name	Field Support and Buy-Ins: Activity Title & Number	Priority *	Duration	Estimated Funding (\$000)			
				FY 2002		FY 2003	
				Obligated by:		Obligated by:	
Operating Unit	Global Bureau	Operating Unit	Global Bureau				
118-0320	AIDSMARK HRN-A-00-97-00021-00	High	2 years		1,700		1,700
118-0320	Applied Res. In CS Services -QA II HRN-C-00-96-90013-02	Medium-High	2 years		500		500
118-0320	CDC IAA AAG-P-00-99-00006	High	2 years		1,500		1,500
118-0320	POPTECH HRN-C-00-00-0007	High	2 years		100		200
118-0320	Synergy (DMELLD) HRN-C-00-99-00005-00	High	2 years		500		500
118-0320	CEDPA/TAACS HRN-C-00-98-00006-00	High	2 years		250		250
GRAND TOTAL.....					4,550		4,650

* For Priorities use high, medium-high, medium, medium-low, low

USAID Costs as ICASS Service Provider

Org. Title: Russia		FY 2001 Estimate			FY 2002 Target			FY 2003 Target			FY 2003 Request		
Org. No: 118		Dollars	TF	Total									
OC													
11.1	Personnel compensation, full-time permanent	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.1	Base Pay & pymt. for annual leave balances - FNDH			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
	Subtotal OC 11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11.3	Personnel comp. - other than full-time permanent	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.3	Base Pay & pymt. for annual leave balances - FNDH			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
	Subtotal OC 11.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11.5	Other personnel compensation	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.5	USDH			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
11.5	FNDH			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
	Subtotal OC 11.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11.8	Special personal services payments	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.8	USPSC Salaries			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
11.8	FN PSC Salaries			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
11.8	IPA/Details-In/PASAs/RSSAs Salaries			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
	Subtotal OC 11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12.1	Personnel benefits	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	USDH benefits	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	Educational Allowances			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
12.1	Cost of Living Allowances			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
12.1	Home Service Transfer Allowances			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
12.1	Quarters Allowances			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
12.1	Other Misc. USDH Benefits			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
12.1	FNDH Benefits	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	Payments to FSN Voluntary Separation Fund - FNDH			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
12.1	Other FNDH Benefits			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
12.1	US PSC Benefits			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
12.1	FN PSC Benefits	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	Payments to FSN Voluntary Separation Fund - FN PSC			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
12.1	Other FN PSC Benefits			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
12.1	IPA/Detail-In/PASA/RSSA Benefits			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
	Subtotal OC 12.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13.0	Benefits for former personnel	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
13.0	FNDH	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
13.0	Severance Payments for FNDH			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
13.0	Other Benefits for Former Personnel - FNDH			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0

USAID Costs as ICASS Service Provider

Org. Title: Russia		FY 2001 Estimate			FY 2002 Target			FY 2003 Target			FY 2003 Request		
Org. No: 118		Dollars	TF	Total									
OC													
13.0	FN PSCs	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
13.0	Severance Payments for FN PSCs			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
13.0	Other Benefits for Former Personnel - FN PSCs			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
	Subtotal OC 13.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21.0	Travel and transportation of persons	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21.0	Training Travel			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	Mandatory/Statutory Travel	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21.0	Post Assignment Travel - to field			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	Assignment to Washington Travel			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	Home Leave Travel			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	R & R Travel			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	Education Travel			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	Evacuation Travel			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	Retirement Travel			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	Pre-Employment Invitational Travel			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	Other Mandatory/Statutory Travel			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	Operational Travel	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21.0	Site Visits - Headquarters Personnel			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	Site Visits - Mission Personnel			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	Conferences/Seminars/Meetings/Retreats			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	Assessment Travel			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	Impact Evaluation Travel			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	Disaster Travel (to respond to specific disasters)			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	Recruitment Travel			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
21.0	Other Operational Travel			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
	Subtotal OC 21.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
22.0	Transportation of things	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
22.0	Post assignment freight			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
22.0	Home Leave Freight			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
22.0	Retirement Freight			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
22.0	Transportation/Freight for Office Furniture/Equip.			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
22.0	Transportation/Freight for Res. Furniture/Equip.			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
	Subtotal OC 22.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
23.2	Rental payments to others	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Office Space			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Warehouse Space			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Residences			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0

USAID Costs as ICASS Service Provider

Org. Title: Russia Org. No: 118 OC												
	FY 2001 Estimate			FY 2002 Target			FY 2003 Target			FY 2003 Request		
	Dollars	TF	Total									
Subtotal OC 23.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
23.3 Communications, utilities, and miscellaneous charges	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
23.3 Office Utilities			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
23.3 Residential Utilities			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
23.3 Telephone Costs			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
23.3 IT Software Leases			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
23.3 IT Hardware Lease			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
23.3 Commercial Time Sharing			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
23.3 Postal Fees (Other than APO Mail)			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
23.3 Other Mail Service Costs			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
23.3 Courier Services			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
Subtotal OC 23.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
24.0 Printing and Reproduction			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
Subtotal OC 24.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.1 Advisory and assistance services	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.1 Studies, Analyses, & Evaluations			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.1 Management & Professional Support Services			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.1 Engineering & Technical Services			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
Subtotal OC 25.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.2 Other services	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.2 Office Security Guards			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.2 Residential Security Guard Services			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.2 Official Residential Expenses			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.2 Representation Allowances			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.2 Non-Federal Audits			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.2 Grievances/Investigations			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.2 Insurance and Vehicle Registration Fees			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.2 Vehicle Rental			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.2 Manpower Contracts			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.2 Records Declassification & Other Records Services			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.2 Recruiting activities			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.2 Penalty Interest Payments			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.2 Other Miscellaneous Services			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.2 Staff training contracts			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.2 IT related contracts			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
Subtotal OC 25.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

USAID Costs as ICASS Service Provider

Org. Title: Russia Org. No: 118 OC		FY 2001 Estimate			FY 2002 Target			FY 2003 Target			FY 2003 Request		
		Dollars	TF	Total									
25.3	Purchase of goods and services from Government accounts	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.3	ICASS			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.3	All Other Services from Other Gov't. accounts			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
	Subtotal OC 25.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.4	Operation and maintenance of facilities	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.4	Office building Maintenance			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.4	Residential Building Maintenance			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
	Subtotal OC 25.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.6	Medical Care			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
	Subtotal OC 25.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.7	Operation/maintenance of equipment & storage of goods	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
25.7	IT and telephone operation and maintenance costs			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.7	Storage Services			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.7	Office Furniture/Equip. Repair and Maintenance			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.7	Vehicle Repair and Maintenance			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
25.7	Residential Furniture/Equip. Repair and Maintenance			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
	Subtotal OC 25.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.8	Substance & spt. of persons (by contract or Gov't.)			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
	Subtotal OC 25.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
26.0	Supplies and materials			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
	Subtotal OC 26.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
31.0	Equipment	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
31.0	Purchase of Residential Furniture/Equip.			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
31.0	Purchase of Office Furniture/Equip.			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
31.0	Purchase of Vehicles			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
31.0	Armoring of Vehicles			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
31.0	Purchase of Printing/Graphics Equipment			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
31.0	IT Hardware purchases			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
31.0	IT Software purchases			0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0
	Subtotal OC 31.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
32.0	Lands and structures	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		

**Washington Offices/Bureaus
Operating Expenses**

Office/Bureau: <input type="text"/>		FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2003
OC	Object Class Code Title	Estimate	Target	Target	Request
11.8	Special personal services payments				
	U.S. PSCs				
	IPA/Details-In/PASAs/RSSAs Salaries				
	Subtotal OC 11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12.1	Personnel Benefits				
	U.S. PSCs - Benefits				
	IPA/Details-In/PASAs/RSSAs Benefits				
	Subtotal OC 12.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21.0	Travel and transportation of persons				
	Training Travel				
	Operational Travel				
	Site Visits - Headquarters Personnel				
	Site Visits - Mission Personnel				
	Conferences/Seminars/Meetings/Retreats				
	Assessment Travel				
	Impact Evaluation Travel				
	Disaster Travel (to respond to specific disasters)				
	Recruitment Travel				
	Other Operational Travel				
	Subtotal OC 21.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
23.3	Communications, Utilities, and Miscellaneous Charges				
	Commercial Time Sharing				
	Other Communications, Util, and Misc. Charges				
	Subtotal OC 23.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
24.0	Printing & Reproduction				
	Subscriptions & Publications				
	Other Printing and Reproduction				
	Subtotal OC 24.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.1	Advisory and assistance services				
	Studies, Analyses, & Evaluations				
	Management & Professional Support Services				
	Engineering & Technical Services				
	Subtotal OC 25.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.2	Other services				
	Non-Federal Audits				
	Grievances/Investigations				
	Manpower Contracts				
	Staff training contracts				
	Other Miscellaneous Services				
	Subtotal OC 25.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.3	Purchase of goods and services from Government accounts				
	DCAA Audits				
	HHS Audits				
	All Other Federal Audits				
	Reimbursements to Other USAID Accounts				
	All Other Services from other Gov't. Agencies				
	Subtotal OC 25.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.7	Operation & Maintenance of Equipment & Storage				
25.8	Subsistence and support of persons (contract or Gov't.)				
26.0	Supplies and Materials				
31.0	Equipment				
	IT Software Purchases				
	IT Hardware Purchases				
	Other Equipment Purchases				
	Subtotal OC 31.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Subtotal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Additional Object Class Codes (If Required)					
Total Other Object Class Codes		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Budget		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Information Annex Topic: Environmental Impact

As currently planned, the Mission will conduct an Initial Environmental Examination (IEE) of its new FOREST Project under Strategic Objective 1.6. If necessary, a full environmental assessment may be completed.

All current activities should be in compliance with their corresponding IEEs and Environmental Assessments. The Mission's new environmental officer will ensure that this compliance is current.

Mission staff will receive detailed training on 22 CFR 216 from the Europe and Eurasia Bureau Environmental Officer during FY 00.

Information Annex Topic: E&E R4 Detailed Budget Information

USAID/RUSSIA BUDGET PLANNING MATRIX FOR FY 2001
As of April 9, 2001
BY SO

Proj/ Comp	SO #	Strategic Objective	IMPLEMENTOR	95 no-year	FY 00 Carry-over	FY 01 NOA	FY 01 Total Budget	FY01 NOA RI	FY 02 NOA	FY 03 NOA
	1.3	Accelerated dev of private enterprises		\$0	\$1,335	\$10,810	\$12,145	\$5,615	\$13,650	\$12,320
	1.4	Robust financial sector		\$0	\$441	\$8,196	\$8,637	\$1,806	\$7,200	\$5,900
	1.6	Reductions in environmental pollution		\$0	\$2,540	\$6,960	\$9,500	\$5,250	\$7,000	\$7,500
	2.1	Increased participation of informed citizens		\$0	\$1,151	\$13,123	\$14,274	\$3,194	\$13,490	\$13,650
	2.2	Rule of law		\$0	\$944	\$2,978	\$3,922	\$594	\$3,880	\$4,380
	3.2	More effective social services		\$100	\$845	\$14,879	\$15,824	\$4,790	\$16,300	\$17,350
	4.1	Special Initiatives		\$0	\$15,000	\$20,000	\$35,000		\$22,000	\$22,000
	4.2	Cross-Cutting Programs		\$0	\$714	\$14,054	\$14,768	\$841	\$13,480	\$13,900
		TOTAL - INCLUDING ENT FUNDS AND EURASIA		\$100	\$22,970	\$91,000	\$114,070	\$22,090	\$97,000	\$97,000
		TOTAL - W/O ENT FUNDS AND EURASIA		\$100	\$7,970	\$61,000	\$69,070		\$65,000	\$65,000
		SO 1.3 Accelerated development and growth of private enterprises		\$0	\$1,335	\$10,810	\$12,145	\$5,615	\$13,650	\$12,320
		<i>Business Development</i>								
0005	1.3	Integrated Russian Business Services	TBD	\$0	\$320	\$1,275	\$1,595	\$130	\$1,300	\$1,700
0005	1.3	Integrated Russian Business Services	TBD	\$0	\$320	\$1,275	\$1,595	\$130	\$1,300	\$1,700
0005	1.3	Integrated Russian Business Services	TBD						\$0	\$1,000
0005	1.3	Policy Advocacy	TBD	\$0	\$0	\$350	\$350		\$350	\$350
0005	1.3	SBWG Action Plan Implementation	AMM/SBA	\$0	\$85	\$165	\$250		\$300	\$300
0005	1.3	PRARI/ Regional Investment Centers	Abt Associates	\$0	\$0	\$350	\$350	\$30	\$350	\$350
0005	1.3	MAC/Rural Credit Coops Development	ACDI/VOCA	\$0	\$0	\$350	\$350	\$45	\$350	\$350
		<i>Micro Credit</i>								
0005	1.3	Micro Credit Sakhalin	ACDI/VOCA	\$0	\$70	\$400	\$470	\$400	\$1,200	\$600
0005	1.3	Microfinance Sector Support	TBD	\$0	\$0	\$800	\$800	\$300	\$800	\$1,100
0005	1.3	Samara Microfinance Program	FINCA	\$0	\$0	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$1,800	\$900
0005	1.3	Micro Credit Khabarovsk	Counterpart	\$0	\$0	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$200	\$0
0005	1.3	RI: Regional Micro-Credit Program/T	FINCA	\$0	\$0	\$550	\$550	\$550	\$1,800	\$1,600
		<i>Management Training</i>								
0005	1.3	Regional Small Business Development	UAA/ARC	\$0	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000
0005	1.3	Chukotka Proposal	UAA/ARC	\$0	\$0	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$0
0005	1.3	Training for Managers	AMM	\$0	\$0	\$250	\$250	\$30	\$250	\$250
0005	1.3	Business practices	Junior Achievemen	\$0	\$0	\$200	\$200	\$50	\$200	\$200

USAID/RUSSIA BUDGET PLANNING MATRIX FOR FY 2001

As of April 9, 2001

BY SO

Proj/ Comp	SO #	Strategic Objective	IMPLEMENTOR	95 no-year	FY 00 Carry-over	FY 01 NOA	FY 01 Total Budget	FY01 NOA RI	FY 02 NOA	FY 03 NOA
		<i>Trade and Investment</i>								
0005	1.3	RI:Innovative Technologies Program	AMM	\$0	\$0	\$250	\$250	\$250	\$0	\$0
0005	1.3	E-Commerce Center	AmCham	\$0	\$0	\$140	\$140		\$0	\$0
0005	1.3	ABC Sakhalin	FRAEC	\$0	\$260	\$0	\$260	\$100	\$0	\$0
0005	1.3	Development Credit Authority-Subsi	TBD	\$0	\$0	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$0	\$0
0005	1.3	Development Credit Authority/LPG-f	Price Waterhouse	\$0	\$0	\$100	\$100	\$50	\$100	\$100
0005	1.3	LPG-Subsidy	TBD	\$0	\$0	\$350	\$350	\$150	\$0	\$0
0005		<i>Administrative, Other</i>								
0005	1.3	Program Management	PSCs	\$0	\$280	\$605	\$885		\$850	\$820

USAID/RUSSIA BUDGET PLANNING MATRIX FOR FY 2001
As of April 9, 2001
BY SO

Proj/ Comp	SO #	Strategic Objective	IMPLEMENTOR	95 no-year	FY 00 Carry-over	FY 01 NOA	FY 01 Total Budget	FY01 NOA RI	FY 02 NOA	FY 03 NOA
SO 1.4 Improved economic infrastructure to support market-orient				\$0	\$441	\$8,196	\$8,637	\$1,806	\$7,200	\$5,900
0005	1.4	RFE: Alaska Sakhalin Working Group	DCED	\$0	\$0	\$306	\$306	\$306	\$400	\$400
0005	1.4	RI: International Accounting Standards	Carana	\$0	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$0	\$0
0005	1.4	International Accounting Standards	AmCham	\$0	\$100	\$0	\$100		\$0	\$0
<i>Fiscal reform</i>										
0009	1.4	Intergovernmental Fiscal Reform	Deloitte&Touche	\$0	\$0	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$50	\$1,000	\$1,000
<i>Economic Institutions</i>										
0009	1.4	Institutional Strengthening	Gaidar Institute	\$0	\$0	\$1,100	\$1,100		\$1,350	\$0
0009	1.4	Institutional Strengthening	MPSF	\$0	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$50	\$0	\$0
0009	1.4	Independent Policy Experts	TBD	\$0	\$0	\$500	\$500		\$500	\$500
0009	1.4	Think Tank Program	TBD						\$1,000	\$1,000
<i>Financial Sector Reform</i>										
0009	1.4	IACC Bank Supervision	DAI	\$0	\$0	\$850	\$850		\$950	\$1,000
0009	1.4	Commercial banks	IFC	\$0	\$300	\$0	\$300		\$0	\$0
0009	1.4	Financial/monetary system	FSVC	\$0	\$0	\$1,400	\$1,400	\$400	\$1,400	\$1,400
<i>Administrative, Other</i>										
0009	1.4	Program management	PSCs	\$0	\$41	\$540	\$581		\$600	\$600
SO 1.6 Increased environmental mngmnt capacity to support sus				\$0	\$2,540	\$6,960	\$9,500	\$5,250	7,000	7,500
0003	1.6	CFC Initiative	World Bank (W)	\$0	\$2,500	\$0	\$2,500			
0003	1.6	Replication of Lessons Learned (RO)	ISC	\$0	\$0	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$1,250	2,500	3,000
0003	1.6	Forest Resources and Technologies	Winrock Internation	\$0	\$0	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	4,000	4,000
<i>Administrative, Other</i>										
0003	1.6	Program management	PSCs	\$0	\$40	\$460	\$500		500	500

USAID/RUSSIA BUDGET PLANNING MATRIX FOR FY 2001
As of April 9, 2001
BY SO

Proj/ Comp	SO #	Strategic Objective	IMPLEMENTOR	95 no-yea	FY 00 Carry-over	FY 01 NOA	FY 01 Total Budget	FY01 NOA RI	FY 02 NOA	FY 03 NOA
SO 2.1 Increased, citizen's participation in political and economic				\$0	\$1,151	\$13,123	\$14,274	\$3,194	\$13,490	\$13,650
		<i>Political Processes</i>								
0007	2.1	Electoral Support	IESD	\$0	\$0	\$250	\$250		\$300	\$450
0007	2.1	Political Process/ NGO support	IRI	\$0	\$0	\$400	\$400	\$100	\$1,100	\$750
0007	2.1	Political Process/ local participation	NDI	\$0	\$400	\$750	\$1,150	\$187	\$750	\$750
0007	2.1	Democratic Leader Training/ Follow	MSPS	\$0	\$0	\$250	\$250		\$200	\$250
0007	2.1	NGO Coalition	Voice						\$150	\$150
		<i>Civil Society</i>								
0007	2.1	NGO Sector Support	IREX	\$0	\$40	\$2,210	\$2,250	\$230	\$1,690	\$2,000
0007	2.1	Women's NGO Support	Women's Consortiu	\$0	\$0	\$100	\$100		\$100	\$100
0007	2.1	Anti-Trafficking	TBD	\$0	\$0	\$500	\$500	\$120	\$500	\$500
0007	2.1	Institutional Development	CNGOS	\$0	\$133	\$67	\$200		\$200	\$200
0007	2.1	RFE NGO Support	ISAR	\$0	\$0	\$650	\$650	\$650	\$800	\$800
0007	2.1	Labor Union Support	ACILS	\$0	\$0	\$850	\$850	\$40	\$1,000	\$1,000
0007	2.1	Crisis Centers	TBD						\$200	\$200
		<i>Independent Media</i>								
0007	2.1	Print Media	TBD	\$0	\$377	\$1,498	\$1,875	\$56	\$1,000	\$1,000
0007	2.1	Broadcast Media	Internews	\$0	\$0	\$2,700	\$2,700	\$311	\$2,000	\$2,000
		<i>Partnerships</i>								
0007	2.1	PARTNER	TBD	\$0	\$0	\$500	\$500		\$1,000	\$1,000
0007	2.1	RFE Partnerships	TBD	\$0	\$0	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500
		<i>Administrative, Other</i>								
0007	2.1	Program management	PSCs	\$0	\$201	\$898	\$1,099		\$1,000	\$1,000

USAID/RUSSIA BUDGET PLANNING MATRIX FOR FY 2001
As of April 9, 2001
BY SO

Proj/ Comp	SO #	Strategic Objective	IMPLEMENTOR	95 no-year	FY 00 Carry-over	FY 01 NOA	FY 01 Total Budget	FY01 NOA RI	FY 02 NOA	FY 03 NOA
SO 2.2 Strengthened rule of law and respect for human rights				\$0	\$944	\$2,978	\$3,922	\$594	\$3,880	\$4,380
		<i>Judicial Reform</i>								
0007	2.2	Judicial Reform	TBD	\$0	\$560	\$640	\$1,200	\$85	\$1,200	\$1,400
0007	2.2	Legal Reform	ABA/CEELI	\$0	\$90	\$570	\$660	\$240	\$800	\$0
0007	2.2	Legal Reform	TBD						\$400	\$1,000
		<i>Human Rights</i>								
0007	2.2	Human Rights	Moscow Helsinki Gr	\$0	\$0	\$500	\$500	\$35		
0007	2.2	Human Rights	Sakharov Center	\$0	\$73	\$57	\$130			
0007	2.2	Human Rights Program	TBD						\$500	\$800
		<i>Corruption Prevention</i>								
0007	2.2	Anti-Corruption Follow' on	TBD	\$0	\$181	\$619	\$800	\$150		
0007	2.2	Anti-Corruption: NGO Grants	Eurasia	\$0	\$0	\$250	\$250	\$84		
0007	2.2	Anti-Corruption Program	TBD						\$600	\$800
		<i>USAID program management</i>								
0007	2.2	Program management	PSCs	\$0	\$40	\$342	\$382		\$380	\$380

USAID/RUSSIA BUDGET PLANNING MATRIX FOR FY 2001
As of April 9, 2001
BY SO

Proj/ Comp	SO #	Strategic Objective	IMPLEMENTOR	95 no-year	FY 00 Carry-over	FY 01 NOA	FY 01 Total Budget	FY01 NOA RI	FY 02 NOA	FY 03 NOA
SO 3.2 Improved effectiveness of selected social services and				\$100	\$845	\$14,879	\$15,824	\$4,790	\$16,300	\$17,350
<i>Health Partnerships</i>										
0004	3.2	PHC Community Partnerships	AIHA	\$100	\$0	\$1,500	\$1,600	\$800	\$2,500	\$2,500
0004	3.2	HIV/AIDS Partnerships	G-PSI/AIDSMARK	\$0	\$0	\$500	\$500		\$700	\$700
<i>Health Reform</i>										
0004	3.2	Quality Assurance 1/Treatment	G-URC	\$0	\$0	\$700	\$700		\$500	\$500
0004	3.2	Quality Assurance 2/ Education	HHS/AHCPR	\$0	\$0	\$300	\$300		\$300	\$300
0004	3.2	Quality Assurance 3/ Training	TBD	\$0	\$200	\$0	\$200		\$0	\$0
0004	3.2	Legal Reform	BU	\$0	\$0	\$100	\$100		\$0	\$0
<i>Infectious Disease</i>										
0004	3.2	HiV/AIDS - Social marketing	G-PSI/AIDSMARK	\$0	\$0	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$50	\$1,000	\$1,000
0004	3.2	AIDS Follow on	TBD	\$0	\$0	\$200	\$200		\$500	\$500
0004	3.2	STD Treatment and Prevention	G/CDC	\$0	\$0	\$300	\$300		\$500	\$500
0004	3.2	TB control	WHO	\$0	\$0	\$1,150	\$1,150		\$1,000	\$1,000
0004	3.2	TB control	G/CDC	\$0	\$0	\$200	\$200		\$500	\$500
0004	3.2	TB control	G/CDC/TBD	\$0	\$350	\$200	\$550		\$500	\$500
<i>Orphans</i>										
0004	3.2	Assistance to Russian Orphans	Holt International	\$0	\$0	\$1,400	\$1,400	\$400	\$1,500	\$1,500
0004	3.2	Assistance to Russian Orphans	Mercy Corps Intl.	\$0	\$0	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$1,000	\$1,000
<i>Women's Reproductive Health</i>										
0004	3.2	Women and Infant Health	John Snow	\$0	\$0	\$1,550	\$1,550	\$1,000	\$1,500	\$1,500
0004	3.2	Women's advocacy	G-NPR	\$0	\$0	\$300	\$300		\$0	\$0
0004	3.2	WIN Assessment	G-LTG Associates	\$0	\$0	\$150	\$150			
<i>Policy Development and Implementation</i>										
0008	3.2	Policy Fellows/Local Policy Skills De	Urban Institute	\$0	\$0	\$650	\$650	\$250	\$300	\$300
<i>Social Sector Restructuring</i>										
0008	3.2	Social Service Delivery Systems Pilg	Urban Institute	\$0	\$0	\$300	\$300	\$100	\$0	\$0
0008	3.2	Social Service Delivery Systems: Vo	TBD	\$0	\$0	\$750	\$750	\$500	\$850	\$1,300
<i>Urban Economic Development</i>										
0008	3.2	Regional Urban Development Cente	IUE	\$0	\$0	\$750	\$750	\$275	\$800	\$1,300
0008	3.2	Regional Public Finance	RTI	\$0	\$0	\$300	\$300	\$325	\$0	\$0
0008	3.2	Municipal Budgeting and Finance:	TBD	\$0	\$0	\$500	\$500	\$390	\$800	\$800
<i>Administrative, Other</i>										
0004	3.2	Strategic Planning	G-LTG Associates/I	\$0	\$100	\$100	\$200		\$100	\$200
0004	3.2	Program Management	PSCs	\$0	\$150	\$673	\$823		\$900	\$900
0008	3.2	Program Management	PSCs	\$0	\$45	\$506	\$551		\$550	\$550

USAID/RUSSIA BUDGET PLANNING MATRIX FOR FY 2001

As of April 9, 2001

BY SO

Proj/ Comp	SO #	Strategic Objective	IMPLEMENTOR	95 no-yea	FY 00 Carry-over	FY 01 NOA	FY 01 Total Budget	FY01 NOA RI	FY 02 NOA	FY 03 NOA
SO 4.1 Special Initiatives				\$0	\$15,000	\$20,000	\$35,000		\$22,000	\$22,000
0011	4.1	Russian American Enterprise Fund	TUSRIF	\$0	\$15,000	\$20,000	\$35,000		\$22,000	\$22,000
SO 4.2 Cross-cutting Programs				\$0	\$714	\$14,054	\$14,768	\$841	\$13,480	\$13,900
0001	4.2	PD & S	Various	\$0	\$265	\$430	\$695		\$565	\$565
0001	4.2	PD & S: Financial Management	TBD	\$0	\$0	\$200	\$200		\$0	\$0
0001	4.2	PD & S: Evaluations	TBD	\$0	\$20	\$653	\$673		\$420	\$420
0001	4.2	PD & S: RI Coordination	TBD	\$0	\$145	\$145	\$290	\$145	\$220	\$220
0001	4.2	PD & S: RLMS	UNC	\$0	\$0	\$686	\$686		\$550	\$470
0012	4.2	Training for Development	AED	\$0	\$260	\$1,740	\$2,000	\$696	\$1,500	\$2,000
0010	4.2	Eurasia Grants	Eurasia	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000		\$10,000	\$10,000
		<i>Administrative, Other</i>								
0012	4.2	Program management	PSCs	\$0	\$24	\$200	\$224		\$225	\$225

Information Annex Topic: Global Climate Change

Reducing the Negative Impacts Of Global Climate Change in FY 00.

USAID/Russia implements a comprehensive climate change program to preserve and expand Russia's globally important carbon sink, and to reduce carbon emissions. This program builds upon our successful natural resources and biodiversity program implemented in the Russian Far East since 1993, and our activities in pollution prevention, which are replicated through the ROLL activity. In the forestry sector, programs focus on forest fire prevention, pest control, reforestation, and forestry policy. In protected areas management, the primary focus is on protecting and expanding Russia's nature reserves through the introduction of innovative financing mechanisms, including environmental education and eco-tourism programs. To support the sustainable use of non-timber and timber products, USAID implements an eco-business program, which generates employment in the region, while also improving the sustainable use of harvested natural resources.

Major accomplishments during the past year include the following:

In the forestry sector, USAID continues to be a pioneer in sustainable forestry management. Officials in Khabarovsk Krai report that, in the past year, out-of-control forest fires have been reduced by 25% because radio and fire-fighting equipment purchased last year by USAID enables them to detect the fires within the first 24 hours and quickly contain them.

USAID's comprehensive reforestation program in Khabarovsk Krai continues to be used as the model for artificial reforestation in regions in the Russian Far East and Siberia. As a result, in Khabarovsk Krai reforestation efforts are now substantially exceeding the amount of timber being cut in the region. USAID-sponsored greenhouses are now self-sustainable and producing 2.5 million seedlings per year.

The Special Initiative to Eliminate Ozone-Depletion Substances (ODS) provides compensation to seven Russian companies for the permanent closure of their production facilities. In March of 2000 Russia stopped the importation of ODS, and in December the permanent production ban came into effect. In FY 2001, USAID intends to obligate \$2.5 million as a final US contribution to the \$27 million multilateral trust fund for the special initiative.

USAID continues to focus on eco-tourism activities aimed at generating much needed revenues to better protect Russia's nature reserves, national parks, and refuges represented mainly by forest ecosystems. In the RFE, nine grants totaling approximately \$150,000 were provided to protected areas in order to improve their basic infrastructure for hosting a modest number of eco-tourists, as well as for marketing, training, and developing educational materials for eco-tourism development. The revenues will be primarily used for biodiversity conservation by patrolling protected areas, forest fire prevention and suppression, and other purposes. In addition, in cooperation with the World Wildlife Fund, USAID continued a small grants program and provided funding (grants averaging \$4,000) to 30 organizations to strengthen the protected areas network and preserve biodiversity in the RFE.

Through the Replication of Lessons Learned activity, nearly 38 grants totaling more than \$1 million were completed by Russian organizations to replicate successful activities to prevent destruction of the carbon sink. Activities included introduction of technologies reducing

greenhouse gas emissions, education of forest fire-fighters, implementation of experimental prescribed fire burns and reforestation, development of regional forestry codes, adoption of "green accounting" practices, land use management, sustainable use of forest products, biodiversity conservation and eco-tourism development. While results of the individual grant activities are significant, more important is the cumulative effect of these successful replication activities. For example, with USAID support, the regional forestry service and government administration in Krasnoyarski Krai drafted and held public review of the regional forestry code. The code will be shortly submitted to the Krai Duma for official approval. This regional forest code clarifies the division of authorities and responsibilities between the Federation and the Krai in terms of ownership, oversight, use and management of forest resources. This legal document, when adopted, may play an important role if the process of forest privatization is started in Russia.

During this past year, work also continued on preserving the non-timber and forest resources of the Russian Far East. In coordination with the Institute for Sustainable Communities, targeted grants for the amount of \$205,000 were provided to 10 small businesses to purchase modest amounts of equipment to introduce new product lines or improve production. As a result, profits have increased, thus generating employment in the region. These activities have resulted in the introduction of environmentally sustainable business practices as well benefits for disadvantaged groups including indigenous peoples, the elderly, and an association for the blind.

FY00 Climate Change Reporting Guidance - Data Tables

Please fill in the YELLOW cells to complete the table.

Table 1.0 - Background Information

Country, Region, Office, or Program Reporting:	
Name of person(s) & IR Teams completing tables:	
Name #1:	Carol Pierstorff
SO Team Name and number1:	SO 1.6 Increased Environmental Management Capacity to support sustainable economic growth
Name #2:	Lyudmila Vikhrova
SO Team Name and number2:	SO 1.6 Increased Environmental Management Capacity to support sustainable economic growth
Name #3:	Yuriy Kazakov
SO Team Name and number3:	SO 1.6 Increased Environmental Management Capacity to support sustainable economic growth
Contact information	
Address (1):	USAID/RUSSIA
Address (2):	Embassy of the United States of America
Street:	Novinsky Boulevard 19/23
City, Address Codes:	121099 Moscow , Russian Federation
Telephone number:	7-095-728-5000, ext 5960
Fax number:	7-095-960-2147
Email address:	cpierstorff@usaid.gov
Other relevant information:	

FY00 Reporting Units participating in the Climate Change Initiative

AFR/SD – CARPE	LAC/RSD
AFR/SD – FEWS	Lithuania
Albania	Macedonia
Armenia	Madagascar
Bangladesh	Malawi
Bolivia	Mali
Brazil	Mexico
Bulgaria	Moldova
CEE Regional	Mozambique
Central America (G-CAP)	Nepal
Central Asia Republics	Nicaragua
East Asia Environmental Initiative	NIS Regional
Ecuador	Panama
EGAD	Paraguay
Egypt	Peru
G/ENV/EET	Philippines
G/ENV/ENR	Poland
G/ENV/GCC	RCSA
G/ENV/UP	Romania

Please fill in the YELLOW cells to complete the table.

TABLE 1.1

Result 1: Increased Participation in the UNFCCC

Indicator 1: Policy Development Supporting the Framework Convention on Climate Change

PLEASE SEE DEFINITIONS BELOW

Policy Measure	STEP 1: Policy Preparation and Presentation	STEP 2: Policy Adoption	STEP 3: Implementation and Enforcement	List Activities Contributing to Each Policy Category	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity
Ex: Integration of climate change into national strategic, energy, and sustainable development strategies	1	1		Gov't-established interagency group has completed all necessary analysis and preparation to develop NEAP.	3.2	CN-23-222
Integration of climate change into national strategic, energy, and sustainable development strategies						
Emissions inventory						
Mitigation analysis						
Vulnerability and adaptation analysis						
National Climate Change Action Plan						
Procedures for receiving, evaluating, and approving Activities Implemented Jointly (AIJ) proposals						
Procedures for monitoring and verifying greenhouse gas emissions						
Growth baselines for pegging greenhouse gas emissions to economic growth						
Legally binding emission reduction targets and timetables						
Other (describe)				No Activity in FY 00		
Other						
Other						
Other						
Other						
Sub-total (number of policy steps achieved):	0	0	0			
	TOTAL (number of policy steps achieved):					

Definitions: Policy Steps Achieved

Policy Measure	"Policy measures" may include documentation demonstrating a legal, regulatory, or other governmental commitment to a defined course of action. Thus, for example, "policy measures" would include: a national, state, provincial, or local law; a regulation or decree; guidance issued by an agency, ministry, or sub-national body; a land use plan; a National Environmental Action Plan; a Climate Change Action Plan; or a National Communication to the IPCC. The term "policy measures" does not include technical documentation, such as technical reports or land use maps, nor site-specific activities reported under Indicators 1 and 2 (e.g., legal demarcation of individual site or granting of community access to single location).
Policy Preparation and Presentation (Step 1)	Draft bill, policy or regulation, vetted through relevant stakeholders in government, non-government, the private sector and civil society, and introduced for debate in appropriate legislative, regulatory, or governmental body.
Policy Adoption (Step 2)	Policy intervention is approved and adopted by the appropriate administrative agency or legislative body. Can take the form of the voting on a law; the issuance of a decree, etc.
Policy Implementation and Enforcement (Step 3)	Actions that put the policy interventions into effect, such as agency personnel trained in procedures, appropriate institutions created or strengthened, or legislation implemented through the appropriate government agency.

Definitions: Types of Activities	
Adaptation	Adjustments in practices, processes or structures of systems to projected or actual changes of climate (may be spontaneous or planned).
Emissions inventory	Detailed listing of GHG sources and sinks.
Growth Baselines	An approach that would link countries' emissions targets to improvements in energy efficiency.
Joint Implementation (JI)	The process by which industrialized countries can meet a portion of their emissions reduction obligations by receiving credits for investing in GHG reductions in developing countries.
Mitigation	An action that prevents or slows the increase of greenhouse gases (GHGs) by reducing emissions from sources and sinks.
National Climate Change Action Plan	Plans that delineate specific mitigation and adaptation measures that countries will implement and integrate into their ongoing programs. These plans form the basis for the national communications that countries submit to the UNFCCC Secretariat.

Please fill in the YELLOW cells to complete the table.

TABLE 1.2					
Result 1: Increased Participation in the UNFCCC					
Indicator 2: Increased capacity to meet requirements of the UNFCCC					
Categories	Types of Support Provided (Enter the number of Training/TA activities for each category)		List the Activities that Contribute to Each Capacity Building Category	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity
	Training	Technical Assistance			
Ex: Support for joint implementation activities	1	3	Provided training and assistance in the economic and financial evaluation of energy efficient projects for consideration in JI activities.	2.4	CN-23-222
Monitoring and verifying GHG emissions					
Growth baselines for pegging GHG emissions to economic growth					
Development of emissions reduction targets and timetables					
Support for joint implementation activities					
Support for Vulnerability and Adaptation Activities					
Other (describe)					
Other			No Activity in FY 00		
Other					
Other					
Other					
Total number of points for Training/Technical Assistance:	0	0			

Please fill in the YELLOW cells to complete the table.

TABLE 2.1

Result 2: Reduced Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Land Use/Forest Management Sector

Indicator 1: Area where USAID has initiated interventions to maintain or increase carbon stocks or reduce their rate of loss

Indicator 2: Area where USAID has achieved on-the-ground impacts to preserve, increase, or reduce the rate of loss of carbon stocks

PLEASE SEE DEFINITIONS BELOW

USAID Activity Name		Location			Indicator 1			Indicator 2 Area where USAID has conserved carbon (hectares)			Additional Information you may have (see codes below)	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity	Justification for Including Site
		Country	Region, Province, or State	Site	Principal Activities (see codes below)	Area where USAID has initiated activities (hectares)	Predominant Vegetation type (Codes below)	Indicator 2a		Indicator 2b				
								Natural ecosystems	Pedominant Managed Land Type (Codes Below)	Managed lands				
Ex	Tapajos National Forest Project	Brazil	Para	Tapajos National Forest	1	595,000	A	595,000			1, 2, 3, 5	1	CN-23-222	Site of Tapajos project was included on the basis of demonstrated progress in forest conservation and resulting carbon sequestration benefits.
					2	5,000	A		3	400				
1	FOREST FIRE DETECTION AND FIGHTING PROJECT	Russia	Russian far east	Khabarovsk and Primorsky Krai	2	99,000,000,000	E	3						Provided radio communication/fire-fighting equipment to effectively combat forest fires.
2	PROTECTION OF SIKHOTE-ALIN NATURE MONUMENT TERRITORY	Russia	Russian far east	Sikhote-Alin Nature Reserve	2	401,428	E	4						Improved nature protection regime of the forested territory.
3		Russia	Russian far east	Komsomolsky Nature Reserve	2	64,278	E	4						Improved forest and biodiversity protection through organizing youth patrols.
4		Russia	Russian far east	Jewish Oblast	2	3,620,000	E	3						Creation of new "Kuldur" Nature Park, protected with no timber harvesting.
5		Russia	Russian far east	Amurskaya Oblast	2	36,370	E	3						Fire Prevention, aerial forest monitoring
6		Russia	Russian far east	Lake Khanka, Lazovsky, Far	1	471,145	D	4						Improved protected area and resource management.

7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
					Total area (hectares):	99,004,593,221	Total area:	21	Total area:	0				
<p>Note: If you need to list more than 45 individual entries in this table, please create a second copy of this spreadsheet, following the instructions at bottom.</p>														

Codes for Land Use and Forestry Sector Indicators									
Principal Activities:		Predominant Vegetation Type:			Predominant Managed Land Type:		Codes for Additional Information:		
1	Conservation of natural ecosystems (may include protected area management, extraction of non-timber products, etc. but <i>not</i> timber harvesting.)	A	Tropical evergreen forest	H	Tropical grassland and pasture	1	Agricultural systems: Less than 15% of the area under trees	1	Maps
2	Sustainable forest management for timber using reduced-impact harvesting (non-timber forest products may also be harvested)	B	Tropical seasonal forest	J	Temperate grassland and pasture	2	Agroforestry systems: Greater than 15% of the area under trees	2	Geo-referenced site coordinates
3	Afforestation/reforestation/plantation forests	C	Temperate evergreen forest	J	Tundra and alpine meadow	3	Plantation Forests: At least 80% of the area under planted trees	3	Biomass inventory
4	Agroforestry	D	Temperate deciduous forest	K	Desert scrub	4	Protected areas	4	Rainfall data
5	Sustainable agriculture	E	Boreal forest	L	Swamp and marsh			5	Soil type data
		F	Temperate woodland	M	Coastal mangrove				
		G	Tropical open forest / woodland	N	Wetlands				
		O	Mediterranean forest / Vegetation						

Definitions: Natural Ecosystems	
Natural Ecosystems	Any areas that have not experienced serious degradation or exploitation of biomass, and without significant harvest of biomass. This includes protected areas, areas used for the extraction of non-timber forest products, and community-managed forests with minimal timber extraction. Areas where non-timber forest products are harvested can be counted in this category but not those that are managed for timber. The latter are included in 2b below. The distinction is important as different approaches are employed in estimating carbon for "natural areas" (2a) and "managed areas" (2b). Natural areas include: (1) protected areas; (2) areas where non-timber forest products are extracted if significant biomass is not removed (often managed as community-based forest management areas); and (3) any other areas which exclude larger-scale biomass harvest from a management regime including many areas managed by communities and/or indigenous groups.
Definitions: Managed Lands Categories	
Sustainable Forest Management for Timber, using Reduced Impact Harvesting (RIH)	<p>A timber management activity will be considered to have a positive impact on carbon (relative to conventional methods) if it employs RIH practices and/or other key criteria. RIH is a package of practices proven to minimize environmental damage and carbon emissions during the logging of natural tropical forest. To be included, an activity must include most of the following practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - tree inventoring, marking and mapping; - careful planning and marking of skidder trails; - vine cutting prior to harvest, where appropriate; - directional felling of trees; - appropriate skidding techniques that employ winching and best available equipment (rubber tired skidder/animal traction) to minimize soil damage; - proper road and log deck construction; - a trained work force and implementation of proper safety practices; - fire mitigation techniques (fire breaks); - existence of a long-term management plan. <p>Report on the area where government, industry or community organizations are carrying out forest management for commercial timber using the techniques above, or forest management areas that have been "certified" as environmentally sound by a recognized independent party. Only the area where sound planning and harvesting is being currently practiced should be included (not the whole concession or forest).</p>
Agroforestry	Agroforestry covers a wide variety of land-use systems combining tree, crop and/or animals on the same land. Two characteristics distinguish agroforestry from other land uses: 1) it involves the deliberate growing of woody perennial on the same unit of land as agricultural crops and/or animals either spatially or sequentially, and 2) there is significant interaction between woody and non-woody components, either ecological or economical. To be counted, at least 15 percent of the system must be trees or woody perennials grown for a specific function (shade, fuel, fodder, windbreak). -- Include the area of land under an agroforestry system in which a positive carbon benefit is apparent (i.e., through the increase in biomass, litter or soil organic matter). Do not include agroforestry systems being established on forestlands that were deforested since 1990.
Reforestation/ Afforestation	The act of planting trees on deforested or degraded land previously under forest (reforestation) or on land that has not previously been under forest according to historical records (afforestation). This would include reforestation on slopes for watershed protection; mangrove reforestation or reforestation to protect coastal areas; commercial plantations and community tree planting on a significant scale, and/or the introduction of trees in non-forested areas for ecological or economic purposes. -- Include the area under reforestation or afforestation (i.e., plantation forests and/or community woodlots). Do not include natural forested areas that have been recently deforested for the purpose of planting trees. Do not include tree planting in agroforestry systems (include this under agroforestry).
Sustainable Agriculture	<p>Agricultural systems that increase or maintain carbon in their soil and biomass through time by employing certain proven cultural practices known to reduce carbon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no-tillage or reduced tillage - erosion control/soil conservation techniques, especially on hillsides - perennial crops in the system - higher crop yields through better nitrogen and soil management - long-term rotations with legumes - the use of organic mulches, crop residues and other organic inputs into the soil - better management of agrochemicals, by stressing careful fertilizer management that will increase yields while minimizing the use of petro-based agrochemicals which
Special Instructions: Creating a Copy of this Spreadsheet	
Step 1	Finish filling any cells you are working on and hit "Return" or "Enter".
Step 2	Click on "Edit" in the menu bar, above. Go down and click on "Move or Copy Sheet". The "Move or Copy" dialog box will open. (NOTE: You may also open this dialog box by using the right button on your mouse to click on the "T4-2.1 Land Use" tab near the bottom of the screen.)
Step 3	Next, scroll down in the dialog box and click on "T2.1 Land Use".
Step 4	Next, click on the box at bottom to create a copy.
Step 5	Hit "OK". A new copy of T2.1 Land Use will appear in the row of tabs near the bottom of the screen. PLEASE NOTE: Some cells may not retain all the original text when the sheet is copied, especially in the definitions sections.

Please fill in the YELLOW cells to complete the table.

TABLE 2.3							
Result 2: Reduced Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Land Use/Forest Management Sector							
Indicator 3: National/sub-national policy advances in the land use/forestry sector that contribute to the preservation or increase of carbon stocks and sinks, and to the avoidance of greenhouse gas emissions							
PLEASE SEE DEFINITIONS BELOW		Enter the number of separate steps for each measure					
Policy Measure	Scope (N or S)	STEP 1: Policy Preparation and Presentation	STEP 2: Policy Adoption	STEP 3: Implementation and Enforcement	List Activities Contributing to Each Policy Category	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity
Ex: Facilitates establishment and conservation of protected areas	N	2	1		Two studies completed on national protected areas law for the Environment Min., including recommendations for legal reform; revised National Protected Areas Law adopted, Min. Decree No. 1999/304.	3.1	TN-556-27
Facilitates improved land use planning							
Facilitates sustainable forest management	N	X	X		National Strategy for Public Awareness for Fire Prevention	SO 1.6	
Facilitates establishment and conservation of protected areas	S	X			Development of Documentation for Artem Nature Park Creation in Primorsky Krai	SO 1.6	
	S	X	X		Development of Regulation on New Protected Area creation in Armuskaya Oblast	SO 1.6	
	S	X			Development of Methodology and Procedures for Marine Protected Area Creation in the Russian Far East	SO 1.6	
Improves integrated coastal management							
Decreases agricultural subsidies or other perverse fiscal incentives that hinder sustainable forest management							
Corrects protective trade policies that devalue forest resources							
Clarifies and improves land and resource tenure							
Other (describe)							
Other							
Other							
Other							

Other							
Sub-total(number of policy steps achieved)		0	0	0			
Total (number of policy steps achieved):				0			

Definitions: Scope	
National Policies (N)	Policies that influence issues on a countrywide level.
Sub-national Policies (S)	Policies that affect a tribal nation, province, state or region that are neither national nor site specific in impact.
Definitions: Policy Steps Achieved	
Policy Measure	"Policy measures" may include documentation demonstrating a legal, regulatory, or other governmental commitment to a defined course of action. Thus, for example, "policy measures" would include: a national, state, provincial, or local law; a regulation or
Policy Preparation and Presentation (Step 1)	Draft bill, policy or regulation, vetted through relevant stakeholders in government, non-government, the private sector and civil society, and introduced for debate in appropriate legislative, regulatory, or governmental body.
Policy Adoption (Step 2)	Policy intervention is approved and adopted by the appropriate administrative agency or legislative body. Can take the form of the voting on a law; the issuance of a decree, etc.
Policy Implementation and Enforcement (Step 3)	Actions that put the policy interventions into effect, such as agency personnel trained in procedures, appropriate institutions created or strengthened, or legislation implemented through the appropriate government agency.

Please fill in the YELLOW cells to complete the table.

TABLE 2.5a				
Result 2: Reduced Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Land Use/Forest Management Sector				
Indicator 5a: Increased Capacity to Address Global Climate Change Issues				
Types of institutions strengthened to address GCC issues	Number of Institutions Strength-ened	Names of Associations, NGOs, or other Institutions Strengthened	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity
Ex: NGOs	3	Friends of Nature Foundation, SITA, Sustainable Forests Unlimited	3.2	CN-23-222
NGOs	25	KRASNOYARSK FUND FOR FOREST PROTECTION AND REFORESTATION, VERKHOVYE ENVIRONMENTAL FUND,	SO 1.6	
Private Institutions	3	KRECHET, "ROSE" ADVERTISING AGENCY, LAMINTSEV ENTREPRENEUR, etc.	SO 1.6	
Research/Educational Institutions	36	#####	SO 1.6	
Public Institutions	14		SO 1.6	
Total Number of Institutions Strengthened:	78			

Please fill in the YELLOW cells to complete the table.

Table 2.5b					
Result 2: Reduced Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Land Use/Forest Management Sector					
Indicator 5b: Technical Capacity Strengthened through Workshops, Research, and/or Training Activities					
Category	Types of Support Provided (Enter the number of Training/TA activities for each category)		List the Activities that Contribute to Each Capacity Building Category	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity
	Training	Technical Assistance			
Ex: Advancing sustainable forest management	1	3	Presentation of nursery & reforestation studies; US training on resource mgmt; env'l impact assessment law training; forest restoration & recovery workshop. TA for fire prevention.	3.3	CN-23-222
Advancing improved land use planning	7		#####		
Advancing sustainable forest management	21	1	US TRAINING ON PUBLIC AWARENESS ON FOREST FIRE PREVENTION, US REFORESTATION AND FIRE-FIGHT ON-SITE ASSISTANCE ON TREE PLANTING METHODS IN KHABAROVSKY AND PRIMORSKY KRAIS, SELECTIV PRACTICE IN SIBERIA, etc.		
Advancing establishment and conservation of protected areas	16		INCREASED CAPACITY OF DIRECTORS TO MANAGE PROTECTED AREAS;INCREASED CAPACITY OF NGOS TO PROTECT RESERVES, INCREASED CAPACITY OF EXPERTS TO ESTABLISH NEW PROTECTED AREAS, TRAININ TOURISM IN NATURE RESERVES.		
Advancing integrated coastal management					
Advancing decreases in agricultural subsidies or other perverse fiscal incentives that hinder sustainable forest management					
Advancing the correction of protective trade policies that devalue forest resources					
Advancing the clarification and improvement of land and resource tenure					
Other (describe)					
Other					
Number of categories where training and technical assistance has been provided:	44	1			

Codes for Fuel Type			
Fuel Types	Code	Fuel Name	
Liquid Fossil	Primary Fuels	A	Crude oil
		B	Orimulsion
		C	Natural gas liquid
	Secondary Fuels	D	Gasoline
		E	Jet kerosene
		F	Other kerosene
		G	Shale oil
		H	Gas/diesel oil
		J	Residual fuel oil
		K	LPG
		L	Ethane
		M	Naphtha
		N	Bitumen
		O	Lubricants
		P	Petroleum coke
		Q	Refinery feedstocks
		R	Refinery gas
S	Other oil		
Solid Fossil	Primary Fuels	T	Anthracite (coal)
		U	Coking coal
		V	Other bituminous coal
		W	Sub-bituminous coal
		X	Lignite
		Y	Oil shale
		Z	Peat
	Secondary fuels/ products	AA	BKB & patent fuels
		BB	Coke oven gas coke
		CC	Coke oven gas
		DD	Blast furnace gas
Gaseous Fossil	EE	Natural gas (dry)	
Biomass	FF	Solid biomass	
	GG	Liquid biomass	
	HH	Gas biomass	

Please fill in the YELLOW cells to complete the table.

TABLE 3.3

Result 3: Decreased Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Energy Sector, Industry, and Urban Areas

Indicator 3: National/sub-national policy advances in the energy sector, industry and urban areas that contribute to the avoidance of greenhouse gas emissions

PLEASE SEE DEFINITIONS BELOW

Policy Measure	Scope (N or S)	STEP 1: Policy Preparation and Presentation	STEP 2: Policy Adoption	STEP 3: Implementation and Enforcement	List Activities Contributing to Each Policy Category	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity
Example: Facilitates improved demand side management or integrated resource planning	N	2	1		Mission supported introduction of two decrees for energy tariff reforms (pursuant to National Energy Reform Law) in the national parliament; one decree was adopted.	2.4	CN-577-92
Facilitates improved demand side management or integrated resource planning							
Facilitates competitive energy markets that promote market-based energy prices, decrease fossil fuel subsidies, or allow open access to independent providers							
Facilitates the installation of energy efficient or other greenhouse gas reducing technologies, including improved efficiencies in industrial processes					NO ACTIVITY in FY00		
Facilitates the use of renewable energy technologies							
Facilitates the use of cleaner fossil fuels (cleaner coal or natural gas)							
Facilitates the introduction of cleaner modes of transportation and efficient transportation systems							
Promotes the use of cogeneration							
Other (describe)							
Other							
Other							
Other							
Other							
Sub-total (number of policy steps achieved):		0	0	0			
Total (number of policy steps achieved):				0			

Definitions: Scope	
National Policies (N)	Policies that influence issues on a countrywide level.
Sub-national Policies (S)	Policies that affect a tribal nation, province, state or region that are neither national nor site specific in impact.
Definitions: Policy Steps Achieved	
Policy Measure	"Policy measures" may include documentation demonstrating a legal, regulatory, or other governmental commitment to a defined course of action. Thus, for example, "policy measures" would include: a national, state, provincial, or local law; a regulation or decree; guidance issued by an agency, ministry, or sub-national body; a land use plan; a National Environmental Action Plan; a Climate Change Action Plan; or a National Communication to the IPCC. The term "policy measures" does not include technical documentation, such as technical reports or land use maps, nor site-specific activities reported under Indicators 1 and 2 (e.g., legal demarcation of individual site or granting of community access to single location).
Policy Preparation and Presentation (Step 1)	Draft bill, policy or regulation, vetted through relevant stakeholders in government, non-government, the private sector and civil society, and introduced for debate in appropriate legislative, regulatory, or governmental body.
Policy Adoption (Step 2)	Policy intervention is approved and adopted by the appropriate administrative agency or legislative body. Can take the form of the voting on a law; the issuance of a decree, etc.
Policy Implementation and Enforcement (Step 3)	Actions that put the policy interventions into effect, such as agency personnel trained in procedures, appropriate institutions created or strengthened, or legislation implemented through the appropriate government agency.

Please fill in the **YELLOW** cells to complete the table.

TABLE 3.6a

Result 3: Reduced Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Energy Sector, Industry and Urban Areas

Indicator 6a: Increased Capacity to Address Global Climate Change Issues

Types of institutions strengthened to address GCC issues	Number of Institutions Strength-ened	Names of Associations, NGOs, or other Institutions Strengthened	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity
Ex: NGOs	3	Center for Cleaner Production, Association of Industrial Engineers, National Solar Energy Foundation, Clean Air Alliance, Institute for Industrial Efficiency	2.4	CN-577-92
NGOs				
Private Institutions		NO ACTIVITY in FY00		
Research/Educational Institutions				
Public Institutions				
Total Number of Institutions Strengthened:	0			

Please fill in the YELLOW cells to complete the table.

Table 3.6b					
Result 3: Reduced Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Energy Sector, Industry and Urban Areas					
Indicator 6b: Technical Capacity Strengthened through Workshops, Research, and/or Training Activities					
	Types of Support Provided (Enter the number of Training/TA activities for each category)				
Category	Training	Technical Assistance	List the Activities that Contribute to Each Capacity Building Category	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity
Example: Use of renewable energy technologies	1	3	Developed sustainable markets for renewable energy technologies. Over 200 renewable energy systems installed. Training for utilities, government officials, NGOs. Study on renewable energy applications completed.	2.4	CN-577-92
Improved demand-side management or integrated resource planning planning		2	Reduction of demands for heat in public and residential buildings - Tomsk and Magadan Oblasts	3.2	
Competitive energy markets that promote market-based energy prices, decrease fossil fuel subsidies, or allow open access to independent providers					
Installation of energy efficient or other greenhouse gas reducing technologies, including improved efficiencies in industrial processes		2	Improve energy efficiency for district heating (Samara Oblast); Implementation of heat conservation and augmentation in vulnerable group institutions (Magadan Oblast).	3.2	
		6	Reforms in areas of municipal housing and communal services in six urban centers. Programs relevant to GCC covered issues of housing maintenance (energy efficiency) and increased cost-recovery and infrastructure finance for efficiency improvements in communal services.	3.2	
Use of renewable energy technologies					
Use of cleaner fossil fuels (cleaner coal or natural gas)					
Introduction of cleaner modes of transportation and efficient transportation systems					
Use of cogeneration					
Other (describe)					
Other					
Total number of points for Training/Technical Assistance:	0	10			

Please fill in the YELLOW cells to complete the table.

Table 4								
Result 4: Reduced Vulnerability to the Threats Posed by Climate Change								
Indicator: USAID Programs that Reduce Vulnerability to Climate Change								
PLEASE SEE DEFINITIONS BELOW								
Key Area	Country	Budget	Duration	Type of Program (see codes below)	Description	SO Name	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity
Example: ii	South Africa	\$1,200,000	FY96-FY99	3	Technical assistance to Rand Water Board to address water resources planning for water shortages	Increased Access to Environmentally Sustainable Housing and Urban Services for the HDP	SO6	
					NO ACTIVITIES IN FY00			

	Key Area Codes	Definitions	Codes for Type of Programs
Coastal Zones	i	Number of programs that are reducing the vulnerability of coastal populations, infrastructure, habitats and living resources to accelerated sea level rise or other environmental changes associated with climate change (e.g., water availability, resource availability, temperature).	1. Urban/Infrastructure
			2. Natural Resource
Emergency Preparedness	ii	Number of programs that are increasing ability to cope with and minimize the damage from natural disasters (e.g., drought, famine, disease outbreaks) through surveillance, early warning, emergency preparedness, capacity building, etc.	1. Early Warning System
			2. Humanitarian Response
			3. Capacity Building
Agriculture & Food Security	iii	Number of programs that are increasing adaptability and resilience of agriculture and food systems to changes in temperature, water availability, pest and pathogen presence or prevalence, soil moisture and other changes in environmental parameters (e.g., crop diversification, water conservation and delivery, flexible market and trade systems).	1. Research and Development
			2. Policy Reform
			3. Extension/ Demonstration
Biodiversity/Natural Resources	iv	Number of programs that are increasing the adaptability of natural ecosystems and levels of biodiversity to changes in temperature, water availability, pest and pathogen presence or prevalence, soil moisture and other changes in environmental parameters (e.g., establishment of biological corridors, habitat conservation, preservation of ex situ germplasm).	1. Preservation of Biodiversity
			2. Forest Conservation
Human Health and Nutrition	v	Number of programs that are reducing vulnerability to climate change through improved access to and quality of health services, vector control, nutrition and environmental health interventions.	1. Improved Quality of Health Services
			2. Vector Control
			3. Improved Nutrition

Information Annex Topic: Greater Horn of Africa Initiative

Information Annex Topic: Non-presence Countries (npcs)

Information Annex Topic: Success Stories

Information Annex Topic: Supplemental Information

R4 ANNEX: HOW USAID/RUSSIA'S PROGRAM HAS CHANGED

Since 1992, the U.S. Government has channeled approximately \$2 billion of assistance to Russia through USAID. The overarching foreign policy goal of that assistance has remained relatively constant over the years, i.e. to support Russia's peaceful transition to a democratic market-led economy and thus enable it to participate actively in the global economy. Although the goal has remained constant, the USAID program has changed substantially since the early 1990s. These changes include the size and composition of the program, the kinds of "partner" organizations with whom we implement our program, the geographic focus, and the ways in which we work.

These changes can be most easily illustrated as follows:

Our program today is much smaller. In the 1992-95 period, the USAID budget, excluding funding for the Enterprise Fund and Eurasia, averaged \$306 million per year. Today's comparable budget is approximately \$60 million, or one-fifth of the earlier average. If one includes funding for the Enterprise Fund and Eurasia, the FY 1992-95 average was \$343 million compared to just over \$100 million today, one-third of the earlier average.

We are working much less with the Central Government of Russia. In the early 1990s, the USAID program was focused to a great extent on national-level policy and programs with the Central Government. But, as reforms stagnated in the Russian legislature (Duma), as the political consensus for reform evaporated, and as the Congress enacted a series of restrictions related to Russian trade with Iran, the USAID program shifted increasingly away from the Central Government. By Fiscal Year 1996, the proportion of USAID assistance going to the Central Government had decreased to 17%; by FY 2000, it had further decreased to 7%. Today, USAID assistance to the Central Government is limited to a few key reform areas: international accounting standards and bank supervision with the Central Bank; training with the judiciary; intergovernmental fiscal relations with the Ministry of Finance; and infectious disease and preventative health measures with the Ministry of Health. Furthermore, none of this even limited funding is obligated directly with the Government of Russia.

We are increasingly working through Russian partners and NGOs to implement our program. In the initial years of USAID's program in Russia, almost all technical assistance was provided by expatriate advisors through American organizations. However, as a result of the substantial training given to Russians by those early contractors and grantees and the explicit efforts of some American partners to create sustainable Russian organizations, we are increasingly able to use Russians to provide technical assistance to other Russians.

This can be seen in many ways. First, in terms of funding, we have increased our direct obligations to Russian entities. For example, in FY 1996, only 1% of the Mission's budget was obligated to six Russian organizations vs. 10% to twenty-one Russian organizations in FY 2000. Second, the number of American experts working on many of our American contracts and grants has declined. For example, in 1998, the number of resident Americans working on the NGO Strengthening Program dropped from nine to one when a new grantee (World Learning) took over program implementation. In the earlier NGO Strengthening

Project, Americans headed several of the NGO Resource Centers in the regions; in the new program, these Centers became truly Russian organizations, led and staffed by Russian experts.

Finally, some of our early American partners created Russian organizations to carry on their work. There are four excellent examples. First, the Institute of Urban Economics, an outgrowth of the early Urban Institute programs, is working actively at local levels throughout the country on municipal social sector restructuring and housing reform. Second, the Institute for Electoral Support and Development, created by the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES), is working with local authorities and NGOs on elections management and civic education. Third, the Center for Fiscal Policy, an outgrowth of early tax reform work by Barents and Georgia State University, is now working actively at the local level on intergovernmental fiscal issues. Fourth, Junior Achievement/Russia, created by JA/USA, is working throughout the country to train teachers and provide business education opportunities to primary and secondary school students. Each of these Russian organizations now provides assistance directly to other Russian entities using direct grants from USAID.

USAID has also more generally changed the organizations we use to implement our programs. In the early years, American commercial companies and universities dominated the program. **Today, we are increasingly using NGOs and non-profit companies to implement our assistance program.** This dramatic change is clearly seen by comparing procurement records for FY 1996 and FY 2000. In FY 1996, 52% of our obligations were with commercial companies and universities and 39% with NGOs and non-profits. In FY 2000, only 13% were with commercial companies and universities and 75% with NGOs and non-profits.

We are making our program more “demand-driven.” We are increasingly trying to respond to Russian initiatives, e.g., in responding to the Russian request for international experts to consult with them as the Government was defining its new economic reform priorities (Gref Plan). Similarly, the Replications of Lessons Learned (ROLL) program provides a mechanism for Russian organizations and communities to replicate environmental protection steps taken within the country. The initiative, however, is in the hands of Russians; they are replicating Russian experience. Similar sub-grant mechanisms that respond to Russian demand are being put into other programs.

Comparable changes have taken place in our municipal development programs. In the early 1990s, when we had large budgets and highly ambitious objectives, we sometimes gave local administrations all the needed hardware and software and provided the consultants to do the work for them. Now, we provide them with much more limited resources and require them to devote human and financial resources up front. We encourage them to implement their own reforms, as our programs play more of a facilitative or supportive role.

Our program has a greater regional focus. The USAID program has worked throughout the country since the early 1990s, but it has become increasingly concentrated, especially in the four Regional Initiative sites (Russian Far East, Novgorod, Samara, and Tomsk). In FY 2000, 80% of the program was outside of Moscow and St. Petersburg, with 29% in the four RI sites. In addition, the program has increasingly been focused in several other pro-reform areas where program effectiveness has been high. These “RI-lite” sites include Saratov, Perm, Nizhny Novgorod, Novosibirsk, and Rostov-on-Don.

Our portfolio has dramatically changed: more democracy, health, and small business support; less “big ticket” macroeconomics and infrastructure. The most significant change in the USAID program has been the reduced focus on Economic Restructuring. As late as FY 1996, 68% of the program was devoted to Economic Restructuring; by FY 2000, this had declined to 51%. Equally important have been the changes within the Economic Restructuring category. USAID is providing less support for economic policy reform – e.g., the FY 2000 amount for policy reform is one-third of the absolute amount in the FY 1996 budget. In addition, because of reduced budgets and new interest by the World Bank in these sectors, USAID has eliminated its substantial earlier work in energy, legal/regulatory reform, and capital markets. Also, because of the lack of Government of Russia commitment to reform, we significantly reduced our support for fiscal and financial reform and agricultural development. The bulk of our work in Economic Restructuring is now focused on small business, micro finance, economic think tanks, environmental protection, and the Enterprise Fund. The Enterprise Fund in fact now uses approximately 50% of our funding in this program area. The Mission has also substantially changed how it supports Economic Restructuring, especially through our enhanced focus on strengthening Russian Business Support Institutions, micro finance institutions, and economic think tanks.

As funding for Economic Restructuring declined, our work in support of Russia’s Democratic Transition took on an increasing proportion of our program – e.g., from 15% in FY 1996 to 31% in FY 2000. Within the Democratic Transition program area, USAID maintained its focus on the original four pillars: rule of law, civil society, independent media, and political process. Within those priority areas, new efforts have been initiated in anti-corruption, reducing domestic violence, and anti-trafficking. The Mission has also increasingly focused its democracy program on the institutional development and sustainability of Russian civic society organizations. This has also meant an increased use of Russian training and technical assistance experts.

USAID’s support for Social Sector Restructuring remained relatively stable at 17-18% over the past five years, although there has been substantial change within that category. Major housing sector work was completed, as was support to promote large-scale investment in the pharmaceutical sector. Also, given the lack of progress in national-level reforms, USAID shifted its health programs from a focus on large-scale health reform at the federal level to regional and pilot demonstrations. This accompanied major new initiatives on women and infant health, including orphans and other “at risk” children, and infectious diseases, especially in HIV/AIDS and TB. And, as in other sectors, there has been an increased focus on strengthening local, Russian institutional capability.

Perhaps most important, as the USAID program has moved increasingly to the regions and to support for grassroots Russian organizations – whether in small business, health, environmental protection, or local advocacy – it has become more of a democracy program. Small business, local community groups, economic think tanks, micro finance providers, independent media outlets, and NGOs are instrumental parts of civil society. By working through these groups, we are helping to give a voice to citizens. And, by helping to strengthen small business and the economic opportunities of people in the regions, we are helping to build a middle class that respects the role of civil society. This means that our program increasingly cannot be artificially divided into the three original categories – Economic Restructuring, Democratic Transition, and Social Sector Restructuring. All parts

of the program are interrelated, and all are ultimately supporting Russia's democratic transition and the creation of a new market-oriented middle class.

Why USAID matters in Russia

(Cable sent February 7, 2001)

Introduction and Summary

1. The U.S. has a vital interest in the long-term integration of a stable, peaceful, and democratic Russia into the global economy. This integration, of course, will depend upon Russia's successful political and economic transformation. These transformations or transitions will succeed only if they are led and implemented by Russians, but the USG can play an important role in supporting these "transformers." Exchanges and educational programs and increased access to the world through the Internet – programs supported through the Public Affairs section of the Embassy – have been and continue to be vitally important. We believe that the development programs of USAID have also made important contributions to Russia's transitions – and that they can do more.

2. This cable focuses exclusively on the USAID assistance program. We outline some of the many accomplishments and new opportunities. These plus the lessons we've learned over the past 8 years, including the need for true Russian leadership of the reform process – a theme being echoed in the recent GAO, Carnegie, and Rand/Carlucci reports – form the foundation for future success. There is important new work to do: e.g., in helping to strengthen civil society and to give a greater policy voice to the Russian people; in helping to strengthen small business and its role as an economic catalyst and employer; in helping to strengthen links to the West; and in helping to solve urgent global problems related to the environment and infectious disease. END SUMMARY.

Past Gains, the Rise of New Reformers, and Continuing Needs Present New Opportunities

3. To take full advantage of its considerable investments to date in Russia's transition, the USG, and particularly USAID, must seize the important opportunities that exist today at the national and local levels in Russia. Many of these opportunities arise because of the presence of strong economic reformers in the Putin Administration, as reflected by the ambitious and highly regarded Gref Plan. Opportunities also arise because of an improved relationship between the Presidency and the Duma, which is permitting policy reform in previously controversial areas such as tax reform. In addition, opportunities arise from increasing federal and regional support for local private sector development, especially of small business. Other opportunities arise from programs and relationships that have been forged over the past eight years, such as partnerships between the American and Russian judiciaries, non-governmental organizations, and health institutions and community activists.

4. These opportunities underscore the significant progress that has been achieved in Russia's economic and political transitions. However, key needs remain, especially in strengthening democracy, in helping Russian institutions become more responsive to the needs of people,

and in creating the institutions that are needed for Russia's participation in the global economy. The unfinished work can be seen in many areas, for example:

A. There has been tremendous positive change at the local level, and grassroots community organizations are much more prevalent and stronger today than five years ago. For instance, local communities are now joining together with the business sector and government to improve social services. In this regard, the non-governmental organization (NGO) fair in Perm in November 2000 sponsored by the Federal District Representative Sergei Kiriyenko saw broad participation from over 600 NGOs representing more than 12 regional communities, as well as the attendance of the oligarch Vladimir Potanin, international donors, and local business representatives. This vivid example is encouraging, but many NGOs in Russia are still very weak institutionally and work in an inhospitable legal environment. The NGO or "third sector," complemented by business and government, still requires further assistance to become truly vibrant and sustainable.

B. There has been astonishing progress since the Soviet era in the development of independent media in the regions. The share of viewers in Russia's vast regions watching private non-state broadcasting jumped from 0 percent in 1991 to an estimated 60 percent of Russia's population by 2000, an indication of the strength and quality of broadcasting in Russia. However, the independent media is clearly not operating in the most hospitable circumstances. Too many local TV stations have been closed by authorities, and too many legal threats and physical attacks made against journalists. And, perhaps even more importantly, most media outlets have not yet developed into viable, sustainable businesses, in great part because of the 1998 financial crisis. Until they are financially sound, they cannot become truly independent.

C. There has been dynamic growth in the small/medium enterprise sector. USAID and other donor programs have been key to creating models of alternative sources of financing and developing Russian capacity to assist Russian entrepreneurs. Despite this progress, entrepreneurs still face too many regulations and impediments to entry into the business sector, and have too little access to finance. Many small businesses also still need training in accounting, management, business planning, and marketing if they are to quickly develop and expand over the short-term.

D. Although increased human rights awareness and stronger protection of these rights are needed in Russia, there has been solid progress in indigenous human rights monitoring. As a result of a USAID grant to the Moscow-Helsinki Group, the status of human rights was monitored in 60 of Russia's 89 regions in 2000. In 2001, human rights in all 89 regions will be monitored and human rights information will be publicized.

E. There has been substantive progress in creating sound enabling environments for investment. Good examples must be replicated and expanded. One encouraging case is Novgorod where an investment promotion unit at the oblast administration helps open and register businesses in Novgorod oblast. Also in Novgorod, new companies interested in direct investments receive local tax holidays until the companies realize profits. Land use and zoning procedures in Novgorod also create a transparent environment for investors. Finally, the introduction and use of international accounting standards helps Russian businesses to cooperate with foreign investors. Many of these reforms can be traced to USG and USAID involvement in Novgorod as a Regional Initiative Site from 1997 to 2000. But,

the Novgorod case contrasts sharply with most other regions where the regulatory environment at the local level can be prohibitively complex and the security of land tenure for solid investments is a rarity.

F. There has been results-driven progress in strengthening some health systems. For instance, a USG tuberculosis treatment and control program has shown promising results: cure rates have increased in two regions, following the introduction and implementation of the internationally recognized approach to treatment. However, many health indicators continue to deteriorate, and there must be even greater attention to the prevention of infectious disease, both to safeguard the Russian people and ensure that infectious diseases prevalent in Russia do not cross international borders.

G. Many Russian municipalities have developed new approaches to social assistance programs, including the targeting of subsidies to those in greatest need. Under USAID programs, four Russian cities have begun the process of means-testing of social assistance programs, and are prepared to privatize and compete the delivery of services. Although highly encouraging, these efforts are in their infancy and must be expanded dramatically to ensure that services reach the truly needy and local economies operate more efficiently. And, as local governments increasingly meet the needs of their citizens, people will see more concretely the benefits of good and participatory governance.

H. Strong partnerships have developed between many American and Russian communities and organizations. A telling example recently emerged. After the bomb in the Pushkin metro in August, many victims were taken to the Skifoskovsky Research Institute, which has been working with Lilas International through USAID's partnership program. The doctors and nurses at the skin bank Institute had the additional technical skills needed to treat burn victims through the training they had received under the USAID partnership. This example demonstrates the power of partnerships, and underscores the potential for even greater success in bringing Americans and Russians together to solve problems.

Successes to Build On

5. The USG has channeled substantial assistance to Russia through USAID since 1992, albeit from levels averaging \$300 million per year in the FY 92-96 period to just under \$100 million during the last three years. As pointed out in a recent GAO assessment, results have been mixed. The report noted that there have been significant accomplishments, including the areas of progress noted previously, but that some projects had limited impact. The GAO looked primarily at macroeconomic stabilization, social safety net protection, privatization, and banking sector reform. They concluded that Russia's transition to a market economy will be long; that donors should design programs that are long-term and flexible in nature; and that assistance should be concentrated in those areas where Russians are most open to making reforms. We believe that USAID has also learned these lessons and increasingly applied them to the current USAID program.

Some results – especially in economic reform – have also been slow to emerge. But the intensive early support of the USG is increasingly being felt, especially in the areas of tax and fiscal reform. For years our programs generated analyses and draft legislation, but action was

consistently stalled due to political infighting between the Yeltsin Government and the Duma. Now many of those early efforts are being implemented, as reflected by recent passage of a flat income tax of 13 percent, as well as positive changes to the value-added tax, excise taxes, and the payroll tax.

7. One of the reasons for success has been “Russification” of the USAID program, i.e., the increased use of Russian experts and organizations, many of which worked closely with American organizations in the early years of USG assistance. These Russians are now leading the transition process – either formally from seats in government or from behind the scenes in think tanks. As noted above, this was true for the drafting and passage of new Russian tax reform legislation. It is equally true as three new Russian NGOs respond to Russian demand for their services and lead reform in their respective areas. First, the Institute for Urban Economics – an outgrowth of the early Urban Institute programs which is working actively at local levels throughout the country on municipal social sector restructuring and housing reform. Second, the Institute for Electoral System Development – an outgrowth of the early work of the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) programs which is working with central and local authorities on electoral reform. Third, the Center for Fiscal Reform (CFR) – an outgrowth of the early work by American contractors on tax reform – is engaged in intergovernmental fiscal issues at the federal and local levels. For example, the CFR contributed significantly to the newly approved budget code. Their expertise has also been in great demand from 40 regional governments. This overall approach to work increasingly through Russian organizations will more likely lead to the adoption of reforms and help guarantee that reforms continue long after USAID leaves Russia.

8. Increased concentration of program resources in the regions has also contributed to recent successes. In the early and mid-1990’s, the USAID program was focused to a great extent on national-level policy and programs. But, as reforms stagnated and as USG legislative restrictions appeared, the program was moved from the center to the regions and from government to NGOs and the private sector. This move was motivated by the recognition that particular regions were emerging as dynamic reformers and could serve as models to other less innovative regions. Now, 75-80% of the program is outside of Moscow and St. Petersburg. In FY 1999, for example, only 9% of the program funding was directed to the central government. As regional concentration has increased, especially through the USG’s Regional Initiative, there has also been better coordination among USG programs – and thus better and more results.

Seizing the Opportunities: A Continued Rationale for USAID Assistance

9. Russia’s economic and democratic transitions are incomplete, and pressing needs remain. U.S. assistance to Russia is an important USG investment in Russia’s future. There is a valuable role for the USAID to play – whether in working at the grassroots, regional, or national level. We must remain agile and flexible, able to respond to changing needs and evolving opportunities. We must take advantage of new opportunities and initiatives. Examples of such initiatives abound: e.g., in expanding partnerships; in building Russian institutions and capacity to support civil society as a channel for Russians to influence decision-making at all levels in the country; in moving forward more aggressively to support the development of technology-based small business; in seizing even small opportunities at

the Federal level to improve the business climate; and in looking to broaden the impact of successful programs through regional approaches such as in Siberia or the Volga River region.

10. We will increasingly channel resources through Russian think tanks and NGOs, especially those that are playing leadership roles in designing and implementing reform throughout the country. Our purpose will be twofold: first, to enhance the replication of reforms; and second, to provide the support these organizations need to become sustainable. In addition, because there is still Russian interest in the views of international experts, we will continue to support external technical assistance, especially on a short-term basis. This will also be important because one of our fundamental goals in all we do will be to strengthen partnerships between Russian and American institutions and people – these are the links that will support Russian reformers long after official USG assistance ends. COLLINS##

Information Annex Topic: Updated Results Framework Annex

SO 1.3 Accelerated development and growth of private enterprises

- IR 1.3.1 Policies, legislation and regulations conducive to broad-based competition and private sector growth adopted
- IR 1.3.2 Successful models of private ownership and modern management widely replicated
- IR 1.3.3 Sustainable network of business support institutions rendering services to entrepreneurs and enterprises

SO 1.4 Improved economic infrastructure to support market-oriented growth

- IR 1.4.1 Tax system fair and efficient
- IR 1.4.2 Legal and regulatory framework for the financial sector established and strengthened
- IR 1.4.3 International accounting standards (IAS) properly match revenues and expenses to improve existing operations and make financial reporting transparent for banking sector supervision
- IR 1.4.4 Economic think tanks' analytical and policy advice capabilities strengthened to support sound policy formulation

SO 1.6 Increased environmental management capacity to support sustainable economic growth

- IR 1.6.1 Increased capacity to deal with environmental pollution as a threat to public health
- IR 1.6.2 Improved management of natural resources and biodiversity protection
- IR 1.6.3 Improved economic mechanisms for natural resources management and environmental protection

SO 2.1 Increased, better informed citizens' participation in political and economic decision-making

- IR 2.1.1 Free and fair elections administered nationally and locally
- IR 2.1.2 Increased public access to information which is needed for informed political and economic choices
- IR 2.1.3 NGO sector provides alternative to ballot box for participating in economic and political decision-making

SO 2.2 Strengthened rule of law and respect for human rights

- IR 2.2.1 Independent Russian judiciary
- IR 2.2.2 Judicial decisions are uniform, predictable, applied equally and made without delay
- IR 2.2.3 Competent counsel available in Russia
- IR 2.2.4 Presence of enforcement service induces better execution of civil judgements
- IR 2.2.5 Effective advocacy for adherence to international human rights commitments increased

SO 3.2 Improved effectiveness of selected social benefits and services

IR 3.2.1 New approaches to service delivery adopted

IR 3.2.2 Increased use of improved and effective responses to reduce the transmission of selected major infections diseases and to mitigate the impact of epidemics resulting from these diseases

IR 3.2.3 Improved cost recovery in the provision of and improved equity in the distribution of selected social subsidies in USAID-supported regions

SO 4.1 Special initiatives

SO 4.2 Cross-cutting initiatives

Changes to Indicators Reported in R4s

R4 2003	R4 2002
<p>IR 1.3.2</p> <p>Unit of measure: "Created/sustained jobs"</p>	<p>Unit of measure: "Additional created/sustained jobs"</p>
<p>IR 1.4.1.3 Objective Criteria and System Developed for Transfer of Resources from Center to Regions and from regions to municipalities</p> <p>Indicator: Regions adopting transparent formula to distribute regional funds to municipalities</p> <p>Unit of measure: Percentage</p> <p>Indicator/Description: Percentage of regions adopting and implementing objective and transparent formula to distribute regional funds to municipalities</p>	<p>IR 1.4.1.3 Objective Criteria and System Developed for Transfer of Resources from Center to Regions</p> <p>Indicator: Transparent and objective criteria for distribution of regional funds to municipalities by formula</p> <p>Unit of measure: percent of regions</p> <p>Indicator/Description: Regional legislation in place and operational for interbudgetary relations with clear methodology for transfer of funds to Municipalities</p>
<p>IR 1.4.1.3</p> <p>Indicator: Transparent criteria for distribution of Federal funds to regions by formula (indicator retired)</p>	<p>IR 1.4.1.3</p> <p>Indicator (the same): Transparent criteria for distribution of Federal funds to regions by formula</p>
<p>IR 1.4.2</p> <p>Indicator/Description: Percentage change in ruble and dollar denominated deposits from individuals in dollar terms. Personal deposits include demand and time deposits by resident and non-resident individuals, and funds of self-employed individuals.</p>	<p>Indicator/Description: Percentage change in ruble and dollar denominated deposits of individuals in dollar terms.</p>
<p>IR 1.4.3 International Accounting Standards properly match revenues and expenses to improve existing operations and make financial reporting transparent for banking sector supervision</p> <p>Indicator 1: New regulations introduced by the Central Bank of Russia to implement IAS-based commercial bank reporting system</p> <p>Unit of measure:</p>	<p>IR 1.4.3 International Accounting Standards will properly match revenues and expenses to improve existing operations and will make financial reporting transparent to domestic and international investors</p> <p>Indicator: International Accounting Standards adopted by companies</p> <p>Unit of measure:</p>

<p>Cumulative number of regulations</p> <p>Indicator/Description: IAS-based commercial bank reporting system developed and implemented by CBR</p>	<p>Number of copies of International Accounting Standards translated into Russian and published</p> <p>Indicator/Description: International Accounting Standards translated into Russian and published</p>
<p>IR 1.4.3</p> <p>Indicator 2: Number of Banks adopting International Accounting Standards</p> <p>Unit of measure: Number of banks</p> <p>Indicator/Description: International Accounting Standards used by banks for reporting to the Central Bank of Russia</p>	
<p>IR 2.1.3</p> <p>Indicator: Number of cities in target regions that have established and are using mechanisms for NGO – local government interaction</p> <p>(Indicator and Indicator/Description are interchanged compared to R4 2002.)</p>	<p>Indicator: Cities in target regions have mechanisms for NGO interaction with local governments in use</p>
<p>IR 2.2.2</p> <p>Indicator: Survey results on uniformity, predictability and fairness of commercial court decisions</p>	<p>Indicator: Annual survey of commercial lawyers taking commercial continuing legal education seminar</p>
<p>IR 2.2.4 Presence of Enforcement Service Induces Better Execution of Civil Judgments</p> <p>Indicator: Percentage of overall value of Bailiffs' Service civil judgments caseload that is executed</p> <p>Unit of measure: Overall value of Bailiffs' Service civil judgments caseload (percent)</p> <p>Indicator/Description: Percentage of overall value of Bailiffs' Service civil judgments caseload that is executed</p>	<p>IR 2.2.4 Presence of enforcement service induces greater voluntary compliance with court judgments</p> <p>Indicator: Percentage of civil judgments fully executed</p> <p>Unit of measure: Civil judgments (percent)</p> <p>Indicator/Description: Percentage of fully executed civil judgments includes both enforced judgments and those voluntarily complied with by debtors</p>
<p>SO 3.2</p> <p>Indicator: Reductions in repeat abortions in selected sites</p>	<p>Indicator: Decrease in abortion rates greater than the</p>

<p>Unit of measure: Percentage of abortion clients who terminated a prior pregnancy by abortion within the last two years</p> <p>Indicator/Description: Percentage of repeat abortion clients who terminated a pregnancy by abortion within the previous two years. Although WIN does not conduct any abortion-related services, its interventions seek to reduce the use of abortions, particularly repeat abortions.</p>	<p>national average in selected regions</p> <p>Unit of measure: Women of reproductive age (ages 15- 49)</p> <p>Indicator/Description: Number of abortions per 1000 women of reproductive age</p>
<p>SO 3.2 level indicator</p> <p>Indicator: Tuberculosis treatment success rates in pilot sites</p> <p>Unit of measure: Treatment success rate = (patients cured + patients completing treatment)/Total number of patients starting the treatment course</p> <p>Indicator/Description: Based on current WHO definitions, the gold standard for treatment success rates in programs implemented in the former Soviet Union is 75%. Results and targets include only civilian portion of TB program, except for the Orel results, which include both civilian and prison populations.</p>	<p>no indicator for TB</p>
<p>IR 3.2.1 New approaches to service delivery adopted</p> <p>Indicator: Increased exclusive breastfeeding rate (0-3 month old) in selected cities</p> <p>Unit of measure: Number of infants 0-3 months of age completed 6 months of exclusive breastfeeding</p> <p>Indicator/Description: Exclusive breastfeeding reduces infant morbidity and mortality and reflects policy, organizational, and service delivery changes to promote the practice addressed by WIN, including prenatal education on the benefits of breastfeeding, rooming-in, family-centered maternity care, and adaptation of evidence-based practices.</p>	<p>no indicator for breastfeeding</p>

<p>IR 3.2.3 Increased capacity of local governments to mobilize resources and provide goods and services on a sustainable basis</p> <p>Indicator: Number of communities with improved social assistance programs</p> <p>Unit of measure: Increase in the number of cities that have adopted means-testing and competitive procurement practices in the delivery of social benefits and/or communal services</p> <p>Indicator/Description: Monitoring and evaluation exercise will test whether or not cities have been successful in introducing means-tested targeting of any social services beyond the currently tested housing subsidies, and whether or not cities have implemented competitive procurement practices for delivery of selected social services by local NGOs</p>	<p>IR 3.2.3: Improved Cost Recovery/Equity in Social Service Delivery</p> <p>Indicator 1: The eligible population participates in the housing allowance programs</p> <p>Indicator 2: Resident's fees for housing maintenance and communal services are adjusted towards cost recovery</p>
---	---

RUSSIA03INST.XLS

Verification	Objective ID	IR No.	IR name	Indicators	Public sector	Private for profit	Private non-profit
Y	118-013	IR 1.3.2	Successful models of private ownership and modern management widely replicated	Number of loans made by USAID-supported microfinance organizations	Y	Y	Y
Y	118-013	IR 1.3.2.	Workable models for new and restructured firms to complete in a market economy are created	obtained by client firms of USAID Business Support Institutions	Y	Y	Y
Y	118-013	IR 1.3.3	Sustainable network of business support institutions rendering services to entrepreneurs and enterprises	Number of self-sufficient business support institutions	Y	Y	Y
Y	118-014	IR 1.4.1.	Objective criteria and system developed for transfer of resources from center to regions and from regions to municipalities	Transparent criteria for distribution of federal funds to regions by formula	Y	N	Y
Y	118-014	IR 1.4.2	Legal and regulatory framework for the financial sector established and strengthened	Annual percentage change in personal deposits in Russian banks	Y	Y	N
Y	118-014	IR 1.4.3	International accounting standards will properly match revenues and expenses to improve existing operations and will make financial reporting transparent for banking sector supervision	International Accounting Standards adopted by banks	Y	Y	N
Y	118-014	IR 1.4.4	Economic think tanks' analytical and policy advice capabilities strengthened to support sound policy formulation	Wider dissemination of policy advice and publications	Y	N	Y
Y	118-016	IR 1.6.1	Increased capacity to deal with environmental pollution as a threat to public health	New approaches/techniques/technologies/actions to prevent and reduce industrial pollution are introduced and implemented throughout the Russian Federation	Y	Y	Y
Y	118-016	IR 1.6.2	Improved management of natural resources and biodiversity protection	New approaches/actions to improve management of natural resources and protect biodiversity are implemented throughout the Russian Federation	Y	Y	Y
Y	118-016	IR 1.6.3	Improved economic mechanisms for natural resources management and environmental protection	Eco-business organizations developed and strengthened	N	Y	Y
Y	118-021	IR 2.1.1	Free and fair elections administered nationally and locally	Participation in national and local elections is certified as free and fair by observers	Y	N	Y
Y	118-021	IR 2.1.2.	More programming produced and broadcast by independent stations in the regions	Regional independent TV stations are the primary source of local news for viewers	N	Y	Y
Y	118-021	IR 2.1.3	NGO sector provides alternative to ballot box for participating in economic and political decision making	Number of cities in target regions that have established and are using mechanisms for NGO-local government interaction	Y	N	Y
Y	118-022	IR 2.2.1.	Legal framework provides judicial independence	100% of the Judiciary budget is transferred to the judiciary or the % of the Judiciary budget transferred is greater or equal to the % of the Executive budget transferred	Y	N	N
Y	118-022	IR 2.2.1.	Judicial department functions as intended by legislation	Judicial department formulates the annual budget of the courts of general jurisdiction	Y	N	N
Y	118-022	IR 2.2.4	Presence of the enforcement service induces better execution of civil judgements	Percentage of overall value of Bailiffs Service civil judgements caseload that is executed	Y	N	N

RUSSIA03INST.XLS

Y	118-022	IR 2.2.5	Effective advocacy for adherence to international human rights commitments increased	Number of regions with human rights monitors trained increases	N	N	Y
Y	118-032	SO-level	SO-level	Tuberculosis treatment success rates in pilot sites	Y	N	Y
Y	118-032	SO-level	SO-level	Reductions in repeat abortions in selected sites	Y	N	N
Y	118-032	IR 3.2.1	New approaches to service delivery adopted	Increased exclusive breastfeeding rate (0-3 month olds) in selected sites	Y	N	N
Y	118-032	IR 3.2.3	Increased capacity of local governments to mobilize resources and provide goods and services on a sustainable basis	Number of communities with improved social assistance programs	Y	N	Y