

# **EU/UNDP Support to the Regional Development of Crimea Project**

## **EVALUATION REPORT**

**Authored by Lyubov Palyvoda**

**Kyiv – Simferopol  
June 2013**

## **CONTENT**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**INTRODUCTION**

**CHAPTER 1. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

**CHAPTER 2. EVALUATION RESULTS**

**2.1. Analysis of outputs and outcomes against project's OVI**

**2.2. Evaluation of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact and coherence of the Project (including best practices and lessons learned)**

**CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**ANNEXES**

- 1. Term of Reference**
- 2. Schedule of meetings**
- 3. Instruments**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents evaluation findings of all activities of the EU/UNDP *Support to the Regional Development of Crimea (SRDC)* project carried out between March 2012 and the end of June 2013 at both republican and local levels. The objective of the evaluation was to assess the relevance and quality of outputs of the EU/UNDP funded SRDC Project and to identify likely outcomes/impacts. Moreover, the evaluation also generated lessons and experiences that could feed into the implementation of other similar interventions in the region and on the national level as well. The main objective of the EU/UNDP funded Project (second phase of the Support to the Regional Development Agency of Crimea) was to contribute to the regional and local development of the peninsula.

Evaluation was conducted during May 28 – June 30 of 2013 and came to the following **conclusions**.

The evaluation has demonstrated that the second phase of the SRDC project was relevant as it was focused on capacity building of regional and local governments in project design, development investment projects, promotion investment capacities of towns and districts; and that was extremely important and relevant for the needs of target groups and beneficiaries. At the same time all expected results were achieved.

The project managed to have achieved all the planned results at the local level and in some instances it went even beyond the expected results. In particular, a number of events, trainings, seminars, consultations and studies delivered under the project framework has exceeded and in some instances substantially exceeded the baseline indicators, namely: the training program has helped train and certify 29 experts instead of 20 experts as originally planned; the project experts have assisted with the preparation of 73 project proposals instead of 21 as originally planned. At the time of the evaluation 12 project proposals were approved and at least 10 more project proposals are expected to be approved for funding; four local development agencies were established and registered in the districts of Kirovskoye, Nyzhnegorskoye, Chornomorskoye and the town of Feodosia; the Memorandums of Cooperation on regional development were signed by i) six NGOs from Bakhchisaray district and the Bakhchisaray District Public Administration, the Bakhchisaray District Council, the Executive Committee of the Town Council of the Town of Bakhchisaray and ii) three NGOs from the town of Yevpatoria and the City Council and the Public Administration of the Yevpatoria Town. In spite of a tight timetable of the SRDC project the communities managed to quickly get engaged in the project implementation and the project events as well as the preparation of project proposals.

Since the project targeted mainly the local level, the regional and national governments received less attention and were only engaged in the preparation and organization of the regional events. Unfortunately the Council of Ministers and other key ministries were not as interested in the project due to its shift from the regional to the local level. Although the intention to form the Regional Development Coordination Council and make it operational was voiced by the Council of Ministers, it somehow just remained an intention and the Council went unnoticed among other councils engaged in similar activities.

The project was a success as it has changed the understanding of investments by the local communities. The project made sure that all pilot communities had the community investment passports prepared as well as the investor's road-maps; the project developed attractive promotional materials and identified greenfield and brownfield. However, the support to FDI promotion has identified the lack of district master plans in the communities and that hinders the preparation of land plots and municipal facilities for perspective investments.

The findings of the evaluation demonstrate that the SRDC project results make a solid foundation for a coherent institutional architecture for regional development in Crimea. Effective approaches that can be applied in other districts of Crimea and in other regions of Ukraine taking into consideration the lessons learned from the project were identified during the implementation of the second phase of the project.

The evaluation identified the SRDC project's best practices that can be used or replicated in the other districts of Crimea and throughout Ukraine. They include: quality of the group of selected pilot communities; the approach the local regional development agencies started with; the project work with communities on investment activity; monitoring and researching reports; a joint database of projects and project ideas; study visits.

The evaluation summarized the lessons learned from the SRDC project implementation. The main take-away is that more time is needed for capacity building, in particular at the local and regional level.

In conclusion, with respect to programming in regional development, achieving tangible results in a short period of time is a complex task because of the breadth of stakeholders and the necessity of working with civil society and different levels of government. District administrations are the level of government responsible for delivering many of the services that citizens see and need on a daily basis. In this sense, local authorities lack the institutional capabilities and budgets to implement their own policies and are heavily dependent on decisions and transfers from the central level. A major challenge is the identification and implementation of projects. The necessity for capacity building in project management and needs assessment, operational planning and building partnerships with NGOs and community members are especially needed at the local level closest to the citizens and their problems firstly, and at the regional level where most of the planning processes are originated and where national resources are collected secondly. From a development perspective, achieving concrete results in regional development requires a long-term approach and an integrated approach where national/regional/local levels are all included in project design.

The following **recommendation** is proposed - EU and UNDP should continue to support regional and local level programming in the peninsula to strengthen their significant investment already made in regional development and to complement their other projects in this area in Crimea.

**Future support** is required to:

- continue to strengthen local and regional capacities to implement and adjust the local and regional strategic plans; to show concrete results through local and regional economic development; and to strengthen the institutional capacity of local and regional administrations to incorporate strategic planning more effectively into their decision-making processes. Emphasis should be placed on in-service mentoring and coaching of technical personnel at the regional and rayon levels and seed grant funds should be available for support of selected projects
- expand the project to other districts of Crimea and support those districts in more effective and efficient means of implementing their strategic plans based on best practices and lessons learned from the SRDC project. Special attention should be given to strengthening the link between strategic planning and a project based approach
- strengthen relations between the region and the districts in a more systematically institutional way by using various means and activities
- continue capacity building of regional and local development agencies in order to transform them into more sophisticated institutions and to disseminate the project experience to other districts of Crimea
- develop a network of the regional development actors both in Crimea and across Ukraine to initiate exchange visits, knowledge sharing and preparation and implementation of joint projects

## INTRODUCTION

Modern regional development is defined by a number of actions, which are implemented based upon a systematic and strategic approach with the aim to increase the competitiveness of the regions in question. The Ukrainian Government intends to reform the current regional development policy. In various political declarations and decisions, the President of Ukraine has instructed the Government to develop a program to reform the "*management system for regional development*" based on EU experience. The Government of Ukraine intends to elaborate a new *State Regional Development Strategy 2020* until July 2013. The European Union supports the Government of Ukraine in elaborating and realizing Regional Policy reforms through a series of actions, following bottom-up as well as top-down approaches. The EU/UNDP *Support to the Regional Development of Crimea (SRDC)* Project is one of the EU/UNDP program contributing to the regional development of the peninsula.

This project is the second phase of the *Support to the Regional Development Agency of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea (SRDA)* project started in 2010 with the aim to build the capacities of the Regional Development Agency of the ARC (ARC RDA) so that it could play a genuine regional development coordination role in the peninsula. The SRDA project was targeted at identifying the best models and practices of EU regional development policy and regional development institutions (including RDAs) and adapting these to the Crimean context. Due the structural issues constraining the project's activities and results, a decision was taken by the EU and UNDP to refocus the Project's resources and activities to other regional development actors and distance itself from the ARC RDA. In its second phase EU/UNDP *Support to the Regional Development of Crimea* Project that started from March 1, 2012 and lasted 11 months. The Project was focused on i) strengthening republican and local expert capacities to develop coherent and equitable regional development policies and strategies, and attract and absorb funding for their implementation in the peninsula; ii) preparing the grounds for the possible set up of an institution able to provide effective coordination of and support to regional and local development actions across the peninsula and support its organization and operations if and when set up; and iii) disseminating the Crimean experience at national level.

This report presents evaluation findings of all activities of the EU/UNDP *Support to the Regional Development of Crimea* project carried out between March 2012 and the end of June 2013 at both republican and local levels. The objective of the evaluation was to assess the relevance and quality of outputs of the EU/UNDP funded Project *Support to the Regional Development of Crimea* (second phase of the *Support to the Regional Development Agency of Crimea*) and to identify likely outcomes/impacts. Moreover, the evaluation also generated lessons and experiences that could feed into the implementation of other similar interventions in the region and on the national level as well.

### **Structure of the evaluation report**

Chapter 1 briefly describes the evaluation methodology. The main evaluation results are summarised in Chapter 2. It includes an analysis of outputs and outcomes against the project's OVI and discussion of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact and coherence of the project. Best practices and lessons learned are presented in this chapter as well. Conclusions and recommendations conclude the report. The Annexes contain information on Term of Reference of the evaluation (Annex 1), schedule of meetings (Annex 2), and evaluation instrument (Annex 3).

## CHAPTER 1. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

### Objectives of the evaluation

The objective of the evaluation was to assess the relevance and quality of outputs of the EU/UNDP funded Project “Support to the Regional Development of Crimea” (second phase of the Support to the Regional Development Agency of Crimea) and to identify likely outcomes/impacts. The evaluation also generated lessons and experiences that could feed into the implementation of other similar interventions in the region and on the national level as well.

The evaluation covered all activities of the Project carried out between March 2012 and the end of June 2013 at both republican and local levels. Key evaluation indicators included:

Relevance, or the extent to which the objectives of the intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ needs and European Commission’s policies.

Effectiveness, or the extent to which the intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

Efficiency means the extent to which the outputs and/or desired effects have been achieved with the lowest possible use of resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.).

Sustainability measures the extent to which the benefits from the development intervention will continue after termination of the external intervention, or the probability that they continue in the long-term prospective in a way that is resilient to risks.

Impact potential aims to identify positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Coherence, or extent to which activities undertaken allow the European Commission and UNDP to achieve their development policy objectives without internal contradiction or without contradiction with other policies and extent to which they complement the country’s policies and other donors’ interventions.

Also the project's objectively verifiable indicators and sources of information indicated in the project’s logical framework were considered as well.

### Participants of the evaluation

The evaluation, with the assistance of the SPDA team, attempted to involve the broadest possible range of stakeholders – representatives of government, CSOs and donors at the national, republican and rayon levels.

Key informant interviews were carried out in Kyiv and Crimea to determine how successful the project has been in achieving its objectives. Representatives of the project target groups and beneficiaries whose information and opinions are important for presenting a balanced perspective on the project achievements to date, its potential impact and sustainability, and recommendations relating to a possible future donors' support to regional development intervention participated in the evaluation.

List of key informants:

- |                |  |
|----------------|--|
| National level | - Ministry of economic development and trade   |
| Regional level | - Council of Ministers of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea;<br>- Ministry of economic development and trade;<br>- Center for local and regional development of Crimea<br>- Crimean regional center for investment and development |
| Local level    | - state administration of the pilot municipalities and rayons  |

- Donors
- city and rayon councils of the pilot communities;
  - local development centers of selected pilot communities.
  - European Union Delegation to Ukraine,
  - UNDP Ukraine Country Office,
  - UNDP Sub-Office in Crimea,

and representatives of the EU funded *Support to Regional Development Policy* project.

### **Evaluation methods**

The evaluation methods included primary and secondary data analysis, participatory, key informant interviews, and group discussions. The format of the evaluation is designed to respond to the questions outlined in the Term of Reference presented in the Annex 1 and to produce a report which will be useful to all stakeholders involved in the implementation of the project.

### **Sources of information**

The evaluation consisted of a literature review including relevant materials from UNDP, other projects implemented by other donors working in the sector, and published materials available on regional development in Ukraine. The list of primary documents reviewed includes the following:

- ✓ Initial description of the Action;
- ✓ EU Monitor's report (monitoring mission carried out in the first phase of the project);
- ✓ Revised description of the Action;
- ✓ Previous annual progress report;
- ✓ Key project's documents (reports, publications, databases, etc.);
- ✓ Articles, reports, research, analysis on regional development in Ukraine.

### **Sites visited**

During the evaluation, the expert met the relevant program officer in the EU Delegation, the Country Director of the UNDP office in Kyiv. Then a field mission to Crimea was conducted which included site visits in Simferopol and to pilot municipalities and rayons. The sites visited in Crimea included: Simferopol, Bakhchysaray, Nyzhnegirskyy, Kirovskoye, Feodosiya, Yevpatoria, Chornomorskoye.

### **Instruments**

The interview questionnaire reflected the evaluation objectives, questions, criteria, and the project OVI. The questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter, designed in English, approved by the UNDP and translated into Ukrainian. Before meetings the interview questionnaire was sent out to all key informants to help them to get prepared for the meeting.

### **Organization of the evaluation**

An evaluation was conducted during May 28 – June 30, 2013 and consisted of several phases:

1. The preparation phase started with a review of the project documents, setting up meetings with key informants and with the design of the interview questionnaire. The meeting schedule and interview questionnaire were approved by the UNDP.
2. Field visits phase started with meeting with EU Delegation and UNDP that helped to clarify the evaluation objectives and questions, participants and their role in the project. Field visits were conducted during June 10 – 19, 2013.
3. A report was prepared according to the provided UNDP format with the aim to present all views of the evaluation participants and the consultant's opinion and recommendations.
4. After the approval of the final evaluation report it was translated into Russian for dissemination amongst relevant stakeholders including the European Union Delegation, government institutions, NGOs and others.

### **Evaluation limitations**

The following constraints and limitations to this evaluation should be kept in mind:

- The complexity of governance projects militates against a rigid evaluation framework. While decentralization policies may bear striking resemblances to one another in a cross national

perspective, implementation frameworks tend to be subject to national, regional and local variations and it is very difficult to establish clear causal relationships in the short to medium-term.

- One challenge for the evaluation consultant was the timing of the mission; it was limited to one month and coincided with the project's end.
- This evaluation focused on the achievement of results at the output/outcome levels. The evaluation methodology was tailored to assess project results at these levels but to make efforts to directly tie results to the investments made, thereby eliminating other explanations. However, given the overall context of the sector in which assistance is being provided, it is methodologically difficult to directly and exclusively tie the results of the project to the investment. Moreover, as the SRDC project was still in operation at the time of the evaluation, an attribution of results beyond the output level will necessarily be preliminary in nature. To address this issue, the evaluation ties aggregate results to the investment to the extent possible but will include reference to external factors that have influenced the result areas, as appropriate.
- UNDP requested that the evaluation be conducted in a compressed time-line in order to feed into other time-sensitive requests for key findings and lessons learned with respect to future programming. Due to the relatively short time frame for organizing the evaluation mission, many of the interviewees were stakeholders in the project which limited the ability to verify data from independent sources.

**CHAPTER 2. EVALUATION RESULTS**

**2.1. ANALYSIS OF OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES AGAINST PROJECT'S OVI**

The main objective of the second phase of the EU/UNDP Support to the Regional Development of Crimea project was to contribute to the regional and local development of the peninsula. The project specific objectives were:

1. to continue strengthening republican and local expert capacities to develop coherent and equitable regional development policies and strategies, and attract and absorb funding for their implementation in the peninsula
2. in parallel, to prepare the grounds for the possible set up of institution(s) able to fulfill the effective coordination of regional and local development activities across the peninsula and support their/is organization and operations if and when set up
3. to disseminate the Crimean experience at the national level

The SRDC project description presented three key results to be achieved by all of the project's activity as follows:

- Result 1 - Crimean institutions (at both republican and local levels) and partnership strengthened for effective policy development, strategy and projects design and implementation
- Result 2 - Local development funds absorption capacities increased and institutional architecture and mechanisms developed
- Result 3 - Crimea recommended as one of the possible best practice regional development mechanisms for other regions of Ukraine.

Further the analysis of the key project’s outputs achieved in the second phase is presented by key results.

***Result 1: Crimean institutions (at both republican and local levels) and partnership strengthened for effective policy development, strategy and projects design and implementation***

In order to achieve this result, the project undertook a set of consulting activity both at republican and local level.

At the republican level, the SRDC Project worked with the Council of Ministers, in particular Vice Prime Minister in charge of investments promotion and climate, Ministries of Economic Development & Trade, Regional Development and Housing & Communal Affairs, Resorts & Tourism, Agro-Policy and Food, and Culture, and the Crimean Parliament. The Project's activity included series of thematic training and workshops, dissemination of best practices of regional development and investment promotion, support in establishment and functioning of the Regional Development Coordination Council, assistance in monitoring the socio-economic situation of Crimea. Results achieved at the republican level versus planned are as follows:

<i>Planned results by outputs/outcomes</i>	<i>Actual results</i>
<p><b><i>Output level</i></b>                      One leaflet on principles of Regional Development prepared and disseminated (1000 copies);</p> <p>No less than 11 events (conferences, seminars, training, advisory meetings) organized and carried out at the republican level;</p>	<p><b><i>Output level</i></b>                      One leaflet on SRDC project and principles of Regional Development (1000 copies) prepared and disseminated.</p> <p>More than 20 events (presentations, focus group discussions, workshops, training, conferences) organized and carried out on the republican level. Thematic focus included Millennium Development Goals localization in Crimea; social, political, inter-ethnic and inter-confessional climate in Crimea; FDI promotion; international economic cooperation and technical assistance; revitalization of older cities; development of investment proposals; regional and local development; land and legal issues regarding investment attraction;</p>

<p>Six semi-annual Republican Strategy Monitoring reports disseminated to stakeholders (30 copies, and electronic distribution);</p>	<p>Six quarterly and semi-annual Republican Strategy Monitoring reports (part of them prepared during the first phase of the project) disseminated to stakeholders (30 copies and electronic distribution):</p>
<p>No less than two other research/surveys on investment climate and other relevant themes;</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Situation Monitoring Report for 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarters 2011;</li> <li>2. Situation Monitoring Report for 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter 2011;</li> <li>3. Situation Monitoring Report for 4<sup>th</sup> quarter 2011;</li> <li>4. Situation Monitoring Report for 1<sup>st</sup> half year 2012;</li> <li>5. Situation Monitoring Report for 2<sup>nd</sup> half year 2012;</li> <li>6. Situation Monitoring Report for 1<sup>st</sup> half year 2013.</li> </ol>
<p>Membership and ToRs of the RDCC are approved by the CoM; RDCC set up and operating.</p>	<p>Six other research/surveys conducted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Survey “Assessment of the system of tourism statistics in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea” (conducted by UN WTO expert David McEwen)</li> <li>▪ Survey “SME Needs Analysis” (conducted by International expert in regional development Mrs. Ane Sindik)</li> <li>▪ Research “Assessment of the Current State of Foreign Direct Investment Promotion Activities in the AR Crimea” (conducted by National expert in FDI promotion Mr. Petro Koshukov)</li> <li>▪ Research “Industrial Park Construction in Bakhchisarayskiy District, Autonomous Republic of Crimea (Pre-feasibility Study)” (conducted by national expert in Industrial Parks Conceptual Planning and Design Mr. Dmytro Kotlyarov)</li> <li>▪ Research “Situation and Revitalization Needs Analysis and Recommendations on Selection of Pilot Cities for the Further Development and Implementation of Revitalization Strategies” (conducted by international expert in Urban Planning and Old Cities Revitalization Mrs. Sorina Racoviceanu).</li> <li>▪ Survey “Socio-Psychological Profile of Population of Bakhchisaray and Bakhchisarai District” (conducted by local expert Marina Beresneva)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Outcome level</b> The Crimean Council of Ministers shows clear evidence of effective planning and coordination of regional development actions through the set up and operations of Crimean Coordination Council</p>	<p>RDCC established by CoM ARC in form of Coordination Council on investment promotion and international technical cooperation. Head of the Council – vice-prime-minister of ARC Mr. Valeriy Palchuk. Membership of the Council approved by CoM.</p> <p><b>Outcome level</b> The Crimean Council of Ministers shows overall evidence of a better understanding of effective planning and coordination of regional development actions. The Ministry of Economic Development &amp; Trade of ARC is leading in coordinating technical assistance projects and ensuring that they meet the regional development needs. The Crimean Coordination Council will require some support to play a more active and effective role in regional development coordination, in particular in engaging regional and local stakeholders to discuss and agree</p>

At the local level the SRDC project worked with city and district administrations; associations of community organizations; representatives of NGOs involved in regional development work, including business promotion centers and/or business associations, and the Crimean population. At the beginning of the second phase, the six pilot communities were selected through an open competitive process. Six pilot communities include two cities (Yevpatoria and Feodosia) and four districts (Bakhchysarayskiy, Kirovskiy, Nizhnegorskiy, and Chernomorskiy).

<i>Planned results by outputs/outcomes</i>	<i>Actual results</i>
<p><b>Output level</b> No less than 20 consultations provided to local stakeholders on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ local development mechanisms and architecture</li> <li>▪ best practices of local development institutions in EU countries and their costs &amp; benefits</li> <li>▪ the possible set up of a Local Development Institution model adapted to Crimea.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome level</b> Local authorities show capacities to plan for sustainable regional development in cooperation with non-governmental and private sectors.</p>	<p><b>Output level</b> More than 40 consultations provided to local stakeholders on local development mechanisms and architecture, best practices of local development institutions in EU countries, their costs and benefits, the possible set up of a Local Development Institution model adapted to Crimea. These consultations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Three one-day workshops with local stakeholders on regional development mechanisms and LDIs in EU countries, their costs &amp; benefits (conducted with support of International expert Ane Sindik)</li> <li>▪ In general 38 working meetings (12), Skype conferences (2) and consultations by phone (19) and e-mail (5) to local stakeholders on specific issues of set up of a Local development institution adapted to Crimea (including consultations provided by national legal expert Mr. Oleg Khusnutdinov) and support to development of local development networks of institutions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome level</b> Local authorities recognize the need in local development institutions and their Governing Boards, building partnership and networking with such institutions. Local and republican authorities are keen and show capacities to support the set up and further development of local and regional development institutions (centers for local and regional development).</p>

***Result 2: Local development funds absorption capacities increased and institutional architecture and mechanisms developed***

For achieving this result the SRDC project prepared the grounds for the possible set up of a local development agency (LDA) and its Governing Board, provided support to LDA operational preparation, implemented “Learning by doing” program, and built partnership and visibility of pilot communities. Below, planned and achieved results are presented.

<i>Planned results by outputs/outcomes</i>	<i>Actual results</i>
<p><b>Output level</b> Model of business plan for local development institution presented and explained to local stakeholders;</p> <p>Statutes of a not for profit organization developed;</p>	<p><b>Output level</b> Two alternative models of local development institutional architecture developed and presented to local and republican stakeholders</p> <p>Statutes for four not-for-profit local development institutions (LDIs) and one not-for-profit regional development institution (RDI) developed, two draft memorandums on cooperation in the sphere of local development prepared. Registration of four LDIs (in Kirovskiy, Nizhnegorskiy, and Chernomorskiy districts and municipality of Feodosia) and one RDI (in Simferopol)</p>

Documents for the institution's Governing Board prepared (ToRs, membership)	supported by legal consultations and advice.
ToRs designed for organization's staff, one three-year business plan developed, three yearly Operational Plans and one operational guidelines developed	Statutes of the four LDIs and one RDI include description of functions of the Governing Board. A series of two one-day trainings for Management and Governing Boards of each of four LDIs conducted.
No less than eight individual coaching programs per pilot area implemented	Strategic Plans for the five organizations (four LDIs and one RDI) developed. Provided consultations on staff recruitment and operational planning.
Up to five amended strategies	Series of three 2-day workshops for the four LDIs and one RDI conducted to increase their capacities in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strategic and operational planning</li> <li>• partnership building and communication</li> <li>• fund-raising</li> </ul> Provided written recommendations to LDIs and RDI (one document prepared by local expert for support institutional development Mr. Ayder Khalilov)
Up to 21 projects' design/re-design supported;	Was not requested by pilots. In place of it two workshops on actualization of development strategies for Crimean cities and districts organized (in cooperation with TA project “Changes for Future” financed by Polish Aid). And two mid-term sectoral development programs developed (for Bakhchisaraiskiy and Kirovskiy district). One on-site workshop (in Kaments-Podolskiy) on strategy implementation organized.
No less than seven projects receive financing;	By mid June 2013, 54 projects (with total budget UAH 34.5 mln.) fully developed and submitted for funding. Three projects fully developed but not yet submitted. Another 15 are nearly finalized. By the end of project on June 30, 2013, the total number of developed projects is expected to increase to 73.
Up-to-date database of projects and property;	By mid June 2013, 12 previously submitted projects (with total budget UAH 4.1 mln) received financing. More than 20 projects are still under consideration. By the end of year it is expected, that no less than 10 projects will be approved for financing, so the overall number of such projects will increase to 22
Up to five financed projects supported in their implementation phase;	The database of developed projects in place and up to date. The database of local NGOs in place and updated. The database of funding opportunities in place and updated (available on-line on the project’s website).
No less than 20 local experts trained	One of the financed projects (funded by “Renaissance” foundation) in implementation phase, implementation of 11 projects approved for funding from state and republican budget (two and nine respectively) can be started immediately after the financing will be opened.
	29 local experts trained on project's implementation and

<p>on project's implementation and management;</p> <p>One practical training on FDI promotional tools in each pilot,</p> <p>One FDI promotion action plan per pilot</p> <p>One investment profile per pilot</p> <p>One brochure on "How to Start-up a Business in our Municipality/District")</p> <p>One district strategy drafted with project's support approved by district's Council</p> <p>One marketing plan designed within two months of not-for-profit organization set up, and implemented;</p> <p>At least four Open Door days widely announced through the press;</p> <p>One organization's web-site supported and maintained</p> <p>One organization's partnership building strategy designed within two months of set up and implemented</p> <p><b>Outcome level</b> One clear concept of an effective and viable not-for-profit regional and/or local development institution presented to project's partners and beneficiaries leading to a possible decision by relevant republican and local stakeholders (municipalities and districts) to set it up</p>	<p>management. More than 150 representatives of local authorities and NGOs received training on projects design</p> <p>Five practical trainings on FDI promotion in project's pilot cities and districts conducted (one per each pilot including an "extra" pilot - Chernomorskiy district, but except Evpatoria). One study-tour on FDI promotion to Novograd-Volynskiy organized</p> <p>One mid-term program of investment activities of Bakhchisarayskiy district developed.</p> <p>22 Investment profiles (in Russian and English) covering territory of all Crimean cities and districts developed (44 documents). Two extended investment profiles for six "Investor's Road-maps" (in Russian and English) developed for all six pilots of the project.</p> <p>One "Catalogue of Local Suppliers" for Bakhchisarayskiy district developed.</p> <p>One sustainable development strategy of Chernomorskiy district till 2020 developed, approved by district Council, and promoted</p> <p>Template of marketing plan for development institutions designed by international expert Ane Sindik.</p> <p>Three "Partners Dialogue" events organized and conducted (for Chernomorskiy, Kirovskiy, and Bakhchisarayskiy districts).</p> <p>The RDI's web-site development supported and maintained. Special training for RDI staff on maintaining the website conducted.</p> <p>The organization's partnership building and communication strategy is integrated as a part into the Strategic Plans of the four LDIs and one RDI (see above).</p> <p><b>Outcome level</b> Clear concept of effective not-for-profit regional and local development institutions presented to project's partners and beneficiaries leading to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Set up of a center for local and regional development (operating at republican level)</li> <li>2. Set up of four local development institutions (agencies) targeted on the development of their respective territories</li> <li>3. Two local development networks comprising LA and NGOs working together on the basis of a MoU</li> </ol>
---	---

***Result 3: Crimea recommended as one of the possible best practice regional development mechanisms for other regions of Ukraine.***

The SRDC project conducted a series of activities under this result that includes an analysis of effectiveness of local capacities and the LDAs as well as project evaluation and results dissemination.

<i>Planned results by outputs/outcomes</i>	<i>Actual results</i>
<p><b>Output level</b> No less than 50 representatives of Oblasts and ten national government representatives are informed about the Crimean experience in Regional Development and funds attraction.</p> <p>One effectiveness analysis of local capacities and (if set up) of the LDA, conducted and report submitted to and discussed with EU, UNDP and CoM (by the end of June 2012); Results of organization's effectiveness analysis presented at local and republican level (one workshop). No less than three additional administrative units join the founding board of the organization. Visibility of both the European Union and the UNDP throughout project's second phase implementation</p> <p><b>Outcome level</b> National government's acknowledgment of Crimea's regional development experience as one of the best in Ukraine and worth disseminating to other regions</p>	<p><b>Output level</b> More than 50 representatives of regions of Ukraine informed about the Crimean experience in Regional Development and funds attraction (meetings during the visit to Dnepropetrovsk Oblast – 45 participants, Project's Final Conference – seven participants from other regions of Ukraine). Four national government representatives are informed about the Crimean experience in Regional Development and funds attraction (participants of the meeting at the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of Ukraine, Regional Policy Department). A series of three practical and user-friendly manuals/guidelines for Ukrainian cities and districts (in Russian and Ukrainian languages) covering different issues of Regional Development prepared and will be disseminated by the end June. Namely: ⇒ "How to Create a Sustainable Local Development Agency. A Practical Guide for Ukrainian Cities and Regions" ⇒ "How to Attract Foreign Direct Investment. A Practical Guide for Ukrainian Cities and Regions" ⇒ "How to Organize the Process of Strategic Planning. Practical Guiding for Ukrainian Cities and Regions" Electronic Library of Regional and Local Development for Ukrainian users, summarizing up SRDC own experience, and experience of other TA projects and organizations in the field of regional development, created and disseminated on CD. By the end of June it will be available on-line on the SRDC project's website and website of the RDI.</p> <p>One capacity assessment of the four LDIs and one RDI conducted (by national expert for organization's capacity assessment Volodymyr Kuprii)</p> <p>Two presentations of the network of local and regional development institutions at republican level (at the Donor's Coordination Meeting and Donor's Forum in Simferopol). This output was not fulfilled during the project's time frame.</p> <p>Evidence of visibility of both the EU and UNDP throughout project's second phase implementation</p> <p><b>Outcome level</b> Ministry of Economic Development &amp; Trade of Ukraine acknowledged the Crimean experience as very interesting and worth disseminating to other regions. The Ministry is keen in particular to be the recipient of the Electronic Library developed by the SRDC project and is committed to maintain it. The Ministry considered this library as being a first and extremely useful attempt to harmonize regional development approaches and tools.</p>

There are certain **results that were not fully achieved** by the SRDC project. They include:

***Membership and ToRs of the RDCC are approved by the CoM; RDCC set up and operating.*** The project envisaged the support to be rendered to the Council of Ministers/Ministry of Economic Development & Trade in developing the membership, ToRs and operating mechanism of the *Regional Development Coordination Council* (further the RDCC) to be set up by the CoM to ensure the relevance of the current and future international technical assistance (TA) projects to the republican strategy, to review and confirm regional/local level development projects' ideas, and to promote coordination and synergies of the TA in the region. The interviews have shown that the first meeting of the Council was indeed conducted. However, no other activities took place afterward. It was the Council of Ministers that has initiated that council at the project's re-orientation stage. Yet the Council duplicated the efforts of other councils. These councils include the Committee of Economic Reforms, the Coordinating Council for Strategic Development, the Civic Council under the Council of Ministers, the Council of Regions and the Investors' Council. The meeting of the technical assistance projects is conducted on a regular basis in Crimea. There are currently 77 active programs and projects implemented in the Republic. The respondents believe the task forces focused on particular and specific issues related to the regional development are more feasible since the regional development is a cross-cutting issue.

***Up to five amended strategies.*** The availability of the development strategy was one of the selection criteria when identifying a town or a district as a pilot for the project. After numerous meetings and consultations of the project experts with the heads and representatives of the local governments several areas were defined for TA to consider and implement the existing strategies in the pilot communities. In particular, regions and cities planned to be assisted in the development of target-oriented programs, and advice on the construction of the monitoring system. The interviews with the communities' representatives have revealed that not all communities had been assisted with the strategies' review and clarification as such support was done only on their requests. Only Yevpatoria and Balhchysaray requested the project assistance with the strategy review.

***Up to five financed projects supported in their implementation phase.*** During the second phase 73 project proposals were prepared for various competitions of state and local programs as well as the international technical assistance programs. At the time of the evaluation 54 proposals were submitted; 18 are designed and about to be submitted. Out of all submitted proposals 12 were approved and only one started its implementation. The majority of the project proposals, in particular 11 of them, were funded by the All-Ukrainian and All-Crimean competitions of projects and programs aimed at the local self-government development. As these programs are funded directly by the budget funds their delivery was delayed to the recipients. Therefore the implementation was delayed as well. At present none of the 11 projects are complete and there are no grounds to state that the project has contributed to the implementation of these project proposals. In addition to that it should be noted that the project experts are going to continue their support to the pilot communities and help them implement various initiatives.

***One FDI promotion action plan per pilot.*** The EU/UNDP Project provided advisory and technical support for pilot regions to develop investment certificates of cities and districts, investment portals and other tools to create a positive image and promote information about investment opportunities for the territories. Unfortunately, such plans, promotional materials and other supporting documents are not enough to bring investments; the communities should also have the city/district master plan.

At the time of the project's evaluation, some **outputs were not completed**:

***One effectiveness analysis of local capacities and (if set up) of the LDA, conducted and report submitted to and discussed with EU, UNDP and CoM (by the end of June 2012).*** At the time of the evaluation such analysis has been in progress.

***No less than 50 representatives of Oblasts and ten national government representatives are informed about the Crimean experience in Regional Development and funds attraction.*** At the time of the

evaluation the project closing conference was in the making. Therefore it is impossible to say how many representatives of the regional and state authorities were informed about the project's outcomes.

At the same time there were some **unanticipated results** that include the following:

- ⇒ The selection of pilot communities for the project has demonstrated a great interest and activity of the communities despite tough requirements to the potential pilot towns and districts.
- ⇒ A number of events, trainings, seminars, consultations and studies delivered under the project framework has exceeded and in some instances substantially exceeded the baseline indicators.
- ⇒ The training program has helped train and certify 29 experts instead of 20 experts as originally planned.
- ⇒ The project experts have assisted with the preparation of 73 project proposals instead of 21 as originally planned.
- ⇒ At the time of the evaluation 12 project proposals were approved and at least ten more project proposals are expected to be approved for funding.
- ⇒ The Millennium Development Goals were prepared and adjusted to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea 2012.
- ⇒ Four local development agencies were established and registered in the districts of Kirovskoye, Nyzhnegorskoye, Chornomorskoye and the town of Feodosia.
- ⇒ The Memorandums of Cooperation on regional development were signed by i) six NGOs from Bakhchisaray district and the Bakhchisaray District Public Administration, the Bakhchisaray District Council, the Executive Committee of the Town Council of the Town of Bakhchisaray and ii) three NGOs from the town of Yevpatoria and the City Council and the Public Administration of the Yevpatoria Town.
- ⇒ In spite of a tight timetable of the project the communities managed to get quickly engaged in the project implementation and the project events as well as the preparation of project proposals.

## **2.2. EVALUATION OF RELEVANCE, EFFECTIVENESS, EFFICIENCY, SUSTAINABILITY, IMPACT AND COHERENCE OF THE PROJECT (INCLUDING BEST PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED)**

### **RELEVANCE**

*Relevance means extent to which the objectives of the intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' needs and European Commission's policies.*

#### ***The SRDC Project Issue/Its Work/Its Results On The Countries/Region's Agenda***

From the European perspective regional development is a long-term process, which requires coordinated efforts of the state, regional and local governments. The project has demonstrated to the state level that the local public authorities should be taught and trained in how to develop strategic plans as well as how to carry out operational planning, to prepare and implement projects in line with the strategic goals and objectives, to raise funds from various sources and to learn how not to be so dependent on the public funds. Yet, it is not enough just to start an Agency for Regional Development. It is important to develop clear policies and procedures for funds handling for public authorities of all levels. Therefore the public authorities should master the same skills the project has introduced to the pilot communities.

The lack of city, district and town master plans turned out to be a crucial lesson learned by the public authorities that encourages oblast and local public authorities to attract investments. It is impossible to prepare and legalize facilities and land plots attractive from an investment point of view without such plans. The lack of the state regional development strategy creates another obstacle that hinders the coordination of the regional development work at different levels. It does not allow for effective use of the limited resources and makes it hard to consolidate and target efforts of public authorities of all levels and bring additional local and foreign investments.

As for the Republic's authorities, the project met their needs and demonstrated the importance of synchronization of different local development strategies (district and municipalities) with the general strategy of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea. The project helped identify the existing resources of the pilot communities and engage the local public authorities as well as the NGOs and business in the regional development and advance the public-private partnership. The project has underlined the importance of coordination of the Crimean government and the districts as well as the coordination between the districts.

#### ***Relevance Of Project Objectives To The Situation In Crimea And Target Groups/Beneficiaries***

The project met the needs of the ARC in general and the needs of the regional and local government in particular. The project focused on capacity building of regional and local governments in project design, development investment projects, promotion investment capacities of towns and districts; and that was extremely important and relevant for the needs of target groups and beneficiaries. In general, with some exceptions, regional and local authorities lack the institutional capabilities and budgets to implement their own policies and are heavily dependent on decisions and transfers from the central level. Consequently, they are on all levels low capacities for the management of regional and local development. A major challenge is not only the design of new policies and of a financial instrument, but especially the identification and implementation of projects. The necessity for capacity building in project management and needs assessment is especially evident at the local level which is closest to the citizens and their problems, and at the level of region where most of the planning processes are originated and where national resources are collected.

As for the pilot communities, the project met their needs even if they were not fully aware of those needs. The project helped the communities identify new opportunities, learn how to prepare project proposals, how to work with strategic plans and view them as a practical tool. The communities understood that an approved master plan of the territory played a crucial role in bringing investments as well as the legalizing the land plots and preparing them for investors rather than just writing business plans. Therefore, the project was important to the pilot communities since it contributed to a better performance of the local governments. It also advanced the interaction of the local public authorities with the communities and existing NGOs and it enabled a better use of the local potential and resources.

#### ***Innovation Of The Project Approach For Crimea/Local Level***

The SRDC project approach was very innovative for Crimea and the local governments since it enabled an outside perspective and helped the beneficiaries believe in opportunities. The respondents indicated the following innovations introduced by the project:

- ⇒ Institutionalization of the local development agencies by conducting an analysis of the existing institutions and their potential, identifying needs and interest in starting new structures and soft and civilized support of the pilot communities when it comes to the implementation of their wish-list
- ⇒ Approach to the Localization of Millennium Development Goals was interesting even if it needs more practical application
- ⇒ Participatory decision making processes at local level concerning regional development
- ⇒ Integrated approach to regional development that involved regional and local governments
- ⇒ Starting a dialogue among the project partners from pilot communities and in the communities, in particular, between the district and rural agencies, governments and NGOs/community)
- ⇒ Development of industrial park concept; investment profiles for pilot communities; investment website

A number of more experienced interviewers commented on a more traditional approach followed by the project to render technical assistance via consultations and trainings. Re-directing the project focus from the regional to local level has paid off only to some extent since it takes more time to follow-up on that and capacity building of local actors.

#### ***Elements Eligible For Replication Elsewhere***

The respondents stressed that all approaches used by the SRDC project and the project in general could be replicated in other regions of Ukraine. However, it would require more time. The important elements that can be introduced to other regions are the Bottom Up and Pilot communities approach, analysis of the

communities' strategic plans and their practical implementation, project preparation and information dissemination at all stages of the project in order to inform all stakeholders about the progress, trips to other regions to share knowledge and experience, NGOs' engagement in the regional development, engagement of representatives of other sectors in training activities, identification of public opinion leaders, and support of the newly-established local development agencies. At the same time the respondents commented that availability of the strategic plan as a selection criteria for the selection of the pilot communities should not be the main issue but should be considered carefully.

### **EFFICIENCY (OF THE PROJECT ITSELF)**

*Efficiency is the extent to which the outputs and/or desired effects have been achieved with the lowest possible use of resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.).*

#### ***Efficiency Of The Project: Activities***

The SRDC project was carried out in compliance with its timetable and did not experience any major deviations that might have had an impact on its implementation. The project did not face any obstacles either. More trainings and seminars were delivered as well as more studies and monitoring were completed under the project. Besides, one more community, Chornomorskiy district, joined the project. The respondents have also commented that local business, NGOs and citizens benefited from the project activities in their communities thanks to the workshops and allocation of funds for various projects and initiatives developed locally.

#### ***Efficiency Of The Project: Resources***

SRDC management structure seemed responsive and flexible. During the project implementation there were no changes of key staff members and experts. The project appears cost-effective in relation to the level of effort involved in regional consulting and research and local capacity building approaches. Most of the respondents mentioned that the project managed to achieve more than it was planned for a given budget. Project management was flexible, and it was easy to move resources to support important efforts and events upon needs. Plans for financial allocation for second phase was jointly discussed and agreed by UNDP with the EU Delegation. Contingency fund was requested for additional capacity building activity for regional and local development agencies, workshops and seminars at republican level, roundtable on medical tourism and conference on city centers revitalization. Where it was possible the project used resources of their partners and conducted many events in pilot communities using partners' premises.

#### ***Extent To Which Project Target Groups/Beneficiaries Are Satisfied With The Results Of SRDC Project***

The majority of respondents are happy about the SRDC project results. The project participants got inspired by new knowledge and skills in preparing project proposals, effective fund-raising efforts focused on specific projects, support rendered to the investment efforts of the communities, practical implementation of strategic plans and relevant guidance, opportunities to learn from other communities from Western Ukraine and their participation in various conferences and fruitful discussions to implement new initiatives. However, it should be noted that despite general satisfaction of cooperation with the project, Feodosia city authority expected more assistance in project design. The specific assistance they required was about project budget preparation and adoption of the proposal to specific grant competition. Also, the community was not happy with frequent changes of the project managers that worked with them and with late information from the project about upcoming grant competitions. In summary, the Feodosia community expected that the project not just provided them with necessary support through mentoring and consultation but did a lot of work for them.

#### ***Looking Again At Implementation: What Went Absolutely Above Expectations? What Went Absolutely Wrong Thus Far In The Project?***

The SRDC project managed to train more experts within a short period of time, to assist with the development of a bigger number of projects than it was originally planned, to encourage wider participation of the communities and to boost generation of new ideas and their further implementation.

The large majority of communities did not expect any funding to be provided for their projects. So when that happened it made them re-assess themselves and what they could do and become more confident and enthusiastic in their work. The communities understood that when they invested knowledge and experience in the project, they were able to receive real money to implement the initiatives that otherwise would never have been supported by public funds. Besides, the pilot communities did not expect the cooperation with NGOs to be that beneficial for the communities as it helped attract additional resources such as volunteers, expert support and grants, gain access to information and to recognize new leaders in the communities, to identify new ideas and revive these communities. In addition, the local governments improved their understanding of the role the civil society organizations play in the communities.

Understanding the notion and engagement in the development of investment projects resulted in a better understanding of the communities of the investment product and what needs to be done to bring investments. The communities no longer translate investment projects as business-plans. They realize they need to legalize land plots and municipal facilities in order to attract investments.

The attitude of the communities towards strategic plans has changed as well, i.e. from being proud to having them to using them in practical terms, updating and monitoring their implementation.

The outcomes of the survey on community values became a surprise to the community of Bakhchisaray district. The results had an impact on the communication and public image policy focused on tourism potential of the district. The community of Feodosia town has now a group of people capable to develop projects despite unsuccessful fund-raising efforts. The experienced community of Yevpatoria was surprised to learn new things from the project experts who introduced them to medical tourism and culinary tourism. The local authorities of Chornomorskiy district did not think that the participation in the trainings could change the way of thinking of participants and encourage the community to be proactive in the development of the district strategic plan.

The respondents commented that no negative unexpected developments took place in the project.

#### ***Look Back: How Project Would Have Be Designed Differently***

All respondents were unanimous that there should have been more time allocated to the project implementation since it is impossible to build capacity overnight. It takes time. International experts significantly contributed to the project success; however, a lot of time was spent on adjusting the international experience to the Crimean context. At present stage of the development of Ukraine and Crimea there are many local experts who have knowledge and experience to share and they would fit the Ukrainian realities better. The respondents favor more targeted international assistance and more local expertise. Besides, the respondents believe that the coordination of the SRDC project and the other EU projects (for example, on tourism development) should be envisioned and improved. In their opinion the project should have had funds for projects developed within its scope. They also commented that the cooperation among experts who work with pilot regions could be improved. And lastly, they think that the project should have engaged more village mayors, developed strategic plans of rural communities and trained local specialists to work with CSOs and communities.

#### ***Efficiency Of The Project: Visibility***

The project enjoyed extensive media coverage and support from printed press and electronic resources at the local and regional levels. The project representatives participated in different programs broadcast on radio and TV. Press-tours were offered to mass media to the pilot regions. A special event was organized for national mass media when launching the project. However, the project was more visible at the local and regional levels; it did not receive proper regular coverage at the national level (there was information about the project on Channel 5). This can be explained by extensive coverage of various events from different oblasts at the national level where news from Crimea and the project and its timing could have been easily lost since the project results that might be of interest to the media will be presented only at the final conference after summing up all project results.

## **EFFECTIVENESS**

*Effectiveness refers to extent to which the objectives of the intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' needs and European Commission's policies*

### **Main Project Results**

The main project results include better understanding of the regional development concept and of the need for realistic and efficient strategic plans that are developed, updated and monitored with a wide participation of the community by the key representatives of the local governments.

The local governments have improved their cooperation with the communities and NGOs. They have re-considered the way they used to perceive the role of civil society, the potential and importance of its organizations. Having learned to prepare projects, the local authorities understand the merit of operational planning based on the community interests. Successful fund-raising experience has inspired both the community and the local authorities; it has also laid the ground for working with different resources and donors.

The pilot communities have understood that the regional development does not mean a band-aid approach in a particular district but coordinated actions of neighboring territories. And that it does not boil down to social issues but also includes proper preparation and search for investors and investments. The project helped many communities identify their strengths and weaknesses, deficiencies in planning and management as well as potential risks and threats.

The pilot communities received support in mobilization of direct foreign investments. Project experts build capacity of staff administration in attracting investments. An investors' road map to help the investor to decide on the specific steps needed to start investment was prepared for each project pilot region. Necessary assistance from the SRDC project in the development of the city and regional investment programs and in preparation of an investment products were obtained by pilot communities as well. Managers and specialists of local government received consulting support in search, identification, and preparation of land and "Brownfield" facilities for the best investment location. In addition, the project provides advisory and technical support for pilot regions in developing investment certificates of cities and districts, investment portals and other tools to create a positive image and promote information about investment opportunities for the territories.

In addition to the expected project results each community has outlined their specific project results. They are as follows:

#### **Bakhchysaray**

- ✓ Documents for the industrial park prepared
- ✓ Four investment sites including promotional materials, information on the websites prepared
- ✓ The Investment Activities program for 2013-2014 endorsed
- ✓ Communication strategy and the public image policy of the district being finalized
- ✓ About 20 experts trained to develop projects and 12 experts trained in fund-raising
- ✓ About 15 project proposals submitted, three of which are approved for funding
- ✓ The Memorandum on Cooperation in the regional policy implementation signed by six NGOs and the district public administration, district council and town executive committee

#### **Nyzhnegirsk**

- ✓ Learned how to develop projects
- ✓ Became more confident
- ✓ Learned how to interact with different actors and target groups
- ✓ Understood the need to rely on internal reserves, promote self-improvement, serve as a good example to others and learn how to work with each other

### **Kirovske**

- ✓ Stirred an interest among people/awakened people
- ✓ Learned to define the development priorities
- ✓ Understood ways to receive additional funding and learned how to get it

### **Feodosia**

- ✓ The Feodosia Regional Development Center Non-Governmental Organizations established
- ✓ The interaction of the local authorities and CSOs improved
- ✓ Mastered communication skills to interact more effectively with the community
- ✓ Improved the understanding of the role and work of CSOs
- ✓ Recognition of NGO role by mass media and community

### **Yevpatoria**

- ✓ Study visits to Rivne, Novograd-Volynsky, Ostrog and Kyiv
- ✓ The Memorandum on Cooperation signed by three NGOs, the city council and the administration

### **Chornomorskiy district**

- ✓ The district strategy for 2013-2020 with the participation of the district community developed
- ✓ A center of project proposals/initiatives established
- ✓ Trainings made the community more active and confident
- ✓ The Memorandum on the Implementation of the District Development Strategy signed by the Center of Project Proposals/Initiatives, the District Council and the District Public Administration
- ✓ The community center is planned to be founded in Chornomorsk on the premises of the kindergarten

In general, all expected results at output level were achieved and many of them went beyond the original expectations. It will take time to evaluate the project effectiveness in the long-term perspective. The received results are consistent with needs of pilot communities and EU policies.

### **IMPACT**

*Impact refers to positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended*

The evaluation indicates that the project has a potential impact at the *local or regional level*. Having said this, the project might lack an impact at the *national level*. This is caused by the project design, which basically supports local and regional initiatives and bottom up approach. Moreover more aggressive information and communication campaign at national level is needed.

In terms of the project impact at the local level the respondents hope that the project participants will use knowledge and skills they have gained in the project, that the project proposals will be funded and consequently they will help address pressing social issues and economic needs in the communities, that the investment products will bring investments to the communities together with new jobs and prosperity, that the new and updated strategic plans will consolidate the local governments and local communities and enhance the cooperation of the local and the republic authorities and that the confidence of the project participants raised by the project will remain and encourage them to generate new initiatives and ambitious ideas. The impressive number of developed and funded project proposals (54 and 12 respectively, at the time of the project's evaluation) initiated by the communities reinforces these hopes. They mean a better understanding of the investment potential and limitations by the communities, available investment products and realistic projects, and a changed attitude of the local governments towards their communities and NGOs. In other words, they now face the people they work for instead of turning their heads and their true engagement in the development of the local policy. In particular, the memorandums on cooperation of NGOs' coalitions and local public authorities were signed in Bakhchisaray district and the town of Yevpatoria. One regional and four local development agencies were established under the project and the project communities developed and updated their strategic plans.

However, in addition to the time that it will take to fulfill these hopes, they also should be backed by the proper national policy on regional development and adequate funding for its implementation as well as cooperation at local and regional levels of all actors and coordinated developmental activity of local and regional authorities in order to generate synergies supporting the wider impact of the SRDC project.

In conclusion, reviewing the evidence about *impact* of SRDC project generates mixed results. On the positive side, the empowering of pilot local communities is certainly positive and there also is positive impact on local and regional development. The negative aspect is that the lack of legislative framework and financial support for regional development mitigates the impact that local and regional level projects have on developments in Ukraine as a whole.

## **SUSTAINABILITY**

*Sustainability refers to extent to which the benefits from the development intervention will continue after the termination of the external intervention, or the probability that they continue in the long-term prospective in a way that is resilient to risks.*

*The project elements that might help its sustainability in future*

There are several project elements that will ensure the project's sustainability in the future.

**Approach of incorporating civil society** was extremely fruitful and useful. The importance of civil society involvement was recognized by all respondents at local, republican and national levels. They acknowledged that ideas brought by public enriched local development activity, bring up human and social values to the plans and prioritized differently than government strategic and project goals. However, it is important to mention that not all pilot communities favored involvement of public and civil society organizations in the beginning. It was necessary to understand how to approach them and how to work with them. While in Bakhchysaray and Yevpatoria there are many strong and active CSOs with some traditions of participation in public policy development, in other four pilot communities it was important to create a specific approach to public by establishing local development agencies.

**Institutionalization of regional and local development agencies** was based on the results of the consultation process in each pilot community. Only when commitment was secured in four communities for the set up of the local development agencies the project provided support in legalization of the new organizations and in building organizational capacity of new entities. The project supported the initiative of two communities to cooperate better with existing CSOs and supported preparation and signing of memorandums of cooperation between network of local CSOs and local state administrations and councils.

**The participatory process** that was used by the project in its work with pilot communities involved, evolved, and was built on receiving feedback from stakeholders and conducting joint activity that includes public institutions, NGOs and the business community. In all pilots many people took part in the training, consultations and other project activity. Participation of civil society leaders and organizations in the project activity at local level shaped authorities' understanding of public needs and interests. At the same time, attention of mass media to project implementation increases public interests and volume of information on project activity.

### ***Outputs/Outcomes Of The Project Are To Be Sustained***

In fact all produced by the SRDC project outcomes could be sustained. As for outcomes the following will likely be sustained:

- Local authorities of six pilot communities will continue work on their plans for sustainable regional development in cooperation with nongovernmental organizations and private sector with use of received knowledge, skills and experience within the SRDC project but with a different pace and extent;
- Cooperation of CSO coalitions and local authorities in Bakhchysaray district and city of Yevpatoria will continue;

- At least two (Kirovske and Chornomorskoje) out of four registered local development agencies and regional development agency will be sustained and continue their work.

### ***Factors Contributing To/ Detracting From Project Sustainability***

Factors that might contribute to sustainability of the project results include:

- Political will and public authorities' interest in and support of new concepts and practices introduced by the SRDC project to the regional development issues at local level;
- Participatory approach to strategic planning and implementation that ensures reflection of public interests, needs, and views in the plans and implementation strategies;
- Combination of project activities at regional and local levels increased the likelihood that practical results and lessons learned of the project will be adequately reflected in policy and activity aimed at regional development;
- Development of a pool of local experts through participation in training, study visits, project ideas identification/development, mentoring and consulting of project beneficiaries contributed to sustainability of the SRDC project. Moreover, materials developed, translated and produced by the project were of a great help to pilot communities and other interested actors and will remain beyond the life of the project, available for use by all who are interested;
- Existence of champions such Bakhchysaray and Yevpatoria that cooperates with representatives of different sectors will increase local ownership and promote changes from within.
- Public-private partnerships.

### ***Factors Detracting From Sustainability Of Results:***

- Lack of the State strategy of Regional Development;
- Continuing financial crisis in Ukraine that further reduces state budget support to regional non-salary expenditures;
- Lack of funds for implementation of the projects developed within regional and local strategic plans;
- Lack of experience and skills of local authorities in obtaining funds for implementation of the projects developed within regional and local strategic plans from the State Fund for Regional Development and international donors, especially EU programs;
- Lack of cooperation of local communities in regional development;
- Lack of or weak capacity of RDA and LDAs.

## **BEST PRACTICES**

The respondents specified some best practices generated by the project.

**Selection of pilot communities.** Six pilot communities were selected from various regions of Crimea to take part in the project. These communities have different level of expertise and development. Although the availability of the development strategy was part of the selection criteria there was only one community that did not comply with that criterion. It was the community of Chornomorskiy district. It was selected because it was one of the two Crimean communities that did not have a strategy. Some communities, in particular, the communities of Yevpatoria town and Bakhchisaray district had experience in working with the international donors, engaging communities and NGOs in the preparation and implementation of the local policy. The selected pilot communities had different social-economic conditions, and their management style, culture and presence of proactive NGOs differed. The combinations of diverse communities made the weaker communities learn from stronger ones and the stronger one share their knowledge and experience with least experienced districts and towns.

**An approach the local regional development agencies were started with.** The regional development agencies were established in several stages. At first, the information campaign on the role and functions of these agencies was conducted in the communities. Then consultations on how the communities perceived an institution to be in charge of the regional development were held. As a result of these consultations two communities, in particular the community of Bakhchisaray district and the town of Yevpatoria, opted to use the existing CSOs as the development agencies and four communities decided to create new organizations. The project assisted the pilot communities to decide on the potential founders

and members of the local agencies and on the type of registration they should choose. It also helped prepare and register these new organizations with the local departments of the Ministry of Justice and other relevant authorities. Similar assistance was rendered to the newly-established regional development agency. When the pilot communities decided to register a new organization the project prepared a program on organizational development of existing and newly-founded local and regional development agencies. The respondents highly appreciated the considerate and discreet attitude of the project staff in the process of creation of new agencies.

The work of the project expert on investment activities, which completely transformed the concept of investment by the pilot communities. The trainings, individual and group consultations resulted in a number of developed investment products for every community. Even more advanced communities commented on his approach as very effective and inspirational, the approach that nurtures initiatives and aspiration.

Production of regular reports on findings of monitoring of social-economic conditions in the region proved to be useful as these reports were of good quality, in demand and simply important.

The creation of a joint data base of projects at the regional level and the creation of a data base of project ideas in some communities make a good example of how organizations and communities can prepare for various competitions ahead of time, how they can find partners and associates and how they can coordinate the inter-district activities. For instance, the community of Kirovske decided to create a sheep-rearing cluster instead of a vegetable one, which has already been started by the neighbor district of Nyzhnehirsk.

Study visits to other regions combined with learning activities and trainings proved to be instrumental and relevant.

## **LESSONS LEARNED**

The lessons learned from the project can be summarized in the following way:

- There is no need to be afraid to change the scope of the project if the original one does not work. It is important to admit mistakes and to not be afraid to stop, review the needs and change the project activities and at times change the goal and objectives and the level of implementation as well as the project activities, the project target groups and its beneficiaries.
- At the initial stage it is crucial to consider the experience the region/the community already has, to know the history, culture and traditions, to understand the specifics of the communities; in other words, the initial mapping should be done carefully and various aspects should be considered
- If it takes a long time to develop a project, then key pre-conditions of the project might lose their relevance and it will be necessary to reconsider ways and methods of the project implementation at the very beginning of the project implementation.
- The international experience shall be adjusted to the local realities before it is introduced locally. There is no point to rely and go for one approach only. It is worth taking the trouble to try various ways. For instance, the regional development is not based and dependent on the existence of the Regional Development Agency.
- Capacity building, in particular at the local and regional level takes time and requires a flexible approach.
- Grant funding is required to support the developed project proposals together with trainings and other learning activities to keep momentum going so that the participants do not feel demotivated and lose their heart but have their skills operational and aspirations high.
- It will be good to have more types of published materials produced to be distributed by the pilot communities themselves. For instance, something like a community investment profile. It is also necessary to update and publish manuals and guidelines to be used by local public authorities in their day-to-day operations. For example, a manual on how to attract investments.

- It is important to ensure coordination of the project participants at the regional level as well as closer cooperation of the project and other similar projects and programs funded by other donors, for instance, the EU-funded project on tourism, the Turkish International Development and Cooperation Agency projects and programs, GIZ, DESPRO and other. Such coordination took place during the time frame of the project.
- Visits to other regions and communities of Ukraine are extremely useful in terms of knowledge and experience sharing. It will be great to have more of them in the project.
- It is crucial to teach the basics of advocacy to the representatives of various sectors in the community in order to empower them to protect their interests when interacting with regional and public authorities.
- It is impossible to attract investment without the endorsed master plans of towns and cities.
- The information and communication campaigns shall be an integral part of the implementation of any strategic plan.
- It is crucial to engage and rely on the potential and resources the community and CSOs have when preparing and implementing the local policy and addressing the pressing issues of the community.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Conclusions

The evaluation has demonstrated that the second phase of the SRDC project was relevant and all expected results were achieved. The project managed to have achieved all the planned results at the local level and in some instances it went even beyond the expected results. In particular, more project experts were trained and more project proposals were developed and funded, more investment products were prepared and more local development agencies were established. Since the project targeted mainly the local level the regional and national governments received less attention and were only engaged in the preparation and organization of the regional events. Unfortunately the Council of Ministers and other key ministries were not as interested in the project due to its shift from the regional to the local level. Although the intention to form the Regional Development Coordination Council and make it operational was voiced by the Council of Ministers, it somehow just remained an intention and the Council went unnoticed among other councils engaged in similar activities. And though the process of the regional strategy update was started, at present it is at the stage when the strategy is being coordinated with the local strategies developed before and with the engagement of citizens versus the “desk” preparation of the regional strategy. In addition the regional strategy is very much economic- and investment-oriented, and as a result the social aspect is rather overlooked and therefore it has to be reconsidered. The work done by the project to localize MDGs in Crimea is important and should be taken into account for future strategy update. The order about the harmonization of the local strategies with the regional strategy was endorsed but as one respondent put it, “The state does not have a right to insist on the harmonization of the local, regional and national levels since it does not provide financial support to the implementation of the strategies”.

The project exceeded all expectations and contributed to the creation of a new regional development agency and four local development agencies. All evaluation participants commented on the considerate and discreet way in which the project rendered its support with the creation of these new agencies. Two communities opted for closer cooperation with the existing organizations by signing the memorandums on cooperation instead of creating new institutions in the communities. The creation of these agencies was accompanied by an intensive capacity building program. Perhaps not all new local agencies will survive and continue to act as the local development agencies and not just as NGOs. The presence of an organization with a mission, permanent staff and institutional memory in the community as opposed to the public authorities that have a tendency for frequent staff turnover is an important cornerstone of sustainability of the work initiated by the project.

The project dedicated a lot of time and efforts to train the representatives of pilot communities how to prepare project proposals in theory and in practice. All communities managed to develop project proposals and one of five of these project proposals was funded, thus making the communities more confident in their work and enabling them to receive additional resources that helped address various problems in the communities. The communities yet to overcome their fears and insecurity and start pursuing more aggressively loans and credits as well as work harder on public-private partnership. Unfortunately due to the project's tight time schedule the communities did not manage to receive sufficient support from the project with the implementation of their own initiatives, which are going on at present whereas the project comes to an end.

The project was a success as it has changed the understanding of investments by the local communities. The project made sure that all pilot communities had the community investment passports prepared as well as the investor's road maps; the project developed attractive promotional materials and identified greenfield and brownfield. However, the support to FDI promotion has identified the lack of district master plans in the communities and that hinders the preparation of land plots and municipal facilities for perspective investments.

The findings of the evaluation demonstrate that nearly all expected project results were not just achieved but they went beyond the original expectations except the creation of the Regional Development Coordination Council. These results make a solid foundation for a coherent institutional architecture for

regional development in Crimea. Effective approaches that can be applied in other districts of Crimea and in other regions of Ukraine taking into consideration the lessons learned from the project were identified during the implementation of the second phase of the project.

In conclusion, with respect to programming in regional development, achieving tangible results in a short period of time is a complex task because of the breadth of stakeholders and the necessity of working with civil society and different levels of government. District administrations are the level of government responsible for delivering many of the services that citizens see and need on a daily basis. In this sense, local authorities lack the institutional capabilities and budgets to implement their own policies and are heavily dependent on decisions and transfers from the central level. A major challenge is the identification and implementation of projects. The necessity for capacity building in project management and needs assessment, operational planning and building partnerships with NGOs and community members are especially needed at the local level closest to the citizens and their problems firstly, and at the regional level where most of the planning processes are originated and where national resources are collected secondly. From a development perspective, achieving concrete results in regional development requires a long-term approach and an integrated approach where national/regional/local levels are all included in project design.

### **Recommendations For Future**

The following **recommendation** is proposed: EU and UNDP should continue to support regional and local level programming in the peninsula to strengthen their significant investment already made in regional development and to complement their other projects in this area in Crimea.

**Future support** is required to:

- continue to strengthen local and regional capacities to implement and adjust the local and regional strategic plans; to show concrete results through local and regional economic development; and to strengthen the institutional capacity of local and regional administrations to incorporate strategic planning more effectively into their decision-making processes. Emphasis should be placed on in-service mentoring and coaching of technical personnel at the regional and rayon levels and seed grant funds should be available for support of selected projects
- expand the project to other districts of Crimea and support those districts in more effective and efficient means of implementing their strategic plans based on best practices and lessons learned from the SRDC project. Special attention should be given to strengthening the link between strategic planning and a project based approach
- strengthen relations between the region and the districts in a more systematically institutional way by using various means and activities
- continue capacity building of regional and local development agencies in order to transform them into more sophisticated institutions and to disseminate the project experience to other districts of Crimea
- develop a network of the regional development actors both in Crimea and across Ukraine to initiate exchange visits, knowledge sharing and preparation and implementation of joint projects

**Specific initiatives** that require support are as follows:

- Preparation of regulations on cooperation of public authorities, civil society organizations and communities in the field of regional development
- Continuation of ad hoc/customized studies to assist the public authorities of different levels. For instance, on barriers to investment, essence of regional development, energy efficiency and energy-saving etc.
- Preparation of comprehensive and major development initiatives of specific territories of the Western and Eastern Crimea. The projects can include the construction of a regional airport in the outskirts of Yevpatoria, development of tourism potential in the area between Feodosia and Kerch etc.
- Introduction of the best practices and standards in the hospitality and tourism area to the respective managers in Crimea and arranging on-the-job training for them with the Western professionals outside Ukraine.

**ANNEX 1. TERM OF REFERENCE****CONSULTANT (ICPN 2013/SO/020): NATIONAL PROJECT EVALUATOR-RE-ADVERTISED**

<b>Location:</b>	SIMFEROPOL, UKRAINE
<b>Application Deadline:</b>	09-May-13
<b>Type of Contract:</b>	Individual Contract
<b>Post Level:</b>	National Consultant
<b>Languages Required:</b>	English Russian
<b>Starting Date:</b> (date when the selected candidate is expected to start)	15-May-2013
<b>Expected Duration of Assignment:</b>	15 May to 20 June 2013

**Background**

**Project name:** EU/UNDP Support to the Regional Development of Crimea (SRDC)

**Country / Duty Station:** Simferopol and home based

**Expected places of travel:** Trips to pilot municipalities/districts in Crimea as well as 1 trip to Kiev

**Supervisor's name and functional post:** Mrs. Elena Panova, Deputy Country Director, UNDP

**Payment arrangements:** Lump Sum (payments linked to deliverables)

**Selection method:** Desk review and interview panel

In August 2010 the UNDP launched a two year European Union funded Technical Assistance project in Crimea to build the capacity of a newly created Regional Development Agency set up by the Crimean Government. From March 2012, the Project has entered its second phase, according to which it focuses its support on selected Crimean municipalities and districts and help them design development projects and attract development funding to their territories.

The key project's outputs expected in this second phase are:

- Local authorities show capacities to plan for sustainable regional development, in cooperation with non- governmental and private sectors.
- 1 pool of no less than 20 local experts at republican level and throughout 5 administrative units and NGOs trained and able to carry out project development, fund attraction and projects' implementation.
- no less than 21 regional and/or local development projects designed and submitted for financing
- 1 clear concept of an effective and viable not-for-profit regional and/or local development institution presented to project's partners and beneficiaries leading to a possible decision by relevant republican and local stakeholders (municipalities and districts) to set it up
- If set up, institution's operational and administrative processes and procedures, as well as partnership mechanisms, are in place and used by relevant parties
- National government's acknowledgement of Crimea's regional development experience as one of the best in Ukraine and worth disseminating to other regions
- Visibility of both the European Union and the UNDP throughout project's second phase implementation

**Objectives of the evaluation****Duties and Responsibilities**

The evaluation will cover all activities of the Project carried out between March 2012 and end June 2013 at both republican and local levels. Key evaluation indicators include:

### Relevance

Extent to which the objectives of the intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' needs and European Commission's policies.

### Effectiveness

Extent to which the intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

### Efficiency

Extent to which the outputs and/or desired effects have been achieved with the lowest possible use of resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.).

### Sustainability

Extent to which the benefits from the development intervention will continue after termination of the external intervention, or the probability that they continue in the long-term prospective in a way that is resilient to risks.

### Impact potential

Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

### Coherence

Extent to which activities undertaken allow the European Commission and UNDP to achieve their development policy objectives without internal contradiction or without contradiction with other policies.

Extent to which they complement the country's policies and other donors' interventions.

The evaluator should also take into account the OVIs (Objectively Verifiable Indicators) and Sources of Information indicated in the Project's Logical Framework.

## **Deliverables**

The key deliverables of the assignment are:

- 1 detailed work plan;
- 1 list of proposed meetings with stakeholders (at national, republican and local level);
- at least 1 questionnaire to be used in the context of the evaluation;
- at least 12 meetings at national, republican and local level with relevant stakeholders;
- 1 Project's Evaluation Report.

The Expert is responsible for organizing all meetings at national, republican and local level. He will be assisted by the SRDC project in organizing all meetings.

At national level meetings should, at least, include meetings with relevant program officer in the EU Delegation, the Country Director and Deputy Country Director of the UNDP office in Kiev, a relevant official of the Ministry of Economic Development Trade of Ukraine (Head of the Regional Policy Department), representatives of the EU funded "Support to Regional Development Policy" project.

At republican level meetings should be conducted, at least, with representatives of the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of ARC, the Center for Local and Regional Development of Crimea, the Regional Development Agency, EU funded "Crimean Tourism Diversification and Support" and "Foreign Direct Investment promotion in Sevastopol" projects. Meetings at local level should be conducted with, at least, mayors of municipalities, heads of local administrations/local councils, representatives of NGOs and businesses.

A full list of project's contacts will be made available to the Expert. The Expert will also be given the following documents:

- Initial description of the Action;
- EU Monitor's report (monitoring mission carried out in the first phase of the Project);
- Revised description of the Action;
- previous annual progress reports;
- keyproject's documents (reports, publications, databases, etc.);
- other documents as requested for the purpose of the evaluation.

The Project Evaluation Report should be structured as follows:

- Executive summary (up to 2 pages);
- Introduction (up to 1 page);
- Description of the evaluation methodology (up to 3 pages);
- Analysis of outputs and outcomes against Project's OVI's (from 8 up to 10 pages);
- Evaluation of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact and coherence of the Project (including best practice and lessons learned) (from 8 up to 10 pages);
- Conclusions and recommendations (up to 4 pages);
- Annexes: charts, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

The Evaluation Report should be drafted in English and the Evaluation Expert is responsible for providing a translation of the report into Russian.

The Evaluation Report will be disseminated amongst relevant stakeholders including the European Union Delegation, government institutions, NGOs and others

### **Monitoring/reporting requirements**

It is expected that during the first week after the start of assignment the expert will provide a detailed plan of works which will be agreed with the Deputy Country Director  
Meetings at national level will take place between 15 and 17 May.

The field visits will take place between 20 and 30 May.

The first draft of the Project's evaluation report will be submitted by 13 June 2013.

The final draft of the Project's evaluation report will be submitted to UNDP Deputy Country Director by 20 June 2013.

**ANNEX 2. SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS**

<b>Date/ Time</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Institution/Address</b>	<b>Position</b>
<b>Kyiv</b>			
June 10	Enzo Damiani	European Union Delegation to Ukraine	Sector Manager Joint Cooperation Initiative in Crimea Coordinator
June 19	Olena Mykhaylivna Nyzhnyk	Ministry of economic development and trade of Ukraine	Director of Department of regional policy
June 11 9:30am	Adeline Gonay Mustafa Sait-Ametov	UNDP Sub-Office Crimea	Head of Sub-Office, Deputy Team Leader / Project Development Expert
June 11	Ricarda Rieger	UNDP Ukraine Country Office	Country Director
<b>Crimea</b>			
<b>June 13</b>			
12pm	Konstantin Grivakov	Crimean Regional Center for Investment and Development	Deputy Director
14pm	Ayder Khalilov	EC/UNDP Support to Regional Development project	Expert
16pm	Anna Kovalenko Denys Maslyakov Kostyantyn Ipatov	Ministry of economic development and trade of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea	Head/Deputy Head of department of investment and image policy; Head of department of strategic development
17pm	Valeriy Vasylievich Palchuk	Council of Ministers of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea	Deputy Head
18pm	Andrey Bessmertny	NGO “Center for local and regional development of Crimea”	Deputy Head
<b>June 14</b>			
9am	Энвер Абляев Катерина Гридасова	Бахчисарайская РГА 5 Sovetskaya Street	Управління економіки
15pm	Николай Николаевич Самойлов	Нижегородский райсовет	Заместитель председателя
15pm	Pavlova-Bormotova Galina Tetyana Berezhnyuk	NGO “Center for development of Nizhegorsky district”	Head/member
17pm	Геннадий Витальевич Руденко	Нижегородская районная государственная администрация 11 Lenina street	Первый заместитель председателя
<b>June 17</b>			
9am	Анатолий Петрович Покидченко Anna Solomakha	Кировская районная государственная администрация	Первый заместитель председателя
9am	Nikolay Vladimirovych Kobets	Kirovsky village council	Deputy head
11am	Nikolay Chuksin Valentyna Pavlova	NGO “Center for development of Kirovskiy district”	Secretary Head
12pm	Василий Васильевич Ганыш Tetyana Sergiivna Krocha	Феодосийский горсовет 4 Zemskaya Street	Заместитель Феодосийского городского головы Economy department
14pm	Minakov Vladimir	NGO “Center for regional and local development of Feodosia”	Deputy Head

<b>June 18</b>			
9am	Сергей Валентинович Стрельбицкий Шевський Сергій	Евпаторийский горсовет 4 Karavayeva street	Заместитель Евпаторийского городского головы
11:30am	Ибадуллаев Дамир Исмаилович	Черноморская районная государственная администрация	Первый заместитель председателя
13pm	Saraseko Ivan	NGO “Center of project initiatives of Chernomorskiy district”	Head
16pm	UNDP Crimea	De-briefing	Adeline Gonay Mustafa Sait-Ametov
17pm	Valentina Olenina	NGO “Center for local and regional development of Crimea”	Head

**Interview questionnaires for evaluation visits**

Dear colleagues,

Please be informed that the UNDP Sub-Office in Crimea has launched evaluation of the second phase of the EU/UNDP Support to the Regional Development of Crimea (SRDC) project that was implemented since March 2012 and ends June 30 of 2013. The objective of the evaluation is to assess the relevance and quality of outputs of the EU/UNDP funded Project “*Support to the Regional Development of Crimea*” (second phase of the Support to the Regional Development Agency of Crimea) and identify likely outcomes/impacts. The evaluation should also generate lessons and experiences that could feed into the implementation of other similar interventions in the region as well at national level.

The list of evaluation questions was prepared in according with the evaluation objectives and key evaluation indicators such as *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact potential and coherence*. The list of questions is presented below. Please review the questions before our meeting. It will help you to define set of questions related to your involvement into the project implementation and you know best. The information you provide is extremely valuable in allowing us to understand the project and its achievements to date best. It is not expected that during our one-one and half hour meeting all questions will be discussed.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact Lyubov Palyvoda

Best regards,

Lyubov Palyvoda

Mobile           +38 050 310 1211  
e-mail:           Palyvoda@ccc.kiev.ua

\*\*\*\*\*

**LIST OF QUESTIONS**

**SECTION 1. RESPONDENT’S INFORMATION**

- Name
- Institution
- Position
- What is your relationship to the project?
- What role do you play in the project?
  - Donor
  - Partner
  - Beneficiary
  - Other

## **SECTION 2 PROJECT OUTPUTS**

What expected key project's outputs were achieved, namely:

### **Result 1 - Crimean institutions (at both republican and local levels) and partnership strengthened for effective policy development, strategy and projects design and implementation**

- The Crimean Council of Ministers shows clear evidence of effective planning and coordination of regional development actions through the set up and operations of a Crimean Coordination Council.
- Local authorities show capacities to plan for sustainable regional development, in cooperation with non governmental and private sectors.

### **Result 2 - Local development funds absorption capacities increased and institutional architecture and mechanisms developed**

- 1 pool of no less than 20 local experts at republican level and throughout 5 administrative units and NGOs trained and able to carry out project development, fund attraction and projects' implementation.
- no less than 21 regional and/or local development projects designed and submitted for financing
- 1 clear concept of an effective and viable not-for-profit regional and/or local development institution presented to project's partners and beneficiaries leading to a possible decision by relevant republican and local stakeholders (municipalities and districts) to set it up
- If set up, institution's operational and administrative processes and procedures, as well as partnership mechanisms, are in place and used by relevant parties

### **Result 3 - Crimea recommended as one of the best practice regional development mechanisms for other regions of Ukraine**

- National government's acknowledgement of Crimea's regional development experience as one of the best in Ukraine and worth disseminating to other regions
- Visibility of both the European Union and the UNDP throughout project's second phase implementation

## **SECTION 3 RELEVANCE**

*Relevance means Extent to which the objectives of the intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' needs and European Commission's policies.*

- 3.1 How high is the SRDC project issue/its work/its results on the countries/region's agenda?
- 3.2 How would you assess the relevance of project objectives to the situation in Crimea and target groups/beneficiaries?
- 3.3 How innovative is the project approach for Crimea/local level?
- 3.4 Are some or several elements eligible for replication elsewhere? Which ones or what kind are you thinking about?

## **SECTION 4. EFFICIENCY (OF THE PROJECT ITSELF)**

*Efficiency is the extent to which the outputs and/or desired effects have been achieved with the lowest possible use of resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.).*

*Efficiency of the project: activities*

- 4.1 Are the project on schedule with planned activities? (Any deviations?)
- 4.2 Were/are there any unforeseen obstacles in implementing the activities?

*Efficiency of the project: Resources*

- 4.3 What has been the cost-effectiveness of the project? (Relation of project costs to results, or, in other words, could results be achieved with less resources?)

*Efficiency of the project: lessons learned*

- 4.4 To which extent are you satisfied with the results of SRDC project
- 4.5 Looking again at implementation: What went absolutely above expectations?
- 4.6 Looking at the implementation: What went absolutely wrong thus far in the project?
- 4.7 If you would/could start again and design a project, would you, and if so, how would

you have designed it differently?

#### *Efficiency of the project: visibility*

- 4.8 Was publicity to promote the visibility of the project enough and all interested were able to get project information at
- National level
  - Crimea
  - Local communities

### **SECTION 5. EFFECTIVENESS**

*Effectiveness refers to extent to which the objectives of the intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' needs and European Commission's policies*

- 5.1 What were the main project results for you?
- 5.2 To which extent the project will achieve/has achieved the objectives as envisaged in the proposal? (How successful is the project (thus far))
- 5.3 What are/have been (for your institution) the learning effects of working with the project?

### **SECTION 6. IMPACT**

*Impact refers to positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended*

- 6.1 What is/will be the potential impact of the project?
- 6.2 How did the impact demonstrate itself?

### **SECTION 7. SUSTAINABILITY**

*Sustainability refers to extent to which the benefits from the development intervention will continue after termination of the external intervention, or the probability that they continue in the long-term prospective in a way that is resilient to risks..*

- 7.1 Has the project elements that help its sustainability in future?
- 7.2 What outputs/outcomes/impact of the project were/are to be, sustained?
- 7.3 What are/might be/have been the constraints for project sustainability (financial, institutional, political, other)?
- 7.4 Do you expect the project to be future financed by EU/other organizations/structures after its end? If yes, what objectives will be defined?

### **SECTION 8. COHERENCE**

*Coherence is the extent to which activities undertaken allow the European Commission and UNDP to achieve their development policy objectives without internal contradiction or without contradiction with other policies. Extent to which they complement the country's policies and other donors' interventions*

- 8.1 Are Overall Objectives and Project Purpose (specific objectives) consistent with and supportive of the EC and UNDP development policy objectives?)
- 8.2 Does the project complement the country's policies/Crimea/local of regional development?

### **SECTION 9 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE**

- 9.1 What issues should be targeted in future TA from UEU?
- 9.2 How local/regional players should be strengthened in order to better develop and implement local/regional development policies? What capacities they will need?
- 9.3 How would you see cooperation/partnership among local authorities, local and regional authorities, and government of Crimea and Ukraine in implementation of local/republican/national development programs?
- 9.4 What institutional framework should be in place (LDA, RDA or association of DA)