

Evaluation Report

UNDP/SDC/UNICEF

Joint Programme

Support to Strategic Policy Formulation, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Republic of Moldova

Final Version

06 December 2007

Roderick Ackermann

Diana Cheianu-Andrei

Glossary

CPA	Central Public Administration
EC	European Commission
EGPRS	Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy
EU	European Union
JP	Joint Programme "Support to Strategic Policy Formulation, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Republic of Moldova"
M&E	Monitoring And Evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MoAFI	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry
MoET	Ministry of Economy and Trade
MoH	Ministry of Health
MSPFC	Ministry of Social Protection, Family and Child
NBS	National Bureau of Statistics
NDP	National Development Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PPMU	Poverty and Policy Monitoring Unit
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SPSS	A commercial statistical analysis application
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	6
Evaluation methodology	7
Relevance	9
Efficiency	14
Effectiveness	17
Impact	21
Sustainability	23
Key Findings And Lessons Learned	25
Examples Of Good Practice	27
Possible Areas for Future Support	28
Conclusions	30
Recommendations	32
Annexes	35
Annex 1. Stakeholders Interviewed	36
Annex 2. Documents Referred To	38
Annex 3. Terms Of Reference - International Evaluator	41
Annex 4. Terms Of Reference - National Evaluator	47
Annex 5. National Consultant Survey Results	53

Executive Summary

1. This report covers the evaluation of the Joint Programme "Support to Strategic Policy Formulation, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Republic of Moldova" (JP), which is jointly funded by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). The evaluation was carried out by Roderick Ackermann and Diana Cheianu-Andrei, the authors of the report, in November 2007.

Relevance

2. The JP is relevant to a number of key strategic policies and documents, in particular the Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EGPRS) of Moldova, and it contributes directly to the development of the National Development Plan (NDP). Key project outputs are highly relevant to Moldova's needs, and to the needs of international organisations supporting Moldova's development.

3. However, this project is essentially a continuation of a previous UNDP project, which was implemented between 2000 and 2004. A key achievement of that project was the establishment of a UNDP-funded Poverty and Policy Monitoring Unit (PPMU) in the Ministry of Economy. At the end of that project, the PPMU was disbanded as the government declined to take on its financing. Thus, the decision to launch a second, more ambitious project, utilising essentially the same delivery model, targeting the same institution, is hard to understand.

4. The JP design ignores the challenges involved in building sustainable capacity in a public administration that is critically underpaid, poorly managed, and highly vulnerable to political changes. The situation has been further complicated by the announcement, in 2005, of a major reform of the central public administration, which remains unfinished.

5. The "joint" approach, involving several donors, has not been effective, as there has, from the start, been a lack of common understanding between them about JP objectives, and other issues.

6. The lack of substantive involvement of the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) in the JP means that project outputs may not be sufficiently incorporated into existing national statistical framework, with consequent risks to sustainability.

7. Some of the activities are of doubtful relevance to the JP objectives and to the immediate needs of the beneficiary institutions.

Efficiency

8. There has been a lack of effective project management at both strategic and operational levels. Project management arrangements are complicated and responsibilities are unclear. Decision making is reported to have been slow and inconsistent, and there is reported to have been inconsistent application of procedures.

9. Project steering has been ineffective and poorly managed and this has contributed to problematic communication between project partners.

10. There has been no effective, systematic monitoring of project activities, outputs, and outcomes, with the result that, with some exceptions, resources are not efficiently utilised.

11. The value added by some of the national consultants appears to have been limited. Those working with the Ministry of Economy and Trade (MoET) are utilised to large extent as substitute civil servants, and for activities that have no relevance to project objectives.

12. Approximately 10% of project expenditures to date are accounted for by foreign study visits and training, which have benefited a small number of people. Approximately 18% of study visit places have been assigned to the UNDP-funded national consultants, rather than to members of the public administration.

Effectiveness

13. Project support has been instrumental in producing, and improving the quality of the 2005 and 2006 EGPRS Implementation Reports and Poverty Reports. The poverty monitoring objectives are reportedly being achieved despite high staff turnover, with the vital contribution of an international consultant. Previously, the government lacked statistics in this area. Small area deprivation indexes and local "socio-economic passports" produced with project support are reportedly contributing to regional development planning. It is understood, however, that much of this achievement remains heavily dependent on the direct input of the UNDP-funded national consultants.

14. The project has contributed to capacity building in the Moldovan public administration, although not to the extent envisaged. Moreover, most of the institutions that have received support from this project have also received related support from other sources, so improvements can only be partially attributed to the JP.

15. The Main Division for Macroeconomic Policies and Development Programmes within the MoET reports that the capacity of at least two of its staff has been significantly increased as a result of project activities.

16. Training in mid 2007 has, to varying degrees, increased the capacity within most of the seven recently established policy monitoring and evaluation (M&E) units. Two of the units did not benefit significantly from participation in the training. The policy M&E unit in the Ministry of Health (MoH) notes an improvement in the quality of policy-related documents since it participated in the training. Since then, it has reviewed four strategy proposals, 15 policy proposals, and two concept proposals. In all, approximately 28 new policy-related documents are reported to have been developed by four of the seven policy M&E units that participated in the training.

17. Most of the seven policy M&E units reported that their contribution to the development of the NDP improved as a result of participation in the training provided in mid-2007.

18. On the basis of feedback from one of the three pilot rajons, there has been some capacity development at the regional level.

19. With project funding, the Participation Council and its secretariat have made a significant contribution to the civil society dialogue in general, and to the NDP consultation process in particular. The Participation Council Secretariat has been directly responsible for the delivery of a number of important papers and reports.

Impact

20. EGPRS Implementation Reports and Poverty Reports provide an important framework for dialogue between the government and international organisations, such as the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund. Moreover, these documents contribute directly to the development of the strategy of these organisations in Moldova.

21. EGPRS Implementation Reports and Poverty Reports are also used by Moldovan stakeholders, such as civil society organisation and universities. Data from these documents will help to guide not only strategic thinking, but also the design and implementation of individual donor-funded projects due to the level of detail.

22. UNICEF notes that the JP has significantly raised the profile of children in the government's policy agenda.

23. The NDP is now in place. National ownership of this document should be enhanced by the comprehensive consultation process that was implemented with the support of the Participation Council and its secretariat

24. The authorities in Rezina report that implementation of the new monitoring methodology has contributed directly to policy making within the rajon by helping to identify important trends. As a result of the JP, they are actively involved in policy making at the national level through close contacts with the MoET and participation in relevant meetings in Chisinau.

25. However, feedback suggests that only in a limited number of areas is the government addressing issues highlighted by project outputs. The results of poverty monitoring are reportedly still not fully accepted by the government, which is reluctant to publish the findings, and poverty monitoring is likely to continue to need support in future.

26. While many policy are now being developed with the benefit of improved know-how, they have yet to be implemented. Given the current state of the Moldovan public administration, the effective implementation of new policies is likely to prove challenging.

27. Only approximately half of Moldova's government ministries have been introduced to new policy tools and techniques through this project. In some ministries that have policy M&E units, their impact is likely to be limited by a lack of understanding and recognition of their role.

Sustainability

28. Sustainability is relatively good in at least one of the seven pilot policy M&E units (the MoH), despite low salaries, and there appears to be good sustainability within the pilot rajon visited by the evaluators.

29. However, in most other respects, prospects for sustainability are very limited.

30. UNDP may be undermining its stated capacity building objectives, and those of other international organisation in Moldova, by continuing to provide essentially the same type of "capacity building" support to the same institution over a seven year period, in the absence of significant sustainable results.

31. There is a general perception that EGPRS Monitoring Reports and Poverty Reports are prepared largely to comply with the requirements of foreign/international organisations, rather than as a government tool to support policy planning and implementation.

32. Much of the capacity building support at the central level has already been undermined by high staff turnover within the public administration, and this is likely to continue to undermine sustainability in future. Furthermore, the continuing central public administration (CPA) reform process is likely to result in more institutional restructuring in relation to institutions that have benefited from the support of the JP.

33. Without continuing support, it is unclear to what extent the government will continue to apply the participatory approach implemented during the development of the NDP.

Conclusions

Progress towards achievement of the main objectives

Increased Government capacity to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate national policies.

34. The project has contributed limited capacity development within the MoET and other ministries to monitor and evaluate national policies. However, the sustainability of this capacity is at risk, in view of the small number of staff whose capacity has been developed, and the instability of the public administration.

35. There are 17 government ministries in Moldova. The capacity to formulate sectoral policies has been strengthened in two or three of these, although this can be only partly be attributed to the current project. However, these institutions themselves acknowledge that they still lack policy implementation capacity. In general, capacity is constrained by staff shortages, and in some cases multiple responsibilities, in the seven newly established policy M&E units. There is also a lack of understanding in some of seven ministries of the role of the new units. Sustainability is at risk due to the general instability of the public administration, and incomplete institutional restructuring in the pilot ministries.

36. Some capacity has been developed to develop and implement policy at the regional and local levels, but these are local initiatives, rather than government initiatives. No evidence was presented to the evaluators of strengthened government capacity to implement national policies at the regional and local levels.

Consolidated participatory process to develop and implement national policies

37. The NDP consultation process was a significant improvement over past practices. However, stakeholder feedback suggests that continuing support will be required for some time to come before this approach becomes embedded in government philosophy. Furthermore, it has been suggested that a lack of government responsiveness to civil society input in some areas is leading to disillusion.

Overall Conclusion

38. The JP objectives are relevant in theory, but in practice they are too ambitious given the current situation in the Moldovan public administration, and the limited capacity of the UNDP to manage a project of this complexity. In particular, the design of the JP overlooks the need to overhaul human resource management in the public administration in order to establish conditions in which significant, sustainable capacity building can be accomplished.

39. The project has delivered some outputs that are of considerable importance for Moldova's development and dialogue with international organisations. There has been some limited capacity building at central and regional levels. Overall, these results could probably have been achieved at significantly lower cost, through better management of inputs.

40. There were significant developments in the "participatory process" in 2007. These were achieved by the Participation Council and its secretariat with JP funding, but in other respects, the JP has added little value to the activities of this body.

41. The CPA reform process has no doubt contributed to the difficulties experienced by the JP, but it is by no means the only factor. The design of the JP, the lack of common understanding between the project donors, and the lack of effective management have added to the difficulties.

Main Recommendations

- For future joint interventions, UNDP should ensure that there is (a) common understanding and agreement amongst all donors on all objectives, management systems, and delivery mechanisms; (b) full understanding of, and agreement on, changes to any of these; (c) a clear and compelling benefit from pooling resources and management in this way; (d) clear understanding and agreement amongst donors regarding existing and future bilateral activities with the same beneficiary institutions and/or in the same thematic area.
- For future projects of this complexity, UNDP should consider retaining the services of an experienced project manager with international experience.
- UNDP should consider retaining experienced, independent experts to carry out ex-ante evaluations of complex project proposals.
- UNDP should work with other donors to implement a more co-ordinated, systematic, and effective dialogue with the government. Working more effectively with other donors in this way would help to establish conditions more conducive to the effective utilisation and sustainability of this and other international interventions in Moldova. Such a dialogue should include the improvement of human resource management in the public administration as a high priority. Future UNDP interventions should place more emphasis on improving overall human resource management at both macro and micro levels.
- UNDP should re-assess its role in Moldova in view of the increasing role of the EU in Moldova. It should co-ordinate future interventions more closely with the EC Delegation to ensure that future interventions in specific policy areas are generally in line with EU approaches.

Introduction

42. This evaluation report has been written by Roderick Ackermann and Diana Cheianu-Andrei under contract to UNDP in Moldova.

43. The report covers the Joint Programme "Support to Strategic Policy Formulation, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Republic of Moldova" (the JP). The evaluation was carried out in November 2007.

44. The programme commenced in late 2004, and was originally due to expire in late 2007, but was extended in late 2007 until the end of April 2008.

45. The project document gave an estimated budget of \$2,584,970, of which \$1,200,000 was to be provided by UNDP, and \$300,000 by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), leaving a budgetary shortfall of \$1,084,970.

46. Ultimately, UNICEF contributed only \$50,000. The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) subsequently committed 500,000 Swiss Francs to the programme in 2005. Thus the budgetary shortfall was not addressed.

47. According to information provided by the JP office, actual disbursements as of mid November 2007 are as follows:

	UNDP (\$)	UNICEF (\$)	SDC (\$)	Totals (\$)
2,004.00	9,275			9,275
2,005.00	525,663	5,493		531,156
2,006.00	416,232	31,738	226,816	674,786
2,007.00	236,212	5,875	161,683	403,770
Totals	1,187,382	43,106	388,499	1,618,987

48. The project document envisages the following outcomes:

- (I) Evidence-based policy development strengthened;
- (II) Institutional framework to manage/coordinate the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of national policies strengthened in the Ministry of Economy;
- (III) Mechanisms to implement/develop, monitor and evaluate national policy strengthened in line ministries (e.g. Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Labor and Social Protection, Ministry of Education, etc.);
- (IV) Mechanisms to support implementation, monitoring and evaluation are strengthened at the regional and local level;
- (V) Government and civil society work in partnership at local, regional and national level to formulate, implement, monitor and evaluate national policy;
- (VI) Information and communication mechanisms are developed to support policy dialogue at central, regional and local levels;
- (VII) Effective project management ensured through: at least 90% delivery rate; timely implementation of planned activities; timely submission of progress reports; compliance with rules and regulations of the participating Agencies; regular reports to donors and effectiveness of resources management.

49. In 2006, the JP was superficially restructured as follows:

- (I) Output 1. Increased Government capacity to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate national policies.
 - (a) Activity 1: Strengthening central government capacity to develop evidence-based and coordinated national policies.
 - (b) Activity 2: Strengthening line ministries' capacity to formulate, coordinate and implement sectoral policies.
 - (c) Activity 3: Strengthening government capacity to implement national policies at the regional and local levels.
- (II) Output 2. Consolidated participatory process to develop and implement national policies.
 - (a) Activity 4: Strengthening social partnership at national, regional and local levels to develop and implement national policies.
 - (b) Activity 5: Ensuring effective project management.

50. The main beneficiary has been the Ministry of Economy and Trade (MoET). Support has also been provided to regional and local authorities in three of Moldova's 32 rajons.¹ In 2007 the JP has supported seven recently established pilot policy monitoring and evaluation (M&E) units with training (shaded rows in the table below indicate which ministries have been supported by the JP). Finally, project funding has been used to enable the continuation of the activities of the Participation Council and its secretariat since February 2006.

Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry
Ministry of Culture and Tourism
Ministry of Defence
Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources
Ministry of Economy and Trade
Ministry of Education and Youth
Ministry of Finance
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration
Ministry of Health
Ministry of Industry and Infrastructure
Ministry of Informational Development
Ministry of Internal Affairs
Ministry of Justice
Ministry of Local Public Administration
Ministry of Reintegration
Ministry of Social Protection, Family and Child
Ministry of Transport and Road Management

Evaluation methodology

51. This evaluation is based on a review of numerous documents (see Annex 2), and interviews with 32 stakeholders from a number of institutions (see Annex 1).

52. Due to the lack of suitable monitoring data, only limited quantitative analysis has been possible.

¹ These do not include the municipalities of Balti, Bender, Chisinau, the autonomous territorial unit of Gagauzia, and the territorial unit, Stinga Nistrului.

53. A questionnaire was circulated to the 10 national consultants, including the two that make up the Participation Council Secretariat. Six responses were received. A translation of the summarised responses is provided in Annex 5.
54. A kick-off meeting was held on 15.11.2007 with the main stakeholders, although UNICEF was not able to participate.
55. An outline of the draft report was submitted to UNDP on 23.11.2007 and this was reviewed at a debriefing meeting later in the day, involving representatives of the Ministry of Economy and Trade, UNDP, SDC, and UNICEF.

Relevance

Strengths

56. The design of the JP incorporates some of the lessons learned that were identified in the evaluation report covering the previous project, *Capacity Building For Poverty Monitoring And Programme Evaluation*. For example:

- (I) *The need to complement basic data with analysis;*
- (II) *The need to broaden the scope of the project to cover both poverty-reduction social programmes, as well objectives relating to economic, political and institutional goals, as included in the EGPRSP;*
- (III) *The need to link project objectives and activities to broader policy objectives of the EGPRSP, MDGs, UNDAF, CCF, and EU.* In this respect, the JP is directly relevant to the objectives of the 2001 United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), to the five areas of co-operation proposed in the 2005 Common Country Assessment, and to the three areas of cooperation outlined in the 2007-2011 UNDAF. The project supports the implementation and monitoring of the Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EGPRS) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG).

57. The project supports the development of the National Development Plan (NDP), and its eventual implementation and monitoring. It contributes to the ongoing central public administration (CPA) reform by supporting the newly established policy M&E units. Project outputs facilitate dialogue between the government of Moldova and international bodies, and it facilitates the strategic planning of the latter.

58. The activities of the Participation Council and the Participation Council Secretariat, in particular (but not only) with respect to the NDP consultation process, have been highly relevant to the objective of improving the participation of civil society in the policy making process.

59. Feedback from one of the pilot regions indicates that new data collection methodology, new software, new hardware, and training have all been relevant to regional and local needs.

Weaknesses

60. Feedback, primarily (but not only) from UNDP suggests that project initiation was driven by one or two Moldovan members of UNDP staff (who have since left), rather than by UNDP institutionally. As a result, there is lack of institutional ownership and commitment on the part of UNDP. This perception was reinforced by the fact that current UNDP Moldova staff were unable to provide substantive information about the JP to the evaluators and several times referred them to former members of staff, who are now working in other countries.

61. The project is, in many respects, a continuation of a previous UNDP project that provided continuous support to the Ministry of Economy from 2000 to 2004 at a cost of \$694,750: *Capacity Building For Poverty Monitoring And Programme Evaluation*. However, the project document for the JP makes limited reference to the previous project.

62. It notes that *The Policy and Poverty Monitoring Unit, created in the framework of this project, has gained wide recognition for the valuable analytical products it created and for the essential contributions in the elaboration of the EGPRSP*. But it fails to note that this unit ceased to function at the end of the project. It thus fails to make it clear that the previous project failed to achieve one of its main objectives, namely *establish sustainable institutional structures to perform these tasks in the longer-term*.

63. The JP project document makes no mention of how the problems of the previous project will be avoided in order to ensure that the JP can achieve its outcomes:

- (I) *A sound institutional framework for the participatory formulation, monitoring and evaluation of development policies and trends in place;*
- (II) *Increased capacity of government employees at both central and local levels to plan and prioritize development projects and programmes as well as manage resources to ensure the achievement of EGPRSP/ MDGs targets.*

64. Under the heading *Risks and Risk Management*, the project document provides a brief and superficial summary of risks, but there is no information about risk management. Given the weak state of the Moldovan public administration, and its vulnerability to political changes, and given the experience of the previous project, the choice of the NEX modality to implement the project with limited UNDP oversight is questionable.

65. The JP project document includes a list of six potential project partners (one of which is *UN Agencies*). One of these "potential partner" DFID informed the evaluators that it had been approached to participate in the project at an early stage but had declined as it considered it to be too ambitious.² Of these "potential partners" only UNICEF has actually been involved in the project, and it subsequently reduced its commitment from \$300,000 to \$50,000. The second largest donor, SDC, is not mentioned at all.

66. Although some of the issues identified in the evaluation report covering the previous project have been taken into account in the design of the current project, other important issues that were identified, for example regarding sustainability and government commitment, were not addressed in design of the current project. Thus, to a large extent, the current project suffers from the same critical issues that undermined its predecessor.

67. It is understood that UNDP was unable to ensure the sustainability of the PPMU established by the previous project, consisting of 19 UNDP-funded staff,³ as it was not taken over by the Ministry of Economy at the end of that project, and the unit therefore ceased to exist. The current project adopted essentially the same approach as the previous project, by establishing a pool of national consultants to work within the Ministry of Economy. At least two of the national consultants have been supporting the MoET in the same area, with UNDP funding, for approximately seven years.

² The UNDP Moldova website lists DFID as one of the project partners, along with the Swedish International Development Agency, although it is understood that neither have played any substantive role in the project. <http://www.undp.md/projects/op15.shtml>

³ Including project management, administrative, and logistical staff.

68. The design ignores the challenges involved in building sustainable capacity in a public administration that is critically underpaid, poorly managed, and highly vulnerable to political changes.. Significant, sustainable capacity building is unrealistic in the present circumstances of high staff turnover in the civil service, which is exacerbated by the protracted and erratic CPA reform process. Even without the CPA reform process, the broad scope of the programme was risky and over-ambitious.

69. There is a lack of government ownership and understanding (at the political level), in particular of the concept of capacity building, possibly due to a lack of effective government involvement in the initiation and design of the JP. The project is therefore, to a large extent, supply driven. Rather than contributing resources to the JP, as recommended by the evaluation report covering the previous project, the main beneficiary appears to be utilising project resources to fill gaps in its human resources.

- (I) Key MoET staff assigned to the JP are overloaded with other responsibilities and can not therefore make an optimal contribution to project activities and objectives.
- (II) Support is largely capacity substitution rather than real capacity building.
- (III) A significant proportion of national consultant time is reportedly spent on activities that are not relevant to the JP objectives.
- (IV) The current project employs a UNDP-funded driver, whose services are reportedly utilised by members of MoET staff. This suggests that UNDP is covering the cost of some of the Ministry's basic logistical requirements.
- (V) All of the new policy M&E units established in the seven pilot ministries are understaffed, and in several cases, staff from these units are simultaneously involved in other activities with other departments within their respective ministries.

70. The evaluation of the previous project identified *The need to ensure that "monitoring by objective and by outcome" is carried out* . There is no evidence of such monitoring having been carried out, and there has, in fact, been little, if any, effective monitoring of the JP. There is no evidence of a substantive baseline study, although the project document envisaged the implementation of such a study at the beginning of the JP.

71. *The need to share the financing of the new project, with other donors* (identified in the evaluation report of the previous project) is not satisfactorily addressed by the current project. The SDC is only other significant donor involved. UNDP failed to capitalise on the involvement of this partner by not involving it in sufficiently in key project decisions.

72. There has, from the start, been a lack of common understanding of objectives amongst the JP donors. The project has suffered from a lack of a real joint approach by the donors, with the result that limited influence has been exerted on the government to establish and maintain conditions suitable for the maximisation of project impact and sustainability.

- (I) Some of the activities carried out by UNDP with project funding are considered by other stakeholders to be of limited immediate relevance to the JP objectives, and indeed of limited benefit to the target institutions.
- (II) UNDP notes that UNICEF engaged in bilateral discussions with the MoET during the implementation of the JP without informing other project partners.

- (III) Both UNICEF and SDC have been dissatisfied with the level of consultation and reporting by UNDP and perceive this to stem from an approach on the part of UNDP that, as lesser contributors to the JP, the views and requirements of these two institutions regarding project design, implementation, and monitoring were less important than those of UNDP.
- (IV) Following the announcement of the CPA reform in 2005, UNDP initiated the CPA Reform Programme, which provides additional support to the same target institutions in parallel with the Joint Programme. This is considered by one of the JP donors to have diluted the effectiveness and impact of the Joint Programme, given the limited absorption capacity of the central administration.

73. Lack of strategic co-ordination between international agencies means that institutions are receiving support simultaneously from several different sources. Stakeholder feedback indicates possible duplication of assistance and overloading of beneficiary institutions.

- (I) Several of the JP beneficiaries are known to be receiving support simultaneously from different sources. Without proper co-ordination, there is a real risk of duplication of efforts.
- (II) Several of the new policy M&E units have participated in training provided by the Academy of Public Administration, with funding from the CPA Reform Trust. Feedback from two of the policy M&E units indicates that some of this training repeats training already provided by the JP.
- (III) English training has been provided to policy M&E units by the JP. It is also being provided in some cases by the CPA Reform Project.

74. There has been a lack of substantive National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) involvement in the JP, which may have negative consequences for the long-term relevance and sustainability of the results. Data collection, analysis, and dissemination of EGPRS monitoring information has not been adequately incorporated into the official national statistical framework. The NBS is sceptical about data collection and analysis methodology, and is uncertain if it meets Moldovan legal requirements and complies with international norms. There is a risk duplication of activities and systems.

75. Changes to design and activities appear to have been ad-hoc with no revision of the project document, and with insufficient consultation amongst the JP donors and between project donors and the government.

76. There is a lack of differentiation amongst stakeholders between this project and the CPA reform project, and some confusion with other support.

77. The project management structure is complicated and ineffective.

- (I) The original design assigned the position of "First Project Executive" to the Minister or Deputy Minister of Economy.
- (II) There has been over-reliance on administrative procedures and insufficient attention to the human factor of management.
- (III) Ad-hoc adjustments have been made to management arrangements, that have further undermined project implementation, rather than improving it.

78. While training provided for the new policy M&E units has been generally relevant to their needs, the design of the training could have been significantly better.

- (I) The training failed to take into account the different capacities within the different policy M&E units. Thus, for the MoET, the training provided little new knowledge, while the policy M&E units in the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Social Protection, Family and Child (MSPFC) felt that it covered too many new subjects too quickly and not in sufficient detail.
- (II) Six of the seven policy M&E unit reported that the timing and duration of the training were highly problematic. All of the units are understaffed and could not afford to allow all staff to attend all training. The training took place in a six week block at a particularly busy period (e.g. during the NDP consultation period).
- (III) Several of the policy units had already been in operation for up to nine months by the time that the training was delivered. Support to these units could have started earlier, thus avoiding the busy summer period, and at the same time enabling them to contribute more effectively to the policy development process, in particular the NDP.
- (IV) The location of some of the training was inconvenient for participants. This was particularly problematic given that the training was only four hours per day.

79. While, in principle, DevInfo is considered to be a useful tool, it currently has limited relevance.

- (I) There is a lack of ownership on the part of the Moldovan authorities. This is largely due to the fact that the NBS is implementing another system (with Norwegian support) that it considers to be superior, and capable of incorporating all the data currently available on DevInfo.
- (II) DevInfo has not been effectively promoted and is therefore not widely used.
- (III) DevInfo has not been updated in a timely manner, thus undermining interest in its utilisation.

Efficiency

Strengths

80. The cost-benefit of training for the rajons is very good. For example, training for 210 participants in the three pilot rajons in 2006 cost \$2,300. Feedback from one pilot rajon indicates that, overall, training delivered significant benefits to the participants.

81. Stakeholder feedback indicates that the Participation Council and its secretariat have implemented numerous activities involving many stakeholders, and have delivered a number of important outputs, in a timely and efficient manner. In particular, the Participation Council and its secretariat have made a significant contribution to the development of the NDP. In all, the Participation Council has accounted for approximately 16% of project expenditures to date. This compares favourably with other project activities. For example, study tours have accounted for approximately 10% of project expenditures to date, with few tangible results.

Weaknesses

82. Project steering has been ineffective and poorly managed. This has contributed to problematic communication between project partners. Minutes of steering committee meetings provide little evidence of decision making, and it is understood that important information has not always been circulated to stakeholders prior to meetings. Reporting at steering committee meetings appears to have been largely superficial.

83. There has been a lack of effective project management at both strategic and operational levels, both before and after the departure of the last UNDP-financed project manager. Decision making is reported to have been slow and inconsistent, and there is reported to have been inconsistent application of procedures. These problems are attributable to a number of factors.

- (I) There have been complicated and cumbersome management arrangements from the start of the JP, including the involvement of senior political figures.
- (II) Following the departure of the last project manager in late 2006, the responsibilities of the project manager were transferred to the already overloaded National Co-ordinator in the MoET, with some responsibilities also transferred to UNDP-funded project assistants.
- (III) There has been high turnover of key personnel:
 - within the MoET at both political and operational levels;
 - within UNDP;
 - within UNDP-funded project management unit at the MoET.
- (IV) The heavy workload of key UNDP staff has limited their ability to facilitate, monitor, and guide project implementation.

84. There has been no effective, systematic monitoring of project activities, outputs, and outcomes.

- (I) It took the JP office more than one week to provide the evaluators with details of the various project training activities. While this information does provide details of each event, it is not possible to determine how many individual experts benefited from training and/or study visits. The duration and subject of these activities is unclear in several cases. In most cases, there is no information regarding the institutions from which the participants came.
- (II) There is no clear relationship between financial reporting and project structure. Therefore, relating expenditure to individual project objectives, components, and activities.
- (III) The available documentation is superficial and does not provide a complete picture of activities. This includes steering committee minutes, quarterly reports, and annual reports.

85. No use has been made of some of the JP outputs. For example, the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the JP developed in 2006 has not been utilised. The evaluators obtained this from the contractor, as neither UNDP, nor the UNDP-funded project office were able to locate it. It is also unclear how or if the MDG Costings have been utilised.

86. The value added by some of the national consultants appears to have been limited.

- (I) The current and previous project management within the MoET expressed considerable dissatisfaction with some of the national consultants provided by the JP. UNDP has either not been made sufficiently aware of such problems, or has not formally been provided with the necessary justification by the MoET to make changes.
- (II) National consultants employed to build capacity in the public administration account for approximately 18% of foreign training and study visit participants (see below).
- (III) Some recruitment to the pool of national consultants has reportedly not been made on the basis of objective selection criteria.

87. The overall cost-effectiveness of training activities is doubtful due to the significantly higher amount spent on foreign training and study visits, the doubtful immediate relevance of some of these activities to project objectives, and participation of project-funded national consultants in foreign activities. Of the \$211,675 spent on training activities, approximately 73% was spent on training and study tours outside Moldova.

- (I) From the information provided to the evaluators, it is not possible to determine exactly how many individual experts benefited from training and study tours, since many experts are reported to have participated in two or more activities. Thus the gross number of participants in foreign training and study visits is 82, the effective number (i.e. the number of individual experts involved) is reported to be significantly lower. Similarly, for training activities within Moldova, the gross number of participants is 708, the effective number is lower.
- (II) The average cost per expert for participation in foreign activities is approximately \$1,886, whereas for participation in training in Moldova, the average cost is \$80.

- (III) It is understood that approximately 18% of foreign training and study visit places (and almost 19% of related costs) were allocated to national consultants funded by the JP, rather than to experts from the Moldovan public administration. The participation of consultants in such events may be justified in some cases, for example to help co-ordinate the implementation of a study visit involving a large group. However, this does not seem to have been the case, since between one and three national consultants participated in relatively small groups (in some cases making up 50% of the group), and 10 of the foreign events involving up to nine people took place without the involvement of any national consultants.
- (IV) Some of the training that took place in other countries is available in Moldova. For example, there is some argument as to whether or not SPSS training could have been provided in Moldova. Such expertise was and is available in Moldova, but there were no SPSS-certified trainers in Moldova at the time of the training.
- (V) The immediate relevance of some of the foreign activities to the JP is unclear, and in some cases is doubtful.

88. It is understood that the envisaged key project outputs have accounted for only a limited proportion of the national consultant support provided to the MoET. Therefore, it is likely that the same result could have been achieved at a significantly lower cost.

- (I) Some national consultants report that their work has not been guided by a clear strategic framework and that they have been largely uncoordinated and unsupervised.
- (II) National consultants and the MoET report that much of the work carried out by the JP for the MoET is ad-hoc and has limited relevance to project objectives.

89. Some of the activities funded by UNDP within the framework of this project were of doubtful immediate relevance to project objectives.

90. Basic training for the newly established policy M&E units between May and October 2006 (the number of days is not known) cost \$21,470. Given that it involved the seven pilot line ministries and the MoET, the cost is modest. However, the overall cost-benefit could probably have been improved by providing it on a more flexible basis to better meet the different needs of individual units (even if the overall cost had been greater). This could have been achieved by:

- (I) Providing training earlier for those policy M&E units that were already established by early 2007;
- (II) Taking more account of the different levels of capacity within the different units;
- (III) Delivering the training during periods that better fitted in with the workloads of the beneficiary units;
- (IV) Ensuring that the training venue was within easy reach of participating institutions.

91. Benefits of support to the rajons could have been improved by earlier delivery of computers and software.

92. It has not been possible to determine the cost of establishing and maintaining DevInfo. Nevertheless, it can be concluded from stakeholder feedback that, regardless of its actual cost, its cost-benefit is currently weak.

- (I) The majority of stakeholders interviewed by the evaluators were either entirely unaware of DevInfo, or knew little about it and have therefore not attempted to use it. Others found it difficult to use and/or that it provided insufficient useful information. Only one of the interviewed stakeholders has made real use of DevInfo.
- (II) DevInfo has not been regularly maintained since the departure the relevant information technology expert from the MoET several months ago.

Effectiveness

Strengths

93. Project support has been instrumental in producing, and improving the quality of the 2005 and 2006 EGPRS Implementation Reports and Poverty Reports. The poverty monitoring objectives are reportedly being achieved despite high staff turnover, with the vital contribution of an international consultant. Previously, the government lacked statistics in this area. Now the NBS is responsible for the data and the MoET for the analysis.

94. Small area deprivation indexes and local "socio-economic passports" produced with project support are reportedly contributing to regional development planning.

95. The project has contributed to capacity building in the Moldovan public administration. However, it should be kept in mind that the JP target groups have received, and continue to receive support from other projects and agencies.

- (I) The Main Division for Macroeconomic Policies and Development Programmes within the MoET reports that the capacity of at least two of its staff has been significantly increased as a result of project activities. One of the national consultants noted that, prior to 2007, the MoET lacked the capacity to carry out poverty analysis calculations. Since the arrival of a new member of MoET staff, some real capacity building has been possible and these techniques are now being transferred to the MoET.
- (II) Training in mid-2007 has, to varying degrees, increased the capacity within most of the seven recently established policy M&E units
 - (a) The training has helped the policy M&E unit at the Ministry of Health (MoH) to review the policy proposals of other departments, and these are reported to have improved as a result.
 - The unit has now reviewed four strategy proposals, 15 policy proposals, and two concept proposals since the training took place. Of these, the following have been approved: the Strategy for the Development of the Health System; the Primary Healthcare Strategy; the Concept for the Reform of the Hospital System; the Health Information Technology Development Strategy.
 - The Youth Friendly Centre Strategy is currently going through the approval process. It is expected that the remainder of these documents will be approved in the near future. All documents benefited from the recent training, and the MoH working groups are reportedly highly satisfied with the policy development process.

- The MoH policy M&E unit provided guidance to civil society organisations involved in assessing the Health for Youth Strategy proposal. It is understood that participating organisations were highly satisfied with the proposal, and readily agreed to it.
- The unit feels better able to review proposals from other ministries in areas relevant to the health sector.
- (b) The policy M&E unit at the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry (MoAFI) notes that, as a result of the training, it has significantly improved reporting procedures, and its capacity to work on strategic plans has been significantly improved. Since the training, the unit has helped to prepare a new for the sustainable development of the agribusiness sector.
- (c) The policy M&E unit at the MSPFC notes that, although it has not yet applied cost-benefit analysis, or drafted any strategic plans since training took place in mid 2007, it is more confident that it knows where to start. The training helped the unit to provide input for the NDP. The unit has analysed the proposals of all departments to ensure that they comply with the Medium Term Expenditure Framework.
- (d) The policy M&E unit at the Ministry of Transport and Roads reports that the training provided the unit with new skills, such as policy and impact assessment, which the unit previously lacked. This new capacity enhanced the unit's contribution to the development of the NDP.
- (e) The policy M&E unit at the Ministry of Industry and Infrastructure reports that it benefited from the training provided in mid 2007.
- It gained an understanding of the linkage between policy and budgeting.
- The unit is better able to identify and address problems in the policy development process.
- The unit notes that documents processed since the training are of a higher quality than they would have been prior to the training. These include proposals for the NDP, and the following strategy/policy documents: machine building industry; light industry; the glass-making industry; radio-electronics, and energy. The latter was adopted in August 2007 and the remainder are expected to be adopted by the end of the year. The unit confirms that reference materials provided during the training continue to be used during the policy analysis process.
- (f) The policy M&E unit at the Ministry of Education and Youth acquired a basic understanding of the policy development process from the training provide in mid 2007. Since the training, it has developed proposals for the NDP, it has developed the Medium Term Expenditure Framework for the Ministry, and it has developed a strategy on the efficiency of schools, which is currently awaiting government approval.
- (III) On the basis of feedback from one of the three pilot rajons, capacity has been built at the regional level.
- (a) A database has been established of administrative records at the local level for regional and community analysis.

- (b) Training has been provided to regional and local officials on how to collect and send data to the MoET.
 - (c) Among the benefits of this training confirmed by Head of the Economic Section of the Rezina Regional Council, was an understanding of how policy decisions should be linked to indicators - an approach which the rajon has now adopted itself. In general, involvement in the JP was reported to have been highly motivating for staff of the Economic Section.
 - (d) New software provided in 2007 has enabled quick identification and correction of data errors.
 - (e) Comparison of data collected for the 2005 and 2006 EGPRS reports, with 2004 data has helped the Rezina Regional Council to identify and address local issues. For example, following the identification of a reduction in the population in the rajon, partly as the result of a low birth rate and a high death rate, a programme has been launched to promote the family and encourage people to stay in the rajon. This includes tangible improvements in living conditions such as connecting communities to running water and to natural gas. Linked to this, efforts are being made to promote small and medium enterprises in the rajon, with TACIS⁴ support.
 - (f) The mayor's office in the village of Tareuca reports that the new data is enabling it to better target humanitarian assistance to those who most need it.
- (IV) One of the national consultants notes that the JP has supported the NBS to carry out a poverty line calculation for the first time. It is worth noting, however, that the NBS, while it acknowledged the support of the MoET, was unaware that it had received support from this project.

96. With project funding, the Participation Council and its secretariat have made a significant contribution to the civil society dialogue in general, and to the NDP consultation process in particular. The Participation Council Secretariat has been directly responsible for the delivery of a number of important papers and reports.

- (I) Early on in the JP, the Participation Council Secretariat developed a concept for civil society participation in the NDP development process, and a government consultation strategy. Both are now being implemented, although reportedly with some reluctance on the part of individual ministries. Ministries are reported to be complying with these documents in general, although they still require encouragement to respond to, and incorporate civil society comments, with explanations. Members of the Participation Council moderated 25 public debates on the NDP in the summer of 2007, with the support and advice of its secretariat.
- (II) The Participation Council has helped civil society organisation to prepare proposals and comments on draft papers and the draft NDP, for example the Anti-Corruption Alliance (which consists of some 20 non-governmental organisations (NGO)). The Participation Council Secretariat is currently preparing a consolidated report on all comments received on the NDP. This explains which recommendations will be incorporated, and which will not, with reasons.

⁴ EC transition assistance programme covering Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

- (III) The MSPFC-NGO Social Partnership Agreement, signed on 02.11.2007, is the result of three years' work by the Participation Council. It is reported to focus on concrete issues rather than vague principles. The annexes include a list of common issues to be jointly solved over four years, and the agreement includes useful practical tools, such as indicators for service standards. The Participation Council Secretariat helped to draft the memorandum and strategy. The MSPFC learned more about NGO activities, lobbying, and partnership. It is hoped that this approach will be used as a model in other sectors, although there is so far no evidence of this. This is a particularly noteworthy achievement, given that the MSPFC has changed its name and functions several times over the past three years, and there has been a change of minister.
- (IV) The Participation Council Secretariat produced the 2006 People's Perception of EGPRS Impact (focusing on education and primary healthcare), and it is currently working on the 2007 perception report. The studies involve qualitative (focus groups of 100 people) and quantitative (1,100 people) research. This activity has had immediate impact, by identifying issues for follow-up by relevant authorities. Some ministries have approached the Participation Council to ask if research is available on specific topics.
- (V) The Participation Council Secretariat has helped the MoET and the NBS to produce the EGPRS Impact Report and the Poverty Reports, respectively.
- (VI) The Participation Council has organised and facilitated meetings on various issues, for example the reintegration of children in state institutions.

Weaknesses

97. There is a critical lack of absorption capacity within the Moldovan public administration.

98. National consultant feedback indicates that, while they were urged by UNDP to build capacity in the MoET, some were not provided with methodological guidelines or training on how to deliver capacity building support.

Impact

Strengths

99. EGPRS Implementation Reports and Poverty Reports provide an important framework for dialogue between the government and international organisations, such as the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund. Moreover, these documents contribute directly to the development of the strategy of these organisations in Moldova.

100. EGPRS Implementation Reports and Poverty Reports are used by Moldovan stakeholders, such as civil society organisation and universities. One NGO reported that the 2005 Poverty Report enhanced its contribution to the NDP. It has also been noted that data from these documents will help to guide not only strategic thinking, but also the design and implementation of individual donor-funded projects due to the level of detail.

101. UNICEF notes that the JP has significantly raised the profile of children in the government's policy agenda.

102. The NDP is now in place. National ownership of this document should be enhanced by the comprehensive consultation process that was implemented with the support of the Participation Council and its secretariat, which has been funded by the JP. The consultation process, combined with the reportedly improved quality of policy proposals provided by the seven pilot ministries that benefited from training should contribute to the feasibility and implementation of the NDP, and to its subsequent monitoring and evaluation.

103. Training provided to the seven pilot policy M&E units has, to a variable extent, enabled them to improve the quality of policy proposals developed within their own and other ministries.

- (I) The policy M&E unit in the MoH, for example, notes that it has facilitated the development of some 15 strategies, policies, and other important documents since the training took place. It reports that other departments within the ministry, and external stakeholders, have noted improvements in the policy development process and the in quality of the final documents.
- (II) Most of the policy M&E units reported that that training had enabled them to contribute more effectively to the development of the NDP.

104. The authorities in Rezina report that implementation of the new monitoring methodology has contributed directly to policy making within the rajon by helping to identify important trends.

105. The authorities in Rezina also report that they are actively involved policy making at the national level through close contacts with the MoET and participation in relevant meetings in Chisinau.

Weaknesses

106. Feedback suggests that only in a limited number of areas is the government addressing issues highlighted by project outputs. There is limited evidence of any follow up with the government by the JP donors, or other international agencies, to specific issues highlighted by project activities. This is also reportedly contributing to disillusionment amongst civil society organisations about the participatory process.

107. The results of poverty monitoring are reportedly still not fully accepted by the government, which is reluctant to publish the findings. Poverty monitoring is likely to continue to need support in future.

108. It is not clear to what extent the EGPRS Implementation Reports and Poverty Reports are used by the EC in developing its strategy for support to Moldova.

109. The impact of the new policy M&E units is limited in several ministries.

- (I) There are varying levels of real support within ministries for the new policy M&E units. Thus working conditions and recognition vary considerable.
- (II) There are significant differences in the capacities of the new policy M&E units with respect to number of staff and experience.
- (III) All units state that they have been unable to fill one or more of the positions envisaged within their units. Several units note that, while they have sectoral expertise, they lack economic and statistical expertise.
- (IV) There is lack of clear understanding within certain ministries about their role. In part, this may be due to a lack of dissemination by some policy M&E units within their ministries.
- (V) In some cases, the responsibilities of the new policy M&E units are reported to overlap with the responsibilities of other units in respective ministries, suggesting that further institutional restructuring is required.

110. There is so far no evidence of any impact from DevInfo.

Sustainability

Strengths

111. Sustainability is relatively good in at least one of the seven pilot policy M&E units (the MoH), despite low salaries.

- (I) The unit has strong and experienced leadership.
- (II) Job satisfaction and commitment within the unit appear to be high.
- (III) There is recognition within the MoH of the contribution of the unit.
- (IV) There are relatively good working conditions.

112. There appears to be good sustainability within the pilot rajon visited by the evaluators.

- (I) The head of the relevant department is highly receptive to the support provided by the JP.
- (II) Relevant staff have worked together for a number of years.
- (III) There appears to be a good working atmosphere and job satisfaction
- (IV) There is limited turnover within the regional administration.
- (V) Project support has delivered tangible benefits to the authorities relatively quickly at both rajon and village level.

Weaknesses

113. UNDP may be undermining its stated capacity building objectives, and those of other international organisation in Moldova, by:

- (I) Continuing to provide essentially the same type of "capacity building" support to the same institution over a seven year period, in the absence of significant sustainable capacity building;
- (II) Failing to exert any influence on the main beneficiary to establish conditions more conducive to the effective utilisation and sustainability of UNDP support;
- (III) Funding a pool of national experts to work in the MoET, some of whom are reported to have no more capacity than their MoET counterparts;
- (IV) Transferring management of the national consultants directly to the MoET, which is thereby free to utilise the consultants as it wishes;
- (V) Failing to monitor how its funding is utilised and thereby failing to ensure that project resources are used strictly for purposes directly relevant to the achievement of project objectives.

114. There is a general perception that EGPRS Monitoring Reports and Poverty Reports are prepared largely to comply with the requirements of foreign/international organisations, rather than as a government tool to support policy planning and implementation.

115. Project results, and translation of those results into impact, are heavily dependant on a small number of highly competent and committed experts within the public administration.

116. Much of the capacity building support at the central level has already been undermined by high staff turnover within the public administration, and prospects for future sustainability remain very weak.

- (I) Salaries are very low (according to one policy M&E unit, just 1,500 Lei per month.
- (II) Human resource management and working conditions are generally poor within the public administration.
- (III) The protracted and erratic implementation of the CPA reform is leading to high levels of uncertainty and frustration within the public administration.

117. The unfinished CPA reform process poses a direct risk to sustainability as more institutional restructuring can be expected in relation to institutions that have benefited from the support of the JP.

118. Without continuing support, it is unclear to what extent the government will continue to apply the participatory approach implemented during the development of the NDP.

119. No arrangements have so far been made for the continuation of the important activities carried out by the Participation Council secretariat beyond the end of April 2008.

120. The future of DevInfo is currently highly doubtful.

- (I) Few stakeholder have made use of it.
- (II) It is not regularly updated.
- (III) The NBS reports that it is installing another, more widely used system with Norwegian support that can incorporate all data DevInfo data and is more user friendly.
- (IV) Access to DevInfo currently appears to be limited to Windows users. It is not accessible from a computer using Mac OS X, a Unix-based platform. This suggests that accessibility from other Unix platforms, such as Linux - a cheap and increasingly popular operating system - may also be problematic.

Key Findings And Lessons Learned

121. The expected benefits of a joint intervention, involving several international organisations, have not materialised due to the lack of a clear common understanding between the JP donors.

122. The combination of support at a number of levels, and to a number of institutions into a single project has proven difficult to manage.

123. UNDP's ability to add value has been limited by its own capacity constraints, which include overloading of key staff, and several changes of key staff since initiation of the JP. These problems have contributed to a lack of institutional ownership within UNDP itself.

124. UNDP has administered, rather than managed the JP. This has contributed to a lack of real strategic and operational planning, and to a lack of effective project oversight, with predictable results.

125. UNDP in Moldova has not applied UNDP's Results-Based Management guidelines to this project.

126. UNDP does not have a sufficiently strategic overview of its support to the MoET. A more strategic approach would have avoided the provision of essentially the same type of "capacity building" support to the same institution, more or less continuously for seven years. UNDP has thus contributed to a culture, within the MoET, of dependency on international organisations.

127. The design of the current project incorporated some of the recommendations of the evaluation report covering the previous project, but the other important issues that were identified in that report were not effectively addressed, with the result that previously identified problems have re-occurred.

128. The project appears to be supply driven, with the result that there is insufficient political understanding of, and commitment to, project objectives and key project concepts, such as capacity building.

129. The key project results and impacts appear to have been achieved at relatively little cost. Conversely, a significant proportion of project funding appears to have been expended on activities of doubtful benefit and/or relevance to project objectives.

130. It is not evident that there is systematic monitoring or follow-up by UNDP, with the government, of policy-related issues highlighted by project outputs and activities.

131. The incomplete CPA reform process has undermined the achievement of project objectives in several ways. It is contributing to uncertainty in the public administration, and is thus a factor in high rates of staff turnover. Delayed institutional restructuring has delayed the implementation of some project activities. The sustainability of some capacity building efforts is doubtful in institutions where further institutional restructuring can be expected.

132. No progress has been made, since the evaluation of the previous project in 2004, in addressing the issue of finding ways to recruit and retain key staff in the public administration. That report made the following recommendation:

While it is recognised that at the present time, Moldovan Government policies do not enable it to pay competitive salaries, steps should be taken to move towards instituting special arrangements to retain and maintain key staff.

133. The impact of any capacity building support for the Moldovan public administration is likely to be limited until human resource management is significantly improved. While very low salaries are a significant factor contributing to high staff turnover in the Moldovan public administration, they are by no means the only factor. Poor human resource management and working conditions also play a significant part. It is not evident to what extent UNDP has attempted to influence beneficiary institutions to address non-monetary factors.

134. There is a lack of systematic and effective co-ordination at the strategic level. More effective co-ordination of donor dialogue with the government might have helped to establish conditions more conducive to the effective utilisation and sustainability of this and other international interventions in Moldova.

135. Moldova is now a European Union (EU) neighbour, and the EU is expected to increase its presence in Moldova, and to increase its assistance to Moldova in a number of policy areas. This has implications for the role of UNDP in Moldova, and the type of assistance it is providing.

Examples Of Good Practice

136. There has been a good dissemination effort by some of the recently established policy M&E units within their ministries regarding their role in policy making, for example, the MoH, the MoAFI, and the Ministry of Education and Youth.

137. The activities and outputs of the Participation Council and its secretariat include a number of examples of good practice. These include:

- (I) The concept for civil society participation in the NDP development process, and a government consultation strategy.
- (II) Moderation of 25 public debates on the NDP in the summer of 2007.
- (III) Support to civil society organisation with the preparation of proposals and comments on draft papers and the draft NDP.
- (IV) The MSPFC-NGO Social Partnership Agreement, signed on 02.11.2007, which focuses on concrete issues to be jointly solved over four years.

138. The policy M&E unit at the MoH has been working closely civil society organisations in the development new policy/strategy documents, for example the Health for Youth strategy.

139. Several of the seven supported policy M&E units are putting their recent training into practice, most notably the policy M&E unit at the MoH, and to a lesser extent the policy M&E unit at the Ministry of Industry and Infrastructure.

140. All of the seven supported policy M&E units have been actively involved in the development of proposals of their ministries for the NDP. Several are actively involved in developing strategic plans for their ministries.

141. The Rezina Regional Council is making direct use of new statistics gathered for EGPRS monitoring to help it identify and address problems in the rajon.

142. The project provided a consultant to help the NBS to analyse difference between its old methodology for collecting data for the Household Budget Survey, and its new methodology, which was developed with the support of another donor. The consultant provided guidelines to facilitate comparisons between data collected using the two methodologies.

Possible Areas for Future Support

143. The impact of any capacity building support for the Moldovan public administration is likely to be limited until human resource management is significantly improved. Systematic improvement of human resource management at both the macro and micro levels should be a high priority of UNDP, and other international organisations in Moldova.

144. Further training and technical assistance will be required to varying degrees in all of the recently established policy M&E units to reinforce the newly acquired knowledge. Several of these units expressed an interest in technical assistance to guide the translation of theory into practice. Several of the units will require more basic support, as they did not benefit sufficiently from the six-week training programme in mid 2007, in part because it covered unfamiliar topics too quickly for them. Moreover, several units are understaffed and will require further training for new staff when these are appointed.

145. Policy formulation, monitoring, and evaluation capacity building is likely to be required in other departments of the seven pilot ministries. The role of the new policy M&E units is generally not well understood in other departments, and this is undermining their potential impact. Even where the role is well understood, it is reported that a lack of policy formulation capacity in other departments is overloading policy M&E units, for example in the MoAFI.

146. So far, only eight ministries have benefited directly from the support of this project. Similar support will be necessary for up to nine other ministries, on the assumption that policy M&E unit are to be established in these as well, in due course.

147. Several stakeholders expressed the need for capacity building in the area of project design and management as the next step, in order to translate policies into concrete actions. The MoAFI notes that it has been unable to take up offers of support from several of the new EU member states due to a lack of mature project proposals. Caution is necessary, however, when delivering this type of support, since, if it is not well planned, there may be a tendency for external consultants to write the project proposals themselves, which may be easier in the short-term than transferring the know. It is also necessary to ensure that any contractors retained to deliver this type of service not only have sectoral expertise, but also have real project cycle management expertise.

148. There was widespread interest in learning more about practices and experiences in other countries through study tours. However, UNDP needs to be more selective about the use of study tours as they are relatively expensive, they benefit only a small number of people, and it is not clear that they have all been immediately relevant to the JP objectives and the real needs of the beneficiary institutions. Nor is it clear that right people have always been selected to participate in study tours. UNDP should seek alternative ways of transferring international know-how and experiences to Moldova, for example:

- (I) Increased use of recognised international experts to transfer know-how on site in Moldova;
- (II) Facilitating the establishment of longer-term "mentoring" relationships between policy M&E units in Moldova and similar bodies in other countries;
- (III) Development and/or adaption of re-usable multimedia training tools.

Conclusions

Progress towards achievement of the main objectives

Increased Government capacity to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate national policies.

149. The project has contributed limited capacity development within the MoET and other ministries to monitor and evaluate national policies. However, the sustainability of this capacity is at risk, in view of the small number of staff whose capacity has been developed, and the instability of the public administration.

150. There are 17 government ministries in Moldova. The capacity to formulate sectoral policies has been strengthened in two or three of these, although this can be only partly be attributed to the current project. However, these institutions themselves acknowledge that they still lack policy implementation capacity. In general, capacity is constrained by staff shortages, and in some cases multiple responsibilities, in the seven newly established policy M&E units. There is also a lack of understanding in some of seven ministries of the role of the new units. Sustainability is at risk due to the general instability of the public administration, and incomplete institutional restructuring in the pilot ministries.

151. Some capacity has been developed to develop and implement policy at the regional and local levels, but these are local initiatives, rather than government initiatives. No evidence was presented to the evaluators of strengthened government capacity to implement national policies at the regional and local levels.

Consolidated participatory process to develop and implement national policies

152. The NDP consultation process was a significant improvement over past practices. However, stakeholder feedback suggests that continuing support will be required for some time to come before this approach becomes embedded in government philosophy. Furthermore, it has been suggested that a lack of government responsiveness to civil society input in some areas is leading to disillusion.

Overall Conclusion

153. The JP objectives are relevant in theory, but in practice they are too ambitious given the current situation in the Moldovan public administration, and the limited capacity of the UNDP to manage a project of this complexity. In particular, the design of the JP overlooks the need to overhaul human resource management in the public administration in order to establish conditions in which significant, sustainable capacity building can be accomplished.

154. The project has delivered some outputs that are of considerable importance for Moldova's development and dialogue with international organisations. There has been some limited capacity building at central and regional levels. Overall, these results could probably have been achieved at significantly lower cost, through better management of inputs.

155. There were significant developments in the "participatory process" in 2007. These were achieved by the Participation Council and its secretariat with JP funding, but in other respects, the JP has added little value to the activities of this body.

156. The CPA reform process has no doubt contributed to the difficulties experienced by the JP, but it is by no means the only factor. The design of the JP, the lack of common understanding between the project donors, and the lack of effective management have added to the difficulties.

Recommendations

	Key Finding	Recommendation	
1	The expected benefits of a joint intervention, involving several international organisations, have not materialised due to the lack of a clear common understanding between the JP donors due to the lack of a clear common understanding between the JP donors.	For future joint interventions, UNDP should ensure that there is (a) common understanding and agreement amongst all donors on all objectives, management systems, and delivery mechanisms; (b) full understanding of, and agreement on, changes to any of these; (c) a clear and compelling benefit from pooling resources and management in this way; (d) clear understanding and agreement amongst donors regarding existing and future bilateral activities with the same beneficiary institutions and/or in the same thematic area.	1
2	The combination of support at a number of levels, and to a number of institutions into a single project has proven difficult to manage.	A more manageable, and less risky approach in future would be to split the objectives between a number of smaller projects to be implemented in succession.	2
3	UNDP's ability to add value has been limited by its own capacity constraints, which include overloading of key staff, and several changes of key staff since initiation of the JP. These problems have contributed to a lack of institutional ownership within UNDP itself.	UNDP should take steps to limit its own staff turnover.	3
4	UNDP has administered, rather than managed the JP. This has contributed to a lack of real strategic and operational planning, and to a lack of effective project oversight, with predictable results.	For future projects of this complexity, UNDP should consider retaining the services of an experienced project manager with international experience.	4
5	UNDP in Moldova has not applied UNDP's Results-Based Management guidelines to this project.	For future interventions UNDP should ensure that the necessary systems are established and implemented to collect and analyse project data on a regular basis. In particular, it should ensure that financial information is available in a format that enables linkages to be identified between budgets and expenditures on the one hand, and individual objectives and activities on the other hand. It should collect and analyse more detailed information regarding project activities in order to identify and implement corrective actions in a timely manner.	5

	Key Finding	Recommendation	
6	UNDP does not have a sufficiently strategic overview of its support to the MoET. A more strategic approach would have avoided the provision of essentially the same type of "capacity building" support to the same institution, more or less continuously for seven years. UNDP has thus contributed to a culture, within the MoET, of dependency on international organisations.	UNDP should consider retaining experienced, independent experts to carry out ex-ante evaluations of complex project proposals.	6
7	The design of the current project incorporated some of the recommendations of the evaluation report covering the previous project, but the other important issues that were identified in that report were not effectively addressed, with the result that previously identified problems have re-occurred.		
8	The project appears to be supply driven, with the result that there is insufficient political understanding of, and commitment to, project objectives and key project concepts, such as capacity building.		
9	The key project results and impacts appear to have been achieved at relatively little cost. Conversely, a significant proportion of project funding appears to have been expended on activities of doubtful benefit and/or relevance to project objectives.	UNDP should place more emphasis on ensuring that its projects deliver value for money.	7

	Key Finding	Recommendation	
10	There is a lack of systematic and effective co-ordination at the strategic level.	<p>UNDP should work with other donors to implement a more co-ordinated, systematic, and effective dialogue with the government. Working more effectively with other donors in this way would help to establish conditions more conducive to the effective utilisation and sustainability of this and other international interventions in Moldova.</p> <p>Such a dialogue should include the improvement of human resource management in the public administration as a high priority.</p> <p>Future UNDP interventions should place more emphasis on improving overall human resource management at both macro and micro levels.</p>	8
11	It is not evident that there is systematic monitoring or follow-up by UNDP, with the government, of policy-related issues highlighted by project outputs and activities.		
12	The incomplete CPA reform process has undermined the achievement of project objectives in several ways. It is contributing to uncertainty in the public administration, and is thus a factor in high rates of staff turnover. Delayed institutional restructuring has delayed the implementation of some project activities. The sustainability of some capacity building efforts is doubtful in institutions where further institutional restructuring can be expected.		
13	No progress has been made, since the evaluation of the previous project in 2004, in addressing the issue of finding ways to recruit and retain key staff in the public administration.		
14	The impact of any capacity building support for the Moldovan public administration is likely to be limited until human resource management is significantly improved. While very low salaries are a significant factor contributing to high staff turnover in the Moldovan public administration, they are by no means the only factor. Poor human resource management and working conditions also play a significant part. It is not evident to what extent UNDP has attempted to influence beneficiary institutions to address non-monetary factors.		
15	Moldova is now an EU neighbour, and the EU is expected to increase its presence in Moldova, and to increase its assistance to Moldova in a number of policy areas. This has implications for the role of UNDP in Moldova, and the type of assistance it is providing.	UNDP should re-assess its role in Moldova in view of the increasing role of the EU in Moldova. It should co-ordinate future interventions more closely with the EC Delegation to ensure that future interventions in specific policy areas are generally in line with EU approaches.	9

Annexes

Annex 1. Stakeholders Interviewed

Institution	Name, Function, Department	Meeting 1	Meeting 2
United Nations Development Programme	Ignacio Artaza, Deputy Resident Representative	15/11/07	21/11/07
United Nations Development Programme	Vasile Filatov, Programme Officer	15/11/07	21/11/07
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation	Thomas Kugler, Country Director	15/11/07	16/11/07
Ministry of Economy & Trade	Natalia Catrinescu, Head of Macroeconomic Policies and Development Programmes	15/11/07	17/11/07
UK Department for International Development (DFID)	Alla Skvortova, Head of Section	15/11/07	
Participation Council Secretariat	Igor Grosu, National Consultant, Participation Policies	15/11/07	
	Maia Sandu, Freelance Consultant (Formerly Head of Macroeconomic Policies and Development Programmes of Ministry of Economy & Trade, 2005-2006, and UNDP Programme Coordinator, 2007)	15/11/07	
Ministry of Social Protection, Family & Child	Dorin Resetilov, Consultant Department of Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation of Policies	16/11/07	
Ministry of Social Protection, Family & Child	Aurelia Bilici, Deputy Chief Department of Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation of Policies	16/11/07	
Ministry of Health	Ghenadie Turcanu, Chief of the Division Department of Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation of Policies	16/11/07	
Ministry of Health	Luminita Avornic, Consultant Department of Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation of Policies	16/11/07	
Ministry of Justice	Olga Verhovetchi, Consultant Department of Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation of Policies	16/11/07	
Ministry of Justice	Fulga Grabovschi, Consultant Department of Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation of Policies	16/11/07	
Ministry of Agriculture & Food Industry	Ion Perju, Chief of the Division Department of Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation of Policies	16/11/07	
JP	Maria Vremes, National Consultant, Database and Poverty Diagnosis	17/11/07	
JP	Viorica Craevschi, National Consultant, Social Policies	17/11/07	
JP	Onorica Banciu, National Consultant, Policy Monitoring and Evaluation	17/11/07	
UNICEF	Ray Torres, Representative	17/11/07	
Economic Section of Regional Council, Rezina	Zoia Vivceariuc, Chief of the Economic Section	19/11/07	
Mayor's Office, Tareuca village, Rezina,	Raisa Andronic, Secretary of the Mayor's Office	19/11/07	

Institution	Name, Function, Department	Meeting 1	Meeting 2
Ministry of Transport & Roads	Maria Griniuc, Chief of the Division Department of Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation of Policies	19/11/07	
Institute for Public Policy	Arcadie Barbarosie, Executive Director	20/11/07	
Ministry of Industry & Infrastructure	Andrei Trifautan, Deputy Chief Department of Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation of Policies	20/11/07	
Ministry of Industry & Infrastructure	Anatolie Nuca, Main Expert Department of Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation of Policies	20/11/07	
United Nations Development Programme	Mihai Peleah, Research Assisstant, Bratislava Regional Centre (formerly UNDP Moldova Programme Associate, 2005-2007).	20/11/07	
National Bureau of Statistics	Oleg Cara, Deputy Director	21/11/07	
Ministry of Education & Youth	Tudor Cojocaru, Chief of the Division Department of Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation of Policies	21/11/07	
World Bank	Melanie Marlett, Country Manager Moldova	21/11/07	
World Bank	Iaroslav Bacalajanschi , Economist	21/11/07	
International Monetary Fund	Johan Mathisen, Resident Representative	21/11/07	
EC Delegation	Martin Kaspar, Head of Operations Section	21/11/07	

An interview was requested with the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency but was not granted.

No response was received to an e-mail request for information from Ms. Liumila Barcari, (UNDP Moldova Programme Associate from 2004 to 2005).

Annex 2. Documents Referred To

Where the date of the document is not provided in the document itself, an approximate date has been given here. These are indicated in *italics*. For example, for the minutes of steering committee meetings, the date of the meeting is used in the absence of a document date.

Title of Document	Author	Year	Month	Day
Annual Evaluation Report Of The Implementation of the Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper 2006	Government of the Republic of Moldova	2007		
Annual Evaluation Report on the Implementation of the Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper 2006	Government of the Republic of Moldova	2007		
Annual Project Report 2006	Author not stated	2007	4	
Millennium Development Goals Report "New Challenges – New Objectives"		2007	10	
Minutes of Steering Committee Meeting No.8 (27.04.2007)	Author and date of minutes not stated	2007	4	27
Minutes of Steering Committee Meeting No.9 (14.09.2007)	Author and date of minutes not stated	2007	9	14
Moldova in Figures Statistical Pocket-Book	National Bureau of Statistics	2007		
National Development Plan 2008-2011 Strategy Paper	Ministry of Economy and Trade	2007	5	
National Development Plan 2008-2011 Strategy Paper (Draft)	Ministry of Economy and Trade	2007	5	21
Project Action Plan for 2007	Not stated	2007	5	11
Project Action Plan for 2007 (Draft 1.1)	Author and date not stated	2007		
Project financial reports	JP Project Office	2007	11	
Project Progress Report, Quarter I, 2007	Not stated	2007	5	10
Project Progress Report, Quarter III, 2007	Author not stated	2007	9	27
Report on EGPRS impact in citizens opinion	Participation Council Secretary	2007		
UNDP Moldova website http://www.undp.md/projects/op15.shtml	UNDP	2007	11	30
2005 Annual Progress Report	Not stated	2006	2	
Annual Evaluation Report on the Implementation of the Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper 2005	Government of the Republic of Moldova	2006		
Development of Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for Programme "Support to Strategic Policy Formulation, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Republic of Moldova"	Aria Consulting & Training Company (Maria Ciubotaru and Angela Secrieru)	2006		

Title of Document	Author	Year	Month	Day
Government Decision No.1495 regarding process of formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of National Development Plan 2008-2011	Government of the Republic of Moldova	2006	12	28
Government Decision No.710 regarding creation of Departments of Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation of Policies	Government of the Republic of Moldova	2006	6	23
JPPM structure after conversion	Author and date not stated (provided by UNDP)	2006		
MDG Needs Assessment Part 1	Robert Stryk	2006	7	
Minutes of Steering Committee Meeting No.6 (03.02.2006)	Author and date of minutes not stated	2006	2	3
Minutes of Steering Committee Meeting No.7 (12.05.2006)	Author and date of minutes not stated	2006	5	12
Poverty and Policy Impact Report 2005	Ministry of Economy and Trade	2006		
Project Action Plan for 2006	Not stated	2006	2	3
Project Progress Report 2006, Quarter I	Not stated	2006	4	4
Project Progress Report 2006, Quarters I-II	Not stated	2006	6	30
Project Progress Report 2006, Quarters I-III	Not stated	2006	10	16
Common Country Assessment Republic of Moldova	Government of the Republic of Moldova and United Nations Organisation	2005	7	
Government Decision No. 851 regarding creation of the system for monitoring and evaluation of poverty	Government of the Republic of Moldova	2005	8	15
Minutes of Steering Committee Meeting No.3	Author and date not stated	2005		
Minutes of Steering Committee Meeting No.4 (18.04.2005)	Author and date of minutes not stated	2005	4	18
Minutes of Steering Committee Meeting No.5 (18.04.2005)	Author and date of minutes not stated	2005	10	28
Poverty and Policy Impact Report 2004	Ministry of Economy and Trade	2005		
Project Progress Report 2005, Quarter I	Not stated	2005	4	
Project Progress Report 2005, Quarter II	Not stated	2005	6	
Review of Joint Programme's Experience in the Republic of Moldova - Qualitative Study	Author not stated (provided by UNDP)	2005	12	10
Support to Strategic Policy Formulation, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Republic of Moldova - Links Between Central and Local Levels: The Local Development Contribution	Jan Barrett	2005	1	

Title of Document	Author	Year	Month	Day
The First National Report - Millennium Development Goals in the Republic of Moldova	Government of the Republic of Moldova with the assistance of UN Agencies in Moldova	2005	3	25
United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2007 - 2011	Government of the Republic of Moldova and United Nations Organisation	2005	12	
Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper	Government of the Republic of Moldova	2004	6	
Minutes of Steering Committee Meeting No.1 (18.11.2004)	Author not stated	2004	11	25
Minutes of Steering Committee Meeting No.2 (10.12.2004)	Author not stated	2004	12	22
Project Document for Joint Programme "Support to Strategic Policy Formulation, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Republic of Moldova"	Author not stated (assumed to be UNDP)	2004	10	
Report Of The Outcome Evaluation Mission Of Mol/00/005 Capacity Building For Poverty Monitoring And Programme Evaluation	Michael Askwith	2004	6	1
Republic of Moldova: Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper	International Monetary Fund	2004	12	
Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results	UNDP Evaluation Office	2002		
United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2001	The UN in Molodova	2001	2	

Annex 3. Terms Of Reference - International Evaluator

Programul Comun "Suport pentru elaborarea, monitorizarea și evaluarea politicilor strategice în Republica Moldova"



The Joint Programme "Support to Strategic Policy Formulation, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Republic of Moldova"

Terms of Reference

**International Expert
for
Evaluation of the Joint Programme "Support to Strategic Policy Formulation,
Monitoring and Evaluation in the Republic of Moldova"**

FINAL, Thursday, July 26, 2007

Purpose of the evaluation

1. The purpose of evaluation is to provide holistic, impartial and trustworthy evaluation of the overall Joint Programme „Support to Strategic Policy Formulation, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Republic of Moldova” (hereinafter JPPM) relevance, performance and results.

Programme and Its Context

2. Following a decade of economic decline and fragmented institutional development, Moldova has since 2001 enjoyed relative political stability and sustained economic recovery, with average annual GDP growth of 6.9%. In June 2005, Moldova published its first national Millennium Development Goals (MDG) report¹. After more than a decade of transition, human development lags behind recent economic growth. At 0.671, the 2003 Human Development Index for Moldova was still lower than its 1990 level of 0.739. From almost 70% in 2000, poverty has decreased to around 27% in 2004, but inequality remains relatively high with consumption Gini of 0.38; poverty is greatest in small towns and rural areas.

3. Recognizing the need to focus on the priorities of poverty reduction and social-economic development, the Government developed in consultation with various international organizations and civil society and approved in June 2004 the Economic Growth and Poverty reduction Strategy (EGPRS) and Moldova's Action Plan with the European Union. This mid-term strategic framework aimed to constitute a qualitative shift in the process of policy-making in Moldova, through coordinating sectorial interventions and linking them to common/national medium and long-term objectives, linking the policy-elaboration process to the annual and medium-term budgeting processes, introducing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms linked to clear indicators and promoting participatory processes. The strategy also envisaged a strengthened role for statistics and better use of statistics and statistical analysis in formulating evidence-based policies. The challenge was to narrow priorities, link strategic planning to budgeting in

¹ available at http://www.un.md/key_pub_documents

practice, establish a single monitoring and evaluation system, and build policy-making capacities. As the EGPRS expiring in 2007, in the late 2006 the Government initiated development of new National Development Plan to cover period 2008-2011 and aimed on achievement of long-term development goals (MDGs).

4. The Joint Programme „Support to Strategic Policy Formulation, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Republic of Moldova” (JPPM) was designed to assist the Government of the Republic of Moldova in strategic long-term planning for achieving nationalized MDGs, as well as in the effective monitoring and evaluation of the Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy targets, Millennium Development Goals and the objectives of the European Union – Republic of Moldova Action Plan. The purpose of the Joint Programme was strengthening national capacities in evidence-based and participatory formulation, monitoring and evaluation of development policies and Programmes. The Programme started in late 2004 and covers period till the end 2007. The Programme represents joint effort of Government of Moldova, UNDP, UNICEF, and Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC).

5. The expected outcome of Programme was formulated in the following way “The capacity of selected government organizations to collect, compile, analyze and interpret data and to use information for decision-making is improved.” Programme include two outputs²—“Increased Government capacity to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate national policies” and “Consolidated participatory process to develop and implement national policies”. These outputs to be achieved through five activities—“Strengthening central government capacity to develop evidence-based and coordinated national policies”, “Strengthening line ministries’ capacity to formulate, coordinate and implement sectoral policies”, “Strengthening government capacity to implement national policies at the regional and local levels”, “Strengthening social partnership at national, regional and local levels to develop and implement national policies”, and “Ensuring effective project management”.

6. During Programme implementation context changed significantly. First, Central Public Administration Reform initiated in mid-2005 shifted put more emphasis on governance institutions reform than on capacity building of existing staff. Second, staff turnover in ministries was high during the whole period of programme implementation, with problem significantly aggravated after announcement of Central Public Administration Reform in mid-2005. Last but not least, Programme experienced constant

² The Programme underwent revision and restructuring in mid-2006 as a part of introduction of new RBM User Guide in UNDP. Initially programme foreseen two outcomes and seven outputs (in old terminology):

Expected Outcome(s):

1. A sound institutional framework for the participatory formulation, monitoring and evaluation of development policies and trends in place.
2. Increased capacity of government employees at both central and local levels to plan and prioritize development projects and programmes as well as manage resources to ensure the achievement of EGPRSP/MDGs targets.

Expected Output(s):

1. Evidence-based policy development strengthened;
2. Institutional framework to manage/coordinate the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of national policies strengthened in the Ministry of Economy;
3. Mechanisms to implement/develop, monitor and evaluate national policy strengthened in line ministries (e.g. Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Labor and Social Protection, Ministry of Education, etc.);
4. Mechanisms to support implementation, monitoring and evaluation are strengthened at the regional and local level;
5. Government and civil society work in partnership at local, regional and national level to formulate, implement, monitor and evaluate national policy;
6. Information and communication mechanisms are developed to support policy dialogue at central, regional and local levels;
7. Effective project management ensured.

changes in national counterparts—it changed four National Programme Coordinators during three years of its implementation. Moreover, programme experienced constant changes in Project Managers, functioning long periods even without Manager.

Evaluation objectives and scope

7. The general objective is to provide evaluation of the overall Programme relevance, performance and results. The evaluation should review and assess project experience and present conclusions. Results of programme evaluation will be considered by the Steering Committee and to derive lessons learnt and to propose ways for future work in the area. The specific objective of the evaluation is to provide answer on the following questions:

- **Programme relevance and design:** Was the programme relevant, appropriate and strategic to national goals and the UNDP, SDC, and UNICEF mandate? Is the programme outcome still relevant and require further assistance? Were the selected approaches and actions to achieve the programme outputs and outcomes effective and efficient?
- **Outcome status:** Determine whether or not the programme outcome has been achieved and, if not, whether there has been progress made towards its achievement. This should specifically focus on: (i) to what extent programme team was able to transfer the knowledge and skills to staff in the MoET and the line ministries; (ii) to what extent capacities created are relevant and used within the relevant institutions on different levels; (iii) whether or not improvement in the national pro-poor policy designing, monitoring and implementation is operational; (iv) to what extent support to the Participation Council Secretariat improved quality of the participation process in development, implementation, and monitoring/evaluation of policies, more specifically in monitoring of the EGPRS and NDP consultative process.
- **Programme Implementation and Management.** Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of Programme Management, role and activity of Steering Committee, efficiency of programme management arrangements, roles of National Coordinator³ and Programme Manager. In which extend Results Based Approach was introduced in programme activities targeted on capacity building? Taking into account the Joint modality of Programme, assess the cooperation and communication between participation agencies—UNDP, SDC and UNICEF.
- **Partnership strategy:** Ascertain whether programme partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective. What were the partnerships formed? How did partnerships arise? How did the partnership contribute to the achievement of the outcome? How did they function and sustain? What was the level of stakeholders' participation? Examine the partnership among UN Agencies and other donor organizations in the relevant field.
- **Underlying factors:** Analyze the underlying factors beyond Programme control that influenced the outcome. What were the key assumptions made? Distinguish the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management capacities and issues including the timeliness of outputs, the degree of stakeholders and partners involvement in the completion of outputs, and how processes were managed/carried out. Taking into account fast changing context

³ Programme started in November 2004 with *M.Lupu*, Minister of Economy and Trade as National Programme Coordinator. In February—June 2005 Mr. *I.Mamaliga*, Vice-minister of Economy and Trade played role of national coordinator, followed by *V.Lazar*, Minister of Economy and Trade in July 2005—September 2006 and *I.Dodon*, Minister of Economy and Trade in September 2006—July 2007. In 2007 Management arrangements were simplified to make them more operational and *N.Catrinescu*, Head of Macroeconomic and Development Programmes Department of the Ministry of Economy, became new, the fifth during 3 years of implementation, National Programme Coordinator.

evaluation should pay specific attentions to external context of programme implementation, on risks and their influence on project implementation, on risks management, and on issues raised during programme implementation.

- o Lessons learnt. How might we do things better in the future? Which findings may have relevance for future programming?

Evaluation Approach

8. An overall guidance on outcome evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results⁴. The evaluators should study the document very carefully before they come up with the concrete methodology for the programme evaluation. The evaluation team has certain flexibility to adapt the evaluation methodology to better suit the purposes of the evaluation exercise. Specifically, during the programme evaluation, the evaluators are expected to apply the following approaches for data collection and analysis:

- (i) desk review of existing documents and materials;
- (ii) interviews with partners and stakeholders (including gathering the information on what the partners have achieved with regard to the outcome and what strategies they have used);
- (iii) field visits to selected sites; and
- (iv) briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP and the Government, as well as with other donors and partners.

Results

9. The key product expected from this programme evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the following contents:

- o Executive Summary
- o Introduction
- o Description of the evaluation methodology
- o Programme Relevance
- o Programme Results: Progress toward Programme Outcome
- o Programme Efficiency and Effectiveness
 - Internal programme efficiency
 - Partnership strategy
 - Changes in context and outside of programme control
 - Sustainability of results
- o Key findings (including best practices and lessons learned)
- o Conclusions and Recommendations
- o Annexes: ToRs, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.⁵

10. Apart from the above, based on the recommendations of the mission, an outline for the future assistance in the respective area (if still deemed relevant) is to be produced.

Evaluation Team

11. The evaluation team will consist of two independent evaluators with absolutely no connection to the design, formulation and implementation of the programme in question. The evaluation team will consist of one international (leading) consultant, and one national consultant.

⁴ Available on-line <http://www.undp.org/eo/methodologies.htm>

⁵ See the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results, available on-line <http://www.undp.org/eo/methodologies.htm>

Tasks and responsibilities

12. Specifically, **international consultant** will undertake the following tasks:
- o Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
 - o Design the detailed evaluation methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
 - o Data review through desk study of relevant documents and visiting the beneficiaries and stakeholders including but not limited to:
 - EGPRSP coordination body (MoET) and its subdivisions;
 - Policy Coordination Units within 7 line ministries;
 - Participation Council;
 - Former National Project Coordinators;
 - Donors agencies, including those financing the project (UNDP, UNICEF, SDC), and those working in the area (WB, SIDA, DFID, etc)
 - o Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs, programme management and partnership strategy, as well as the cross-cutting issues (as per the objective and scope of the evaluation described above);
 - o Draft related parts of the evaluation report;
 - o Present and discuss initial findings of the evaluation with project sponsors and national counterparts; and
 - o Finalize the whole evaluation report and submit it to UNDP.

Qualification requirements

13. **The international consultant** should have an advanced university degree in development studies, economics, or other relevant area, technical knowledge and at least 7 years of work experience in the field of capacity building for policy making, sound knowledge about results-based management, especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation (The Evaluation Team Leader needs to know how to establish a link between the progress of UNDP's assistance and the role it plays in bringing about development change). The leading national consultant will take the overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of the evaluation report in English.

Implementation Arrangements

14. Evaluation team (the international and the national consultants) will work directly with National Programme Coordinator⁶ and UNDP Portfolio Manager⁷. Programme Management Team⁸ will ensure logistics for the evaluation as well as participation of partners and stakeholders.

15. Both National and consultants will be hired and start their activity in September 2007. An initial note reflecting substantive and logistical issues, including the evaluation methodology that would have to be addressed in order to complete the evaluation successfully will be prepared and submitted by the Leading National Consultant to UNDP Moldova. The Assistant National Consultant will conduct documents collection and their initial review in September 2007. Evaluation mission to Moldova will take place in second half of September 2007 or begging of October 2007. Draft evaluation report comprising all the above described components will be made available 3 working days prior to the scheduled completion date of the evaluation mission. A plenary meeting with partners and stakeholders to validate findings, lessons learned and recommendations will be held 1

⁶ *Natalia Catrinescu*, Head of Macroeconomic and Development Programmes Department of the Ministry of Economy

⁷ *Mihail Peleah*, UNDP Moldova Programme Associate

⁸ Programme Assistants/managers *Diana Zaharia* and *Lucia Martinenco*

Terms of Reference
Evaluation of the JPPM

working day prior to the scheduled completion date of the evaluation mission. The Evaluation Team Leader will forward the Final Report of the Evaluation to the UNDP Moldova within two weeks after the completion date of the evaluation mission. The Final Evaluation Report should be accepted by the Programme Steering Committee.

16. The required inputs are 15 working days of leading national consultant (5 days desk review, 7 days – evaluation mission, 3 days report finalization) and 25 working days of assistant national consultant (15 days documents collection and desk review, 7 days – evaluation mission, 3 days report finalization).

17. Payments should be provided in two tranches – advance payment (up to 15%) and final tranche upon completion of all works. Payments will be provided only in case of presentation of qualitative materials. Non-qualitative materials will be returned for revision. All materials prepared under current assignment are belong to UNDP.

Annex 4. Terms Of Reference - National Evaluator

Programul Comun "Suport pentru elaborarea, monitorizarea și evaluarea politicilor strategice în Republica Moldova"



The Joint Programme "Support to Strategic Policy Formulation, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Republic of Moldova"

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of the Joint Programme "Support to Strategic Policy Formulation, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Republic of Moldova"

Revised, Wednesday, October 31, 2007

Purpose of the evaluation

1. The purpose of evaluation is to provide holistic, impartial and trustworthy evaluation of the overall Joint Programme „Support to Strategic Policy Formulation, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Republic of Moldova” (hereinafter JPPM) relevance, performance and results.

Programme and Its Context

2. Following a decade of economic decline and fragmented institutional development, Moldova has since 2001 enjoyed relative political stability and sustained economic recovery, with average annual GDP growth of 6.9%. In June 2005, Moldova published its first national Millennium Development Goals (MDG) report¹. After more than a decade of transition, human development lags behind recent economic growth. At 0.671, the 2003 Human Development Index for Moldova was still lower than its 1990 level of 0.739. From almost 70% in 2000, poverty has decreased to around 27% in 2004, but inequality remains relatively high with consumption Gini of 0.38; poverty is greatest in small towns and rural areas.

3. Recognizing the need to focus on the priorities of poverty reduction and social-economic development, the Government developed in consultation with various international organizations and civil society and approved in June 2004 the Economic Growth and Poverty reduction Strategy (EGPRS) and Moldova's Action Plan with the European Union. This mid-term strategic framework aimed to constitute a qualitative shift in the process of policy-making in Moldova, through coordinating sectorial interventions and linking them to common/national medium and long-term objectives, linking the policy-elaboration process to the annual and medium-term budgeting processes, introducing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms linked to clear indicators and promoting participatory processes. The strategy also envisaged a strengthened role for statistics and better use of statistics and statistical analysis in formulating evidence-based policies. The challenge was to narrow priorities, link strategic planning to budgeting in practice, establish a single monitoring and evaluation system, and build policy-making capacities. As the EGPRS expiring in 2007, in the late 2006 the Government initiated

¹ available at http://www.un.md/key_pub_documents

development of new National Development Plan to cover period 2008-2011 and aimed on achievement of long-term development goals (MDGs).

4. The Joint Programme „Support to Strategic Policy Formulation, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Republic of Moldova” (JPPM) was designed to assist the Government of the Republic of Moldova in strategic long-term planning for achieving nationalized MDGs, as well as in the effective monitoring and evaluation of the Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy targets, Millennium Development Goals and the objectives of the European Union – Republic of Moldova Action Plan. The purpose of the Joint Programme was strengthening national capacities in evidence-based and participatory formulation, monitoring and evaluation of development policies and Programmes. The Programme started in late 2004 and covers period till the end 2007. The Programme represents joint effort of Government of Moldova, UNDP, UNICEF, and Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC).

5. The expected outcome of Programme was formulated in the following way “The capacity of selected government organizations to collect, compile, analyze and interpret data and to use information for decision-making is improved.” Programme include two outputs²—“Increased Government capacity to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate national policies” and “Consolidated participatory process to develop and implement national policies”. These outputs to be achieved through five activities—“Strengthening central government capacity to develop evidence-based and coordinated national policies”, “Strengthening line ministries’ capacity to formulate, coordinate and implement sectoral policies”, “Strengthening government capacity to implement national policies at the regional and local levels”, “Strengthening social partnership at national, regional and local levels to develop and implement national policies”, and “Ensuring effective project management”.

6. During Programme implementation context changed significantly. First, Central Public Administration Reform initiated in mid-2005 shifted put more emphasis on governance institutions reform than on capacity building of existing staff. Second, staff turnover in ministries was high during the whole period of programme implementation, with problem significantly aggravated after announcement of Central Public Administration Reform in mid-2005. Last but not least, Programme experienced constant changes in national counterparts—it changed four National Programme Coordinators

² The Programme underwent revision and restructuring in mid-2006 as a part of introduction of new RBM User Guide in UNDP. Initially programme foreseen two outcomes and seven outputs (in old terminology):

Expected Outcome(s):

1. A sound institutional framework for the participatory formulation, monitoring and evaluation of development policies and trends in place.
2. Increased capacity of government employees at both central and local levels to plan and prioritize development projects and programmes as well as manage resources to ensure the achievement of EGPRSP/MDGs targets.

Expected Output(s):

1. Evidence-based policy development strengthened;
2. Institutional framework to manage/coordinate the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of national policies strengthened in the Ministry of Economy;
3. Mechanisms to implement/develop, monitor and evaluate national policy strengthened in line ministries (e.g. Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Labor and Social Protection, Ministry of Education, etc.);
4. Mechanisms to support implementation, monitoring and evaluation are strengthened at the regional and local level;
5. Government and civil society work in partnership at local, regional and national level to formulate, implement, monitor and evaluate national policy;
6. Information and communication mechanisms are developed to support policy dialogue at central, regional and local levels;
7. Effective project management ensured.

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of the JPPM

2

during three years of its implementation. Moreover, programme experienced constant changes in Project Managers, functioning long periods even without Manager.

Evaluation objectives and scope

7. The general objective is to provide evaluation of the overall Programme relevance, performance and results. The evaluation should review and assess project experience and present conclusions. Results of programme evaluation will be considered by the Steering Committee and to derive lessons learnt and to propose ways for future work in the area. The specific objective of the evaluation is to provide answer on the following questions:

- **Programme relevance and design:** Was the programme relevant, appropriate and strategic to national goals and the UNDP, SDC, and UNICEF mandate? Is the programme outcome still relevant and require further assistance? Were the selected approaches and actions to achieve the programme outputs and outcomes effective and efficient?
- **Outcome status:** Determine whether or not the programme outcome has been achieved and, if not, whether there has been progress made towards its achievement. This should specifically focus on: (i) to what extent programme team was able to transfer the knowledge and skills to staff in the MoET and the line ministries; (ii) to what extent capacities created are relevant and used within the relevant institutions on different levels; (iii) whether or not improvement in the national pro-poor policy designing, monitoring and implementation is operational; (iv) to what extent support to the Participation Council Secretariat improved quality of the participation process in development, implementation, and monitoring/evaluation of policies, more specifically in monitoring of the EGPRS and NDP consultative process.
- **Programme Implementation and Management.** Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of Programme Management, role and activity of Steering Committee, efficiency of programme management arrangements, roles of National Coordinator³ and Programme Manager. In which extend Results Based Approach was introduced in programme activities targeted on capacity building? Taking into account the Joint modality of Programme, assess the cooperation and communication between participation agencies—UNDP, SDC and UNICEF.
- **Partnership strategy:** Ascertain whether programme partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective. What were the partnerships formed? How did partnerships arise? How did the partnership contribute to the achievement of the outcome? How did they function and sustain? What was the level of stakeholders' participation? Examine the partnership among UN Agencies and other donor organizations in the relevant field.
- **Underlying factors:** Analyze the underlying factors beyond Programme control that influenced the outcome. What were the key assumptions made? Distinguish the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management capacities and issues including the timeliness of outputs, the degree of stakeholders and partners involvement in the completion of outputs, and how processes were managed/carried out. Taking into account fast changing context evaluation should pay specific attentions to external context of programme

³ Programme started in November 2004 with *M.Lupu*, Minister of Economy and Trade as National Programme Coordinator. In February—June 2005 Mr. *I.Mamaliga*, Vice-minister of Economy and Trade played role of national coordinator, followed by *V.Lazar*, Minister of Economy and Trade in July 2005—September 2006 and *I.Dodon*, Minister of Economy and Trade in September 2006—July 2007. In 2007 Management arrangements were simplified to make them more operational and *N.Catrinescu*, Head of Macroeconomic and Development Programmes Department of the Ministry of Economy, became new, the fifth during 3 years of implementation, National Programme Coordinator.

implementation, on risks and their influence on project implementation, on risks management, and on issues raised during programme implementation.

- **Lessons learnt.** How might we do things better in the future? Which findings may have relevance for future programming?

Evaluation Approach

8. An overall guidance on outcome evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results⁴. The evaluators should study the document very carefully before they come up with the concrete methodology for the programme evaluation. The evaluation team has certain flexibility to adapt the evaluation methodology to better suit the purposes of the evaluation exercise. Specifically, during the programme evaluation, the evaluators are expected to apply the following approaches for data collection and analysis:

- (i) desk review of existing documents and materials;
- (ii) interviews with partners and stakeholders (including gathering the information on what the partners have achieved with regard to the outcome and what strategies they have used);
- (iii) field visits to selected sites; and
- (iv) briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP and the Government, as well as with other donors and partners.

Results

9. The key product expected from this programme evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the following contents:

- Executive Summary
- Introduction
- Description of the evaluation methodology
- Programme Relevance
- Programme Results: Progress toward Programme Outcome
- Programme Efficiency and Effectiveness
 - Internal programme efficiency
 - Partnership strategy
 - Changes in context and outside of programme control
 - Sustainability of results
- Key findings (including best practices and lessons learned)
- Conclusions and Recommendations
- Annexes: ToRs, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.⁵

10. Apart from the above, based on the recommendations of the mission, an outline for the future assistance in the respective area (if still deemed relevant) is to be produced.

Evaluation Team

11. The evaluation team will consist of two independent evaluators with absolutely no connection to the design, formulation and implementation of the programme in question. The evaluation team will consist of one international and one national consultant.

⁴ Available on-line <http://www.undp.org/eo/methodologies.htm>

⁵ See the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results, available on-line <http://www.undp.org/eo/methodologies.htm>

Tasks and responsibilities

12. Specifically, the **national consultant** will undertake the following tasks:
- Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
 - Conduct documents collection and review of data through desk study of relevant documents and visiting the beneficiaries and stakeholders including but not limited to:
 - EGPRSP coordination body (MoET) and its subdivisions;
 - Policy Coordination Units within 7 line ministries;
 - Participation Council;
 - Former National Project Coordinators;
 - Donors agencies, including those financing the project (UNDP, UNICEF, SDC), and those working in the area (WB, SIDA, DFID, etc)
 - Conduct an analysis of the Programme relevance, Outcome status, Programme performance, and Partnership strategy (as per the objective and scope of the evaluation described above);
 - Draft related parts of the evaluation report;
 - Present and discuss initial findings of the evaluation with project sponsors and national counterparts; and
 - Contribute to the finalization of the whole evaluation report and submit it to UNDP.

Qualification requirements

13. **The National Consultant** should have an advanced university degree in development studies, economics, or other relevant area, technical knowledge and from 5 to 8 years of work experience in the field of capacity building for policy making, sound knowledge about results-based management, especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation.

Implementation Arrangements

14. Evaluation team (the international and the national consultants) will work directly with National Programme Coordinator⁶ and UNDP Programme Officer⁷. Programme Management Team⁸ will ensure logistics for the evaluation as well as participation of partners and stakeholders.

15. Both National and International Consultants will be hired and start their activity in November 2007. An initial note reflecting substantive and logistical issues, including the evaluation methodology that would have to be addressed in order to complete the evaluation successfully will be prepared and submitted by the International Consultant to UNDP Moldova. The National Consultant will conduct documents collection and their initial review during November 05 – 15, 2007. Evaluation mission to Moldova will take place in second half of November 2007. Draft evaluation report comprising all the above described components will be made available 2 working days prior to the scheduled completion date of the evaluation mission. A plenary meeting with partners and stakeholders to validate findings, lessons learned and recommendations will be held 1 working day prior to the scheduled completion date of the evaluation mission. The team of Evaluation Consultants will forward the Final Report of the Evaluation to the UNDP

⁶ *Natalia Catrinescu*, Head of Macroeconomic and Development Programmes Department of the Ministry of Economy

⁷ *Vasile Filatov*, UNDP Moldova Programme Officer

⁸ Programme Assistants, acting managers *Diana Zaharia* and *Lucia Martinenco*

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of the JPPM

Moldova within two weeks after the completion date of the evaluation mission. The Final Evaluation Report should be accepted by the Programme Steering Committee.

16. The required inputs are 15 working days for international consultant (3 days desk review, 9 days – evaluation mission, 3 days report finalization) and 22 working days for national consultant (10 days documents collection and desk review, 9 days – evaluation mission, 3 days report finalization).

17. Payments should be provided in two installments – first installment upon collection of necessary documents and desk review and final installments upon completion of all works. Payments will be provided only in case of presentation of qualitative materials. Non-qualitative materials will be returned for revision. All materials prepared under current assignment belong to UNDP.

Annex 5. National Consultant Survey Results

A questionnaire was circulated to 10 national consultants, including the two that make up the Participation Council Secretariat. Six responses were received. The results are summarised below.

Questionnaire for UNDP-funded national consultants employed on the project "Support for Strategic Policy Formulation, Monitoring and Evaluation"

When did you join the project? (year, month)

3 persons in 2005 (1 in January, 1 in July and 1 in October)

3 persons in 2006 (1 in February, 1 in August, 1 in October)

		<i>Yes, completely</i>	<i>Mostly yes</i>	<i>Mostly not</i>	<i>Not at all</i>
1	<i>Does your work on the project correspond to the job description provided when you applied for the job?</i>	2	3	1	
2	<i>Did you have enough information about the project and its objectives when you started?</i>	1	4	1	
3	<i>Are your terms of references clear?</i>	3	2	1	

Do you have a clear project work plan for you to follow?

Yes - 5

No - 1

Do you have the possibility to plan your work systematically?

Yes - 5

No - 1

Were you able to carry out your work systematically?

Yes - 5

No - 1

Have you been asked to carry out tasks that are not relevant to the project?

Yes - 4

No - 2

If yes, approximately what % of your time working in the project is spent on non-project work?

50%, 30%, 10%, 5%

How effectively do you think the project has made use of your expertise?

Very much - 1

A lot - 3

A little - 2

Very little - 0

Has there ever been a systematic analysis of how your time is utilised on the project?

Yes – 2, quarterly according to our individual progress report

No – 3

No answer - 1

If yes, did this lead to any changes?

No, because the individual actions plans are not changed during the year. And in the individual progress report there are no questions about the problems that we encountered during our project activities

		<i>Very clear</i>	<i>Mostly clear</i>	<i>Less clear</i>	<i>Not clear</i>
1	<i>Are the project objectives clear to you?</i>	3	2	1	
2	<i>Are the project objectives clear to your counterparts in the public administration?</i>		4	2	
3	<i>Lines of communication in the project</i>		3	3	

Has there ever been a formal, objective review of your contribution to the project?

Yes - 2. If yes, how often? When? At the beginning of the year

No - 4

Were these changes useful?

Not all the time

Is it clear who you report to?

Yes - 5

No - 1

		Yes	No
1	<i>Do you feel confident about delivering capacity building services?</i>	5	1
2	<i>Have you received training or guidance on capacity building techniques and tools?</i>	3	3

To what extent have staff changes in the MoET undermined your work?

Not at all.

A bit - 3

A lot. - 3

Roughly what % of your work on the project was helping others to do their job better?

No answer - 2

Yes – 4. 1 about 70%, 1 – 40%, 1 – 35%, 1 – 30%.

And what % of your activity is doing their job for them?

Never – 1

No answer – 1

Yes – 4. 2 – about 70%, 1 – 65%, 1 – 30%

Which were the most difficult parts of your involvement in the project?

High turnover in the Ministry of Economy and Trade

Lack of the experience of a new personal of the ministry

CPA reform

Inadequate salaries

Lack of coordination

System for contracting is rigid and too long

Which was the most important success of the project?

Support of the Ministry of Economy and Trade for Strategic Policy Formulation

Memorandum regards to Economic and Financial Policies between Government of R.Moldova, National Bank of Moldova and International Monetary Fund

Poverty Reports

EGPRS Reports

The National Development Plan

The creation of the Departments of Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation of Policies

MDG revising

The quality of the document of the Government is improved

Capacity building of some personal from the Ministry of Economy and Trade

What are the failures of the project?

Insufficient management

Lack of results

Absence of the one joint document of actions for Ministry of Economy and Trade regarding capacity building

Lack of sustainability of some trainings

Which are the key outputs that you produced / helped to produce in the project? In which year?

- The involvement in development of the National Development Plan, discussions with the ministries

- Poverty Reports

- EGPRS Reports

- Memorandum regards to Economic and Financial Policies between Government of R.Moldova, National Bank of Moldova and International Monetary Fund

- Reports on MDGs results 2005, 2006

- Report on MDGS adjustment

- Concept and Law regards legalization of the capital and implementation of fiscal amnesty

- Monitoring and Evaluation of the National Programs