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# Executive summary

**Overview**

This evaluation has been commissioned by the Czech-United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Trust Fund (CTF) that is funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic (MFA) and is implemented byUNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (UNDP/RBEC)through Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH)**.** The evaluation measures the effectiveness and efficiency of CTF activities in relation to the stated objective and expected outputs, assesses the relevance of the CTF, including its design, and contains lessons and recommendations that can improve its sustainability and impact.

The CTF supports continuing triangular development cooperation in Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (ECIS) aimed at transfer of Czech transition-related knowledge, expertise and experience around the main 4 priority areas: environmental protection, good/local governance, economic transformation, and HIV/AIDS prevention. The CTF’s expected output is increased capacity of experts and public officials in ECIS through transfer of knowledge and experience from the Czech Republic’s transition to democracy and market economy as well as of the EU accession process. Typically, the activities involve study tours, workshops, feasibility studies, trainings, and formulation missions, based on selected proposals from UNDP COs.

The CTF has a relatively small annual budget, with average yearly contribution of USD 515,000 between 2014-2017, to operate with, where more than 50% of disbursements are directed towards energy, environment and agriculture area.

**Evaluation focus and methodology**

The evaluation focused at functioning of the CTF as a whole and covered activities implemented under the current CTF cycle (2014-2017). Geographically, as the evaluation could not realistically cover all countries supported by the CTF, it focused on the following countries: Armenia, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Montenegro, Serbia, and Tajikistan. The evaluation was undertaken from early April to early June 2017 by an independent expert. The evaluation assessed all CTF components, outputs and outcomes. Its specific objectives were to:

* Assess relevance of the CTF activities, including the Fund design. Evaluate the relevance for the regional Programme for ECIS.
* Measure the effectiveness and efficiency of the CTF activities in relation to the stated objectives and its contribution to the regional programme framework.
* Draw lessons that can improve effectiveness and sustainability of the CTF activities.
* Produce recommendations on how to improve management of the CTF and its impact, including monitoring and measuring of CTF outputs and activities.

**Findings**

The CTF concept and design included a high level of flexibility. Such a high degree of flexibility proved to be very successful and allowed the CTF to respond quickly and effectively to rapidly changing circumstances of the region, emerging challenges and opportunities.

CTF activities were relevant as they were aligned with geographic and thematic priorities of the Czech development cooperation and UNDP’s Strategic Plan and Regional Programme Document. The CTF was addressing the most important development needs identified by the national partners in partnership with UNDP COs. All interviewees highly praised Czech experts for their commitment, willingness to go far beyond the TOR requirements and continue providing advice without having a formal contractual relation.

Central to success of the CTF was its ability to mobilize knowledge and know-how and feed into resolving specific development objectives identified by UNDP COs in consultation with national counterparts. The CTF, however, did not systematically apply consistent knowledge management strategies and it was challenged to ensure that its knowledge transfer activities contribute to achieving broader outcomes and make impact. There are insufficiently quantifiable and measurable outcome indicators that limited the CTF ability to achieve and assess systemic outcomes of its interventions.

Overall, the CTF demonstrated its ability to manage and deploy financial resources, identify and recruit Czech development expertise, and establish and maintain strong working relations with UNDP COs and national beneficiaries. The CTF is managed frugally and has a very lean management structure.

**Lessons learned**

* CTF can achieve systemic changes by focusing on a limited number of priorities.
* It is important to focus on sustainable results, beyond activities.
* "Best practice" breakthroughs in the Czech Republic may not work in an entirely different country setting. While Czech expertise and experience can illuminate options for reform in ECIS countries, Czech solutions have to be adapted to local realities to be successfully implemented.

**Recommendations**

* Enhance focus on results byfocusing on a limited number of areas of support and plan activities strategically, with sustainability in mind, with involvement of COs and IRH experts with at least one year planning window. Consider establishing a special budget line for long-term multi-country activities. Actively promote CTF across all COs.
* Develop a comprehensive knowledge transfer system, with more extensive use of on-line tools.The existing CTF website can be expanded to collect and systematize various “know-how” products developed by Czech experts. CTF is advised to explore use of social media such as Facebook and Twitter to support information exchange, dissemination and application.CTF is advised to require Czech experts to produce short summaries of their work that should be easily accessible in terms of format, language and length, highlight their achievements and make them available on the CTF website. Develop videos, webinars and online resources based on Czech experts’ work implemented in ECIS that are relevant to a number of ECIS countries and make them available on the CTF website**.**
* Establish a pool of well-recognized Czech experts and companies in narrowly defined areas who have the necessary country and language skills and actively promote them among COs by showcasing their work to UNDP COs and IRH. Facilitate yearly face-to-face events or online forums of Czech experts involved in the CTF-funded work and IRH colleagues and other relevant parties to disseminate effective practices and share lessons learned.

# 1. Introduction: Background and Context

**This evaluation has been commissioned** by the Czech-United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Trust Fund (CTF) that is funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic (MFA) and is implemented by the UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (UNDP/RBEC)through the Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH)**.** The evaluation measures the effectiveness and efficiency of CTF activities in relation to the stated objective and expected outputs, assesses the relevance of the CTF, including its design, and contains lessons and recommendations that can improve its sustainability and impact.

**The primary users** of this evaluation are the MFA, UNDP/RBEC and UNDP Country Offices (COs). It is expected that the evaluation findings, lessons learned and recommendations will inform work of all partners on the new CTF Project document for the 2018-2021 cycle.

**The evaluation report is structured** as follows:

Chapter 1 contains introduction and background information.

Chapter 2 provides an overview of the CTF, including its areas of focus and operations.

Chapter 3 presents scope of the evaluation and its objective.

Chapter 4 elaborates on evaluation approach and methods.

Chapter 5 presents detailed evaluation findings and assesses CTF’s relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact.

Chapter 6 presents conclusions and lessons learned.

Chapter 7 formulates detailed recommendations linked to evaluation findings.

The chapters are supported by Annexes, which include a range of supporting documents such as the evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR), bibliography, evaluation questionnaires, mission agenda, and self-reporting templates.

# 2. Overview of the CTF: design, operations, areas of focus, expected results, internal and external factors likely to affect success

The CTF was established in 2003 to support sharing knowledge and lessons learned from the Czech Republic. The Czech Republic and UNDP are long-standing partners, with cooperation dating back to the late 1990s and taking a mature institutionalized form of the CTF that was the first trust fund established with UNDP in the ECIS. CTF evolution reflects development of the Czech Republic as an emerging donor that became the second largest (after Poland) of the new EU donors. In 2014 the CTF entered a new phase when a Project document for the period 2014-2017 was prepared to serve as a strategic guideline for its activities. During this period some new areas and modalities were explored, such as the Expert on Demand programme.

The CTF supports continuing triangular development cooperation in Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (ECIS) aimed at transfer of Czech transition-related knowledge, expertise and experience around the main 4 priority areas: environmental protection, good/local governance, economic transformation, and HIV/AIDS prevention. It supports the socio-economic development in ECIS by sharing experience, good practices and lessons learned from the Czech transition to democracy and market economy and the EU accession process. Typically, the activities involve study tours, workshops, feasibility studies, trainings, and formulation missions, based on selected proposals from UNDP COs.

**The CTF’s expected output** is increased capacity of experts and public officials in ECIS through transfer of knowledge and experience from transition to democracy and market economy as well as EU accession process. These goals are achieved through sharing of experience, good practices and lessons learned from the Czech transition to democracy and market economy and the EU accession process. The CTF is also used as an “incubator” for wider Czech Official Development Assistance (ODA) activities or programmes, and portion of the CTF funding is allocated to capacity building of the Czech ODA professionals.

**Key partners involved in the CTF implementation and their roles.** The MFA is the donor that finances all CTF activities and appoints two Project managers who are responsible for day-to-day management and decision making for the CTF, and have overall responsibility for the use of funds and meeting CTF objectives. UNDP IRH hosts the CTF and is responsible for its overall management, backstopping and monitoring. UNDP COs are involved in implementation of specific activities approved by the CTF. They submit proposals that fall under the CTF’s areas of focus and once approved by the CTF, implement and monitor them on the ground. Typically, these activities are supportive and complimentary to larger projects implemented by UNDP COs.

The CTF Project Board includes representatives of the MFA and UNDP/RBEC. The Project Board is chaired by the Deputy Regional Director of RBEC, who serves as the CTF Executive and takes the overall responsibility for its management.

Geographically, the CTF focuses on all ECIS so that diverse social, political, economic, demographic and institutional factors have bearing on CTF’s results.ECIS region is characterized by diversity in terms of social, economic and cultural conditions, natural resources, institutional capacity, geography and levels of human development. The region has a wide variety of countries where some countries share a joint European aspiration where the EU agenda drives the domestic policy priorities and reform processes and countries in transition with more centralized and authoritarian systems. Many countries of the region have to address diverse and unique development challenges such as poverty, social exclusion, gender inequality, and recent conflicts.

As visuals below demonstrate, the CTF has a relatively small budget to operate with, where more than 50% of disbursements are directed towards energy, environment and agriculture area.

**Visual 1 CTF budget delivery, by area of focus, 2014**

**Visual 2 CTF budget delivery, by area of focus, 2015**

**Visual 3 CTF budget delivery, by area of focus, 2016**

# 3. Evaluation Scope and Objectives

The evaluation focused at functioning of CTF as a whole and covered activities implemented under the current CTF Project cycle (2014-2017). Geographically, as the evaluation could not realistically cover all countries supported by the CTF, it focused on the following countries: Armenia, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Montenegro, Serbia, and Tajikistan.

The evaluation assessed all CTF components, outputs and outcomes. Its specific **objectives** were to:

* Assess relevance of the CTF activities, including the Fund design. Evaluate the relevance for the regional Programme for ECIS.
* Measure the effectiveness and efficiency of the CTF activities in relation to the stated objectives and its contribution to the regional programme framework.
* Draw lessons that can improve effectiveness and sustainability of the CTF activities.
* Produce recommendations on how to improve management of the CTF and its impact, including monitoring and measuring of the CTF outputs and activities.

As per the evaluation TOR, the consultant focused on the following four main evaluation questions:

* CTF concept and design. The consultant reviewed the expected outputs set by the CTF and its strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the results and resources framework with planned activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The evaluator reviewed the work plan, budget of the CTF, and assessed its progress on the results framework.
* Implementation. The evaluation assessed the implementation of the CTF in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. The consultant evaluated also effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the CTF.
* The CTF output and results. The evaluation assessed the achievement of the CTF outputs and goals, and whenever possible long-term effects of the CTF and sustainability of its results. The evaluation assessed the extent to which the implementation of the CTF has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and whether it was able to create collaboration among different partners. The evaluation identified also the CTF’s unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.
* Sustainability. The consultant assessed the prospects for sustainability of achieved results and extent to which the benefits of the CTF will continue, within or outside the CTF domain, after it has come to an end. Additionally, prospects for follow up activities, involving Czech expertise, funded from sources other than CTF were explored.

The consultant operationalized the evaluation criteria outlined in the TOR. Their description can be found in Table 1 below.

**Table 1 Evaluation Criteria and Their Description**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Relevance** | The relevance of Fund activities to the needs of intended beneficiaries. The evaluation examined the degree of alignment of Fund’s interventions with the regional and national priorities and preferences of beneficiaries. |
| **Effectiveness** | The extent to which the outcomes/output changes intended by the CTF project document have been realised. The consultant identified enablers as well as factors that impeded achievement of set outcomes, external and internal to the CTF. The consultant analyzed a range and robustness of partnerships established/maintained by the CTF with UNDP COs, Governments, and other partners. |
| **Efficiency** | The evaluation did not present a ‘value for money’ or full efficiency analysis, but commented on resource allocations and associated strategies and their deployment relative to the results generated. Specific strategies utilized by the CTF to improve efficiency of its activities were explored. |
| **Sustainability** | The consultant assessed the extent to which the benefits of the outcomes/outputs achieved by the CTF would continue beyond the support provided.Maindimensions of sustainability that were assessed included: continued use of Czech experts and institutions, reflection of know how provided through Czech experts/study tours into national laws, policies, and practices; scaling up of CTF-supported activities by the national authorities and/or developmental partners, etc. Main obstacles that hindered the ability of CTF to make its interventions sustainable were identified. |
| **Impact** | It may not be feasible to robustly assess impact given the scarcity of results data, limited extent of interventions, and insufficient data to assess contribution of CTF’s activities to broader development goals pursued by UNDP COs, and longer term horizon that is needed for interventions to make measurable changes. However, some reasonable assessment of *plausible contribution* to changes in policies, practices and mindsets of interventions’ beneficiaries were made for CTF-supported activities in Serbia and Montenegro that were visited by the consultant. The aggregate impact of all CTF activities on broader region’s public service capacity was assessed as well. |

# 4. Evaluation approach and methods, including limitations to evaluability and mitigation strategies

The evaluation was undertaken from early April 2017 to early June 2017 by an independent expert with extensive experience in evaluation of UN system programmes and projects, with particular expertise in the ECIS region. In addition to multiple e-mail exchanges and skype calls with the CTF management, the Czech MFA, Czech experts and companies, diverse UNDP COs staff and beneficiaries, the consultant visited Serbia and Montenegro to conduct semi-structured interviews with UNDP COs and beneficiaries.

This evaluation is based on the belief that evaluation should be supportive and responsive to the CTF needs, rather than become an end in itself. The consultant covered as comprehensively as possible strategic and operational aspects of Fund operations, including sustainability and impact of its activities.

The consultant tried to make sure that the evaluation methodology is sufficiently transparent and explicit to produce robust and reliable findings that would be replicated by an independent evaluator using the same evidence. Taking into consideration complex nature of the evaluation object, the consultant developed an elaborate inception report to present focus, objectives and scope of the evaluation, its methodology and a detailed workplan. The inception report provided an opportunity for the CTF management to validate the focus and methodology of evaluation. Through the inception report development, selection criteria for activities to focus on were identified and activities were selected, informants were identified and tools to collect information were identified. The consultant conducted two skype calls with the CTF managers and had extensive e-mail exchanges to clarify TOR expectations, seek additional resources, identify countries to visit and specific activities to focus on. A preliminary review of a wide range of documents assisted the consultant in obtaining sufficient background and context understanding to develop the inception report, prepare the data collection instruments as well as to obtain a better understanding of how the CTF operates.

In such a comprehensive, multi-method evaluation, the evaluation model blended confirmatory research (determining the extent to which specific, expected results outlined in the CTF Project document were achieved), exploratory research (examining what happened and what is currently happening), and forward looking analysis (identifying strategies and approaches that worked and have a strong potential to be effective during the next Project cycle). All data gathered was verified through triangulation or ensuring the credibility of data gathered by relying on data from different sources (primary and secondary data), data of different types (qualitative, quantitative and resource information) or data from different respondents. When deeper understanding was required, additional methods were used to explain findings obtained by one method and CTF management was approached for such information. In addition, the consultant has identified quotes or examples that brought the key evaluation findings to life and illustrated how diverse CTF activities worked on the ground.

One of the major data gaps is that consistent high quality results-focused reports/data were not available for all CTF activities. Evaluations such as this are heavily reliant on the available information and where that information is comprehensive, the analysis is robust. However, where the information available was incomplete or focused on the description of inputs and activities, the analysis of effectiveness, partnership and impact was weaker. Overall, the quality, quantity and availability of documentation across all activities varies that limited the consultant’s ability to assess the CTF performance at the aggregate level.

A large set of different and complementary evidence was collected and analyzed by utilizing both qualitative and quantitative **data collection methods** that included:

* **A desk documents review.** A number of documents such as Czech-UNDP Trust Fund Project Document, Virtual Project Board Meetings Minutes, UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017, Regional programme document for ECIS, 2014-2017, the Development Cooperation Strategy of the Czech Republic 2010-2017, the Multilateral Development Cooperation Strategy of the Czech Republic, 2013–2017 as well as diverse country activity level documents were reviewed. A complete list of documents reviewed by the consultant can be found in Annex 8.3. The desk review has uncovered sources of usable secondary data, thus lessening the need to collect primary data. The desk review has helped also to identify those areas where primary data at the level of activities is needed to complement limitations in terms of quality and availability of secondary data. For purposes of this evaluation, the CTF management created a Dropbox folder with all the relevant information that was easily accessed by the consultant.
* **Semi-structured interviews:** The consultant conducted skype semi-structured interviews with a diverse range of partners, including CTF and relevant UNDP staff, mainly in COs, with Czech activities’ implementers and selected beneficiaries. This method has been selected to obtain diverse perspectives on CTF operations and results and collect suggestions regarding the CTF priorities and operational modalities for the next CTF Project cycle. More specifically, through interviews the consultant explored collective relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of CTF activities. As a number of interventions supported by the CTF is too complex and diverse, the interviews were different and hence the key informant interview guides/protocols development was not practical. The questions served as guideposts only, helping ensure the conversation stayed on track, while allowing it to evolve organically. As the CTF, UNDP COs and beneficiaries’ perspectives were different, the consultant prepared three different questionnaires customized to these audiences that can be found in Annex 8.5.
* **Focused analysis of selected activities.** The evaluation focused on activities implemented during the current CTF Project cycle (2014-2017) in the following countries: Armenia, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, and Tajikistan, Serbia and Montenegro. In the first 5 countries, a total 15 activities were selected by the consultant to be examined in detail. An evaluation missions was conducted to Serbia and Montenegro. The sampling methods for interventions selection was based on the following criteria:
* Expert on Demand/study tour balance.
* Sectoral diversity.
* Funding – high/low range.

A self-reporting template was developed and distributed to COs to collect information on the nature and results of selected activities supported by the CTF and identify lessons learned (see Annex 8.6). Short self-reporting forms were distributed to beneficiaries of these activities to get their perspective on relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and impact of CTF-supported interventions (see Annex 8.7). Once the information was collected and analyzed, the consultant followed up with additional requests for information and/or conducted skype calls with UNDP COs, as necessary.

* **A 4 days mission to Serbia and Montenegro was undertaken.** During the visit, semi-structured interviews were conducted with UNDP COs focal points and selected beneficiaries. Face to face semi-structured interviews allowed exploring in detail activities’ implementation, challenges, perceived effectiveness, sustainability and impact. A substantial part of interviews focused on exploring potential improvements to the CTF operations and identification of its priorities for the next CTF Project cycle.

Data collection methods by evaluation criteria are presented in Table 2 below.

**Table 2 Data Collection methods**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Relevance** | * Systematic documentary review, applying structured tools * Mapping of available contextual analyses. * Technical analysis and testing of the CTF logframe * Semi-structured interviews |
| **Effectiveness** | * Analysis of results data from the CTF at the aggregate and individual interventions level * Mapping of risk analyses undertaken/ mitigation measures implemented * Systematic documentary / data review * Semi-structured interviews * Attribution/contribution analysis to determine how CTF interventions contributed to achieving intended outcomes. |
| **Efficiency** | * Systems analysis of management strategies * Financial analysis * Systematic documentary / data review, particularly of the M&E data * Assessment of the CTF efficiency optimizing strategies |
| **Sustainability** | * Systematic documentary review, applying structured tools * Semi-structured interviews |
| **Impact** | * Analysis of country-level activities reports * Systematic documentary review, applying structured tools * Semi-structured interviews |

The evaluation followed the UNEG Norms and Standards as well as the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.[[1]](#footnote-1) The consultant applied human rights and gender equality-sensitive processes and maximize stakeholders’ participation in the evaluation.

Special measures were put in place to ensure that the evaluation process was ethical and that interviewees could openly express their opinions. Confidentiality was maintained. All the necessary measures were undertaken to ensure objectivity and independence of evaluation (e.g., conducting interviews on stakeholders’ premises). UNDP or CTF staff did not participate in interviews.

The CTF management was informed of evaluation progress though routine e-mail updates. The progress updates outlined recent activities, any issues that had to be resolved, and an overview of next steps. The consultant had four check points for quality assurance:

1. A discussion of the Inception Report and plans of action to ensure that the consultant’s understanding of what is required corresponds to the CTF expectations and UNDP evaluation standards.
2. Presentation and discussion of preliminary findings.
3. A review of a draft report.
4. An acceptance procedure for completed report.

Adjustments were made to reflect feedback at each of these points. This process ensures that multiple opportunities are provided to resolve issues and challenges throughout the evaluation exercise.

The consultant emphasized the involvement of partners and strongly supported a participatory approach to evaluation. Key stakeholders that benefitted from, have interest in and influence on the CTF include:

* Diverse groups of beneficiaries from countries of the region.
* CTF management that made decisions regarding Fund management and priorities.
* UNDP COs that applied for and were supported by the CTF to implement activities.
* Diverse donors, including European Union and bilateral donors supporting similar Trust Funds that use similar implementation modalities such as EoD and study tours.
* Partner UN agencies operating in ECIS.
* The Government of Czech Republic and the MFA that fund the CTF and oversee strategic aspects of its operations.
* Czech experts and companies that were funded by the CTF or would like to be considered for opportunities in the ECIS region supported by the CTF

**Limitations of the evaluation methodology include**:

* Difficulties in attributing the direct influence of analytical and advisory CTF activities to broader national level UNDP results because CTF-funded interventions were often a part of a larger programme of support. In addition, a number of intervening factors at the national and regional level affected interventions’ effectiveness, sustainability and impact, that made it challenging to identify the CTF interventions’ attribution[[2]](#footnote-2) to expected outcomes at the aggregate level.
* Resourcing and timing restrictions, which limited the ability to conduct full and in-depth assessment of all CTF interventions.
* Variability in degree of sophistication and precision in UNDP COs’ reporting. A limited number of documented internal M&E reports and other routine performance monitoring reports at the level of individual activities supported by the CTF impeded the consultant’s ability to assess achievements in a systematic way.

The consultant has identified a number of other methodological limitations and developed a range of mitigation strategies to address them that can be found in Table 3 below.

**Table 3 Evaluation Methodological Limitations and Mitigation Strategies**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Methodological Limitations | Mitigation Strategies |
| Complexity and diversity of areas supported by the CTF may result in methodological and logistical challenges in capturing the full scope of CTF work. | * Discuss the expectations for the evaluation with the CTF management. * Conduct weekly and if necessary more regular updates with the CTF on the evaluation progress to ensure ongoing alignment with CTF expectations and priorities and quickly resolve any emerging challenges. * Clearly define key deliverables and acceptance process at the outset of the evaluation. |
| The CT has been implemented through different regional UNDP programme cycles that were pursuing various outcomes. | * Ensure the focus of evaluation on the current programme cycle. |
| Attribution challenges to determine how diverse interventions implemented by UNDP COs contributed to the CTF intended output: *Increased capacity of experts and public officials in ECIS countries through transfer of Czech knowledge and experience from transition to democracy and market economy as well as EU accession process* | * Seek additional information from the CTF and UNDP COs on logframes of individual activities and assess how they are linked to intended CTF output. * Critically review the CTF Project Document to examine the underlying hypotheses, and assess whether the targeted barriers, stakeholder analysis, assumptions and risks are still relevant and correct. * Clarify with the CTF core indicators (number of countries benefitting from the Czech knowledge transfer; and improved innovative platform for sharing knowledge and promotion of expertise is operational). * Explore with the CTF management additional indicators to capture the CTF outputs/outcomes. |
| Time limitation makes impossible an in-depth evaluation. | * Inception Report development and acceptance to identify priorities and focus areas. * Utilise skype and e-mail exchanges to obtain rich evidence from multiple stakeholders and beneficiaries if they are unavailable during the mission. |
| Inconsistent and insufficient data at the activity level to capture their contribution to the CTF Project outcomes | * Use diverse information sources (e.g., interviews, partners reports) to get sufficient data and triangulate it * Use diverse internal UNDP activity country level sources. |
| Inability of some key stakeholders for interview during the mission to Serbia and Montenegro | * Consultations with main stakeholders/beneficiaries planned with enough flexibility to account for their schedules. * Some interviews may be conducted via phone/skype * The consultant is willing to conduct meetings outside of regular business hours to accommodate stakeholders scheduling constraints. |

# 5 Evaluation Findings

The consultant assessed the CTF concept and design and found that it included a high level of flexibility and strong capacity for rapid response to better address emerging issues and changing circumstances. The CTF was intentionally designed with relatively broad articulation of expected outcomes that provided the CTF with the necessary flexibility to timely respond to diverse COs needs. Such a high degree of flexibility proved to be very successful and allowed the CTF to respond quickly and effectively to rapidly changing circumstances of the region, emerging challenges and opportunities.

The CTF’s expected outputs are fairly specific in terms of what CTF is contributing to and are focusing on outputs such as a number of ECIS benefitting from the Czech experience and establishing a robust mechanism to identify and deploy Czech expertise. The CTF Project document, however, does not includes specific measures to assess the CTF’s progress towards the intended output “Increased capacity of experts and public officials in ECIS countries through transfer of Czech knowledge and experience from transition to democracy and market economy as well as EU accession process.” The CTF design does not put sufficient emphasis on achieving these intended long-term outputs at the expense of short-term activities. As a result, the work planning processes are more focused on processes and activities such as timely identification and deployment of Czech expertise, procurement of services and organization of visibility events. The CTF Project document is missing some crucial elements to ensure that CTF activities result in sustainable outcomes at the national level. Specific accountabilities of the IRH, for instance, in selection, monitoring and evaluation of supported activities are not well elaborated in the CTF design. The CTF, however, has engaged the IRH staff (experts with relevant sector expertise, i.e. from the Sustainable Development Team) into selection committee in the past CTF Project cycle that helped to ensure a high-quality, objective review process and strengthened focus on results. As a result of these Project design limitations, success of individual activities and the CTF mostly depended on how professional and diligent UNDP COs staff were in putting the proposals together and ensuring their implementation and follow up. It can be expected that a new application template that was introduced in 2016 that requires more information on sustainability and expected outcomes of proposed initiatives will strengthen focus on results of COs and CTF.

It can be argued that some CTF activities are too small to merit proper focus on outcomes and elaborate reporting. It seems counterproductive to apply robust and extensive UNDP reporting requirements to all CTF activities as they may be too complicated or onerous. In consultant’s view, simplified and results-oriented requirements in design and reporting have to be followed to ensure consistent focus on results, namely the increased capacity of national partners.

The consultant found that the CTF Project document correctly identified operational risks such as limited cooperation with key partners at the Czech Development Agency and Ministry and suppliers due to relocation of UNDP Regional Centre for Istanbul. Potential risk management strategies were outlined as well. Such important risks as limited supply of qualified Czech experts and limited capacity of country level beneficiaries to accept and implement recommendations provided by Czech experts and apply knowledge and skills acquired through study tours have not been identified in the original CTF Project Document that limited CTF’ focus on outcomes. In November 2016 the risk log update, however, identified a risk of limited availability of quality service providers. Potential risk management strategies to address these critically important risks are explored in the section 7 of this report.

The consultant confirms that the CTF achieved its main planned outputs. The following discussion provides a more detailed analysis.

### 5.1 Relevance

Relevance deals with the appropriateness of the CTF design to the needs of ECIS. This evaluation concludes that CTF activities have responded to regional and national priorities identified in multiple UNDP, Czech MFA strategies and programmes that has been confirmed through interviews with CTF, UNDP and MFA management and staff.

CTF activities are aligned with geographic priorities of the Czech development cooperation, as countries of Eastern Europe and Central Asia are traditionally at the centre of its focus as well as its thematic priorities, including the transfer of Czech knowledge and transition experience, and private sector support and involvement. CTF activities are also supportive of the Czech MFA’s Development Cooperation Strategy for the period 2010-2017[[3]](#footnote-3) goal to facilitate commercial follow-up to ODA and promote opportunities for sustained, strategic engagement on the part of Czech companies and non-governmental organizations in partner countries.

The CTF activities are aligned and supportive of the overall programmatic framework and planned results of UNDP’s 2014-2017 Strategic Plan and Regional Programme Document.[[4]](#footnote-4), which identifies eight priority areas contributing to the Achievement of Outcome 4 Development debates and actions at all levels priorities poverty, inequality and exclusion, consistent with CTF engagement principles of the Strategic Plan, and is closely linked with Regional Programme Output 4.3 South-South and Triangular cooperation partnerships established and/or strengthened for development solutions including through support to new and emerging development cooperation providers.

**In Their Own Words: Beneficiaries’ Comments on a study tour „Enhancing capacities of local self-government units in providing business enabling environment for the micro, small and medium enterprises and clusters in Montenegro”**

**Study Tour Agenda was carefully developed, respecting all our comments and suggestions. The tour was fully in line with participants‘ needs and expectations. Presentations were very informative, brief and concrete, with very knowledgeable lecturers and presenters, who made themselves available for additional questions and clarifications. Organizers were very welcoming and cooperative, ready to consider and address all participants‘ requests and suggestions, and what is more important – they were available to all participants all the time. The interpreters were highly professional, ready to support the group and share additional information.**

There is clear alignment between the CTF activities and relevant international frameworks such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Relevance of CTF interventions was strongly confirmed by UNDP COs in self-reporting templates and through interviews with selected UNDP COs staff and beneficiaries.

Unlike some other Funds where the funding use reflects the donors’ policy priorities and not necessarily recipient countries’ needs, the CTF was addressing the most important development needs identified by the national partners in partnership with UNDP COs. Due to partnership with UNDP at the regional and CO level, the CTF supported activities of development importance, consistent with country and global development priorities and aligned with UNDP mandate and strategies.

The main beneficiaries of CTF activities have been primarily at the national and local Government levels. The Government beneficiaries who were interviewed highly appreciated CTF’s flexibility and confirmed that activities were designed in close partnership with them in response to their needs.

Overall, the CTF managed to strike a right balance among various sectors, and experts on demand and training tours implementation modalities.

**CTF utilized a number of strategies to ensure continued relevance of its interventions**:

* CTF Project Board comprising the MFA and UNDP IRH senior management was established to oversee CTF implementation that helped to maintain the overall CTF relevance. The consultant reviewed Project Board’s meetings minutes and confirms that they played an important role in keeping the CTF on track and improving their focus on results by adding more robust reporting and application requirements, for example.

**In Their Own Words: Beneficiaries in Serbia and Montenegro**

The need in Czech experts will increase in the future as multiple sectoral negotiations with EU are underway. Czech Republic successfully completed this process and joined EU. It will be appreciated if CTF establishes a mechanism to partner with Czech experts who could support us with contextualizing and operationalizing EU rules and regulations to our realities.

* The CTF application template was improved to enhance focus on relevance, sustainability and results.
* CTF introduced consistent feedback mechanism for study tours beneficiaries to assess their satisfaction with relevance and quality of training provided and solicit feedback for future similar activities.
* The supported activities were relatively flexible to adjust them to changing beneficiaries’ needs, although a need for more flexibility, especially for long-term initiatives was identified by some interviewees.
* CTF managers built rapport with key IRH and UNDP COs colleagues to stay informed of beneficiaries’ needs and expectations.

### 5.2 Effectiveness

Effectiveness focuses on results, not processes. The consultant examined if the CTF was producing its planned outcomes and meeting intended objectives and examined if the changes occurred can be attributed to CTF-funded activities.

Overall, the CTF was effective in producing outputs at the aggregate level and the collected evidence demonstrates that it achieved its main intended objectives. The beneficiaries’ responses in templates and individuals interviewed positively evaluated the effectiveness of the CTF interventions. Outcome information is much scarcer.

Although more extensive intervention-level evaluations are needed to provide rich evidence, the available information demonstrates that some activities were more effective than others. There are a number of reasons beyond CTF control that affected CTF effectiveness. As the applications for support were generated by UNDP COs, effectiveness of CTF activities depended on effectiveness of individual activities designed and implemented by COs, competencies and skills of Czech experts, and willingness and ability of national partners to implement know-how and advice provided by Czech experts.

The results of activities are congruent with the CTF Project document. Supported activities achieved numerous short-term results and some have even contributed to more systemic changes, but there is less evidence of long-term results.

The consultant evidenced examples of impressive technical sophistication of Czech experts supported through the CTF that were highly appreciated by national counterparts. Several government officials interviewed emphasized the value of flexible, “just-in-time” policy and technical Czech advice. Many informants remarked upon strategic foresight of CTF and UNDP COs in grasping the significance of diverse areas relevant to supported countries’ EU accession and carefully building support of key national partners in these areas. In many instance, CTF-supported activities were well positioned into broader UNDP COs’ programmes and fostered Czech know how and innovations. The consultant found that about half of the activities supported were innovative.

The CTF management was successful in promoting coherent approaches, and in providing rapid and effective responses to COs requests. The consultant identifies **a number of strategies and approaches that the CTF utilized to improve effectiveness of its interventions**:

* Careful selection of Czech experts in consultation with UNDP COs and national beneficiaries.
* Organizing short-term scoping missions of Czech experts to selected countries to assess the situation, make recommendations on the next steps and identify potential Czech experts for implementation of more comprehensive interventions.
* Careful selection of study visit participants, combining decision makers and technical staff.[[5]](#footnote-5)
* Involving IRH experts into applications review process to improve relevance and effectiveness of supported activities.
* Developing robust and comprehensive applications review templates.[[6]](#footnote-6)
* Conducting satisfaction surveys of activities’ beneficiaries.
* Some Czech experts and companies conducted their own surveys of beneficiaries’ satisfaction with relevance and quality of training/advice provided.[[7]](#footnote-7)
* CTF management monitoring visits.[[8]](#footnote-8)
* Collection and review of reports produced by Czech experts and UNDP COs.
* Continuous monitoring of activities’ progress through e-mail communication with COs’ colleagues.

Many of reviewed activities’ designs and approaches were relevant, logical and well executed, with measurable contribution to broader national and UNDP COs’ objectives. Overall, study tours pursuing awareness raising were less effective than EoD and study tours with realistically achievable and clear objectives such as development of national legislation that would comply with EU requirements.

**Some positive results achieved have been verified during interviews, skype calls, beneficiaries’ feedback and document review and include**:

* CTF created a modern, self-service [database of Czech experts](https://czech-expertise.atlassian.net/wiki) that is easy to access and navigate. COs can use the database when looking for experts.[[9]](#footnote-9) It is advisable to monitor the database use by COs, national partners and donors and collect their feedback on database relevance and utilization.
* In 2015, in Armenia CTF supported EoD to calculate the cost for installation of intra-community gasification network and conduct an in-depth feasibility study in 7 border communities.[[10]](#footnote-10) The issue of community development is high on the agenda of Armenian authorities, especially in border neighbor communities. Czech expertise was needed to evaluate the financial stability among selected communities, feasibility of installation of gas network, potential of its efficient use by the households and businesses and recommend how to apply energy efficient solutions for gas utilization at homes and commercial buildings. A report that contains assessment of the potential gas use in villages and potential energy efficiency improvements and renewable energy source investments by typical end-users (households, municipal/commercial buildings and small industrial enterprises) was prepared by Czech experts.[[11]](#footnote-11) Recommendations were provided on the most suitable market-based technologies to be applied in selected regions.
* In 2014-2016, in Armenia CTF supported transfer of Czech knowledge to strengthen national drug information system. Armenia has experienced a considerable increase in the number of injection drug users. The existing epidemiological data was inconsistent and the national anti-drug strategy was absent. As the anti-drug information system of the Czech Republic was evaluated by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction in 2002 as the best practice in EU, CTF identified a leading Czech company and experts to share their advice and know how to develop capacities of the national drug related agencies to collect, analyse and disseminate drug related information in accordance with EU standards.[[12]](#footnote-12) Two high quality reports with clear recommendations were developed by Czech experts and shared with the national decision makers and experts.[[13]](#footnote-13) In response to Czech experts’ advice, research/study in the area of drug epidemiology and namely Treatment Demand Indicator was initiated, National Drug Monitoring Center has been supported to improve the methodology of data capturing, analysing and reporting that helped to improve the quality and scope of the monitoring of utilization of specialized services by former drug addicts. And finally, Czech experts’ advice was extensively reflected in the adopted by the Government National Drug Strategy.[[14]](#footnote-14)
* In 2015, in Kosovo CTF-funded Czech experts strengthened capacities of the Division of Tourism within the Department of Industry in the Ministry of Trade and Industry that has the authority to design and monitor policies on tourism. Relying on their extensive experience in research in tourism, strategy formulation, and marketing, Czech experts conducted a thorough assessment of the existing technical and human capacities of the Division of Tourism and developed specific recommendations regarding strengthening of its capacities in such areas as designing tourism legislation, drafting strategic policy documents for tourism development, providing support to the promotion of Kosovo as a touristic destination, creating conditions for cooperation with international tourism associations, providing support to the organization of fairs, conferences and workshops in the field of tourism and hotels. A two-year action plan was presented that serves as a guide to the Division of Tourism in achieving its medium-term objectives. The beneficiary found that due to Czech experts’ support, “staff increased their capacities in policy making and the Tourism Council has been re - functionalized and a number of its members has been increased.”[[15]](#footnote-15)
* In 2016, in Moldova CTF supported post disaster needs assessments. Moldova is highly vulnerable to natural disasters and international partners were supporting national authorities in Post Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNA).[[16]](#footnote-16) National partners requested Czech experts’ support to improve methodology for data collection that would help the Government to estimate loss and damage after the disaster, being a basis for recovery strategy and possible compensations of damage.[[17]](#footnote-17) A Czech expert delivered capacity building workshops to representatives of the ministries and governmental agencies, UN agencies, local governments, NGOs and universities. Advance PDNA methodology was introduced to the inter-agency group of national participants in Moldova and workshop participants made specific recommendations on integration of more advanced methodology into the existing practice to enhance inter-agency nature of the work and ensure detailed assessment of not only physical loss and damage, but also human and humanitarian needs and lost opportunities. The methodology for agricultural sector has been integrated into the standard assessment practice in post disaster context. It is expected that some sectors will include new PDNA methodology as well and the Government expressed its strong interest to engage the same Czech expert.[[18]](#footnote-18)
* In 2015, in Montenegro CTF engaged Czech experts to enhance capacities of local self-government units in providing business enabling environment for the micro, small and medium enterprises and clusters. A study tour for the Ministry of Economy and municipal governments staff was organized to familiarize them with Czech experience in cluster development policies/initiatives, including understanding of the role of different actors, possible incentives and support measures as well as risks and benefits.[[19]](#footnote-19) Practical presentations from diverse Czech partners informed a number of changes: A State Programme of support of clusters in Montenegro was redefined and shifted from support of equipment to more substantive and sustainable support covering salaries of cluster brokers and structure of Cluster Organizations was improved. Clusters themselves learned how to support their development so that a number of clusters applying for state support increased from 11 in 2015 to 17 in 2016.
* In 2015-2016, in Montenegro CTF engaged internationally recognized Czech experts into promoting of modern radon diagnosis methods. Radon poses a great health risk, being the second most frequent cause of lung cancer. Montenegro established a radon mitigation team comprising experts from different fields and some of them benefited from a study tour to Czech Republic where they learned various measuring techniques and diagnostic methods. Czech experts have more than 30 years of experience in National Radon Programme, which includes radon measurements, sophisticated radon diagnoses performance, prevention and corrective measures, and radon policy.[[20]](#footnote-20) Czech experts visited Montenegro to conduct a workshop and radon diagnosis performance in two primary schools in Podgorica in order to demonstrate modern diagnostic tools for radon sources identification and radon entry routes localization.[[21]](#footnote-21) The interview with beneficiaries confirmed that knowledge and skills acquired by the Montenegro radon mitigation team from Czech experts are extensively used in their everyday work.
* In 2015-2016, in Kyrgyzstan CTF helped to promote experimental ecosystem accounting (EEA), an innovative approach which appraises natural resources as well as a System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA). The scoping mission of a Czech consultant resulted in situation analysis and a Road Map for implementing SEEA-EEA in the Kyrgyz Republic.[[22]](#footnote-22) Capacities of the National Statistics Committee, Environment Agency, Ministries of Finance and Economy, academia on SEEA-EEA were strengthened through online and face-to-face consultations and guidance.[[23]](#footnote-23) Specific data gaps for conducting full-scale Experimental Ecosystems Accounting were identified and the National Statistics Committee is addressing them. Pilot case study in Kyzyl-Unkur forestry is conducted using the EEA framework. The work of Czech experts was very timely, given its link to SDGs. Beneficiaries highly evaluated the training materials prepared and found the support somewhat relevant and useful but suggested to have a stronger team of Czech experts in SEEA-EEA.[[24]](#footnote-24) It can be expected that the SEEA EEA national implementation will facilitate SDG monitoring, introduce evidence of the value of ecosystem services and promote sustainable use of natural ecosystems and nature protection.[[25]](#footnote-25)
* In 2016, in Serbia CTF engaged a Czech expert to support adaptation of Serbian agriculture to climate change. Agriculture is one of the most important economic sectors in Serbia that provides significant employment.[[26]](#footnote-26) In order to support the Government of Serbia in advancing agricultural risk management, Czech expert undertook risk assessment of Serbian agriculture to climate change, including impacts on productivity, trade and export volumes and capacity needs to respond to these risks, and developed a set of recommendaitons to address these risks based on Czech and the EU experiences.[[27]](#footnote-27) The recommendations were developed in such a way that they could be easily translated into initiatives.
* In 2015-2016, in Serbia CTF supported transfer of Czech knowledge for advancing nature conservation system in response to a need identified by national authorities to support country’s EU integration process and negotiations process for the entire environment chapter. The activity included both study tours and EoD. One study visit, for instance, contributed to improved knowledge of Serbian experts on NATURA 2000 sites selection, data gathering and evaluation and informed development of “Methodological guidelines for Natura 2000 sites selection”.[[28]](#footnote-28) This document will be used as a guide for Natura 2000 establishment once necessary data on species and habitats are collected. A well respected Czech expert mobilized through the EoD mechanism produced a Report on the state of transposition of the EU Birds and Habitats Directives into Serbian national law and Specific Implementation Plans for both Birds and Habitats Directives.[[29]](#footnote-29) The national partners highly evaluated both documents and expert’s contribution and support and confirmed that documents helped to improve the Nature Conservation Law and develop a comprehensive roadmap for full implementation of EU nature directives.
* In 2015-2016, in Tajikistan CTF engaged Czech experts to scale up the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and apply the System of Environmental-Economic Accounts (SEEA).[[30]](#footnote-30)The overall objective of the activity was to enhance the capacity of relevant government specialists as well as representatives of civil society on EIA and the techniques of conducting EIA, as well as developing mechanisms/approaches to ensure proper application of EIA in Tajikistan. Astudy tour to the Czech Republic helped the participants to better understand related legislation and processes behind the formulation of EIA. Czech experts provided extensive support and valuable recommendations how to undertake EIA and what is needed for the development of EIA legislation as well as provided their feedback on the proposed national EIA law.[[31]](#footnote-31) Extensively using knowledge acquired from Czech experts, a working group comprising 11 experts from Ecological Commission of the Parliament, Committee for Environmental Protection under the President of the Republic of Tajikistan, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, the Executive Office of the President, and 2 independent environmental experts drafted Law on EIA that is currently under the Parliament review.
* In 2015-2016, in Tajikistan CTF engaged Czech experts to promote Public Private Partnership (PPP) at the national and local levels. The Government of Tajikistan identified a need to attract private sector into the public service delivery.[[32]](#footnote-32) Czech experts analyzed the existing PPP mechanisms, including the current legislation and procedures, assessed training needs of PPP Centre staff and provided specific recommendations.[[33]](#footnote-33) They participated also in a number of seminars and organized a study tour to the Czech Republic. The participants found a study tour professionally organized and confirmed that it provided them with a lot of important and practical information that they extensively used. In response to Czech experts’ recommendations, two initiatives were launched that utilized a recommended PPP model: “Installation of electrical wiring for energy supply to Free economic zone Danghara” and “Reconstruction and management of kindergarten #133 in Dushanbe.”

The study tour informed changes to the following national laws” “On the Public-Private Partnership”, “Civil Code of the Republic of Tajikistan”, “On the privatization of the public property in the Republic of Tajikistan” that are at different stages of the legislative approval. Successful experiences of the Czech Republic in the field of public transport services and parking facility provision were presented to the responsible parties and other stakeholders in Dushanbe city who explore the options for their implementation.

**In Their Own Words**

I use models and approaches in accessing possible PPP projects acquired in the Czech Republic

*Participant in a Study Tour to Czech Republic*

**One of the indirect results** to which the CTF has contributed was building appreciation and trust of national partners in the Czech Republic for its genuine efforts to address their development priorities. All interviewees highly praised Czech experts for their commitment, willingness to go far beyond the TOR requirements and continue providing advice without having a formal contractual relation.

Activities supported by the CTF have helped to increase the knowledge of targeted national partners, but the Fund as a whole has been less successful in managing and disseminating Czech knowledge and know how broadly across the ECIS region. Underdeveloped knowledge transfer practices were exacerbated by a limited ability to systematically evaluate individual CTF-supported activities. The activity-level COs reports were not designed as evaluation documents. As a result, reports from both experts and UNDP COs are different in terms of quality, depth of analysis and focus on results. The UNDP COs reports in general are too short, output focused and do not contain assessments of the contribution of specific EoD or study tours to achieving broader developmental objectives. Table 4 below captures consultant’s assessment of output and outcome evidence of success of CTF activities for selected countries.

**Table 4. Evidence of output and outcome successes for selected countries and activities.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Country | Activity | Output Level Evidence of Success | Outcome Level Evidence of Success |
| Armenia | Strengthening of drug information system in Armenia | Yes | Yes, limited |
| Energy Efficiency for Gas Utilization and Business Development | Yes | Yes, limited |
| Kosovo | Review of vulnerable group policies, legislation and government strategies in Kosovo | Yes, Limited | No |
| Strengthening capacities of the division of tourism | Yes | Limited/No |
| Kyrgyzstan | Human Resources Management in the Public Service | Yes | Limited |
| Piloting SEEA-EEA in Kyrgyzstan | Yes | Yes, limited |
| Developing System of Environmental-Economic Accounting – Experimental Ecosystem Accounting in Kyrgyz Republic | Yes | Contributed to SEEA-EEA piloting |
| Moldova | Reform of the National Ecological Fund in Moldova: Study tour to Czech Republic | Yes | No |
| Capacity and Building for Developing the ESCO Market in Moldova | Yes | No |
| Supporting post disaster needs assessment in Moldova | Yes | Yes, limited |
| Montenegro | Mapping and Assessment Ecosystems and their Services of Grassland and Forest in Montenegro | Yes | Yes, limited |
| Enhancing capacities of local self-government units in providing business enabling environment for the micro, small and medium enterprises and clusters in Montenegro | Yes | Yes |
| Support Development of the Law on Nature Protection for Montenegro | Yes | Yes |
| UN Framework Convention on Climate Change | Yes | Yes |
| Promotion of Modern Radon Diagnosis Methods in Montenegro | Yes | Yes |
| Serbia | Local Self-Government’s Role in Creating Environment without Discrimination and Stigmatization of PLHIV to the Representatives from the Republic of Serbia | Yes | Yes, very limited |
| Expert on EU Birds and Habitats Directives | Yes | Yes |
| Advancing Nature Conservation System in Serbia | Yes | Yes, limited |
| Supporting adaptation of Serbian agriculture to climate change | Yes | No |
| Supporting productivity and competitiveness of Serbian agriculture | Yes, limited | No |
| Tajikistan | Ecosystem Accounting | Yes | No |
| Promotion of Public Private Partnership at national and local levels | Yes | Yes |
| Environmental impact assessment in Tajikistan: From legislation to implementation | Yes | Yes, limited |

In November 2016, the CTF announced a geographically limited mini Call for Proposals focused on Business-Development Partnerships as a cross-cutting issue. The CTF experience in supporting the Serbia’s agricultural sector to export its products to Czech markets demonstrated that more planning of business-focused interventions is required to develop more realistic TORs, clarify expectations, assess readiness of all partners for business partnerships and identify Czech experts with right business promotion expertise. Given a strong interest of ECIS UNDP COs in developing business opportunities for national partners with Czech companies that was expressed by UNDP COs, the CTF is advised to partner more extensively with such entities as the Ministry of Trade and Industry, possibly CzechTrade, Czech Development Agency (CzDA) and other partners to develop Czech Government-wide strategies and approaches to advance commercial follow-up to ODA.[[34]](#footnote-34)

There are insufficiently quantifiable and measurable outcome indicators that limited the CTF ability to achieve and assess systemic outcomes of its interventions. Some activities did not result in expected outcome that can be attributed to insufficient analytical work prior to activity design, limited Czech expertise, too high UNDP COs’ expectations, and inadequate focus on results.

To enhance focus on results, CTF management recently introduced a more comprehensive and results-focused application form that requires COs to identify expected outputs, outcomes, and elaborate how activities are linked to wider COs’ projects, outline the follow up activities and monitoring processes, including impact assessment. The consultant reviewed a number of applications received from COs that were based on a new template and found that a new format helped COs to stay better focused and clearly elaborate linkages between inputs, outputs, outcomes and capture some expected impact.[[35]](#footnote-35) It can be expected that the quality and focus on results will improve as well. In addition, the activities can now be monitored by experts from the IRH.[[36]](#footnote-36) The consultant provides detailed recommendations on how to further enhance focus on results and improve monitoring tools in section 7 of this report.

### 5.3 Efficiency

Efficiency measures how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) are converted to results. Efficiency of the CTF was difficult to determine as it was influenced by efficiency of individual activities and the consultant could not examine all CTF-supported activities. In addition, the consultant could not apply traditional efficiency lens to assess outcomes of CTF activities as the Fund supported policy advice and other forms of ‘soft’ assistance.

Overall, the CTF demonstrated its ability to manage and deploy financial resources, identify and recruit Czech development expertise, and establish and maintain strong working relations with UNDP COs and national beneficiaries. The CTF is managed frugally and has a very lean management structure. Analysis of the CTF budget expenditure indicates that the Fund spent the budget allocations on time. The CTF structure created efficient governance for the Fund. Both managers of the Fund had to multitask and combine separate functions such as strategy-setting, analytical, approval and monitoring functions. While this is laudable that most resources are directed at activities and beneficiaries, it is causing some functions such as monitoring and evaluation, knowledge management and CTF promotion, not being carried out extensively. The need in more capacity at CTF may potentially increase if its budget and annual disbursements increase and more emphasis is put on implementing multi-country activities, improved quality assurance and monitoring and evaluation.

The consultant examined the extent to which selected CTF activities produced their planned outputs in relation to expenditure of resources. The consultant found that the CTF strived to meet its expected outputs by looking for cost-efficiencies in CTF operations and utilizing prudent business practices. **The following strategies utilized by the CTF can be considered as effective practices that helped to optimize the CTF efficiency**:

* The CTF was following a standard transparent approach in COs’ proposals review and selection that helped to promote overall transparency, value for money and efficiency for activities’ outcomes.
* Expedited procurement procedures were highly appreciated by beneficiaries who praised CTF for “just-in-time” assistance in response to national requests for specialized technical assistance.
* CTF covers only the costs incurred in the Czech Republic, while international travel costs are covered by national partners and UNDP COs. When Czech experts travel to ECIS, UNDP COs organize and cover the costs of meetings, travel and translations services, if needed.
* A lot of efforts were put into identifying Czech experts with solid track record to apply for advertised opportunities.
* CTF requests UNDP COs to co-finance EoD and study tours, if possible. If the cost of EoD exceeds USD10,000, COs cover the difference.
* Trust-funded activities were subject to the UNDP’s procurement guidelines.
* CTF is co-located with IRH that provides access to technical and procurement UNDP experts.

In consultant’s view, some opportunities to use resources more efficiently to achieve the

intended results were not sufficiently explored. For instance, if a strategic long-term planning approach is adopted to identify potential areas of support with IRH experts and COs’ engagement, the CTF could have identified some potential multi-country opportunities for Czech experts’ involvement as well as have more time to conduct a broad search for right Czech expertise. The CTF may build on successes of its Regional initiative “Support of the UNDP Aid for Trade Project in Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan (Transfer of Czech Know-How)” to develop a consistent approach to identifying and implementing multi-country interventions. Potential multi-country activities could have pursued in the area of environment where a number of COs are implementing projects or pursue clearly defined topics of EU accession where Czech experts possess strong competitive advantage.

Operationally, as the CTF management is located in Istanbul, direct access to Czech companies, state institutions and experts is problematic and hence the CTF’s ability to build a pool of Czech experts through face to face interactions, jobs fairs, conferences, and other events is weakened.

Overall, the consultant concludes that CTF was able to achieve results in an economic manner and with manageable transaction costs. Moreover, partners were keen to emphasise flexibility and adaptability of CTF both during interventions planning and implementation. UNDP COs appreciated particularly an opportunity to apply for EoD throughout the year, outside the standard Call for proposals period.

### 5.4 Sustainability

Sustainability is about being strategic and looking to the future. Sustainability is the likelihood that the achievements recorded so far will endure beyond the CTF life that reflects the resilience of the achievements to financial, political, systemic and other risks. Some indicators of sustainability include assessment of whether the “know-how”, knowledge and skills acquired through CTF support continue beyond their completion and if Czech experts were invited by beneficiaries.

It is difficult to measure sustainability of small, short-term, targeted knowledge transfer activities supported by CTF. The main limitation that hindered sustainability of activities’ results was that sustainability was not a concern from the very inception of CTF, and CTF did not require UNDP COs to ensure sustainability in their activities at the design phase and no explicit exit strategies were developed. Respondents to this evaluation identified several factors affecting sustainability, such as short-term nature of CTF-supported activities, limited readiness of the Government to accept Czech experts’ recommendations and commit budget resources, and time needed to build broad buy in and support for know-how and advice provided. Sustainability is required by UNDP for the wider UNDP projects of which CTF initiatives are part of but only in a few instances the consultant was able to assess sustainability of CTF-supported activities within broader UNDP COs projects. The introduction of a new application template that contains a requirement to address sustainability may encourage COs to pay more attention to sustainability strategies.

**A number of COs’ activities supported by the CTF addressed sustainability by adopting the following measures**:

* Activities were explicitly aligned with strategic country priorities, especially in the area of EU accession.
* Activities were logically integrated into broader projects and programmes implemented by UNDP COs.
* Beneficiaries’ buy-in was ensured through their extensive involvement into the TOR development, selection of Czech experts and active follow up support from UNDP COs.
* Explicit plans of actions following Czech experts’ involvement were developed, including plans for National Governments to assume funding responsibility for a course of actions recommended.

The consultant concludes that due to the nature of support – small-sized interventions and short term expertise - overall sustainability of CTF outcomes is limited, but some activities are more sustainable than others. The beneficiaries demonstrated different degrees of their institutional, technical and financial commitments to activities’ objectives that reflects to a large extent how effectively UNDP COs positioned the CTF-supported activities within their broader set of interventions. The consultant found evidence of sustainability in the following areas: technical resilience, financial resilience, and ownership by government counterparts. **Some examples of CTF activities with strong sustainability prospects include**:

* The Law on Environmental Impact Assessment introduced in Tajikistan with inputs from Czech experts have a strong support of the Committee for Environmental Protection and the Ecological Commission of the Parliament that will ensure its enforcement once it is adopted by the Parliament.
* Following a study tour to Czech Republic and in response to Czech experts’ recommendations, regional authorities in Pluzine municipality in Montenegro established a regional Park in 2015. They assumed administrative and financial responsibility for its management and the Park became self-sustainable in a few years.

### 5.5 Impact

Impact measures changes in human development and people’s well-being that are brought about by development initiatives. The previous sections assessed the Fund's work effectiveness and results produced (e.g, increased capacity, adoption of some Czech practices), but their impact can be examined within the context of broader UNDP COs projects that integrated CTF-funded activities. The TOR for this evaluation recognized that complexity: "There are no sufficient data to evaluate long term outcomes and impact of CTF activities."

The CTF Project documentation does not separate short term results and long term impacts of its activities. For instance, adoption of legislation informed by Czech experts that is aligned with EU requirements or exposure of national decision makers to Czech expertise and know how are important outputs and outcomes, but it is equally important to ensure that the laws adopted are implemented and result in measurable sustainable human development outcomes while the training beneficiaries use knowledge and skills received in developing national policies and programmes.

CTF is about capacity building through knowledge and know-how transfer which is the process that puts knowledge into action. Knowledge transfer cannot solely focus on identifying some expertise and knowledge to share but should also focus at the subsequent absorption of beneficiaries that should ultimately result in know-how and advice becoming a sustained, routine practice that is accepted as “normal”. Moreover, a know-how is not institutionalized until it endures beyond the time/presence of those who originally adopted it. In addition to technical aspects of contextualizing and adapting Czech expertise and know-how to national circumstances, national partners willing to translate Czech knowledge into practice have to ensure that a wide range of other supporting factors are in place such as political commitment, conducive legislative and policy environment, adequate resources, capacity of public service to implement and societal readiness to accept the changes.

Although there is a little expectation that the CTF can make a substantial impact across the

very broad goals it has set itself, the consultant found **a number of examples where measurable impacts attributable to CTF activities were achieved**:

* Interventions helped to build the broader ownership of recommendations provided by Czech experts. Czech experience, for example, inspired both national and municipal authorities to better promote and support cluster development in Montenegro, with increasing number of clusters that are fully operational and motivated.
* Achievement of many activities’ outcomes is seen as a joint responsibility of Government, UNDP, and donors. A number of laws, regulations and programmes adopted and implemented by National Governments were informed by Czech experts’ advice (e.g., National Drug Strategy in Armenia, PDNA methodology for agricultural sector in Moldova, Nature Conservation Law in Serbia, On the privatization of the public property in the Republic of Tajikistan and others).

**In Their Own Words: Beneficiaries of a Study Tour to Czech Republic from Serbia:**

We established good personal professional relations with colleagues from ministries in Czech Republic and if necessary, we can contact them for advice and guidance.

* National authorities and other partners saw the value of Czech experts and confirmed their intention to engage them into their work. At the invitation of other partners (GIZ and American University of Central Asia[[37]](#footnote-37)) One of the team members of company engaged by the CTF visited Kyrgyzstan to give a lecture on SEEA-EEA from Czech experience. There was an interest from the State Agency for Environment Protection and Forestry of Kyrgyz Republic to engage with the Czech team on Valuation of Ecosystems Services, another topic linked to SEEA-EEA.
* Beneficiaries unanimously believe that Czech experts are well qualified and positioned to address their needs, especially in the area of EU accession. Study tours to the Czech Republic raised awareness of Serbian representatives on EU requirements and importance of adequate planning for establishment of NATURA 2000 network and confirmed that Czech experts are an excellent choice to support this process.
* CTF managers’ understanding of international development and skills to develop and implement projects in international settings are greatly enhanced during their secondment from MFA to CTF. If they return back to either Czech Development Agency or the MFA, it contributes to the overall increase of Czech ODA staff capacities.

Overall, interviewees think that the funding allocated to individual activities isn’t too small and can advance innovations and have long-lasting impacts. Some respondents expressed a need to extend duration of activities to enable national partners access to Czech experts’ guidance on operationalization of critical elements of their recommendations.

The CTF does not have a well-established system to monitor contribution of its activities to achieving broader outcomes/impacts and changes in countries supported. The M&E system captures a lot of important information on activities operations, outputs and outcomes but it is not comprehensive and not consistent across all activities to capture all diverse results and areas of impact. As a result, consistent and harmonized outcome and impact level data is not collected across all areas and activities that limits effective monitoring at the aggregate and outcome level that restricts effective decision-making and makes difficult to identify effective practices and promote them ECIS-wide. Moreover, the CTF is limited in its ability to use measurable impact level evidence to support and inform its promotion campaigns and public relations work.

### 5.6 Partnerships

Close partnership arrangement with the IRH and UNDP COs was one of CTF key achievements that positively contributed to its efficiency and effectiveness. The consultant highly praises the CTF management for enhancing its collaboration with the IRH by establishing formal arrangements and fora supporting informal exchanges, understandings and relationships. IRH experts brought regional perspective and knowledge of strategic development priorities in ECIS as well as provided expert advice in reviewing UNDP COs applications for CTF funding. The CTF regularly exchanged information with other partners working in the region and regularly participated in meetings of other Trust Funds and new donors operating in the region.

The CTF established excellent partnership relations with selected UNDP COs in planning, implementing, and monitoring CTF-supported activities. Such partnerships helped to identify the most relevant Czech experts and enhance sustainability and effectiveness of supported activities as partners routinely shared updates on the activities progress.

Given that CTF was working in too many areas and its budget was relatively small, it was unable to build more long-term relations with such key players as EU, UN sister agencies and international NGOs operating in the ECIS as well as key Czech national ministries with significant expertise in areas supported by CTF. There is no doubt that stronger and long-term relations with selected Czech and international partners who could bring complimentary specific technical expertise and knowledge of the region, could have helped CTF to advance technically sound and evidence informed responses to challenges faced by ECIS.

The consultant believes that the CTF potential in resource mobilization was not fully utilized and more targeted efforts could have been implemented to promote CTF activities’ achievements among bilateral donors and international organizations operating in the region. It is advisable to develop a comprehensive outreach strategy to promote CTF accomplishments that may bring donors’ interest in continuing to support Czech innovations pioneered in the region.

# 6 Conclusions and Lessons learned

The consultant concludes that overall the CTF has achieved multiple measurable outputs through its previous CTF Project cycle and was flexible and responsive to national partners. Despite some limited focus on results, beneficiaries and partners highly value quality and relevance of assistance provided.

On the whole, the CTF’s support of Czech knowledge transfer has been well regarded and found useful by government officials as it has directly addressed immediate national priorities and capacity gaps. The CTF has contributed to developing national capacity by exposing government representatives and other key stakeholders to effective Czech approaches and practices, raising awareness for reform options, policy choices and assisting with diagnosis and implementation. The CTF highlighted the importance of a flexible implementation structure that can respond to changes in beneficiaries’ needs. Long-term effects of CTF interventions can be found in, but are not limited to development of new legislation and policies; capacity development at the institutional and individual levels; and awareness raising in critically important development areas.

Central to success of the CTF was its ability to mobilize knowledge and know-how and feed into resolving specific development objectives identified by UNDP COs in consultation with national counterparts. The CTF has been successful in promoting Czech “know-how” and innovation that is extremely important to the region but very hard to achieve.

The CTF, however, did not systematically apply consistent knowledge management strategies and was challenged to ensure that its knowledge transfer activities contribute to achieving broader outcomes and are making impacts. Knowledge management includes three key stages: acquisition, organization, and transfer of knowledge so that the ultimate beneficiaries use it to be more effective and results oriented. The experience of CTF demonstrated thatknowledge and “know how” production is an interactive process in which Czech experts interact with national partners and develop locally relevant solutions to development challenges.

Outstanding Czech experts in environment or agriculture, for instance, may write excellent manuals explaining how to do things, but what is done by the recipient of these manuals on the basis of that explanation is, of course, less perfect. **The consultant finds that success of capacity building through knowledge transfer depends on a number of factors**:

* Availability of Czech expertise with sufficient understanding of recipient country’s realities;
* Availability of Czech best practices and lessons learned from the Czech Republic’s accession to the European Union that is relevant to many countries of the region;
* Knowledge of Russian or national language skills of Czech experts.
* Institutional, political and capacity readiness of national partners to learn, understand and translate Czech knowledge into local realities and action.
* Success in operationalization and localization of Czech know how and knowledge.

CTF can achieve more substantial impact if national policymakers accept the Czech experts’ recommendations and implement them. They, however, must contend with a particular set of institutional arrangements that govern what can be done to address any given issue, pressure from a variety of economic interest groups about what they would like to see done to address and other multiple and equally important contextual factors.

In some instances, where the activities have to address multiple barriers and contextual matters, a longer term engagement of Czech experts may be needed. Success in capacity development can be achieved through hands-on, learning-by-doing where Czech experts regularly interact with national partners.

The main lesson learned is that in face of highly competitive market of international development consultants, declining donors’ resources and increasingly diverse UNDP COs needs, the CTF has to be more results oriented and address both the demand and supply side of its activities. **The consultant identifies the following lessons learned:**

* CTF can achieve systemic changes by focusing on a limited number of priorities. Achieving strategic and long lasting impact is challenging if CTF pursues multiple objectives and is spread too thin. CTF can achieve more results if it focuses on those areas where there is a supply of internationally recognized Czech expertise and a strong ECIS countries’ demand for Czech “know-how” and expertise.
* It is important to focus on sustainable results, beyond activities. Achieving long-term impact is possible when individual CTF-supported activities are based on a simple but well developed logframe matrix where outcomes, outputs and indicators are properly identified and monitored and the necessary changes are made to ensure matrix relevance.
* "Best practice" breakthroughs in the Czech Republic may not work in an entirely different country setting. While Czech expertise and experience can illuminate options for reform in ECIS countries, Czech solutions have to be adapted to local realities to be successfully implemented.

# 7 Recommendations

CTF is well-established, well-respected, and valued by the MFA, UNDP COs and beneficiaries. UNDP’s impartiality and presence in all ECIS countries coupled with CTF’s ability to quickly mobilize and deploy high quality Czech expertise are major advantages of the CTF for the next CTF Project cycle. UNDP COs’ knowledge of local realities and ability to engage into very complex and often sensitive development matters opens multiple opportunities for CTF engagement.

The CTF offers an opportunity to experiment and innovate, away from the restrictions of traditional development project instruments. Such innovations based on Czech “know how” can make a measurable difference in ECIS with relatively small amount of development funding. The focus should be made on enhancing strategic results-oriented approach of CTF operations to translate Czech know how to inform policies, programmes and practices of direct relevance to the ECIS priorities and to support application of these practices to leverage improved outcomes. The recommendations outlined below include changes to the CTF design to improve the achievement of planned results and increase its impact.

### 7.1 Enhance focus on results

The following strategies outline how focus on results can be enhanced through improved CTF accountabilities, strategic planning and improved M&E.

* Focus on a limited number of areas of support.[[38]](#footnote-38) CTF is advised to identify priorities, countries to focus on and support modalities in close consultation with the MFA, Czech Development Agency and UNDP IRH to reduce duplication and maximize the impact. It is advisable, in particular, to promote activities involving a number of countries, especially in the field of environment where there is a significant Czech expertise and where multiple COs implement comparable programmes/projects. In addition to promoting proven and region-tailored Czech “know how”, cross country activities would involve exchange of information among national partners that may lead to formation/strengthening of regional networks.
* Deepen partnerships with the private sector that can be seen as an equal partner of development actors. As this would be a new area for CTF, it is advisable to hire EoD to develop a new partnership modality, including processes and accountabilities. Many UN sister agencies in ECIS work extensively with corporate private partners and another EoD study can be commissioned to gather this information, identify lessons learned and develop recommendations for partnership with Czech and non-Czech businesses.

**In Their Own Words: UNDP CO colleague**

CTF is well positioned to advance innovations in the region such as engaging social media in consultations on important development matters. It is important to be ahead of the curve and experiment to develop innovations and promote them in the region.

* Plan activities strategically with involvement of COs and IRH experts with at least one year planning window. Consider establishing a special budget line for long-term multi-country activities. Actively promote the CTF across all COs that can learn from experiences of other COs that have benefitted from Czech expertise.
* Encourage Czech experts to make their training and advice more practical and tailored to targeted country realities. Beneficiaries greatly appreciated support with operationalization of advice provided and expressed a need to strengthen practical aspects in those instances where the advice provided was too generic or only reflected Czech experience without customization to local realities.
* Further elaborate accountabilities of IRH, UNDP COs and CTF for supporting activities at the country level.[[39]](#footnote-39) UNDP accountabilities for CTF that it manages are weaker than for UNDP funded and implemented activities. Although the CTF follows UNDP rules and procedures in its work, such mechanisms as M&E are not explicitly elaborated for activities supported by CTF. The CTF focuses mostly on inputs and outputs with very little attention to outcomes. Although the authority for activities implementation is delegated to UNDP COs, the role of IRH experts in identifying Czech experts, identification and prioritization of areas for CTF support, design of UNDP COs’ activities and their monitoring should be better elaborated to enhance the focus on results and promote ECIS cross-country collaboration. The consultant is confident that COs staff would appreciate more support from IRH advisors in identification, preparation and implementation of CTF-funded activities.
* Streamline results into monitoring, evaluation and reporting mechanisms. Establish a standardized activity-level M&E framework, including consistent formats for final reports, lessons learned summaries, mini logframes, with a focus on outcomes. Lack of clarity about specific expected outcomes/results contributes to an inability to track needed data or to tracking data that are not useful in assessing impact. CTF, in collaboration with IRH evaluation team, can develop a short guide on how to measure activities’ success, taking into account short and focused nature of these interventions, and how to select right indicators. Some results-focused indicators may include: a number of specific policy recommendations made by Czech experts adopted by the Government, satisfaction of Government officials with the quality and timeliness of advice/support provided by Czech experts; number of requests coming from national partners for Czech expertise; number of visits of CTF web-site by country and specific documents downloads; and use of knowledge and skills acquired by beneficiaries. One of study tour beneficiaries suggested, for instance, to monitor how training beneficiaries use knowledge and skills acquired in their work.
* Give more extensive and elaborate consideration to sustainability principle. Share the sustainability strategies identified in this report more broadly across UNDP COs considering applying for CTF funding. Develop a more robust follow up process, supporting COs in ensuring that sustainability strategies and approaches outlined in their applications are implemented.
* Ensure long-term financial and management stability of CTF. Consider increasing CTF budget to at least $1million per year and ensure that CTF managers stay for at least 3 years in their positions. It is difficult to ensure sustainability and impact of CTF-supported activities if the funding is very limited and the CTF management does not have sufficient time to plan strategically for at least two years and to be involved in all stages of the CTF project cycle management to successfully capture lessons learned, which could be transformed in to inoovative initiatives and practices. Similarly, significant time investment is required for building and maintaining new partnerships, especially with private sector.

### 7.2 Develop a comprehensive knowledge transfer system, with more extensive use of on-line tools

Knowledge is a key asset of CTF and the intersection of that knowledge with UNDP COs and countries’ needs is one of its critical comparative advantages. However, the results and lessons learned from these activities are not systematically identified, captured or generated to inform broader learning or regional knowledge for all ECIS countries. This knowledge could be better leveraged for the benefit of future activities through better capture, storage and dissemination. Concerted efforts to vet, catalogue and share knowledge products generated through CTF activities can have longer-term development benefits for ECIS, while also helping promote Czech development experts. To address these gaps, a knowledge management mechanism has to be developed, which defines a systematic process for identifying, generating, disseminating and storing/organizing knowledge.

CTF should develop a knowledge management strategy and in consultation with MFA and IRH determine what knowledge generated by Czech experts has to be transferred, to whom and which means of knowledge transfer should be utilized. Effective knowledge mobilization can happen if a comprehensive strategy is developed and implemented as discrete interventions cannot achieve significant long lasting impact. There is a wide range of capacity building/knowledge transfer strategies that can be considered by the CTF, but the consultant suggests exploring the following:

* Some innovative activities were able to achieve great impact in spite of their smallness. These activities could be showcased as innovative approaches that might be replicated in other countries, be treated as lessons learned or be an example of which ingredients are needed for an activity to be successful.
* The existing CTF web-site can be expanded to collect and systematize various know-how products developed by Czech experts. In addition, a more comprehensive web-site that contains knowledge products will facilitate exchange among beneficiaries and the information and knowledge-sharing along thematic, sectoral or other lines.
* Explore use of social media such as Facebook and Twitter to support information exchange, dissemination and application.
* Require Czech experts to produce short summaries of their work that should be easily accessible in terms of format, language and length and highlight their achievements and make them available on the CTF website. Develop videos, webinars and online resources based on Czech experts’ work implemented in ECIS that are relevant to a number of ECIS countries and make them available on CTF website.
* Require beneficiaries who attended learning events (e.g. study tour) to provide other national colleagues with a brief, written summary of key learnings and lessons learned and make a short presentation to decision makers and staff of relevant national institutions.
* It is advisable to translate relevant materials into national languages only if COs are committed to widely disseminate them and follow up with national counterparts.

### 7.3 Continue building a pool of Czech experts.

One of challenges faced by CTF was identifying Czech experts with the necessary technical and practical expertise. For some positions only one or few experts have applied and sometimes they did not have the necessary qualifications and expertise that negatively affected activities’ outcomes. Some beneficiaries acknowledged that although some Czech experts have the necessary skills and competencies, they did not always have deep understanding of local circumstances and local language skills. Some experts may not have the necessary experience in the international development as well. When short-term EoD instrument was utilized, experts without the necessary language skills, country background knowledge and ability to produce practically applicable and understood by beneficiaries materials are unlikely to make long-term and sustainable impacts. It is advisable for both COs and CTF to be as specific as possible in outlining region and country expertise expectations in experts/companies TORs.

Once a range of areas of CTF focus is reduced and priorities for Czech experts’ engagement are identified for the next few years, CTF is advised to establish a pool of Czech experts and invest into their capacity building. More specifically, CTF may consider implementing the following activities for experts who do not have sufficient ECIS experience:

* Establish pool of well recognized Czech experts and companies in narrowly defined areas who have the necessary country and language skills and actively promote them among COs by showcasing their work to UNDP COs and IRH. It is not advisable to offer support in those areas where there is no internationally competitive Czech expertise is available.
* Facilitate yearly face-to-face events or online forums of Czech experts involved in CTF funded work and IRH colleagues and other relevant parties to disseminate effective practices and share lessons learned. Support professional learning communities among Czech experts who in addition to technical expertise will be able to discuss countries’ political and economic context and practical lessons learned. Some more experienced experts can be requested to develop and deliver webinars on practical hints of being an international development expert working in ECIS.

# 8 Annexes

## 8.1 Terms of Reference for the evaluation

See a separate Annex 1

## 8.2 List of meetings conducted and persons interviewed, including skype and email exchanges

| **Day and time** | **Names of individuals and purpose of interview** | **Venue** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 13 April 2017 | Lukas Svatek and Ivan Lukas, CTF managers | skype |
| 26 April 2017 | Barbora Latečková, MFA Czech Republic, formerly manager of CTF | skype |
| 28 April 2017 | Dmitry Mariyasin, Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP Armenia, formerly leader of the Partnership team in IRH | skype |
| 3 May 2017 | Robert Hejzak, Czech expert, CzechInvent | skype |
| 4 May 2017 | Peter Roth, Czech expert | skype |
| 5 May 2017 | Susan Legro, Czech expert | skype |
|  | Karin Pavone, MFA Czech Republic – email exchange | skype |
| **Mission to Serbia** | | |
| 8 May 2017  9:00 – 10:30 | Katarina Vuksic, UNDP CO, to discuss Expert on Demand: Expert on EU Birds and Habitats Directives; Sharing and Applying Czech Knowledge for Advancing Nature Conservation System in Serbia; and Expert on Demand: Supporting adaptation of Serbian agriculture to climate change. | Omladinskih brigada 1 (SIV III), V floor, office 558  Belgrade |
| 9:00 – 10:30 | Goran Simunovic, UNDP, Expert on Demand: International consultant in Agribusiness and Trade | Omladinskih brigada 1 (SIV III), V floor, office 558  Belgrade |
| 10:30– 11:30 | Vladica Bozic, Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection, Sharing and Applying Czech Knowledge for Advancing Nature Conservation System in Serbia. | Omladinskih brigada 1 (SIV III), II floor, office 125  Belgrade |
| 11.30-12.30 | Lidija Stevanovic and Jelena Ducic, Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection, Expert on Demand: Expert on EU Birds and Habitats Directives;  Sharing and Applying Czech Knowledge for Advancing Nature Conservation System in Serbia | Omladinskih brigada 1 (SIV III), V floor, office 125  Belgrade |
| 14:00 – 15:30 | Ms. Sladjana Baros, Senior Associate for Monitoring and Evaluation of the National HIV Response in the Institute of Public Health, Study tours in the Czech Republic; HIV/AIDS Prevention |  |
| May 9  9:00 – 10:00 | Milos Stojanovic, Prime Minister’s Office, Team for Agriculture, Expert on Demand: International consultant in Agribusiness and Trade | Nemanjina 11 |
| 11:00 – 12:00 | Nenad Sekulic, Institute for Nature Conservation of Serbia, Expert on Demand: Expert on EU Birds and Habitats Directives; Sharing and Applying Czech Knowledge for Advancing Nature Conservation System in Serbia. | Institute for nature Conservation of Serbia, Dr.Ivana Ribara 91 |
| 12:00 – 13:00 | Alen Kis, Institute for Nature Conservation of Vojvodina Province, Expert on Demand: Expert on EU Birds and Habitats Directives; Sharing and Applying Czech Knowledge for Advancing Nature Conservation System in Serbia. | Call  UNDP, Bulevar Zorana Djindjica 64,  2nd floor large, conference room |
| **Mission to Montenegro** | | |
| 10 May 2017  10:00 – 11:00 | Jelena Mrdak, Dzenana Scekic, UNDP CO, Transfer of Czech Knowledge: Enhancing capacities of local self-government units in providing business enabling environment for the micro, small and medium enterprises and clusters in Montenegro | UN Eco Building |
| 11:00 – 12:00 | Ms. Milena Jovetic, Advisor in the Ministry of Economy Transfer of Czech Knowledge: Enhancing capacities of local self-government units in providing business enabling environment for the micro, small and medium enterprises and clusters in Montenegro | UN Eco Building |
| 12:30-13:30 | Snezana Dragojevic, UNDP CO | UN Eco Building |
| 13:30 – 14:30 | Ms. Olivera Kujundzic from Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism | UN Eco Building |
| May 11  9:00 – 11:00 | Borko Vulikic, UNDP CO | UN Eco Building |
| 11:00 – 12:00 | Slobodan, Director of Nature Park Piva | UN Eco Building |
| 13:00-14:00 | Prof. Perko Vukotic, former University professor, national team leader for radon protection and mitigation and Ranko Zekic, member of the mitigation team, working at the Centre for Eco-toxicological research, radio-ecology. | UN Eco Building |
| 17 May 2017  12:00 -13:00 skype call | Milena Bataković, MSc, Senior adviser, Department for nature protection, monitoring, analysis and reporting, Environmental Protection Agency of Montenegro | Skype call |
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## 8.4 Activities, by country, examined for this evaluation

**Serbia – field mission**

1. Transfer of Czech Best Practice and Lessons Learned: Local Self-Government’s Role in Creating Environment without Discrimination and Stigmatization of PLHIV to the Representatives from the Republic of Serbia
2. Expert on Demand: Expert on EU Birds and Habitats Directives
3. Sharing and Applying Czech Knowledge for Advancing Nature Conservation System in Serbia
4. Expert on Demand: Supporting adaptation of Serbian agriculture to climate change
5. Expert on Demand: Supporting productivity and competitiveness of Serbian agriculture

**Montenegro – field mission**

1. Transfer of Czech Knowledge: Mapping and Assessment Ecosystems and their Services of Grassland and Forest in Montenegro
2. Transfer of Czech Knowledge: Enhancing capacities of local self-government units in providing business enabling environment for the micro, small and medium enterprises and clusters in Montenegro
3. International Expert to Support Development of the Law on Nature Protection for Montenegro
4. Transfer of Czech Experience: UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (MRV, Mitigation)
5. Promotion of Modern Radon Diagnosis Methods in Montenegro

**Armenia**

1. Transfer of Czech Knowledge: Strengthening of drug information system in Armenia
2. Energy Efficiency for Gas Utilization and Business Development

**Kosovo**

1. Review of vulnerable group policies, legislation and government strategies in Kosovo
2. Strengthening capacities of the division of tourism

**Kyrgyzstan**

1. Sharing of Czech Experience: Human Resources Management in the Public Service
2. Sharing of Czech Experience: Piloting SEEA-EEA in Kyrgyzstan
3. Developing System of Environmental-Economic Accounting – Experimental Ecosystem Accounting in Kyrgyz Republic

**Moldova**

1. Reform of the National Ecological Fund in Moldova: Study tour to Czech Republic
2. Capacity and Building for Developing the ESCO Market in Moldova
3. Supporting post disaster needs assessment in Moldova

**Tajikistan**

1. Sharing Expertise on Ecosystem Accounting
2. Promotion of Public Private Partnership at national and local levels (Use of Czech Experience)”
3. Employing Czech experience in scaling up the environmental impact assessment in Tajikistan: From legislation to implementation

## 8.5 Evaluation Questions

**Questionnaires for CTF management**

**Relevance**

What has been done to ensure that the CTF activities are complementary to and/or harmonized with activities of UNDP, Czech Republic development cooperation, or other stakeholders’ activities in this field? What are specific examples of such complementarity/harmonization?

What is the mechanism in place to ensure and maintain such relevance?

What is the process of selecting activities to fund?

**Effectiveness**

Is there a robust Project logframe? What are the Project’s targets?

What is the CTF’s monitoring system? How do you measure success of your activities?

What are the CTF’s main achievements? What have been the major factors that facilitated or impended the Project in achieving the results?

Are the activities implemented the most effective way to achieving Project’s expected outcomes? What other options to achieve the Project expected results were considered?

What, if any, have been the unexpected results to which the Project has contributed?

To what extend have the project activities contributed to achievement of the planned results?

How can effectiveness of the Project design and operations be improved?

What are the key challenges and obstacles faces during the Project implementation? How did you address them?

Are the risks identified in the Offline risk log the most important and are the risk ratings applied appropriate? What additional risks and risk management strategies can you identify?

**Efficiency**

Where the resources and inputs converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner? What strategies optimizing efficiency of the CTF operations have you utilized? Have they worked?

Please describe a procurement of study tours providers/selection of Experts on Demand process.

What are the most effective and promising practices utilized by the CTF that strongly contributed to the achievements of project goals?

Do monitoring tools provide necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective?

Do you have any suggestions how the existing the CTF governance, operations and monitoring systems can be improved?

**Sustainability**

To what extend are the Project results likely to continue after the project? Are the project results sustainable?

Is stakeholders’ and implementers engagement likely to continue, be scaled up, replicated or institutionalized after CTF activities end (e.g. engaging Czech experts in other similar projects or activities not financed by CTF)? Were there any such cases?

Is the Project adequately coordinated with activities of the government institutions, UNDP, and other stakeholders that can ensure sustainability of Project activities?

What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of results? How do you plan to enhance sustainability of CTF results?

**Impact**

What is the prospective impact (primary and secondary long-term effects) of the Project activities related to its expected output?

What can be done in short-term to improve the Project implementation and increase its impact?

Have the cross cutting issues such as gender, environment been incorporated in the Programme and how has the Programme addressed these issues?

Do you identify the lessons learned on a regular basis? How do you use these lessons to improve the Fund’s operations and focus on results?

What actions have you taken to improve the CTF operations and enhance focus on results?

**Partnerships**

How do you partner with other organizations pursuing similar activities to find synergies (regionally and at the country level)?

To what extent have partnerships been sought and established and synergies created in the project implementation? Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships.

What are the opportunities for leveraging resources?

What is main added value of the UNDP/RBEC? What are weaknesses of this cooperation mode?

What is the contribution of UNDP/RBEC “soft” assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination) to the achievement of project goals?

What are the key strengths of Programme partners (UNDP/RBEC) and Donor (MFA)? Are they fully utilised in the Programme implementation?

What is the contribution of the UNDP Country Offices and the role they have played in promoting and facilitating the implementation of the Project?

**Questionnaire for UNDP COs**

**Relevance**

How relevant is the CTF support to national and UNDP priorities, as they had been identified by national and international partners?

Were these activities aligned with/supportive of other developmental partners’ work?

How do you ensure relevance of supported activities?

**Effectiveness**

What have you tried to achieve through CTF-supported activities? Do you have a logframe, with specific targets and indicators of success?

What are the main achievements of activities funded by the CTF?

What have been the major factors that facilitated or impended your project in achieving its results?

What, if any, have been the unexpected results to which the Project has contributed?

How can effectiveness of the Project design and operations be improved?

**Efficiency**

What strategies optimizing efficiency of the CTF-funded activities have you utilized? Have they worked?

What are the most effective and promising practices utilized by UNDP CO that strongly contributed to the achievements of project goals?

Do monitoring tools provide necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective?

**Sustainability**

To what extend are the activities’ results likely to continue after their completion? Are they sustainable?

Is there an intention on the part of stakeholders and partners to continue engaging Czech experts and institutions? Are there any such cases?

Have been some results achieved due to the CTF support scaled up or institutionalized?

Did you coordinate your activities with work of the government institutions and developmental partners?

What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of results? What can be done to enhance sustainability of results of CTF supported activities?

**Impact**

What is the prospective impact of the activities supported by CTF?

Do you have any suggestions how the existing CTF governance, operations and monitoring systems can be improved?

**Partnerships**

How do you partner with other organizations pursuing similar activities to find synergies for the CTF-supported activities?

How have you promoted the activities supported by the CTF?

**Questionnaires for Czech implementers**

Please describe your activity. What did you plan to achieve and how?

Was it easy to find and apply for the assignment with the CTF?

What are key challenges and obstacles that you faced in implementing your activity? How did you address them?

How would you describe your main accomplishments?

To what extend are the results achieved through your activity likely to be sustainable? Is there an intention of stakeholders to engage Czech experts and institutions after the CTF activities are completed?

What are key lessons learned through the activity implementation?

What can be potential areas for the CTF support for the next five years? How to improve relevance, quality and impact of the CTF funded activities?

## 8.6 A Self-Reporting Template for UNDP COs Staff

**A Self-Reporting Template to be Filled by UNDP Country Office staff responsible for Czech Trust-Fund (CTF)-Supported Activity(ies)**

**Due: April 24, 2017**

**Country:**

**Activity Title:**

**Name:**

|  |
| --- |
| **How would you assess relevance of the CTF-supported activities to the national developmental needs? How well they were aligned with UNDP and other partners’ work?** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **What are the key achievements of activities supported by the CTF? Please be as specific as possible.** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **How would you assess sustainability of these achievements? Have these achievements informed changes in policies and practices? Have they been scaled up and/or followed up with other activities built on achievements attributed to the CTF activities?** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Did you register increased interest in Czech Expertise by partners/beneficiaries? Do stakeholders intend to engage Czech experts and institutions after completion of the CTF-supported activities?** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **What are key lessons learned through the activity implementation? What were key challenges that you faced in implementing your activity and how did you address them?** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **What can be potential areas for the CTF support for the next five years?** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **How to improve relevance, quality and impact of CTF-funded activities?** |
|  |

## 8.7 Czech Trust Fund-UNDP Beneficiaries Survey

|  |
| --- |
| Czech Trust Fund-UNDP Beneficiaries Survey |

To help us to evaluate relevance, effectiveness and impact of supports that you received through the XX activity funded by the Czech Trust Fund and help the Fund to improve its operations and focus on results, please complete this survey and return it to an independent evaluator, Arkadi Toritsyn, at [artoritsyn@rogers.com](mailto:artoritsyn@rogers.com), by Tuesday, April 25, 2017.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Statement | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| I find the know-how provided through the Czech Trust Fund-funded activities relevant to my country development priorities |  |  |  |  |  |
| I find that the Czech Trust Fund-funded activities met my professional needs |  |  |  |  |  |
| The know-how provided through the Czech Trust Fund increased my knowledge and skills |  |  |  |  |  |
| I use knowledge and skills acquired due to Czech Trust Fund’s activities in my work |  |  |  |  |  |
| I will seek consultations/knowledge exchange opportunities from Czech experts and institutions in the future |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall, I am satisfied with the know-how, knowledge and skills obtained with the help of the Czech Trust Fund |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Open ended questions** | | | | | |
| Please provide a few examples of specific skills/knowledge acquired due to the Czech Trust Fund-supported activities that you use in your work |  | | | | |
| Please provide any comments and suggestions on how to improve relevance, quality and impact of Czech Trust Fund’s activities/initiatives. |  | | | | |
| Additional comments. |  | | | | |

Individual answers will not be shared or presented in any way that would identify the respondents as the source.
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