

EC/UNDP COMMUNITY BASED APPROACH TO LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT



Nov 2013

Mid-Term Evaluation Report – Phase II

By Olena Krylova and Ildar Gazizullin

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Introduction

Project Background

Brief Project History

CBA Implementation Strategy

Evaluation Methodology

Scope and Methods

Limitations

Findings and Conclusions

General Project Relevance

Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability

Establishing partnership

Support structures

Community mobilization

Local capacity-building

Micro-project support

Methodology replication

Rural economic development

Energy efficiency component

Knowledge management

Policy level

Project management

Visibility

Recommendations

General Strategy

Policy level

Micro-projects implementation

Capacity-building and knowledge management

Project Management

Visibility

Risks Management

Annexes

Abbreviations

ASC	Agro-service cooperative
ASCU	The Agricultural service cooperatives Union of Ukraine
CBA	Community-Based Approach to the Local Development Project
CDF	Community Development Funds
CO	Community organisation
DESPRO	Swiss-Ukrainian Decentralization Support Project
EE	Energy efficiency
EU	European Union
LDF	Local Development Forum
LED	Light-emitting diode
MGSDP	Municipal Governance and Development Program
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
PAS	Participatory Self-Assessment
RCC	Regional Coordination Council
RRC	Rayon Resource Center
SAEE	State Agency for Energy Efficiency
TC	Town council
ToR	Terms of Reference
UADRC	Ukrainian Association of District and Rayon Councils
UAH	Ukrainian Hryvnia
USD	United States dollar
USIF	Ukrainian Social Investment Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
VC	Village council

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report reflects on the results of the evaluation of the EU/ UNDP Community Base Approach to Local Development (CBA) project conducted in September-November 2013. The evaluation concluded that:

Relevance

The project is highly relevant to national development priorities, the local governance reform agenda and the national energy efficiency strategies. CBA methodology is appropriate and well accepted by partners at all levels.

Effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability

In terms of **establishing partnership**, CBA uses well elaborated and transparent procedures for selecting partner rayons and villages/towns but targeting of most socio-economically vulnerable rayons and villages can be compromised by a lack of local government commitment and inability to meet the co-funding requirements. Besides, the less than 10,000 population criterion deprives large villages and small towns from participation in CBA, although these communities face very similar development challenges.

Current **support arrangements** established at the rayon and oblast level appear to be appropriate and effective for project coordination and steering, although their role is still limited to facilitating CBA implementation and their general impact on overall development, development planning and participatory budgeting at these levels remains modest. The project national support structures steer project implementation, but their leverage in facilitating project implementation at regional and national level is underutilized.

The most fruitful cooperation is achieved in oblasts and rayons where collaborations are created through partnerships between elected councils and local administrations.

Rayon Resource Centers (RRC) are playing a crucial role in the CBA support system to communities. They are very successful, and sustainability prospects of their work are greater where they are well established structurally/ institutionalized.

In **social mobilization of communities** previous experience of collective action is an important asset. Social mobilization appears to be the domain of women.

Establishment of community organizations (CO) is a very effective approach for CBA implementation but overall effectiveness of these organizations beyond CBA is still difficult to judge. Wide population coverage and democratic governance and management of established COs is among their most valued assets and are an important provision for their future sustainability. However, their sustainability depends mainly on their leadership and resources mobilization capabilities.

Capacity-building of RRCs and COs is a very important investment in their effectiveness and maturity. RRCs are gradually built into expertise centers but many are still limited in their technical base, and human capacities and abilities for resource mobilization beyond CBA. Peer exchange proves to be one of the most effective and welcome ways of learning among the CBA partners.

CBA achieves relatively high **micro-project implementation** efficiency through good standardization of project implementation procedures. Micro-projects are very effective in producing desired results.

Although CBA does not always target the most urgent priorities it serves the purpose of providing the community with a tool for mobilization and solving its problems. Besides, communities' financial participation in micro-projects boosts their sense of responsibility and increases prospects for sustainable operation and maintenance of the established or improved infrastructure. Overall, CBA has had an impressive impact on both communities and local authorities.

Multiple examples of retrospective adjustment to the rayon development programs, and plans to accommodate community priorities defined in the CBA process, and to allow budget co-funding reveals that the practice of participatory planning and budgeting is not yet a widely spread practice in the country.

Sustainability of most infrastructures established or improved as a result of micro-projects is secured. It is more difficult to ensure sustainability in cases of communal infrastructure projects that imply paid services/a need to introduce tariffs (such as water supply or waste collection and disposal) or agricultural service cooperatives.

The CBA **methodology replication scheme** introduced by the project is in demand among better off rayons and communities.

In terms of supporting, **rural economic development**, there are early signs of success in the functioning of agro-service cooperatives (ASC) established under CBA II but it is too early to judge their effectiveness. It remains to be seen how effective is the CBA approach is in targeting the poor and reaching the 80% coverage of community residents. Besides, the vision with regards to social and economic vision of the cooperatives and their performance criteria are not yet well defined yet.

Clearly, the ASC component has the potential to better mobilize the men and youth part of the rural population, yet this does not seem to be done at the expense of excluding the women.

With the establishment of a cooperative and purchasing assets necessary for its functioning (basically, completion of CBA micro-project in technical terms) the project of making a cooperative function is only the beginning for the community, which implies a need for still intensive technical support in the future. Success in the development of ASCs is largely dependent on adequate support for infrastructure and basic regulatory environment. CBA efforts in supporting ASCs are still somewhat isolated from the overall ASC movement in Ukraine.

The **energy efficiency component** of CBA is in high demand but its effective implementation requires a high level of awareness and intensive capacity-building inputs. CBA assistance to regional authorities to develop Energy Efficiency Strategies is important, given the national energy efficiency program, but their implementation remains a challenge. Potential for energy efficiency projects replication is limited unless a supporting environment is created.

The micro-projects are able to raise awareness and demonstrate an impact on efficient energy use. Often these micro-projects have more of a technological demonstration and social mobilization value but are not necessarily justified from a cost-benefit perspective.

In the **knowledge management domain**, cooperation with UADRC has a strong potential for dissemination of CBA-generated knowledge and for addressing wider local governance concerns. Securing outreach and sustainability of the knowledge web platform is a challenge that still lies ahead. Cooperation with Universities opens multiple win-win opportunities that can be further deepened.

At the policy level, through cooperation with UADRC, CBA is cementing the ground for a strategically important partnership. Project potential to influence directly policy and regulatory environment is still underutilized.

Project management

CBA is implemented by a very capable team of people but they are working under difficult conditions. Accelerated speed of CBA II implementation is associated with certain efficiency and effectiveness gains, but compromises the project capacity-building objectives. Further, the project clearly faces a dilemma between investment into further staff capacity-building and outsourcing of narrow expertise.

Visibility

The project is less visible among non-partners and at the national level. The role of EU as the main funder of the project, and UNDP as implementer, is known among partners at all levels. The project has clear visibility guidelines that are respected.

Media coverage of CBA at the local level is extensive but the message content (in relation to promoting CBA approach) is weak and needs improvement.

INTRODUCTION

This report reflects on the results of the Min-Term Evaluation of EU/UNDP Community-Based Approach to the Local Development Project (CBA) Project that aims at (see *Annex 1* for detailed ToR):

1. Assessing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, visibility and sustainability of the CBA Project and its development approach and methodology;
2. Formulating recommendations for the development approaches, priorities focus, areas of intervention and design of the third phase of the CBA project.

The evaluation was conducted in the period of September-November 2013 by a team of two consultants – Olena Krylova (as an International Team Leader with local governance and community development background) and Ildar Gazizullin (as a National Expert specializing in economic issues and energy efficiency).

This report reflects on the results of the Min-Term Evaluation and is structured in the following way:

- The “*Introduction*” chapter sets the context of the evaluation and provides basic information on the project background, explains evaluation objectives and methodology;
- The “*Findings and Conclusions*” chapter contains main findings of the evaluation and conclusions¹ for different components of the project;
- The “*Recommendation*” chapter draws main lessons from the project implementation and provides recommendations on both general project strategy and advancement of each of its components.

Project Background

Brief Project History

UNDP, with the support of EU funding, launched CBA in December 2007 (total budget Euro 13,300,000) with the objective of strengthening participatory governance and improving the quality of life of the rural population of Ukraine. During its first phase, the project operated in all 25 regions in Ukraine and covered 209 rayons (42% of the total number of rayons in the country), 1123 village/city councils (10% of the total number of local councils in the country) and 1145 local communities.

CBA is one of the few internationally supported projects in Ukraine with national coverage.

The project introduced community-based methodology which promotes joint community planning and implementation of community-led projects aimed at improving living conditions, and fostering sustainable local development. A variety of capacity-building activities were organized by the project to develop the professional skills and knowledge of community organizations and local authorities to put the CBA methodology into practice. The project also carried out awareness-raising activities to inform local-, regional- and national-level stakeholders of the community-based approach to local development, and to motivate policymakers into recognizing the value of this methodology for national development.

¹ Conclusions are marked in italics and bold in the main body of relevant sections

Phase I of CBA has been followed by a four-year Phase II aimed at:

- Enhancing relevant professional skills and knowledge of community organizations and local authorities to initiate and maintain participatory local processes of social economic development and public services delivery;
- Increasing energy efficiency at local level through promotion of innovative technologies implemented by collective action of local communities and local authorities;
- Demonstrating effective participatory local governance and decentralised management mechanism throughout Ukraine for public service delivery.

The second phase continues to operate in 25 regions, 200 rayons and 900 village/city councils, with 40 percent of rayons and local councils being new partners. It expands activities to 100 new rayons, in addition to supporting activities in 100 previously covered rayons². This phase retains the objectives and fundamental methodology established during the first phase. The major focus of the second phase is methodology replication within a national framework. It also foresees an expanded energy efficiency component. It supports selected regions to develop energy efficiency strategies and implement selected projects in line with the strategy. In addition, it promotes cooperatives in rural areas and provides support to establish small rural businesses in the selected regions. It supports standard community projects and energy efficiency projects under cost-sharing and joint decision-making arrangements. For further scaling up of the community based approach to sustainable development, the project also works on establishing a knowledge management hub and curriculum development in universities and national training institutes for civil servants and elected officials.

Agreement has been reached in principle with the EU Delegation in Ukraine to finance a third phase of the project that will cover the period of 2014-2018. The new phase will be focused on the institutionalization of a community-led approach, and on the expansion of the project support to urban areas, building on the experience accumulated by UNDP in the framework of its Municipal Governance and Development Program (MGSDP).

The major strategic directions of the new phase of the CBA project have been identified and agreed upon with the donor and the national partners and include: 1) replication of community-based development methodology; 2) enhancing energy efficiency at local level; 3) expansion of support to economic activities in rural areas; 4) community-based approach to improve urban housing; 5) introduction of innovation activities and new technologies at local level.

CBA Implementation Strategy

The strategic goal of the CBA is to build the capacity of local communities and local authorities for participation in joint decision-making processes, and to use this capacity for multi-stakeholder cooperation and multi-sectorial interventions whilst ensuring local ownership of the process. The process is *bottom-up* and involves stakeholders from grassroots, meso- and macro levels.

At national level the project works with line ministries, parliamentary committees, national associations of local councils and other counterparts under the overall coordination of the Secretariat of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine. At regional level the Project cooperates with oblast state administrations and oblast

² Total budget of the second phase was Euro 16,8 mn.

councils (in the case of AR Crimea – with ARC Council of Ministers and Verkhovna Rada of AR Crimea). At rayon level, CBA partners with rayon state administrations and rayon councils. At local level, partnership is established with village / town councils (VCs/TCs).

CBA partner rayons, village/town councils and local communities are selected through open *competition*. The project tries to reach the most disadvantaged population areas of the region or rayon. It targets communities with a population under 10,000 people.

Local level activities of the CBA are carried in *partnership* with the stakeholders, based on a commitment to cost sharing and joint decision-making.

CBA support structures are established at all levels of partnership

- At rayon level, there are rayon coordinators and Rayon Resource Centers (RCC), as well as Local Development Forums (LDF) that are meant to facilitate CBA implementation and support VCs/TCs partners and communities throughout the process;
- At regional level (oblasts and ARC), Regional Coordination Councils (RCC) are established to monitor CBA activities in the region, to resolve issues related to local policies/procedures, and to support programming and resource mobilization;
- At national level, there is a Steering Committee (SC) to ensure national level coordination and to provide advisory support.

The **social mobilization process** prepares communities for participation in CBA. Community organisations (CO) are formed by representation of at least 80% of households in the selected community to lead the community through identification of pending community problems, selection of priority projects for CBA (micro-projects), community resources mobilization and micro-projects implementation.

The **capacity-building** component of CBA strengthens abilities of COs to make joint decisions with local authorities, to mobilize resources, implement local priorities, sustain the results and function further as community-based organisations. The capacity of partners (VCs/TCs, rayon/oblast etc.) is strengthened to implement the participatory approach. Along with training, advice, exposure visits and dialogue, the project provides COs with small grants (in support of community priority micro-projects) which enable communities to practice skills, learn by doing, and acquire self-confidence through achieving tangible results.

CBA-II supports pilot rural communities in solving the most pressing local developmental problems by implementing community initiatives (micro-projects) within the major project priorities of:

- Health (local health posts)
- The Environment (waste utilisation, sewage & drainage etc.)
- Water supply
- Energy (energy saving and efficiency)
- Rural economic development (agro-service cooperatives – ASC).

Knowledge and experience acquired in the process of implementation is being gathered, analyzed and distributed through a knowledge hub in cooperation with academia and associations representing local self-governing bodies.

Evaluation Methodology

Scope and Methods

The evaluation included 5 weeks of field works (in Ukraine) and visits to seven regions of Ukraine (namely, Autonomous Republic of Crimea, Zakarpattia, Zhytomyr, Kyiv oblast, Dnipropetrovsk, Mykolaiv, Poltava oblast). Inclusion into the evaluation was based on each region's geographic representation and performance (high performing, medium and low – as rated with the use of an internal CBA performance assessment).

The evaluation used a comprehensive set of tools, which allowed verification and triangulation of information:

- Desk study of a large number of project related documents;
- Semi-structured and unstructured interviews with project partners and main stakeholders at national, regional and rayon level;
- Round table discussions with project partners at oblast, rayon and village level;
- Focus group discussions with community groups involved in CBA I and CBA II;
- Site visits and observation (mainly site visits to community projects and observation of Local Development Forums conducted at the rayon level);
- Questionnaire-based survey among all RRC and CBOs involved into CBA I and CBA II;
- Content analysis of project related media reports (annual media clips of CBA by regions), selected Regional Energy Efficiency Strategies and Rayon Development Plans.

As a result of field activities, the Evaluation team had the opportunity to meet representatives from 14 regions of Ukraine (representatives of another seven regions³ joint Round Table discussions organized in seven regions visited by the team) and met around 600 people, 64% of whom were women. For the detailed evaluation program see [Annex 2](#).

Limitations

The main challenge the evaluation faced was to assess project outcomes and impact in the context of a lack of systematic focus of the CBA project on outcomes and impact indicators in its Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E).⁴ The CBA Results Framework is mainly oriented towards delivery of outputs. Thus, the evaluation team had to identify indicators of project effectiveness and impact as it experienced the project through discussions with the team and the project partners. It attempted, with the generous support of the project M&E unit, to draw on statistical evidence by correlating different pieces of information from the project database.

Additional information was gathered through the survey of RRC and COs that targeted 100% of these units. Response rate in survey was 42% for RRCs and 21% for COs, which strong statistical significance. Where data was not available, the team relied in its judgments on opinions of partners (validated and verified in

³ Donetsk, Zaporizhzhia, Kirovohrad, Kharkiv, Kherson, Odesa, Ternopil oblasts

⁴ There was one perception based sociological survey conducted in 2010, to capture project impact retrospectively based on some indicators of social impact. The CBA regional offices collect some indicative information, like self-assessment of COs based on five criteria (organizational development and sustainability, ability to plan jointly and to implement community projects, and quality of life) but this information is not systematically aggregated and analyzed.

different locations and with different stakeholders), as well as anecdotal evidence and people's sentiments (occasionally illustrated by quotations of what different people have said to the evaluation team during the meetings⁵).

The project performance is assessed at the level of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, whereby:

- **Relevance** indicates the degree of project importance in the context of which it operates;
- **Efficiency** is the extent to which project resources (time, effort or cost, etc.) translate into outputs used for the intended purpose;
- **Effectiveness** is the capacity to produce a desired result that reflects on the relation between project outputs and outcomes;
- **Impact** refers to changes attributed to the project that (in case of intended positive impact) reflects on the relation between project outcomes and its objective;
- **Sustainability** is viewed as the capacity of actors to maintain the positive changes (this includes institutional and regulatory frameworks, cultural and other appropriateness of approach, resources related aspects, including financial);
- **Visibility** reflects the degree to which the project is visible, its main contributors are acknowledged and its outcomes are known among the project target group and beyond.

⁵ Quoted in italics in brackets throughout the report.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

General Project Relevance

The CBA project is highly relevant to national development priorities and the local governance reform agenda. CBA is implemented in the spirit of decentralization that has been promoted by the new concept of Local Governance Reform planned for 2013-20 (which is expected to be formally endorsed in the immediate future). The project is making an important contribution to strengthening communities, increasing their resourcefulness (in a wider sense) and building capacities of local government at the lowest level to involve citizens in governance process and the improvement of their livelihoods. It provides them with the experience of participatory decision-making regarding the use of public funds. This is very important in the context of upcoming decentralization and gradual growth of the pool of the funds available to local governments the disbursement of which they can decide at their own discretion.

The project also supports healthy competition between rayons and the village councils and boosts their performance, which will be a decisive factor in decision-making related to the upcoming territorial administrative reform (i.e. scaling up local government units and concentration around “points of growth”). Additionally, in the context of the EU-Ukraine Association agenda, the project is promoting the idea of solidarity between EU and Ukraine (“*We were wondering in the beginning of the project why EU would help us without asking anything in return, but now we realize that Europe is investing in a stronger and well governed neighbor*”).

Project focus on energy saving and energy efficiency is particularly relevant and strategic in the view of most partners. It is fully in line with the government policy, particularly the National Energy Efficiency Program, which has a clear regional dimension. Ukraine’s membership in the European Energy Community provides an institutional framework and additional impetus for achieving energy efficiency and renewable energy targets.

The project’s overall objective is clear to national and local counterparts. Its general impact on communities’ activism is widely known and acknowledged. Remarkably, the CBA project is viewed as the most relevant and effective community development project ever, by many project counterparts (at both national and regional level) with experience of participation in internationally funded projects.

CBA methodology is appropriate and well accepted by partners at all levels. The CBA is highly praised for its well-defined methodology at each stage of project implementation – from the selection of partners at rayon and village level to the step-by-step implementation of community initiatives. Among the project’s most valuable aspects cited by many is its ability to address community problems through pooling resources from different sources, including the community itself, and the strong social mobilization effect observed in most communities that have been through the CBA “school”. There are also examples of the application of the CBA approach to community mobilization and social partnership between citizens, local self-government and state administration in implementing community-based projects through co-funding are emerging in the regions. The approach is used in designing rayon and oblast level grant completion programs for local communities, to which COs and/or village councils can apply.

Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability

The following section presents findings and conclusions related to effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability by main project components.

Establishing Partnership

CBA has well elaborated procedures for selecting partner rayons and villages/towns. Initially, rayons can compete by actively applying for participation in the project. Their selection is based on a combination of criteria: 1) socio-economic hardship (ranking of level of socio-economic development provided by each oblast), 2) several CBA selected criteria of socio-economic status (namely, access to water supply, health service, state of environment and energy situation), and 3) commitment and performance in CBA I (for those rayons included in CBA I). The selection process is transparent and well documented. It is conducted by a committee consisting of representatives from UNDP, CBA project, regional council and regional state administration.

Selection of the rayons is followed by village/towns selection using a similar approach: launching seminars are conducted in each rayon for VC/TC heads, their active application and selection is based on ranking (with the use of such criteria as relevance of basic infrastructure\services problems in relation to CBA priorities, partners` commitment and performance in CBA-I).

As a result, 209 rayons and 1,123 VCs/TCs⁶ participated in CBA I (out of 557 rayons and 2803 VCs/TC that applied). In CBA II, 200 rayons and 855 VCs/TCs were selected as partners (from 557 rayons and 2,798 VCs/TC that applied) under the main quota (with 96 rayons and 506 VCs/TCs identified for the reserve list). Additionally, 251 VCs/TCs⁷ were selected in the framework of replication scheme (additional quota) from 566 applications (with 124 VCs/TCs identified for the reserve list). Half of the rayons included in CBA II were partners in CBA I and half are “new”.

In CBA II, 8 rayons and 37 villages have been replaced from the reserve list (by the time of evaluation), mainly due to a failure to complete the social mobilization process and/or mobilize community and/or local budget co-financing. In CBA I, the replacement rate was 6 rayons (or 2.8%) of and 119 villages (or 10%).

Targeting of most socio-economically vulnerable rayons and villages can be compromised by a lack of local government commitment and inability to meet the co-funding requirements. The co-funding criteria can outweigh the socio-economic status of the rayons, especially in the replication scheme. According to the partners, rayons with heavily subsidized budgets, where oblast co-funding to CBA is absent or negligent, have the least chance to participate in CBA.

The chance of villages/towns to be included into the CBA is largely dependent on enthusiasm and capacity of the VCs/TCs heads representing their communities at the CBA launching sessions; they are also required to submit formal applications (*“In our rayon there were several communities that did not get into CBA I because heads of their VCs were personally not interested. These community groups used to approach us and complain. IN CBA II there are less such cases as people know about the project, and even where the VCs are reluctant community groups push them to participate.”*)

The less than 10,000 population criteria deprives large villages and small towns from participation in CBA, although these villages face very similar development challenges. There are multiple examples of large settlements and small towns (often rayon centers) that exceed the population limit by several

⁶ The share of town and city councils in CBA I was 12% and 2%, respectively.

⁷ The share of town and city councils in CBA II is 8.3 and 1.1% respectively.

thousand (or less) and that feel discriminated against regarding their access to the CBA experience and resources. Access to development and funding opportunities becomes critical for many villages, towns and rayons in the context of the upcoming territorial-administrative reform, scaling up of local government units and clustering around the points of growth.

The most fruitful cooperation is achieved in oblasts and rayons where collaborations are created through partnerships between elected councils and local administration.⁸ The tandem between local council and the local administration seems to yield the highest level of political and financial support to CBA. Though in most regions councils and administrations are involved in a tripartite agreement with UNDP/CBA, there are instances when one of the partners tends to be less active.

Support structures

Current support arrangements established at the rayon and oblast level appear to be appropriate and effective for project coordination and steering. Oblast level coordinators⁹ and oblast CCs, together with rayon coordinators, RRCs (usually headed by rayon coordinators) and LDFs are instrumental in addressing issues related to the project and ensuring its smooth implementation (by facilitating the process or exercising power, depending on situations). These issues may range from providing technical and administrative support by different departments of local administration to securing budget financial contributions.

However, utilization of the structures established at the rayon and oblast level with the support of CBA is still limited to facilitating CBA implementation and their general impact of on overall development, development planning; participatory budgeting at these levels remains modest.

As long as these structures focus on CBA-specific issues and involve only CBA partner rayons and VCs/TCs, and deal with only a small share of public expenditure (co-funding of CBA), it is difficult to see their impact on wider decision-making and budgeting process. Moreover, in the context of deficient funds/capital investments available for local development (in the face of competing priorities, there is a risk of causing budget distortion by CBA. There are examples of rayons diverting their scarce resources to co-funding of diverse small community initiatives under CBA at the expense of addressing a larger priority problem. (*"The CBA approach is great for waking up the communities but it has limited impact on local development. If we'd had a chance to better concentrate the use of CBA funds and budgetary resources on comprehensively addressing one or two key problems in our rayon, instead of dispersing them to many small and not always complete community initiatives, the effect on rayon development could have been greater"*).

There are examples where these support structures develop their roles further on their own initiatives, like oblast CCs organizing their assemblies in the field, in order to better understand the situation on the ground, and the LDFs expanding their focus beyond CBA to include other "non-CBA" VCs in discussion of local development priorities and the CBA experiences. But these are rare examples.

RRCs are playing a crucial role in the CBA support system to communities. RRCs are very successful, and sustainability prospects of their work are greater where they are well established structurally/institutionalized. RRCs are formed in each rayon. According to internal CBA performance assessment of

⁸ Executive power of oblast and districts is exercised by local administrations and not by the executive set up by the councils. In other words, the oblast and rayon councils do not have their own executive committees, although they are allowed to establish structures and hire technical support for their work). This practice is not in line with the European standards of organization of local and regional government.

⁹ These are often representatives of departments that dealing with economic development and investments in case of partnerships with oblast administration, or local government committees in case of partnerships with the oblast councils.

RRCs, 80% of RRCs supported in CBA II are good and excellent. Effectiveness of RRCs depends to a large extent on enthusiasm and resourcefulness of individuals working in these centers (especially, given overall weak institutional capacity of the administrations and councils), but also on structural maturity of the centers.

RRCs have different affiliation and organizational forms. They are established either by rayon councils or rayon administration (often within the department related to economic and investments affairs with one person assigned to run RRC part-time). The most effective prove to be those that are established as separate structures and staff are assigned full-time with clear job descriptions. This happens mainly in cases of RRC under rayon councils that enjoy more flexibility in modifying their structural set up and staffing policy rather than rayon administrations. There is also a small number of RRCs that are established as communal enterprises or NGOs). (*“People constantly come to our Resource Center (also because it is so accessibly situated on the first floor, next to the most visited departments) and it would be difficult to split my working time between activities in the center and other tasks. An active center absorbs it all.”*)

The structurally better established a center is the more likelihood there seems of it expanding the mandate beyond CBA and working more widely with villages and community groups, thereby attracting other donors and resources.

During the survey conducted in the framework of the evaluation the RRCs effectiveness was assessed both by COs and RRCs themselves on 1 to 5 scale (where 5 is very high and 1 is very low). The assessment was rather high: 4.6 by COs and 4.1 by RRCs. The average number of people involved in RRC is 2.4; a person working in an RRC spends on average 38% of his/her working time on CBA and RCC related activities. According to RRCs staff, on average 50% of all COs in the rayon (both CBA and non-CBA) actively use their services.

Project national support structures steer project implantation but their role in facilitating project implementation at regional and national level is still underutilized. The interest of national level structures and key ministries (mainly Ministry of Regional Development and Construction, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, Ministry of Energy and Coal Industry, Ministry of Agricultural Policy, Ministry of Finance) whose mandate is relevant to CBA fields of activities to participate in the CBA SC and have a stake in the project is weakened by the fact that none of these ministries is officially a counterpart of the project (national “project beneficiary” in EU terminology). There are a number of challenges that the project is facing, starting with general financing and systematic payment delays by the Treasury office since 2012 and ending with sector-specific and regulatory issues that obstruct CBA implementation and remain unaddressed (for more on these issues in the section on Policy).

Community mobilization

Previous experience of collective action is an important asset in social mobilization of communities under CBA. Around one fifth of COs met during the course of the evaluation mission had previous experience of collective action and acting for the common good (setting up temporary gasification cooperatives, construction of water supply systems, resolving social infrastructure problems through co-funding in the framework of Ukrainian Social Investment Fund – USIF, maintaining village solidarity cashboxes).

Establishment of community organizations is an effective tool of community mobilization but effectiveness of these organizations beyond CBA is difficult to judge. Most COs formed legally with the support of CBA are registered as NGOs (94% COs participating in CBA II). The program also provides an opportunity for existing COs to adjust to the CBA requirements – so called “grafting” (17% of COs

participating in CBA II are “grafted”). In total, 576, 250 households (including 57% women) are listed as members of CBA I supported COs.

Although RRC maintain relations with most COs in their areas, the project does not systematically monitor the functioning of COs after completion of their micro-projects. The evaluation team encountered examples of both very active and rather passive COs. Typically, an active CO is able to mobilize further resources from different sources and conduct their own initiatives aimed at improving life in their communities, while passive COs often lack a vision of their role beyond a micro-project.

It is too early to assess sustainability of COs formed under CBA II (some of them are less than a year old). Clearly, COs that have had a chance to particulate in both CBA I and II are much more mature.

COs currently are very efficient in achieving the purpose of CBA, but efficiency of their overall functioning is yet to be seen. Efficiency of COs is mainly linked to their ability to draw on community solidarity, volunteerism and internal community resources, often fueled by the ability to produce quick and concrete results with the support of CBA. However, not all COs have the capacities and abilities to maintain their operations. There are also examples of COs that have to outsource certain functions such as reporting and bookkeeping (usually to RRC staff).

Also, COs thinking tend to be limited by the horizons of their communities and most of them are heavily reliant on RRC and CBA assistance (in particular in accessing information and funds). Small COs “with small thinking” have difficulty competing for funding aimed at more substantive development. The low quality of proposals received from the areas where CBA supported COs are active under the recent grant competition in the framework of the EU Regional Development Program from CBA supported COs supports this conclusion.

There is clearly potential for scaling up some aspects of COs functioning in order to increase their collective efficiency and role in local and regional development in the long term.

Wide population coverage and democratic governance and management of established COs is among their most valued assets and are an important provision for their future sustainability. However, their sustainability depends mainly on their leadership and resources mobilization capabilities. The project relied to a large extent on traditional leaders in the village (typically school headmasters, teachers, doctors, heads of cultural centers) but it also manages to raise new/alternative leaders in communities (from housewives, farmers, retired professionals, etc.). There are examples of community leaders moving to local government structures (a positive impact of the project discussed below) and COs, unable to reproduce new leaders, being “beheaded”.

There is a certain level of optimism in terms of the chances of COs to implement new projects (3.95 out of 5 as assessed by COs and 4.1 out of 5 as assessed by RRCs). About 45% of surveyed COs have experience of mobilizing resources for their project(s) outside CBA.

Social mobilization appears to be the domain of women. Community activists come from diverse backgrounds, depending on micro-project implemented, but the majority are women of middle and more senior age. This category of population clearly dominated in most of the meetings conducted within communities in the framework of the evaluation. This is partially explained by demographic situation but also by the fact that men often can not attend community meetings as they are at work. Involvement of men was in higher non-social infrastructure micro-projects (such as water supply or street lighting) and in activities that require more technical expertise (such as conducting tenders, inspecting construction, heavy labor inputs during micro-project related renovation activities). Involvement of youth was also limited to

children's participation in school repairs and young parents' involvement in the case of kindergarten-related projects.

Local capacity-building

Capacity-building of RRCs and COs is a very important investment in their effectiveness and maturity. CBA provides good quality technical assistance and methodological support to both partners – RRCs and COs through the production of manuals, trainings on main CBA components and advice/coaching throughout the process. This resulted in good understanding and the proper application of the CBA methodology in the field.

Training provided to CO members on various aspects of Cos' work, such as accounting, planning, MP preparation and implementation, Participatory Self-Assessment (PAS) and public audit is highly appreciated and its coverage is impressive (27,268 CO members trained in CBA I and 13,474 CO members trained in CBA II). Moreover, since the beginning of CBA II, 3,984 CBA staff and state\elected officials were trained in energy efficiency (total 3,079 people), economic component (total 1,275 people) and in methodology replication (2,388 people participated in the cluster training).

Production and dissemination of information and awareness-raising materials (printed materials on different aspects on CBA related work and especially video) is attested to be an important source by all partners.

System of monitoring performance of COs is in place but is not maintained beyond a project cycle. CBA invests intensively into COs capacity-building and has several tools for measuring their performance, such as PAS and maturity index. These tools are useful for identifying COs' strengths and weaknesses in relation to participation, leadership, governance, micro-project implementation, sustainability of a CO and its activities, coordination and linkage with local authorities and other development agencies. According to internal CBA assessment, performance of 75% of COs involved in CBA II is good or excellent. The self-assessment conducted by COs shows some improvement in organizational capacities of COs, their sustainability, ability of people to plan together and implement community projects. For instance, in ARC average COs organizational development assessment and sustainability of COs improved from 15 to 18, ability to plan jointly from 16 to 18 and to implement community projects from 16 to 17 (on the 20-grade scale). Similarly, in Mykolaiv average COs organizational development assessment grew from 13.5 to 16, sustainability of COs 15.5 to 16.5, ability to plan jointly from 15 to 16.5 and to implement community projects from 14 to 17 (on the 20-grade scale).¹⁰

However, application of these tools is limited to current partner COs (COs formed in CBA I and not participating in CBA II are not monitored). Assessment of current capacities of the former CBA partners is very difficult to make.

RRCs are gradually built into expertise centers but many are still limited in their technical base, and human capacities and abilities for resource mobilization beyond CBA. As discussed above, capacities of RRC differ and depend largely on the commitment of local partners and the level of their structural maturity. RRC abilities to provide effective support to communities also depend on their technical base. Not all of them have adequate equipment (own computer, printer, access to a multifunctional printer, photo cameras, etc.).

Competition for the "Best RRC" awards conducted among the centers boost boosted their development. In 2012, 180 rayons participated in the competition (140 from the main quota and 40 from the replication

¹⁰ Results of PAS rating compiled by the evaluation team for the two regions.

scheme) and 73 won a grant of up to USD1,000 for improving their technical base. The competition push many to go the extra mile in organizing their space and work (*“Our Resource Center won the competition largely thanks to the fact that administration with the support of private sponsors renovated the room of the center and provided basic equipment”.*)

CBA does not monitor sustainability of RRC established under CBA I from those rayons not included in CBA II.

Peer exchange proves to be one of the most effective and welcome ways of learning among the CBA partners. This extends to both communities and local governments. Although peer exchange has been supported by CBA on particular occasions (seminars and trainings across communities, rayons and oblasts, and exchange visits), it is increasingly taking place without CBA support (where Internet and social networks play an important role). There are multiple examples of mature COs (mainly those that have been through CBA I and CBA II) that provide consultations to peers in their regions on different issues related to COs management and micro-project implementation.

Micro-project support

Relatively high micro-project implementation efficiency is achieved through good standardization of project implementation procedures. Micro-project implementation draws on well-elaborated procedures linked to the establishment of functional groups, identification of priority projects, project preparation and implementation (including tender, quality supervision and financing schemes) and transfer of assets to an owner of infrastructure.

Specifically, the practice of conducting tender by COs is being praised as it allows maximization of community in-kind/labor inputs, and the savings are used for increasing the number of completed works. The standard practice of conducting a public audit upon completion of a micro-project secures transparency and accountability.

Inefficiencies in the process in the course of CBA implementation identified by the evaluation team occurred mainly due to:

- lengthy process of micro-project documentation preparation (also because of the regulatory changes related to construction and licenses, delays in obtaining permits);
- complexity of UNDP tender and reporting procedures in the context of a lack of COs capacities (however, justified by the learning effect and high quality of micro-projects implementation);
- delays in the tender process, due to a lack of adequate bidders and occasional conflict during contract negotiations;
- problems with local co-funding (delays in release of funds by the Treasury). Good relations between COs and contractors often allow continued construction in the absence of funding but at the expense of exhaustion of contractors' own working capital.

Another efficiency-related issue is CBA inflexibility in applying a three-tranche approach in release of CBA funds. This minimizes risks of funds misuse but generates excessive reporting and in some cases the first tranche does not allow meaningful completion of the first micro-project stage. Often this occurs in energy efficiency projects where expensive equipment needs to be purchased at the initial stage.

Micro-projects are very effective in producing desired results. There are multiple mentions of positive effects of micro-projects implementation by community residents:

- In the case of water supply projects – improved access to safe drinking water, easier family care, health improvements and lessening the burden on women;
- In the case of health outposts projects – improved access to basic health services (especially for the elderly, children and pregnant women), improved working conditions, ability to employ extra people from the settlement;
- In the case of kindergartens and schools – improved temperature, less respiratory disease among children and teachers, less child sick leave for parents, improved child attendance, better working conditions, reduced energy consumption, and even extension of coverage;
- In the case of street light projects – improved sense of personal security, more active social life in the evenings (especially among the elderly and youth), fewer accidents and petty criminality.

Communities' financial participation in micro-projects boosts their sense of responsibility and increases prospects for sustainable operation and maintenance of the established or improved infrastructure.

The share of CBA funding has slightly decreased from average 46.5% in CBA-I to 38% in CBA-II. The shares of local budgets and COs increased and reached 70% and 10.5% in the replication component, to 49% and 7.7% in the main component, to 43.5% and 10.1% in the energy efficiency component and 10.5% and 22.7% in the rural economic development component, respectively.

The share of private sponsors in total CBA project has slightly grown: from 1.3% in CBA I to 1.7% in CBA II. It is the highest in the energy efficiency projects (2.2%) and in the rural economic development initiatives. However, private contributions are hindered by the reluctance of private companies to “declare” their financial involvement and thus avoid the attention of the tax administration.

Although CBA does not always target the most urgent priorities it serves the purpose of providing the community with a tool for mobilization and solving its problems. Thematic and funding limitations sometimes forces COs to pick up a secondary or tertiary problem of their community. Prior to identifying a project for CBA, the COs draw a list of priority community infrastructure problems (so-called Community Development Plan). Priorities are weighed against such key criteria as intensity of need (or number of people that benefit from the project) and sustainability perspective, but the third criteria – feasibility to solve the problem by community (often linked to resources) – overrides the other. However, the projects aim at “*providing communities with rods and not the fish*”. There are examples where communities, inspired by their ability to resolve a problem, were able to mobilize resources and tackle other priority issues.

In the survey conducted during the evaluation, among their three top pending priority projects the COs mentioned: schools - 18%, kindergartens - 14% and health posts - 13%. The bottom three priorities were cooperatives and sport facilities - 2% each and gasification - 4%.

Multiple examples of retrospective adjustment to the rayon development programs, and plans to accommodate community priorities defined in the CBA process, and to allow budget co-funding reveals that the practice of participatory planning and budgeting is not yet widely spread. The tension between planning from above and a number of competing community priorities from below exists in all rayons, especially those that face a deficit in funding. An extreme example to demonstrate this tension is the case where rayon authorities tried to rationalize school infrastructure by cutting down on schools with low pupil numbers and organizing bussing services for them to larger schools. The community wants to preserve the

school at any cost, putting forward a project for its renovation¹¹. Fortunately, CBA has managed to avoid supporting such cases – if such proposals occur communities are able to choose another micro-project.

Potential tension between planning from below and above exists in the economic domain, where the authorities would like to see investments into spheres in which the region has economic and growth potential – a vision that communities may not necessarily have on their radar. This risk also exists in some communal services like waste management, where preferences of communities may not necessarily coincide with the spatial plans and locations of waste landfills. Fine-tuning between the two levels of planning is a complicated process and this practice needs time to evolve. The project is testing a methodology for participatory planning from below in Luhansk region, but it is too early to assess the results of this experiment.

CBA has had an impressive impact on both communities and local authorities. This impact is not captured through the project M&E system but among the effects mentioned by most of the partners are:

- Community self-confidence (this effect was captured also by the sociological survey commissioned by the project at the end of CBA I in 2011);
- Improvement of technical skills (learning project cycle management skills, proper tender procedures, etc.);
- Improved trust and cooperation between communities (also across generations) and local authorities, better mutual understanding (including understanding by citizens of the constraints faced by local authorities in investing and maintaining basic services);
- Transparent and accountable management of funds;
- Improved solidarity and social climate in communities, social trust and reciprocity;
- Improved community responsibility in maintaining and improving its infrastructure and environment;
- Growth of solidarity between generations;
- Emergence of new and/or alternative leaders, as well as their transformation into local government;
- Popularization of new technology, like plastic windows, energy efficiency equipment;
- Capacity-building of contracted companies.

A survey on social capital conducted in the Sumy region by Sumy University in early 2013 on their own initiative registered in particular the impact on community traditions, communication and exchange, empowerment and political action, anti-paternalism, level of trust, solidarity and inclusion, general norms, collective action and cooperation, etc. (*“I call CBA “a project of Believe, Hope and Love” as the project helped people to believe in themselves, gave them hope and now they love and care for the improvements they made in their communities”*).

Remarkably, people perception of quality of life has been growing, according to self-assessment conducted among COs (from 10 to 11 on average in ARC and from 12 to 14 in Mykolaiv based on 20-grade scale).¹²

¹¹ By the law a school cannot be closed without agreement of the community

¹² Results of PAS rating compiled by the evaluation team for the two regions.

Sustainability of most infrastructures established or improved as a result of micro-projects is secured. It is more difficult to ensure sustainability in cases of communal infrastructure projects that imply paid services/a need to introduce tariffs (such as water supply or waste collection and disposal) or cooperatives (discussed later in the report).

CBA pays careful attention to the issues of maintenance and sustainability of micro-projects already at the planning stage; explanation of further maintenance of CBA supported infrastructure is a part of micro-project proposal. As a part of the sustainability plan, all assets are properly handed over to relevant owners. A few COs establish Community Development Funds (CDF) to further support small repairs in their renovated schools, kindergartens, and replace burned lamps on the streets, but their ability to maintain this fund systematically is hindered by regulatory limitations on NGOs abilities to accumulate funds.

The model of service management in some of the water projects visited by the evaluation team needs further thought.. In some cases the communities are not aware of existing management options; neither have they the capacity to assess which management option is most suitable to their water supply system (related to type of water supply, number of users, costs of water, etc.). In other cases tariffs for water are set at a rather low level without consideration of full cost-recovery. Also, management of water supply and collection of water fees by a COs is not a sustainable solution – being NGOs, they are not allowed to provide paid services and accumulate income.

Methodology replication

The replication scheme is in demand among better off rayons and communities. To get into the replication scheme, rayons and VCs/TCs must go through the same selection procedure, although priority by the project is given to new (“non-CBA”) rayons, VCs/TCs and those from the CBA-II reserve list. The difference in local co-financing (local/rayon/regional authority – 70%, CBA Project – 25% (max USD 2,600) and community – 5%) implies a higher reliance on local partners’ abilities to mobilize resources. As budgetary funding increases, the leverage of local authorities in selecting projects grows. At the same time the risk of non-compliance with the financial commitment also increases (the dropout out rate in the replication scheme is slightly higher than in the main quota). In CBA II the replication micro-projects have been focusing on the following: health posts– 13%, energy saving – 79%, water supply – 7%, environment – 1%. The concentration of the replication micro-projects varied across regions: 20 out 25 regions participated in replication, with 7 regions accounting for 50% of all replication projects.

Rural economic development¹³

Rural economic development

CBA support in creating ASC is very timely and highly relevant in the context of rural development in Ukraine. The project assists communities in creating ASCs to promote rural economic development. The project views service cooperatives as an instrument to mobilize poor households and realize local development potential. Communities choose those types of services for cooperatives that are relevant to the majority of households: for example, plowing of land, selling milk, meat, purchasing inputs (seeds, chemicals) or delivering products to the final consumers, among others.

¹³ The material in this section is also based on evidence collected from field visits conducted within the 2013 UNDP evaluation of CBA rural economic development component.

The development of ASCs reflects both the needs of the local communities and the policy development priorities. Poor employment and income opportunities are the main problem in most rural communities. The majority of the interviewed communities and local authority representatives expressed their great wish to see this component of CBA expanded in their areas. In their view, resolution of the employment and income problem would lead to a greater improved ability of the rural population to solve other problems, including improving and sustaining social infrastructure. There are expectations that ASCs would prevent youth migration from rural areas.

There are early signs of success in the functioning of ASCs established under CBA II but it is too early to judge their effectiveness is still too preliminary. In the framework of the evaluation some of the 15 communities in 8 regions (Cherkasy, Chernivtsy, Dnipropetrovsk, Donetsk, Mykolaiv, Kirovohrad, Sumy and Ternopil oblasts) have been through the process of establishing the cooperatives. Those communities that have already registered cooperatives have barely started to use the equipment. Some initial evidence indicates success of ASC operations. For example, according to the results of one of the ASCs in Mykolaiv oblast, the total cost of service rendered over several months has reached about 8,000 UAH (which greatly exceeds expectations).

Overall, it is still too early to form any conclusions on the impact of the pilot ACSs, as they are still at the initial stage of their development. The payback period for most CBA ASCs (as defined in the business plans) is 2-5 years, so their economic and social effects will to be monitored over a period of several years.

It remains to be seen how effective is the CBA approach is in targeting the poor and reaching the 80% coverage through ASCs. The CBA community mobilization approach in creating ASCs will have to be assessed after some period of time after, once the cooperatives start their operations.

In choosing target households the CBA has applied the self-easements survey which identifies those who are willing to participate in the ASC and those who are eligible (poor and middle income households). Most of the communities tend to agree with the CBA targeting approach. Some suggested lifting up the requirements to allow membership to all willing households and entities.

There is evidence that it is hard to reach all target households at the initial stage of registration of the ASC. The ASC members comprise about 10-40% of all households in the community, which is less than the project target of 80%. However, there is a trend for membership growth, especially, once the ASCs start operations (e.g. a tractor is bought).

The households hesitate to participate in the ASCs because of the following reasons:

- *ASC risks are perceived as being higher than the returns.* The level of trust in ASCs is somewhat lower than in the case of other CBA initiatives. Firstly, there are real failure risks of the venture, and secondly, the benefits to the community and ASC members are less tangible and their realization takes prolonged in time (unlike in energy saving projects).
- *The membership contribution is significant.* The financial contribution required from the households varies, depending on the number of ASC members (the bigger the membership, the less is the contribution). It is not uncommon, however, that at the initial stage the contribution can be as high as UAH 1,000 per one household. In some cases, the ASC leadership has allowed the poor households to make the payment in several tranches. However, in some communities, this option was not foreseen and some willing but poor households were not able to participate.
- *Some poor households are not capable of utilizing ASC opportunities.* Some households are not capable to utilize the ASC benefits: the elderly (old age persons, relying solely on pensions and payments from leasing their land and having little excess products to sell), socially marginalized groups

(e.g. people addicted to alcohol). It is difficult to assess the share of such households as it varies from community to community.

- *The major activity of ASC is not relevant to target households.* Some households are not involved in the ASC type of business activity (e.g. have no cows in the case of the ASC focusing on the milk trade or they have a very small land plot, not requiring mechanized plowing). This is not a major barrier, however, as the CBA ASCs are multi-functional (*“Our cooperative is now dealing with milk and meat but with time it can help me to market and sell my dried apples and other fruit.”*)

Financially, there are high-entry costs for households, given that the financial contribution is 15% of the total budget (the other 70% and 15% are provided by CBA and local authorities respectively). While there is clear evidence that local communities face difficulties when raising the funds, this problem becomes manageable once the size of ASC membership grows.

On the other hand, there are also valid reasons to limit ASC membership at the initial stage, given the financial limitations of the CBA grant and, thus limiting the capacity for the ASC to provide services to all members (*“We have to see how far we can expand our membership. At the moment one tractor we bought is hardly sufficient to plow the plots of all cooperative members. We do not want to create conflicts among members”*).

The eligibility criteria for (poor) households imposed by CBA could be difficult to sustain. The Ukrainian legislation does not limit membership of households based on their income level, while the legal entities are allowed to join the ASCs. At the current stage of ASC activity rich households are not interested in participating in ASCs, as since the cooperatives do not yet have many resources or enough scale of operation to attract them. But as the cooperatives develop, the risk of cooption may increase.

The project has correctly identified the availability of local capacity as a prerequisite for partnering with the community. The availability of skilled persons with financial and technical backgrounds is crucial for sustaining ASC activities. ASC leadership is comprised of people with prior experience in a similar role (e.g., an accountant in a state collective farm) and people with flexible or part-time work schedule (public sector employees).

The ASC component has the potential to better mobilize the men and youth part of the rural population, and this does not seem to be done to the exclusion the expense of women. The economic component, since it has potential to generate employment and income attracts the male population (men are traditionally seen as the family bread winners). The ASC functional group appears to be generally gender balanced, while the leadership tends to be slightly dominated by males (60-70%). As in other CBA components the involvement of young people (20-40 yrs category) is relatively low, though in selected communities, their proportion is quite high.

The social and economic vision of the cooperatives and their performance criteria are not yet well defined. In terms of the vision of the cooperatives` future there is a certain tension exists between their social role (supporting the livelihoods of poor) and economic potential (generating employment and income).

There is a need to clarify and closely monitor the expectations (both social and economic) levied on the cooperatives. According to the ASC business plans, it is expected that CBA will lead to the following benefits:

- Job-creation. Most of ASC would create two or three jobs: one of an accountant and one of an ASC director, although receiving a minimum wage of about UAH 1000 per month. Most ASC would pro-

vide part-time employment (e.g., a tractor driver). Some ASCs plan to engage an accountant on a voluntary basis at the initial stage due to the shortages of working capital.

- Savings. The difference between the market price of the service and the cost of ASC service for its members is expected to be in the range of 10-30%.
- Higher productivity. It is expected that some of the ASC services will help increase production yields of ASC members by providing them with better seeds, better livestock or due to timely plowing and better agricultural techniques. Communities plan to achieve economies of scale by combining their efforts and using the advantages of specialization (focusing on a certain type of economic activity).
- Mitigating the problem of income disparity. The CBA project makes a considerable effort to engage poor households in the ASC activities.
- Boosting the development of the rural economy. A number of village council heads and ASC leaders have a clear vision of how ASC activity might increase transparency of local business transactions, monetize the largely virtual rural economy and establish horizontal and vertical links among economic agents in the community.

Some CBA ASCs that are trying to maximize on income possibilities are already facing risks. The first risk is providing services to non-members in order to increase revenues. This appears to be happening in one of the CBA ASCs. Such practices violate the legal status of the ASC and may result in the ASC losing its non-profit status. In many cases the tax administration (Ministry of revenues and fees) exerts constant pressure on ASCs to start paying taxes (by changing their status).

The establishment of a cooperative and the purchasing assets necessary for its functioning (basically, completion of CBA micro-project in technical terms) leads to new challenges for the community. This implies a need for intensive technical support in the future. This capacity-building need ranges from technical assistance in the ASC specialization areas to more universal areas like management, marketing and bookkeeping.

Another risk is linked with the high administrative burden placed on the one or two individuals in charge of ASC management and finances. The capacity for implementing the accounting function is particularly quite low, and there is very little potential to outsource. This is true for some ASCs. People with the professional backgrounds tend to either to work in towns or be of pension age. This risk is currently mitigated by extensive support from CBA and the RRCs side.

Success in the development of ASCs is largely dependent on adequate support for infrastructure and basic regulatory environment. The government program to support agricultural cooperatives is in place and provides a number of incentives, a major one being the tax exemption for the non-profit ASCs. However, since the state supported infrastructure is still not available on a continuous basis, especially at the local level, this presents a major risk to ASC sustainability:

- State financial support is not sufficient and not regular. There was no government funding available for ASC in 2011 and the one disbursed in 2012 (or in previous years) was provided in a non-systematic way.
- Constant changes of ASC legislation confuse the stakeholders. For instance, it is very difficult for existing ASCs to apply the new amendments in the legislation to utilize the benefits of non-profit status. A number of CBA ASCs faced significant opposition from the tax administration during the registration process.
- Support at the local level is quite limited. Rayon government programmers on ASC development are usually provided ad hoc to support only the ASC created by the CBA.

- Regulatory support of ASC is not settled. The regional network of advisory services is weak (with some exceptions) and the ASC Union is just emerging, with limited resources.
- ASCs face barriers in reaching final consumers. Those ASCs willing to reach cities or wholesale buyers would face fierce competition from larger businesses. ASCs will face further difficulties, given high certification costs and the relatively short shelf life of their (organic) products.

CBA was successful in registering the pilot ASCs despite significant difficulties encountered by the project. This was due to low awareness of the ASC concept among local authorities, communities, tax administration, and because of changing legislation on cooperatives. The project managed to overcome the registration challenges of almost all cooperatives on an individual basis, but the issue does not appear to be resolved at the system level.

The CBA project provides good quality manuals that cover the major needs (financial, organizational) the ASCs might have. The project has begun to provide the ASCs with the services of short term consultants (finance, taxation) on an ad hoc basis, which is welcomed by the communities.

Local authorities appear to be confused about the role of supporting the agricultural sector in general and cooperatives in particular, as they still lack know-how for securing support services for the private sector under free market conditions. This is because the members of the CBA oblast and rayon resource centers usually come from the economic departments and are not experts in the ASC area, or they face certain communication difficulties with their colleagues from agricultural departments.

The major ASC activity type has been chosen in accordance with the priorities of the local communities. Multi-activity ASCs and those having vertical linkages are likely to have more advantages compared to more simple types of ASCs. For example, an ASC involved in the milk-selling activity plan to provide services for improving a breed of the cattle, resulting in increased milk yields in the future. Linking the cooperatives with the relevant value chains that have potential in the context of particular regions remains to be a challenge.

CBA efforts in supporting ASCs are still somewhat isolated from the overall ASC movement in Ukraine.

According to the ASCs Union, there are about 1,000 ASCs registered in Ukraine and this number is growing rapidly. The Association is very interested in cooperating with CBA in the future in order to provide more systematic support to this movement. There are still few ASC success stories and the overall number of ASC is quite low.

This domain is not crowded with technical assistance in Ukraine (USAID and Heifer are also active in this). Demand for cooperatives will increase with the introduction of EU requirements pertaining to rural production by households (this concern was brought up by villagers during the evaluation meetings).

Energy efficiency component

The EE component of CBA is in high demand but its effective implementation requires a high level of awareness and intensive capacity- building inputs. The CBA EE aims – that of increasing the share of renewable energy (RE) in the energy mix and application of more energy-efficient technologies – are highly relevant for rural development in Ukraine. Local authorities appear to generally prefer CBA energy efficiency projects to energy saving projects (which largely focus on relatively simple measures like replacing old windows in buildings). Rayon and oblast administrations perceive the EE component as having a higher value added, particularly because of the potential linkages with local producers of energy- efficient equipment, and because of decreased gas consumption, which is being replaced by renewable sources of energy.

The CBA project clearly defines the needs to be addressed: lack of awareness of energy- efficient technologies and renewable energy, and the lack of relevant skills to use energy in a sustainable way. The total project budget for the energy efficiency component is USD 3,650,000 and it is to be spent on:

- Developing energy efficiency strategies in 6 selected oblasts.
- Providing seed grants for implementation of 300 micro-projects.
- Establishing an institutional mechanism (for joint decision and collective actions)
- Providing training, roundtables, workshops and exposure visits for raising awareness and skills.

The very reason that EE projects are more difficult to implement than energy saving projects is also why the end result in greater capacity-building and learning of communities and authorities. Communities have learned how to obtain permits from regulatory authorities both at the local and national level; they know how to communicate with national monopolists (regional electricity distribution companies), and they know how to choose between different technological solutions. Local authorities in the 6 regions with advanced piloting were trained to develop regional efficiency strategies that have a greater local focus and level of detail. The EE projects therefore have led to a greater level of interaction and cooperation between communities and authorities.

It is, however, difficult to assess the extent to which the local capacity has been built and whether that capacity will lead to replication of the CBA experience. There are numerous output indicators available (e.g., the number of trainings and seminars conducted), but not many outcome indicators are available. During the interviews, it was clear that the awareness level of CO representatives and local authorities regarding the legal requirements and EE and RE technologies had increased. However, there is an impression that communities have little optimism regarding the possibility of replicating the EE experience in the future, given the difficulties they faced when overcoming regulatory barriers.

Generally, unlike the energy saving projects, EE projects are more challenging, as they require: 1) more time for obtaining permits and making audits, 2) greater funding (existing CBA budget limit is barely sufficient in some cases), 3) greater engagement of national level authorities (e.g., approvals by the State Agency for Energy Efficiency).

CBA assistance to regional authorities to develop EE Strategies is important, given the national energy efficiency program, but their implementation remains a challenge. CBA assistance to develop energy strategies increases the capacity of regional authorities to implement the national energy efficiency program and the National Energy Efficiency Action Plan, which have been developed according to the requirement of the European Energy Community. The project has assisted several regions in the expansion of their Energy Efficiency Strategies. However, financial and technical capacities of local authorities to implement the strategies and their link to CBA- supported micro-projects are yet to be secured. For example, many CBA EE projects fail to secure co-funding through the national or regional energy efficiency programs (despite the CBA requirement for regions to have relevant programs and budgets in place). The strategies and proposals to energy efficiency strategies that the CBA project helped to develop for the 6 regions are of varying quality, and their usefulness is difficult to assess.

The micro-projects are able to raise awareness and demonstrate an impact on efficient energy use.

Significant financial savings have been achieved by most projects:

- Replacing boilers in schools and kindergartens has led to less fuel being burned, or more expensive fuel (gas) being replaced by cheaper and locally produced ones (biomass or solar). This in turn results in energy bill savings, and, according to provided evidence, up to 40-50%. Since the old boilers

tend to be left in operation, the combination of regular energy supply with that of renewable energy creates an additional reserve capacity increasing energy security.

- Installing energy-efficient (LED) lighting and or solar-based lighting makes commuting in the area possible and safe at night.
- When EE is accompanied with energy saving measures (which often takes place), the temperature is back to normalized in the modernized buildings. This leads to a higher attendance rate at schools and kindergartens, fewer sickness absences and thus allowing parents more time for work.

Preparation of EE passports enables local communities and authorities to improve the management of social infrastructure. EE passports provide sufficient data to make evidence-based investment and maintenance decisions. The COs and VCs are well aware of energy saving effects and potential efficiency effects. CBA expects that this data would be used to measure the return of investment made by the Project for raising energy efficiency, and to compare energy saving performances of different technologies, but the evaluation mission has not yet supplied come across this information.

Often EE micro-projects have more of a technological demonstration and social mobilization value but are not necessarily justified from a cost-benefit perspective. CBA supports a wide range of innovative and renewable energy solutions, but communities tend to focus on few technologies: LED street lighting, photovoltaic modules and systems, solar collectors and pyrolysis boilers, whereas wind energy, hydro energy and biogas are not in demand. The choice of certain EE project types is largely determined by the economic rationale.

The project has clear guidelines and strong technical assistance on EE project implementation, which enables communities to choose among the available options, finalize the project, and properly manage innovative equipment (boilers, solar systems etc). EE projects tend to require a greater level of engagement when compared to energy saving projects:

- 1) More time needed for obtaining permits also from the national level authorities (e.g., approvals by the State Agency for Energy Efficiency) and making costly audits.
- 2) Greater funding requirements, given the complexity of technological solutions (the existing CBA budget limit is barely sufficient in some cases).

Some EE projects have limited value for money. Local communities voiced the following specific concerns:

- *Costly maintenance of renewable energy systems.* The solar modules require expensive accumulators that are in turn quite vulnerable to irregular regimes of operation. There is a high risks of the life cycle of accumulators being reduced to only 3-4 years (instead of the planned 8-10 yrs) when exposed to low temperatures (in winter), or when the charge level is below the norm because of limited solar insolation (also in winter). The fact that conventional street lighting systems have higher energy costs compared to the “free” solar supply does not appears to compensate for expected high maintenance costs of the solar system. Solar systems also require additional costs because of regulatory barriers: communities cannot use the existing electricity line poles and have to raise new poles to install the solar modules. Finally, communities cannot benefit from the major mechanism, feed-in prices, used for supporting renewable energy development. This makes renewable energy projects economically much less attractive, given that electricity prices for consumers in rural areas are kept at quite a low level.
- *Risks of accusations of mismanagement of public funds.* Limited solar insolation in some regions of the country also could also result in performance failures of the lighting system, which could lead to government authorities accusing the local council of mismanagement of public funds.

- *Limited coverage and number of beneficiaries.* Solar based LED lighting systems have up to four times less coverage in term of the number of lamps and rural territory covered, when compared to than conventional street lighting (using regional electricity power lines). This makes it more difficult to explain the choice of the project to members of the community, especially to those who could have benefitted from applying a different solution for the same amount of money.

The above concerns are mostly relevant to photovoltaic systems, although there is some evidence, mostly from non-CBA experience, that the efficiency of pyrolysis boilers is sensitive to the mode of operation and type of fuel used. In other words, renewable and innovative energy supply projects have very high maintenance requirements, which is hard to meet by the local communities find hard to meet. Yet this is exactly the reason why CBA supports technologically demanding projects in the first place: to increase local capacity and awareness.

Communities do choose such “difficult” projects and they do it for a number of reasons. Firstly, a high share of CBA contribution increases the economic appeal of the project. Secondly, other more preferred project types (e.g., installing pyrolysis boilers) either require funding, which greatly exceeds the CBA budget limit, or those improvements have been already implemented. Thirdly, some communities choose solar street lighting systems because there are significant regulatory constraints to reconnect to the centralized electricity power line.

There is sometimes a dilemma faced by local authorities between achieving the best value for money and a desire to support local producers of energy-efficient and innovative equipment/technology. There is a risk of greater pressure being exerted on local communities to choose locally produced equipment, which might have an adverse impact on the effectiveness of future tender procedures and system performance. However, if the local government provides financial stimuli to communities to purchase the equipment of its choice, this may reduce the magnitude of possible negative outcomes.

Potential for EE projects replication is limited unless a supporting environment is created. The evidence indicates that achieving sustainable energy efficiency faces a number of hindrances:

- Systematic solutions to regulatory and other barriers at the local level have not been found. Solutions to accessing regional electricity network or obtaining a permit from SAEE in a timely way are found on a case- by- case basis. It seems unlikely that the communities will be able to replicate CBA EE projects on their own (unless they commit more time and financial resources).
- The policy climate environment for energy efficiency and renewable policy projects is not favorable, due to low energy prices and the feed-in prices for renewable energy being non- applicable to small scale producers.
- There is evidence from non-CBA experiences that innovative energy- efficient or renewable energy equipment is not maintained properly because of low technical and management capacity, thus, reducing its effectiveness.

Knowledge management

Cooperation with UADRC has a strong potential for dissemination of CBA-generated knowledge and for addressing wider local governance concerns. Collaboration between CBA and the UADRC is a strategic element of the project’s management knowledge concept. UADRC has a great potential to strengthen links to its constituencies through legislative and lobbying activities, serving as a platform for discussion of different issues\ laws\ reforms, as well as becoming a resource center for the provision of information, expertise and advice on local governance issues. The knowledge management hub/web portal established

in 2012 under the auspices of the Association with the support of CBA is an important resource that is in high demand.¹⁴ Currently, the portal has more than 600 registered users and 4 functioning discussion groups. Daily site attendance reaches 500 users on average. By the end of the year all partner Universities will be connected to the portal and more than 400 representatives of rayon and oblast governments will be trained to use this knowledge resource.

Securing outreach and sustainability of the knowledge web platform is a challenge that still lies ahead.

There are a number of elements in place already that help to secure sustainability of the web platform, including appropriate institutional anchoring at UADRC, a clear vision of the Association leadership with regards to what the portal should be and how it can further develop, the cost sharing of UADRC (19%), reliance on local experts and moderators, and certification of experts.

However, financial sustainability of the knowledge hub is hindered by several factors, including the inability of the Association to adequately stimulate the local experts supporting the Association and knowledge platform users (consulting, moderation of discussion forums, etc.), and the inability of the Association to generate income (currently prohibited by the Law regulating the work of the associations). The inclusion and participation of smaller VCs/TCs is also an issue: quite a few VCs visited in the framework of the evaluation still do not have easy access to the Internet. Cooperation with the Ukrainian Association of VCs is not yet well established and their role in current knowledge management set-up is not yet clear.

Cooperation with Universities opens multiple win-win opportunities that can be further deepened.

Partnership established between CBA and a network of 20 universities in the area of extra-curricular teaching course on sustainable development, CBA students' internship, research and generally promoting the idea of sustainable development (through organization of Sustainable Development Days, inter-regional debates, academic summer school, etc.) provides the project with an opportunity to disseminate important development messages among youth, to attract the attention of the academic community to the development agenda, and also to give students and researchers access to practical experience in rural development.

CBA provides a wide range of research possibilities that are being accessed by students: the students' research competition revealed a broad spectrum of interests in studying the CBA experience. However, so far, examples of applied research work in relation to CBA or research that can have utility for CBA are limited (the best one is research on CBA impact on social capital conducted by Sumy University).

Cooperation with the institutions providing training for public servants started at the regional level through involvement of regional coordinators and some CBA experts in training activities of these institutions, but it is not well advanced. Bringing community and rural sustainable development into training for local government practitioners is a challenge that lies ahead.

CBA engagement in wider knowledge-sharing is an additional channel for promoting the approach regionally. This is being done primarily through exchange with other UNDP programs (such as the ones in Belarus and Armenia) and through facilitating access to CBA experience by international journalists.

Policy level

Through cooperation with UADRC, CBA is cementing the ground for a strategically important partnership.

Partnership with UADRA is seen as instrumental in advocating policy and regulatory level changes supporting local sustainable development. The project assisted the Association in drafting the Law on Bodies of Self-Organization of Population and continues supporting its activities aimed at advancing the

¹⁴ <http://rozvytok.in.ua/>

local governance reform. In addition, CBA provided expert support to the review of eight laws elaborated during 2013 that were discussed at regional roundtables organized by UADRC and on a website.

Project potential to influence directly policy and regulatory environment is still underutilized. This is partly due to a lack of direct partnership with key line ministries (as mentioned earlier in the report) and inadequate attention to analytical work (producing and disseminating deeper critical analysis of key issues that hinder sustainable local development based on experience of CBA).

Project management

CBA is implemented by a very capable team of people but they are working under difficult conditions.

Both at the level of project management and in the field the evaluation mission mostly met extremely dedicated and experienced professionals. There is continuity in staff – many staff members keep the institutional memory from CBA I. But the speed of CBA implementation and the heavy workload generate excessive stress, which is especially felt at the level of regional coordinators. Among the main concerns is overworking: long hours, intensive travel, uneven distribution of tasks – in some regions there is only one coordinator, doing the work meant for two without any compensation.

Accelerated speed of CBA II implementation is associated with certain efficiency and effectiveness gains, but compromises the project capacity-building objectives. Packaging of CBA in two years instead of four, as initially planned, has certainly led to minimization of management costs/overhead. Quick delivery of concrete results (micro-projects) has allowed maximizing on the momentum in the communities. However, the delivery rush compromises capacity-building of partners. As a result, regional coordinators have less time left for capacity-building and, sometimes in order to speed up the process, they have to step in carrying out some tasks for communities and RRCs, thereby reducing their learning opportunities. If the ability of CBA III to support the maturity of only recently established COs under CBA II is not guaranteed, CBA II runs the risk of producing a large number of immature COs.

The project clearly faces a dilemma between investment into further staff capacity-building and outsourcing of narrow expertise. Limited abilities of project staff to draw on narrow expertise was especially felt in the area of energy efficiency (in relation to choosing best technology, economic expediency) and economic development (in relation to establishment and functioning of ASCs. For instance, short-term national energy experts were involved primarily in the elaboration of Regional Energy Strategies and (recently) in financial assistance to ASCs but systematic support to regional coordinators on EE and ASCs issues generated at the level of micro-projects is badly needed.

Visibility

The project is less visible among non-partners and at the national level. Specifically, there appears to be inadequate knowledge about the project among the donor community. This is possibly due to the lack of activity in terms of active coordination and formal exchange (e.g. in the form of systematic meetings) between the key donors contributing to local governance and regional/local development in Ukraine. Project coverage at the national level is weak (and hence the outreach to “non-CBA” rayons) but there is a strong potential for growing publicity through the use of the knowledge hub that targets the right audience – councils and other local governments bodies at rayons, town and village level.

The role of EU as the main funder of the project, and UNDP as implementer, is known among partners at all levels. This was obvious from conversations and meetings held during the evaluation at all levels.

Analysis of the media reports revealed a high level of awareness and recognition in relation to EU contribution to the project.

The project has clear visibility guidelines that are respected. The project effectively follows guidelines related to the use of corporate identity (CBA logo, UNDP and EU logos). Overall, CBA attends equally to the visibility of both EU and UNDP during the organization of events, publications, etc. All project sites are accompanied by project passports clearly indicating contributions of both organisations (which is an obligatory condition for the completion of every project).

Media coverage of CBA at the local level is extensive but the message content is poor. Content analysis of media clips (compilation of printed and Internet publications that is well organized by regions) conducted by the evaluation team showed that most publications report on events (signing of CBA agreements, launching meetings, training workshops, completion of micro-projects/ “cutting the ribbon” ceremony, etc.), but very few publications convey the message or communicate the values that CBA is trying to promote.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations

Based on the evaluation findings, conclusions and CBA lessons learned, the evaluation mission makes the following recommendations:

General Strategy

- CBA III should **establish a more binding partnership with the key line Ministries** that would ensure their closer follow-up on CBA achievements, outcomes and challenges, as well as providing the project with an opportunity to more directly inform national decision-making, and feed project experience into national level policy and regulatory work.
- **Preserve the existing competition-based approach to rayons and VCs\TCs selection.** The Ministry of Economy that is responsible for regional development and monitoring of the socio-economic development status of administrative territories can be more actively involved with the partner selection process in the future.
- **Allow participation of small towns** in CBA III (with the population up to 50,000) that face similar small and social infrastructure problems as the rural settlements.
- The evaluation mission suggests **revisiting the idea of including focus on condominiums into CBA III**, which is new for the project and is associated with a number of serious risks (discussed above).
- To achieve greater effect, sustainability and visibility of CBA, to **foresee “profiling of oblasts”** (allowing “specialization” in different components of CBA III – e.g., on energy efficiency, rural economic development (ASCs), municipal development and support to condominiums (if CBA decided to pursue this component). Profiling of oblasts can be based on the willingness of oblasts and rayons to advance in a particular area, of their actual needs in these areas, and of the assessment of those support systems in place. This approach will allow CBA III to:

- Go beyond the support of an individual community and more strongly link them to the meso-level by supporting local governments in developing demonstration ground\models of good governance and management in a given sector (from the grassroots level to the role of village\town, rayon, oblast);
- Secure stronger linkages between socio-economic development strategies\plans elaborated at the regional and rayon level, and between grassroots activities;
- Provide more targeted technical assistance to partners;
- Minimize the burden on regional project staff;
- Gain more credibility and stronger leverage on governance and management in the main project focus areas at both regional and national levels.

This approach might require increasing the relevant capacity of the regional CBA staff to reflect regional specialization.

- **Apply tighter conditionality on institutionalization of rayon and oblast level support structures (RRC, ORC, LDF) and the use of CBA approaches** in oblast\ rayons' own programs and grant competitions. To maximize project impact on other communities and general local development; to allow non-participating communities to benefit from project experience by expending LDF to all VCs\TCs, and to overall rayon development planning and management issues. Further capacity-building of RRC to support VC\TC, COs on local development issues and resource mobilization will also be required, in the context of their expanded role. Develop feasible RRC institutional options (municipal organization, a separate department with a clear ToR – all based on CBA current best practice) to be applied by local authorities.

Policy level

- **Instrumentalize the partnership with UADRC and the AASC as the main channels for advocacy and lobbying**; consider **engagement of the UAVC and the Small Town Association** (in the case of expanding CBA to urban areas).
- Together with partners, **identify carefully and address key policy issues generated by the CBA implementation experience** related to the advancement of sustainable local development. Some issues that were identified in the course of evaluation include (this might not be an exhaustive list):¹⁵
 - Regulatory security regarding the release of budgetary funding that is committed as co-sharing to international technical assistance projects (entailing Budget Code adjustments);
 - Bridging a gap between mid-term planning and budgeting at the local level\ promoting local development planning from below;
 - Spatial planning and linking spatial planning to regional and local development strategies;
 - Monitoring levels of socio-economic development of local territories;

¹⁵ This is not meant to recommend CBA to address all the issues listed, rather this list is indicative of type of policy issues the evaluation identified as relevant for CBA activities in the field.

- Reinforcement of the Law on Bodies of Self-Organization of Population in the regions (also linked to such issues as transfer of local government competencies and resources to these bodies);
 - Regulatory environment for social partnership and public-private partnership (community, local government and private sector) at national and regional levels;
 - Favorable environment for the development of rural ASC at national and regional level;
 - Regulatory barriers related to EE (e.g., interface with oblenergo networks, energy auditing, etc.);
 - Condominium management and access to resources (ownership rights, the use of surrounding territory, access to grants and credits, etc.);
 - Regulation of the work of local government associations (linked to their ability to increase financial sustainability, provide good service to their members and maintain the knowledge platform created with the support of CBA);
 - Local regulatory packages on rural service management, including inter-municipal cooperation (joint service management, water, waste management, etc.);
- Stronger policy leverage of CBA (both directly vis-à-vis the Ministries or through local government associations) will unavoidably imply **a need to support analytical work on main policy regulatory issues that are pursued.**
- **UNDP and EC should play a more proactive role in facilitating coordination among main donors** involved in advancing local governance and sustainable regional and local development in Ukraine.

Micro-projects implementation

- **Preserve existing modes of micro-project support**, including replication, but consider the possibility of oblasts and rayons collaborating on a number of projects and the use of the CBA pool of funds. This flexibility will be required also if the CBA adopts the idea of profiling the oblasts.
- **Do not limit sectors and type of infrastructure in the “non-profiled” oblasts or rayons** (if the recommendation on profiling is not accepted or in case of oblasts and rayons that will not be profiled). However, but the targeted sectors have to be within the competencies of the local government partners.
- Conduct quick assessments of the current status of all **water projects** previously supported by CBA, and ensure that those facing operational and maintenance challenges **are provided with proper technical assistance and can secure sustainability of their systems**. Coordinate such technical inputs for the existing and upcoming water projects with the DESPRO project, which has strong expertise in the area of rural water supply in Ukraine. Encourage CBA partners interested in sustainable rural water supply and sanitation solutions to join the DESPRO knowledge platform.
- **Clearly define the goals and expected outcomes of the replication scheme** (e.g., to increase coverage? to allow completion of a started project? etc.). Adjust the criteria for partner selection for the replication scheme accordingly.

➤ **Under the EE component**

- **Closer scrutiny should be given to the value for money criterion when deciding on EE projects.** Alternative energy sources (solar collectors and modules) should be chosen only when conventional energy is clearly more expensive or not reliable (since in many cases, alternative energy is used only as a back-up or reserve energy source). The choice of more economically viable solutions can be stimulated by investing more time into community awareness-building on costs and benefits and a requirement to increase local contribution.
- **Focus adequately on awareness-raising activities.** The project and its partners should collect data from the implemented projects (also, using EE passports) to develop a time-based plan to be used for awareness-raising, both at the local and national levels. CBA could use its strong partnerships with academic institutions to implement this activity. Influencing the overall situation with EE will imply a need to work on awareness-building of the wider population (main energy consumers).
- **Ensure greater quality control over strategies prepared with the support of the project.** The regional EE Strategies or proposals developed with the assistance of the CBA in the future should more closely follow national and EU standards (both in terms of the structure and substance).

➤ **Under the rural economic development component:**

- Initiate **regular (quarterly) monitoring for ASC financial operations.** This would 1) enable CBA or its partners to intervene in a timely way once there is a risk of violating ASC statute or legislation, 2) enable assessment of the effectiveness of CBA rural economic component, 3) improve the accountability of the ASCs and mitigate the principal agent problem (members not being able to hold the leadership accountable).
- Develop **follow-up strategies to lead newly created ASCs through their operations.** This assistance will not likely be direct financial assistance (which was provided at the initial stage of the project) but rather more ad hoc consulting and developing the support networks (government programs, business associations). CBA could partner with an organization to provide such support and disseminate CBA ASC best practices, and advocate legislative changes (e.g., with the ASC Union or with AgroOsvita).
- **Focus on those regions which have a system of ASC support already in place** and/or clear willingness to provide policy support. CBA should then strive to choose in each region a specific area (both in terms of the ASC activity and location) in which to create a model ASC network. The ASC network might unite ASCs involved in the same business activity with potential for vertical or horizontal integration. This would ensure achieving greater effect, sustainability and visibility of the CBA intervention.
- **Relax requirements on the target group.** While it is important to ensure homogeneity of the ASC members, there are also benefits to limiting requirements. It is important to increase the scale of ASC operations to effectively compete with large and medium businesses, and to increase access to human and financial capital. ASCs will also decrease risks of business failure if they manage to enable vertical integration of their activities (from field to the table).
- Consider **making the economic rationale of ASC activities a primary criterion.** ASC activities should provide greater economic incentives for households to join, given the potential risk of taxation. Current tax legislation makes it possible to tax incomes of ASC individual members and apply VAT. The requirement to increase the economic appeal of ASC might also imply shifting the CBA focus onto ASC activities that have short-term payback periods.

- Ensure **continuous awareness-raising of ASC concepts and practices** through a wide number of communication channels, such as videos, seminars, and peer-to-peer exchange visits.
- In the future phase, strike a **balance between time needed for community maturation and partners' capacity-building**, on one hand, **and the speed of delivery of micro-projects**, on the other.
- **Review the current tranches reimbursement scheme** with the idea of either reducing the number of tranches to two, or an increase of the first tranche, in order to allow communities to complete a meaningful amount of work under their micro-projects.
- Following the participatory spirit of the project, organize a Round Table, with oblast coordinators and selected oblast and rayon partners, to discuss planned modifications to CBA prior to finalization of the phase III approach.

Capacity building and knowledge management

- **Continue the support to UARDA knowledge hub** (including experts pool) but do so with a clear sustainability vision in mind. Encourage connection of all CBA partners to the knowledge platform.
- **Focus future cooperation with academic\education institutions** in the two following areas:
 - Use of research for M&E of CBA and encouraging more applied research topics related to regional sustainable development;
 - Bringing CBA experience into the training of civil servants.
- **Partner with ASC Association and/or AgroOsvita under the rural economic development component.** Support the Association of ASC in becoming a center of expertise on cooperatives, by establishing a knowledge center (depository) / electronic knowledge platform on cooperatives (similar to that with UARDC), and networking between the cooperatives and advocating their interests at the national level. Encourage the CBA-supported cooperatives to join the Association.
- **Continue the production and wide dissemination of visual materials** (videos, awareness-raising and education materials) in relation to main CBA components. Make better use of new information and communication technologies – e.g. consider investing into the production of Applications on sustainable rural development and CBA approach.
- **Strengthen and systematize networking and peer exchange between CBA partners**, especially at oblast and rayon level, to maximize peer learning. Promote selective identified strong RRCs and COs to become “coachers” to other rayons and COs, based on clearly identified “coaching” tasks. Introduce small incentives for coaches.
- **In line with the chosen profile of partners, provide more targeted capacity-building** of relevant local government specialists and other technical assistance to local government partners for implementation and monitoring of their relevant strategies, and for establishing adequate support systems.
- **Further promote competition among CBA partners, and CBA visibility, at the regional and national level by establishing annual nominations** (“CBA Oscars” for the best RRC, COs, ASC, most innovative project, largest community contribution, best applied research, etc.).

Management

- **Ensure synchronization of CBA annual implementation plans with the budget cycle** in order to ensure that budget contributions are planned well in advance by relevant local government units.
- **Review distribution of workload for regional coordinators** to avoid the danger of burn-out among staff. In line with the regional visions of sustainability of Oblast RCs, plan a phasing out and smooth transfer of know-how from CBA coordinators.
- **Secure the ability of regional coordinators to access narrow expertise**, specifically in the area of EE and ASC development. This will be critical if CBA undertake to profile the regions.
- CBA should apply a **more rigorous M&E system**, allowing it to illustrate outcomes and impact on pre-established indicators.

Visibility

- Consider implementing a **concentrated information campaign related to propagating a community-based approach and participatory sustainable development** (with the involvement of media, printed visual materials, electronic social networks, social advertisement, etc.). It would be important that such a campaign targeted the right audience, i.e., regions and local governments.
- Encourage **more substantive and critical media coverage of CBA**. This can be done through commissioning targeted articles in national and regional newspapers. Consider “CBA Oscar” for the best awareness-raising and analytical publications, consider publication of a series of articles).

Potential Risk Management

In planning the next phase of the project attention should be given to the following potential risks:

- Fiscal austerity measures being applied to the public budget in Ukraine may cause difficulties in mobilizing budgetary co-funding for the project in the coming year.
- Some windfall disbursements of funds in support of ASCs are likely, following the expected adoption of the National Program for ASC Development, but there is a danger that funding of the Program will not be sustained due to general budget constraints.
- The introduction of bonds into inter-budgetary relations in Ukraine may jeopardize the ability of some regions and rayons to mobilize financial contributions to CBA.
- There may be stress on local government budgets in regions where other donor programs (such as DESPRO or EC Regional Development Program) are working on the co-financing principle.
- CBA taking too many thematic directions linked to local development (EE, economic development, condominiums, etc.) entails a risk of diluting the project’s focus, losing its image of well targeting rural development projects, and weakening its credibility and leverage in each of the focus areas, especially in policies. Such action also implies a need for multiple partnership arrangements at national, regional and local levels, as well as extra stress on CBA project team capacities.
- Delivery-oriented culture of UNDP may diminish the sustainability of CBA.

These risks are to be carefully considered in the planning of CBA III and adequate mitigation measures, where possible, are to be planned.

ANNEX 1 REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE

Project name: *Community Based Approach to Local Development Project (CBA)*

Country: Ukraine

BACKGROUND

UNDP, with the support of EU funding, launched the Community-Based Approach to Local Development Project (CBA) in December 2007 with the objective to strengthen participatory governance and improve the quality of life of the Ukrainian population in selected rural areas. During its first phase, the project operated in all 25 regions in Ukraine and covered 209 districts (42 percent of the total number of districts in the country), 1123 village/city councils (10 percent of the total number of local councils in the country) and 1145 local communities. All project partners were selected through a competitive process based on criteria of hardship such as poverty, availability of basic services (health, water, energy, waste management, school transportation) and level of commitment to share their resources.

Phase I of the project introduced community-based methodology which promotes joint community planning and implementation of community-led projects aimed to improve living conditions and foster sustainable local development. A variety of capacity-building activities were organized by the project to enhance the professional skills and knowledge of community organizations and local authorities to put the CBA methodology into practice. The project also carried out awareness-raising activities to inform local-, regional- and national-level stakeholders about the community-based approach to local development and motivate policymakers to recognize the value of this methodology for national development. This dimension includes documenting the experience of project implementation, disseminating reports and newsletters, conducting roundtables, ensuring media coverage, etc.

Phase I of CBA has been followed by a four-year Phase II, with duration from June 2011 till 2014. The main outputs of CBA II Project include:

Output 1. Enhanced relevant professional skills and knowledge of community organizations and local authorities to initiate and maintain participatory local process on social economic development and public services delivery.

Output 2. Energy efficiency at local level increased through promotion of innovative technologies implemented by collective action of local communities and local authorities

Output 3. Demonstrate effective participatory local governance and decentralised management mechanism throughout Ukraine for public service delivery

The second phase continues to operate in 25 regions, 200 rayons and 900 village/city councils, with 40 percent of rayons and local councils being new partners. It expands activities to 100 new rayons, in addition to supporting activities in 100 previously covered rayons. This phase retains the objectives and fundamental methodology established during the first phase. The major focus of the second phase is methodology replication within a national framework. It also foresees an expanded energy efficiency component. It supports selected regions to develop energy efficiency strategies and implement selected projects in line with the strategy. In addition, it promotes cooperatives in rural areas and provides support to establish small rural businesses in the selected regions. It will support 600 standard community projects and 300 energy efficiency projects under the framework of standard cost-sharing and joint decision-making arrangements. The project also works on establishing knowledge management hub and curriculum development in more than 10 universities and national training institutes for civil servants and elected officials. This arrangement will support further scale-up of the CBA methodology in the country.

Agreement has been reached in principle with EU Delegation in Ukraine to finance a third phase of the project. The new phase will be focused on the institutionalization of community-led approach as well as on the expansion of the project support to urban areas. The later direction has been piloted by UNDP Municipal Governance and Development Programme (MGSDP) aimed to promote democratic governance and improve the quality of life in urban Ukraine. MGSDP started its activities with support to community initiatives and gradually expanded its work to develop partnerships with local

governments and provide policy advisory support at the national level. Next phase of CBA project will utilize the lessons learned from MGSDP implementation and ensure scaling up of community mobilization approach in the urban context.

The major strategic directions of the new phase of CBA project have been identified and agreed with the donor and the national partners and include: 1) replication of community-based development methodology; 2) enhancing energy efficiency at local level; 3) expansion of the support to economic activities in the rural areas; 4) community-based approach to improve urban housing; 5) introduction of innovation activities and new technologies at the local level.

Further details about CBA can be found at: www.cba.org.ua

MAIN OBJECTIVES OF THE ASSIGNMENT

UNDP Ukraine has initiated the present evaluation of the Community Based Approach to Local Development Project (CBA) with the aim to review and assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of CBA Project and its development approach.

The already selected priority areas for the Phase III present a logical evolution of the project approach, however, a comprehensive evaluation of the project results and search of future potential is required for the detailed design of the third phase. Therefore, the evaluation aims also at providing recommendations for the development of the third phase of the project based on the strengths and advantages of the currently applied CBA methodology.

The main objectives of the mid-term evaluation are as follows:

- To assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of CBA Project and its development approach and methodology.
- To formulate recommendations for the development approaches and design of the third phase of CBA project.

The main stakeholders of the evaluation are:

On central level:

Ministry of Regional Development, Construction, Municipal Economy of Ukraine

Ministry of Economic Development and Trade

Secretariat of Cabinet of Ministers

Association of Local and Regional Authorities

On local level:

Regional Administration and Regional Councils

Rayon administration and Rayon councils

Village councils

Private sector

Community organizations

DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES / SCOPE OF WORK

The Mid-term Project Evaluation will be conducted jointly by independent Consultant and UNDP BDP Advisor. Consultant will function as the Team Leader of the mission.

Team Leader will be responsible for the entire work of the mission and for delivery of the expected outputs of the mission.

Specifically, the Consultant - Team Leader, will perform the following functions:

Lead and guide the evaluation team;

Elaborate the methodology of the evaluation;

Conduct the evaluation mission in cooperation with EU Delegation in Ukraine, the government, public and private sector at national, sub-national and local levels;

Formulate and submit to UNDP Ukraine a comprehensive Project Evaluation Report agreeable to the UNDP standards and requirements (see Annex I).

The scope of work includes review, analysis and provision of findings/conclusions on four groups of issues listed below:

Project design (relevance, coherence):

Is the project overall objective clear to national and local counterparts and relevant to Ukraine development priorities?

Is the project's methodology clear to/understood by project's target groups and accepted as valid to Ukraine's context by national and local counterparts?

Is the project's methodology implemented as planned (i.e. without any variations)? If not, explain what has changed and why.

How relevant are the Project's outputs to its outcome/main objective?

Are implementation targets clear to project's staff and its counterparts?

Project effectiveness (and efficiency):

Are project management and implementation arrangements effective?

Are project activities performed as planned (on track)?

Are resources spent as planned?

Is the project reaching the intended target population?

How satisfied are the target groups with their involvement in the project?

What and how much progress has been made towards the achievement of outputs (and output targets) and objectives?

Compare the cost effectiveness of the project ($\$$ invested / people reached = unit cost) with similar local development projects in other countries.

Project's sustainability

What is the level of institutionalization of the project's methodology at the national/regional level?

Can the project's actions be implemented without continued intervention and financing?

What are the key constraints, if any?

Lessons learnt/recommendations for the third phase of CBA project

What lessons can we learn from the way in which the project is unfolding?

What could have been done differently in CBA II (from a methodology and/or activity, or resource usage point of view) to complete the project more effectively?

What is the level of readiness for implementation of each component of the third phase of the project. What are external factors, risks and risk mitigation approaches?

What in the development approach and in the implementation arrangements of CBA II could be improved in order to sharpen the focus of CBA III strategy and to better address the most salient issues surrounding local development?

EVALUATION APPROACH

The approach to be used during the evaluation will include: extensive review of documentation, interviews and field visits. The evaluation will take place mainly in Kyiv with two field visits to project sites (one to Western and another to Eastern Ukraine)

Desk Review

The evaluator will review the documents related to the project, listed in Annex II to this TOR, prior to the start of the mission. The documents will be provided by CBA II Project Team and UNDP Country Office.

Field visits and interviews

The evaluator will visit and interview the CBA II project management unit, UNDP, Ministry of Regional Development, Construction, Municipal Economy of Ukraine, Secretariat of Cabinet of Ministers, Association of Local and Regional Authorities, sub-national and local partners and project beneficiaries. The list will be proposed by UNDP and finalized upon the consultations with evaluation team.

Participatory techniques

The evaluator may apply any other relevant participatory techniques and approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

DELIVERABLES

The expected outputs from the mission are:

- UNDP format Mid-Term Project Evaluation Report agreeable to the UNDP standards and requirements.
- Presentation of findings by the consultants to all stakeholders, including UNDP Ukraine Office, national partners.
- The report should be structured around the same set of four groups of questions and should not exceed 30 pages in total. First draft of the report should be submitted to the UNDP Country Office within 10 days of completion of the in-country part of the mission. UNDP will send the report for comments to government counterparts (Ministry of Regional Development, Construction, Municipal Economy of Ukraine, Secretariat of Cabinet of Ministers, Association of Local and Regional Authorities), EU Delegation in Ukraine and project management team.

If there are discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

ANNEX 2 LIST OF MEETINGS AND OTHER REVIEW ACTIVITIES

9-10 September 2013, Kyiv
Miroslava Didukh, Programme manager, EU Delegation Oksana Remiga, Senior Programme manager, UNDP Dr. Jaysingh Sah, CBA Project manager CBA project team members
Yuri Petrushenko, Sumy State University, Assistant Professor, Department of economic theory
Olexiy Khabatyuk, Chairman of Supervisory Board, Environmental (Green) Investments Fund, CBA consultant on energy efficiency (regional energy strategy development)
Olena Ruditch, Community Development Specialist
Oleg Baranetsky, Oleg Rogozin, Oleksandr Karnauh – CBA engineers
Tetyana Matiychyk, ex-Head, Department of cooperation with Verkhovna Rada and the regions, CBA focal point from Secretariat of the Cabinet of Ministers (SCMU)
11 September 2013, Kyiv
Yuriy Andriychuk and his colleagues, UADRC
Kateryna Koretska and her colleague, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Regional Development and Construction
Olena Troshchynska, CBA communications specialist Tetyana Diyeva, CBA monitoring assistant
Volodymyr Brygilevych, Head of Management Executive Board, Centre of Local Government Studies, CBA consultant (regional energy strategy) – Skype call
12 September 2013, AR Crimea
Round table in Simferopol Anna Kovalenko, head of department, investment and image policy, Ministry of economic development and trade, AR Crimea Vladimir Klychnikov, head of commission, relations with local governments, Parliament of AR Crimea Radmila Golosova, first deputy head, Association of local government authorities, AR Crimea CBA regional coordinators, a representative of academia

Dzhankoi rayon, Round table with representatives of rayon authorities, rayon resource centre (RRC), civil organizations (COs), members of the Local development forum (LDF), CBA-I and CBA-II partners
Visit to Yarkoe, CO «Dobrobut-2012», CBA-II, water supply
Visit to Luganskoye, CO “Fakel”, CBA-II, street lighting
13 September 2013, AR Crimea
Krasnoperekopsk raion, round table with representatives of rayon authorities, RRC, CSOs, members of LDF, CBA-I and CBA-II partners
Ishuny, CSO “Nadia-2009”, CBA-I, kindergarten, school
Magazinka, CSO “Magazinka”, CBA-II, kindergarten, street-lighting (energy efficiency component)
2 October 2013, Kyiv
Ms. Mashtakova , ex-CBA government contact point
Mr. Negoda, Secretariat of Cabinet of Ministers
Ms. Postemska, National Programme Officer, Swiss Cooperation Office in Ukraine
3 October 2013, Kyiv
Micki Maily Mitre, Foreign Service Officer and Viktor Rادیєвич, Project Manager, USAID
Denis Poltavets, CBA Community Development Specialist
3 October 2013, Zakarpattia
Round table in Uzhhorod
Igor Svysho, first deputy head, Zakarpattia OSA
Viktor Lukecha, director, department of municipal services, construction and infrastructure, OSA
Viktor Terelya, deputy head, department of agro-industrial development, head of division, agro-development and food industry, Zakarpattia OSA
Mykhailo Popovych, head, apparatus of Zakarpattia oblast council
Vasyl Grytsko, deputy head, Ternopil OSA
CBA regional coordinators
Berehovo, Berehovo rayon, round table with the representatives of local authorities, RRC, COs, members of the LDF, CBA-I and CBA-II participants
Visit to Zapsony, CSO “Evropeisky Vybir za Zapsony”, CBA-II, kindergarten (energy saving)
Visit to Velyka Bakta, CSO “Vidrodzhennia Bakta”, CBA-I, water supply

<p>4 October 2013, Zakarpattia</p> <p>Volovets, Volovets rayon, round table with the representatives of local authorities, RRC, COs, members of the LDF, CBA-I participants</p> <p>Visit to Verkhni Vorota, CSO “Stozhary”, CBA-I, health post</p> <p>Polyana, Svalyava rayon, round table with the representatives of local authorities, RRC, COs, members of the LDF, CBA-I and CBA-II partners</p> <p>Visit to Polyana, CSO “Kupel”, CBA-I, CBA-II, kindergarten (energy saving)</p>
<p>7 October 2013, Mykolaiv</p> <p>Bashtanka, Bashtanskyi rayon (CBA II, RED component, RRC. Local Development Forum meeting: COs, local authorities, representatives from Odesa oblast, Snigurivskyi rayon, Mykolaiv oblast</p> <p>Mr. Rubskyi, head of rayon administration</p> <p>Ms. Yelantseva, deputy head, rayon council</p> <p>Mr. Gvozd, head, depart of investment policy, rayon council, RRC</p> <p>Mr. Protsak, deputy head, rayon administration</p> <p>Mr. Galaguz, Dobre council head</p> <p>Ms. Figura, CSO “Mrii Zbuvayutsa”</p> <p>Ms. Zdor, head of division on European integration and foreign relations, Odesa oblast administration</p> <p>Ms. Volovych, head of CSO “Chas Zmin”</p> <p>Mr. Masyuk, ASC “Zhmenka”</p> <p>Visit to Yavkine. Meeting with ASC “Yavkynskyi prolisok”, RED CBA-II and CO “Chas zmin”, Yavkine Ambulatory (MPP CBA –II)</p> <p>Visit to Dobre. Meeting with CO “Mrii Zbuvayutsa”, kindergarten</p>
<p>8 October 2013, Mykolaiv</p> <p>Mykolaiv, Meeting with oblast authorities: Mykola Kruglov, Igor Dyatlov, Valeryi Zviryan, Oleksandr Smirnov, Vita Tvardovska, CBA regional coordinators</p> <p>Voznesensk, Voznesenskyi rayon (CBA-I, CBA-II, EE), Roundtable on energy efficiency implementation (rayon partners from Pervomaisk rayon and Kherson oblast)</p> <p>Mr. Kucher, head of rayon administration</p> <p>Mr. Burdin, head of rayon council</p> <p>Mr. Kalyna, rayon RRC</p> <p>Mr. Demchenko, rayon administration</p>

<p>Mr. Skvortsov, RRC from Kherson</p> <p>Mr. Mozheyenko, energy audit expert</p> <p>Mr. Mudryi, specialist, division on energy and energy efficiency, oblast administration</p> <p>Mr. Livik, vice-president, JSC Zelenyi Gai</p> <p>Mr. Solodayev, first deputy, rayon head</p> <p>Ms. Kozub, deputy head, rayon council</p> <p>Mr. Balanchuk, head of division, constriction and infrastructure, rayon administration</p> <p>Mr. Utkin, Bilousivka council head</p> <p>Ms. Mustafina, Michurin, council head</p> <p>Ms. Tereshenko, Prybuzhanivka, council head</p> <p>Ms. Antochi, CO "Association of social and economic development of Timiryazyevka"</p> <p>Ms. Stasyshina, Timiryazyevka council</p> <p>Ms. Udovychenko, CO "Svitanok"</p> <p>Ms. Smashnyuk, RRC, Pervomaisk rayon</p> <p>Mr. Liakhov, Kamyanomostivsk council head</p> <p>Ms. Pokhylchenko, CO "Oberig Katerinki"</p> <p>Mr. Protsak, deputy head, Bashtanka state administration, energy efficiency</p> <p>Ms. Sobchishena, RRC, Novotroitsk, Kherson oblast</p> <p>Mr. Ryzhnev, first deputy head, Velykooleksandrivsk rayon, Kherson</p> <p>Mr. Bureiko, deputy head, Chaplin rayon, Kherson oblast</p>
<p>Visit to JSC Zelenyi Gai, biogas station, wind and solar system (non-CBA object)</p> <p>Visit to Martynovka, CO "Association of home owners Vognyk-2"</p> <p>Visit to Bilousovka, CO "Nadia"</p>
<p>9 October 2013, Dnipropetrovsk</p>
<p>Briefing by CBA regional coordinators and oblast focal person</p>
<p>10 October 2013, Dnipropetrovsk</p>
<p>Mr. Adamskyi, acting head, oblast council</p>
<p>Roundtable with representatives of oblast authorities from Dnipropetrovsk, Kharkiv and Zaporizhzhia oblasts</p> <p>Mr. Adamskyi, acting head, oblast council</p>

<p>Mr. Tishkin, head, division on local government development</p> <p>Mr. Mayetnyi, deputy head, division on local government development</p> <p>Mr. Savchenko, head of Apostolivska rayon council</p> <p>Mr. Khalimendyk, head of Mezhyivska rayon council</p> <p>Ms. Skripchenko, head of Tomakivka rayon council</p> <p>Ms. Romanova, deputy head of Apostolivska rayon council</p> <p>Ms. Gorbachova, coordinator, Zarychansk rayon council</p> <p>Ms. Solomko, Petrikivsk rayon council</p> <p>Mr. Goncharuk, deputy head, Zaporizhzhia oblast administration</p> <p>Ms. Borshova, deputy head, Berdyansk rayon administration, Zaporizhzhia oblast</p> <p>Mr. Klenin, deputy head, Orekhivska rayon administration, Zaporizhzhia oblast</p> <p>Ms. Rotareva, professor, Zaporizhzhia state university</p> <p>Mr. Ryaby, CBA coordinator, Zaporizhzhia oblast</p> <p>Mr. Ustimov, CBA coordinator, Zaporizhzhia oblast</p> <p>Ms. Kulishova, deputy head, division of investment policy and foreign relations, Kharkiv OSA</p> <p>Ms. Kamasas, chief specialist, Kharkiv oblast council</p> <p>Ms. Chala, CBA coordinator in Kharkiv oblast</p>
<p>Visit to Verkhniodniprovsk (regular, CBA-II). Dialogue with rayon and local council project partners, RRC</p> <p>Visit to Vodiane. Dialogue with of CO “Vodianskyi fond dobrobutu” (kindergarten)</p> <p>Visit to Gannivka. Dialogue with CO “Gannivskiy pervotsvit” (street lighting)</p>
<p>11 October 2013, Dnipropetrovsk</p>
<p>Tomakivka urban village, Tomakivskiy rayon (CBA-I and CBA-II, EE component), meeting with rayon authorities, RRC, COs</p> <p>Visit to COs of Tomakivskiy rayon, Zoria village – health post; Volodymyrivka village – kindergarten and street lighting</p>
<p>5 November, Kyiv</p>
<p>Mr. Blyznyuk, member of Verkhovna Rada</p>
<p>6 November 2013, Kyiv oblast</p>

<p>Baryshevskyi rayon, Kyiv oblast</p> <p>Roundtable with representatives of rayon authorities, local councils, COs</p> <p>Visit to Selyshe (ambulatory)</p> <p>Visit to Yabluneve (school)</p>
<p>7 November 2013, Poltava oblast</p>
<p>Meeting with the Head of OSA, Head of OC, Poltava oblast</p> <p>Roundtable with representatives of Kirovohrad and Donetsk oblast, Poltava agricultural Academy.</p> <p>Ms. Adamovych, director, department of economic development, Poltava OSA</p> <p>Mr. Marchenko, deputy head of oblast council</p> <p>Mr. Orlov, deputy director, department of economic development, Poltava OSA</p> <p>Mr. Kalaur, deputy head of Chutiv rayon council</p> <p>Mr. Garkavenko, deputy head of Kotelevsk rayon council</p> <p>Mr. Ivanina, deputy had, Poltava RSA</p> <p>Mr. Knish, head of Semenivsk rayon administration</p> <p>Mr. Zhovtylo, deputy head, Malovyskivska council, Kirovohrad oblast, RRC</p> <p>Ms. Boyko, head of agro-development centre, Kirovohrad OSA</p> <p>Ms. Shynkarenko, CBA coordinator in Donetsk oblast</p> <p>Ms. Osypenko, head of economic division, Kostyantynovskyi rayon, Donetsk oblast</p> <p>Ms. Malyna, head of economic division, Amvrosvyivskyi rayon, Donetsk oblast</p> <p>Mr. Yesikov, counselor to head of Lokhvitsk rayon council, RRC</p> <p>Mr. Galych, dean, economic department, Poltava State Agricultural Academy</p> <p>Ms. Kiriyevska, head of Lokhvitsk rayon council</p> <p>Mr. Kurinnyi, counselor to head of Chutiv rayon head, RRC</p> <p>Ms. Kulbaka, Poltava rayon RRC</p> <p>Ms. Fedenko, counselor to head of Semenivsk rayon council</p> <p>Ms. Erli, specialist, Kotelevsk rayon council, RRC</p> <p>Mr. Kalinichenko, professor, Poltava State Agricultural Academy</p>

<p>Chutivskiy rayon (CBA-II replication), Meeting with the Head of RSA/RC, participation in LDF</p> <p>Mr. Kalaur, deputy head of LDF</p> <p>Mr. Kurinnyi, RRC</p> <p>Mr. Klimenko, accountant, CO “Dovira y yednist”</p> <p>Mr. Ponomarenko, head, CO “Dzherelo nadiy”</p> <p>Mr. Odarenko, head, CO “Spilna dumka”</p> <p>Ms. Kalyuzhna, secretary, CO “Spilna nadiya”</p> <p>Visit to CO “Spilna nadiya” of Nova Kochubeyivka village (CBA-II replication), CBA-II, school</p> <p>Visit to CO of Vasylivka village, meeting with CO “Dovira y yednist”, CBA-II, health post</p>
<p>8 November 2013, Poltava</p>
<p>Semenivsk rayon, meeting with Head of RC/RSA, RRC, participation in LDF</p> <p>Visit to CO of Stepanivka village, CBA-I and CBA-II, street lighting for two village councils, CO “Granit 2012”</p> <p>Visit to Veselyy Podil, CBA-II and energy efficient component), CO “Veselopodilska”. CBA-II, kindergarten and EE component, street lighting</p>
<p>11 November 2013, Zhytomyr</p>
<p>Meeting with representatives of Zhytomyr OSA</p> <p>Round table in Zhytomyr rayon with participation of rayon authorities, village council heads and heads of community organizations of the rayon, premises of Zhytomyr rayon council</p> <p>Visit to CO of Sadky village, Zhytomyr rayon</p> <p>Visit to CO of Tarasivka village, Zhytomyr rayon</p>
<p>12 November 2013, Kyiv</p>
<p>Dr. Valentyna Sereda, Taras Shevchenko University</p> <p>Mr. Negoda, SCMU</p> <p>CBA coordinators in Luhansk oblast, SAT4SLD piloting – Skype conference</p> <p>Mr. Maksimenko, deputy head, Kyiv oblast state administration</p> <p>Ms. Romantsova, head of economic department, Kyiv oblast state administration</p>
<p>13 November 2013, Kyiv</p>

Oksana Remiga, Senior Programme Manager, UNDP

Ivan Tomych, director, Union of ASC

Representatives of the EU Regional Development Programme

Ms. Nyzhnyk and colleagues, department of regional development and department of international cooperation,
Ministry of Economic Development and Trade

Irina Sinyavskaya and her colleagues, NMC "AgroOsvita"

15 November 2013, Kyiv

Debriefing with CBA/PM and UNDP/SPM