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**End-of-the Project Evaluation** **Report**

# **Executive Summary**

1. **Background**

The RoK-UNOSSC [[1]](#footnote-1)Facility/Programme Phase 2 had three components: The Consortium (6 participating Institutions), the Platform (3 institutions) and the Scaled-Up Project (1 institution). It was funded by the Ministry of Science and ICT (MSIT) of the Republic of Korea (RoK) and implemented under the Direct Implementation (DIM) arrangement by UNDP through the United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation (UNOSSC). While two countries were selected for piloting the integrated project led by the Consortium (Cambodia and Indonesia); the scaled-up project under the Regional Cooperative Agreement Regional Office (RCARO) had 14 participating countries in the Asia-Pacific Region. The Facility budget of USD 3,829,547.40 was released through annual contributions to UNOSSC by the Government of the Republic of Korea. The Ministry of Science and ICT (MSIT) requested the Steering Committee of the Facility to appoint one of the implementing institutions (STEPI) to represent the Ministry in the coordination of the participating institutions in RoK. The collaboration was designed as a triangular cooperation programme.

An End-of-the Project Evaluation (EPE) for the RoK-UNOSSC Facility Phase 2 (2016 – 2021), was planned and budgeted for in compliance with the UNDP evaluation policy, relating to the scale of the project and the provision in the monitoring and evaluation framework included in the Phase 2 Facility Document. The evaluation was intended to provide a comprehensive assessment of how well the project had achieved its intended results. In addition, as per the terms of reference (TOR), the partners working on a Phase 3 intended to incorporate findings from the evaluation in its design.

The methodology for the evaluation covered the following areas[[2]](#footnote-2):

* Desk study review of all relevant project documentation (*listed in the main report*);
* Consultations with multiple stakeholders (*listed in the main report*).

This EPE assessment was undertaken differently from other normal development cooperation project evaluations by virtue of it being a triangular cooperation (TrC) project evaluation. The evaluation was forward-looking, it captured the successes, challenges, and lessons learnt from the implementation of the project. It also provides information about the Facility in the 14 participating countries with a focus on the implementation process, particularly the application of TrC processes and facilitation of South-South Cooperation (SSC) amongst the participating countries. In the main report, the evaluation ends with a list of recommendations generated from this analysis for a potential Phase 3 – as per the TOR, however; a Phase 3 project document with a focus on Water-Energy-Food (WEF) nexus has already been approved.

1. **Summary of findings**

Overall, the Facility/Programme was seen by the main stakeholders as an overwhelmingly positive project, with many benefits and opportunities not only for the receiving countries, but also for the participating RoK institutions. It was also deemed to offer actionable knowledge and practices to achieve the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

While this feedback points to positive results, the purpose of this evaluation was to build an understanding beyond what worked well, challenges and lessons learnt. But it was also forward-looking, to capture lessons learnt effectively, closely examine and provide information on the nature, extent, and where possible, the results achieved through the Facility in the 14 participating countries. Based on the evidence reviewed, the evaluator concludes at this EPE stage, that it is evident that the project is consistent with 1). South-South Cooperation and Triangular Cooperation (SS & TrC) principles; 2). The project has achieved all its intended results as per results framework as set out in the Programme documents and summarised in Table 1 and Table 2 (*with full detailed achievements captured in Table 4 of the main report*). There were no major changes to its original results framework. There were some demand-led adjustments (*additions and/or changes*) made based on joint work planning, reviews and consultative meetings to the results framework. An example is the harmonization of village indicators in Indonesia and establishment of a Technology-based Business Incubator, these new initiatives were added to the revised results framework and endorsed by the Steering Committeee. In summary, the following observations were made by the EPE Evaluation based on questions identified in the EPE’s terms of reference:

**Table 1: Intended results achieved by South-South Cooperation and Triangular Cooperation (SS & TrC)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Thematic area | Summary explanation or description of aspect(s) [and whether they are existent or not existent ] | |
| South-South Cooperation and Triangular Cooperation (SS & TrC) | The Facility was designed to share the Republic of Korea’s development experiences with developing countries in the Asia-Pacific Region in the areas of science, technology and innovation. The involvement of a developed country (Republic of Korea) and the United Nations rendered this a triangular cooperation project. The SS & TrC took place mostly on a bilateral basis through technical exchanges by some of the partner countries. The operation of a Project Steering Committee with country representatives on it alongside the invitation ofPlatform, Consortium and Scaled-upmembers that convened regularly helped demonstrate a manifestation of solidarity among all the stakeholders through sharing knowledge, skills, expertise and resources. | |
| Country ownership and demand-driven cooperation from national key players | There was clear evidence that suggests the activities in Indonesia supported the government’s leadership including the eventual idea to set up the South-South Centre of Excellence on Village Innovation (SSCEVI). The SSCVI was an example where the integrated approach under the Consortium Component of collaborating with governments increased sustainability through the enhanced role of the central government and other stakeholders. However, of the two countries involved in the consortium, this was only occurring systematically in Indonesia. In Indonesia various parts of governments coordinated by the Planning Ministry worked together and demonstrated country ownership and demand-driven cooperation from national key players. In the context of Cambodia, the government requested STEPI to develop capacities of business national leaders with profound knowledge and management skill through a newly established Technology Business Incubation Center. | |
| ICT Technologies as an opportunity | The outbreak of the global COVID-19 epidemiological pandemic had an impact on the project. However, ICT tools presented an opportunity which, RCARO for example, utilised for continuation of implementation of the project with online activities. A Group Fellowship Programme in 2020 and Final Review Meeting/Technical Workshop in 2021 were successfully completed using the online platforms and tools. | |
| Communication | Many promotional materials and videos capturing key achievements were compiled during Phase 2 of the Facility, including testimonials from participating stakeholders [link](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.southsouth-galaxy.org%2Fnews%2Frca-unossc-project-on-electron-beam-applications-in-the-asia-pacific-region%2F&data=04%7C01%7Cyejin.kim%40unossc.org%7C42227db5975741a8e11b08d8b94d8cbd%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637463090032604519%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=tbU3MvAJstVBwUtBs%2B05MP5aA%2F2a6q3xF%2FEto5Av3Os%3D&reserved=0) to communicate achievements and knowledge sharing. Clear communication lines facilitated by a partnership rather than a top-down relationship were evident, while the communication strategy was a success with benefits relayed in both interviews and project reports. | |
| Knowledge Management, Joint-learning and knowledge-sharing for sustainable development | The documentation of activities and results of the project was an evident significant knowledge management process. For example, the case studies by TEMEP demonstrated this whilst the three platform institutions cooperated in co-hosting international capacity building workshops every year since the starting year of the project, as part of knowledge management and learning. There was evidence that an established knowledge and Innovation Platform with knowledge products is available on the online platform (idn.snu.ac.kr) and the compilation of best practices exists. The Consortium Group worked closely with Platform institutions to relay an effective message to partners on their pilot experience. The Scaled-up project also developed an e-learning platform for Joint-learning and knowledge-sharing <http://rcaro.org/elearning/ebfellowship/>. Knowledge and capacity transfer from Korean to Cambodian and Indonesian governments and institutions was successful according to interviews and project reports. | |
| Shared commitment | It was evident that in Indonesia, cooperation involved many parties from the RoK institutions under the Consortium, the central government, academics, regional governments and villages. Indonesia has been effective at highlighting this aspect of shared commitment. An example is BAPPENAS and the Ministry of Villages’ enlistment of STEPI to facilitate a process to harmonise two different sets of village development indices in Indonesia and to identify the best harmonization strategy. According to Bappenas, the results of the consultative meeting on this subject led to the formulation of a harmonised index, managed by Statistics Indonesia (BPS) (linked to project Activity 1.1.6). Furthermore, the index figures are used as village development targets for the country’s National Medium-Term Development Planning (RPJMN), 2020 – 2024. Throughout Phase 2, STEPI cooperated with local experts in Indonesia and Cambodia to identify required technology demands, to provide a platform to connect these demands and supplies. | |
| Focus on results-oriented approaches and solutions | There is evidence that a RoK-UNOSSC Facility Result Framework (*Project Results tracking system*) existed and was updated on a quarterly basis to keep track of progress towards achieving project outputs and objectives as captured in Table 2. Multi stakeholder project results progress discussions and site visits to review and physically see these results as documented in progress reports took place. |
| Inclusive partnerships and multi-stakeholder dialogues | Due to the complex design and context as a triangular cooperation Programme, there was a wide variety of stakeholders. There were multiple instances where local consultative meetings, the preparation of required documents for Ministry and translation services were done for Government counterparts etc. Joint capacity building aspects were also supported, with regular communications facilitated and coordination activities with all stakeholders undertaken. |
| Transparency and mutual accountability | It is evident that UNOSSC jointly organised the Project Steering Committee Meetings with MSIT, STEPI and representatives from Cambodia and Indonesia. Quarterly progress reports and annual reports were produced and available. Knowledge products and publications were also available on the South-South Galaxy [link](https://www.southsouth-galaxy.org/publications/directory-of-institutions-and-experts-for-science-technology-and-innovation-in-asia-unossc-2021/). Mission (Back-to-office reports) also exist. The heads of institutions had an accountability role to grants allocated to them – they signed off on activities that were relevant and linked to the project activities. There was also a separation of accountability between project leaders and the heads of institution. UNOSSC undertook spot checks to ensure that institution heads (grant signatories) exercised their oversight over the project staff. |
| Innovation and co-creation | Evidence exists onAPWINC’s coaching of cooperative members in identifying new markets tosell their products and leveraging ICT tools to promote their products online for the first time – the women were subsequently using ICT and social media platforms to promote and sell their products**.** The Consortium institutions enhanced efforts of Governments on village innovation through the pilot integrated approach in Srey Santhor (Cambodia) and Sukabumi (Indonesia). This was building on the momentum of the integrated pilot project in Sukabumi which was aligned to the country’s Village Innovation Programme (VIP), that the Government of Indonesia (GoI) had committed to establish a Centre of Excellence in Sustainable Rural Development in Sukabumi to share its policy, strategy and know-how and practical experiences with other countries in the Global South. The Technology Business Incubation (TBI) Centre in Cambodia, which included the introduction of some advanced innovation and technology, for example smart farming, was also innovative. |
| Advance the empowerment of women and girls | Gender disaggregated data and outputs on the empowerment of women and girls: “women-led agricultural cooperatives” / “women entrepreneurs” were clear and evident. A gender bias was also evident as the project encouraged female researchers to participate and list experts by gender. These outputs were captured and implemented through the Programme with many women being involved on the Programme in Cambodia and Indonesia. Healthy Schools Projects also offered capacity building opportunities and access to clean drinking water to both girls and women teachers. The project aimed to ensure equal representation of women across all components. |
| Leaving no one behind. | There is evidence that the Facility supported: “integrated community projects implemented” … “women-led agricultural cooperatives” / “women entrepreneurs”, thus addressing the empowerment of women and girls. Part of the core capacity building by the Canaan Global Leadership Centre was on community leadership. This component of the CGLC is based on its pioneering role in Korea in the Village Movement. |

In summary, the following intended results were achieved by the project from its set results framework – components deliverables aligned to the results framework (*a detailed version of the results is also available in the main report:* Table 4).

**Table 2: Summary of intended results achieved from results framework: components deliverables aligned with the results framework**

| a). Summary of platform component’s deliverables aligned with the results framework | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Intended Outputs | Output targets | Indicative activities summary | Results achieved  [Yes, or Unclear or No] |
| 1. Knowledge & Innovation Platform established | * 1. A fully functional platform created by the second year of the project, all Phase 1 data uploaded. | From 1.1.1 – 1.1.7 | Yes (all) |

| b). Summary of Consortium project’s deliverables aligned with the results framework | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Intended Outputs | Output targets | Indicative activities summary | Results achieved  [Yes, or Unclear or No] |
| 2. At least one integrated community project implemented | 2.1 Baseline activities completed before actual capacity development work takes place. Results captured consistently and given to platform. | From 2.1.1 - 2.1.3 | Yes (all) |

| c). Summary of Scaled-up project’s deliverables aligned with the results framework | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Intended Outputs | Output targets | Indicative activities summary | Results achieved  [Yes, or Unclear or No] |
| 3. One or two projects scaled up | 3.1 Project activities either scaled up to more countries or new targets in terms of technology diffusion defined. | From 3.1.1 - 3.1.3 | Yes (all) |

| d). Summary of deliverables based on results framework from the Programme Document (STEPI) | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Intended Outputs | Output targets | Indicative activities summary | Results achieved  [Yes, or Unclear or No] |
| 4. Effective coordination of Korean inputs facilitated | 4.1 Local consultative meetings, preparing required documents for Ministry, translation done for Government counterparts. | 4.1.1 | Yes |

| e). Summary of deliverables based on results framework from the Programme Document (STEPI) | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Intended Outputs | Output targets | Indicative activities summary | Results achieved  [Yes, or Unclear or No] |
| 5. Project Monitored | 5.1 Monitoring of project-by-project management. | 5.1.1 | Yes |

**b1.0) Relevance**: Upon assessing the design relevance and the focus of the Facility/Programme (project), there is evidence that the project outputs were very clear. The project was designed as a South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SS & TrC) project with all the applicable characteristics of a SS & TrC as highlighted in Table 1 above. It is also evident that the provisions of triangular cooperation followed a horizontal-mutually beneficial approach for all stakeholders involved. The inputs and strategies were realistic and adequate to achieve the results of Phase 2.

**b1.1) South-South Cooperation and Triangular Cooperation have been promoted and strengthened (SS & TrC)**: There is evidence that an expert network was established and reinforced throughout the implementation period, developing synergies among the participating countries. It is evident that project meetings, technical workshops etc. contributed to the strengthened dialogue, information exchange and cooperation among the experts. The experts provided demand led scientific, technical, policy and strategic guidance to partner countries. Forums were formed as well as activities undertaken in a form of bilateral, multilateral and on a regional basis, contributing to SS & TrC[[3]](#footnote-3).

**b2.0) Effectiveness**: It is evident that the project’s M&E mechanism and systems were effective. They contributed to meeting project results. They kept progress on deliverables in check. The strategies and tools used in the implementation of the project were effective. The project effectively achieved all its overall objectives and achieved all its envisaged SS & TrC outcomes and results (*outputs*). To meet the high standards of project governance, accountability and transparency, UNOSSC as the Facility Project Management worked closely with all stakeholders at all stages of project implementation through consultation. It conducted effective monitoring visits and spot checks. For systematic monitoring and coordination, UNOSSC ensured that all ROK institutions continued to submit quarterly progress reports describing key progress and challenges faced, as well as listing upcoming activities in the next phase as prescribed in the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT). In this way, all stakeholders could easily follow-up government needs, identify constraints and actions recommended to mitigate risk and facilitate achievement of results which was effective.

There is clear evidence that strong coordination, clear project goal setting and effective strong TrC contributed to achieving intended objectives and output of the project. The project was effective at delivering on the relevant needs identified and it also enhanced the principles of SS & TrC among participating countries. It is evident that the management and accountability structures were very effective for Phase 2 of the project. The overall effectiveness of the findings from monitoring visits highlighted the benefits to partner countries and participating RoK institutions.

**b2.1) Human and institutional capacities have been strengthened through training the trainers (ToTs)**: It is evident that the project convened several regional training courses, with lectures and on-site training provided. For example, the Group Fellowship Programmes that fulfilled the needs for long-term customised education were evident. Regional experts were directly sent to the local institutions to transfer technology effectively and efficiently through expert missions. Dispatching of regional experts to the local institutions and providing customised Programmes was helpful in responding to the local issues and expanding the beneficiaries/participants from the governmental, institutional and academia organisations as well as private sectors that were involved to strengthen human and institutional capacities as illustrated in Table 3.

**Table 3: The number of trainees for Consortium activities in both Cambodia and Indonesia**

| Country | No. of Students\* | No. of Women | No. of Men | Total |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cambodia | 5,813 | 607 | 752 | 7,172 |
| Indonesia | 5,306 | 1,072 | 1,019 | 7,397 |

\* Notes: the no. of students wasn’t disaggregated by gender and is presented as such in this table

1. **Conclusion and recommendations**

Since the project has concluded and Phase 3 design completed, what follows are observations rather than recommendations. While Phase 2 was highly successful in meeting all its targets that verify the achievement of project outputs and outcomes, the project could have benefited from the observations listed below.

**Table 4: Summary of observations**

| Observation 1: The project could have used a logical framework approach for systematic and analytical planning processes to identify beneficiary countries upfront before having a signed off Phase 2 Programme document |
| --- |

The EPE observes, as also highlighted in the mid-term evaluation, that the project could have benefitted from developing and using a logical framework approach for the following reasons:

* systematic and analytical planning processes to identify beneficiary countries upfront before having a signed off Phase 2 Programme document alongside in-country project champions. This would have helped strengthen the project design and implementation.
* its overarching goal would have determined the causal links between project activities/interventions that the Programme supported and noted progress in achieving impact at the national and local levels, not solely expected results/outputs (*tracked by the existing results-based M&E*), since log frames enable the tracking of results towards sustainable impact, as a way of interpreting the intensity and significance of results/outputs.

| Observation 2: The project could have fostered greater use of efficient and less time-consuming cooperative program of work options amongst partnering institutions |
| --- |

Greater use of efficient and less time-consuming cooperative program of work options amongst partnering institutions could have included the following:

* where feasible consideration of virtual proximity and the exponential boom of online and virtual meetings could have positively contributed towards breaking down the physical barriers/silos of physical distance amongst institutions. It must be noted that not all meetings needed to be physically in person convenings and remote meetings in instances where the technology exists or was available at local levels could have cut down on wasted travel time without requiring any travel budget (*a hybrid of both physical and online as necessary could have been of benefit as opposed to one option over the other*).

| Observation 3: The continuous strengthening of the understanding / implications of SS & TrC and what it entailed for all stakeholders and partner countries involved would have been beneficial |
| --- |

For a Programme that was incubating innovative, integrated, and demand-driven southern owned solutions, with multi-disciplinarily approaches, this could have included the following:

* continuously making a clear understanding of the characteristics and principles of SS & TrC to all the stakeholders.
* besides the once off project implementation kick-off induction session/workshop, the project could have used all its other follow up meeting sessions/workshops where all the stakeholders convened to ensure that there is also a focus on continued orientation to fully understand the SS & TrC implications.

| Observation 4: The project could have granted more flexibility to encourage women participation on targeted Programme activities and ensured that they were designed around the convenience of women participation despite their matriarchal responsibility for taking care of their homes and families |
| --- |

This could have included the following:

* the Programme’s activities targeted at women being flexibly designed around their responsibility for taking care of their homes and families[[4]](#footnote-4) so that women participation was easily encouraged with buy-in to the process.
* Women/female participants could also have been identified well in advance so that those who required to pre-plan their family life around the project activities (*where applicable*) as participants on the program were able to do so with great ease from any limitations and/or barriers.

| Observation 5: The project could have had a clearer definition of the cross-cutting target of gender equality and/or gender disaggregated target setting *in the results framework (was the aim “gender equality”* or *“gender disaggregated data”?*) |
| --- |

This could have included the following:

* clarity in the Programme/Facility results framework by having gender disaggregated targeting explicitly captured since gender equality is an aspect that a project target using a gender capacity building[[5]](#footnote-5) approach.
* alternatively, if that was not the intention, then a clear definition of what the Programme implied by gender equality could have been developed as this clarity was missing.

1. For the purposes of this report the words Project, Facility and Programme or Facility/Programme will be used interchangeably to mean the same thing. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The evidence obtained and used to evaluate the results generated by the facility was triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on the achievement of indicators, existing reports, evaluations and technical documents, interviews with stakeholders and focus groups. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. this is acknowledged by several stakeholders [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For example, a full two (2) days training session can be run over eight (8) quarter days training sessions so that women can benefit from the training without being unable to take care of their homes and families – this flexibility needs to consider the matriarchal roles played by women as opposed to using matriarchal roles as an excuse of convenience to create barriers to participation that disadvantage women from being active participants and benefactors of the programme. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Sample Gender Equality Indicators could include: 1). Evidence that training and capacity building strategies include gender equality objectives and activities to address barriers to equitable outcomes or 2). Evidence that training and capacity building curricula delivery promotes equality between women and men, girls and boys <https://www.oecd.org/derec/adb/tool-kit-gender-equality-results-indicators.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)