

**MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF FINLAND**

# **MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE WIDER EUROPE INITIATIVE**

**Final Report**

**September 2012**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>22</b>
1.1 THE WIDER EUROPE INITIATIVE .....	22
1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION .....	23
1.3 METHODOLOGY .....	24
1.3.1 <i>Evaluation criteria</i> .....	25
1.3.2 <i>Case studies</i> .....	25
1.3.3 <i>Indicators</i> .....	25
1.3.4 <i>Methods</i> .....	26
1.3.5 <i>Structure of the report</i> .....	27
1.4 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	28
<b>2. THE DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE WIDER EUROPE INITIATIVE .....</b>	<b>29</b>
2.1 THE POLICY CONTEXTS OF THE WIDER EUROPE INITIATIVE .....	29
2.2 PROGRAMMING .....	31
2.2.1 <i>Identification stage</i> .....	31
2.2.2 <i>Aims of WEI</i> .....	33
2.2.3 <i>Formulation of WEI:</i> .....	33
2.3 ADMINISTRATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WIDER EUROPE INITIATIVE BY MFA.....	34
2.3.1 <i>Ministry for Foreign Affairs – WEI administration</i> .....	35
2.3.2 <i>Diplomatic representations in the WEI region</i> .....	36
2.4 VISIBILITY AND COMMUNICATIONS.....	36
<b>3. REVIEW OF WIDER EUROPE INITIATIVE INTERVENTIONS.....</b>	<b>38</b>
3.1 STRUCTURE AND FOCUS OF REVIEW .....	38
3.1.1 <i>Relevance</i> .....	38
3.1.2 <i>Efficiency</i> .....	40
3.1.3 <i>Effectiveness and Impact</i> .....	40
3.1.4 <i>Sustainability and Ownership</i> .....	41
3.1.5 <i>Aid effectiveness – complementarity</i> .....	41
3.1.6 <i>Finnish Value Added</i> .....	42
3.1.7 <i>Cross-cutting objectives</i> .....	42
<b>4. REVIEW OF WEI CLUSTER 1 – SECURITY.....</b>	<b>45</b>
4.1 CASE-STUDY REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH CLUSTER .....	45
4.1.1 <i>Aims and objectives of the Research Cluster initiative:</i> .....	45
4.1.2 <i>Administration of the Cluster</i> .....	46
4.1.3 <i>Relevance of Cluster projects and activities</i> .....	49
4.1.4 <i>Effectiveness and Impact:</i> .....	49
4.1.5 <i>Sustainability:</i> .....	53
4.2 CRIMEA POLICY DIALOGUE .....	53
<b>5. REVIEW OF WEI CLUSTER 2 – TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT .....</b>	<b>56</b>
5.1 AID FOR TRADE.....	56

5.2	SUPPORT TO FISHERY AND AQUACULTURE MANAGEMENT IN THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC .....	57
5.3	UKRAINE CLEANER PRODUCTION .....	58
<b>6.</b>	<b>REVIEW OF WEI CLUSTER 3 – INFORMATION SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT.....</b>	<b>60</b>
6.1	CREATING SUSTAINABLE BUSINESS IN THE KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY .....	60
6.2	REGIONAL COMMUNICATIONS REGULATORY TRAINING PROGRAMME .....	61
<b>7.</b>	<b>REVIEW OF WEI CLUSTER 4 – ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT.....</b>	<b>63</b>
7.1	ENVSEC .....	63
7.1.1	<i>Previous evaluations of ENVSEC .....</i>	<i>64</i>
7.1.2	<i>Relevance, Coherence &amp; Complementarity .....</i>	<i>66</i>
7.1.3	<i>Efficiency .....</i>	<i>67</i>
7.1.4	<i>Effectiveness .....</i>	<i>68</i>
7.1.5	<i>Impact .....</i>	<i>69</i>
7.1.6	<i>Sustainability .....</i>	<i>70</i>
7.1.7	<i>Management and administration.....</i>	<i>71</i>
7.1.8	<i>Finnish Added Value .....</i>	<i>72</i>
7.1.9	<i>Cross-cutting objectives.....</i>	<i>73</i>
7.2	FINWATERWEI .....	74
7.2.1	<i>History of the programme and its objectives .....</i>	<i>74</i>
7.2.2	<i>Objectives, structure and individual project activities.....</i>	<i>75</i>
7.2.3	<i>Relevance, Coherence and Complementarity.....</i>	<i>77</i>
7.2.4	<i>Efficiency.....</i>	<i>77</i>
7.2.5	<i>Effectiveness .....</i>	<i>78</i>
7.2.6	<i>Impact .....</i>	<i>79</i>
7.2.7	<i>Sustainability .....</i>	<i>79</i>
7.2.8	<i>Management and administration.....</i>	<i>80</i>
7.2.9	<i>Finnish Added Value .....</i>	<i>81</i>
7.2.10	<i>Cross-cutting Objectives .....</i>	<i>82</i>
7.3	RESTORATION OF FOREST ECOSYSTEMS DAMAGED IN ARMED CONFLICT IN GEORGIA.....	83
7.4	COOPERATION IN THE METEOROLOGICAL SECTOR - PROMOTING MODERNISATION OF METEOROLOGICAL AND HYDROLOGICAL SERVICES IN CENTRAL ASIA .....	84
7.5	EASTERN EUROPE ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND ENVIRONMENT PARTNERSHIP FUND .....	85
7.6	EBRD WATER FUND .....	85
7.7	GEO-SECTOR INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND CAPACITY BUILDING IN CENTRAL ASIAN COUNTRIES .....	86
7.8	CAPACITY BUILDING FOR DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPEAN-TYPE GEO-INFORMATION MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE GEOLOGICAL SECTOR OF UKRAINE .....	87
7.9	CHERNOBYL SHELTER FUND.....	87
7.10	NUCLEAR SAFETY AND SECURITY CAPACITY BUILDING IN UKRAINE .....	88
<b>8.</b>	<b>REVIEW OF WEI CLUSTER 5 – SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY.....</b>	<b>90</b>
8.1	PROMOTING DECENT WORK.....	90
8.2	ETC - EARLY TRANSITION COUNTRIES FUND .....	91
8.3	JUSTICE SECTOR SUPPORT FACILITY IN CENTRAL ASIA.....	92
8.4	TECHNICAL COOPERATION IN THE AREA OF STATISTICS.....	94
8.5	TRAINING OF OFFICIALS FROM GEORGIA AND MOLDOVA (ESTONIAN SCHOOL OF DIPLOMACY) .....	96
8.6	TC (TECHNICAL COOPERATION) FUND - EBRD .....	96
<b>9.</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>98</b>

9.1	CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED .....	98
9.1.1	<i>Programming and Administration of WEI</i> .....	98
9.1.2	<i>Relevance</i> .....	99
9.1.3	<i>Efficiency</i> .....	100
9.1.4	<i>Effectiveness</i> .....	100
9.1.5	<i>Impact</i> .....	101
9.1.6	<i>Sustainability</i> .....	102
9.1.7	<i>Aid Effectiveness and Visibility</i> .....	103
9.1.8	<i>Finnish Value Added</i> .....	104
9.1.9	<i>Cross-cutting objectives</i> .....	104
9.1.10	<i>FinWaterWEI</i> .....	104
9.1.11	<i>ENVSEC</i> .....	105
9.1.12	<i>Research Cluster</i> .....	105
9.2	RECOMMENDATIONS .....	106
	<i>Aid Effectiveness and Visibility</i> .....	108
<b>ANNEXES</b> .....		<b>111</b>
<b>ANNEX 1 – TERMS OF REFERENCE</b> .....		<b>112</b>
<b>ANNEX 2 – PEOPLE INTERVIEWED</b> .....		<b>120</b>
<b>ANNEX 3 – SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND MAJOR DOCUMENTS CONSULTED</b> .....		<b>130</b>
<b>ANNEX 4 –EVALUATION QUESTIONS</b> .....		<b>190</b>
<b>ANNEX 5 – ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY</b> .....		<b>201</b>

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
EaP	Eastern Partnership
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
EC	European Commission
EECCA	Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia
ENPI	European Neighbourhood Policy Instrument
ENVSEC	Environment and Security Initiative
ETC	Early Transition Countries fund (EBRD)
EU	European Union
EUD	EU Delegation
EUWI	EU Water Initiative
FAO	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization
GTK	Geological Survey of Finland
ICI	Institutional Cooperation Instrument
IFC	International Finance Corporation
ILO	International Labour Organization
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
OSCE	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
PATRIR	Peace Actions, Training and Research Institute of Romania
REC	Regional Environment Centre for Central and Eastern Europe
STUK	Finnish Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority
SYKE	Finnish Environment Institute
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
WEI	Wider Europe Initiative

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of a mid-term evaluation of the Wider Europe Initiative (WEI), a bilateral development cooperation programme in Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Central Asia announced by Finland in 2008. The Wider Europe Initiative is being implemented in the following eleven countries:

- Eastern Europe: Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine
- South Caucasus: Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia
- Central Asia: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan

The global objective of the Wider Europe Initiative, identified by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA) of Finland, is to strengthen stability and security across the regions through interventions focused on the following priority themes: security, trade and development, information society development, energy and the environment and social sustainability.

FCG Finnish Consulting Group was contracted to carry out the mid-term evaluation of the WEI between February and September 2012, with an evaluation team of four experts. The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to assess the progress made in the WEI interventions, most of which were launched in 2009, and scheduled to complete in 2013 and 2014.

The report begins (Section 1) with an outline of the scope of the evaluation and the methodology adopted by the evaluation team. Section 2 provides an analysis of the development and administration of the Wider Europe Initiative, including an overview of the evolution of the WEI as an expression of Finnish Development Policy, and a review of the programming procedures employed in the identification and formulation of the initiative.

The review of WEI interventions is introduced by Section 3, which also includes a summary of the findings of the online survey conducted by the evaluation. (The current evaluation does not include coverage of the Local Cooperation Funds, and OSCE activities, which form part of the overall WEI framework, as these are subject to separate evaluations.) The report then provides, in Sections 4 through 8, reviews of the WEI interventions, set in their respective thematic clusters. As requested by MFA Finland, the evaluation devotes particular attention to three case-study interventions – the Research Cluster, ENVSEC, and FinWaterWEI.

The report concludes with in Section 9 with summative conclusions and lessons learned, and a set of recommendations addressed to the MFA Finland.

The following grid summarises the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the report. As an introduction to the contents of this grid, the following summative comments are offered, relating to the lessons learned from the implementation of the WEI programme:

### **Global conclusion – the impacts of the WEI programme**

On the basis of the extensive set of evidence gathered for this evaluation – including interviews with a wide range of stakeholders, analysis of a considerable quantity of documents, and observations conducted during field missions – the evaluation team believes strongly that through the Wider Europe Initiative, Finland is making a very significant contribution as a donor in the countries covered by the initiative. The rich blend of interventions are achieving

impacts that positively influence the lives and livelihoods of a considerable number of beneficiaries, and serve to build the capacity of institutions in the beneficiary countries to tackle the wide range of priorities and challenges addressed in WEI.

As a donor country, Finland justifiably enjoys a strong reputation among beneficiaries, and international partner organizations, in particular for its:

- Expertise and experience in key thematic areas, represented by the core thematic priorities included in WEI (and reflected in a number of interventions by the involvement of Finnish experts, companies, organizations);
- Readiness to work with beneficiary countries in addressing a range of issues requiring sensitive political and social issues - with Finland's status as a neutral country; its track record in good governance, and the promotion of human rights; and its position as a neighbour of Russia (and thus a sense of shared experience with WEI countries) all seen as positive factors influencing Finland's ability to work constructively in this region;
- Supportive and proactive stance as a donor, ready to lend assistance to implementing partners, and also show patience and understanding with regard to the attainment of results in what are often challenging contexts where time is required in order to achieve and sustain momentum.

#### **Global recommendations**

- The evaluation team notes the intention, declared in the 2012 Finnish Development Policy, to scale down Finnish aid activities in the WEI region. However, the report would nevertheless recommend, in light of the achievements of WEI, noted above, and given Finland's very strong reputation as a donor in the WEI region, MFA consider ways in which it can maintain a presence across the WEI region in the sphere of development cooperation, even at a more limited level.
- In line with the preceding recommendation, and Finland's stance as a development entrepreneur - conduct consultations with stakeholders in WEI countries and interventions regarding the achievements of WEI, and the possible paths of development for WEI II, in order to inform stakeholders and raise their awareness, and to elicit their feedback regarding the potential for future collaboration in the existing WEI region.

FINDINGS	CONCLUSIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Programming and Administration of WEI</i>		
<p>The process of identification and programming of WEI was conducted in a short timescale, which restricted the extent to which MFA staff were able to engage in extensive consultations with partner organizations and beneficiary country governments and civil society.</p>	<p>The limitations noted in the process of identification and programming hold implications with regard to ensuring Relevance at the level of the programme. (However, the report notes that in the case of WEI, these limitations have been offset, at least to some extent, by the fact that MFA was able to draw on existing understandings of the priorities of WEI countries, gained from interventions that MFA had been supporting prior to the launch of WEI; and on the priorities identified by the EU, and other multilateral organizations, in the WEI region.)</p>	<p>Review the procedures employed for programming of such complex initiatives as WEI, to ensure that in future:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>sufficient time and resources are allocated in order to conduct systematic and comprehensive consultations with stakeholders in beneficiary countries and partner organizations at the identification stage, in order that MFA takes the lead in identifying the relevance of proposed interventions, and assessing the priorities of beneficiary countries;</li> <li>programmes are results-based, and measurable indicators are embedded into the programme's logframe or similar document - in order for the programme to be implemented, monitored, and evaluated at the level of the programme as a whole; and in order to increase transparency, and enhance donor coordination;</li> <li>the composition of such complex programmes is achieved more effectively, with regard to deciding which interventions to include (and which not to include) in a programme portfolio, to ensuring balanced coverage across the thematic priorities identified for a given programme, and avoiding potential overlaps between interventions.</li> </ol>
<p>WEI contains a blend of interventions implemented through a range of modalities, including activities commenced prior to the launch of WEI,</p>	<p>The existing blend of modalities of intervention represents an effective and flexible model, allowing Finland to support a wide range of activities through</p>	<p>Drawing on the findings of the current evaluation of WEI as a whole, and on evaluations of individual interventions, as these become available, conduct an internal review of the</p>

<p>and new interventions launched on the basis of the WEI programme.</p> <p>The evaluation provided evidence of the commitment and professionalism of the MFA staff in Helsinki, and their ability to manage a large and diverse set of interventions. Evidence was also gathered with regard to the contribution to WEI activities by Finnish diplomatic staff in the WEI region.</p> <p>In addition to routine monitoring, attendance of meetings, providing feedback to partners by MFA staff, the direct involvement by MFA staff has proved crucial for dealing with problems arising in a number of interventions, as noted by implementing partners.</p> <p>Finland's approach as a donor has been praised by respondents from a range of partner organizations and beneficiary institutions and citizens, with particular note made of the patience shown by Finland with regard to expecting results, the support shown in dealing with complex issues and problems.</p>	<p>collaboration with implementing partners that are well suited to the respective demands of a particular intervention. However, the evaluation questions whether all interventions included into WEI should have been covered by the initiative (in relation, among other considerations, to the declared intention for WEI to achieve a reduction in the existing number of interventions). This point also relates to the relative balance in the number of interventions found across the WEI priority themes.</p> <p>The contribution of MFA staff and Finnish diplomatic staff to WEI has been a significant factor in the impact of the programme, ensuring effective support for the implementation of WEI interventions.</p> <p>The level of commitment and professional expertise demonstrated by MFA has served as a vital element in Finland's very strong reputation as a donor country in the WEI region.</p>	<p>relative performance of interventions and their contribution to WEI according to the modality of support (e.g. ICI, outsourced administration, INGO managed, multilateral organization as implementing partner), in order to identify the most appropriate modalities to map onto the requirements of future programming, in the context of the 2012 Development Policy.</p> <p>Continue to foster and support the effective, 'hands on' and informed approach of its staff in overseeing the WEI interventions.</p> <p>Ensure that the MFA WEI team conducts regular stocktaking of the overall objectives of WEI and progress of the interventions.</p>
---	--	--

<i>Relevance</i>		
	<p>As stated above, the report has noted deficiencies in the programming phase, which impacted on the identification of Relevance. However, the report notes that this has been compensated for, to a good degree, by drawing on a bottom-up identification of Relevance through the WEI interventions. At the level of interventions, the process of identification of relevance of activities, and the degree to which these can be seen to be demand-driven, has generally been conducted very effectively, with implementing partners deploying comprehensive procedures, implemented on a regular basis.</p>	
Thematic priorities and foci of interventions show strong correlation with needs of beneficiary countries, and reflect Finnish development policy strengths.	In combination, the WEI clusters (based on the priority themes of Finland's Development Policy) provide a comprehensive response to the complex challenges and needs of the beneficiary countries and regions, drawing on key strengths in Finland's own capacity and experience. WEI activities map very well onto EU priorities and policies for the respective regions covered in WEI (Eastern Partnership, and Central Asia), serving to complement EU activities.	Continue to emphasise the current thematic priorities in the WEI region, as these address key priorities and needs of the beneficiary countries, and reflect and draw on Finland's particular strengths and areas of expertise.
Amalgamated analysis of interventions demonstrates that a regional approach has been achieved, although often through country-based activities rather than regional/cross-border cooperation.	The WEI programme contains an effective blend of interventions aimed at single-country activities, and regionally-oriented interventions (although it is also noted that often regional approaches require a focus at the country level, where cross-	Continue the emphasis seen in WEI of a regional approach, to the extent that this is possible within the revised framework of WEI II.

<p>Interventions address the needs of a wide range of stakeholders in beneficiary countries – government institutions, NGOs, populations.</p>	<p>border or regional cooperation encounters obstacles).</p> <p>Interventions are seen by stakeholders as being very relevant to the needs of a wide range of beneficiary groups in the WEI countries, including government institutions, NGOs, populations. On the basis of the evidence reviewed, the WEI interventions have responded effectively to changes in political, economic, social conditions in beneficiary countries during implementation (including reacting to situations of considerable flux, such as seen in Kyrgyzstan in 2010, in relations with Belarus, etc).</p>	<p>Work with partners, government and civil society stakeholders in beneficiary countries to ensure that Finnish interventions continue to address the priorities of countries and populations of the WEI region.</p>
<p><b>Efficiency</b></p>		
<p>A review of progress reports and other evidence from WEI interventions indicates that activities are, in the majority of cases, being implemented on schedule and to budget. In those cases where problems with finances have occurred, MFA and implementing partners have taken appropriate remedial measures.</p> <p>The blend of modalities of intervention allows MFA flexibility in supporting activities, in line with the demands of particular sectoral and regional contexts.</p>	<p>The MFA has achieved effective selection of implementing partner organizations, which have mostly proved competent and reliable in implementing activities in a cost-effective manner, and adhering to MFA's requirements for reporting. A review of progress reports and other evidence from WEI interventions indicates that activities are, in the majority of cases, being implemented on schedule and to budget. In those cases where problems with finances have occurred, MFA and implementing partners have taken appropriate remedial measures.</p>	

<p>Generally the financial commitment associated with supporting multilateral organization-led interventions are seen to be cost-efficient.</p> <p>The interventions delivered by INGOs allow MFA to achieve extended outreach to regions, beneficiaries and coverage of priority thematic areas.</p> <p>The evaluation has identified a number of cases where Finland can be perceived to operate as a development entrepreneur.</p>	<p>The collaboration with multilateral implementing partners brings associated overheads costs – but strong benefits for Finland, allowing it to support significant development cooperation activities in the WEI region in a cost-effective manner.</p> <p>Interventions implemented by INGOs have provided a cost-effective means of utilising the specialised background of these organizations to achieve WEI impacts.</p> <p>The MFA has, in certain interventions, demonstrated a proactive attitude to responding to identified priorities in WEI countries, taking a lead in providing donor assistance and supporting the work of partner organizations and beneficiaries – with this support achieved notwithstanding Finland's limited diplomatic presence and resources in the WEI region.</p> <p>Taken as an amalgamated set of interventions, implemented according to a diverse range of modalities with regard to implementing partners, the WEI programme has, across all thematic priorities, provided a cost-effective mechanism for Finland to engage in development cooperation activities that have produced tangible value with relation to the financial commitment of Finland to WEI.</p>	<p>Continue the productive collaboration with multilateral implementing partner organizations.</p> <p>Review the experience in WEI of collaborating with International Non-Governmental Organizations as implementing partners, and aim to continue to build such partnerships in future.</p> <p>Continue to place an emphasis on Finland's role as a development entrepreneur, and develop a clear definition of what this comprises, to guide both MFA staff and partner organizations and beneficiaries.</p>
---	---	---

<b>Effectiveness</b>		
<p>Comparison of intervention effectiveness must bear in mind the fact that interventions are at varying stages of implementation, with some only having recently commenced by mid-2012.</p> <p>The evaluation found that the majority of interventions have well-developed strategies for implementation, derived often, though not always, from logframes with clearly defined objectives and indicators. Most interventions are on track to achieving their targets as of mid-2012, with appropriate measures being taken by implementing partners, supported by MFA, in cases where delays and problems have been encountered.</p> <p>The evaluation identified cases where problems with implementation had been encountered (e.g. the FAO intervention in Kyrgyzstan), and traced the measures taken by the implementing partner and MFA to address these issues.</p>	<p>A benefit gained from including a mix of pre-existing interventions, in collaboration with long-standing partners, alongside initiatives launched specifically under WEI, is that this allows MFA the reassurance of the track record of interventions that have already proved effective and that are now continuing, thus allowing MFA to focus relatively more emphasis and resources on assisting new interventions to achieve effective results.</p>	<p>Continue to support a blend of existing interventions with a track record of effective implementation, in collaboration with long-standing partners, alongside new initiatives that address identified needs (in line with the development entrepreneur approach).</p>
<b>Impact</b>		
<p>By mid-2012, tangible impacts could be observed in a number of WEI interventions, among beneficiary country citizens, NGOs, government and research institutions. These impacts map across all of the WEI priority themes. In other cases, due to the nature of the intervention, impacts are anticipated at a later stage.</p>	<p>Impacts on the lives of beneficiaries / the work of beneficiary institutions: The WEI initiative has already achieved significant impacts on the lives of a substantial number of final beneficiaries, and assisted a large number of governmental, private sector and non-governmental organizations in WEI countries to develop capacity, adopt more effective practices,</p>	<p>Continue to support interventions that aim at achieving impacts, collectively, among a wide set of beneficiaries (with a particular focus on addressing the needs of disadvantaged groups within populations of the WEI region).</p>

<p>The variegated nature of the WEI interventions allows impacts to be achieved through a diverse range of channels, appropriate to the specific target beneficiary group or institution (e.g. access to justice, improvement of employment prospects).</p>	<p>forge effective relations with partners locally and internationally. Impacts are diverse, and range, for example, from improved access to legal assistance for disadvantaged citizens in Central Asia; through greater capacities of beneficiaries in the spheres of trade, entrepreneurship, technical knowledge and skills; to impacts recorded in water management, environmental protection, societal security and stability; and improvements in the capacities of beneficiary country ministries, agencies and institutions.</p> <p>Regional impacts: The distribution of coverage of countries in the WEI region can be considered to be proportionate to the relative needs of individual countries, with relatively greater emphasis being afforded to those countries with more acute problems that are addressed by the WEI priority themes. WEI interventions can be seen to have made tangible impacts in fostering effective cross-border and regional collaboration (e.g. cross-border activities supported by ENVSEC), notwithstanding difficulties faced at times in promoting regional cooperation among beneficiary countries.</p> <p>The development of synergies between WEI interventions could have been afforded greater attention by MFA, both at the programming stage, and in the administration of WEI during implementation of interventions.</p>	<p>Continue to promote within WEI (and, subsequently, within the contexts of WEI II) a regional approach that fosters cross-border cooperation and regional collaboration.</p> <p>Devote greater attention to the active identification and exploitation of synergies among WEI interventions (and, where relevant, with the interventions of other donors).</p>
---	---	--

<b><i>Sustainability</i></b>		
<p>In the majority of cases, WEI interventions have clearly defined strategies regarding sustainability, including the development of ownership among beneficiaries, and the inclusion of appropriate exit strategies.</p> <p>Most interventions appear to be well on track towards ensuring sustainability of their activities, although the degree to which this can be achievable by the end of current WEI funding varies.</p> <p>In those cases where intervention implementation has stalled, the report found that the implementing partner organizations were taking appropriate and effective measures to respond, with the active involvement of MFA Finland.</p>	<p>Prospects for sustainability across interventions are quite diverse, because of the varied nature of modalities of support, and the nature of the activities and associated impacts. In certain cases, impacts are visible very soon after launch of activities (e.g. in the case of final beneficiaries having received assistance in the access to law project); but sustainability of provision of such access will take longer to develop. In other cases, impacts take longer to become visible (e.g. in environmental clean-up projects), which affects the pace at which sustainability efforts can be put in place.</p> <p>In assessing prospects for sustainability beyond the current WEI support, and in the light of the introduction of the 2012 Finnish Development Policy, which envisages an apparent considerable contraction in Finnish development cooperation activities in the WEI region, it is important to differentiate between multi-donor and single-donor interventions in the WEI portfolio. In those cases where Finland is one among several or many donors supporting an ongoing initiative, it is assumed that any curtailment of Finnish support after the expiry of current commitments will be mediated by the contributions of other donors (although this is not certain in all cases – e.g. ENVSEC).</p> <p>In those cases where Finland is the single,</p>	<p>In the programming of WEI II, factor in the patterns of sustainability found in current WEI interventions, to ensure that all relevant internal and external influences on sustainability are recognised. Those interventions whose impacts would be adversely affected by non-continuation of Finnish support should be afforded particular attention, to assess possibilities for continued support; and to offer assistance in identifying a replacement donor, if necessary.</p>

	<p>or main donor, in an intervention which is likely to require, or seek, follow-on funding after the current funding agreement comes to an end, the situation is rather different. Finding replacement donors will be easier for some interventions than others, and it is assumed that MFA Finland will assist existing partners in this process.</p>	
<b><i>Aid Effectiveness and Visibility</i></b>		
<p>Donor coordination: The identification and programming stages were conducted under time pressure. This impacted on the procedures employed for ensuring donor coordination at this phase.</p> <p>The approach to the formulation of WEI included a large emphasis on the adoption of existing interventions into the WEI framework – which allowed continuity with regard to relations with partner organizations, but also impacted on the number and balance of interventions.</p> <p>Coordination with multilateral organizations took place at the level of intervention, accordingly, rather than at the level of the programme as a whole; and consultations and coordination with other donor and beneficiary governments was conducted on a limited scale.</p> <p>Visibility: There is currently a deficiency in the level of visibility and communications coverage of WEI as a</p>	<p>The gap in conduct of systematic and comprehensive identification activities at the level of the programme has significant drawbacks – as it places too much reliance on individual interventions to take responsibility for ensuring relevance, establishing the demand-driven nature of activities, consulting with beneficiaries, and ensuring donor coordination. It holds the potential for adverse effects on aid effectiveness.</p> <p>Deficiencies in visibility and communications serve to restrict both the extent to which Finland can exploit</p>	<p>Work towards more effective and comprehensive coordination with other donors and with beneficiary stakeholders at the programming and implementation stages.</p> <p>For the remainder of the current WEI programme until 2014, allocate more human and financial resources to visibility and communication</p>

<p>programme (rather than at the level of interventions).</p>	<p>effectively the positive potential provided by its strong reputation as a donor in this region, and awareness among partners and beneficiaries about WEI as a framework initiative.</p> <p>Given the achievements of WEI, there is considerable scope for MFA to highlight the positive impacts that WEI interventions are seen to be having across the region, through increased efforts in communications and visibility activities.</p>	<p>activities related to WEI, in order to raise awareness about WEI activities and achievements among audiences in beneficiary countries, among partner organizations, in the EU, and in Finland. This is important not only in relation to highlighting Finland's role as a donor and the achievements seen in the interventions, but also for the purposes of donor transparency and accountability.</p> <p>In line with the previous recommendation - establish a dedicated WEI website as a priority, with links to the individual interventions and frameworks, contact persons, and information on the activities in each country.</p> <p>Afford greater attention to the need to provide regular information briefings to EU Delegations in the WEI countries, and to other donors (e.g. through attendance of donor coordination meetings), to ensure awareness of Finnish development cooperation activities and to facilitate donor coordination and complementarity.</p> <p>Organize information days showcasing the achievements of Finnish funded interventions on an annual basis in the WEI countries. Such events could be organized at relatively little cost.</p> <p>Explore possibilities for identifying and appointing representatives in the WEI countries (for example, Finnish citizens resident in that location), who could contribute to such information events and activities.</p>
---	---	---

<b><i>Finnish Value Added</i></b>		
<p>The experience of Finland in certain key priority spheres (such as Water, energy efficiency, telecommunications), and the expertise that its consultants and implementing organizations bring to WEI activities, received strong recognition and praise from respondents to the evaluation.</p> <p>The evaluation received a substantial amount of evidence regarding perceptions of Finland's role as a donor, with respondents noting its reputation as a committed, reliable partner, ready to take a proactive stance to assist implementing organizations, while retaining a 'modest' stance on its achievements in the WEI region.</p>	<p>Those WEI interventions that relate to spheres in which Finland and Finnish experts have key strengths have, mostly, drawn effectively on the availability of Finnish expertise in their activities.</p>	<p>MFA should continue to embed Finnish Value Added into the programming and implementation of interventions, and assist Finnish companies and experts in exploiting opportunities for involvement in Finnish development cooperation activities.</p>
<b><i>Cross-cutting objectives</i></b>		
<p>The topics of climate change and environmental protection are well covered in the WEI activities. For many of the interventions, these are the primary objectives, and the remaining interventions are not likely to exacerbate problems. In addition, the projects are generally making strong contributions to good governance and transparency.</p> <p>Coverage of other cross-cutting objectives (such as gender, social inclusion of easily-marginalised groups, HIV/AIDS, etc) is only 'fair' within the</p>	<p>Seemingly most of the cross-cutting objectives have not been prioritised in the selection and planning of the projects, nor in the monitoring by the MFA.</p> <p>The nature of the implementation modality, often using multilateral organisations to implement policy level activities, makes it difficult to consider many issues of social inclusion.</p>	<p>More attention should be paid to incorporation of cross-cutting objectives in reporting of the existing interventions. The principle of "do no harm" should be most basic in the WEI projects, and the cross-cutting themes should be included in reporting formats for all projects – updated in the future to reflect the 2012 Development Policy, where possible.</p> <p>With stronger management from MFA, this could also include proactive suggestions of activities within existing projects (and consequent re-allocation of budgets), provision of specific training on the themes, or selection of future</p>

<p>WEI programme and its interventions overall.</p> <p>There is a relative lack of attention to embedding cross-cutting issues within the individual projects, and their monitoring and reporting (with a few notable exceptions).</p>		<p>projects or programmes by the MFA that are more likely to permit consideration of cross-cutting objectives.</p> <p>When discussing the selection of new activities, more attention should be paid to mainstreaming issues such as gender and social inclusion, applying a HRBA and selecting specific activities that reflect MFA priorities, such as HIV/AIDS.</p>
<b>Research Cluster</b>		
<p>The research projects and associated activities have, overall, been implemented effectively, and achieved early impacts.</p> <p>Research institutions have bolstered their research profile and added to staff expertise; and MFA Finland has been able to draw on the results of policy-relevant research. Outputs have included publications, conferences, networking among Finnish institutions and between Finland and the region, as well as outreach to academic and policy audiences in the EU and globally.</p> <p>Impacts have also been felt among the beneficiary country participants in Research Cluster activities - including visits to Finnish institutions for study periods, collaboration on research and publications, participation in events conducted in Finland and the WEI region (with interaction also achieved in cases with researchers from other WEI countries).</p>	<p>This initiative has proved a successful catalyst for assisting Finnish research institutions to develop a substantial growth in capacity, in their coverage of researching the nexus between security and development, focused on the WEI region.</p> <p>As impacts within the research sphere tend to take time to develop fully, the full impact of this WEI intervention will depend on the extent to which the institutions concerned will be able to maintain the momentum of these activities (in which the nature of ongoing MFA support can play an important role).</p>	<p>Support Finnish research institutions in maintaining the momentum achieved in the Research Cluster, through facilitating the continuation and strengthening of networking and mobility activities of Finnish research institutions and WEI collaborating partners relating to the thematic and geographical foci of the initiative.</p> <p>Consult with the Finnish research and academic community with regard to the further development of capacity in this sphere, including the potential for increasing dedicated research funds to support junior researchers, research projects, events.</p> <p>Increase opportunities for Finnish researchers to be seconded to MFA, to work on specific policy-relevant activities.</p>

<p>The outsourced administrative arrangement has encountered certain difficulties, which have reduced its effectiveness.</p>		<p>Review the administrative model of the Research Cluster, and explore alternative options to the current outsourced arrangement.</p>
<p><b><i>FinWaterWEI</i></b></p>		
<p>The activities or sub-projects funded within the framework were mainly continuations of earlier support, pulled together into the one framework. They have been generally relevant, effective and appreciated by the participating countries.</p> <p>The outsourcing of administrative support to SYKE is improving the Finnish government's institutional memory in the water sector, as well as supporting Finnish experts to participate in international workshops.</p> <p>At present the roles of other Finnish actors (such as the Finnish Water Forum, NGOs, consulting companies or research institutes) are quite limited.</p> <p>The workload of the MFA has decreased as a result of the outsourcing, but not significantly. More importantly has been the qualitative benefit in providing support to the framework by Finnish water specialists (mainly from SYKE). The activities are being carried out in a cost-effective manner.</p>	<p>Strategically FinWaterWEI fits well within WEI, as well as with policies of the regions, and reflects Finnish involvement with water issues internationally.</p> <p>As with most WEI interventions, the activities funded have been mainly continuations of earlier support, rather than anything new. Whilst these activities have been valuable, and on the whole effective, the main innovative factor has been the grouping of interventions and contracting of SYKE to administer the framework.</p> <p>The budget of FinWaterWEI is too small for the ambitious range of activities. The monitoring is focusing on administrative issues and not on the achievement of the results of the overall strategy.</p>	<p>Continue support to FinWaterWEI activities under the present contract. No new activities should be begun during this phase.</p> <p>Accentuate efforts to monitor the overall results and impact with regard to the FinWaterWEI document rather than only the administrative achievements.</p> <p>Concentrate funds to a smaller number of activities. Either funding could increase (unlikely in the current situation) or activities should be restricted in future planning.</p> <p>In a potential WEI II, diversify modalities (for instance, as used in the case of the Finnish support to the Mekong River basin, where activities are implemented by a range of government institutions, multilateral organisations, NGOs, consultants, and research institutions).</p>

<b>ENVSEC</b>		
<p>ENVSEC projects and sub-regional activities provide a platform for bringing together governmental and civil society actors, together with international organizations, to discuss and act on the priority issues identified.</p> <p>At the level of projects, ENVSEC activities are being effectively implemented and address a range of important issues relating to the security-environment nexus. At the level of the organization, the contributing partner international organizations state that have benefitted from the collaborative environment provided by ENVSEC.</p> <p>Some concerns were raised regarding the extent to which ownership was promoted among beneficiary country stakeholders.</p> <p>Finland's contribution to the ENVSEC initiative remains at a very high level, with questions over the sustainability of this commitment.</p> <p>The ENVSEC Secretariat absorbs a high proportion of the funds allocated to ENVSEC overall, resulting in the majority of the MFA's funds being used for administration.</p>	<p>ENVSEC is an excellent match to the WEI, and it is working in themes and individual projects that are of enormous importance for the regions. It is an effective vehicle for tackling sensitive issues – bringing together the combined capacity of the participating organizations.</p> <p>There is considerable interest among stakeholders (from the contributing organizations and beneficiary country organizations) for continuation of ENVSEC, although issues relating to ownership, donor commitment, and commitment to collaboration among beneficiary governmental and civil society actors (on a national and regional basis) need to be addressed by ENVSEC if the initiative is to be sustainable.</p> <p>The donor funding situation has yet to be resolved despite Finland's appeals for other donors to consider taking a greater share of the financial burden.</p> <p>Issues relating to the administrative costs of the Secretariat and the administration of ENVSEC need to be addressed.</p>	<p>Continue to support ENVSEC implementation projects, with strengthened support to Central Asia.</p> <p>Encourage ENVSEC's Management Board to review the regional coordination roles, and if considered appropriate, rotate the host organisations.</p> <p>Work with ENVSEC to develop an exit strategy, or a strategy for ENVSEC to make a transition to a much lower level of funding from Finland.</p> <p>Phase out the support to the Secretariat, moving to a lighter model of coordination.</p> <p>Move the Trust Fund management to one of the partners.</p>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 *The Wider Europe Initiative*

This report presents the findings of a mid-term evaluation of the Wider Europe Initiative (WEI), a bilateral development cooperation programme in Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Central Asia announced by Finland in 2008. The Wider Europe Initiative is being implemented in the following eleven countries:

- Eastern Europe: Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine
- South Caucasus: Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia
- Central Asia: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan

The global objective of the Wider Europe Initiative, identified by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA) of Finland, is to strengthen stability and security across the regions through interventions focused on the following priority themes: security, trade and development, information society development, energy and the environment and social sustainability. The WEI interventions are presented in Table 1 below, clustered according to these priority themes, and identifying the implementing partner where relevant. It should be noted that certain interventions contain synergies with other themes – e.g. between ‘Security’ and ‘Social sustainability.’ The evaluation will include an assessment of the extent to which these synergies have been effectively exploited.

**Table 1. Wider Europe Initiative – Interventions by Cluster**

1. Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Research Cluster (Security and Development)</li><li>• Crimea Policy Dialogue (PATRIR, Romania)</li><li>• OSCE activities (not covered in evaluation)</li></ul>
2. Trade and Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Aid for Trade (UNDP)</li><li>• Support to Fishery and Aquaculture Management (FAO)</li><li>• Ukraine Cleaner Production (IFC)</li></ul>
3. Information Society Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Creating Sustainable Business in the Knowledge Economy (InfoDev – World Bank)</li><li>• Regional Communications Regulatory Training Programme (EBRD)</li></ul>
4. Energy and the Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Chernobyl Shelter Fund (EBRD)</li><li>• Cooperation in the Meteorological Sector (Institutional Cooperation) (Finnish Meteorological Institute)</li><li>• Eastern Europe Energy Efficiency and Environment Partnership Fund (E5P Fund) (EBRD)</li><li>• EBRD Water Fund</li><li>• ENVSEC</li><li>• FinWaterWEI (SYKE)</li><li>• Geo-Sector Information Management System Development and Capacity Building in Central Asian Countries (GTK)</li><li>• Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership (NDEP)</li></ul>

**Table 1. Wider Europe Initiative – Interventions by Cluster**

	(EBRD)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nuclear Safety and Security Capacity Building (Finnish Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority STUK)</li> <li>• Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in Georgia (UNDP)</li> </ul>
5. Social sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decent Work Country Programmes (ILO)</li> <li>• ETC - Early Transition Countries fund (EBRD)</li> <li>• Justice Sector Support Facility in Central Asia (Eurasia Foundation Central Asia and the Venice Commission of the Council of Europe)</li> <li>• Occupational Safety and Health Systems (ILO)</li> <li>• Technical Cooperation in the Area of Statistics (Statistics Finland)</li> <li>• Training of officials from Georgia and Moldova (Estonian School of Diplomacy)</li> <li>• EBRD Technical Cooperation Fund</li> <li>• Local Cooperation Funds (not covered in evaluation)</li> </ul>

The Wider Europe Initiative is designed as, and should therefore be evaluated as, a complex programme – covering a diversity of thematic priorities, through interventions conducted on regional and country bases, through the application of a range of modalities of intervention involving a diverse stakeholder community of partner organizations and beneficiaries.

The WEI was developed on the basis of the Finnish 2007 Development Policy Programme, which placed emphasis on adopting a regional approach, and is intended to address core problems in the countries of the WEI region, in the spheres of governance, civil society and the rule of law, economic development, environmental challenges, management of energy and natural resources. It is intended to complement the European Union's policies in the regions covered in the Initiative. The budget allocation for WEI for the period of 2009-13 is approximately 60,3 million euros, of which OSCE is 3,25 million and Local Cooperation Funds 6,4 million euros. The two latter programmes are not included in this evaluation. The combined value of funding allocated to the interventions covered in the current evaluation, accordingly, amounts to approximately 50,7 million euros.

## **1.2 Purpose and Scope of Evaluation**

FCG Finnish Consulting Group was contracted to carry out the mid-term evaluation of the WEI between February and September 2012, with an evaluation team of four experts. The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to assess the progress made in the WEI interventions, most of which were launched in 2009, and scheduled to complete in 2013 and 2014. The findings of the evaluation are due to inform decision-making in MFA Finland with regard to the planning of the Wider Europe Initiative II, which will be introduced from 2014.

As stated in the Terms of Reference for the evaluation, the objectives are:

1. *to provide evidence of the performance of the WEI to date and likely performance in the future (i.e., is WEI achieving its objectives, including the cross-cutting objectives);*

2. *to analyse the reasons explaining success and failure in performance;*
3. *Special emphasis should be on evaluating the WEI implementation approach that builds on regional cooperation, use of multi-bi instruments, focusing on chosen themes and objectives;*
4. *to provide recommendations on any interventions that will be seen as needing modifications*

The **scope** of the evaluation has been to analyse the Wider Europe Initiative as a whole<sup>1</sup>, to assess its overall performance and the extent to which it has achieved, or is on the way to achieving, its aims; and to analyse the effectiveness of the administration of the Initiative and its interventions by MFA and partner organizations.

The Terms of Reference specify that particular attention should be given to three interventions: the Security and Research Cluster, FinWaterWEI, and ENVSEC. In all three cases, the administration for these interventions has been outsourced to a separate organization – and one of the aims of the current evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of this approach.

The remaining WEI interventions (with the exclusion of OSCE and Local Cooperation Fund initiatives) are covered in the current evaluation, as requested by the TOR, at a more general level, highlighting and assessing their contribution to the overall impact of WEI, as well as particular features of that intervention or the nature of Finnish support. (It should be noted that the current evaluation, accordingly, does not aim to substitute for the mid-term or end-of-project evaluations of individual interventions – indeed, all WEI interventions are subject to regular evaluation according to the procedures of the respective implementing organization.)

Empirical data for the evaluation has been gathered through documentary analysis, interviews with respondents from MFA, partner organizations, governmental and non-governmental organization representatives and final beneficiaries in the WEI region, EU representatives.

As requested in the TOR, evidence has been gathered and analysed from all 11 countries of the WEI region. A particular emphasis has been placed on evidence from 4 case-study countries (Armenia, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Ukraine), which were selected by MFA and indicated in the TOR. In addition, supplementary missions were made to Geneva and Tallinn, and a workshop was attended in Azerbaijan.

The temporal scope of the evaluation covers the period from 2009-2012 (but also reflecting retrospectively on the period preceding 2009, in which the WEI programme was formulated; and looking forward, to anticipate the possible scenarios for the evolution of the WEI activities until and after the end of the current funding period, in 2014).

### **1.3                      Methodology**

In this section the methodological approach to the evaluation is outlined, after a review of the requirements established by the Terms of Evaluation.

---

<sup>1</sup> With the exception of OSCE and Local Cooperation Fund interventions

### **1.3.1 Evaluation criteria**

The mid-term evaluation of the Wider Europe Initiative has been conducted with reference to the following criteria:<sup>2</sup>

(In line with the OECD/DAC criteria for the evaluation of development assistance)

- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Impact
- Sustainability

In addition, the TOR requested that the evaluation examine the following, in relation to the implementation of the Wider Europe Initiative as a whole:

- Aid effectiveness
- Programme management and administrative arrangements
- Finnish added value
- EU complementarity

### **1.3.2 Case studies**

As stipulated in the TOR, the evaluation has incorporated a case-study approach with respect to the coverage of the regional dimension of WEI, and the WEI interventions:

- The selection of case-study countries for the field missions (Armenia, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan and Ukraine) was made by MFA, the rationale being to cover all 3 sub-regions included in the WEI initiative;
- The selection of 3 interventions (ENVSEC, Research cluster, FinWaterWEI) for more in-depth coverage in the evaluation was also made by MFA – with a key factor being the outsourced nature of the administration of these interventions, a relatively innovative approach on which MFA required detailed feedback.

### **1.3.3 Indicators**

As stated in 2007 policy statement, Finnish development policy supports and adheres to the principles of aid effectiveness as defined in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness of 2005. However, the Wider Europe Initiative programme does not have a set of indicators (i.e. targets to be attained by the Programme and its components) at the level of the programme as a whole (e.g. that might be contained within a substantive foundational document, or a logframe). Rather, the intended outcomes/results of the Initiative are set in more general terms, without reference to specific figures, outputs, etc.

The absence of a clear set of indicators at the level of WEI holds implications, accordingly, for the assessment of the aid effectiveness of the Initiative, as it is not possible to refer to the extent to which WEI has achieved specific results that were identified at the outset of the Initiative. The report will return to this issue in its broader discussion of aid effectiveness in subsequent sections.

---

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 4-7 of the Terms of Reference in Annex 1

For the evaluation process, the absence of indicators also presented a methodological challenge, which has been addressed by extrapolating indicators included at the level of interventions, and using the amalgamated perspective provided by the combined indicators to achieve, within limits, an overall picture of WEI-related indicators. However, it should be noted that intervention-level indicators are qualitatively quite different from those that would be provided by an initiative-level set of indicators. The team also developed a working reconstruction of an intervention logic for the WEI overall, and an associated model logframe, to serve as a reference point for the purpose of conducting the evaluation.

### **1.3.4 Methods**

The evaluation team developed a methodological approach to meet the afore-mentioned requirements, and also to ensure that all levels of analysis would receive appropriate attention (from programme level, through thematic priorities, key case studies, regional coverage of WEI, and individual interventions). The evaluation used the following methods of data collection:

*Documentary review and analysis:* The evaluation team received and reviewed a very large number of documents relating to the WEI, at the policy and programme level from MFA, and at the level of interventions from MFA and implementing partner organizations and beneficiaries. The documentation reviewed included Finnish, English and Russian language sources.

*Interviews:* Drawing on a question set developed on the basis of the evaluation questions included in the TOR, semi-structured and unstructured individual and group interviews were conducted (in English, Finnish and Russian) with a large number of respondents (in total 329 persons were interviewed, some several times). The names and positions of those interviewed are provided in Annex 2.

*Survey of stakeholders in WEI interventions:* In order to expand the breadth of feedback on WEI interventions beyond the four case-study countries visited by the evaluation team, an online survey was developed on the basis of the evaluation questions. The evaluators and MFA agreed that the survey findings would serve as illustrations, rather than provide representative findings across all respondent groups and interventions, as this would have required considerably greater time and resources than were available for the purposes of the current evaluation. (The request to complete the survey, for instance, was distributed to contact persons in WEI interventions, or to contact lists provided by those contact points. However, the evaluation team was not in a position to monitor the process of responding to the survey, and thus confirm the validity of results to the degree required when claiming that findings are valid and representative.) The purpose of the survey was rather to give insights into the perceptions of those respondents who were reached by the survey, and to draw the attention of the evaluation team to issues arising, which could be followed up through interviews and other means (the survey responses were monitored during the period of the survey's implementation, from April to July 2012).

The survey results presented in the report should, accordingly, be viewed with these limitations in mind. (Indeed, the rather positive findings may indicate a certain bias, possibly traceable to the strong representation of stakeholders from international organizations (i.e. including implementing partner organizations) among the respondents.) The findings serve,

rather, as illustrations of overall trends in respondent perceptions, which were explored in more depth by the evaluation team in their field missions and documentary analysis.

Respondents completed the survey online (with the choice of responding to either the English or Russian language version), answering a set of 16 closed questions (5-point Likert scale). The diversity of the interventions of WEI, and the attendant diversity of the respondent base, meant that the survey questions were by necessity set at a generic level that would be applicable to all, to render the results comparable. The survey questions were framed as statements, with responses ranging from 'strongly disagree', through 'disagree' to 'agree' and 'strongly agree', with the response 'neither agree nor disagree' also included as an option. The total number of respondents was 113, (a response rate of 39.5% from 286 persons contacted with a request to complete the survey).

Responses were requested from participants in all interventions, with invitations sent by email to contact addresses received from intervention administrators, or sent via these administrators. The results show that responses were indeed received from all 28 WEI interventions. Some 60% of responses were made in English, 40% in Russian; and 54% of respondents were female, 46% male). Of the 113 respondents, 36.3% work in international organizations, 12.4% work in beneficiary government structures, 15.9% in the non-governmental sector in beneficiary countries, 24.8% in universities or think-tanks, and 10.6% in 'other' capacities. Respondents were invited to provide additional comments after each question, which allowed the survey to capture more specific feedback.

*Observation:* The evaluation team took advantage of opportunities to observe activities of the interventions visited during the field missions – e.g. on a visit to Issyk Kul lake in Kyrgyzstan to observe fisheries related activities; accompanying an OSCE team to a mining town in Armenia, where an ENVSEC project supporting the work of local civil society in examining potential environmental impacts was being implemented; and to attend a United Nations policy conference in Geneva on transboundary water issues.

### ***1.3.5 Structure of the report***

In Section 2, the report will discuss the development and administration of the Wider Europe Initiative at the Programme level. This discussion will reflect first on the policy context within which WEI was conceived and launched (referring to the evolution of Finnish development policy in its 2004 and 2007 versions). The programming process of WEI will then be examined, followed by analysis of the way in which the programme has been administered by MFA since 2009. This section will also provide coverage of the issues of WEI visibility and communications, at the level of the initiative as a whole.

Section 3 will introduce the key themes and issues to be explored in the review of WEI interventions, which will be presented in Sections 4 to 8, according to the WEI thematic priorities (clusters). The case-studies of the Research Cluster, FinWaterWEI and ENVSEC will be addressed within their respective thematic clusters.

Section 9 will present conclusions and recommendations relating to the Wider Europe Initiative.

#### **1.4**

#### ***Acknowledgments***

The evaluation team would like to express its gratitude to the staff of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, and the many respondents who have contributed to the work of this evaluation. The team trusts that this necessarily compressed account and analysis of the nature of the Wider Europe Initiative and its component interventions provides an accurate representation and reflection of the myriad views expressed to the team by the respondents.

## 2. THE DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE WIDER EUROPE INITIATIVE

The focal point of this section is the role of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, in the development and programming of the Wider Europe Initiative, and, following its launch, the administration of the WEI, including activities relating to visibility and communications.

### 2.1 *The Policy contexts of the Wider Europe Initiative*

The Wider Europe Initiative was developed as a regional programme that would address key challenges facing the countries of the former Soviet Union (excluding the Russian Federation), in the sub-regions of Eastern Europe, Central Asia and South Caucasus. A key figure in the development of WEI was the then Minister for International Trade and Development, Dr Paavo Väyrynen, who had worked with the region since the Soviet Union period.

The rationale for WEI can be discerned in the Government Programme of 2007<sup>3</sup>, and subsequently in the Development Policy Programme 2007<sup>4</sup>, which stated that Finnish policy was based on the ‘guiding principles’ of coherence, complementarity and effectiveness in development, and emphasising the need for a regional approach. The thematic priorities of WEI reflected the themes set out in Finnish development policy, with the 2007 policy taking forward and refining those established previously in the 2004 policy. These policy developments are summarised in Table 2.

**Table 2. Finnish Development Policy Programmes, 2004 and 2007**

Policy	Thematic priorities	Cross-cutting issues
2004	<p>Overarching goal: eradication of extreme poverty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of environmental threats</li> <li>• Promotion of equality, human rights, democracy and good governance</li> <li>• Promotion of worldwide security</li> <li>• Promotion of economic interaction</li> <li>• Additionally: to encourage Finnish companies’ involvement in developing countries to promote the attainment of MDG, public-private partnerships, and promotion of Information and Communication Technology (ICT)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion of the rights of women and girls, and of gender and social equality</li> <li>• Promotion of rights of vulnerable groups</li> <li>• Environment</li> <li>• Commitment to rights-based approach and sustainable development</li> </ul>
2007	<p>Main goal: to eradicate poverty and to promote ecologically, economically and socially sustainable development in accordance the MDG, placing particular</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion of the rights and the status of women and girls, and promotion of gender and social equality</li> <li>• Promotion of the rights of groups that are easily excluded, particularly children, people with disabilities, indigenous people</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> *Pääministeri Matti Vanhasen II hallituksen ohjelma* *Prime Minister Matti Vanhanen’s 2<sup>nd</sup> Government Programme* 19.4.2007

<sup>4</sup> *Development Policy Programme Towards a Sustainable and Just World Community - Government Decision-in-Principle, 2007*

**Table 2. Finnish Development Policy Programmes, 2004 and 2007**

Policy	Thematic priorities	Cross-cutting issues
	emphasis on climate and environment.	and ethnic minorities, and the promotion of equal opportunities for participation
	Strategy papers for different sectors (such as water, environment, rural development) developed, outlining Finland's specific approaches in these sectors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Combating of HIV/AIDS as a health and social problem.</li> </ul>

The Finnish approach has emphasised the linkage between security and development (including the need to address conflict-related issues), and has also sought to draw on Finnish expertise in key priorities (such as the environment, and information technology).

WEI was developed at the same time as the European Union was intensifying its activities in the respective regions covered by WEI – through the Eastern Partnership (which includes the South Caucasus and Eastern European WEI countries, initiated in 2008 as an extension of the European Neighbourhood Policy - East), and the Development Cooperation Instrument for Central Asia (approved in 2007). Finnish Neighbouring Area Cooperation ('Lähialueyhteistyö') has operated since 1992, and supported cooperation between Finland and north-west Russia. This functioned mainly via outsourcing to Finnish government institutions, and this experience of outsourcing was another of the formative inputs to the development of the WEI. Attention was also given to the perceived need for WEI to contribute to fostering constructive relations with the Russian Federation, both from the part of Finland, and from the side of the countries covered in the WEI initiative. Dr Väyrynen was particularly concerned that following the war between Georgia and Russia, further conflict should be avoided. He considered that by working with the WEI framework, confrontation could be avoided at the same time as developing cooperation with the wider region.<sup>5</sup>

The development of EU policies in these regions provided a broader context for the cooperation activities of Finland, as an EU Member State, with these countries; while the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness of 2005, to which Finland is a signatory, provides the global framework of good practice in development cooperation within which WEI operates.

A further input to the development of WEI was provided by the 2009 Evaluation Report on 'Finland's Development Cooperation in Central Asia and South Caucasus.' That report recommended:

- The prioritisation of bilateral projects, stating that these should 'form the core of Finnish development cooperation in the regions under consideration.' (The evaluation was critical of the work of multilateral donor organisations, involved in implementing projects to which Finnish funding was allocated.) As can be seen from the list of WEI interventions, this recommendation did not lead to a decrease in engagement with multilateral organizations – and as the current report will highlight later, this decision has been justified;
- Narrowing the geographical focus of activities – to prioritise Central Asia (specifically - the Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan), and Georgia within the South Caucasus.

<sup>5</sup> Paavo Väyrynen, *Huonomminkin Olisi Voinut Käydä*, pp. 192-193

Again, this was not followed up in the WEI programme launched in 2009, which covers 11 countries of the former Soviet Union region (with the exclusion of the Russian Federation, and the 3 Baltic EU member states). However, it should be noted that a decision has already been taken (announced during the current evaluation) that WEI II will indeed focus on a smaller number of countries;<sup>6</sup>

- Placing an emphasis on Finnish 'added value,' through strengthening the visibility of Finnish funding and support, and of Finnish presence in activities. WEI has included a focus on this issue, and the current evaluation has assessed the extent to which this has proved effective;
- Development of Finland's role as a 'development entrepreneur.' WEI has included this aspiration, although the concept remains rather vague and under-developed. The current evaluation will examine the ways in which the concept has been applied, and its effectiveness.

## **2.2 Programming**

Moving on from the contexts and factors that can be seen to have influenced the decision to develop the Wider Europe Initiative, in this section the focus is on the Programming process. How was the idea to develop WEI taken forward to operationalisation?

### **2.2.1 Identification stage**

In line with the principles of development cooperation set out in the Paris Declaration, donor countries should aim to establish that cooperation programmes reflect the needs of beneficiary governments and populations, i.e. that cooperation is based on a demand-driven approach, and that the core issue of Relevance of programmes and interventions is afforded the highest priority. Cascading from this starting point, the following interlinked principles should be observed in the identification stage:

- Donor coordination – in order to avoid overlaps and clashes with the work of other donors, and to aim towards complementarity where feasible;
- Ownership and sustainability – the prospects for beneficiaries to develop the capacity to assume ownership of the intervention activities should be assessed and measures built in to the programme to work towards this goal;
- Transparency and mutual accountability should be emphasised, and incorporated into the cooperation programme;
- Risks associated with the proposed programme should be identified and made clear to all stakeholders, with mediating measures included into the programme as appropriate; Exit strategies should also be identified and incorporated into the programming;
- A Results-based approach should be adopted in the programme identification and formulation, to establish clear, specific goals drawn from the global objectives; and measurable indicators should be established for the programme.

The Wider Europe Initiative was conceived on the basis of Finnish development policy priorities, and core thematic emphases as the starting point – however, in line with the aforementioned principles, clearly it was important that the MFA ensured that these priorities matched the perceived needs of the countries of the WEI region – and, moreover, given the

---

<sup>6</sup> Finland's Development Policy Programme: Government Decision-in-Principle, 16 February 2012

regional dimension of WEI, that regional cooperation priorities were taking into account. How was this task addressed in the programming of WEI?

Here, the limited diplomatic presence of Finland in the countries of the WEI region, and the limited human resources in MFA itself, influenced the extent to which widespread consultation could be conducted. For instance, Finland has embassies only in Kazakhstan and Ukraine. The South Caucasus is covered by one roving ambassador; three Central Asian countries (Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan) are covered by another roving ambassador (while Kyrgyzstan is covered by the embassy in Kazakhstan); Moldova comes under the auspices of the embassy in Romania; and Belarus is covered by the embassy in Lithuania.

As indicated in interviews with MFA staff who participated in the programming stages, supplemented by documentary evidence, and further feedback from external stakeholders, a range of activities was undertaken by MFA towards this end:

- A certain amount of consultation at the governmental level was conducted with WEI region governments;
- Finnish embassies and diplomatic staff fed into the process, while the then Minister for Development travelled himself to the region to discuss WEI proposals with relevant policy officials;
- Consultations were held with international organizations working in the region (including existing partners in Finnish development cooperation), although it seems that these discussions focused on the level of interventions, rather than on WEI as a whole, and therefore do not serve fully as evidence of donor coordination per se, on the overall WEI level;
- Furthermore, it should be noted that WEI drew heavily on existing interventions in the composition of the Initiative, and was therefore able to incorporate the experience of these interventions with regard to addressing issues of relevance, ownership, sustainability, etc.

However, notwithstanding this range of activities, it must be noted that a systematic, region-wide consultation process covering all relevant stakeholder was not conducted (due, according to interview evidence, to a lack of human resources, and time pressure on MFA to launch WEI within a short timeframe).

Overall, it can be noted that the identification and formulation stage relied in relative terms on a bottom-up approach, informed at the level of interventions (including pre-existing activities). This can be seen to have shaped the subsequent development and management of WEI, and serves as a possible explanation for the absence of an overarching programme founding document and logframe, specifying indicators at the level of the Initiative as a whole.

The current report does not aim at establishing the relative merits of the approach adopted by Finland in this identification stage, compared with those of a more comprehensive, structured identification that could be obtained through extensive consultations direct with partner governments and civil society. Rather, the report will examine the ways in which this approach can be perceived to have impacted on the subsequent development and management of WEI, and the implementation of its interventions, with reference to aid effectiveness:

- Would the restricted amount of consultations with beneficiary governments and civil society stakeholders impact on issues of visibility of WEI, relevance of interventions to the needs of the beneficiary societies, sustainability and ownership of interventions?

- Would donor coordination be achieved, and complementarity observed?
- How would Finland meet its obligations as a donor with regard to accountability and transparency?

### **2.2.2 Aims of WEI**

As stated in the original programme document, WEI was launched with four main aims:

1. *To act according to good principles and coordinating with EU and other donor countries, and honouring the needs and ownership of the recipient countries;*
2. *To support projects that will promote mutual cooperation between these countries with EU and Russia;*
3. *To increase Finland's and Finnish companies' participation in the area;*
4. *To integrate the Finnish cross-cutting themes into each intervention;*
5. *To activate more NGO-operations in the region*

The evaluation will assess the extent to which these goals have been achieved effectively, with the exception of aim 2 (regarding relations with Russia). As stated by MFA staff in interviews, this aim was originally included in response to the tense situation following the Russia-Georgia conflict in 2008. A revised version of the WEI programme document was produced by MFA in 2011, in which this objective of promoting cooperation between the countries of the region with Russia was removed, and replaced with an aim "to defuse and prevent confrontation in the region and to promote cooperation and friendly neighbourly relations between the countries."<sup>7</sup>

### **2.2.3. Formulation of WEI:**

The thematic priorities identified in Finnish Development Policy formed the parameters for the five clusters of interventions identified for WEI, as shown in Section 1: Security; Trade and Development; Information Society Development; Energy and Environment; Social Sustainability. As Table 1 indicates, the Energy and Environment cluster contains relatively a greater proportion of interventions, reflecting the high priority afforded to this theme by Finland (although it should be noted, of course, that there are significant synergies with other themes contained within many interventions, not least ENVSEC, which brings together environmental and security foci).

Despite the intention declared originally to reduce the overall number of interventions in the region from the previous figure of 31, to a target of around 10 interventions, the number of WEI interventions remained at a high level – a reflection, it would appear, of the bottom-up nature of identifying and including interventions into the WEI programme, which involved, in some cases, adopting interventions already underway with Finnish support; in others, responding to approaches made by multilateral organizations by including their proposed intervention into the WEI programme (which, in most cases, did fit with the WEI priorities – although the Chernobyl Shelter Fund (EBRD) inclusion seems to have been made as a pragmatic decision to locate it in WEI).

---

<sup>7</sup> MFA, WEI Implementation Plan for 2011-2014, December 2011, page 4

The evaluation will take into account the number of interventions, and question whether this has impacted on issues of efficiency and effectiveness of WEI. Attention will also be paid to the question of synergies within and between clusters, to assess the degree to which these have been exploited effectively.

The modalities of intervention demonstrate a diverse range, including:

- Framework programmes focused on a particular theme, containing a range of activities/projects, and managed through an outsourced structure (ENVSEC, Research Cluster, FinWaterWEI). The process of selection of the respective administrative bodies will be addressed in the case studies presented in Section 3;
- Institutional Cooperation Instrument (ICI) based interventions. The ICI was launched in 2008 to promote small-scale projects between Finnish and partner country government authorities and agencies, with the objective to support capacity-building in the partner agency. This supported the Finnish-value added aims of the 2007 Development Policy, and it was a natural instrument for WEI. Some of the Finnish institutions (in the fields of environment, geology, meteorology and radiation) already had experience of cooperation in the region that they could build on;
- Interventions implemented by international NGOs (Eurasia Foundation; and PATRIR);
- Interventions implemented by multilateral organizations (UNDP, EBRD, ILO, World Bank, FAO, IFC), some on a multi-country basis, some focused in one or two countries.

The evaluation will assess the relative effectiveness of this range of modalities of intervention, both with regard to the achievements of select individual interventions, and the way in which the range has blended within the overall WEI programme.

### **2.3      *Administration of the implementation of the Wider Europe Initiative by MFA***

In this section the report reflects on the administration of WEI by MFA Finland. (Analysis of the administration of interventions by partner organizations will be presented separately, in Section 3.)

The following challenges to the administration of WEI were identified by the present evaluation:

- The MFA was required to administer a complex programme, which has a range of implementation modalities, including outsourced administration in some cases, which has called for flexible administrative approaches by MFA staff;
- Furthermore, WEI has a diversity of thematic priorities that require appropriate specialist knowledge on the part of MFA staff, combined with knowledge of the WEI regions and countries. The WEI region has witnessed considerable flux in some countries during the period of WEI implementation - for instance, considerable tensions have been experienced in the relationship between the EU and Belarus, impacting on WEI activities; while the inter-ethnic violence seen in Kyrgyzstan in 2010 demanded a response from Finland and other donors to adjust their interventions appropriately, to mention two examples;
- The MFA has had to administer WEI with relatively limited human resources, accompanied by quite a significant turnover rate of core staff; while the impact of the global economic crisis has brought additional pressures, with a downturn in donor funding placing restrictions on aid cooperation (now reflected also in the Finnish Development Policy of

2012, in which it is openly stated that resources are limited and that difficult decisions must therefore be made with regard to allocations and future programming).

How has the MFA and its staff responded to these challenges, in the administration of WEI? In the following sub-sections the evaluation reviews the administrative work of staff based at MFA in Helsinki, and the WEI-related activities of staff in diplomatic missions in the WEI region.

The evaluation draws on interviews with MFA staff, review of documentation, and also on interviews with representatives of partner (implementing) organizations and beneficiary organization representatives. Particular interest was paid to the following issues:

- Had the administrative demands on MFA staff been affected by the outsourcing arrangements deployed in three interventions? (The aim had been to use this as a means to reduce MFA workload);
- How had staff approached the tasks associated with the Programming stages of WEI, and the subsequent transition to programme administration?
- What impact had turnover of staff had on administration of WEI?
- How did staff cope with the need to monitor and provide support to such a broad range of interventions (not least with regard to the significant amount of documentation produced by these interventions – e.g. progress reports, financial reports, evaluations)?
- Had any particular challenges arisen as a result of changing political, economic, social conditions in the countries of the WEI region, with regard to administrative issues?
- What is the extent, frequency, nature of interaction between MFA staff and representatives of implementing partner organizations, and governmental and non-governmental representatives in the beneficiary countries?

### **2.3.1 Ministry for Foreign Affairs – WEI administration**

The primary day-to-day responsibility for oversight and administration of WEI within MFA is located in Unit ITÄ-20, with further input provided by sectoral advisers in the Ministry, when required.

*Time allocation:* Within the ITÄ-20 unit, the Head of Unit allocates a proportion of their commitment to WEI issues, while of the remaining staff, 2 reported that they commit 85-90% of their working time to WEI, and 3 staff work 100% of their time on the Initiative. Staff reported in interviews that this level of commitment is necessary in order to cover all required WEI tasks, and is generally sufficient, although at certain times overload is seen (e.g. if reports from several interventions need to be processed simultaneously). The time commitment includes frequent travel to attend meetings of implementing partners, and to monitor and observe interventions at first hand. However, clearly resources are limited, and there appears to be little if any capacity to deal with additional demands, which should also be seen as important tasks in WEI. For instance, there is a need (as will be discussed in 2.4 and later sections) to devote more attention to visibility and communications activities related to WEI; and the report will draw attention to the question of promoting greater synergies and coordination within and between clusters. These points will be afforded further attention in Sections 3 and 4.

*Commitment:* The evaluation team noted the high level of commitment and dedication to WEI tasks demonstrated across the Unit staff, and the capacity shown to deal with the wide diversity of thematic priorities referred to above (supplemented by contributions from

specialist advisers on an ad hoc basis). This level of commitment was also referred to frequently in interviews conducted with partner organization staff, and beneficiary country respondents – for instance, attention was drawn to the level of knowledge displayed by MFA staff in responding to issues raised by intervention personnel, the detailed questions that MFA staff would pose after reviewing intervention documentation, the support shown to intervention staff in dealing with issues arising in day-to-day activities, as well as urgent responses to ‘crisis’ situations.

### **2.3.2 Diplomatic representations in the WEI region**

Given the limited nature of Finland’s diplomatic presence in the WEI region, which, as noted above, had restricted the extent of consultations held in WEI countries in the identification stage, the evaluation team paid particular attention to the role of Finnish diplomatic representations in supporting the implementation of WEI, to assess the extent to which such limiting factors would influence this stage as well.

From evidence gained in interviews held with Finnish roving ambassadors, diplomatic staff in the embassy in Kyiv, staff from the embassy in Kazakhstan, and the embassy in Lithuania (responsible for Belarus), along with feedback provided by implementing partner organizations and beneficiaries, a similar picture to that found in MFA in Helsinki emerged. The apparent limitations in terms of human resources, and the need to cover (in the case of roving ambassadors) three countries while operating from a distant base in Finland, are addressed through a high level of commitment and effort on the part of diplomatic staff, who demonstrate close interest in, knowledge about, and support for WEI interventions being implemented in the country/countries they work with. The project leader of the Crimea Policy Dialogue reported, for instance, the very active contributions made by the Finnish ambassador to Ukraine and other embassy staff; while UNDP Georgia staff discussed at length with the evaluation team the contribution made by the roving ambassador in support of their work in the Restoration of Forest Ecosystems project in Georgia, particularly during a period of tense negotiations with Georgian ministerial staff.

On the basis of such feedback, it would appear that Finnish diplomatic missions are able to provide support for WEI interventions, alongside their other diplomatic commitments – although clearly this task is easier in the case of embassies based in the WEI region, less so for the roving ambassadors, whose time availability for such work is necessarily still rather limited.

However, capacity is still limited, and resources are already stretched – which leads to an overall shortcoming in coverage of WEI support in the beneficiary countries in the sphere of visibility and communications, as the following section will discuss.

## **2.4 Visibility and Communications**

Visibility and communications activities play a vital role in the field of development cooperation:

- To domestic audiences of donor countries, they can provide clear and accessible information regarding the rationales for aid programmes, the results achieved, and thus contribute to debates on expenditure allocated to international aid;

- For international partner organizations and countries, effective visibility and communications activities can contribute to donor coordination and complementarity of policies and interventions;
- For the citizens of beneficiary countries, and their governments and NGO/civil society sectors, effective visibility and communications on the part of the donor country is essential if the commitment to transparency, accountability, and development of effective ownership is to be observed.

The visibility and communications activities of the Wider Europe Initiative are rather limited in their scope, and therefore impact. There is no dedicated website for the initiative, for instance, while information in English on the MFA website regarding WEI requires effort on the part of the reader to locate, rather than being showcased. A review of the websites of embassies in WEI countries – in Kyiv and Astana – shows that WEI activities are given little attention (on the Astana embassy website a page titled Wider Europe Initiative is provided in Russian, but no text has been added to the page).

Such factors contribute to the relatively low level of awareness among international partners, and beneficiaries, with regard to the Wider Europe Initiative as a whole, as demonstrated by interviews held during field missions to the WEI region. While intervention participants tend to be aware of the support of Finland for that particular intervention, the fact that this is part of a much larger Finnish programme (WEI), covering 11 countries, is often far less visible.

The response of staff interviewed in EU delegations in the case-study countries visited by the evaluation team gives particular cause for concern – as they reported having, overall, a very low level of knowledge of WEI and Finnish interventions in that country.

These shortcomings in visibility and communications reflect the limited resources available to MFA – but they should be seen as having a negative effect on Finnish development policy efforts through WEI in the countries of the WEI region. The current report will return to these issues in the recommendations section, Section 9.

### **3. REVIEW OF WIDER EUROPE INITIATIVE INTERVENTIONS**

#### **3.1 *Structure and focus of review***

This section contains the reviews of all WEI interventions, presented according to their respective clusters. The three case-study interventions – ENVSEC, FinWaterWEI, and Research Cluster – receive proportionately more detailed coverage, but all WEI interventions are included in this review. As was noted in Section 1, and in accordance with the Terms of Reference, the scope of the current report is not to seek to replicate the level of detail and analysis that would be afforded in evaluation reports focused on a single intervention, but to analyse the implementation and impacts of WEI interventions in the context of the WEI programme as a whole.

The methodology developed for the evaluation reflected this task: in addition to a focus on the work of individual interventions, the team sought feedback and evidence regarding the nature of interaction between an intervention and MFA Finland, the level of awareness of the intervention's place within the WEI programme, and, at a broader level, the context of development cooperation in the beneficiary country, against which Finnish cooperation through the WEI programme could be placed.

This initial section reflects on the issues arising from analyses of the key evaluation criteria used for the evaluation, including a summary of results received in the online survey (the survey questions are shown in Annex 5), and coverage is provided of the key themes/priorities that run across interventions – i.e. cross-cutting issues, the regional emphasis of WEI, Finland's role as development entrepreneur, the question of Finnish added value. The issues highlighted here will then be revisited in relevant intervention reviews, to explore these issues in the context of that particular activity and/or country/region.

##### **3.1.1 *Relevance***

A number of issues relating to Relevance were raised in Section 2 – including the extent to which WEI can be seen to have been developed in response to the needs of the beneficiary countries and regions, to reflect Finnish development policy as a whole, and to complement and coordinate with EU policy and the work of other donors. In the review of interventions, the evaluation will assess the extent to which MFA has been able to rely on the work of implementing partners in ensuring that commitments regarding Relevance are achieved, given the limitations observed in MFA's own capacity to conduct systematic and comprehensive consultations with beneficiary countries' governmental and civil society sectors.

According to the responses received to the online survey, the overall picture appears quite positive:

- 59.1% of respondents (110 responses received) stated that they strongly agreed with the statement (Question 4) that the intervention they are involved with 'matches closely the needs of the local community in which it is implemented' (question 4), with a 34.6% agreeing with this statement; 0.9% disagreed, and 2.7% strongly disagreed, while 2.7% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement.

- A similar result is seen in response to the statement (Q5) 'The project matches closely the needs of the country as a whole': of 111 respondents, 49.5% strongly agreed, and 45.1% agreed; while 0.9% disagreed, and 0.9% strongly disagreed, and 3.6% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- On the issue of whether interventions were demand driven (i.e. reflected expressed needs of beneficiaries), 88.4% of 112 respondents stated that 'Yes', (Q6) 'The final beneficiaries of the project's activities (i.e. the persons/communities/organizations towards which the project is targeted) were consulted with regard to the need for the project, its content and delivery'; with the remaining 11.6% of respondents replying 'Don't know.' ;
- With regard to the regional emphasis of WEI (included under Relevance in the TOR evaluation focal issues), to the statement (Q10) 'The work of the project has included substantive interaction / collaboration with similar projects/activities in neighbouring countries' some 35.9%% strongly agreed, and 41.5% agreed; while 2.8% disagreed, and 19.8% neither agreed nor disagreed.

Additional feedback provided by respondents to the survey indicate that in most cases, extensive activities are undertaken by implementing organizations with regard to Relevance issues, to ensure that an open dialogue is maintained with beneficiary institutions. The evaluation team reviewed such activities during the course of the field missions, and through analysis of the documentation received from interventions. The extent of this activity, which is conducted in most interventions on a regular basis, indeed provides a level of reassurance for MFA that WEI interventions represent, overall, a good match to local needs, and that feedback loops are in place for beneficiaries to express their views.

However, at the level of WEI as a whole, still there are issues that need to be addressed, with regard to ensuring that commitments under Relevance are met – while the work of implementing partners can be relied on to a degree, they may not provide sufficient coverage at the level of the WEI programme, i.e. above their responsibilities at intervention level. Further to the issues raised in meetings with EU Delegation staff, noted in Section 2, the evaluation team also elicited commentary from representatives of the Georgian and Kyrgyzstan governments (State Office for Euro-Atlantic Integration; and Ministry of Justice, respectively) that highlights the issue of the visibility of WEI among beneficiary government audiences. In the Georgian case, the senior official indicated that their Office (which is the primary interface in the Georgian government in dealing with the EU) had very little information about WEI, or indeed about Finnish activities being implemented in the country. In the case of Kyrgyzstan, the official stated (during an interview regarding the Eurasia Foundation led intervention there, but referring to more general concerns) that there is disquiet in the government of the Kyrgyz Republic regarding a perceived gap between the needs identified and expressed by the government to donors, and the interventions presented by the donor community. While this remark was not aimed at Finland per se – and the official stated their support for the work of the Eurasia Foundation's intervention – the statement does provide a clear instance of the need for Finland, as for all donors, to ensure that effective engagement and cooperation with beneficiaries is prioritised.

The positive response regarding regional cooperation will be explored further in the subsequent intervention reviews – as it should be noted that interview feedback from respondents from various interventions also indicated a more cautious, or negative appraisal, referring to obstacles in the path of achieving effective regional collaboration (most notably in situations affected by a history of conflict, as in the case of Armenian-Azerbaijan relations, and tensions between Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, and the situation in EU-Belarus relations).

The evaluation will reflect on the ways in which interventions have addressed such issues in the regional cooperation aspects of their work.

### **3.1.2 Efficiency**

The Wider Europe Initiative has been allocated substantial funding, with this budget disbursed according to a range of funding models, including the interventions managed through outsourced administration. The precise figures committed and expended by country (and within that, by year) are seemingly not possible to collect from the MFA's financial systems, due to the multitude of multi-country, multi-year activities implemented by multilateral or outsourced administrative arrangements. This is problematic for the MFA and embassy staff, as they cannot quote to a participating country the specific funding spent by Finland each year. However, when OSCE and LCF funds are excluded the expenditure and commitments for 2009-2013 are in the order of 50,7 million Euros. The current evaluation is not intended to provide a detailed financial analysis or audit, of course – but it has aimed to assess the extent to which individual interventions have been administered and implemented efficiently.

According to the survey results, participants in interventions believe, overall, that they are operating efficiently – in response to the statement (Q8) 'The project has been / is being implemented in a cost-efficient manner', 41.1% (of 107 respondents) strongly agreed, and 43.9% agreed, while 2.8% disagreed and 12.2% neither agreed nor disagreed. In the following review of interventions the report will go beyond this aggregated view, to assess the relative efficiency seen across the variety of funding modes deployed in WEI, paying particular attention to:

- Support for interventions administered by multilateral organizations;
- The results seen in the outsourced administration models (examined in the three case-study interventions);
- The nature of support for ICI projects;
- Support for international NGOs

As requested in the TOR, the report will reflect on the results achieved to date through the varied modes of support (bearing in mind, of course, that this is a *mid*-term evaluation, and results may therefore be only of an interim nature at present).

With regard to the assessment of Finland's role as 'development entrepreneur,' the report will highlight examples of where the evaluation team believed that such practice can be observed – or could have been deployed – but it should be noted that this remains an under-defined concept with no clear definition of what a development entrepreneur is, at least in the case of the WEI programme.

### **3.1.3 Effectiveness and Impact**

The online survey, again, produced a rather positive overall response both with regard to the statement on effectiveness, and to that on impact: of 110 respondents 40.9% strongly agreed, and 45.5% agreed, with the statement (Q7) that 'The project has successfully delivered / is successfully delivering positive results / outcomes'; while 1.8% disagreed, and 0.9% strongly disagreed (with 10.9% neither agreeing nor disagreeing). In response to the statement (Q9) that 'The project has had / is having a positive impact on the

lives/work/environment of the final beneficiaries' – 38.9% of 108 respondents strongly agreed, 50% agreed, 10.2% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 0.9% disagreed.

Again, the review of interventions will bear in mind the mid-term nature of the evaluation (although also taking into account the fact that certain interventions are long-standing ones, with regard to Finnish support, and their effectiveness and impact rating should therefore be more clearly established). The report will, as requested in the TOR, examine the extent to which the interventions support the thematic objectives of the programme (and, in connection with this, the extent to which synergies between interventions have been identified and exploited). With regard to impacts, the review will examine the evidence available to support the viewpoint of respondents that interventions can be seen to be achieving tangible results for the final beneficiaries.

### ***3.1.4 Sustainability and Ownership***

In line with the TOR requirements, the report will examine the prospects for sustainability of projects, including the assessment of obstacles that might stand in the way of this aim, the likelihood of securing funding from other sources once Finnish support ends, and the degree to which beneficiaries will be ready to take over the work of interventions. It will also explore the issue of exit strategies – how have these been discussed between MFA and implementing partners (in particular with regard to the anticipated impact of the contraction of the programme envisaged in WEI II, under the 2012 Finnish Development Policy).

The survey results on these issues revealed that 43.1% of 109 respondents strongly agreed with the statement (Q15) that 'The activities conducted under the project have strong prospects for continuing after the funding of the project ends,' with 43.1% agreeing, and 13.8% neither agreeing nor disagreeing (no respondents stated that they either disagreed or strongly disagreed). With regard to ownership, in response to the statement (Q16) that 'The project has effectively developed the capacity of local stakeholders / final beneficiaries, equipping them to sustain the activities / approaches of the project,' 42.2% of 109 respondents strongly agreed, 49.5% agreed, and 8.3% neither agreed nor disagreed (and no respondents stated that they either disagreed or strongly disagreed).

### ***3.1.5 Aid effectiveness – complementarity***

A similarly positive overall assessment is provided by respondents to the survey on the issue of complementarity – a key issue in aid effectiveness and donor coordination. In response to the statement (Q11) that 'The work of the project effectively complements activities in the same / related spheres implemented by other donor organizations in this country / region', 36.5% strongly agreed, 47.7% agreed, 14% neither agreed nor disagreed, while 0.9% disagreed, and 0.9% strongly disagreed.

As has been discussed earlier in the report, the evaluation has identified certain gaps in the process of achieving donor coordination at the level of WEI as a whole – however, it may indeed be the case that this is compensated for to at least some extent by the bottom-up nature of the composition of the programme, in which the involvement of multilateral organizations as partners, and the inclusion of interventions based on pre-existing cooperation involving Finnish organizations (e.g. SYKE's collaboration in Georgia) has helped

to achieve coordination and complementarity at the level of interventions. The review will shed further light on this aspect of the programme.

### ***3.1.6 Finnish Value Added***

The evaluation team was asked by MFA to assess the extent to which interventions could be seen to involve an identifiable 'Finnish Value Added' ingredient, and to report on the particular characteristics of any such Finnish contribution. The evaluation duly elicited feedback from intervention staff and beneficiaries with regard to the extent to which, e.g. Finnish expertise had been sought/offered and included into activities; whether visits to Finland, or to the beneficiary country by Finnish officials or experts had been recorded. The team also asked respondents to comment whether, in their opinion, Finland's support contained particular features, and whether the potential of Finland's contribution had been achieved.

As the review of interventions will indicate, quite a varied pattern of Finnish involvement in activities can be observed – from very prominent, in some cases, through to a distant presence in others, with Finnish support not visible to final beneficiaries (although 99.1% of 110 respondents to the survey (Q12) reported that they were aware that the intervention they were involved with was supported by Finnish funding, and only 0.9% stated that they did not). Overall, in response to the question (Q13) 'Finnish expertise (e.g. through involvement of Finnish consultants, companies, institutions) has been applied in the implementation of this project,' 67.9% stated 'Yes,' 12.8% replied 'No', while 19.3% did not know.

The evaluation team also monitored evidence of the presence of Finnish companies in WEI activities (one of the original aims of WEI had been 'to increase Finland's and Finnish companies' participation in the area'). The evidence from interaction with the Finpro office in Kyiv, and from feedback from intervention teams, indicates that this aim has not been actively pursued, and relatively little involvement of Finnish companies can be observed (Nokia is a partner in the InfoDev activities, but apparently on quite a passive basis to date).

The review will focus more, therefore, on the role of Finnish organizations (including the MFA) as development partners, as seen from the perspective of implementing organizations and beneficiaries.

### ***3.1.7 Cross-cutting objectives***

As requested by the TOR, the evaluation has monitored the extent to which interventions have embedded the following cross cutting themes (from the 2007 Finnish Development Policy) into their activities:

- promotion of gender and social equality;
- human rights and equal participation opportunities of easily marginalized groups (including children, people with disabilities, indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities);
- HIV/AIDS as a development challenge;
- environment, climate change and disaster risks;
- good governance.

Alongside the assessment of interventions' work on these issues, the evaluation also analysed the role of MFA role in defining and promoting the inclusion of these issues among its implementing partners, and the ways in which activities were monitored by MFA.

Cross-cutting themes have been considered important in Finnish development cooperation for many years. The 2007 Development Policy, on the basis of which WEI was launched, clearly outlined the cross-cutting themes of Finnish development cooperation; while in June 2009 the MFA released an 'Internal Instruction on cross-cutting themes in the Development Policy Programme of the Government of Finland,' to further clarify requirements in this area. However, it has been noted in several evaluations and audits prior to the current evaluation, that there had been difficulties in implementation of the cross-cutting objectives. The instruction noted that "mainstreaming cross-cutting themes in all activities is a binding principle and reasons must be given in case of any deviation from the principle," a clear message for all implementing partners, it would appear. Has the experience of incorporating cross-cutting priorities in WEI interventions demonstrated an increased emphasis and achievement of results?

The evaluation team assessed the extent to which adequate consideration of cross-cutting objectives were embedded in all WEI activities as priorities (e.g. in logframes and programmatic documents), and subsequently addressed and monitored in the course of implementation as indicators. On the evidence of this review, it has to be noted that, in general, crosscutting issues or objectives are not evident in many of the programmes and projects supported within WEI – neither in the policy level and choice of activity to fund, nor in the actual implementation and reporting.

Some projects by their nature are highly sensitive to cross-cutting objectives – for instance the Eurasia Foundation led Justice Sector project deals with persons facing discrimination and gender-based violence issues, the Crimea Policy Dialogue project deals with ethnicity, discrimination and conflict prevention, the ILO Decent Work project deals with disability, youth and gender (particularly ensuring access to safe and legal employment), and several projects are working on environment-linked topics (which in the 2007 Development Policy was no longer considered a cross-cutting theme but a higher level objective).

In some cases, the activity is very technical in nature and trying to draw connections to gender or HIV/AIDS, for instance, might be seen as an artificial exercise – this was evident in discussion with stakeholders and in reading programme documents and reports. However, in other cases, it is somewhat surprising that more attention has not been given, especially as the multilateral implementing organisations are usually expected to have standards for reporting on these issues. Most projects, for instance, should be expected to address gender, ethnicity and other relevant issues in their staffing and training reports, and at least monitoring sex-disaggregated data. Some less-experienced implementing organisations did not even appear to be aware of the cross-cutting themes.

There has not been much discussion of cross-cutting objectives in the discussion recorded from the Quality Group meetings, when analysing the separate projects. Several MFA staff commented that as the Instruction was only produced in mid-2009, it was too late to be applied to many of the programs in WEI. However, the issues were clear in the Development Policy from November 2007 (and indeed, in the Development Policies from earlier years). Others have commented that in the limited time given to programme the Wider Europe Initiative, a focus on cross-cutting themes was not prioritised.

The topic of HIV/AIDS is virtually not considered in the WEI projects. This is partly due to the relatively low incidence of HIV/AIDS in the region, compared with other regions such as Africa. It should be noted, however, that in 2010 UNAIDS reported a sharp rise in HIV infections and AIDS-related deaths in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Consequently there are potential links in sectors where WEI is working with a higher incidence of HIV/AIDS – for instance in the justice sector activities (links to prison population), or in the fisheries sector. As noted above, the selection of predominantly technical projects was also an important factor. It appears difficult for many beneficiaries and also implementing organisations to give more than cursory consideration to HIV/AIDS when they are focused on technical issues such as trans boundary water quality monitoring.

Environment is a cross-cutting theme of many of the development partners (for instance, for UNDP) and naturally environment is one of the main themes of WEI, giving a strong focus in the FinWaterWEI and ENVSEC programmes, but also in the IFC Clean Production project and many of the ICI projects. However, outside of those projects with a clear environment orientation, there is not much consideration of environment. UNDP Aft seems to be mainly taking an approach of 'do no harm'. On the other hand, some of the Research Cluster projects are taking environment as a theme for consideration (eg. looking at the impacts of mining in Central Asia). The FAO project is considering environment with regard to sustainability of fish stocks and developing training in EIA exercises.

## 4. REVIEW OF WEI CLUSTER 1 – SECURITY

This section contains reviews of two interventions:

- The Research Cluster (previously titled Security Cluster – renamed to avoid confusion with the broader WEI Cluster 1), which is one of the three case-study reviews in this evaluation report;
- The Crimea Policy Dialogue

As noted earlier, activities implemented by OSCE in connection with WEI are not covered in this evaluation, as they are subject to a separate evaluation.

The case-study review of the ENVSEC programme will be presented in Section 7's coverage of Energy and Environment related interventions (as the MFA documentation on WEI locates ENVSEC in that cluster), although clearly there are also synergies between the Security Cluster and ENVSEC work.

### 4.1 *Case-Study Review of the Research Cluster*

The following review, as with the two other case-study reviews, will provide a more in-depth examination of this intervention in comparison with the briefer coverage afforded to the remaining 25 WEI interventions. In addition to exploring evidence relating to the core evaluation criteria, the review will reflect on further key issues highlighted in the TOR and developed by the evaluation team.

#### 4.1.1 *Aims and objectives of the Research Cluster initiative:*

No logframe has been developed for the Research Cluster. The evaluation team, accordingly, has drawn on the available documentary sources associated with the Cluster, supplemented by interviews with MFA staff, staff of the Institute for Russia and Eastern Europe (which has administered the Cluster), research project teams of Finnish institutions that have participated in the Cluster, and respondents in beneficiary countries who have been involved in project activities, as a means of collating information and views regarding the strategic purpose of the Cluster.

As established by MFA in their WEI-related documentation, the rationale for the Research Cluster can be summarised thus:

'A cluster of research institutes in the field of foreign and security policy has been established to work out multi-year research programmes in the target region. The main goals of the research projects are to highlight the link between security and development in accordance with the concept of comprehensive security, increasing interaction and networking between research institutes, and confidence building measures in the target areas'.<sup>8</sup>

The declared aim of the Cluster is further elaborated in the following statement, published on the website of the Institute for Russia and Eastern Europe:

---

<sup>8</sup> 'Wider Europe Initiative: Finland's Development Policy Framework Programme Implementation Plan for 2011-2014' (December 2011)

‘The main objectives [of the Research Cluster] are to highlight a broad concept of security that underlines the connection between security and development, to increase dialogue and networking between research institutions, and to engage in activities that inspire confidence in the target areas. The cluster seeks to promote widespread stability and wellbeing in partner countries, as development cannot occur without stability. A further goal is to increase knowledge and understanding of the target region.”

A number of issues arise from these statements, with regard to the task of evaluating the work of this Cluster in the context of the Wider Europe Initiative:

- The emphasis in the Cluster is on the development of capacity in Finland itself (in research institutes and universities); while capacity-building of beneficiary country researchers is also included in activities, this is far from the primary aim. This sets the work of the Research Cluster apart from other WEI interventions, accordingly, the focus of whose activities is on the beneficiary countries and their populations;
- This situation affects, somewhat, the evaluation process in the current mid-term evaluation, as it is not so straightforward to apply the evaluation criteria designed for assessing development cooperation programmes targeted on beneficiary countries. The TOR, indeed, refers only to administrative arrangements and effectiveness as the categories for analysis requested for this Cluster. Nevertheless, the review below refers to the overall evaluation criteria, to allow for comparison with other interventions (while bearing in mind the different context of evaluation – as the Research Cluster projects are not development cooperation activities per se). It should also be noted that the research projects included in the Cluster are also subject to the standard evaluation procedures of their respective institutions, which will be available once published;
- The stakeholder dynamics of this Cluster are also qualitatively different from those in other WEI interventions; given the emphasis on capacity-building within Finland (i.e. the beneficiaries of funding provided ostensibly under development cooperation programming are primarily Finnish based researchers). This is reflected in, for instance, the nature of relations between research project participants and MFA staff, as will be discussed below;
- Extending from the previous point, interviews revealed quite a range of opinions among stakeholders (MFA staff, researchers in Finland, collaborators in beneficiary countries) regarding the anticipated outcomes of the Cluster – should the Cluster aim to provide a source of policy relevant research and material, on which the MFA could draw? Or sponsor independent academic research, without imposing a policy agenda? Should the projects seek to make a direct contribution to policy debates in the WEI countries, or maintain a more detached position?

The review below explores the extent to which an effective consensus can be seen to have been achieved on these points, and whether or not such issues have affected the implementation and outcomes of project activities.

#### **4.1.2 Administration of the Cluster**

The evaluation team was asked by MFA to analyse the administrative arrangements of the Cluster, to assess the extent to which the outsourced model employed has proved cost-effective, and to evaluate the administrative procedures deployed in the Cluster.

**Outsourced administration:** The administration of the Cluster was delegated to the Institute of Russia and Eastern Europe, apparently owing to the Institute’s regional focus.

However, the Institute and its staff did not have a background in the management of research programmes or research grant schemes, a factor that has at times, according to interviews with research project teams, led to certain problems in dealing with project team enquiries. As a result, project teams have taken in some cases to approaching MFA staff direct with enquiries that were due to have been handled by the Institute, thus undermining the rationale for outsourcing (which is supposed to save time resources of MFA staff). Further, due to the limited experience of the Institute in this type of management arrangement, combined with the lack of experience within ITÄ-20 of managing this form of outsourcing, there have also been communication problems at times between the two – with the Institute approaching the MFA frequently to seek clarifications over responsibilities and obtain permissions. (This can be compared with the administration of the outsourced FinWaterWEI, which has operated more smoothly thanks to the experience of SYKE staff, who had a clearer idea of how much delegated authority they had).

**Structure:** A Steering Group is in place to supervise the work of the Cluster, with members drawn from the MFA departments and units (the Department for Russia, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, the Department for Europe, the Department for Development Policy and the Unit for Policy Planning and Research), assisted by the Institute of Russia and Eastern-Europe, whose representative participates in the meetings. The first meeting was held on 23.4.2010. The purpose of the Steering Group is to guide the activities of the cluster, launch new calls for applications, and evaluate project proposals. The MFA has the final word on decisions.

In addition to the Steering Group, an Advisory Board was established, with members drawn from research institutions and MFA. Meetings of the Advisory Board are open for all the relevant research organisations that can facilitate accumulation of information, discuss new project ideas, create situational awareness over research discussions, and to initiate ideas for new cluster activities.

**Procedures for selection and oversight of projects:** The Selection process was conducted by the Steering Group, whose members consist of 6 people from the MFA: 4 members from the Department for Russia, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, 1 researcher from the Department of Development Cooperation, 1 researcher from the Unit for Policy Planning and Research, and 2 people from the Unit for EU Enlargement and Western Balkans), assisted by the administrating institute. It is noteworthy that this selection process did not include input from academic research specialists, who might have provided peer evaluation of the proposals. The Steering Group panel graded the projects based on the following general criteria:

- support for the goals of the Wider Europe Initiative;
- relevance to EU and Russian interests taken into account in addition to those of the target countries (the reference to Russian interests, as previously noted in this report, was later modified in the overall WEI aims);
- displaying a connection between security and development;
- the ability to define a desired impact on development in the region;
- ODA (Official Development Assistance) eligibility (note that the OECD definition, as applied to research activity, is that '*only research directly and primarily relevant to the problems of developing countries may be counted as ODA*'<sup>9</sup>)

---

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.oecd.org/investment/aidstatistics/34086975.pdf>

- Ability to increase knowledge and understanding of the region, both within the region and in Finland;
- capacity to engage in co-operation and networking with comparable institutions in the region;
- potential to produce practically applicable results;
- capacity to undertake actions that inspire confidence;
- application of a broad concept of security;
- demonstrable attention to cross-cutting priorities

These criteria were developed based on emerged needs, detected new issues areas, new priorities in MFA, and through Advisory board discussions.

Calls for project proposals are posted on the administrative institute's website, circulated more widely in the email-list of academic institutions and among the Advisory board members and their institutions. The prospective applicants are encouraged to consult each other and their contacts within the Administration, Steering Group, and the MFA, and to pay particular attention to the establishment of links with regional and local counterparts in the WEI countries, with such networks given strong emphasis in the assessment of proposals. In many cases, MFA officials have assisted in creating contacts within the target countries. In many cases, there has been quite a lot of preparatory dialogue and assistance from other projects/institutions and from the MFA.

The Total budget in the period 2010-2013 for the Research Cluster was €2,5 million. By 30.6.2012, research project funding had been granted for a total of €2 267 868, with the funding awarded to the following projects:

- The South Caucasus Beyond Borders, Boundaries and Division Lines: Conflicts, Cooperation and Development (Aleksanteri-institute);
- Regional stability, borders, minorities and immigration. Research network project Moldova, Ukraine and Belarus, and Azerbaijan and Tajikistan. (Karelian Institute);
- Pan-European conflict resolution and geopolitical rivalries in the operating environment for security and development policies in the states within Wider Europe; with focus on Moldova, Armenia; Tajikistan and Kazakhstan (Tampere Peace Research Institute - TAPRI);
- Environmental Security, Mining and Good Governance (University of Eastern Finland);
- EU - Central Asia Monitoring: Security and Development (Karelian Institute);
- Water Security in the Small and in the Large. Analysing and comparing regional security implications on micro-, meso- and macro level water management collaboration and policy options (Aalto, Water and Development Research Group);
- National Regulation and Corporate Social Responsibility in Mining in Central Asia (University of Eastern Finland);
- Security and Development Research within the Wider Europe Initiative Security Cluster; Pan European Institute;
- Environment and Security in the Western Balkans: Risks and Opportunities through Co-operation (Aleksanteri Institute). This project belongs not to WEI but to a separate Balkan framework although it was administered within the Research cluster. It does not form part of the current evaluation report).

**Project-level administration:** The current evaluation has also analysed the nature of administration of Cluster activities through review of documentation, project websites, and through interviews with project staff. From the evidence provided, all project teams have met

the requirements of the programme with regard to submission of reports on activities and finances, and all have achieved, or are on track to achieve, the target outputs for their project (such as events, publications, training of researchers). The projects generally have well maintained websites (although a link from the MFA site could have been established, to showcase the work of the Cluster).

#### **4.1.3      *Relevance of Cluster projects and activities***

The issue of Relevance in the case of the Research Cluster can be interpreted somewhat differently than its application in the case of other WEI interventions, given the particular focus of the Cluster on capacity-building within Finland. Relevance here, accordingly, derives from the needs and priorities identified by MFA, with Finland's needs in mind primarily, rather than those of the beneficiary countries of the WEI region. Furthermore, it would appear that this identification process was something of a closed one, within the walls of MFA – relatively little consultation had taken place with Finnish universities and research institutes regarding the need for the Research Cluster.

Given this background, the level of interest and commitment shown by those institutions that were awarded project funding should be seen as positive, but not as a given – if such an initiative is conducted in future, more extensive consultation should be carried out, and more time given to research institutions to put forward their proposals regarding the nature and content of such programmes. In a time of university cutbacks, not all institutions are prepared to risk investing in new areas of research, for relatively low amounts of funding – and if they do, they need assurances that this will not be a short-term venture, but a long-term commitment.

The research institutions were able to draw, of course, on their existing strengths in researching security and development issues, as well as a specialist background, in some cases, on researching Russian politics and society (with some researchers able to apply Russian-language skills, accordingly, in their work on the WEI region). The project applications submitted to the scheme, and the resulting projects that have been implemented following the award of funding, can be seen to match the general aims established for the Cluster, and map relatively well against the assessment criteria established for the Steering Group's selection process.

#### **4.1.4      *Effectiveness and Impact:***

The evaluation of effectiveness and impact of the Research Cluster as a whole is hindered by the absence of a logframe, which would have added specific objectives to accompany the global objectives outlined in 4.1.1, and which would have established measurable indicators for the expected outcomes of the work of the Cluster. The current report has therefore used a list of indicators extrapolated from the documentation of Cluster projects, and from generic indicators that can be found in analogous programmes internationally, against which to base the assessment (incorporating also indicators identified in the TOR evaluation questions). The evaluation has therefore examined evidence relating to the presence of, and quality of, the following:

- Research capacity development: e.g. how many researchers are involved in WEI-related activities (specifically, research activities) funded through the Research Cluster; how has the capacity of individuals and institutions developed in the focal areas supported, both in

Finland and the beneficiary countries; have any permanent academic positions, research centres, ongoing projects been established on the basis of the WEI-funded work;

- Research focus: has the research activity emphasised the need for policy-relevant, empirically driven work, which can contribute to evidence-based policy making processes;
- Research outputs – what is the quantity and quality of outputs achieved through:
  - Academic publications (it should be noted that it is still too early to expect that journal articles or books based on WEI funded research will have been published by the summer of 2012, as the publication cycle for academic work tends to be lengthy);
  - Policy papers;
  - Websites, blogs
  - Events: conferences, seminars, policy briefings
- Networking: how much activity has been seen with regard to networking among research teams in Finland; between Finnish researchers and counterparts in beneficiary countries; between research teams and MFA (e.g. through briefings); between research teams and audiences (policy, public) in Finland, beneficiary countries, EU countries, internationally;
- Have synergies between Research Cluster projects and other WEI interventions been identified and exploited;
- Have the Research Cluster projects made inputs into academic (teaching) programmes in their respective institutions (e.g. modules for undergraduate and Master's students; supervision opportunities for PhD students) – this was not an indicator envisaged in the Cluster's aims, or in the MFA's TOR for the evaluation, but it would be a natural extension of the work of research projects in research-based universities;
- Impact on the security environment in the beneficiary countries – which is established in the global objectives for the Cluster. Here again the absence of a logframe renders assessment of impact in this case very problematic – as it is not possible to establish causality regarding such complex political and societal issues, as those seen for instance in the conflict-affected regions of the WEI region, linked to the contribution of academic research activities only commenced relatively recently. The evaluation has focused, rather, on gauging perceptions among Finnish and beneficiary country participants in the Research Cluster projects, and those of other observers, on the extent to which the Cluster activities can be seen to be making a contribution (through the afore-mentioned list of impacts) to understanding and responding to the security environment of the WEI region.

**Research capacity development:** From the feedback received from participants in the Research Cluster, it would appear that the perception is that overall, the WEI programme has achieved its baseline aim of stimulating the development of capacity in researching security and development focused on the WEI region, as witnessed through the growth in the number of researchers specialising fully or partly in this field, and outputs achieved (as will be summarised below). Crucially, the level of funding has been sufficient to allow for the conduct of field missions to the WEI region, and to fund visits to Finland and to the WEI region for the research teams, and support the organization of events – all essential ingredients in the development of policy-relevant activities based on empirically-focused research.

This is also evident through the increased profile of Finnish researchers and institutions in academic and policy debates on this field, within Finland, the WEI region, and more broadly in the EU, and indeed further afield (e.g. through the work of EUCAM in Brussels and Washington DC).

In the case of the WEI beneficiary countries, the capacity-development context is rather different to that in Finland. Independent academic research on the subject of security remains underdeveloped in comparison to the situation in Finland and many other EU countries, with many universities not teaching this subject, or conducting research in this field. Indeed, in certain WEI countries the study of security issues remains a sensitive area, and the state controls the extent to which academic institutions can openly engage in independent research. Within the thinktank and NGO community work on security issues, moreover, it can be the case that a partisan, politicised approach is the norm. These factors restrict the opportunities for Finnish institutions to locate and collaborate with researchers who are institutionally based. Nevertheless, the engagement of Finnish projects with researchers in the WEI countries has been a very important part of the Research Cluster's work, with this engagement often achieved through identifying individual researchers (some of whom are based in independent thinktanks/ centres/NGOs). Interviews and survey feedback from such participants indicates a generally strong perception of achievement and development gained through the collaboration with the WEI-funded projects, which has included visits to Finnish institutions for study periods, collaboration on research and publications, participation in events conducted in Finland and the WEI region (with interaction also achieved in cases with researchers from other WEI countries).

A respondent interviewed in Georgia (a young university lecturer, who has established his own independent think-tank in order to be able to engage in security research) stated that the 3-week period as a visiting researcher in Finland was seen to have been a landmark in the respondent's research career, allowing him to build contacts and also gain insights into the ways in which independent research on security is conducted in Finland. Similar examples can be found in several of the WEI-funded projects, and indicates that the Cluster has had a meaningful impact at the level of individual researchers. In these cases the two sides tend to be maintaining communication, and discussion possibilities for extending the collaboration in the future.

**Research focus:** The tendency around Europe is that government funding of academic research increasingly brings requirements with regard to the policy-relevance of the work to be supported and the outputs it commits to produce. This is also the case, clearly, in the WEI-funded activities of the Research Cluster. The research project teams have responded positively to this requirement, and generally the research conducted, and the associated activities that have been based on the research, demonstrate a commitment to producing research that is empirically driven and seeks to address priorities in the sphere of security and development.

An example is provided by the work of the University of Eastern Finland in the Environmental Security, Mining and Good Governance project, which has sought to develop a toolkit to be deployed in addressing cases of the linkages between environment and security in a participatory manner. The Karelian Institute's EUCAM-SD (EU Central Asia Monitoring – Security Dimension) project can be seen to be actively contributing to policy dialogues on issues in the WEI region, and in policy centres in EU and North America, as witnessed by the evaluation team through attendance of the workshop organised by the project in Bishkek, in May 2012. These two project examples can also be seen, coincidentally, to be contributing to the WEI programme's overall priorities of good governance, cross-cutting issues, security and development, linkages with EU policy.

**Research outputs and impacts:** As evidenced by information provided on the website of the Institute for Russia and Eastern Europe, and the websites of the respective projects, the

WEI-funded research has also resulted in a substantial number of published outputs (policy papers, and a certain number of academic, peer-reviewed articles and submissions to edited volumes), with more anticipated in the years to come; and an active programme of conferences, seminars and other events based on the work of the projects. For example, the Aleksanteri Institute's conflict prevention workshops in the Caucasus have been well received by participants; while Tampere Peace Research Institute's (TAPRI) organised a conference on "Security and development – Choices in a Complex Policy Environment" (May 29-30, 2012) that brought together experts from Finland, EU, Moldova, Armenia, Kazakhstan and Tadzhikistan, with this event followed by a number of guest lectures by the senior participants.

The evaluation team believes that the project of Tampere Peace Research Institute on 'Pan-European conflict resolution and geopolitical rivalries in the operating environment for security and development policies in the states within Wider Europe' can serve as a showcase project under this WEI intervention. While the focus of the project is on Moldova, Armenia, Tajikistan and Kazakhstan, it also addresses the key role of Russia. TAPRI's project concentrates on Russian border-related conflict resolution strategies, power dynamics, and normative argumentation. The project approaches the research problem of how the military and political presence of a much greater power affects the development of a small country. The project design takes into account the interconnectedness of security policies and ongoing and historical integration processes.

Events were arranged both in Finland and in the target countries to maximize the reach and visibility of the project's work, several organized in collaboration with projects two major Finnish partners: Aleksanteri Institute and Karelia Institute. Among the high quality deliverables is a Conference publication titled "Security and Development in a Complex Policy Environment: Perspectives from Moldova, Armenia, Tajikistan and Kazakhstan" (Rytövuori-Apunen, Helena & Helle Palu & Shushan Khatlamajyan & Nina Iskandaryan, 2012, Yerevan: Limush Printhouse). It is a concise and well-argued summary of projects main results so far. The language of the conference report is approachable by both researchers and policy-makers. It brings together coverage of high politics (e.g. security and geopolitics) in a context of low politics (economy, society, and culture) while including insightful analysis of Russia's role in the countries chosen.

**Networking and Synergies:** In addition to the networking opportunities afforded in the range of conferences and other events, project participants in Finland and WEI countries confirmed that there has been quite an active engagement among project participants, and (to some extent) across projects. Furthermore, project participants and MFA staff reported a good deal of contact and discussion regarding project work and findings, with a senior MFA official stating that this input had been extremely valuable.

The interaction with NGOs in the implementation of projects can be seen to support the overall WEI aim on this issue, and also to have served to extend the impact of the Research Cluster. The collaboration between the University of Eastern Finland project team and the NGOs GAIA and ZOI environment network, for instance, has allowed the project to benefit from valuable contacts in the target countries that would have not been possible otherwise.

Synergies with other WEI interventions have not been given a great deal of emphasis to date, it seems, in the Research Cluster, and this is an area that can be addressed in the coming period (e.g. with ENVSEC activities).

***Impact on security environment in WEI region:*** As noted above, it is not possible to make an objective assessment of the extent to which WEI-funded projects of the Research Cluster can be seen to be having an impact on the security environments of the countries of the WEI region, given the complexity of this sphere, and the very large number of stakeholders who influence security issues in this region.

Nevertheless, as confirmed by respondents in the WEI region interviewed by the evaluation team, as well as participants in the projects both from Finland and the beneficiary countries, overall WEI projects are seen to be making a valuable contribution to the public debate on security in the region, and, as some stated, bring a certain **Finnish added value**. Specifically, respondents referred to the Finnish experience as a small neighbour of Russia (thus establishing a linkage with the experience of WEI countries), Finland's reputation in the sphere of conflict mediation and resolution (of close relevance in those countries affected by conflicts).

#### **4.1.5 Sustainability:**

Based on the review of projects in the WEI Research Cluster, the current report can conclude that WEI has succeeded in stimulating the development of a stronger research base within Finland on security and development focused on the countries of the WEI region, and gone some way to supporting the development of research collaboration with counterparts in the WEI countries themselves.

Respondents from the research teams stated that they see this as the start of a process – the crucial next phase will be to ensure that the momentum is not lost, and that this foundation is built upon effectively. This will require a long-term commitment within the respective Finnish research institutions (e.g. evidenced through supporting the establishment of permanent academic posts, support for research programmes, integrating specialist input into teaching programmes and PhD supervision). It should also involve the ongoing development of a community of research specialists, within Finland and involving WEI region participants.

This does not necessarily mean that MFA must fund this – indeed, universities should be encouraged to seek alternative funding sources. But MFA, as a key stakeholder in the use of evidence-based research, should actively engage with research teams, to continue the academic-policy dialogue.

#### **4.2 Crimea Policy Dialogue**

This intervention is regarded as a success story by the evaluation team, and is accordingly afforded an extended coverage in this report, in line with the TOR request to provide analysis of factors underlying successful cases.

The intervention is allocated €1,2 million (2010-13), and is managed by the Romanian INGO PATRIR, which was appointed on the basis of its strong track record of work in the field of conflict resolution and prevention in various parts of the world. The project aims to develop a policy dialogue on key issues related to societal security and stability in the Crimean region of Ukraine, bringing together representatives of the ethnic communities of Crimea, as well as influential figures from across Ukraine and international participants.

The evaluation team conducted interviews with dialogue participants, the project leader, a representative of the EU Delegation in Kyiv (Coordinator of the Joint Cooperation Initiative in Crimea), and a senior official from MFA Finland. On the basis of the feedback received, as well as responses to the online survey and documentary evidence, this intervention can be said to be rated extremely positively by all concerned, and is seen as a showcase of what can be achieved through effective interventions that address sensitive issues in the sphere of societal security. The following factors, mapped against the evaluation criteria, can be referred to:

**Relevance:** The PATRIR team devoted considerable effort to ensuring that the intervention addressed the needs expressed by the stakeholders – and that the diversity of viewpoints of the communities covered by the intervention were dealt with tactfully and diplomatically. Respondents noted that this is one of the most significant projects of its kind seen in Crimea over the last decade, and praised highly the skill of the implementing organization.

**Effectiveness:** Within an overall context of effective implementation, the project team stressed to the evaluators the role played by Finland as, in their words, a ‘model donor’ – providing active and committed support both through embassy staff (including the ambassador) from Kyiv, and MFA staff in Helsinki. Crucially, in the view of the project team, the MFA has understood the long-term commitment necessary for launching and gaining momentum in such a case, and has showed patience and encouragement, rather than demanding quick results.

**Finnish added value:** The intervention has included a substantial degree of input from Finnish expertise, for instance in the sphere of multi-lingual education, one of the core focal issues in the Policy Dialogue’s work (two study tours to Finland have been conducted, for instance). Finland has been able to draw (in the view of respondents) on its reputation as a neutral country, with a strong background in conflict mediation, which is viewed as being well suited to the challenges found in Crimea.

**Support of EU policy:** The intervention provides a good example of effective coordination among donors, and support for and complementarity with EU activities. The EU Delegation representative stressed that Finland’s contribution to the work of the donor community in Crimea has been of enormous significance, addressing highly sensitive issues that other EU member states have not been covering in their work in this region.

**Impact and Sustainability:** Although all participants emphasised the need for caution in claims regarding the achievements of the intervention at this relatively early stage, the unanimous view was that the Dialogue is on track to providing impressive impacts, which can have a tangible effect on the situation in Crimea, including practical measures in e.g. the school curriculum, influencing land ownership issues, etc. The intervention is succeeding in creating an atmosphere of trust and cooperation among the diverse stakeholders – some of whom have traditionally held opposing, entrenched views that have obstructed effective policy development.

As related by the participants, the project team emphasises the need to develop ownership among the Dialogue contributors, as part of the well founded PATRIR approach, which bodes well for the long-term sustainability of the initiative. However, the project team, participants, and indeed the EU Delegation representative made it clear to the evaluators that they believe it is still far too early to consider withdrawing support (funding) for the Policy Dialogue, as it

enter the challenging phase of expanding the intervention's coverage to include a wider set of stakeholders.

**Overall contribution to WEI:** The Crimea Policy Dialogue intervention has demonstrated what can be achieved in effectiveness partnership with a specialist NGO responsible for implementation, in a project that addresses several key aims, priority themes and cross-cutting issues of the Wider Europe Initiative (security and stability, rights of minority groups, good governance). The intervention shows a high level of complementarity with EU policy and the work of other donors; and, indeed, contributes to an original WEI aim of fostering constructive relations with Russia (as Russian participants contribute to the project). It also serves as an example of a case where Finland indeed can be seen to be acting as a **development entrepreneur** – identifying an intervention to which Finland can contribute through its strengths and reputation in a particular field, in a location with a strong need for support, but where other donors have not responded to that particular priority set of issues.

For more detailed information, refer to the progress reports submitted by PATRIR to MFA, and (once available) to the mid-term evaluation of the Crimea Policy Dialogue, which is underway at the time of writing of the current report.

## 5. REVIEW OF WEI CLUSTER 2 – TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

This section contains reviews of three interventions:

- Aid for Trade (UNDP)
- Support to Fishery and Aquaculture Management (FAO)
- Ukraine Cleaner Production (IFC)

The three cases provide examples of the nature of Finland's interaction with multilateral partner organizations in the implementation of WEI activities. They also reveal the degree of variation in such relations, with regard to the extent of Finnish presence in implementation, as well as the extent to which MFA needs actively to engage with the oversight of interventions. One intervention (Aid for Trade) is a regional programme, the other interventions are focused on individual WEI countries.

### 5.1 *Aid for Trade*

This intervention built on Finland's existing support for the Aid for Trade programme in other parts of the world, to include as well the countries of the WEI region in line with the aims of Finland's development policy, and also in support of EU strategy on Aid for Trade. The programme mirrors the WEI coverage of 11 countries, and is indeed titled 'The Wider Europe: Aid for Trade for Central Asia, South Caucasus and Western CIS.'

The evaluation team visited Aid for Trade teams in UNDP offices during the missions to case-study countries, which also afforded the opportunity to conduct field visits to observe Aid for Trade project implementation and gain feedback from local project staff as well as beneficiaries. Evidence was also gathered from an interview with the regional coordinator of the programme, based in UNDP Bratislava; through review of documentation, and from feedback to the online survey.

The intervention provides an example of the potential for Finland to achieve a high level of outreach as a donor, that would clearly not be possible through bilateral efforts – it is a comprehensive, regional programme involving substantial administrative resources, interaction with beneficiary government at the national and local levels, a network of local level interventions, and involving a large number of final beneficiaries who reside in some of the most disadvantaged areas of their respective countries. UNDP's administrative resources are thus a vital component in the implementation – drawing on local expertise, international partnerships, and, from the evidence received, acting in close coordination with MFA Finland, providing regular feedback to Helsinki and receiving strong, effective support and commitment in return. (UNDP respondents asked the evaluators to take note of their respect for Finland's role as a donor, which, as was the case with the Crimea Policy Dialogue, some described as a 'model' partner.)

From the feedback received, and from reviewing intervention documentation, it is clear that the issue of Relevance is afforded a great deal of emphasis, through comprehensive needs assessment and consultation procedures, which help to ensure a close match with the priorities of the target beneficiaries and the local areas in which projects are implemented. This also allows the intervention to draw on its common methodology on a regional basis (in which UNDP teams share experience as a community), but also respond to local needs (as

shown by the response of a Belarusian participant, in their online survey commentary, which stated that the programme maps onto the national and local needs of Belarus very well).

The intervention receives a considerable amount of funding from WEI (€6,2 million over the period 2009-13), but this allows coverage of the whole region, and the commitment of considerable UNDP resources. Reports indicate strong results in terms of efficiency and effectiveness indicators (which in some countries show an over-achievement of targets set in the respective logframes), and a high level of impact felt among beneficiaries. The intervention can be seen accordingly, to make a strong contribution to WEI's overall aims – of addressing tangible needs of beneficiary populations and governments, contributing to social stability and security in the region, and fostering effective cooperation with beneficiary governments in the WEI region.

The involvement of Finnish expertise is quite limited, according to the evidence received, although some project teams indicated that they had sought the inclusion of Finnish experts in their work. Nevertheless, the visibility of Finnish support is emphasised by UNDP in its communications and visibility work with beneficiaries (e.g. brochures clearly identify Finnish support by showing the government of Finland logo on the front cover).

## **5.2      *Support to Fishery and Aquaculture Management in the Kyrgyz Republic***

In contrast to the more 'passive' (albeit committed) role that Finland has been able to play in the case of Aid for Trade, in which MFA has been able to leave its implementing partner to take the lead in implementation, the case of the FAO intervention in the Kyrgyz Republic (allocated €1,76 million over 2009-13) provides an example of more proactive Finnish involvement – both with regard to the extent to which Finnish expertise has formed a foundation for the intervention, and to the need felt by MFA Finland to intervene at certain critical junctures in order to exert influence on the course of implementation. It also serves as an illustration of the effect of external factors on intervention activities, as well as the potential for a single-country based intervention to aim to achieve broader impacts on a regional basis. An evaluation team member conducted interviews with key participants, and beneficiaries, in Finland, Bishkek and through a field visit to Issyk-Kul lake.

The Relevance of the intervention was mapped in identification activities, which included a report by a Finnish specialist. These established the importance of the intervention's activities, which address a complex set of issues affecting the beneficiary population, and exerting broader impacts on social sustainability in Kyrgyzstan (for instance, poverty reduction, migration outflow, good governance, food security, environmental issues, etc). The resulting intervention maps onto core WEI priority themes and cross-cutting issues.

However, at the early implementation phase, the intervention ran into difficulties arising both from external and internal factors. The political flux seen in 2010, with a resulting change of government, caused instability in relations between the project and government ministries and agencies (e.g. with a high turnover of staff at this point), and also increased certain problems encountered with bureaucratic procedures. Internally, a range of issues relating to the management of the intervention arose, including a case of alleged corruption. MFA Finland requested that the project be suspended for a period, subject to the findings of an audit conducted by FAO (the intervention subsequently being restarted, with management

changes having been made). MFA Finland appears to have been actively engaged in this process, attending key meetings and maintaining close monitoring of the situation.

The intervention also experienced problems in some of its activities – notably in the case of the delivery of a Master's degree programme in Finland for participants from Kyrgyzstan. According to respondents' evidence, the selection process was affected by the refusal of the Kyrgyzstan government to release officials to study on the programme, resulting in the need to recruit candidates outside of the originally intended target group. Those candidates who were selected lacked sufficient preparation, including English language proficiency, and the outcome of studies in Finland has proved disappointing.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, the intervention displayed a degree of resilience (supported by the commitment of MFA and FAO), and has continued, getting back on track and producing tangible outcomes and impacts among a range of beneficiaries at the local level, and at the level of government and specialist research institutes. For instance, the project has to date trained some 300 planners, scientists, technical officers, farmers and fishermen; and is seeking outreach impacts in the Central Asian region through distribution of a set of guidelines developed for the purposes of the intervention.

This can be seen, accordingly, as a case of a problematic intervention that could, potentially, have been curtailed by the donor – but which, through the adoption of effective mediating measures and ongoing commitment is now showing strong signs not only of recovery, but of the potential to meet the original aims established for the intervention.

### **5.3            *Ukraine Cleaner Production***

This intervention (allocation - €1,6 million 2009-12) forms part of a broader, regional programme implemented by IFC across countries of the WEI region, to address the pressing need for substantive modification of industrial production practices. As with the case of UNDP's Aid for Trade, it is based on a tested and existing programmatic model designed to implement a complex series of measures aimed at achieving sector-wide and sustained impacts. The evaluation gathered evidence on this intervention from documentary analysis, survey feedback and interviews with the IFC team in Kyiv.

In the case of Ukraine, the country is identified as the least energy efficient economy in Europe. This intervention can therefore be seen to map onto several WEI priority themes and cross-cutting issues – tackling the identified needs on a regional basis, linking trade and development to environmental issues and sustainable development, and bringing together a broad range of stakeholders, from companies through to local and national governments and agencies. The identification of Relevance and needs was conducted by IFC at the regional level, and at country levels – with this used, apparently, as a basis to inform the involvement of Finland in the case of Ukraine, given the fit with Finnish development policy (e.g. energy security, water efficiency, agriculture and rural development, sustainable use of natural resources) and the match between Finnish experience and expertise and the priorities identified in the Ukrainian case, of agri-business, cross-industry energy and process efficiency, and water efficiency.

Notwithstanding an overspend at an early stage in the intervention, by 2012 the evidence received points to impacts being achieved, for instance, through capacity-building measures for companies and the relevant stage agency, for instance (which is being rolled out on a

sub-regional level in Ukraine); the potential for one enterprise to attain very large CO<sub>2</sub> savings through a straw-to-cellulose project. The intervention team also refers to the influence of the project on the national strategy for energy efficiency. With regard to cross-cutting measures, the project has sought to integrate consideration of these issues in the selection process of partner enterprises (beneficiaries). The evaluation team thought, however, that more efforts could be made to address the issue of gender representation, and coverage of cross-cutting questions in reporting procedures.

## **6. REVIEW OF WEI CLUSTER 3 – INFORMATION SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT**

Information Society Development is a WEI priority theme that draws on Finland's recognised expertise and capacity in this sphere, and opens opportunities for the contribution of private sector actors to the implementation of WEI interventions. The cluster contains two interventions:

- Creating Sustainable Business in the Knowledge Economy (InfoDev – World Bank)
- Regional Communications Regulatory Training Programme (EBRD)

### ***6.1 Creating Sustainable Business in the Knowledge Economy***

This is a global programme being implemented by InfoDev of the World Bank group in 3 regions of the world (Africa, Asia-Pacific regions, as well as the WEI region through activities in all 3 South Caucasus countries, and Belarus and Kazakhstan). MFA supports the interventions in the WEI countries through an allocation of €3 million in the period 2009-13.

The global objectives of the initiative are to support the capacity-development of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) to assist them in becoming more competitive in the global knowledge economy, and thus to contribute to sustainable growth, development and job creation. There is a particular emphasis on mobile communications and business incubation. In the WEI region, the activities have focused on:

- Establishment of a mobile applications laboratory – with the Armenia Enterprise Incubator Foundation in Yerevan selected after a competitive process that included bids from Belarus, Armenia, Moldova, Georgia;
- Creation of social networking hubs (in Baku, Tbilisi, Chisinau) related to the mobile communications industry;
- Business incubation initiatives in Moldova, Kazakhstan and Belarus (agri-business and ICT sectors);
- Supporting the removal of barriers to investment in cross-border broadband infrastructure.

The current report draws on evidence received through documentary analysis and review of InfoDev web-based materials; a field visit to the Mobile Application Lab in Yerevan, Armenia; and an interview with the InfoDev team in Washington DC, held via Skype.

Although the evaluation team noted that certain issues had been encountered during implementation, such as delays in receiving funding, and some concerns over reporting procedures of raised by MFA staff, these appear to have been addressed by June 2012, with the InfoDev team stating to the evaluators that good progress is being made in implementation in the WEI region. The current report can note the following key features relating to the programme:

- The initiative provides good regional coverage, including countries (Belarus and Azerbaijan) where there are issues with state control and interference in operations of mobile telecommunications and internet operators. Successful implementation in those cases will require careful efforts and monitoring – but represent a positive achievement (especially in the context of blockages in cooperation with Belarus, for instance, experienced by donors in other priority areas);

- Furthermore, the global community of the InfoDev initiative allows WEI region beneficiaries to expand their interaction with colleagues in those parts of the world (the global meeting of InfoDev teams in Helsinki in 2011 should also be noted in this regard);
- There is a significant Finnish presence, through the involvement of Nokia, with respondents stating that there is regular interaction between Nokia and the World Bank team (although the Yerevan MLab team did state that they would welcome increased contact with Nokia, during the evaluation team's visit);
- The programme scores highly on Relevance, supporting tangible needs of the beneficiary countries – including the issue of reversing the 'brain drain' of talented young IT specialists; as a survey respondent also noted, the programme is making outreach to rural and low income areas, and tackling the question of economic diversification and the support of entrepreneurs.

## **6.2      *Regional Communications Regulatory Training Programme***

The Regional Communications Regulatory Training Programme is one component of Finland's support for activities under the EBRD Technical Cooperation (TC) Fund, which in the WEI programme has received an overall allocation of €3,8 million for the period 2009-13. According to the agreement between EBRD and Finland, signed in 2007, emphasis would be placed on activities relating to priority sectors within Finland's development policy, namely environment, energy, forestry, agriculture, water and sanitation, regional policy, trade and economic development as well as information and communications technology.

The other components of the TC Fund supported by Finland will be covered in Section 8.6 (as they relate to social sustainability themes). The Regional Communications Regulatory Training Programme is presented here, in Section 6, as it maps on to the thematic priority of the Information Society Development cluster.

This intervention has received an allocation of €2,2 million for the period 2009-13, for activities in the WEI countries of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Turkmenistan and Ukraine (for training activities on telecommunications regulatory issues, aimed at government/state officials and representatives of the commercial sector). Belarus was also originally included, but had to be removed owing to insurmountable difficulties in implementing the project there, due to the political climate (note that the InfoDev activities have, so far, been able to proceed). Four of the country programmes had been completed by the time of writing, while the project in Turkmenistan is still under implementation. In the Spring of 2012 EBRD commenced work on follow on projects on broadband policy in Georgia (under implementation), and Armenia (at procurement stage by the time of writing).

The training has been implemented by a Finnish consulting company (Kanervisto consulting), according to a criterion set by MFA Finland that the implementing partner's team should be comprised at least 50% by Finnish experts. There has, accordingly, been a substantial Finnish presence in the intervention.

The current report is based on evidence gained through a Skype interview with the head of the Finnish consulting company, feedback from another team member, the EBRD officer overseeing the intervention, and documentary evidence. Furthermore, the evaluation team visited beneficiaries (state regulatory bodies and other training participants) in Georgia and Ukraine, receiving considerable input and feedback from them. The beneficiaries confirmed in both cases a very strong level of satisfaction with the training received, noting that it was

highly relevant, extremely well-tailored to their needs and specific contexts, and that the training had been organised and delivered in a very effective manner. The Ukrainian respondents indicated that they had initially been sceptical about the extent to which the training would be valuable, and were reluctant to spare the time from their busy schedules – but had quickly been convinced by the training programme that this indeed was of great value. They confirmed that subsequently they had drawn heavily on the experience in shaping new developments in the Ukrainian national policy approach in this sphere.

The project team stated that the implementation in Azerbaijan had been slightly less smooth, because of the local conditions there relating to the role of the state in this area (which tends to exert more control), but that training nevertheless had been successfully conducted, with feedback from participants in all countries showing very high ratings for the activities.

The evaluation team identified an apparent overlap between this intervention (particularly the second stage, on broadband policy) and that of InfoDev, and brought this to the attention of MFA, which in turn asked the two intervention teams for feedback – as a result, the two teams are indeed discussing possibilities for complementary engagement (though they confirm that there is no actual repetition of activities at present).

## 7. REVIEW OF WEI CLUSTER 4 – ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

In terms of the number of interventions, this is the largest, reflecting Finland's particular strengths in these spheres, and the emphasis placed on these issues within Finnish development policy. This section will review the following interventions, starting with the two case-study interventions of ENVSEC and FinWaterWEI:

- ENVSEC
- FinWaterWEI (SYKE)
- Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in Georgia (UNDP)
- Cooperation in the Meteorological Sector (Institutional Cooperation) (Finnish Meteorological Institute)
- Eastern Europe Energy Efficiency and Environment Partnership Fund (E5P Fund) (EBRD)
- EBRD Water Fund
- Geo-Sector Information Management System Development and Capacity Building in Central Asian Countries (GTK)
- Capacity Building for Development of European-type Geo-Information Management Infrastructure in the Geological Sector of Ukraine (GTK)
- Chernobyl Shelter Fund (EBRD)
- Nuclear Safety and Security Capacity Building (Finnish Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority STUK)

The intervention 'Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership (NDEP) (EBRD)' is not included, as the evaluation team has not received any documentary or other evidence relating to this intervention and, according to information received from the MFA and embassy, the intervention (which relates to Belarus based activities within this overall programme) has been stalled.

### 7.1 ENVSEC

The Environment and Security Initiative, or ENVSEC, has been implemented since 2003 by a group of multilateral organisations (initially OSCE, UNDP and UNEP; joined by NATO as an associated member in 2004, and in 2006 by two more full members, REC and UNECE). The overall goal of the programme is to contribute to the reduction of environment and security risks, and to the increased cooperation on addressing environment and security issues in Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Central Asia, with activities mapping on to the specific needs of these sub-regions. (ENVSEC also works with south-eastern Europe, but these activities are not considered within this evaluation.)

The ENVSEC Secretariat is run from the offices of UNEP in Geneva, and administrative and financial tasks have been carried out by UNOPS since 2010, within the ENVSEC Trust Fund. There are Regional ENVSEC Desk Officers working under UNDP and OSCE, and National Focal Points in each country within the local relevant ministries. In April 2012 there were 49 on-going ENVSEC projects (including south-eastern Europe).

Finland is currently the primary donor in the community of donor nations – funding 62% of ENVSEC on-going and pipeline projects in 2012<sup>10</sup>, for instance, and contributing 92% of the

---

<sup>10</sup> Other donors' contributions to project activities were: Austria 7.7%, Belgium 2.2%, Canada 9.7%, Germany 0.2%, UNDP 0.4%, Sweden 17.8%. Information supplied on [www.envsec.org](http://www.envsec.org)

funding of the ENVSEC secretariat.<sup>11</sup> The Finnish commitment is therefore substantial, as reflected also in the budget allocation under WEI for the period 2009-13, which amounts to some €7,6 million. In March 2012, of 13 on-going ENVSEC projects in the southern Caucasus, 10 received Finnish funding; in the Eastern Europe sub-region, of 18 on-going projects 8 received Finnish funding; while in Central Asia, 4 of 10 projects were funded by the MFA Finland.

ENVSEC activities match closely the WEI priority issues of regional stability and security, environment, good governance, civil society and NGO development, and open strong potential for Finnish contributions and influence in key linkages between environment and security across the WEI region. It also provides the opportunity for Finland to strengthen its relations with the international organizations involved in the ENVSEC initiative, drawing on Finland's recognised background in the environmental sphere, and its approach to addressing issues relating to human and societal security, and conflict resolution.

The current evaluation report covers the ENVSEC initiative as one of the case-study interventions of the Wider Europe Initiative. The evaluation team reviewed documentation supplied by the ENVSEC secretariat and MFA Finland, discussed the history of Finnish involvement with current and past MFA staff, and met with Secretariat members and the Rotating Chair in Helsinki and in Geneva. They also interviewed the head of the host office of UNEP in Geneva, and the three regional ENVSEC coordinators. Team members participated in a South Caucasus regional coordination meeting in Georgia, which brought together stakeholders from all three participating countries, as well as technical staff and donor representatives. They also visited partner organisation offices, national focal points, government representatives, consultants and projects in Armenia, Georgia, Ukraine and Kyrgyzstan.

The review begins with reflections on other recent evaluations undergone by ENVSEC.

### ***7.1.1 Previous evaluations of ENVSEC***

A Strategic Review of ENVSEC was conducted by an independent consultant in 2009.<sup>12</sup> This report highlighted the strong relevance of the initiative, and the innovative nature of the collaboration between the participating organizations, allowing a multidisciplinary response to the complex challenges faced by the target regions, at the intersection between environmental degradation and security risks. It pointed also to ENVSEC's approach to bringing together governmental and civil society actors in the beneficiary countries, to address these challenges.

Through a range of activities (assessments, technical environmental projects (eg. clean-up and remedial projects), contributions to a range of transboundary collaborations), the ENVSEC initiative had, since 2003, in the view of the 2009 report, served a catalytic role, facilitating closer collaboration between the contributing organizations and attracting support for projects by other donors. The Review noted that ENVSEC has been able to provide a space where sensitive issues could be discussed, and de-politicised to some extent – an

---

<sup>11</sup> NATO contributes 6%, and Sweden 2%

<sup>12</sup> [www.envsec.org/publications](http://www.envsec.org/publications)

important matter, given the tensions that can be observed in the ENVSEC regions at national and local levels, regarding perceptions of the causes and impacts of environmental problems. However, the Review noted that there was a risk that the activities had at times been implemented in a donor-based fashion, with insufficient local consultation, ownership and participation, with consequences for the potential for sustainability.

The Review also reported some problems with waning interest from participating countries, and also risks that the individual interests of the ENVSEC partners were tending to dominate the joint work. The reviewer argued that there was insufficient programmatic coherence and an increasingly loose thematic definition at country and regional level. The review gave recommendations for reform of the management of ENVSEC and donor coordination, improved cooperation between country level offices, improved visibility and communication, and stressed the need for a more secure financial basis. In addition, the Review gave recommendations for changes in the organization of the regional desk officer posts. It recommended co-funding of activities by local participating organisations (10-25%), for increased local capacity building, and harmonisation with national and regional strategies.

MFA Finland also commissioned an independent evaluation in 2010<sup>13</sup> which looked at individual projects as well as the work of the Secretariat. It found the ENVSEC is a unique platform, which was relevant and reasonably effective, and funds were spent appropriately. It noted progress in the development of effective management and administration of the initiative, but recommended strengthening of the monitoring and reporting procedures. This report was more positive than the 2009 review, with regard to prospects for sustainability and evidence of support among stakeholders in the beneficiary countries, while noting, however, that awareness of ENVSEC in the target regions was still relatively limited. The report recommended a sharpening of the ways in which the security dimension and implications of environmental risks were identified within ENVSEC activities, in order better to understand the linkages between the various factors involved.

The report commented on the need to develop exit strategies, as well as the critical problem of fundraising and attracting additional donors to support the initiative. It did also state, however, the benefits that Finland can be seen to gain from its high-profile support for ENVSEC, and recommended that MFA take a lead in shaping the future development of ENVSEC, in order to ensure that the initiative could exploit its potential effectively.

Finally, the current evaluation team for the mid-term evaluation of WEI received from the ENVSEC secretariat a draft copy of a report on *Advancing the Security Dimension of ENVSEC*, dated May 2012. This report and recommendations apparently responds to previous evaluations and discussions within ENVSEC, and among its donors, with regard to the development of a more substantive concept of the linkage between security and environment as applied in the initiative. The report provides a set of recommendations for measures that can be taken to extend the impact of ENVSEC, through a sharpening of the focus of activities and the incorporation of appropriate toolboxes and methodologies designed for ENVSEC, more effective engagement with donors and beneficiary organizations, a transition from a project to a programme based approach, increased visibility and communications work, etc.

---

<sup>13</sup> *Evaluation of Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC)*, Gaia Consulting Oy, 17 November 2010

The current review will use these preceding evaluations and sets of recommendations as a reference point in the discussion below, of the evaluation of ENVSEC within the context of the mid-term evaluation of the Wider Europe Initiative.

### ***7.1.2 Relevance, Coherence & Complementarity***

As a component of the WEI programme, and in relation to Finnish development policy emphases, ENVSEC maps closely onto the thematic priorities of Security, Energy and Environment, and Social Sustainability, as well as the cross-cutting priority of good governance. It has a very strong regional focus, delivered through sub-regions that map on to the WEI regions, and activities include a strong degree of transnational interaction and fostering of collaboration. The emphasis placed on the involvement of civil society and local populations in responding to environmental risks also maps closely onto the core WEI aim of supporting NGO development in the WEI region. Some of the ENVSEC sub-projects also demonstrate synergies with other WEI projects. For instance, the Environmental Security, Mining and Good Governance project implemented within the Security Research Cluster has links to the ENVSEC mining project, and Zoi consultants are providing inputs in both. There is considerable synergy with FinWaterWEI activities (particularly those implemented with UNECE) and some of the other projects, such as the GTK ICI or FMI ICI projects in Central Asia (such as the Dam Safety project). At times there are the same technical staff and stakeholders crossing between the projects. This was evident, for instance, in the UNECE and OSCE project on the Transboundary Water Convention, where Finnish funds were supporting activities via ENVSEC and via FinWaterWEI. However, despite risks for overlap, this has been seemingly managed well.

With regard to complementarity with the policies and priorities of multilateral organizations, the ENVSEC emphasis on the nexus between security and environment (and the need to search for transnational solutions to common problems such as water scarcity, which have the potential to lead to conflict situations, and placing an emphasis on sustainable development) reflects the evolution of understandings of and policy and societal responses to security seen over recent decades. ENVSEC is envisaged as a mechanism through which a combined and concerted focus on technical solutions as a means to defuse political and societal tensions can be achieved, as well as providing opportunities for the organizations involved to pool capacity and share information. Activities to achieve the objectives include vulnerability and risk assessments, clean up and remediation of hot spot sites; capacity building of government institutions for more effective integrated policies, training of civil society, awareness campaigns and public hearings for improved awareness of the linkages between environment and security risks and enhanced participation of interested actors in activities that aim to prevent and reduce these risks.

ENVSEC can also be seen to correspond closely with EU policies in the Eastern Partnership and Central Asian regions (ENVSEC has succeeded in establishing an important partnership with the EC Instrument for Stability, and the EU is, apparently, now discussing more active involvement with ENVSEC), while the composition of the ENVSEC initiative facilitates coordination among the member organizations to ensure dovetailing of ENVSEC priorities with those of the 'parent' organizations. The regional coordination system of ENVSEC assists with coordination between organisations and countries. For instance, the evaluators attended the regional coordination workshop in the Caucasus, where both political and technical staff from the three countries, donor representatives and consultants, could share experiences and lessons learned from the projects. At times there are inputs from other agencies – for

instance, WHO has sometimes participated in projects on environmental health, and ENVSEC is actively looking for other partners, including NGOs (for instance, the website encourages registration of other organisations with interest in the topic). The contacts and links established and nurtured within ENVSEC have also had a spill over effect to other processes and projects of the partners.

The initiative can be seen to be contributing towards more effective donor coordination, and a greater degree of awareness within the respective member organizations of the roles and activities of the other members. (The evaluation team asked ENVSEC participants from UNEP, OSCE and UNDP whether the initiative had led to a sense of learning common lessons and adapting organizational cultural practices, and received confirmation that this indeed was occurring, at least among those personnel actively involved in the collaboration.)

With regard to ensuring relevance of ENVSEC activities in the beneficiary countries, however, a more mixed picture emerged (reflecting an ongoing pattern noted in previous evaluations referred to above). At times it was difficult for the evaluators to see clear consultation and involvement of local government focal points (for instance in Ukraine and Kyrgyzstan). The ENVSEC projects, while seen by the evaluation team to be effective projects overall, tend to originate from the ENVSEC partner organisations or individual links they may have with local government organisations. They are then sent for approval by the national focal points, but at times this is a very last minute and cursory process (for instance, in the case of Kyrgyzstan). Armenia has earlier held a national consultation process with government, partner organisations and NGOs, to analyse progress, existing problems and future project ideas. However, such a meeting has not been held for the past two years, while other countries reviewed in the case study visits do not appear to have held similar consultations recently. Several interviewees at local level commented that there is also limited feedback on the decisions made in the Board (for instance, why some projects are approved and others not). ENVSEC considers that feedback should be the responsibility of the individual organisations; however, they would only be able to feedback to their own organisations, and not to government or NGOs (the links between ENVSEC Secretariat and the governments are not obvious). This limited involvement of local stakeholders in the planning and implementation means that ENVSEC is often project-based, and with limited top-down transparency, rather than consisting of national programmes with potential more sustainability.

Alongside this negative aspect of limited consultation, it should also be noted that at times it can be desirable for project proposals to be put in place without overly drawing attention to the linkages with security issues, given the sensitivities surrounding such issues, and the tendency for governments in the WEI region to consider that they have a privileged position when it comes to the 'ownership' of security-related matters, and decision-making on how (or whether) such problems are tackled.

### **7.1.3 Efficiency**

On the basis of interview feedback with a range of stakeholders, including MFA Finland, and through review of the available documentary evidence and financial reports, the current report concurs with the analyses found in previous reviews of ENVSEC that problems remain with regard to the efficiency of the administration of ENVSEC and the operation of the Secretariat. Of course, transaction costs exist when working with more than one multilateral organisation – this can be seen also in the One UN System. The system is too heavy and

inefficient, and there have been difficulties in working through UNOPS, including a budgeting mistake by that organization that led to a shortfall of funds for the Secretariat. Nevertheless, the level of funding of administration costs in ENVSEC, and the running costs of Secretariat in particular, raise concerns as to whether the current organizational arrangements for the Secretariat provides sufficient added value for the cost.

The Finnish contribution to the budget for Phase I was 2 600 000 Euro. The total budget for Phase II was 5 580 000 Euro, with Finland's share being 3 500 000 Euro. This makes ENVSEC the largest component within WEI. Within the budget for Phase II, 1 995 000 Euro was allocated to the Secretariat, and 259 365 Euro as the management fee. In other words, the administrative costs are almost double that of the implementation.

**Table 3: Proposed budget of ENVSEC Phase II (prior to adjustments)**

	Finland	Total Co-financing	Grand Total	Finland's share
<b>Eastern Europe</b>	415 245	1 300 000	1 715 245	24,21 %
<b>Central Asia</b>	415 245	200 000	615 245	67,49 %
<b>Southern Caucasus</b>	415 245	580 000	995 245	41,72 %
<b>Sub-total</b>	1 245 735	2 080 000	3 325 735	
<b>Secretariat</b>	1 995 000	0	1 995 000	100,00 %
<b>Management fee</b>	259 265	0	259 265	100,00 %
<b>Sub-total</b>	2 254 265	0	2 254 265	
	<b>3 500 000</b>	<b>2 080 000</b>	<b>5 580 000</b>	<b>62,72 %</b>

However, this situation has become more extreme in practice, due to the UNOPS budgeting error, which will be discussed further below. The total for the Secretariat for the three year period is now estimated to be 3 140 780 USD. Given the change in the Euro exchange rate, this would now be equivalent to approximately 2 559 723 Euro or 73% of the total Finnish funding to ENVSEC. This means that in practice (and assuming no further fall in the Euro rate) only 19.5% of Finland's contribution may now be available for implementation.

On the positive side, some new funding (1,5 M€) has recently been obtained from the EU's Instrument for Stability for work on climate change and security. In addition, the different partner organisations are bringing in their own funds – either as cash, reimbursables or in-kind. For instance, this includes the time and travel inputs of the Rotating Chairs from the different participating organisations. In addition, the improved coordination and sharing of information between the partner organisations leads to less over-lapping and replication, and therefore improved efficiency.

#### **7.1.4 Effectiveness**

Monitoring of progress appears to be difficult to achieve for the programme, a reflection in part of the distribution of oversight responsibilities among the contributing organizations. There are no consistent indicators as the work is based on individual projects. In addition, the consolidated reporting (carried out by UNOPS) has been quite slow – with the annual report for 2010 only finalised in August 2011. Regional snapshots are available on the website for 2011 and 2012 (and these are very useful for presenting the individual projects and summarising progress as a region) and individual reports were obtained on request from

ENVSEC, but it does not appear that there has been a change in the overall reporting criticised in the 2010 Evaluation.

Nevertheless, by drawing on the reports available at the level of local interventions, and through feedback gained during the evaluation team's fieldwork and meetings with ENVSEC project teams, the report can state that results have generally been very positive according to most stakeholders interviewed. ENVSEC works via a combination of small scale local projects (eg. Aarhus centres,), risk assessments and larger scale cross-border interventions. There have been very positive advances in capacity building; and in the building of relationships and information sharing at the technical level between countries, even those with 'frozen conflicts'.

Flexibility is an advantage of ENVSEC's approach – using the most appropriate combination of ENVSEC partners to achieve results, depending on the local political situation and the type of project. The opportunity to work together has led to improved understanding between the organisations of their portfolios, capacities and ways of working and this has led to further work together outside of ENVSEC. Some examples of the most successful ENVSEC projects include:

- Aarhus Centres – the centres supported under the auspices of the Aarhus Convention by OSCE have been highly successful in improving community information and involvement in environmental issues. ENVSEC now supports 37 centres.
- Capacity Building for Cooperation on Dam Safety project in Central Asia (UNECE and UNDP) – which has included cooperation with Finland also through FinWaterWEI and GTK
- Climate Change Scenarios – for instance, the UNDP report on the impacts of climate change in the southern Caucasus was considered ground-breaking

### ***7.1.5 Impact***

The impact of ENVSEC is high – the whole seems to achieve better results than the parts, i.e. the funds allocated via ENVSEC acquire added value, a feature noted by representatives of all participating organisations interviewed as one of the most positive elements of ENVSEC. By working together, and forming flexible consortia for the individual projects, the relative strengths of the organisations can be maximised. For instance, in some countries political sensitivities make it difficult for NATO or OSCE to act, and UNDP or UNEP may bring more neutral leadership (for example in the 'Cooperation for the Protection and Sustainable Development of Mountain Regions in the Southern Caucasus', implemented by UNEP and REC, which has required considerable discussions to achieve consensus with the participating governments). On the other hand, UNEP and UNECE have specific global environmental expertise but do not have local offices and therefore need to work together with organisations such as UNDP, OSCE or REC to gain knowledge of grass-roots ideas and access to partners. OSCE brings important security expertise, and UNDP plays an important role in project management, etc. (for example, the project 'Promoting cooperation to adapt to climate change in Chu-Talas transboundary basin', in Central Asia is implemented by a consortium of UNDP, OSCE and UNECE). NATO has brought specific expertise on military hardware and waste disposal, which has enabled learning by the partners.

Clear, measurable indicators for ENVSEC at framework level are problematic to identify. The logical frameworks of the regional programmes define the impact level indicators as:

- Extent to which environmental risks to security are acknowledged and mitigated by the recipient countries

- Extent of environmental dialogue and cooperation in areas of conflict and instability

The impacts of ENVSEC activities in security are particularly difficult to pin down, as a positive outcome (first indicator) would be the absence of serious conflict. Environmental impacts of the individual projects are possible to quantify, but due to the size of the problems, even these are difficult to measure at framework level beyond the numbers of workshops held, etc.

Many of the projects funded are very small. On the other hand, some small activities, such as the CASE projects of southern Caucasus, have very good involvement of local beneficiaries, which has broadened their impact and sustainability.

With regard to visibility, the evaluators noted that while the brand of ENVSEC is not always evident, the names of individual organisations' overseeing the implementation of a particular project are more prominently publicised, an issue to be addressed as ENVSEC continues to forge an identity in the regions covered.

### **7.1.6 Sustainability**

At the level of the ENVSEC initiative as a whole, the prospects for sustainability are far from clear. Despite the development of ENVSEC's strategic goals, reflected in the draft report of 2012 received by the evaluation team (*Advancing the Security Dimension of ENVSEC*), considerable doubts exist with regard to the viability of the ENVSEC initiative, given the current uncertainties over the future of donor funding (and in the context of the high level of funding required to support the Secretariat). Finland has already stated that it cannot remain as the main donor for an extended period, particularly given the changed priorities of the new Development Policy – however, despite extensive efforts made by the ITA-20 staff to write to and visit other European potential donors and lobby on behalf of ENVSEC, only limited results have so far been achieved. An exit strategy for Finland as the main donor is critical. In the Proposal for Activities for 2011-13, the Secretariat proposed that special attention would be paid to "Developing exit strategies ensuring sustainability and impact of the project activities as well as avoiding generating false expectations about continued donor support" (page 4). However, there is no clear evidence of a strategy yet from ENVSEC's side.

At the level of project interventions conducted under the ENVSEC initiative in the beneficiary countries, the picture is rather mixed, and sustainability dependent on a range of factors (availability of on-going support from implementing organization, the level of commitment and ownership of beneficiary country civil society and governmental organizations). The issue mentioned earlier, with regard to the limited involvement of local stakeholders in planning and implementation of ENVSEC project activities, holds consequences for sustainability, of course. For instance, the Aarhus Centres have been very successful and are an excellent example of developing local community involvement in environmental issues. However they are currently very reliant on OSCE for core funding, and it is difficult to see a sustainable funding channel in the future that would not compromise their independence from government and business. In Azerbaijan, the Aarhus Centres are integrated in the Ministry of Ecology, which has resolved to some extent the financial issues and allowed recruitment of high quality staff, but has potentially limited their independence and led to self-censorship.

### **7.1.7                      *Management and administration***

As noted earlier, ENVSEC is an initiative based on the collaboration of the six partner organisations, run through the Secretariat which is based in UNEP in Geneva. There are also (in the WEI region) three regional coordinators supported by the partner organisations (UNDP and OSCE), and national focal points for the governments in the participating countries. There is a Management Board, which meets regularly and carries out collective decision-making, with participation from high level representatives of the partner organisations. Donors, including Finland, can also participate as observers in the Board meetings. This has been important for maintaining transparency.

There has been active involvement of an annual Rotating Chair from one of the partner organisations (apart from NATO), and this has been important for the decision-making and for representation at high-level meetings. This is a useful system that should be continued. It involves quite heavy time commitment by the Chair – perhaps 20-30% of their working time – and therefore is not seen as sustainable on a permanent basis. However, that period tends to increase the ownership assumed by the partners, and the twelve months of increased visibility tends to raise awareness within the Chair's organisation. OSCE and UNEP particularly made a big effort in the role as Chair, as ENVSEC has been important for them.

The requirements for ENVSEC management, coordination and administration were defined together with the main donors in 2009, and set out in an MOU, in response to the Strategic Review. In 2009 it was decided that a new position (Senior Programme Manager) was needed to lead the resource mobilisation efforts. The Secretariat consists of the ENVSEC Senior Programme Manager, the Coordination Officer, four Regional Desk Officers and an Administrative Assistant (defined in the Addendum and Renewal of the MOU, 31.3.2010). A finance consultant and a communications consultant were proposed for addition to the Secretariat team in 2011. Donor and partner funds pass through the ENVSEC Trust Fund, which is managed by UNOPS. However, the costs of the Secretariat have risen significantly from the budgeted costs, and part of its time has to be dedicated to raise funds for its own functioning, rather than for project implementation. Due to budget errors, there will not be sufficient funding available for all the planned posts. The likely result is one post will cover both administration and communication and the finance consultant will be employed on a retainer basis.

Each partner organisation has its own reporting system and lines of command. This led to some delays initially due to coordination of procedures of different organisations. In addition, the Secretariat does not have any power of supervision over Regional Desk Officers, as they are employed by different organisations.

However, at project level the administration seems to work well. ENVSEC issued pilot Programme and Project Guidelines in November 2010, describing in detail the aims of the programme, the structure, the project cycle and procedures, and including formats for project proposals, budgets, etc. At country or regional level, the different participating organisations consult with local partners and decide who is interested in which project activity when preparing ideas to send for approval. Once the project begins, specific roles are designated and the funds are divided to the different organisations. There seems to be good communication in the field, with project managers keeping close communication between themselves, with their own Secretariats and with the Regional Desk Officers. For instance, in the Dniester project in Eastern Europe, OSCE, UNEP and UNECE (and the NGO Zoi) are collaborating, with each taking responsibility for the different components, with support from

the others. An ENVSEC reporting template is provided for all organisations to use, and strict procedures are followed for procurement. The line of command is through the Regional Desk Officer, rather than the Secretariat. The Secretariat maintains communication with the regional desks via monthly teleconferences and face-to-face meetings around three times per year.

Since 2006, the same organisations (OSCE in the Caucasus, UNEP in Eastern Europe, and UNDP in Central Asia) have been responsible for regional coordination (unlike the post of Chair, which rotates annually and brings in fresh ideas and enthusiasm). They employ the Regional Desk Officers based outside of the region (although they are not usually working full-time for ENVSEC). This tends to mean that the projects of the lead organisation dominate in the region they coordinate, and may have led to some fatigue and waning interest. According to the ENVSEC MoU between the partner organisations the host organisations of the Regional Desk Officers should be reviewed every three years (they were last reviewed in 2009). A rotation of organisations could bring fresh enthusiasm and new project ideas.

Problems have arisen with financial budgeting, transfers & administration (UNOPS). This is partly due to the use of incorrect proforma unit costs when planning the budget, particularly with regard to two of the posts. As a result there was a shortfall in the budget for 2011-2013 of 425 780 USD. Given that the exchange rate of the Euro has fallen with regard to USD, this situation is even more problematic for a donor such as Finland, which makes its contribution in Euros.

It is not clear that Finland's administrative burden has been decreased significantly via the outsourced administration for ENVSEC in the form of the Secretariat, although staff members concede that it is easier to work. Staff members within ITÄ-20 appreciate the good relationship with ENVSEC Secretariat staff, but they still dedicate considerable time to monitoring progress, and on arranging workshops, visiting other donors, etc. on behalf of ENVSEC. The cost of administration by the Secretariat and UNOPS is much higher than the equivalent cost if carried out by the MFA. However, given that this is a multilateral programme, it would not be appropriate for the work to be done by one donor. The long term employment by UNEP of a Finn in the coordination role of ENVSEC has been beneficial for providing institutional memory within MFA Finland, as in the last ten years there has been a high turnover of focal points in the MFA (nine focal points in ten years!).

#### **7.1.8 Finnish Added Value**

The evaluators only encountered limited Finnish added value in ENVSEC. If we consider direct involvement of Finnish experts, there have been two long term examples. A Finnish Junior Professional Officer (JPO) worked earlier with UNDP in Central Asia (fully funded by MFA Finland), and was mostly focused on ENVSEC coordination tasks. This was very beneficial to ENVSEC, as she maintained close links with the Regional Coordinator and the Secretariat. However, when UNDP applied for and was assigned a new Finnish JPO, the TOR was changed and she is mostly dedicated to UNDP tasks. There is also Finnish national expert in UNEP, working part-time in the Secretariat. This expert serves as a useful conduit for the MFA Finland. There are also links via other Finnish WEI projects that provide potential added value – for instance, short term inputs by SYKE experts to project 'Promoting cooperation to adapt to climate change in Chu-Talas Transboundary Basin', via UNECE; and links to the Geological Survey of Finland (GTK) for data exchange and information sharing in the comprehensive study of glaciers in Central Asia.

Finland is able to influence the choice of projects to some extent, and the earlier evaluation supported by Finland provided useful inputs to ENVSEC's development. From the interviews carried out it was evident that Finland is viewed as a reliable, substantive partner, with long-term predictability. The partner organizations understand that Finland wants to move away from the core funding role, but appreciate the fact that it is actively attempting to find new donors.

However, despite the considerable funding provided by Finland, there appears to be very little Finnish 'branding' or visibility, and it is likely that downstream project participants are not aware that Finland is main donor. When analysing the ENVSEC website, for example, the donors are only mentioned on one sub-page under the section 'About Us'. Some of the sub-projects include the MFA Finland logo on their project materials, but not all. This is a fact of life of co-funded and multilateral programmes, and some of the participating organisations noted that it would not be appropriate for Finland to receive more attention. Yet for the sake of sustainability of donor (and their tax-payers') interest, the evaluators consider more attention should be paid to this issue by MFA.

#### **7.1.9 *Cross-cutting objectives***

When dealing with several different implementing organisations – and with funding coming from several donors – it is reasonable that the specific cross-cutting objectives of the Finnish Development Policy are not necessarily addressed. Most donors and multilateral organisations do embed gender, as a rule, within their programming and project implementation - however, the logical frameworks for each ENVSEC regional programme make no mention of even gender in the anticipated outcomes or indicators. HIV/AIDS is not touched within ENVSEC. Ethnic conflict and human rights issues are relevant topics, but require careful treatment within ENVSEC activities given the sensitivities associated with these issues, and the need for ENVSEC to engage effectively with beneficiary governments. Naturally environment is a main topic of ENVSEC and is being addressed in the projects by their nature.

A useful Gender Mainstreaming checklist is provided as part of the 'ENVSEC Programme and Project Guidelines' and at least in theory, the ENVSEC Management Board reviews the gender mainstreaming plans. The gender mainstreaming guidelines of the individual organisations should be applied to the individual projects (for instance, the evaluators discussed the use of the guidelines of UNDP and OSCE) and advice provided by the partner organisations' Gender Advisors. However, consideration of cross-cutting objectives such as gender, social inclusion and HIV/AIDS are not very evident in practice – at least the overall Logframe, monitoring and reports. At the field report level there may be more consideration given – for instance, the CASE progress report sighted from the southern Caucasus had a chapter on involvement of women and youth.

The Eastern Europe regional programme has emphasised inclusion of cultural issues in publications. For instance, old postage stamps depicting flora, fauna, clothes and culture were incorporated in one publication as an innovative way of introducing ideas. Environmental journalism has also proved a safe way of dealing with issues of 'rights' – for instance, in Belarus.

## **7.2      *FinWaterWEI***

FinWaterWEI is the water sector cooperation framework funded under WEI (2009-2013). In addition to exploring evidence relating to the core evaluation criteria, the review will reflect on further key issues highlighted in the TOR and developed by the evaluation team, to analyse the administrative arrangements put in place for the framework, and to assess the extent to which the outsourced model employed has proved cost-effective.

Information was collected in a number of ways, in order to include as many sources as possible, and to balance quantitative with qualitative information. Information gathering methodologies included participation in ENVSEC, UNECE and EU NPD/IWRM workshops, and interviews with key informants (water initiative committee members, government staff, development bank staff, local municipalities, academic and NGOs communities). Interviews were used to follow up points covered in SYKE reports. The evaluators were able to review a proportion of the original project proposals from the sub-projects contained in the framework.

### **7.2.1      *History of the programme and its objectives***

The Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE) is part of the government structure of Finland, operating mainly under the auspices of the Ministry of Environment, and functions as a centre of environmental expertise and a research institute. SYKE has worked for many years in international water cooperation, and had existing relationships with many environmental agencies in the region, as well as with the multilateral organisations such as UNECE.

The 2007 Finnish Development Policy had emphasised the central role of water in development. In 2009 the International Strategy for Finland's Water Sector was published. The strategy is focused on inland waters and established five themes for international cooperation:

- Integrated Water Resources Management
- Development of water management institutions
- Impact of climate change on water courses, adaptation to and mitigation of climate change
- Protection and rehabilitation of water courses, including water quality issues
- Security issues relating to waters, including transboundary waters and water and health

At the start of the WEI, MFA was approached by various organisations looking for funding. The MFA was interested to use the institutional memory within SYKE, in order to establish a framework strategy for the water sector (2009). The MFA contracted an independent expert, who had earlier worked with both SYKE and UNECE, to design a regional programme. He considered the EU links (such as the EU Water Initiative and the Environment for Europe Process), the Global Water Partnership and the UNECE-supported water conventions and legal instruments that had received considerable support from Finland. He consulted regional actors and the existing multilateral partners (but not the individual countries) and prepared a document with an initial budget of 5 million Euro.

The FinWaterWEI Strategic Programme document is a well written and coherent framework for water cooperation under WEI, with five themes (Water and health; Transboundary

waters; Dam safety; Monitoring, Reporting and Assessment; and Climate Change). FinWaterWEI fits within the Energy and the Environment theme of WEI, but also makes cross-cutting contributions throughout the other themes. It reflects most of the themes from the Water Strategy.

As with all the WEI activities, the FinWaterWEI went through a process of discussion and approval within the Quality Group of the MFA.

### **7.2.2 Objectives, structure and individual project activities**

The Overall Objective was stated as: Water issues no obstacle for economic development and no cause of health problems in the EECCA countries; and the Programme Purpose as: Reduction of water disputes inside and between the countries and improved water supply and sanitation through improved education, increased investment and better alignment of water management with the UNECE Water Convention and its Health Protocol. The strategy had quite ambitious long term goals in line with the expectation that the budget would increase, but in practice this never happened. The three result areas dealt with governance and transboundary water issues; governance of water sector instruments; and capacity building, however in practice the elements of education and training have been cut due to lack of funding.

Most of the budget was tied up quite quickly with proposals from multilateral organisations, therefore leaving relatively little room for Finnish expertise to be involved (other than the experts of SYKE itself). The agreement for the administrative unit of FinWaterWEI was signed in May 2010 for the period of 1 January 2010 – 31 December 2013. By the time the unit began to function in early 2010 some projects were already underway, and Activity 7 with GWP-CACENA had completed. In practice, the budget was too limited to work with many individual projects, and most of the funds went to UNECE or to the two ICI projects implemented by SYKE. Much of the budgets are directed to payment of local consultants and regional events and training.

**Structure:** A Steering Committee is in place to supervise the work of FinWaterWEI, with members drawn from the MFA (including representatives of ITÄ-20 and the water adviser) and from the Ministry of the Environment and SYKE. The purpose of the Steering Committee is to guide the activities of FinWaterWEI, consider reports, new proposals, travel plans for SYKE staff, etc.

In addition to the Steering Committee, an Advisory Board was established, with members drawn from relevant government institutions such as the Ministry of the Environment, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Ministry of Social Affairs, Helsinki University of Technology, Geological Survey of Finland and the Finnish Water Forum. The MFA has also given financial support to the Regional Environment Centre (REC) of the Southern Caucasus and also from REC Central Asia to participate in some meetings. The purpose is to discuss new project ideas, to initiate ideas for new activities, and to plan for joint activities (such as the arrangements for Stockholm Water Week or the Astana Ministers' Conference). These meetings have not been frequent – perhaps only once per year.

There are several types of activity – multilateral processes (eg. UNECE), bilateral projects, and ICI twinning projects. The two ICI projects (Georgia and Kyrgyzstan) use normal ICI procedures, with reporting by the organisation to the MFA, and reports checked by ICI

consultant. They are within FinWaterWEI due to their content and geographical location, but their administration is performed outside of the framework. Many of the other projects are implemented by UNECE, with SYKE acting as the supervisor.

There have been 12 FinWaterWEI sub-projects, as well as the Administration and Support contract between MFA and SYKE (2010-2013). Three sub-projects have been completed, one has been transferred to the security cluster and the future of one is uncertain, but likely to continue. Ten sub-projects have been planned, carried out or completed in cooperation with other international donors, UNECE, OECD, UNDP, and GWP, while two projects are operated by SYKE directly.

The individual sub-projects planned within FinWaterWEI have been:

Name of sub-project	Implementing organisation	Project period	Implemented in FinWaterWEI?
1. 2nd Assessment of transboundary rivers, lakes and groundwaters	UNECE	2009-12	Yes - complete
2. EU Water Initiative / National Policy Dialogues on IWRM in Kyrgyzstan and Georgia	UNECE	2010-12	Yes, under work
3. OECD EAP Task Force Support to Water Management Policies	OECD-EAP Task Force	2009-10	Yes - complete
4. GWP-CACENA + IWRM, New Generation of Experts 2010-2013, Capacity Building	GWP/Aalto-University	2010-13	No – moved to Aalto under Security Cluster
5. Support to target setting for sustainable water management, access to safe water and adequate sanitation in Armenia	UNECE	2012-13?	Initially EBRD Water Fund, and then World Bank financing was planned, but now planned for UNECE
6. Promoting adaption to climate change in transboundary basins	UNECE	2010-12	Yes, under work
7. Support to Global Water Partnership (GWP)-CACENA networking programme	GWP	2009	Yes - complete
8. Water quality monitoring in the Kyrgyz Republic (KGZ-Water), ICI	SYKE	2010-13	Yes, under work (administered under ICI)
9. Capacity Building on Water Monitoring and Management in Georgia (Georgia Waters), ICI	SYKE	2010-13	Yes, under work (administered under ICI)
10. Support to participation in international meetings on water by EECCA representatives	UNECE/ EAP-TF	continuous	Yes, under work
11. Supporting transboundary dialogue between Kazakhstan and China in Ili-Balkhash River Basin	EU/UNDP	2011-12	Yes, under work
12. Improving water and health in	UNECE	2011-	Yes, under work

Name of sub-project	Implementing organisation	Project period	Implemented in FinWaterWEI?
Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia		2013	

### **7.2.3      *Relevance, Coherence and Complementarity***

All the selected projects demonstrate very good synergy with Finnish Development Policy and WEI, as they are working regionally on topics of environment and security. The water sector is clearly a significant sector in the region, as it has significant potential for transboundary conflict. Upstream-downstream water supply issues, for instance, are the cause of considerable tensions already in Central Asia, with upstream countries Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan prioritising hydro-electricity production, and downstream Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan demanding water for irrigation of water needy cash crops. As noted earlier, there was no process of local consultation during the formulation of the FinWaterWEI strategy. However, the individual projects appear to have strong local interest and participation.

Finland has been an active participant in the Water Convention (the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes, also known as the Helsinki Convention) and the Protocol on Water and Health, so the UNECE activities included in WEI are a natural progression. Water activities are in line with Finnish future development cooperation interests (for instance, water was the main focus for Finland's work in the Sustainable Development Conference in Rio 2012).

At times, ENVSEC and FinWaterWEI work together, even funding parts of the same project (for instance the projects implemented by UNECE). However, in the view of the evaluators, there do not appear to be overlaps or duplication.

The link to the EBRD water fund is unclear. Initially it was planned that EBRD could take responsibility for one of the FinWaterWEI sub-projects, however it did not eventuate. There are good synergies with other WEI activities, including the geological and the meteorological ICI projects (both GTK and FMI are invited to participate in the FinWaterWEI Advisory Board meetings). There would also be the potential for links to other WEI activities, such as the FAO Kyrgyzstan fisheries project.

All selected projects are relevant to the country needs and WEI purposes. However, the choice of activities demonstrates too much reliance on UNECE, even though this has proved to be a good partner. In addition, the UNDP transboundary project seems a strange choice, given that it involves a totally external country on one side (and in this case, China is a quite reluctant participant). In addition, the framework gives virtually no role for the private sector or NGOs. Although the Finnish Water Forum was included in the Advisory Board and expected to play a role, there is very little opportunity for any participation outside of SYKE and UN organisations, due to the form of the framework and the choice of sub-projects.

### **7.2.4      *Efficiency***

FinWaterWEI has a total Budget of 4 895 000 Euro over 2009-13 (4 years), including the indicative budget of approx 700 000 Euro as an overall management fee for SYKE - or 14.3%

of the total budget. Expenditure by end 2011 was €2 612 644 (53.4 % of planned). At the planning stage it was anticipated that the budget for FinWaterWEI would be increased, but this has not happened. In practice the budget is too small for the multitude of activities planned and implemented, leading to a reduction in the potential impact. In comparison, for instance, the ILO Decent Work project is implementing only one project (over a similar time frame).

FinWaterWEI appears quite efficient, with a relatively low profile, although there are many layers of administrative costs (MFA, SYKE, UNECE, etc). The efficiency of the individual sub-project budgets is very difficult to assess, as all have different methods of calculating their overheads, etc. For the ICI projects SYKE charges an administrative multiplier of 1,8 on the salary of staff (making it the least expensive multiplier of the Finnish institutions) and the work appears to have been carried out in a cost effective manner. In the case of the multilateral organisation projects, it is less clear. UNECE charges an overhead of 13% and where comparison of fees is possible, the unit rates appear to be reasonable (for instance, in comparison to the costs within the ENVSEC Secretariat. In addition to the listed funding, there are unbudgeted in-kind costs contributed by participating organisations – for instance, the time and expertise of local experts. The Finnish funding has often served as core funding, on which basis additional funding from other donors and multilateral organisations was contributed.

### **7.2.5 Effectiveness**

The monitoring of the activities is mainly focused on assessment of activity reports received from the implementing organizations. There is little opportunity for SYKE to evaluate the work in practice beyond participation in relevant meetings and through regular contacts with the implementing organizations. The Steering Committee has the mandate to monitor, but is reliant on SYKE. As a result, clear reporting against indicators of the overall strategy's logical framework is not evident, making the effectiveness and impact difficult to comment on. SYKE reports only on the progress against indicators from the administration contract, which are quite basic (x reports prepared, y meetings attended).

The development objectives of the two result areas under implementation are: Result 1: 'Ecologically, politically and socially sustainable management of waters. Justified allocation of water, water disputes no obstacle for development.' and Result 2: 'Safe drinking water and adequate wastewater treatment through increased financing available for water supply and sanitation'. The choice of the projects reflect these objectives, and it is likely that progress is being made towards achieving them. However, data is not reported on. Qualitatively the evaluators consider that at least Result 1 is making progress.

Result 3: Modern water management sector curricula and education and research related to Water Security introduced in partner universities and sector institutes in EECCA, has largely been dropped from FinWaterWEI. The one linked activity has been separated into the research cluster. This is unfortunate, as the original premise still stands, that there is a need for future development of competent staff for the participating organisations. However, it was considered that there was insufficient budget to fund this component.

The projects implemented directly by SYKE in Kyrgyzstan and Georgia under the Institutional Cooperation Instrument are very much appreciated by the local stakeholders, and in the case of Georgia appear to be effective in building capacity (Kyrgyzstan is at an early stage still

after considerable delays). They are both built on earlier cooperation between SYKE and the environmental authorities, and these personal relationships between staff have assisted with implementation. The UNECE 2nd Assessment and National Policy Dialogue (NPD) activities also appear to be effective, and are highly praised by the stakeholders contacted. The staff of the Georgian Environmental Agency have participated in study tours to Finland, and purpose designed formal training courses with SYKE, as well as hands-on training in the field. All those interviewed were positive about the results of the training, and felt that they had developed important competencies to carry out their jobs. In the first phase, equipment was also provided.

The implementation of several of the projects has been negatively impacted by political, institutional and legislative changes in the participating countries. For instance, in Kyrgyzstan, some governmental water and environmental institutions lost data and staff after the April 2010 revolution. Institutional changes within the Ministry of Environment/HydroMet, Ministry of Agriculture and Amelioration, State Environmental Protection and Forestry/ Environmental Inspection on control water quality and Chu River Basin Council in the Kyrgyzstan, have had some impact on FinWaterWEI activities. There were changes also in Georgia (and therefore downstream in Azerbaijan) where forest protection (a key element of water resources development and protection) was moved away from the Ministry of Environment to the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, and dam control functions were transferred to Ministry of Emergency Situations. These government plans have changed the IWRM-based priorities and relevant data. However, these changes are beyond the control of WEI and flexibility has been employed to work with these changes – for instance, changing the project plan in the case of the Kyrgyz ICI project; and patiently continuing to organise meetings for the NPD discussions in the southern Caucasus.

FinWaterWEI performs a useful role encouraging the work of other donors with the multilateral organisations working in the sector. The UNECE activities have been able to attract other donors on the basis of the Finnish funding and organisation of meetings. In addition, the regular workshops and meetings supported by Finland allow the country participants to meet and build working relationships. Many respondents commented on the importance of making these technical links, particularly where political tensions exist.

#### **7.2.6      *Impact***

There is no clear effort being made to monitor achievement of the objective and development impacts set in the strategic project document (29.10.2009).

The development impact of the overall objective was described as 'Water quality improved and adequate amounts of water available for population, agriculture and industry. Drinking water available for all'. That of the programme purpose was 'Water issues no obstacle to overall development of the countries and to the well-being of the people in the targeted area'. These are very optimistic targets, and would be very unlikely to be achieved within a four year programme with a small budget. However, there are also no obvious efforts being made to report against the linked indicators.

#### **7.2.7      *Sustainability***

Sustainable impacts cannot be anticipated for many of the sub-projects within the 4 year implementation period, as while results are expected to strengthen country level economic and environmental capacity, many of the activities are long term, process type activities. For instance, the 2<sup>nd</sup> assessment was a process rather than just an end result, giving important opportunities for discussions between countries and developing capacities. The lessons learned will be used in future UNECE activities, for instance in new work on the energy, water and food security nexus. The activity will be repeated in some years' time. The National Policy Dialogues will continue but in order to achieve sustainability they would need much more time. However, it is likely that Finland will continue to finance many of the activities, inside or outside of WEI.

The use of a government institution to administer the framework is a contribution to sustainability, as the institutional memory of the water sector is developed and maintained within the government sector.

The Georgia ICI project is a continuation from earlier support. The laboratory has achieved accreditation and new standards are set. The institutional set-up also appears stable, and it is likely that human capacities developed by the project will continue sustainably. The Kyrgyzstan ICI is also building on earlier collaboration, but there have been delays due to the institutional changes, which may threaten sustainability still.

Water reforms, institutional changes and conflict over water use remain critical issues for WEI operations in the regions. The success of FinWaterWEI activities fully depends on the political will of the participating governments - however these are outside of the scope of the project to influence.

### ***7.2.8 Management and administration***

SYKE was selected by the MFA for the outsourced implementation of the framework. Using a Finnish institution was preferred in order to simplify the procedures and legal requirements. There was no specific assessment of the qualifications of SYKE, but it was a logical choice. The decision was instead based on the earlier relationships between the MFA, SYKE and the implementing organisations. It was hoped that the FinWaterWEI would amplify the Finnish role and increase information sharing, which does appear to have taken place. SYKE employs a very capable and experienced Programme Coordinator and an Administrator, and can provide ad hoc services to the MFA. A programme website is set up, sharing project documents and news.

The evaluators found that most of the stakeholders were happy with the role of SYKE, and considered that the role of Finland had been strengthened. The MFA staff consulted was in general very satisfied with the role of SYKE in administration, considering that it was carried out efficiently and effectively. The project coordinator is experienced and able to apply discretionary management, referring to the Steering Committee or the MFA for major changes, but dealing with small issues himself. Reports are delivered reasonably on time (given the understandable delays due to the late delivery of reports by the sub-contracted organisations). Some MFA respondents felt that the role of SYKE had become too subsumed into administration and perhaps had not had a strong enough role of guiding strategic project choice, and ensuring a focused approach.

The outsourced organisations and the partner institutions were satisfied with the work of SYKE and considered that FinWaterWEI provides a useful service for project administration and coordination. UNECE, for instance, stated that they have weekly contact with SYKE, and the Georgian Environmental Agency staffs were unanimous in their positive feedback regarding the management of the ICI project.

Several respondents commented that SYKE acts as the outsourced institutional memory of the MFA. There is no water or environment expertise working within ITÄ-20, and at present the MFA's water sector adviser has little time to advise on FinWaterWEI (with a budget of €4,8 million, compared with approximately €280 million of Finnish funds dedicated to the water sector in general). However, despite the outsourced arrangement, there is still quite a large MFA time commitment to the administration of the programme. MFA Staff still attend Steering Committee and Advisory Board meetings, and read reports.

By using the unallocated working days in the administration budget (100 days for SYKE staff, and 100 days for local experts), SYKE is able to assist the different sub-projects with the provision of Finnish (SYKE) expertise – for instance in the National Policy Dialogues, participating in international workshops, or in the Chu Talas project with UNECE. In addition this time is used for various administrative tasks such as checking or developing further the project documents. If the work was only outsourced to the multilateral organisations directly Finland would have much less link to the workshops and projects. This system guarantees some level of Finnish value added, as well as better information and links with the projects.

The framework has been quite flexible. For instance, initially one of the activities was to be capacity building and research in IWRM, implemented by GWP-CACENA. However, there were problems with the implementation as GWP was not very strategic with their project ideas (liaison was between the MFA and GWP). Consequently a decision was taken to move this to become a research based activity and moved to the Security Cluster for implementation by Aalto University.

### ***7.2.9 Finnish Added Value***

The choice to use SYKE to administer the framework, rather than directly outsourcing to the implementing organisations, gave the opportunity for Finnish added value. Involvement of SYKE brings a direct link to Finnish experience via experts and twinning of institutions. SYKE experts are directly involved as experts in FinWaterWEI activities, providing advisory services and attending workshops and meetings. The Director of SYKE chairs the Monitoring and Evaluation panel in UNECE. However, other opportunities to utilise Finnish expertise beyond the SYKE staff are not sufficiently explored within the framework.

FinWaterWEI has provided Finland with quite good visibility, with the findings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Assessment being particularly praised in the Astana Environment for Europe Ministerial Meeting as an important contribution by Finland. Local participants as well as the multilateral partners recognise Finnish expertise and are keen to continue the cooperation. Finland is also considered to bring added value from its relevant experience in sharing a border and transboundary waters with Russia.

However FinWaterWEI, as a programme, is not clearly recognised by participating countries. UNECE state that the Finnish origin of financial support is always clearly visible, but this was

not very clear in the workshop attended by the evaluators, nor was it found on the UNECE website. Naturally the ICI projects demonstrate a clear Finnish link.

SYKE staff supported the Finnish preparations for the Astana meeting, and in particular for the preparations of its Finnish side event, the 'Finnish Forum'. The World Water Week in Stockholm in August 2011 and its side event required both preparations and participation from the Administration Unit. The work was carried out in cooperation with the Finnish Water Forum (FWF). Expert support was provided for the water strategy development processes and policy dialogues, both directly with participating countries and within workshops implemented by the multilateral organisations such as UNECE.

### **7.2.10 Cross-cutting Objectives**

There is almost no evidence of consideration of cross-cutting objectives (other than environment/climate change, which are addressed well as the main issues of the programme) in the overall strategy document, logframe indicators, or individual project documents. The individual sub-project reports vary in their treatment. Some make only general observations that in the long term the activities will have "a positive impact on the lives of women, and on gender and social equality", and recognise that as HIV/AIDS is not a water-borne disease, activities are unlikely to impact on it. Naturally it is true that working on water and sanitation issues can have an impact on socio-economic issues, and a particular benefit for women and girls. However, in practice there is not a clear link. Some of the project implementers have made efforts to ensure equal participation of men and women in training events, and have discussed the general topic in their reports. In some countries in the programme (e.g. Georgia, Kyrgyzstan) this has not been problematic as the line staff of counterpart organisations are reasonably gender balanced.

There do not appear to have been specific activities to promote gender equity or social inclusion (other than trying to ensure balanced participation in study tours or training), nor disaggregated monitoring. Certainly disability, ethnicity or other causes of disadvantage are not reported, despite the fact that ethnicity is a hot issue in some of the participating countries. However, as most of the activities are at policy level, and are carried out by third party implementing organisations, it is also quite difficult to ensure practical activities.

IWRM implementation by WEI has the potential for providing benefits to disadvantaged groups, by ensuring provision of water for drinking and farm production, as well as alleviating some of the risks of floods. Environmental protection and water saving activities could improve the livelihoods of people in the river basins upstream as well as downstream.

In the area of climate change, disaster risk reduction and environmental protection, FinWaterWEI activities are making a significant contribution. Support to transboundary water convention activities, such as water modelling and dam safety, has improved the opportunities to predict floods and develop climate adaptation activities, as well as predict future water levels.

### **7.3            *Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in Georgia***

This intervention serves as another example, similar to that of the FAO intervention in Kyrgyzstan covered in Section 5, of a case where external factors have impacted on the course of implementation, requiring appropriate proactive responses from MFA Finland and the implementing partner organization. The evaluation team received evidence from the UNDP team in Tbilisi (UNDP has acted as implementing organization), and from the Finnish roving ambassador to the South Caucasus.

The intervention was conceived as a response to dealing with the impacts of forest fires caused by the August conflict of 2008, following an appeal for assistance made by the Georgian Prime Minister at the Donor Conference held in Brussels in autumn 2008. The identification process involved a study made under ENVSEC auspices (with the participation of OSCE and UNEP), which drew attention to problems of soil erosion, risk of flooding and landslides, impacts on wildlife, and on the local population's livelihoods. The Finnish government's commitment of €1,5 million funding was mapped on to the priority activities recommended in this report, with the demand-driven nature of the proposed intervention confirmed by the Georgian government, through the national counterpart organization (the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Georgia), and from feedback gathered among citizens living in the affected area.

However, the activities proposed by UNDP, developed on the basis of this initial context, were subsequently held up by the following factors:

- Changes in the governmental structures of Georgia meant that the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources took over responsibility for this sphere (with further changes occurring in the structures of the implementing agencies originally identified for the intervention)
- Changes in national priorities of Georgia were announced by the government, with the new Forest Code criticized by observers, who raised concerns about the potential weakening of environmental protection procedures that the Code might lead to.

These changes led to an apparent impasse in the acceptance of the UNDP proposals, and the launching of the intervention, with only limited activities undertaken during this period (2010-11). The UNDP team confirmed to the current evaluation team that MFA Finland showed great understanding and provided invaluable support over this period, with the roving ambassador participating actively in discussions with the Georgian ministry staff, and discussing at length the options available to the UNDP team in adapting to the changed circumstances. . Eventually, by Spring 2012, a revised version of the intervention had been worked out, with the intervention renamed 'Support to Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment,' based on a new concept, and agreed with the National Counterpart (responsibility had by now reverted to the Ministry of Environment Protection). The focus of the revised intervention is promotion of sustainable livelihoods, and capacity-building in dealing with natural disasters in Borjomi municipality.

As with the case of the FAO intervention in Kyrgyzstan, this case provides evidence of Finland's entrepreneurial role in development cooperation (identifying and supporting priority interventions), and of its commitment, patience and resolve in supporting international and beneficiary partners in finding solutions in, at times, tense and contested contexts. It also demonstrates the role played by an implementing organization such as UNDP, with its considerable resources and staff expertise and commitment, in dealing with such issues –

which Finland could not have coped with by itself, clearly, given the lack of a permanent diplomatic or aid cooperation representation in Georgia.

#### **7.4        *Cooperation in the Meteorological Sector - Promoting Modernisation of Meteorological and Hydrological Services in Central Asia***

The Cooperation in the Meteorological Sector initiative promotes the development of the observation and weather service operations provided by meteorological service agencies. The Finnish Meteorological Institute prepared a cooperation project proposal with the aim of enhancing the capacity of the meteorological sector in the Central Asian states. FMI has a history of collaboration with the region. This project began from an MOU signed with Kazakhstan in 2007, and consists of the initial planning phase (2009-11) and the implementation phase (2011-13).

The project fits well within the Finnish Development Policy and with WEI, and there is scope for good collaboration with some of the other WEI stakeholders. For instance, information has been shared with FinWaterWEI and with the GTK Geological project, with respect to the hydrological services aspect of the project. Synergies also exist, in principle, with the ENVSEC activities, although it appears that these have not been exploited (the evaluators did not see clear evidence of joint activities). The economies of the Central Asian countries are based on weather sensitive sectors such as agriculture, energy, construction, transportation and communication. There has been a deterioration in meteorological and hydrological professional capacities and data sharing since the break-up of the Soviet Union. Weather is not a single country issue and does not stop at borders, therefore it is beneficial to work as a region (as in the Nordic region) and share information. However in practice this is quite difficult, due to different technical capacities and also lack of trust. There are several donors working in the sector, including the World Bank working on infrastructure investments. The World Bank and UN-ISDR began planning a regional project and this feasibility study fed into the ICI project planning. Efforts expended on attempting to develop a regional project did not lead to positive results, and it was decided to move to a bilateral agreement, focused on Uzbekistan, as the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) training centre is located there (thus there could be a small regional training component). The Finnish Roving Ambassador provided valuable assistance in getting the MoUs signed.

The overall objective of the project is 'Increased capacity of Uzhydromet & other National Hydrometeorological Services in Central Asia to produce sustainable & end-user driven public & private services and adapt to climate change'. The two-year project was officially launched in May 2011, after planning work carried out over 2008-9, however in practice the work only began in November 2011. Possibilities for regional cooperation are being explored to expand similar institutional cooperation in other Central Asian countries. At present the project is working mainly with Uzbekistan, but bringing in regional participants for training events (giving it a semi-regional nature). The budget for the project is €526 225. FMI applies an administrative multiplier rate of 1,885 on the staff salaries, one of the lowest of the Finnish institutions). Consideration is given to some cross-cutting objectives, although it is recognised that this is a technical and male dominated field. Attempts are made to include women in the study tour and in training.

As with all the ICI projects, the involvement of FMI brings a direct link to Finnish experience via the work of Finnish experts and the twinning of institutions. FMI activities support future

Finnish business opportunities. A Finnish technology company Vaisala has demonstrated their meteorological equipment in some training events, and the potential exists for future sales in the region.

### **7.5            *Eastern Europe Energy Efficiency and Environment Partnership Fund***

Finland is one of 10 donors, in addition to the government of Ukraine, supporting the E5P Fund activities in Ukraine. Under WEI, Finland is contributing €2 million between 2011-14. The initiative is aimed at addressing energy efficiency issues and reducing energy consumption through projects targeting a range of areas, including municipal heating and hot water infrastructure.

The initiative was launched in 2009, and the agreement ratified by the Ukrainian parliament in early 2011. As reported to the evaluation team by the EBRD team overseeing implementation, some delays in implementation have been encountered owing to changes in the budgetary practices of local authorities in Ukraine, and other issues relating to the Ukrainian contribution to the fund, but project activities have been identified and a range of agreements were either already in place, or on the point of being signed, by May 2012. The aim of the projects will be to assist with upgrading the existing infrastructure, to all for greater efficiency in the use of fuel and electricity, and an increase in the quality of water and heat provided to consumers.

It is too early to discuss questions of the impact, efficiency and effectiveness of this intervention for the purposes of the current report. The Relevance of the intervention to WEI priorities is demonstrated by the importance attached to the E5P activity by the donor community, and through the identification activities listed by EBRD in their progress reports.

### **7.6            *EBRD Water Fund***

Finland has committed €1 million to this multi-donor fund, which addresses issues relating to the safe supply of water and upgrading of obsolete wastewater treatment infrastructure in Central Asian countries. The evaluation team interviewed the EBRD Principal Banker overseeing the initiative, and the EBRD team in Bishkek.

On the basis of evidence reviewed (including project progress reports for 2010 and 2011), the intervention appears to be an effective mechanism for Finland to support activities in this WEI priority area, through the resources of EBRD (including the activities undertaken by EBRD to ensure strong relevance through extensive stakeholder engagement, and the regional coverage offered by the programme). As the EBRD team noted, the fund is proving to be a flexible tool, sometimes combining with other programmes, e.g. the ETC programme (although no synergies appear to be made with the work of FinWaterWEI or SYKE).

There is evidence of Finnish input to activities, beyond the contact EBRD has had through reporting to MFA - Finnish consultants were involved, for instance, in the development of a master plan in Tajikistan.

## **7.7            *Geo-Sector Information Management System Development and Capacity Building in Central Asian Countries***

The project organized by Geological Survey of Finland (GTK) aims at enhancing the capacity of geological sector in Central Asia, within the Institutional Cooperation Instrument modality (ICI). The utilization of modern geo-sector information management systems, augmentation of national and regional cooperation and capacity building in Central Asia are the focal points of the project. GTK has carried out earlier work in Kyrgyzstan, and based this project on the links they had developed, following a meeting with the then Minister for Development Cooperation, Mr Väyrynen. The project is very compatible with the Finnish Development Policy and the WEI Strategy, as well as with the policies of the participating countries. Mineral exports are critical for the economies of the Central Asian countries, and the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) support involvement in this sector. No overlaps are evident with the activities of other donors. Synergies are evident with other projects, including those supported by Finland, such as ENVSEC. There have been joint meetings with ENVSEC on climate risk and environment project, and they will co-host some local workshops. The objective is to work together on issues such as environmental protection, uranium mining & processing and melting glaciers. Some links are also present to other ICI projects (Meteorology, Statistics & SYKE), and FinWaterWEI (GTK participates in the FinWaterWEI Board meeting).

During the year-long preparatory phase (2009-2010) geological sector materials were collected, a training syllabus was prepared and the implementation plan of the project drafted. Following an external appraisal, the project was approved for implementation. The implementation phase of the project with four countries was launched in August 2011 with a total budget of €2,9 million - approximately 700 000 Euro/ country for Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, & 471 000 Euro for Kazakhstan (as it is already further advanced in digitalisation). This project is much bigger than normal ICI projects (normally they have a maximum budget of 500 000 Euro), as it involves several countries. GTK applies an administrative multiplier cost of 3,15 on the staff salaries (the highest rate applied by the Finnish institutions).

The specific needs of Central Asian countries are being assessed and taken into consideration when developing the information management systems, and the technical staff of the participating countries have worked together to design the new portal. The emphasis is on a 'learning-by-doing methodology, and is likely to produce sustainable results. GTK staff have put a very strong focus on stepping back and encouraging the beneficiary institution staff to undertake the tasks, to ensure an effective learning process.

The project is providing a useful regional networking opportunity (as with many of the WEI activities) – for instance, staff of local agencies have the opportunities to meet for the first time and construct a joint web portal. Some of these countries do not need the money but they appreciate the chance to share their expertise and learn from GTK's technical experts.

Turkmenistan is the only Central Asian country that decided not to participate in the project (although Uzbekistan has been slow to participate due to the regional nature of the project). Work is underway to develop a separate project proposal for Turkmenistan.

## **7.8      *Capacity Building for Development of European-type Geo-Information Management Infrastructure in the Geological Sector of Ukraine***

This is another ICI project implemented by GTK on the topic of geo-information (2011-2013). The project is consistent with Ukrainian government policy, strategy & needs (such as Strategic Development Plan (2006-2030) of the Ministry of Environment Protection of Ukraine, the Mineral Resource Development Plan (2006-2030) and the National Vision of the Ukrainian Euro-Integration), and is in line with the Finnish Development Policy and WEI strategy. Once again, the topic demonstrates synergies with other projects, including those supported by Finland, such as ENVSEC.

Given that the project mainly involved technology improvements, the MFA's Quality Group queried whether this should be implemented via an ICI project, rather than competitive tendering. However the decision was taken to proceed with GTK. Some difficulties have been encountered with slow progress due to local bureaucracy, lack of a framework agreement between Finland and Ukraine, and local partner issues. There have been almost weekly changes in local legislation concerning taxation (with regard to procurement of specialised equipment). This is clearly a serious issue for consideration in future support to Ukraine, as it also has impacted on the ICI project implemented by STUK.

The objective of the project is to develop a new Ukrainian geo-portal (as in Central Asia), and it is based on earlier collaboration between the Ukrainian institutions and GTK. The work is at a very early stage, with a first stage of project planning, then procurements carried out and a short training in Ukraine, and a study tour to Finland. In the long term it is planned that the project will enhance and increase the availability of mineral & geoscientific data & support investment. This should enable good governance practices and transparency of the licensing system, and thus minimize corruption. The budget is 496 629 Euro over 2½ years. GTK applies an administrative multiplier cost of 3,15 on the staff salaries (the highest rate applied by the Finnish institutions).

## **7.9      *Chernobyl Shelter Fund***

Finland is a long-term contributor to this multi-donor fund, set up in 1997. Under the WEI programme a further allocation of €3,1 million was made to the initiative. The evaluation team conducted a telephone interview with the director and deputy director of the programme, based in EBRD London, and interviewed the MFA specialist who acts a liaison point for the Fund in Finland, as well as reviewing reports received from EBRD.

From the interview evidence, Finland has been noted as an active member of the Fund's donor community, able to draw on relevant technical expertise and making a tangible contribution to the work of the Fund's management. As noted in documentary evidence, the Fund has had to respond to a variety of challenges over the years, including difficulties, at times, in the relationship with Ukrainian authorities, problems related to oversight of the Project Management Unit, etc, but these have been effectively dealt with by the Fund Management and EBRD on behalf of the donors. Finland's contribution is relatively large for a small donor, but reflects Finland's commitment to the thematic priority of environment, and the importance of international collaboration in providing a long-term response to regional security.

However, while this fits the overall theme of environmental security, this is more by accident than design. The MFA simply needed a source for the final tranche. The activity is managed outside of ITÄ-20, and could not be said to be particularly connected to WEI.

### **7.10      *Nuclear Safety and Security Capacity Building in Ukraine***

This project consists of two phases of support to the Ukrainian authorities by the Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority of Finland (STUK). Initial work from 2007 was funded by the Neighbourhood Cooperation budget of the MFA, while the second phase has been funded from WEI. In 2009 a mobile radiation detection laboratory ('Sonni') was planned and training was given in collaboration with Ukrainian counterparts. Difficulties with customs and taxation delayed the hand-over but this was finally carried out in 2010. The second phase (2011-12) involved training in the use of Sonni (as well as 'Vasikka', a back-pack radiation detection device) and instrumentation.

The project is relevant, fitting well within the objectives of the Finnish Development Policy (environmentally safe & sustainable development) and the security & environment sections of WEI. Synergies exist with other radiation projects funded by Finland – eg. the Chernobyl Shelter Fund & EBRD Nuclear Safety Account. There are also strong links to other donor funded activities, particularly those funded by the IAEA. Finland has supported strongly the UN resolutions on nuclear safety, and this is a practical activity of this support. Further support has been received in 2012 from the EU in coordination as a direct result of the STUK project. Finland and Ukraine have worked together on the topic since the 1990s. This latest work supports the IAEA Country Action Plans for protection of the UEFA EURO 2012 football championships. Again, this was a project that was already functioning with funding from other sources,

The overall objective is 'Improved safety and nuclear security in Ukraine. More efficient protection of environment and people' – a challenging (and perhaps overly optimistic) objective with such a short and limited project. In theory the project should support the Ukrainian partners to be self-sufficient in radiation detection, as well as a strong skill base. However, the sector is quite donor dominated, leading the evaluators to raise questions regarding the sustainability for maintenance of this expensive equipment. Hardware always has a shelf-life. The local partners are aiming to extend the functions of the hardware and to work with local government bodies as paying clients, but it is unclear how sustainable the use of the equipment will be without the Government of Ukraine committing budget to this.

Customs difficulties have arisen when importing the equipment, as Finland does not have an Agreement on Terms and Procedures for Development Cooperation with Ukraine (which normally would provide for project associated imports to avoid income duties). As a result, it wasn't possible for Finland to import Sonni directly. Initially it was thought that it could be carried out via Sweden, but eventually the solution was to donate it to the IAEA (who have tax-free status), who in turn, donated it to the Ukrainian authorities. IAEA undertook to bear all the costs associated to the delivery, certification and training of the crews responsible for the operation of the mobile laboratory. However, it became clear that IAEA didn't have sufficient funding and there was insufficient local capacity to operate it. Further resources were needed for instrumentation and training of the operative personnel in order to ensure that the mobile laboratory SONNI could be used by mid-2012. The timing of the project was

important for Ukraine, as the mobile laboratory was used to provide added security during the Euro 2012 Football Championships.

There was an annex to the project plan regarding treatment of cross-cutting objectives in the project. This is a quite realistic estimation of the difficulty of covering these issues in a technical project of this type, and at least demonstrates recognition of their importance. In practice there is good gender balance of the staff working with the project in Kiev and both women and men have travelled to Finland, and have participated in training. HIV/AIDS is not a significant issue for this project. By using the lab as a means of identifying radiation sources, the project has the opportunity to reduce contamination of the environment and local populations. Finnish added value has come to the project via use of STUK expert staff as well the inclusion of Finnish companies that are providing equipment (e.g. computers) and expertise, in order to ensure the functioning and appropriate use of the very high tech radiation detection equipment.

The initial funding for the equipment (outside of WEI) was 500 000 Euro, and the final phase of the project has a budget of 208 089 Euro for one year, from WEI. The implementation appears to be quite efficient, and the successful work of STUK with the Ukrainian partners has encouraged the addition of funds by the EU. In accordance with ICI project rules, most of budget is going to Finnish salaries & reimbursable costs. STUK applies an administrative multiplier cost of 2,62 on the staff salaries (putting it in the middle ranking of the Finnish institutions).

## 8. REVIEW OF WEI CLUSTER 5 – SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

This Cluster contains the following interventions:

- Decent Work Country Programmes and Occupational Safety and Health Systems (ILO)
- ETC - Early Transition Countries fund (EBRD)
- Justice Sector Support Facility in Central Asia (Eurasia Foundation Central Asia; and the Venice Commission of the Council of Europe)
- Technical Cooperation in the Area of Statistics (Statistics Finland)
- Training of officials from Georgia and Moldova (Estonian School of Diplomacy)
- TC (Technical Cooperation) Fund - EBRD

### 8.1 *Promoting Decent Work*

WEI is supporting the International Labour Organisation to implement this project in the Southern Caucasus and Central Asian countries from 2010-2013 (4 years). The main objective is to support society stability, social sustainable development and promote the Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) taking into account the priorities set by the ILO and the tri-partite constituents in each country. The evaluators considered this to be a good practice example within WEI, which includes a regional approach, implemented by a multilateral organisation but with strong Finnish links. Project stakeholders were visited in Armenia, Georgia and Kyrgyzstan, and ILO and Finnish stakeholders were also interviewed.

The project operates under the tripartite (government, employers and workers) ILO declaration - the Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization (unanimously adopted in June 2008), and ILO has worked on this topic since 1999. The Global Economic Crisis has made it even more important, and this project is designed as a response. The three main priorities are 1) promotion of employment (employment opportunities), 2) occupational safety and health systems reform, 3) social protection and social improvements. The priorities have been derived from the countries national long-term development plans (though not all countries are fully supportive). The project is aimed at assisting the national partners (Government, Trade Unions and Employers' Organisations) in eight CIS countries, consisting of the five Central Asian and three South Caucasus countries, to put into practice the priorities that they have themselves identified in the pursuit of Decent Work (for instance in Georgia one focus has been on the building sector, while in Kyrgyzstan it has been dealing with agricultural workers in particular). ILO has worked for many years in these countries, and Finland has also a history of working with ILO and on labour issues in these countries.

The Decent Work Project is very compatible with the Finnish Development Policy - particularly that of 2012, where human rights, disability, gender, democracy, are emphasised, but also with the 2007 policy and Millennium Development Goals. It is in line with the WEI framework objectives, supporting socially sustainable development. Within the countries, the project stakeholders are continuing to work on synergies and joint activities with other organisations (particularly with UN organisations, such as UNDP Georgia).

The project was developed during the planning stages of WEI by a Finnish expert working in the ILO Moscow office, following a visit by the Minister for Development Cooperation. The project has a good quality project document with detailed indicators, and gives strong consideration to cross-cutting objectives. For instance, it includes topics such as supporting

incorporation of disabled people to workplaces, or the access and legal protection of women (including pregnant women) and youth to employment.

This is an efficient project, with a relatively low budget leading to good results. There is very little procurement of goods, with 43% of total Finnish budget dedicated to technical assistance and support services (this is a reasonable division in a project mainly devoted to capacity building). There is a total budget of 4 000 000 Euro from Finland (with 10% local in-kind contribution) over 4 years, being used over 8 countries. However, there are additional inputs from ILO (staff time, travel, materials), and leveraging of other funding from recipient governments & other donors. The sub-regional office of ILO is providing approx 50 000 Euro/year in staff costs and technical support. The budget is not strictly allocated by country but is used flexibly. The Finnish Ministry for Social Affairs is also providing continuing inputs in the form of an expert's time.

The main focus of the project is on sharing of ideas and influencing recipient governments. The results have been very positive so far, although in some countries (e.g. Georgia) the government is not very supportive, despite signing up to international labour agreements. In addition, in Kyrgyzstan the political changes have slowed progress. High value comes from the regional nature of the project – some countries can provide good examples and some provide examples of 'bad practice'. In addition, it brings the advantage of flexibility, as when local circumstances may hold up work in one country the project can push ahead with activities in another. This is a difficult topic, and is vulnerable to changing political views and relationships, but to date it has been successful.

The project is managed from ILO's Moscow office, with local administrators and coordinators employed in each participating country. A Chief Technical Advisor is based in ILO's Moscow office, as well as supporting advisors. The project has benefited from valuable inputs from the MFA sector advisor, MFA staff and roving ambassadors. There has been a Finnish advisor involved in the design and early implementation of the project. He is now working for the Finnish Ministry for Social Affairs, which continues to provide his support and involvement as required. Finnish experiences and materials regarding Occupational Health and Safety have also been utilised.

Given the success of the project, it is serving as a useful concept for replication – now initial steps are being taken to design similar projects in Africa for Finnish funding, together with ILO.

## **8.2            *ETC - Early Transition Countries fund***

This EBRD multi-donor fund has operated since 2004, with the aim of responding to the difficulties faced in transition economies in coping with unstable investment environments, the limitations of domestic markets and opportunities to engage with outside markets, the impact of outdated infrastructure, etc. In the WEI region, the countries of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, the Kyrgyz Republic, Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan are covered by the Fund. Finland had contributed €3,5 million to the fund by 2011 (from a total donor investment of €79,6 million).

The evaluation team visited EBRD teams in Yerevan and Tbilisi to discuss their implementation of ETC fund activities, and reviewed progress reports submitted to MFA in line with EBRD reporting requirements. The Armenian office discussed their work in the

sphere of micro-lending to SMEs, while the Georgian office outlined their work in the area of modernization of water treatment facilities in several cities.

On the basis of the evidence received and reviewed, including reports on individual projects, as well as summative findings relating to the overall impact of ETC Fund by 2012, the Fund would appear to be achieving tangible impacts on the economies of these countries, and on the sustainable livelihoods of a substantial number of final beneficiaries who have received support from the scheme. It has a high degree of relevance, as confirmed by EBRD reports and feedback from beneficiaries, and is delivered in an efficient and effective manner. For Finland, it allows the funding of activities that have outreach far beyond that which would be possible for Finland to achieve through bilateral efforts, and the activities map closely onto WEI priorities.

However, the ETC Fund, and, to an extent, other EBRD funded interventions in WEI, do represent a modality of support in which the visibility of any individual donor is, of course, much lower than is the case in bilateral initiatives, and those interventions made with multilateral partners where Finland's presence is still quite visible to partners and beneficiaries (through direct involvement of MFA, for instance). In the case of the ETC Fund, for example, the evaluation team found both in Armenia and Georgia that local teams took some time to understand the connection between the evaluation of a Finnish framework programme, and their work on ETC fund activities. For frontline project staff, not to mention beneficiaries, it is not important to try to make connections between activities and donors.

This raises the question of whether or not such interventions should actually be included in a programme such as the Wider Europe Initiative (particularly those whose implementation pre-dates the launch of such a programme) – given that they operate according to a somewhat different modality, and donor identity and influence is not a factor to be stressed. The report will return to this issue in Section 9.

### **8.3        *Justice Sector Support Facility in Central Asia***

This intervention represents a substantial commitment from MFA, within the context of the WEI framework programme – a total of €5,2 million is allocated over the period 2010-13 (with a 30-month implementation taking place after an initial 6-month identification period). It has been divided into two projects – one implemented by an international NGO and one by the Venice Commission (the Council of Europe's advisory body on constitutional matters). It is a multidimensional programme, which addresses key priorities in Finnish cross-cutting issues – it is aimed at improving the protection of rights of vulnerable people (including women, children, disabled people), by facilitating their access to the justice system; building the capacity of the justice system itself, and its treatment of rights-based cases; capacity-development in the higher-education sector, working with universities to upgrade their legal studies curricula; and interacting with populations and governments in the beneficiary countries to raise awareness of and stimulate debate on the issues covered in the programme. It is a regional programme, aimed at the Central Asian region as a whole.

One intervention is managed by the international NGO, Eurasia Foundation (EF), which has regional offices in Central Asia (EFCA – Eurasia Foundation in Central Asia). It was appointed by MFA following the outcome of the initial survey conducted under EFCA's auspices, which identified the strong demand for the intervention and gave a detailed contextualization of the current situation in the Central Asian countries. The Venice Commission of the Council of

Europe started contributing to the programme activities from June 2012, through capacity-building activities aimed at the judicial sector (e.g. on meeting obligations as signatories of UN and other conventions on the protection of the rights of women, children, disabled people and other people facing discrimination). However, as there has been only limited progress so far, the report deals mainly with the EFCA-implemented component.

As well as the relevant MFA staff, the evaluation team conducted interviews with EFCA staff and participants in the intervention at the EFCA offices in Bishkek, with further meetings held during visits to partner NGOs funded by the intervention in Bishkek, and with representatives of Eurasia Foundation and EFCA during a visit to Helsinki. Documentary evidence, including the report of the survey which served as the foundation for the intervention, were also reviewed.

This intervention, as is the case with the Crimea Policy Dialogue, provides an example where MFA Finland has appointed an international NGO as its implementing partner, after receipt of a detailed proposal submitted by EFCA. In both cases, the INGO is tasked with implementing activities that relate to very sensitive political and societal issues in the respective countries. This does raise issues regarding the extent to which a donor government can both rely on, and devolve responsibilities to, an INGO in addressing such matters, and the evaluation team, accordingly, paid particular attention to this issue in interviews with MFA staff, and with other respondents. The majority of respondents confirmed that, in their view, the sensitive nature of the activities indeed are best implemented by a well-respected, independent organization of this kind, which have strong track records in their respective fields and regions of operation. However, MFA Finland must ensure that it monitors the situation in the countries where its INGO partners are implementing Finnish-funded activities, and be ready to provide support where needed and engage with beneficiary authorities if required. This, indeed, appears to be the case in the EFCA-led project, where the active contribution of the MFA staff was mentioned by respondents.

The intervention activities demonstrate a very high degree of relevance, which was established in the initial mapping survey, and is now confirmed by participants in the various activities (e.g. NGO staff delivering training and services, and final beneficiaries – with staff of the legal clinic visited by the evaluation team reporting that they are now receiving a large volume of enquiries in the regions where they are operating in Kyrgyzstan, from citizens who have heard about the impacts the project is having in their locality). Although the intervention is only at a relatively early stage of implementation, it does appear that positive impacts are already being felt, therefore, among the target audience, with beneficiaries able to address and resolve the problems they were facing thanks to the legal aid and consultations provided.

The intervention is an umbrella activity, with EFCA overseeing the work of a range of organizations (many of them NGOs) charged with implementing specific projects. Reports from the survey and interview feedback suggest a varying degree of efficiency, encountered at the early stage, but overall EFCA appears to be providing effective management of the complex programme. The efficiency of the administrative set-up of Eurasia Foundation and EFCA and is a little unclear. Personnel time is charged against the actual time used but it is unclear how this is planned and monitored. In addition, the unit rates and associated costs for technical assistance staff are quite high for an NGO. One issue the evaluation team looked at relates to the funding level for NGOs, and the mechanisms of oversight – the amount of funding received can be in the range of €200 000 for a local NGO, which is a large amount in the regional context (and does require that robust anti-corruption measures are in place).

Indeed, EFCA reported that one NGO was not approved for funding on the basis of due-diligence checks that EFCA performed, which indicates that such procedures are apparently proving effective.

There is a strong element of Finnish visibility and added value in the activities of the intervention, seen through study visits to Finland, and contributions by Finnish experts (such as university staff) and diplomats.

#### **8.4        *Technical Cooperation in the Area of Statistics***

This ICI project has been implemented by Statistics Finland in collaboration with the National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic (NSC). The project activities have been aimed at assisting NSC to strengthen and modernize its capacity in statistical data management. The project provides an example of direct involvement of Finnish expertise in a bilateral mode of intervention, aimed at addressing a set of issues relating to core WEI priorities.

The project is in line with the goals of the Kyrgyz National Statistical Committee and fits well within the Finnish Development Policy and the WEI framework, strengthening social sustainability and good governance. Synergies exist with projects in the sector funded by other donors, but it is important that duplication is avoided. Statistics Norway has been operating in Kyrgyzstan since 2006 with a larger project, and they have a long term staff member in situ, however there do not appear to be any overlaps. The project was aimed to support the National Statistics Committee of Kyrgyzstan, and the implementation of the Statistical Master Plan (SMP) for the development of the State Statistics and Information System in the Kyrgyz Republic (2006-2009). This should support the economic development of the country in line with the Country Development Strategy, as well as facilitating good governance and transparency. The project develops the statistical methods of data collection, classification and analysis of data. It is critical that the Government has the data available in order to deal with international institutions such as the IMF and EU.

The initiative for the project came from the MFA. The MFA urged Statistics Finland to begin an ICI project in 2008 and recommended the Kyrgyz Republic, partly because anticipated financial support from the World Bank had not come through. It was considered that there were similarities between the countries (eg. population) that supported collaboration. The Kyrgyz Statistics Institute received support from the EU and IMF approx 10 years ago for similar work on Financial Accounts but it wasn't completed satisfactorily and the EU encouraged the Kyrgyz participants to address the topic again. The contents and activities of the project were determined by the Kyrgyz from the point of view of their needs in consultation with a group of staff from Finland (2009). The Kyrgyz were very keen to utilise Finnish expertise as Finnish systems are renowned for their high quality, and they were keen to learn from them. This was one of the first ICI projects and wasn't required to have the same quality of project document as normal. The MFA's Quality Group encouraged better incorporation of cross-cutting themes, in particular sex-disaggregated data and data on ethnic minorities. This is not particularly evident in the reports, however, as they are focused on very technical issues regarding statistical data collection and handling, although in some cases the results of the improved statistics might be of benefit to different groups. However, in practice there seems to be reasonable gender and ethnicity balance within the staff and stakeholders of the project. If anything this is a female dominated field in Kyrgyzstan (probably due to low public service salaries).

As well as meeting with Statistics Finland staff, the evaluation team interviewed senior officials in NSC in Bishkek, in May 2012. Feedback gained during the interview, and evidence drawn from project reports submitted by Statistics Finland, indicate that the project has been implemented in an effective manner (albeit with certain delays encountered, resulting in an extension request until the end of 2012). The NSC team did raise the issue of the funding model used in the ICI project, under which the vast majority of funding is allocated to the Finnish implementing partner to conduct capacity-building (which they compared with the investments made in infrastructure upgrades by the parallel Norwegian-funded project). This, of course, is a characteristic of the ICI model – but perhaps the Finnish organization could have made more efforts to clarify this with the Kyrgyz beneficiaries, as it seems to be a small issue of contention.

The NSC team did state that they were very keen on continuing the collaboration, which they believed had brought tangible benefits already, and pointed to the current scoping study made by the World Bank, regarding the development of a master plan for the future of the statistics sphere in the Kyrgyz Republic, noting that they hope that Finland could contribute to this larger, forthcoming activity.

The political turbulence in Kyrgyzstan and changes in staffing in the partner organisation have caused some concern and last minute changes and delays. It is also sometimes difficult to get adequate sharing of information between government agencies and departments in Kyrgyz Republic – particularly in the Population Register. However, during 2012 there appears to have been good progress and agreements made on data sharing in some other topics. There has been varying effectiveness between the components. The work on the Financial Accounts has been successful. There has been a lot of enthusiasm and progress on the Business and Agricultural Register activities. The Population Register has been problematic due to collaboration issues between the local agencies. The old Population Register has not been updated for years, and there are no clear lines of responsibility, as it falls between the Statistics office, the Ministry of the Interior and the Police. The other components fall more clearly under the Statistical Central Office and they are a priority, therefore they are progressing. The Finnish support to the different domains operates quite independently and Finnish staffs are never brought together for any coordinating meetings or assessment of overall progress. This may have limited the effectiveness. On the other hand, presumably as the different domains are relatively independent, slow progress in one should not interfere with other parts of the support. There is only limited experience in development cooperation within Statistics Finland – most international experience comes from EU, accession countries or Nordic twinning arrangements.

Capacity building is good in general but the project is only working with a small group of staff. It is up to NSC to implement the recommendations in the long term and achieve sustainability. The Kyrgyz staffs have definitely benefited from the capacity building and they know what is now needed, the sources of data and structures, but the work still needs to be finalised, and the project has officially ended.

Involvement of Statistics Finland brings a direct link to Finnish technical experts and twinning of institutions. In addition to Statistics Finland staff, experts from the Information Centre of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry in Finland (TiKe) have provided inputs to the Agricultural Register. WEI has provided funding of €384 000 over the period 2009-12. An administrative multiplier of 2,8 is applied to the staff salaries, putting this in the mid-range of the Finnish Institutions.

## **8.5            *Training of officials from Georgia and Moldova (Estonian School of Diplomacy)***

This intervention is a 9-month programme of study in international relations and European Integration for junior (early career) officials in the diplomatic corps of countries of the Eastern Partnership region. The programme bears 60 credits (ECTS). Finland has supported the programme since 2006 (i.e. pre WEI), funding the participation of 2 officials each year from Georgia and 3 from Moldova (at a cost of approximately €75-80 000 per annum).

The programme maps onto WEI core aims and priorities in several ways. This is a regional programme, which brings together officials from all 6 Eastern Partnership countries, and opens communication with counterparts in EU member states. The programme focus relates to key WEI aims of promoting regional cooperation and stability, good governance, and security. Programme funding reflects effective donor coordination (Finland cooperates with Estonia's MFA and Sweden's SIDA in supporting the intervention).

An evaluation team member visited the programme in spring 2012. On the evidence of this visit, as well as survey feedback from participants, and documentary analysis, the current report concludes that the programme provides good value for money (although costs have risen recently - from 7 200 Euro/student during 2010-11, to 15 984 EUR/student during 2011-14, mainly due to an increase in administrative costs) and has achieved positive impacts, within the scope of the support for just 5 participants per year. The Estonian School of Diplomacy monitors the subsequent career development of the alumni, and confirms that the majority do indeed remain in their respective diplomatic corps (one graduate, for instance, is now Moldovan ambassador to Estonia). The programme contains a clear Finnish added-value, through a study visit to Helsinki (to the MFA and other institutions), and includes contributions from Finnish lecturers to the academic programme.

## **8.6            *TC (Technical Cooperation) Fund - EBRD***

This sub-section relates to the remaining components of the EBRD TC Fund activities supported by Finland (the Regional Communications Regulatory Training Programme having been covered in 6.2). The components are:

- Kyiv Traffic Management - Development of a Parking Strategy for City of Kyiv (Ukraine) (allocation: €119 500);
- Khujand Water II - Preparation of Master Plan (Tajikistan) (allocation: €199 950);
- Belarus - MEI Framework Facility - Corporate Development and City/Regional Support Programmes for the Cities/Regions of Vitebsk, Brest, Grodno, Slonim and Baranovich and their Water Companies (allocation: €805 000);
- Finnish funded - Analyst / Associate Banker - EBRD Tbilisi RO (allocation: €142 835) (this component is not covered in the current evaluation).

**Kyiv Traffic Management:** This intervention was intended to address the significant problems of traffic congestion in the Ukrainian capital through the development and implementation of a parking strategy, which might include public-private partnership arrangements regarding income generation from parking fees. The stated success indicator for the intervention was the establishment of a Parking Management Strategy by the Kyiv city

authorities. In accordance with the agreement with Finland, as donor, a Finnish consulting company (Traficon) was appointed to conduct the assignment.

However, as recorded in the EBRD report, despite the efforts of Traficon, the relatively low level of collaboration received from the side of the beneficiary authorities, combined with problems in obtaining sufficient and accurate data, severely hampered the implementation of the assignment, with the result that the deliverable was delayed, and limited in scope, compared with the originally intended goals of the project.

**Khujand Water II - Preparation of Master Plan:** This intervention was intended to follow on from Phase I, which had been implemented between 2004-8, and address issues relating to water supply and the treatment of waste water. The Finnish company WSP Finland Ltd was contracted to develop a Master Plan to use as a foundation for the implementation of the identified activities in the period to 2030.

According to EBRD reporting, the development of the Master Plan was achieved effectively, with substantial consultations with stakeholders conducted (beyond that envisaged originally – seen as a positive outcome by EBRD). The Plan is now being used as a basis for discussion between EBRD and the Khujand Water Company with the relevant municipal authorities and government agencies.

**Belarus - MEI Framework Facility:** This intervention had not commenced by the time of writing (EBRD anticipated that it would start later in 2012). It comprises a set of measures aimed at improve municipal services in up to eight cities in Belarus, in the sphere of wastewater treatment, power production from biogas in wastewater treatment plants, and other related activities. To note is the risk identified by EBRD, that the decentralized nature of contractual arrangements would not be accepted by the Belarusian government – an issue to monitor.

## **9. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **9.1 *Conclusions and Lessons Learned***

On the basis of the extensive set of evidence gathered for this evaluation – including interviews with a wide range of stakeholders, analysis of a considerable quantity of documents, and observations conducted during field missions – the evaluation team believes strongly that through the Wider Europe Initiative, Finland is making a very significant contribution as a donor in the countries covered by the initiative. The rich blend of interventions are achieving impacts that positively influence the lives and livelihoods of a considerable number of beneficiaries, and serve to build the capacity of institutions in the beneficiary countries to tackle the wide range of priorities and challenges addressed in WEI.

As a donor country, Finland justifiably enjoys a strong reputation among beneficiaries, and international partner organizations, in particular for its:

- Expertise and experience in key thematic areas, represented by the core thematic priorities included in WEI (and reflected in a number of interventions by the involvement of Finnish experts, companies, organizations);
- Readiness to work with beneficiary countries in addressing a range of issues requiring sensitive political and social issues - with Finland's status as a neutral country; its track record in good governance, and the promotion of human rights; and its position as a neighbour of Russia (and thus a sense of shared experience with WEI countries) all seen as positive factors influencing Finland's ability to work constructively in this region;
- Supportive and proactive stance as a donor, ready to lend assistance to implementing partners, and also show patience and understanding with regard to the attainment of results in what are often challenging contexts where time is required in order to achieve and sustain momentum.

The evaluation team would like, accordingly, to emphasise this positive sense of achievement of WEI, as an initiative, in the conclusions and the recommendations in 9.2.

The following set of conclusions, including lessons learned, mapped against the evaluation criteria deployed for this evaluation, provide more detail to support this statement – and, naturally, also include reference to certain shortcomings to which the evaluation team believes the MFA should address attention. The conclusions include separate sets relating to the three case-study interventions.

#### **9.1.1 *Programming and Administration of WEI***

The evaluation noted that the process of identification and programming of WEI was conducted in a short timescale, which restricted the extent to which MFA staff were able to engage in extensive consultations with partner organizations and beneficiary country governments and civil society. This can be seen to hold implications with regard to ensuring Relevance at the level of the programme. This has been offset, at least to some extent, by the fact that MFA was able to draw on existing understandings of the priorities of WEI countries, gained from interventions that MFA had been supporting prior to the launch of WEI; and on the priorities identified by the EU, and other multilateral organizations, in the WEI region.

The existing blend of modalities of intervention represent an effective and flexible model, allowing Finland to support a wide range of activities through collaboration with implementing partners that are well suited to the respective demands of a particular intervention. However, the evaluation questions whether all interventions included into WEI should have been covered by the initiative (in relation, among other considerations, to the declared intention for WEI to achieve a reduction in the existing number of interventions). This point also relates to the relative balance in the number of interventions found across the WEI priority themes.

The report has noted the appreciation expressed by respondents across many interventions, with regard to the commitment and professionalism of the MFA staff in Helsinki, who have found constructive solutions to coping with the limited human resources available for managing WEI (and despite considerable staff turnover), and demonstrated the ability and resolve to provide effective administration and support for such a diverse range of interventions, being implemented across a very large geographical area. The sustainability of this level of support might be questionable - although the workload on staff presumably may be easier, if MFA oversees a more limited commitment in WEI II.

The evaluation team was similarly impressed by the level of commitment and expertise demonstrated by Finnish diplomatic staff in the WEI region. It was clear from evidence provided by implementing partners and beneficiaries that Finnish embassy staff and roving ambassadors pay considerable attention to supporting WEI interventions (although some, necessarily, are afforded more priority at times, because of the constraints of time and human resources). This support has proved crucial at the identification phase, for instance, in a number of interventions, and at certain critical junctures in the implementation process (e.g. in the case of the reforestation project in Georgia).

Such commitment serves to underpin the strong reputation that Finland enjoys as a donor country in the WEI region, respected by beneficiaries and implementing partner organizations. Particular note was made in interviews, for instance, of the patience shown by Finland with regard to expecting results, the support shown in dealing with complex issues and problems, also on the commitment and competence displayed by MFA staff and diplomats in managing and supporting in interventions, and interacting with beneficiaries and partners.

### **9.1.2        *Relevance***

At the level of the WEI programme as a whole, the report has noted deficiencies in the programming phase, which impacted on the identification of Relevance. However, the report notes that this has been compensated for, to a good degree, by drawing on a bottom-up identification of Relevance through the WEI interventions. At the level of interventions, the process of identification of relevance of activities, and the degree to which these can be seen to be demand-driven, has generally been conducted very effectively, with implementing partners deploying comprehensive procedures, implemented on a regular basis.

In combination, the WEI clusters (based on the priority themes of Finland's Development Policy) provide a comprehensive response to the complex challenges and needs of the beneficiary countries and regions, drawing on key strengths in Finland's own capacity and experience. Furthermore, interventions are seen by stakeholders as being very relevant to

the needs of a wide range of beneficiary groups in the WEI countries, including government institutions, NGOs, populations. On the basis of the evidence reviewed, the WEI interventions have responded effectively to changes in political, economic, social conditions in beneficiary countries during implementation (including reacting to situations of considerable flux, such as seen in Kyrgyzstan in 2010, in relations with Belarus, etc).

The WEI programme contains an effective blend of interventions aimed at single-country activities, and regionally-oriented interventions (although it is also noted that often regional approaches require a focus at the country level, where cross-border or regional cooperation encounters obstacles).

The thematic priorities embedded within the WEI programme, and the nature of interventions deployed in WEI, map very well onto EU priorities and policies for the respective regions covered in WEI (Eastern Partnership, and Central Asia), serving to complement EU activities.

### **9.1.3      *Efficiency***

In the absence of programme level indicators, efficiency has to be assessed through analysis at the level of interventions. The MFA has achieved effective selection of implementing partner organizations, which have proved competent and reliable in implementing activities in a cost-effective manner, and adhering to MFA's requirements for reporting. A review of progress reports and other evidence from WEI interventions indicates that activities are, in the majority of cases, being implemented on schedule and to budget. In those cases where problems with finances have occurred, MFA and implementing partners have taken appropriate remedial measures.

The collaboration with multilateral implementing partners brings associated overheads costs – but strong benefits for Finland, allowing it to support significant development cooperation activities in the WEI region in a cost-effective manner, while also supporting a range of bilateral initiatives.

In a number of interventions Finland can be seen to be acting as a development entrepreneur, in the opinion of the evaluation team, through the MFA's proactive attitude to responding to identified priorities in WEI countries, taking a lead in providing donor assistance and supporting the work of partner organizations and beneficiaries – with this support achieved notwithstanding Finland's limited diplomatic presence and resources in the WEI region.

Taken as an amalgamated set of interventions, implemented according to a diverse range of modalities with regard to implementing partners, the WEI programme has, across all thematic priorities, provided a cost-effective mechanism for Finland to engage in development cooperation activities that have produced tangible value with relation to the financial commitment of Finland to WEI.

### **9.1.4      *Effectiveness***

In the absence of programme level measurable indicators, assessment of effectiveness of the programme as a whole is problematic. The evaluation addressed this through development of

an amalgamated set of findings based on the effectiveness of interventions. Comparison of intervention effectiveness must bear in mind the fact that interventions are at varying stages of implementation, with some only having recently commenced by mid-2012.

A benefit gained from including a mix of pre-existing interventions, in collaboration with long-standing partners, alongside initiatives launched specifically under WEI, is that this allows MFA the reassurance of the track record of interventions that have already proved effective and that are now continuing, thus allowing MFA to focus relatively more emphasis and resources on assisting new interventions to achieve effective results.

The evaluation found that the majority of interventions have well-developed strategies for implementation, derived often, though not always, from logframes with clearly defined objectives and indicators.

According to progress reports reviewed, most WEI interventions are being effectively implemented, and meeting their targets; the evaluation identified cases where problems with implementation had been encountered (e.g. the FAO intervention in Kyrgyzstan), and traced the measures taken by the implementing partner and MFA to address these issues.

#### **9.1.5      *Impact***

The report's primary focus in analysing impact was on the level of the programme as a whole. However, the process of assessing the nature and extent of impact at the level of WEI overall is hampered by the lack of indicators associated with the programme. Rather than being able to refer to the impact of WEI relative to earlier defined specific targets (as distinct from the global objectives that can be discerned for the programme), the evaluation team has sought to synthesise evidence on impacts drawn from other sources - from the indicators embedded in intervention level logframes, for instance, and from triangulation of findings gathered from interviews, reviews of documentation relating to WEI, etc. The following summary provides a synthesized, aggregated overview of WEI impacts as assessed by the evaluation team by mid-2012. It is worth repeating at this point that the current report is a mid-term evaluation, and that in the case of some interventions impacts may not yet be felt (indeed, some interventions have only recently got underway).

**Regional impacts:** The distribution of coverage of countries in the WEI region can be considered to be proportionate to the relative needs of individual countries, with relatively greater emphasis being afforded to those countries with more acute problems that are addressed by the WEI priority themes. In certain cases, WEI interventions have faced challenges in developing effective implementing due to the current political climate seen in particular countries. The current report considers that MFA (and its implementing partners) should be praised for having made progress, where this has proved possible, in overcoming the considerable obstacles encountered by donors in such cases (see, for example, the range of activities implemented in Belarus, under the WEI auspices).

WEI interventions can be seen to have made tangible impacts in fostering effective cross-border and regional collaboration (e.g. cross-border activities supported by ENVSEC), notwithstanding difficulties faced at times in promoting regional cooperation among beneficiary countries.

**Impacts on the lives of beneficiaries / the work of beneficiary institutions:** From the evidence studied for the evaluation, relating to the diverse set of WEI intervention, it is possible to state that the WEI initiative has already achieved significant impacts on the lives of a substantial number of final beneficiaries, and assisted a large number of governmental, private sector and non-governmental organizations in WEI countries to develop capacity, adopt more effective practices, forge effective relations with partners locally and internationally. Impacts are diverse, and range, for example, from improved access to legal assistance for disadvantaged citizens in Central Asia; through greater capacities of beneficiaries in the spheres of trade, entrepreneurship, technical knowledge and skills; to impacts recorded in water management, environmental protection, societal security and stability; and improvements in the capacities of beneficiary country ministries, agencies and institutions.

With regard to synergies between WEI interventions, the report concludes that although these have been identified and exploited in some cases, the development of synergies could have been afforded greater attention by MFA, both at the programming stage, and in the administration of WEI during implementation of interventions.

#### **9.1.6 Sustainability**

In the majority of cases, WEI interventions have clearly defined strategies regarding sustainability, including the development of ownership among beneficiaries, and the inclusion of appropriate exit strategies.

Most WEI interventions appear to be well on track towards ensuring the sustainability of their activities – in some cases, this is being achieved through follow-on activities aimed at increased capacity-development; in others, beneficiaries reported the adoption of effective practices developed during the implementation of WEI-supported interventions; in others, implementing partners and beneficiaries are engaged in constructive discussion regarding the prospects for sustained activity, the perceived need for continued donor support, the importance of adapting to changes in the local contexts of an intervention, etc.

In those cases where intervention implementation has stalled, the report found that the implementing partner organizations were taking appropriate and effective measures to respond, with the active involvement of MFA Finland.

The situation regarding the prospects for sustainability across interventions is quite diverse, because of the varied nature of modalities of support, and the nature of the activities and associated impacts. In certain cases, impacts are visible very soon after launch of activities (e.g. in the case of final beneficiaries having received assistance in the access to law project); but sustainability of provision of such access will take longer to develop. In other cases, impacts take longer to become visible (e.g. in environmental clean-up projects), which affects the pace at which sustainability efforts can be put in place.

With regard to the prospects for sustainability beyond the current WEI support, and in the light of the introduction of the 2012 Finnish Development Policy, which envisages an apparent considerable contraction in Finnish development cooperation activities in the WEI region, it is important to differentiate between multi-donor and single-donor interventions in the WEI portfolio. In those cases where Finland is one among several or many donors supporting an ongoing initiative (as in the case of EBRD interventions), it is assumed that any

curtailment of Finnish support after the expiry of current commitments will be mediated by the contributions of other donors.

In those cases where Finland is the single, or main donor, in an intervention which is likely to require, or seek, follow-on funding after the current funding agreement comes to an end, the situation is rather different. Respondents from some implementing partner organizations did state to the evaluation team that MFA Finland had notified them about the change of circumstances, and the possibility (or perhaps likelihood) that this will mean that Finnish support will not be available after the conclusion of current interventions. Finding replacement donors will be easier for some interventions than others, and it is assumed that MFA Finland will assist existing partners in this process.

### **9.1.7      *Aid Effectiveness and Visibility***

**Donor Coordination and Complementarity of Activities:** As was noted in 9.1.1, MFA did not conduct extensive consultations with beneficiary countries and other donors with regard to the identification and programming of WEI. Instead, MFA relied to a certain degree both on the experience of existing (ongoing) interventions, and on feedback received from existing or potential implementing partner organizations, for the purposes of programming.

While this pragmatic approach can be seen to have worked effectively at the level of interventions, the gap in conduct of systematic and comprehensive identification activities at the level of the programme has significant drawbacks – as it places too much reliance on individual interventions to take responsibility for ensuring relevance, establishing the demand-driven nature of activities, consulting with beneficiaries, and ensuring donor coordination. It holds the potential for adverse effects on aid effectiveness (as seen in the lack of awareness of Finnish development cooperation activities among certain key stakeholders in the region, including EU delegation staff).

**Visibility:** The report is critical of the visibility and communications activities relating to WEI undertaken by MFA – these cannot be seen as adequate or effective (see, for instance, the lack of information about WEI on embassy websites). This serves to restrict the extent to which Finland can exploit effectively the positive potential provided by its afore-mentioned strong reputation as a donor in this region, and also restricts the visibility of WEI as a framework initiative.

With regard to the visibility of the WEI programme at the level of the WEI region, or its sub-regions, variation can be observed. The evaluation noted a relatively low level of awareness about the WEI programme as an entity, and focal point for Finnish development cooperation in this region, among respondents. Rather, awareness tends to be focused on individual interventions, and perceptions of their impacts on a regional basis. Within this set of perceptions, the Finnish support and association with the impacts achieved is more evident for respondents with regard to such cases as the Aid for Trade, InfoDev, and Decent Work programmes, in which Finland's support for multilateral implementing organizations is relatively visible. In other interventions with regional coverage, such as is the case with certain EBRD interventions, for instance, Finland's role and association with regional impacts is less visible to beneficiaries, and even country staff of the implementing partner.

Given the achievements of WEI, the evaluation team considers there to be strong scope for MFA to highlight the positive impacts that WEI interventions are seen to be having across the region, through increased efforts in communications and visibility activities.

### **9.1.8 *Finnish Value Added***

The evaluation received a substantial amount of evidence regarding perceptions of Finland's role as a donor, with respondents noting its reputation as a committed, reliable partner, ready to take a proactive stance to assist implementing organizations, while retaining a 'modest' stance on its achievements in the WEI region.

The experience of Finland in certain key priority spheres, (such as water, energy efficiency, telecommunications), and the expertise that its consultants and implementing organizations bring to WEI activities, also received strong recognition and praise. In general, those interventions that relate to spheres in which Finland and Finnish experts have key strengths have drawn effectively on the availability of Finnish expertise in their activities.

### **9.1.9 *Cross-cutting objectives***

The topics of climate change and environmental protection are well covered in the WEI activities. For many of the interventions, these are the primary objectives, and the remaining interventions are not likely to exacerbate problems. In addition, the projects are generally making strong contributions to good governance and transparency.

Coverage of other cross-cutting objectives (such as gender, social inclusion of easily-marginalised groups, HIV/AIDS, etc) is only 'fair' within the WEI programme and its interventions overall, with the five WEI intervention components addressing all of the core Finnish priorities at the level of global objectives. However, the evaluation team is concerned by the relative lack of attention paid by implementing partner organizations to embedding cross-cutting issues within the individual project documents, the implementation of activities at the level of intervention, and to subsequent systematic monitoring and reporting of cross-cutting issues in the course project implementation. Seemingly this has not been prioritised in the selection and planning of the projects, nor in the monitoring by the MFA. The evaluators note that there are however, some projects with excellent consideration of cross-cutting objectives (for instance the Decent Work project, and the Justice Sector program). They also recognise that the nature of the implementation modality, often using multilateral organisations to implement policy level activities, makes it difficult to consider many issues of social inclusion.

### **9.1.10 *FinWaterWEI***

Strategically FinWaterWEI fits well within WEI, as well as with the themes of importance for the future economic, environmental and security stability of the regions. It reflects the historical involvement of Finland with water issues internationally, as well as continuing earlier support to international organisations and conventions, and providing good Finnish visibility.

The outsourcing of administrative support to SYKE is improving the Finnish government's institutional memory in the water sector, as well as supporting Finnish experts to participate in international workshops. At present the roles of other Finnish actors (such as the Finnish Water Forum, NGOs, consulting companies or research institutes) are quite limited. The workload of the MFA has decreased as a result of the outsourcing, but not significantly. More importantly has been the qualitative benefit in providing support to the framework by Finnish water specialists.

The activities or sub-projects funded within the framework were mainly continuations of earlier support, pulled together into the one framework. They have been generally relevant, effective and appreciated by the participating countries. The budget of FinWaterWEI is too small for the ambitious range of activities. As a result the monitoring is focusing on administrative issues and not on the achievement of the results of the overall strategy. The activities are being carried out in a cost-effective manner.

#### **9.1.11 ENVSEC**

Strategically, ENVSEC is an excellent match to the WEI, and it is working in themes and individual projects that are of enormous importance for the regions. In itself, ENVSEC is a very successful initiative, with added value beyond the funding to individual organisations, i.e. the whole is more than the parts. The participating organisations consider that they and the beneficiaries benefit from the collaboration, and they are universally supportive of its continuation.

There is considerable interest among stakeholders (from the contributing organizations and beneficiary country organizations) for continuation of ENVSEC, although issues relating to ownership, donor commitment, and commitment to collaboration among beneficiary governmental and civil society actors (on a national and regional basis) need to be addressed by ENVSEC if the initiative is to be sustainable.

The ENVSEC Secretariat absorbs a relatively high proportion of the funds allocated to ENVSEC overall, resulting in the majority of the MFA's funds being used for administration. While good management of the programme is important it is difficult to justify such high expenditure. The current situation, with Finland acting as principal donor both for the Secretariat and for project activities, is not sustainable for Finland as a donor.

There is very little Finnish visibility, due to the multilateral and many layered nature of the cooperation.

#### **9.1.12 Research Cluster**

The Research Cluster initiative<sup>14</sup> has proved a successful catalyst for assisting Finnish research institutions to develop a substantial growth in capacity, in their coverage of researching the nexus between security and development, focused on the WEI region. The benefits accrued have been felt by the respective research institutions, which have bolstered

---

<sup>14</sup> The Research Cluster is alternatively known as the Security Cluster by MFA. The term Research Cluster, also used by MFA, has been employed in this report to distinguish it from the Security Cluster, which is one of the 5 WEI thematic clusters, each containing multiple interventions.

their research profile and added to staff expertise; and by MFA Finland, which has been able to draw on the results of policy-relevant research.

Impacts have also been felt among the beneficiary country participants in Research Cluster activities, although on a smaller scale, as the emphasis in the Cluster's work was on capacity-building within Finland.

The report has highlighted certain issues that arose regarding the administrative arrangements of the Cluster, which have meant that the outsourcing experiment has not proved entirely successful in this case.

As impacts within the research sphere tend to take time to develop fully, the key issue will be whether the institutions concerned will be able to maintain the momentum of this initiative, and the extent of ongoing MFA support.

## **9.2        *Recommendations***

The following recommendations are addressed to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.

### **Global Recommendation – Achievements of WEI :**

1. The evaluation team notes the intention, declared in the 2012 Finnish Development Policy, to scale down Finnish aid activities in the WEI region. However, the report would nevertheless recommend, in light of the achievements of WEI, noted above, and given Finland's very strong reputation as a donor in the WEI region, MFA consider ways in which it can maintain a presence across the WEI region in the sphere of development cooperation, even at a more limited level.
2. In line with the preceding recommendation, and Finland's stance as a development entrepreneur - conduct consultations with stakeholders in WEI countries and interventions regarding the achievements of WEI, and the possible paths of development for WEI II, in order to inform stakeholders and raise their awareness, and to elicit their feedback regarding the potential for future collaboration in the existing WEI region.

### **Programming and Administration of WEI**

3. Review the procedures employed for programming of such complex initiatives as WEI, to ensure that in future:
  - a. sufficient time and resources are allocated in order to conduct systematic and comprehensive consultations with stakeholders in beneficiary countries and partner organizations at the identification stage, in order that MFA takes the lead in identifying the relevance of proposed interventions, and assessing the priorities of beneficiary countries;
  - b. programmes are results-based, and measurable indicators are embedded into the programme's logframe or similar document - in order for the programme to be implemented, monitored, and evaluated at the level of the programme as a whole; and in order to increase transparency, and enhance donor coordination;
  - c. the composition of such complex programmes is achieved more effectively, with regard to deciding which interventions to include (and which not to include) in a programme portfolio, to ensuring balanced coverage across the thematic priorities identified for a given programme, and avoiding potential overlaps between interventions.

4. Drawing on the findings of the current evaluation of WEI as a whole, and on evaluations of individual interventions, as these become available, conduct a review of the relative performance of interventions and their contribution to WEI according to the modality of support (e.g. ICI, outsourced administration, INGO managed, multilateral organization as implementing partner), in order to identify the most appropriate modalities to map onto the requirements of future programming, in the context of the 2012 Development Policy.
5. Continue to foster and support the effective, 'hands on' and informed approach of its staff in overseeing the WEI interventions.
6. Ensure that the MFA WEI team conducts regular stocktaking of the overall objectives of WEI and progress of the interventions.

### **Relevance**

7. Continue to emphasise the current thematic priorities in the WEI region, as these address key priorities and needs of the beneficiary countries, and reflect and draw on Finland's particular strengths and areas of expertise.
8. Continue the emphasis seen in WEI of a regional approach, to the extent that this is possible within the revised framework of WEI II.
9. Work with partners, government and civil society stakeholders in beneficiary countries to ensure that Finnish interventions continue to address the priorities of countries and populations of the WEI region.

### **Efficiency**

10. Continue the productive collaboration with multilateral implementing partner organizations.
11. Review the experience in WEI of collaborating with International Non-Governmental Organizations as implementing partners, and aim to continue to build such partnerships in future.
12. Continue to place an emphasis on Finland's role as a development entrepreneur, and develop a clear definition of what this comprises, to guide both MFA staff and partner organizations and beneficiaries.

### **Effectiveness**

13. Continue to support a blend of existing interventions with a track record of effective implementation, in collaboration with long-standing partners, alongside new initiatives that address identified needs (in line with the development entrepreneur approach).

### **Impact**

14. Continue to support interventions that aim at achieving impacts, collectively, among a wide set of beneficiaries (with a particular focus on addressing the needs of disadvantaged groups within populations of the WEI region).
15. Continue to promote within WEI (and, subsequently, within the contexts of WEI II) a regional approach that fosters cross-border cooperation and regional collaboration.

16. Devote greater attention to the active identification and exploitation of synergies among WEI interventions (and, where relevant, with the interventions of other donors).

### **Sustainability**

17. In the programming of WEI II, factor in the patterns of sustainability found in current WEI interventions, to ensure that all relevant internal and external influences on sustainability are recognised. Those interventions whose impacts would be adversely affected by non-continuation of Finnish support should be afforded particular attention, to assess possibilities for continued support; and to offer assistance in identifying a replacement donor, if necessary.

### **Aid Effectiveness and Visibility**

18. Work towards more effective and comprehensive coordination with other donors and with beneficiary stakeholders at the programming and implementation stages.
19. For the remainder of the current WEI programme until 2014, allocate more human and financial resources to visibility and communication activities related to WEI, in order to raise awareness about WEI activities and achievements among audiences in beneficiary countries, among partner organizations, in the EU, and in Finland. This is important not only in relation to highlighting Finland's role as a donor and the achievements seen in the interventions, but also for the purposes of donor transparency and accountability.
20. In line with the previous recommendation - establish a dedicated WEI website as a priority, with links to the individual interventions and frameworks, contact persons, and information on the activities in each country.
21. Afford greater attention to the need to provide regular information briefings to EU Delegations in the WEI countries, and to other donors (e.g. through attendance of donor coordination meetings), to ensure awareness of Finnish development cooperation activities and to facilitate donor coordination and complementarity.
22. Organize information days showcasing the achievements of Finnish funded interventions on an annual basis in the WEI countries. Such events could be organized at relatively little cost.
23. Explore possibilities for identifying and appointing representatives in the WEI countries (for example, Finnish citizens resident in that location), who could contribute to such information events and activities.

### **Finnish Value Added**

24. Continue to embed Finnish Value Added into the programming and implementation of interventions, and assist Finnish companies and experts in exploiting opportunities for involvement in Finnish development cooperation activities.

### **Cross-Cutting Objectives**

25. Afford more attention to the incorporation of cross-cutting objectives in the reporting of existing interventions. The principle of "do no harm" should be most basic in the WEI projects, and the cross-cutting themes should be included in reporting formats for all projects – updated in the future to reflect the 2012 Development Policy, where possible. With stronger management from MFA, this could also include proactive suggestions of activities within existing projects (and consequent re-allocation of budgets), provision of

specific training on the themes, or selection of future projects or programmes by the MFA that are more likely to permit consideration of cross-cutting objectives. The MFA's cross-sectoral advisor team could provide further guidance to the ITÄ-20 staff.

26. When discussing the selection of new activities, more attention should be paid to mainstreaming issues such as gender and social inclusion, and selecting specific activities that reflect MFA priorities, such as HIV/AIDS.
27. When discussing the selection of new activities, more attention should be paid to mainstreaming issues such as gender and social inclusion, and selecting specific activities that reflect MFA priorities, such as HIV/AIDS.

### **FinWaterWEI**

28. Continue support to FinWaterWEI activities under the present contract. No new activities should be begun during this phase.
29. Accentuate efforts to monitor the overall results and impact with regard to the FinWaterWEI document rather than only the administrative achievements
30. Concentrating funds to a smaller number of activities would save administrative efforts, and permit improved impact. Either funding could increase (unlikely in the current situation) or activities should be restricted in future planning.
31. On the other hand, a diversification of modalities would provide fresh ideas (for instance, as used in the case of the Finnish support to the Mekong River basin, where activities are implemented by a range of government institutions, multilateral organisations, NGOs, consultants, and research institutions).

### **ENVSEC**

32. Work with ENVSEC to develop an exit strategy, or a strategy for ENVSEC to make a transition to a much lower level of funding from Finland.
33. Continue to support ENVSEC implementation projects, with strengthened support to Central Asia.
34. Phase out the support to the Secretariat. Support to coordination could be continued via support with Junior Professional Officers and United Nations Volunteers – in Geneva and in the regional coordination. Consider the possibility of allocating a role to an MFA staff member to support this.
35. Move the Trust Fund management to one of the partners (away from UNOPS) – for instance, to UNEP itself. For the same cost, this would bring the administration closer to ENVSEC, would hopefully be better coordinated and give more ownership. The UNOPS contract will run until the end of 2012, therefore this decision should be taken as soon as possible.
36. Encourage ENVSEC's Management Board to review the regional coordination roles, and if considered appropriate, rotate the host organisations. This could bring in fresh ideas, enthusiasm, more ownership and reinvigorate ENVSEC locally.

37. During the remaining funding period to the end of 2013, encourage the Secretariat to work on collection and publication of best practices and lessons learned.
38. Support ENVSEC to build a global platform for exchange on climate change impacts, and the nexus between climate change, energy and food, given that this is likely to have security implications in the future.

#### **Research cluster**

39. Support Finnish research institutions in maintaining the momentum achieved in the Research Cluster, through facilitating the continuation and strengthening of networking and mobility activities of Finnish research institutions and WEI collaborating partners relating to the thematic and geographical foci of the initiative.
40. Consult with the Finnish research and academic community with regard to the further development of capacity in this sphere, including the potential for increasing dedicated research funds to support junior researchers, research projects, events.
41. Review the administrative model of the Research Cluster, and explore alternative options to the current outsourced arrangement.
42. Increase opportunities for Finnish researchers to be seconded to MFA, to work on specific policy-relevant activities.

## ANNEXES

## ANNEX 1 – TERMS OF REFERENCE

ULKOASIAINMINISTERIÖ  
ITÄ-20

### Terms of Reference for a Mid-Term Evaluation - Wider Europe Initiative

#### Background to the mid-term evaluation

##### 1.1. Context of the Wider Europe Initiative

The Wider Europe Initiative is a bilateral development cooperation programme in Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Central Asia announced by Finland in 2008. Hereafter, the Initiative will be referred to as “the programme”.

The programme is carried out in three regions in the following eleven countries:

- Eastern Europe: Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine
- South Caucasus: Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia
- Central Asia: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan

The partner countries’ problems include underdeveloped public sector, deficiencies in the rule of law and democracy development and the challenges linked with good governance. The infrastructure, dating back to the Soviet era, is crumbling, and serious environmental, energy and natural resources problems occur in the region.

The programme is based on the Finnish Development Policy Programme 2007, which emphasized regional approach. The diverse projects also promote the cross-cutting themes of the Finnish development policy. The projects have started gradually since 2009 and have been linked with other donors’ and international organizations’ projects in the region.

Finland’s bilateral contribution to the region’s development corresponds with the objectives and measures of the European Union. The WEI complements the European Neighbourhood Policy and the strategic objectives of its Eastern Partnership (2009), particularly in sectors in which Finland has special expertise and strengths. The themes of the framework program are also consistent with the EU’s Central Asia Strategy (2007).

##### 1.2. Description of the Wider Europe Initiative

The implementation plan of the Wider Europe Initiative for the years 2009 – 2013 was published in July 2009 (Annex 1). The total budget for 2009 was 8,5 million €. The plan was to have the yearly budget doubled by 2013 but this will not materialize due to the tightening of the general economic situation. The budget is 11,7 million € for 2011 and 12,1 million € for 2012, including interventions funded by Ministry and implemented by Finland’s OSCE Mission in Wien (1 million €) and Local Cooperation Funds, implemented by Finnish Embassies and Roving Ambassadors (yearly about 1,4 million €).

In the Wider Europe Initiative, priority is given to strengthening stability and security through a regional and thematic approach. The programme sets out five themes to receive attention in accordance with the relevant circumstances and requirements of each region. The themes are **security, trade and development, information society development, energy** and the **environment and social sustainability**.

Within the initiative, the initial flagship projects for the five themes were

- 1) Security: “Research on security and development” (Institute for Russia and Eastern Europe)
- 2) Trade and development: “Aid for Trade”, Aft (United Nations Development Programme UNDP)

- 3) Information society development: "Electronic Communications Regulatory Training Programme" (European Bank of Reconstruction and Development EBRD)
- 4) Energy and the environment: "Strategic Cooperation Programme for Finland" (Suomen Ympäristökeskus SYKE) and "Environment and Security Initiative" (United Nations Environment Programme ENVSEC)
- 5) Social sustainability: "Access to Justice/a Rule of Law"- project in Central Asia (Equal before the law, Eurasia Foundation of Central Asia and the Venice Commission EFCA), and since 2010, "Decent and Safe Jobs" (International Labour Organisation ILO)

The main goals for WEI projects were listed as

- 1) to act according to good principles and coordinating with EU and other donor countries, and honoring the needs and ownership of the recipient countries.
- 2) to support projects that will promote mutual cooperation between these countries with EU and Russia.
- 3) to increase Finland's and Finnish companies' participation in the area
- 4) to integrate the Finnish cross-cutting themes into each intervention
- 5) to activate more NGO-operations in the region

The aim was also to reduce the already existing 31 interventions (excluding NGO and locally funded interventions) in the area to about 10 larger interventions in order to maximize the effectiveness, better administration and more efficient follow-up.

In 2011 the programme has reached a state where all planned projects have been launched. The Initiative consists of

- regional and thematic projects which are mostly implemented by international organizations and financial institutions
- seven institutional cooperation (ICI) projects
- projects implemented by Finnish OSCE Mission in Wien, and Local Cooperation Funds implemented by Finnish Embassies and Roving Ambassadors.

The multi-bi options as cooperation instruments were seen as the most efficient options to increase Finland's active role in the region keeping in mind the limited human resources of MFA's own staff. There are only two Finnish Embassies located in these 11 countries. Another factor for choosing these instruments was the regional and thematic nature of the programmes, aiming at bigger impact, effectiveness and efficiency than local bilateral projects.

In the security and research cluster as well as in water sector cooperation, the administration has been delegated to the Institute of Russia and Eastern Europe and to the Finnish Environment Institute SYKE.

In order to achieve the development cooperation goals in this region, the key factors were to create an administrative model to suit the Wider Europe Initiative and to benefit from Finnish expertise by recruiting locally persons to certain key functions and by participating actively in the board and steering group activities of the cooperation partners.

A list of organizations and their designated funds or interventions to be included in the evaluation is in Annex 2.

### **1.3. Lessons learned from previous cooperation**

This is the first evaluation for the Wider European Initiative programme but Finland's development cooperation with Central Asia, South Caucasus, and Eastern Europe dates back to the mid-1990s (Annex 3).

A previous evaluation on Finland's Development Cooperation in Central Asia and South Caucasus took place in 2009. Based on the evaluation, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs has given out recommendations how to implement the conclusions of the evaluation. This management response should be taken into account in this evaluation.

The main conclusions of the 2009 evaluation were:

- MFA work in the sphere of development cooperation adheres to Finland's development policies and themes ("cross-cutting issues") and has evolved with them.
- Within the broad new region defined by the Wider European Initiative (WEI) Finland should devote special attention to Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Georgia, and expand its presence in Uzbekistan.
- Finland's areas of activity are broadly in line with local priorities but the area of public administration reform and good governance has so far suffered from neglect.
- There are numerous examples of Finnish "value added" in the projects reviewed. The best among these have been carried out in the bilateral mode.
- Finland's potential "value added" is directly proportional to the amount of human resources it is willing to invest in the endeavour. The fundamental approach recommended is that the MFA be less a passive funder and instead recognize and embrace the role of "development entrepreneur." As such, it should focus greater effort on the task of identifying and defining projects in which other development partners might then become involved. This requires expanding Central Asia and South Caucasus the MFA's development staff far beyond the five percent stipulated in Finland's 2007 development policy.

## **2. Rationale, purpose and objectives of the evaluation**

Most of the WEI interventions launched in 2009 have reached their mid-term phase by 2012 and are expected to end by 2013 or 2014. This evaluation will be used by the MFA as a base for planning Wider Europe Initiative II from 2013 onwards.

The objectives of the evaluation are:

1. to provide evidence of the performance of the WEI to date and likely performance in the future (i.e., is WEI achieving its objectives, including the cross-cutting objectives);
2. to analyse the reasons explaining success and failure in performance;
3. Special emphasis should be on evaluating the WEI implementation approach that builds on regional cooperation, use of multi-bi instruments, focusing on chosen themes and objectives;
4. to provide recommendations on any interventions that will be seen as needing modifications, however excluding OSCE and Local Cooperation Fund interventions;

## **3. Scope of the Evaluation**

The Evaluation covers all WEI activities.

It will concentrate more closely on two interventions: security and research cluster, and water sector co-operation within the FinWaterWEI. These two interventions will be fully covered. The two interventions are administrated by an outsourced body: the security cluster by the Institute for Russia and Eastern Europe and the FinWaterWEI by SYKE environment centre of Finland.

Stakeholder groups to be interviewed are MFA, implementing partner, local partners and authorities, and Finnish embassies and roving ambassadors covering the region.

Geographical area to be covered is the whole region of 11 countries in Eastern Europe, Southern Caucasus and Central Asia. Field missions will take place in four countries: Kyrgyzstan, Ukraine, Armenia and Georgia.

The programme is still ongoing. The main emphasis of this evaluation will not be on the final beneficiary level but the evaluation should assess the likeliness of a sustainable impact.

## **4. Issues to be addressed and evaluation questions**

#### **4.1. Cross-cutting objectives**

An evaluation of the cross-cutting objectives is to be integrated into the evaluation criteria and questions. The WEI-programmes are to be examined in relation to all cross-cutting objectives including

- promotion of gender and social equality,
- human rights and equal participation opportunities of easily marginalized groups (including children, people with disabilities, indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities),
- HIV/AIDS as a development challenge,
- environment, climate change and disaster risks
- good governance.

#### **4.2. Evaluation criteria and evaluation questions**

The main objective of the mid-term evaluation is to produce an overall assessment of the Wider Europe Initiative. Two interventions, security and research cluster and the water initiative FinWaterWEI are to be evaluated more thoroughly. The rest of the programme will be evaluated in a more general level considering the instruments used and the administration of both MFA and cooperation partners.

The appraisal should focus on following questions but the appraisal team is encouraged to address all issues that are relevant for the success of the project. After the general questions there are some specific questions on the security cluster and the water initiative.

### **RELEVANCE**

Relevance refers to the extent to which the objectives of the programme are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and Finland's policies.

#### **Policy priorities**

- is the regional approach of the WEI relevant? Is it consistent with the policies of the partner countries?
- Are the objectives and achievements of the country specific WEI programmes consistent with the policies of the partner country?
- Are the objectives of the programme consistent with Finland's development policy and regional priorities, sectoral and thematic priorities? Whose poverty and inequality is the programme focused to reduce? Whose sustainable development is it promoting?
- Has the situation changed since the approval of the programme?
- To what extent has the WEI complemented the EU strategy in the region?

### **EFFICIENCY**

The efficiency of a programme is defined by how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. Comparison should be made against what was planned.

#### **Value for money**

- How efficient is the multilateral approach? Can the costs of the programme be justified by the results?
- Has the role of the MFA been that of a development entrepreneur as recommended in the evaluation in 2009?
- Quality of technical assistance?
- Have the contributions by the partner country and the donor(s) been provided as planned?

## **DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS**

Effectiveness describes if the results have furthered the achievement of the purpose of the programme, or are expected to do so in the future. The evaluation will be made against the related indicators.

### **Achievement of immediate benefits**

- To what extent has the programme achieved its purpose or will it do so in the future? Do the interventions support the thematic objectives of the programme?

## **DEVELOPMENT IMPACT**

Impact describes how the programme has succeeded in the attainment of its overall objective, i.e. targeted impact for its beneficiaries. The evaluation will be made against the related indicators.

### **Achievement of wider benefits**

- Has the WEI made progress towards achieving its objectives: security; trade and development; information society development; energy and social sustainability? Which indicators show that the intended changes are starting to take place?
- Through which transmission channels (prices, employment, access, authority, assets) are the programme impacts supposed to be transmitted to the lives of the poor women and men?

## **SUSTAINABILITY**

Sustainability can be described as the degree to which the benefits produced by the programme continue after the external support has come to an end.

### **Likely continuation of the achieved benefits**

- What are the possible factors that enhance or inhibit sustainability, including ownership/commitment, economic/financial, institutional, technical, socio-cultural and environmental sustainability aspects?
- Who will take over the responsibility of financing the activities, or have they become self-sustaining?
- What would be the appropriate exit strategies to ensure sustainability?

## **PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**

### **Sound management in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the partner organizations**

- What is the quality of WEI management, incl. monitoring and reporting, resource and personnel management, financial management, cooperation and communication between stakeholders?
- Are the roles and responsibilities between the involved institutions clear and appropriate?
- Have important assumptions been identified? Are risks appropriately managed, including flexible adaptation to unforeseen situations (e.g. political changes)?

## **AID EFFECTIVENESS = EFFECTIVENESS OF AID MANAGEMENT AND DELIVERY**

- How has donor coordination been carried out in initial identification and planning and during implementation?
- Does the programme improve complementarity and division of labour among donors?

## **FINNISH VALUE ADDED**

- What is the added value provided by the Finnish support?
- What are the distinctive features of Finland's support?

### **Security Cluster**

#### Administration:

- from the perspectives of the MFA and the institutions carrying out the research projects, how has the outsourced administration worked? How effective has it been and has it reduced the administration of the MFA?
- is the administrator's capacity in line with the requirements?
- is the outsourcing agreement cost-effective?

#### Effectiveness:

- has the capacity of the research institutions to carry out WEI related work increased both in Finland and in the region?
- has the capacity of individual researchers benefiting from the programme increased?
- has the networking led to more permanent professional relationships between the parties? Is the programme leading to more stable cooperation between the institutions in Finland and in the region including possible synergies with research institutions within the EU?
- has the research information been useful for MFA? Has it been utilized in policy/strategy building and programming?
- how well the cluster is known in the region (academia, civil society, donor community, state bureaucracies)? Seminars have been organized in the region to raise the awareness – has this been a useful tool?
- how well do the research interventions fit into the overall objectives of the programme (i.e. are there synergies between the research work and the WEI programme as a whole)?
- how well do they support other research and objectives of the partner countries?
- have the cross-cutting themes been included thoroughly into the programme?

### **FinWaterWEI**

#### Administration:

- from the perspectives of the MFA and the international organizations and local stakeholders, how has the outsourced administration worked? How effective has it been and has it reduced the administration of the MFA?
- is the administrator's capacity in line with the requirements?
- is the outsourcing agreement cost-effective?
- is there certain additional Finnish value-added in such arrangement?

#### Effectiveness:

- has the Finnish contribution given added value to the water sector cooperation in the region? Does FinWaterWEI have a specific niche in the region?
- does the selection of activities under the FinWaterWEI support the Strategic Cooperation Programme for Finland's Water Sector Support to the EECCA countries 2009-2013 (published 29.10.2009).
- have the cross-cutting themes of the Finnish development policy been included thoroughly into the programme?

#### Sustainability:

- How sustainable FinWaterWEI's outcomes can be expected to be (also in terms of local ownership)?
- Which kinds of capacity enhancements the program is expected to lead to, and for whom?

- Achieving the set objectives and development impact Is FinWaterWEI on its way in achieving the objective, results and development impacts set in its strategic project document (29.10.2009), particularly in its Logical Framework? If not, what should be done?

## **5. Methodology**

The methodology applied relies on desk studies based on the proposal itself, reports and interviews with the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the implementing institutions and organizations, other donors and partner organizations and stakeholders in partner countries. Further, comments from the Finnish Embassy in Astana (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan), Kiev (Ukraine), Vilnius/Minsk (Belarus) and Bucharest (Moldova) are to be taken into account.

## **6. The evaluation process and time schedule**

The main task is carried out as a desk study supported by oral interviews and electronically received comments and field missions to four countries. The whole evaluation procedure is estimated to take no more than 16 weeks (including 2 weeks for reporting).

Evaluation process will include:

- kick-off meeting
- inception and desk-study phase
- interviews and field missions
- reporting and presentation of the evaluation results.

## **7. Reporting**

The evaluation team must submit the following deliverables:

### **Inception report**

The desk study results are included in the inception report as a concise analysis of the policies, guidelines, and other documents studied for the evaluation. The desk study report must also contain a plan for the field study, i.e. what kind of questions need to be clarified by interviews, who will be interviewed in the Ministry, who will be interviewed in the partner institutions and in the field, outline of the questions to be asked in the interviews etc.

The inception report must include detailed work methodologies, a work plan and detailed division of labour within the evaluation team, list of major meetings and interviews, detailed evaluation questions linked to the evaluation criteria in an evaluation matrix, reporting plans including proposals for tables of contents of the reports.

### **Presentation on the field findings**

Presentation on the field findings must be given in the partner country and in Helsinki.

### **Draft final report**

Draft final report amalgamates the desk study and the field findings. The evaluation report presents findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons separately and with a clear logical distinction between them and integrating the evaluation results on cross-cutting objectives.

The MFA and the relevant stakeholders will submit comments on the draft final report to the consultant.

The comments will be submitted two weeks after receiving the draft report. The draft final report is commented only once. The commentary round is only to correct misunderstandings and possible mistakes, not to rewrite the report.

## **Final Report**

The final report must be submitted after two weeks after receiving the comments. The final report must follow the report outlines agreed on during the inception phase.

## **Presentation on the evaluation findings**

The evaluation team is expected to give a Power Point supported presentation on the evaluation findings.

Each deliverable is subjected to specific approval. The evaluation team is able to move to the next phase only after receiving a written statement of acceptance by the MFA.

The reporting schedule is included in the contract.

## **8. Expertise required**

Sound experience in development cooperation, use of project cycle management and Logical Framework approach. Experience in project evaluation.

Evaluation team should consist of maximum four persons. The team leader must have experience in team leading. One of the evaluation team should have expertise in water sector and one in research sector. Experience in Eastern Europe, Southern Caucasus and Central Asia is also required. At least one team member has to be fluent in Finnish and conversant with Finnish development policies, and at least one has to be fluent in Russian.

## **9. Budget**

The maximum available budget for this evaluation is 200 000 euro, excluding VAT.

## **Mandate**

The appraisal team is entitled and expected to discuss matters relevant to this appraisal with pertinent persons and organizations. However, it is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of the Government of Finland.

## **Annexes:**

1. Wider European Initiative; Framework Programme for Finland's Development Policy, Implementation Plan for 2009-2013 (June 2009)
2. A list of organizations and their designated funds and/or interventions to be included in the evaluation
3. MFA Evaluation report on Finland's Development Cooperation in Central Asia and South Caucasus 2009
4. OECD/DAC and EU quality standards for evaluations
5. Outline of the Mid-Term Evaluation Report

## ANNEX 2 – PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

Persons met In Finland or via telephone or Skype	Date
Ms Sirpa Rajasärkkä, Programme Officer, ITÄ-20, MFA	16.2.2012, 27.2.2012 29.2.2012
Mr Juhani Toivonen, Ambassador, Development Policy Advisor, MFA	16.2.2012
Ms Johanna Ketola, Programme Officer, ITÄ-20, MFA	16.2.2012, 27.2.2012
Mr Harri Kämäräinen, Director, Unit for Eastern Europe & Central Asia, ITÄ-20, MFA	16.2.2012, 29.2.2012
Ms Kristiina Hope, Programme Officer, ITÄ-20, MFA	16.2.2012, 29.2.2012
Mr Petri Salo, Ambassador of Finland to Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia	27.2.2012 29.2.2012
Ms Marja-Leena Vuorenpää, Counsellor, Unit for Regional Cooperation, MFA	29.2.2012
Ms Hannele Lehtimäki, Attaché, Unit for Regional Cooperation, MFA	29.2.2012
Mr Jukka Multala, Geological Survey of Finland (GTK)	17.2.2012
Mr Karri Eloheimo, Project Manager, Finnish Environmental Institute (SYKE)	17.2.2012 24.2.2012 24.4.2012
Mr Ari Mäkelä, Technical Advisor, Freshwater Centre, SYKE	24.4.2012
Ms Tea Törnroos, Head of Unit, International Affairs Unit, SYKE	17.2.2012 24.4.2012
Ms Irma Kettunen, Coordinator of Security Cluster, Institute for Russia and Eastern Europe	17.2.2012 11.6.2012
Mr George Kordzakhia, Advisor to the Head of the Agency, National Environmental Agency of Georgia	24.2.2012
Ms Tamara Gobejishvili, Head of the Telecommunication Service of the Hydrometeorological Department, National Environmental Agency of Georgia	24.2.2012
Ms Elina Bakradze, Head of Department of Environmental Pollution Monitoring, Atmospheric Air, Water and Soil Analyses Laboratory, National Environmental Agency of Georgia	24.2.2012
Mr Irakli Megrelidze, Head of Division, Management of Hydrometeorological Hazardous Events, National Environmental Agency of Georgia	24.2.2012
Mr Vano Tsiklauri, Environmental Consultant	24.2.2012
Mr Mikko Sane, Flood Modelling Unit, SYKE	24.2.2012
Mr Olli-Pekka Mattila, Geoinformatics Division, SYKE	24.2.2012
Mr Markku Törmä, Geoinformatics Division, SYKE	24.2.2012
Mr Heikki Susimaa, Geoinformatics Division, SYKE	24.2.2012
Ms Lea Kauppi, General Director, SYKE	24.2.2012
Ms Marine Chigitashvili, Inorganic Chemistry, Atmospheric Air, Water and Soil Analyses Laboratory, National Environmental Agency of Georgia	24.2.2012
Ms Ekaterina Shubladze, Microbiologist, Atmospheric Air, Water and Soil Analyses Laboratory, National Environmental Agency of Georgia	24.2.2012
Ms Maka Khvedeliani, Organic Chemistry, Atmospheric Air, Water and Soil Analyses Laboratory, National Environmental Agency of Georgia	24.2.2012
Ms Leila Salamashvili, Metal Analyses, Atmospheric Air, Water and Soil Analyses Laboratory, National Environmental Agency of Georgia	24.2.2012
Mr Zaur Vekua, Hydrologist, Management of Hydrometeorological Hazardous Events, National Environmental Agency of Georgia	24.2.2012
Ms Irma Jebirashvili, Hydrologist, Management of Hydrometeorological Hazardous Events, National Environmental Agency of Georgia	24.2.2012
Mr Besiki Kavtaria, Hydrologist, Management of Hydrometeorological Hazardous Events, National Environmental Agency of Georgia	24.2.2012

<b>Persons met In Finland or via telephone or Skype</b>	<b>Date</b>
Dr Sunil Siriwardena, International Team Leader, FAO Kyrgyzstan	27.2.2012
Roseanna Avento, MSc Coordinator, University for Eastern Finland	27.2.2012
Mr Duisheev, State Secretary, Kyrgyzstan Deputy Minister of Agriculture,	28.2.2012
Mr Dogochiev, Director of the Department of Fisheries	28.2.2012
Ms Dinara Rakhmanova, Assistant FAO Representative, Kyrgyzstan	28.2.2012
Mr Mustapha Sinaceur, FAO Sub-Regional Coordinator, FAO representative for Kyrgyzstan (from the FAO Office in Ankara)	28.2.2012
Field Programme Officer Reza Najib, Kyrgyzstan	28.2.2012
Mr Juha Rautjärvi, ICI Project Coordinator, STUK	6.3.2012
Mr V. Bogorad, Head of Radiation Protection Department SSTC SNRIU	6.3.2012
Mr O. Petrenko, Specialist of Radiation Protection Department SSTC SNRIU	6.3.2012
Ms O. Slepchenko, Head of Laboratory, SSTC SNRIU	6.3.2012
Ms T. Lytvynvska, Deputy Head of Radiation Protection Department SSTC SNRIU	6.3.2012
Ms Tatjana Lipäinen, Researcher, EUCAM, University of Eastern Finland	6.3.2012
Mr Horton Beebe-Center, President of Eurasia Foundation	7.3.2012
Mr Jeff Erlich, Project Manager, Eurasia Foundation	7.3.2012
Ms Janel Bayastanova, Director of Central Asia operations, Eurasia Foundation	7.3.2012
Mr Patrick Luternauer, Regional Business Line Leader, IFC	9.3.2012
Ms Kristina Turilova, Program Manager, UCPP, IFC	9.3.2012
Ms Anna Malinen, currently UNV but formerly staff of ITÄ-20, MFA	16.3.2012
Mr Matti Kääriäinen, Ambassador, MFA	21.3.2012
Mr Kaisar K. Kozhamuratov, Deputy Director Ministry of Industry & New Technology, Kazakhstan	21.3.2012
Mr Sidorento Dmitriu, Deputy Head, Ministry of Industry & New Technology, Kazakhstan	21.3.2012
Mr Albanov Kurbek, Geological Agency of Kyrgyzstan	21.3.2012
Mr Kultekov Kyrmarbek, Geological Agency of Kyrgyzstan	21.3.2012
Mr Sulaymon Shobenov, Geological Agency of Tajikistan	21.3.2012
Mr Aziz Gulamadshoev, Geological Agency of Tajikistan	21.3.2012
Mr Jukka Kanervisto, Kanervisto Consulting – EBRD ETC consultant	22.3.2012
Mr Sergii Malynovskyi, Finpro Ukraine	22.3.2012
Mr Jens Wandel, Director of Bratislava Regional Centre (UNDP)	23.3.2012
Ms Laura Rio, Senior Programme Manager, Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC)	23.3.2012
Ms Marika Palosaari, Programme Officer, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	23.3.2012
Ms Hanna Vuokko, Counsellor, Development Aid Specialist, Embassy of Finland in Kazakhstan	4.5.2012
Ms Heli Mikkola, Advisor HIV/AIDS, Children and Development, MFA	23.3.2012
Mr Erik Ulfsted, Ambassador and Programme Officer	23.3.2012
Mr Olli Ruohomäki, Advisor, Conflict and Societal Development, MFA	23.3.2012
Ms Katariina Hautamäki-Huuki, Programme Officer, MFA	23.3.2012
Mr Pertti Ikonen, infoDev, Aid for Trade Coordinator, MFA	28.3.2012
Mr Timo Voipio, Advisor for Social and Labour Policy	28.3.2012
Ms Laura Reinilä, Ambassador at Large, WEI	29.3.2012
Ms Riitta Oksanen, Senior Advisor, Development Evaluation, MFA	29.3.2012
Ms Catarina Hansen, Operations Leader, EBRD Water Fund	28.03.2012
Mr Vince Novak, Director, Chernobyl Shelter Fund, EBRD London	30.03.2012
Ms Tarja Parkkinen, Consul, Embassy of Finland, Ankara, Turkey	18.04.2012
Dr. (Ms) Helena Rytövuori (Tapri)	24.4.2012
Ms. Helle Palu (Tapri)	24.4.2012

<b>Persons met In Finland or via telephone or Skype</b>	<b>Date</b>
Director Tuomo Melasuo (Tapri)	24.4.2012
Dr. (Ms) Tuula Honkonen (UEF)	24.4.2012
Director Markku Kivinen (Aleksanteri Institute)	29.4.2012
Dr. (Mr) Mikko Palonkorpi	29.4.2012
Ms Saija Vuola, Finnish Water Forum (and earlier, JPO working with ENVSEC in Central Asia)	2.5.2012
Ms Riikka Otsamo, ICI Facilitation Consultant, FCG	3.5.2012
Ms Nina Vaskunlahti, Director General, Department for Russia, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, MFA	4.5.2012
Ms Tuula Yrjölä, Ambassador of Finland to Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan	4.5.2012
Mr Jouko Eskelinen, Environment Advisor, MFA	7.5.2012
Mr Antti Rautavaara, Water Advisor, MFA	10.5.2012
Ms Ulla-Maarit Saarinen, Tilastokeskus (Statistics Agency)	30.5.2012
Mr Tõnis Idarand, Deputy Head of Mission of Estonian Embassy in Helsinki	1.6.2012
Mr Eero Kontula, ex-Water Advisor, MFA (retired)	13.6.2012
Mr Rolf Buchel, Chief Technical Advisor, Decent Work Project, ILO Moscow –	13.6.2012
Prof (Mr) Ilkka Liikkanen, Director & Senior Researcher, Karelia Institute	13.6.2012
Prof Rauno Sairinen, Prof. Environmental Politics, University of Eastern Finland	13.6.2012
Mr Wiking Husberg, ex-ILO advisor and participant in Decent Work project (now Ministerial Adviser, Department for Occupational Safety and Health, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Finland)	18.6.2012
Ms Meri Lahtinen, Justice Adviser, MFA	20.6.2012
Ms Irma Ylikangas, Project Manager, Promoting Modernisation of Meteorological and Hydrological Services in Central Asia, Finnish Meteorological Institute	21.6.2012
Ms Danièle Gelz, Project Manager, Poverty Practice, UNDP Europe and the CIS, Bratislava Regional Centre	5.7.2012
Ms Ellen Olafsen, InfoDev, World Bank	19.7.2012
Mr Matti Okko, Head of unit, Government and sector accounts, Statistics Finland	14.8.2012
Mr Pekka Myrskylä, Senior Adviser, Statistics Finland	14.8.2012
Ambassador Marja-Liisa Kiljunen, Finnish Embassy in Vilnius (for Belarus)	15.8.2012
Mr Anders Lund, E5P EBRD – contact by email only	
Mr Denis Gaiovy E5P EBRD– contact by email only	
Ms Jane Karanda E5P EBRD– contact by email only	
Ms Olga Filippova, Kharkiv University (Security Cluster) – only minimal email feedback	
Mr Volodymyr Kravchenko, Kharkiv University (Security Cluster) – only minimal email feedback	
Mr Roman Koval, Ukrainian Centre for Common Ground (PATRIR) – only minimal email feedback	
Mr Igor Semyvolos (PATRIR) – only minimal email feedback	

### **Meetings in Estonia**

Mr Ekke Nomm, Director, Estonian School of Diplomacy	8.5.2012
Ms Katrin Borgen, Project Manager, Estonian School of Diplomacy	8.5.2012
Mr Vahur Made, Deputy Director, Estonian School of Diplomacy	8.5.2012
Ms Darina Mskhaladze, Georgia, Student, Estonian School of Diplomacy	8.5.2012
Mr Alexander Mishvelidze, Moldova, Student, Estonian School of Diplomacy	8.5.2012

### **Meetings in Armenia**

Mr Vrej Jijyan, Portfolio Analyst, Socio Economic Governance, UNDP Armenia	12.3.2012
Mr Babjen Babayan, Project Coordinator, UNDP Armenia	12.3.2012
Ms Christina Aroyan, Project Assistant, UNDP Armenia	12.3.2012
Mr Gagik Tsutsulyan, Director, SME DNC and Market Information Centre,	12.3.2012

Tavush	
Mr Andranik Veranyan, Component Coordinator, SME DNC Tavush	12.3.2012
Ms Tamara Gabrielyan, Expert (Information, Trade Promotion), SME DNC Tavush	12.3.2012
Ms Irina Nazaryan, Expert (Start-ups, Training), SME DNC Tavush	12.3.2012
Ms Layle Ayvazuan, Cooperative member and Treasurer, Lusadzor	12.3.2012
Mr Suren Kocharyan, Director, Cooperative Lusadzor	12.3.2012
Mr Sergey Minasyan, Caucasus Institute	12.3.2012
Mr Alexander Iskandaryan, Caucasus Institute	12.3.2012
Ms Marina Saryan, Caucasus Institute	12.3.2012
Mr Varazdat Karapetyan, Executive Director, SME DNC of Armenia	13.3.2012
Mr Timothy Straight, Honorary Consul, Finland	13.3.2012
Mr William Hanlon, Economic and Environmental Officer, OSCE Armenia	13.3.2012
	16.3.2012
Mr Edward Safaryan, National Project Officer, Environmental Security, OSE Armenia	13.3.2012
	16.3.2012
Ms Gohar Ghazinyan, Aarhus and environmental journalism, OSCE Armenia	13.3.2012
Mr Richard Giragosian, Director, Regional Studies Center, Armenia	13.3.2012
Mr Bagrat Yengibaryan, Director Enterprise Incubator Foundation, Armenia	14.3.2012
Ms Mariam Dartyan, mLab Project Leader	14.3.2012
Mr Armen Melkonyan, mLab Technical Project Manager	14.3.2012
Ms Margarita Korkhmazyan, Head, International Relations Division, Ministry of Nature Protection of Armenia	14.3.2012
Mr Antti Hartikainen, Team leader, EU Advisory Group, Armenia	14.3.2012
Mr Sergii Malynovskyi, Finpro	15.3.2012
Ms Aghavni Karakhanian, Director of the Institute for Civil Society and Regional Development (ICSRD)	15.3.2012
Ms Shushan Khatlamajyan, Programme Coordinator, Institute for Civil Society and Regional Development (ICSRD)	15.3.2012
Ms Karine Ghazaryan, Human Rights Network, Civil Society Program Coordinator, Open Society	15.3.2012
Ms Sona Ayranyan, Transparency international Anti-corruption Centre	15.3.2012
Mr Alexander Babayan, Senior Banker, EBRD Armenia	16.3.2012
Ms Anna Grigoryan, ILO	16.3.2012
Mr Hrayr Hakobyan, Director Local Employment Centre, Abovian City, Armenia	16.3.2012
Mr Edgar Abgaryan, beneficiary of ILO supported activities, Abovian City	16.3.2012
Ms Hasmik Yeghoyan, Deputy Director Local Employment Centre, Abovian City	16.3.2012
Ms Liana Khachatuzyah, Coordinator of the Job Club, Abovian City	16.3.2012
Mr Arakelyan Jora, Hrazdan Aarhus Centre Coordinator	16.3.2012
Ms Mnatsakanyan Anahit, Hrazdan Aarhus Centre Coordinator	16.3.2012
Mr Arsen Arsenyan, member of Mining Project Committee, Hrazdan	16.3.2012
Mr Mouses Manukyan, member of Mining Project Committee, Hrazdan	16.3.2012
Mr Ray Reeder, volunteer, Hrazdan Aarhus Centre and Mining Project	16.3.2012

### Meetings in Georgia

Mr Giorgi Shubitidze, Project Coordinator, Heinrich Böll Foundation, South Caucasus	2.4.2012
Mr Ketevan Cheishvili, Capacity Building Specialist, UNDP	2.4.2012
Ms Nino Antadze, Team Leader, Environment and Energy Portfolio, UNDP	2.4.2012, 3.4.2012
Ms. Lali Meskhi, Forestry Project Manager, UNDP	2.4.2012
Dr (Ms) Sophie Kemkhadze, Assistant Resident Representative, UNDP	2.4.2012
Mr George Nanobashvili, Economic Development Team Leader, UNDP	3.4.2012
Mr John Vijgen, Civil Protection Expert, EU funded programme for the Prevention, Preparedness and Response to man-made and natural disasters in the ENPI East Region (ENPI-PPRD East)	3.4.2012
Mr Otto Simonett, Director, Zoi Environment Network	3.4.2012

## Meetings in Georgia

Mr Armen Martirosyan, Portfolio Analyst, Environmental Governance, UNDP	3.4.2012
Prof (Mr) Johan Goldammer, Global Fire Monitoring Centre, Fire Ecology Research Group	3.4.2012
Mr William Hanlon, Economic and Environmental Officer, OSCE Yerevan	3.4.2012
Mr Edward Safaryan, ENVSEC National Project Officers, OSCE Yerevan	3.4.2012
Ms Nino Sharashidze, Environmental Affairs Officer, UNECE – Espoo Convention	3.4.2012
Ms. Zahra Ahmadova, OSCE Azerbaijan, CASE Programme Coordinator	3.4.2012
Ms Esra Buttanri, Environmental Affairs Advisor, Office of the Coordinator of OSCE Economic & Environmental Activities	3.4.2012
Dr (Mr) Andrzej Klimczyk, Political Officer, NATO Liaison Office in Georgia	3.4.2012
Mr Alexander Bohr, Austrian Development Agency, Officer for the South Caucasus	4.4.2012
Mr Rudolph Schoch, Regional Director of Cooperation, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation	4.4.2012
Mr Matthias Jurek, Eastern Europe Hub, - Mountain Partnership Secretariat, UNEP Vienna	4.4.2012
Ms Nino Gokhelshevili, ENVSEC Focal Point, Georgia & Head of Department of International Relations, Ministry of Environmental Protection, Georgia	4.4.2012
Ms Nino Malashkhia, Associate Environmental Affairs Officer, OSCE, Georgia (Regional Cities Project & UNECE Water Convention)	5.4.2012
Ms Zahra Admadova, CASE Programme Coordinator, OSCE Baku	4.4.2012
Mr Bariz Mehdiyev, REC Caucasus Azerbaijan Office	4.4.2012
Mr Roman Kakulia, Adviser to the State Minister, Office of the State Minister of Georgia on European and Euro-Atlantic Integration	4.4.2012
Mr Mamuka Salukvadze, Head of Economic Affairs Office, Tbilisi City Hall	4.4.2012
Ms Khatuna Gogaladze, ENVSEC National Coordinator, Aarhus Centre	4.4.2012
Ms Nino Gvazava, Assistant Manager, Aarhus Centre	4.4.2012
Mr Gocha Aleksandria, National Project Coordinator, ILO Decent Work Project	5.4.2012
Mr Konstantine Nanobashvili, Executive Director, Georgian Employers' Association	5.4.2012
Mr Paata Beltadze, Head of Staff, Georgian Trade Unions Confederation	5.4.2012
Mr. Giuseppe Vasques, Attache, Communication-Information Officer, EU Delegation in Georgia	5.4.2012
Mr. Oliver Reisner, Attache, Civil Society, Higher Education, Culture, Social and Labour Affairs, EU Delegation in Georgia	5.4.2012
Mr Jamie McGoldrick, Resident Representative, UNDP	5.4.2012
Mr George Zedginidze, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Environment Protection	5.4.2012
Ms Natia Iordanishvili, Chief Specialist, Forest Management Department, Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources	5.4.2012
Mr. George Kordzaklis, Head of International Project Management and Cooperation department, National Environmental Agency	5.4.2012
Mr. Vano Tsiklauri, National Environmental Agency, Consultant	5.4.2012
Mr. George Kordzakhia, Adviser of Director, National Environmental Agency	5.4.2012
Ms. Tamara Gobejishili, Head of Telecom Services of Hydromet Department, National Environmental Agency	5.4.2012
Ms. Marina Arabidze, Head of Environmental Pollution Department, National Environmental Agency	5.4.2012
Ms. Elina Bakradze, Head of Hydromet Department, National Environmental Agency	5.4.2012
Ms Nino Sul Khanishvili, Executive Director, Ecovision	5.4.2012
Ms Nino Chkhobadze, Co-Chair, The Green Movement of Georgia	5.4.2012
Ambassador (Mr) Alexander Rondeli, Honorary Consul of Finland	5.4.2012
Ass Prof (Mr) Kornely Kakachia, Department of Political Science, Tbilisi State University	6.4.2012
Mr. Levan Melikadze, EBRD, Municipal and Environmental Infrastructure Team, Senior Analyst	7.4.2012
Ms. Tea Sharvadze, EBRD, Municipal and Environmental Infrastructure Team,	7.4.2012

### Meetings in Georgia

senior Banker	
Ms. Sofia Britanchuk, Georgian National Communication Commission, Commissioner	7.4.2012
Ms. Mzia Gogilashvili, Georgian National Communication Commission, Strategy development department, international affairs Coordinator	7.4.2012
Mr. George Dzamukashvili, NGO, NPD Coordinator	7.4.2012

### Meetings in Geneva

Ms (Dr) Annukka Lipponen, Environmental Affairs Officer, Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes, UNECE	25.4.2012
Mr Bo Libert, Regional Advisor on Environment, UNECE (ENVSEC & FinWaterWEI)	25.4.2012
Mr Jan Dusik, Acting Director and Regional Representative, Regional Office for Europe, UNEP (ENVSEC Management Board)	25.4.2012
Ms Sonja Koepfel, Environmental Affairs Officer, Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes, UNECE	26.4.2012
Ms Laura Rio, UNEP	26.4.2012
Mr Nickolai Denisov, Senior Associate, Zoi Environment - & Regional Coordinator for Eastern Europe, ENVSEC	26.4.2012
Ms Francesca Bernadini, Secretary to the Water Convention, Environment Division UNECE	26.4.2012
Ms Natalia Alexeeva, Water Programme Coordinator for Central Asia, UNDP Almaty	26.4.2012
Ms (Dr) Svetlana Dolgikh, Head of the Climate Research Department, National Hydro-meteorological Service 'Kazhydromat', Kazakhstan (Chu Talas Project)	26.4.2012
Mr (Dr) Shamil Iliasov, Expert, Chu Talas project, Kyrgyzstan	26.4.2012
Mr (Dr) Markku Maunula, SYKE	27.4.2012
Ms Nino Sharashidze, Environmental Affairs Officer, UNECE (& Georgian Environment Ministry staff)	27.4.2012
Mr Grygorii Petruk, Head, Division of Water Ecosystems and Resources, Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources, Ukraine (Dniester Project)	27.4.2012
Mr Mikhail Pencov, Deputy Director, Water Agency within Ministry of Environment, Moldova (Dniester project)	27.4.2012
Mr Roman Corobov, EcoTiras International Environmental Association of River Keepers, Moldova (Dniester project)	27.4.2012
Mr Igor Tchoulba, Programme Officer, UNDP, Belarus (Nieman River project & others)	27.4.2012
Mr Vladimir Korneev, Chief of Sector, Research Institute for Complex Use of Water Resources (Nieman River project), Belarus	27.4.2012

### Meetings in Ukraine

Dr (Mr) Boris Maliuk, Chief, Division of International Cooperation, Ukrainian State Geological Research Institute, UkrSGRI	14.5.2012
Mr Mykhailo Geichenko, Deputy Director of Department of Geology, State Geological and Subsurface Survey of Ukraine (SGSSU)/ State Service of Geology and Mineral Resources of Ukraine	14.5.2012
Ms Tetiana Zurian, Engineer, Ukrainian State Geological Research Institute (UkrSGRI)	14.5.2012
Ms Natalia Flore, Head of Geological Research Department	14.5.2012
Mr Patrick Luternauer, Manager, Sustainable Business Advisory, IFC Europe and Central Asia (by VC from Moscow)	14.5.2012
Ms Kristina Turilova, Program Manager, Ukraine Cleaner Production Programme, IFC (by VC from Moscow)	14.5.2012
Dr (Mr) Sergii Nevmyvanyi, Technical Expert, Ukraine Cleaner Production Program, IFC Advisory Services	14.5.2012, 15.5.2012

## Meetings in Ukraine

Ms Olga Iakymenko, Consultant, Ukraine Cleaner Production Program, IFC Advisory Services	14.5.2012, 15.5.2012
Ms Mariya Malaya, Head of Department of Promotion and Public Relations, State Agency on Energy Efficiency and Energy Saving of Ukraine	14.5.2012
Ms Tetiana Kovriga, Deputy Head of Department of Promotion and Public Relations, State Agency on Energy Efficiency and Energy Saving of Ukraine	14.5.2012
Mr Dmytro Glazkov, Energy and Infrastructure Operations Officer, Sustainable Development Department, Europe and Central Asia Region, World Bank	14.5.2012
Mr Vladimir Volkov, Finance Officer, IFC	14.5.2012
Ms Arja Makkonen, Ambassador, Embassy of Finland to Ukraine	15.5.2012
Ms Outi Isotalo, Second Secretary, Embassy of Finland to Ukraine	15.5.2012
Mr Sergiy Kurbatov, Head of Analytical Department, Mryia Agro Holding	15.5.2012
Mr Roman Shvets, Project Manager, Mryia Agro Holding	15.5.2012
Mr Rene BeBeau, Senior Project Manager and Deputy Head of Mission, OSCE	15.5.2012
Ms Hanna Plotnykova, Project Officer, OSCE	15.5.2012, 28.5.2012
Ms Elena Panova, Deputy Country Director, UNDP	16.5.2012
Dr (Ms) Katerina Rybalchenko, Senior Programme Manager, UNDP	16.5.2012
Dr (Ms) Iryna Kobuta, Project Manager, Aid for Trade Project in Ukraine, UNDP	16.5.2012
Mr Andriy Zayika, Project Analyst, Aid for Trade Project in Ukraine, UNDP	16.5.2012
Mr Sergey Nerpiy, Associate Director, Interconsult Ukraine Ltd	16.5.2012
Ms Olga Makarovska, Deputy Chairperson, State Nuclear Regulatory Inspectorate	17.5.2012
Mr Oleg Petrenko, Specialist of Radiation Protection Department SSTC SNRIU	17.5.2012
Ms O. Slepchenko, Head of Laboratory, SSTC SNRIU	17.5.2012
Mr V. Bogorad, Head of Radiation Protection Department SSTC SNRIU	17.5.2012
various others....at SSTC and SNRIU	17.5.2012
Mr Valeriy Pystnytskiy, Commissioner for European Integration, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of Ukraine	17.5.2012
Ms Olga Lysyuk, Head of the Multiple Water Resource Use and Monitoring Department, State Agency of Water Resources	17.5.2012
Mr Rustam Yuldashev, Head of Department, Department of Trade Policy, WTO and International Markets, Ministry of Agricultural Policy of Ukraine	17.5.2012
Ms Natallia Gavrylenko, Head of Division on Trade Policy and Cooperation with the WTO, Ministry of Agrarian Policy and Food	17.5.2012
Dr (Mr) Igor Markov, Head of Department of Ethnic & Social Studies, Institute of Ethnology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine	18.5.2012
Ms Hanna Hopko, Freelance journalist (work on ENVSEC)	18.5.2012
Ms Natalya Belitser, Pylyp Orlyk Institute for Democracy (PATRIR – member of core group)	28.5.2012
Ms Innesa Medvedenko, Parliamentary Apparatus (National Security and Defence of Ukraine), ENVSEC	28.5.2012
Ms Yulia Tyschenko, Head – Civil Society Programmes, Ukrainian Centre for Independent Political Research (PATRIR)	29.5.2012
Mr Igor Syrotenko, Member of the National Commission for the State Regulation of Communication and Informatization (NCCIR)	29.5.2012
Mr Mykola Sokyrko, Director of Regulation and Licensing Department, NCCIR	29.5.2012
Mr Volodymyr Gresko, Director of Communications Department, NCCIR	29.5.2012
Ms Liubov Tkachenko, Head of Mutual Settlements Division of Economic Analysis Department, NCCIR	29.5.2012
Ms Tetiana Farmahei, Head of Protocol and International Projects Support Division of International Affairs Department	29.5.2012
Mr Leonid Osherov, Head of the Board of the Ukrainian Association of Telecommunications Operators, TELAS	29.5.2012
Ms Outi Isotalo, Second Secretary, Embassy of Finland to Ukraine	30.5.2012
Mr Richard Jones, Aid Effectiveness Adviser, EU Delegation	30.5.2012
Mr Sergii Malynovskyi, Consultant, Finpro Ukraine	31.5.2012
Mr Mykola Babych (ENVSEC), former Deputy Chairman of State Committee of	31.5.2012

## Meetings in Ukraine

Ukraine for Water Management	
Mr Enzo Damiani, EU Delegation, Joint Cooperation Initiative in Crimea Coordinator	1.6.2012
Mr Denis Matveev, Co-Director, Crimea Policy Dialogue Project	1.6.2012

## Meetings in Kyrgyzstan

Mr. Dogdurbek Dogochiev, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Fisheries, Director	21.5.2012
Dr. (Mr) Sunil Siriwardena, UN FAO Support to Fishery and Aquaculture Management Project, Team Leader	21.5.2012, 24.5.2012, 25.5.2012
Ms. Jyldyz Choroeva, UNDP, Aft/ENVSEC	21.5.2012
Mr. Isaev Talaibek, UNDP, Aid for Trade component Coordinator	21.5.2012
Ms. Mametova Toktokan, Leader of Women's Entrepreneurs' Association, Batken	21.5.2012
Mr. Halmurzaev Abdirashit, Leader of Mol Tushum Cooperative, Batken	21.5.2012
Mr Usupov Chagylgan, Leader of Batken Information Marketing Centre	21.5.2012
Mr. Alexander Avanesov, UNDP, Resident Representative	21.5.2012
Ms Katja Karppinen, UN Public Information and Communications Adviser, Office of the UN Resident Coordinator (Finnish UNV)	21.5.2012
Prof. (Mr) Jeremy Smith, Professor of Russian History and Politics, University of Eastern Finland, Joensuu Campus	21.5.2012; 22.5.2012; 23.5.2012
Ms Tatjana Lipiäinen, International Affairs Coordinator, VERA Centre for Russian and Border Studies, Karelian Institute	21.5.2012
Dr. Jos Boonstra, Head EUCAM programme, FRIDE, Brussels	22.5.2012
Mr. Turarbek Sadykbekov, ENVSEC focal point, head of laboratory for water quality monitoring at the State Committee for Environmental Protection and Forestry	22.5.2012
Mr. Erkin Orolbaev, NPD National Coordinator, National Project Coordinator of EUWI/NDP/IWRM, UNECE	22.5.2012
Professor (Mr) Djendaev Bekmamat Murzakmatovich, Director, Institute of Biology and Pedology of the National Academy of Science of Kyrgyz Republic	22.5.2012
Ass. Prof (Mr) Almazbek Orozumbekov, Head of Centre of Cooperation, Kyrgyz National Agrarian University	22.5.2012
Mr Tom Massie, Minister-Counsellor Operations, Delegation of the European Union to the Kyrgyz Republic	22.5.2012
Mr Islan Osmonaliev, Project Manager, Delegation of the European Union to the Kyrgyz Republic	22.5.2012
Mr Kumar Kylychev, Programme Associate, Environment and Disaster Risk Management, UNDP	22.5.2012
Ms Zhyldyz Uzakbaeva Mansurovna, Program Officer, Uranium Tailings Program (ENVSEC), UNDP Environment	22.5.2012
Ms Taru Kernisalo, Attachee, Project Manager, Delegation of the European Union to the Kyrgyz Republic	23.5.2012
Mr. Chyngysbek Uzakbaev, NDP Chairman, Deputy Director General of Water Resources Department of Ministry of Agriculture and Amelioration	23.5.2012
Ms. Ekaterina Sahvaeva, Head of Information and Analysis division of Department of Water Resources at the Ministry of Agriculture and Amelioration	23.5.2012
Dr. Sebastien Peyrouse, Frida	23.5.2012
Mr Bolotbek Orokov, National Coordinator, ILO Kyrgyz Office	23.5.2012
Mr. Azizbek Kirgizbaev, Project Assistant, Decent Work Project, ILO	23.5.2012
Mr. Asylbekov Talaybek, a.i. State Secretary of State Technical Inspection Service	23.5.2012
Mr Manas Beksultanov, Executive Director of Federation of Employers in Industry	23.5.2012
Mr Tyrsynbek Dzysybukovich, President of the Association of Alcohol	23.5.2012

## Meetings in Kyrgyzstan

Producers and Director of Union of Directors	
Mr. Kumushbek Mambetov, Chair of Agricultural Sectoral Trade Union	23.5.2012
Mr. Rysbek Apasov, EU/UNDP, Promoting IWRM and Fostering Transboundary Dialogue in the Central Asia Project, Project Manager	24.5.2012
Ms. Aicholpon Jorupbekova, Kalikova & Associates Law Firm	24.5.2012
Ms. Jyldyz Mambetalieva, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Justice	24.5.2012
Mr. Tilek Isabekov, Chu-Talas River Basin IWRM project, Regional Coordinator	24.5.2012
Mr. Jeff Erlich, Senior Advisor, Eurasia Foundation	24.5.2012
Mr. Elmurat Abdraimov, Project Manager, Eurasia Foundation of Central Asia	24.5.2012
Mr. Mirbek Asangariyev, "Disabled Youth Movement", EFCA	24.5.2012
Ms. Zulfya Kochorbayeva, "Women's Alliance for Legislative Initiatives", EFCA	24.5.2012
Ms. Ainura Osmonalieva, Coordinator in legal clinic "Adilet"	25.5.2012
Mr. Azamat Kerimbaev, Director of the American Bar Association, office ABA/ROLL	25.5.2012
Dr. Paul Fryer, University Lecturer University of Eastern Finland	24.5.2012
Mr. Rustam Madaliev, Project coordinator "Support to legal and judicial reforms in the countries of Central Asia", GIZ, EFCA	25.5.2012
Director Valentin Bogdetsky, Agency of Ecology, EUCAM	24.5.2012
Ms. Lolakhon Baimatova, Head of International Cooperation Department National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic	25.5.2012
Ms. Eppu Mikkonen-Jeanneret, Regional Representative EECA	24.5.2012
Mr Azat Alamanov, Project Manager, Strengthening Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Fishery Sector, UNDP	24.5.2012
9 fishermen (currently illegal) from Tup district working on sanitary fishing with UNDP/GEF	24.5.2012
Mr. Djapaev Asan – Chairman of Association of Fishermen & Fish Farmers of the Tup district	25.5.2012
Mr. Bekboev Sadyk – Accountant of the Association of Fishermen & Fish Farmers of Jety-Oguz district.	25.5.2012
Mr. Mametov Maksat – Director of Association of of Fishermen & Fish Farmers of Jety-Oguz.	25.5.2012
Mr. Dreshpan Fedor- Deputy Director of the Association of Pond Farmers.	25.5.2012
Mr. Turganbaev Nurlan – Association of Fishermen of Tup district.	25.5.2012
Mr. Ablabekov Abdrahman – Fisherman of Tup district (and member of Association)	25.5.2012
Mr. Dyachkov Valeryi Dmitrievich – Fisherman of Tup district, Toguzbulak village (and member of Association)	25.5.2012

## Meetings in Azerbaijan

Mr. Mutallim Abdulhasanov, Environmental policy department, Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources, Chairman of NPD Steering Committee	07.06.2012
Mr. Rafiq Verdiyev, NPD National Coordinator	07.06.2012
Mr. Markku Maunula, SYKE, division manager, Freshwater Centre	07.06.2012
Prof. Kari Kinnunen, Centre for Economic Development, Transport and Environment for Lapland, Senior Specialist, Chair of Finnish-Swedish Transboundary River Commission	07.06.2012
Mr. Antti Belinsij, Principal Administrator, Legal Affairs, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Department of General Affairs Water Resources Unit (MMM.FI)	07.06.2012
Mr. Bo Libert, UNECE Regional Adviser for Environment	08.06.2012
Ms. Tatiana Efimova, OECD, Project Manager, Environmental Performance and Information Division, Environmental Directorate	08.06.2012
Mr. Nicola di Pietrantonio, EC Programme Manager for Regional Programmes Neighbourhood East, EuropeAid	08.06.2012
Mr. Emmanuel Huntzinger, OSCE, head of Economic and Environmental Unit	08.06.2012
Mrs. Mary Matthews, UNDP/GEF Project Coordinator, Reducing Transboundary Degradation of Kura Aras River Basin	08.06.2012
Mr. Tim Hannan, Senior IWRM expert, UNDP/GEF Project Coordinator,	08.06.2012



## ANNEX 3 – SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND MAJOR DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

This summary document is a set of working notes, developed by the evaluation team members as a tool for the initial mapping of issues arising in the analysis of WEI interventions, during the desk research and field mission phases. It served as a basis for internal discussion and comparison among the team members, and informed the subsequent writing up of the evaluation final report (which does not replicate fully the analysis and provisional conclusions found here). It is included for the reader's information, as it provides a supplementary source of data, and illustrates the ways in which the evaluation team's discussion of the interventions evolved. It also includes lists of documents reviewed, per intervention (these lists are not exhaustive, as the team reviewed thousands of documents in total).

### Security Cluster Research Projects

#### Individual Security Cluster Research Projects

The South Caucasus Beyond Borders, Boundaries and Division Lines: Conflicts, Cooperation and Development Aleksanteri Institute	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well aligned with Finnish Dev Policy</li> <li>• Building of conflict prevention and resolution approach. Therefore, contributes to and draws from the peace mediation expertise in Finland.</li> <li>• Finland as a model: Applies the lessons learned from the Finland's relationships with Russia.</li> <li>• Tailors approaches to the local contexts. Not out of box type of approach.</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WEI budget 284 983 Eur</li> <li>• Aleksanteri Institute's previous WEI project facilitated the the good start for this project. The synergies and complementarities between different activities indicate a good value for the money at the institutional level.</li> <li>• The project has produced a few milestone events that are highly notable – in Tbilisi, Yerevan and Baku.</li> <li>• The list of deliverables indicates responsible use of grant funding.</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experienced research team both in Finland and in terms of experts in the regions.</li> <li>• Good conflict resolution workshops.</li> <li>• Ability to bring different actors together</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project has managed to bring together people from the opposing sides of conflicts.</li> <li>• One of successes</li> <li>• More lasting build up of Finnish expertise.</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good reputed partners (e.g. Heinrich Böll Foundation).</li> <li>• Hard to sustain in absence of external funding.</li> <li>• Academy of Finland should consider providing funding for the continuing research in the region.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The expert capacity is likely to sustain itself in the intermediate term.</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aleksanteri institute is an independent part of the University of Helsinki. It is freer to manage ministry funded projects</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project makes use of Finland's experiences in cross-border cooperation with Russia</li> <li>• Build up of relevant academic expertise in Finland.</li> <li>• Enhances regional experiences and contacts.</li> <li>• Peace mediation is an important theme in Finland.</li> <li>• Promotes Finland as a model country.</li> </ul>

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?** The strategy is to use workshops to lower the tensions between parties to a conflict. The strategy draws from the Finnish expertise in two senses: It brings in Finnish experts on various issues and it uses the Finnish historical experiences as the model for contemporary conflict relations in the region of South Caucasus.

**Is there a Logframe?**

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** The project aims at qualitative evaluation of the impact. The deliverables – exchanges, events, and publications – provide the key to measuring project results.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** Fairly detailed listing of deliverables. In addition, there are some peer reviewed academic deliverables.

**Gaps in documentation or information?** No gaps. Many contacts with ministry staff.

**Areas of concern?** The cross-cutting objectives of gender could be emphasised more as it also plays a vital function in conflict resolution efforts.

**Key documents considered:**

Laaturyhmäkäsittely 2.10. Laajemman Euroopan Aloite: Turvallisuuskusteritoiminta ja Turvallisuus ja Kehitys-Tutkimus 2009-2013.

Turvallisuuskusteri, presentation, ITÄ-20

Seurantayhteenveto. 20.11.2010. WEI/Turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus.

List of ongoing projects 2012.

List of events during 2012.

Memo of Advisory board meeting. 9.2.2012.

3.12.2010. Turvallisuuskusteri ja turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus 2009-2013.

Laaturyhmän käsittely. 2.10.2009. Laajemman Euroopan aloite: turvallisuuskusteritoiminta ja turvallisuus ja kehitys -tutkimus 2009-2013. ITÄ20.

Kehitysyhteistyön laaturyhmä 25/2009.

Wider Europe – Regional Security Report. Western CIS – South Caucasus – Central Asia Biannual Review. Issue NO. 1, 11 Feb 2011.

**Regional stability, borders, minorities, and immigration: Research network project Moldova, Ukraine, Belarus, Azerbaijan and Tadzhikistan**

**Karelian Institute**

<b>Evaluation criterion</b>	<b>Analysis, issues arising</b>
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very clear link to the aims of WEI</li> <li>• Reasonable fit with other projects, especially in terms of EU's European Neighbourhood Policy.</li> <li>• Migration and minorities are particularly timely research issues.</li> <li>• Border management is research in the connection of regional stability and economic development. Some of the countries are European Union neighbours. The border control is directly relevant for the EU.</li> <li>• Joint themes with other research projects and high complementarity.</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WEI funding 242 566 Eur</li> <li>• The list of deliverables is in line with the funding.</li> <li>• There is a danger of scattered research results as the topics are and targets are multiple.</li> <li>• Resources are spread thinly as the project focuses both on European Union and Russian borders and border-regions.</li> <li>• The country reports on migration produce new and highly relevant knowledge.</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The broadness coverage of regions and number of countries studied is difficult to successfully manage. This leads to pressures on the underlying research design.</li> <li>• Balance between in-depth and general knowledge should be carefully considered</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increases situational awareness regarding the regional border and immigration policies.</li> <li>• Policy-relevant implications.</li> <li>• The idea of 'soft security' is not adequately framed.</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Border research has become much better established and is likely to continue in the future.</li> <li>• A research project is not sustainable if not fully funded. Possibility of Academy of Finland or FP7 funding</li> <li>• The project has had a steady output of research. This level of policy relevant outputs cannot be sustained without external funding.</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large project with many target countries.</li> <li>• Researchers have done many administrative tasks.</li> <li>• The institute has a good reputation in running projects of this type. However, personnel issues can cause delays in project implementation</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project design does not indicate clear awareness of any Finnish added value, although it is intuitively clear that the Finnish border is applicable to the borders under study.</li> <li>• However, the topic is important also for the Finnish policymakers.</li> <li>• Possibilities of policy relevant knowledge transfer</li> </ul>

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?**

The strategy is a bit confusing although the topic is timely and valuable. The reasons for choosing different partners in the region are not clear. There is a sense that many choices were made by luck rather than proper research design.

**Is there a Logframe?**

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** The project has produced well formulated academic deliverables, which makes qualitative evaluation possible.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** Reporting to MFA has been relatively thorough.

**Gaps in documentation or information?**

**Areas of concern?** Relatively little consideration of cross-cutting objectives.

**Key documents considered:**

Project website

Start-up document. 28.1.2010.

Progress report. 30.11.2011.

Progress report. 29.11.2010.

Laaturyhmäkäsittely 2.10. Laajemman Euroopan Aloite: Turvallisuuskusteritoiminta ja Turvallisuus ja Kehitys-Tutkimus 2009-2013.

Turvallisuuskusteri, presentation, ITÄ-20

Seurantayhteenvedo. 20.11.2010. WEI/Turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus.

List of ongoing projects 2012.

List of events during 2012.

Memo of Advisory board meeting. 9.2.2012.

3.12.2010. Turvallisuuskusteri ja turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus 2009-2013.

Laaturyhmän käsittely. 2.10.2009. Laajemman Euroopan aloite: turvallisuuskusteritoiminta ja turvallisuus ja kehitys -tutkimus 2009-2013. ITÄ20.

Kehitysyhteistyön laaturyhmä 25/2009.

Wider Europe – regional Security Report. Western CIS – South Caucasus – Central Asia Biannual Review. Issue NO. 1, 11 Feb 2011.

Pan-Europe conflict resolution and geopolitical rivalries in the operating environment for security and development policies in the states within Wider Europe Tampere Peace Research Institute	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good match to Finnish Develt Policy</li> <li>• High complementarity with other projects. Shared resources and mutual coordination.</li> <li>• Ties low and high politics well together.</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WEI funding 242 427 Eur</li> <li>• One of the best articulated deliverables to funding relationship.</li> </ul>

**Pan-Europe conflict resolution and geopolitical rivalries in the operating environment for security and development policies in the states within Wider Europe**

**Tampere Peace Research Institute**

<b>Evaluation criterion</b>	<b>Analysis, issues arising</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The list of deliverables is longer than what would be justified by the funding given to the project.</li> <li>• High number of exchanges and guest lectures.</li> <li>• Conference publication, <i>Euro - Asian Security after 2010: challenges and perspectives of cooperation</i>, is qualitatively an outstanding work that indicates high level efficiency.</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clear benchmark project.</li> <li>• Held in high regard by many stakeholders.</li> <li>• Policy relevant also in the high political sense. The inclusion of geopolitical dimension.</li> <li>• Very well articulated research design.</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good and well organized research contacts to the local institutions.</li> <li>• Excellent collaborative network within Finland.</li> <li>• Has greatly enhanced the Finnish expertise</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on pre-existing research contacts and expertise.</li> <li>• Good chances of being sustainable project as long as the key people remain committed to the research and the University of Tampere will continue to facilitate their work.</li> <li>• Good chances of attracting future funding.</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nimble operation.</li> <li>• Very well administrated.</li> <li>• Detailed reporting.</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses the past Finnish experiences as a model.</li> <li>• Builds Finnish expertise in the regions.</li> </ul>

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?** Yes, well articulated strategy. The most meticulous research design. Very experienced principle investigator.

**Is there a Logframe?** A clearly articulated logframe

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** The list of deliverable is detailed impressive and allows for proper academic evaluation and assessment of quality. The best balance between efficiency and results/output.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** Reporting and website are exemplary.

**Gaps in documentation or information?**

**Areas of concern?** No

**Key documents considered:**

Project webpage

Progress Report 11/2011

Progress Report 11/2010

Laaturyhmäkäsittely 2.10. Laajemman Euroopan Aloite: Turvallisuuskusteritoiminta ja Turvallisuus ja Kehitys-Tutkimus 2009-2013.

Turvallisuuskusteri, presentation, ITÄ-20

Seurantayhteenvedo. 20.11.2010. WEI/Turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus.

List of ongoing projects 2012.

List of events during 2012.

Memo of Advisory board meeting. 9.2.2012.

3.12.2010. Turvallisuuskusteri ja turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus 2009-2013.

Laaturyhmän käsittely. 2.10.2009. Laajemman Euroopan aloite: turvallisuuskusteritoiminta ja

turvallisuus ja kehitys -tutkimus 2009-2013. ITÄ20.

Kehitysyhteistyön laaturyhmä 25/2009.

Wider Europe – regional Security Report. Western CIS – South Caucasus – Central Asia Biannual Review. Issue NO. 1, 11 Feb 2011.

Tapri conference programme: ” Security and Development in a Complex Policy Environment: Perspectives from Moldova, Armenia, Kazakhstan and Tadzhikistan”. 29 - 30 May 2012. Tampere.

Start-up report. 27.01.2010

Environmental Security, Mining and Good Governance University of Eastern Finland	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project in line with Finnish Development policy.</li> <li>• Clearly articulated emphasis with the needs of local communities.</li> <li>• Addresses several cross-cutting objectives.</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Synergies with other projects at the University of Eastern Finland</li> <li>• WEI funding 427 719 Eur</li> <li>• Justifiable list of deliverables. If carried out as planned the project delivers good value for the money.</li> <li>• High efficiency will be reached if the project manages to enhance natural resource use and conflict mediation; and facilitates both community and private sector involvement.</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Milestone deliverable: a more robust methodology with a flexible and effective toolkit to assess and communicate issues of environment and security.</li> <li>• Vital topic since many of the conflicts at the local level are mining related.</li> <li>• Important examination of the relationship between the local communities and the private multinational mining companies</li> </ul>

**Environmental Security, Mining and Good Governance**  
**University of Eastern Finland**

<b>Evaluation criterion</b>	<b>Analysis, issues arising</b>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has developed good networks and contacts.</li> <li>• Highly relevant development of conflict prevention tools.</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Despite a good research plan, the sustainability seems difficult to achieve.</li> <li>• The toolkit for the local level mining related conflict prevention/resolution conflict cannot be updated if the project discontinues.</li> <li>• It is not clear how the locals are given adequate know-how to continue updating the toolkit on their own.</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The network of partners is somewhat complex and has not been articulated fully.</li> <li>• The administration seems to be complex to a degree that one wonders how much researchers' time is consumed with practicalities and administrative tasks.</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well articulated project with a limited scope that can be fulfilled.</li> <li>• Potential for highlighting the Finnish knowhow and expertise.</li> </ul>

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?**

One the one hand, mineral exports are critical for the future development of countries involved. On the other, the mining activity easily leads to local level frictions. The project brings these two facets together in quite efficient way. The strategic vision is clear.

**Is there a Logframe?**

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** Evaluation is based on qualitative assessment of the various deliverable. In this case, the usefulness of the toolkit is of vital interest. The written materials provided do not clearly spell out how its effectiveness should be evaluated.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?**

**Gaps in documentation or information?**

**Areas of concern?**

**Key documents considered:**

Honkonen, Tuula (2012). Environmental security, mining and good governance: Mining Regulation in the Kyrgyz Republic. University of Eastern Finland. WP (April 2012).  
Tender for the Environment and Security Theme. Environmental security, mining and good governance. Development research of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2010.  
Environmental Security, Mining and Good Governance. First Progress Report. 30 November 2012.  
Environmental security, mining and good governance, 1 page introduction.  
Project presentation. November 2011. Environmental security, mining and good governance.  
Laaturyhmäkäsittely 2.10. Laajemman Euroopan Aloite: Turvallisuuskusteritoiminta ja Turvallisuus ja Kehitys-Tutkimus 2009-2013.

Turvallisuusklasteri, presentation, ITÄ-20

Seurantayhteenvedo. 20.11.2010. WEI/Turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus.

List of ongoing projects 2012.

List of events during 2012.

Memo of Advisory board meeting. 9.2.2012.

3.12.2010. Turvallisuusklasteri ja turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus 2009-2013.

Laaturyhmän käsittely. 2.10.2009. Laajemman Euroopan aloite: turvallisuusklasteroiminta ja turvallisuus ja kehitys -tutkimus 2009-2013. ITÄ20.

Kehitysyhteistyön laaturyhmä 25/2009.

Wider Europe – Regional Security Report. Western CIS – South Caucasus – Central Asia Biannual Review. Issue NO. 1, 11 Feb 2011.

EU – Central Asia Monitoring: Security and Development Karelian Institute	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vital evaluation of EU's security and development policies towards Central Asia.</li> <li>• Large projects with multiple funding sources.</li> <li>• Connecting directly with the European level research activities.</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WEI funding 599 019 Eur</li> <li>• Highly efficient with the number of partners delivering a steady stream of deliverables.</li> <li>• Good binding to the European level activities.</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benchmark project</li> <li>• Many reputable (e.g. Frida) partners can enable effective knowledge transfers.</li> <li>• Wide collaborative networks.</li> <li>• Synergies and actionable knowledge development.</li> <li>• Broad monitoring with credible partners.</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To enhance EU's policies towards the region</li> <li>• European level research collaboration and bring added value to the region and to Finland through this interaction.</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainability is based on multiple sources of funding.</li> <li>• Indicates a collaborative project that should be continued also in the future.</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management and administration appear good on paper.</li> <li>• Complex project with much burden on the administration.</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finland has always promoted transparent evaluation. The project underlines this goal.</li> <li>• Transfer of knowhow to Finland.</li> <li>• Connecting the Finnish added value with the European level discussions.</li> <li>• Allowing the access for the regional partners to the European research and policy debates.</li> </ul>

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?**

The project evaluation EU's policies. As such, the project design is easy to comprehend and its strategic vision and place are well articulated.

**Is there a Logframe? Yes****How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?**

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** Evaluation studies have their own measures that can be verified.

**Gaps in documentation or information?**

**Areas of concern?** Some of the cross-cutting objectives could be further stressed such as gender and HIV/AIDS.

**Key documents considered:**

EUCAM Water Report Outline, April 20

Contacts in Central Asia

EUCAM-Security and Development (SD). First Interim Report for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland. 29th November 2011.

EUCAM-Security and Development (SD). A research proposal for Finland's Wider Europe Initiative. 1 January 2011 – 31 December 2012

Progress report. 23.3.2011.

Laaturyhmäkäsittely 2.10. Laajemman Euroopan Aloite: Turvallisuuskusteritoiminta ja Turvallisuus ja Kehitys-Tutkimus 2009-2013.

Turvallisuuskusteri, presentation, ITÄ-20

Seurantayhteenveto. 20.11.2010. WEI/Turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus.

List of ongoing projects 2012.

List of events during 2012.

Memo of Advisory board meeting. 9.2.2012.

3.12.2010. Turvallisuuskusteri ja turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus 2009-2013.

Laaturyhmän käsittely. 2.10.2009. Laajemman Euroopan aloite: turvallisuuskusteritoiminta ja turvallisuus ja kehitys -tutkimus 2009-2013. ITÄ20.

Kehitysyhteistyön laaturyhmä 25/2009.

Wider Europe – regional Security Report. Western CIS – South Caucasus – Central Asia Biannual Review. Issue No. 1, 11 Feb 2011.

**National regulation and Corporate Social Responsibility in Mining in Central Asia**

**University of Eastern Finland**

**Analysis, issues arising**

**Evaluation criterion**

**National regulation and Corporate Social Responsibility in Mining in Central Asia**  
**University of Eastern Finland**

<b>Evaluation criterion</b>	<b>Analysis, issues arising</b>
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Synergies with the other project in the same themes.</li> <li>• Complementary with other projects of the security cluster.</li> <li>• Important topic since mining activities correlate with increase in conflicts and tensions at the social/local level.</li> <li>• Corporate responsibility is important topic since many the target countries' legislations do not function properly.</li> <li>• Arguably, there could be too much overlap with the other mining project. These could have been combined</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WEI funding 120 724 Euro</li> <li>• Combines with another project's experiences and staff. High synergy.</li> <li>• Well run and focussed research project.</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project has been organizing events – seminars and exchanges - in the target countries to examine the social issues of mineral extraction.</li> <li>• The central idea of the project is well articulated and persuasive. However, the actual implementation possibilities seem a little more demanding than in the Eastern Universities other ongoing project</li> <li>• The issue of CSR provides a qualitatively different perspective to the security cluster.</li> <li>• Emphasis so far has been on Finnish language publications and conference presentations</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The legislation related to mining leaves much to be desired. The idea is that corporate social responsibility might help to alleviate the problem.</li> <li>• Developing the practices of corporate social responsibility might act as a conflict prevention tool.</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project is potentially very important also academically.</li> <li>• This might allow for it to receive funding from other sources.</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The management appears to be running efficiently.</li> <li>• Administration at the University of Eastern Finland has the required experience to run multiple projects simultaneously.</li> <li>• Heavy admin workload on the researchers.</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contributes to the Finnish soft law tradition. Allows Finnish researcher to demonstrate the relevancy of their knowledge.</li> <li>• Development of research networks to the region.</li> </ul>

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?**

Yes, the central research ideas are well articulated and are in synergy with the WEI's overall goals.

**Is there a Logframe? Yes**

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** The cross-cutting objectives have been noticed. However, some of them could be more strongly integrated into the research design.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** The web page of the project reflects well reporting practice that the management team has adapted. The project is well documented.

#### Gaps in documentation or information?

#### Areas of concern?

#### Key documents considered:

National Regulation and Corporate Social Responsibility in Mining in Central Asia Research project, 2011-2012. University of Eastern Finland in association with Gaia Consulting Oy.

National Regulation and Corporate Social Responsibility in Mining in Central Asia. Security and Development research of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2011. Proposal for the Minerals for Development theme. University of Eastern Finland. In association with Gaia Consulting Oy.

Laaturyhmäkäsitely 2.10. Laajemman Euroopan Aloite: Turvallisuuskusteritoiminta ja Turvallisuus ja Kehitys-Tutkimus 2009-2013.

Turvallisuuskusteri, presentation, ITÄ-20

Seurantayhteenveto. 20.11.2010. WEI/Turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus.

List of ongoing projects 2012.

List of events during 2012.

Memo of Advisory board meeting. 9.2.2012.

3.12.2010. Turvallisuuskusteri ja turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus 2009-2013.

Laaturyhmän käsittely. 2.10.2009. Laajemman Euroopan aloite: turvallisuuskusteritoiminta ja turvallisuus ja kehitys -tutkimus 2009-2013. ITÄ20.

Kehitysyhteistyön laaturyhmä 25/2009.

Wider Europe – Regional Security Report. Western CIS – South Caucasus – Central Asia Biannual Review. Issue NO. 1, 11 Feb 2011.

Analysing and comparing regional security implications of micro-, mesa- and macro-level water management collaboration and policy options Aalto University	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ties in with WEI's other projects in the security/research cluster.</li> <li>• The security-link is approached yet it remains under-developed.</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WEI funding 239 430 Euro</li> <li>• Project has just started. However, if the intended list of deliverables are carried out, there is clear value for the granted funding.</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Just starting. However, the synergies with the cross-cutting theme of water is well explicated in the research design</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential to reduced future water conflicts in the region. Building of methodologies.</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build local capacities and can become sustainable if adequately implemented</li> </ul>

Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Just starting, but experienced management.</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finnish water expertise is relevant in the implementation of the program.</li> <li>• Is in coherence with other components of WEI.</li> </ul>

### **Strategy – is the strategy clear?**

The water issues are clearly potential causes of local conflicts. The strategic formulation seems adequate and relatively solid.

### **Is there a Logframe?**

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** Quite good quality project document. The cross-cutting objectives should be taken better into account.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?**

### **Gaps in documentation or information?**

### **Areas of concern?**

#### **Key documents considered:**

Project website

Laaturyhmäkäsittely 2.10. Laajemman Euroopan Aloite: Turvallisuuskusteritoiminta ja Turvallisuus ja Kehitys-Tutkimus 2009-2013.

Turvallisuuskusteri, presentation, ITÄ-20

Seurantayhteenveto. 20.11.2010. WEI/Turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus.

List of ongoing projects 2012.

List of events during 2012.

Memo of Advisory board meeting. 9.2.2012.

3.12.2010. Turvallisuuskusteri ja turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus 2009-2013.

Laaturyhmän käsittely. 2.10.2009. Laajemman Euroopan aloite: turvallisuuskusteritoiminta ja turvallisuus ja kehitys -tutkimus 2009-2013. ITÄ20.

Kehitysyhteistyön laaturyhmä 25/2009.

Wider Europe – regional Security Report. Western CIS – South Caucasus – Central Asia Biannual Review. Issue NO. 1, 11 Feb 2011.

## Completed Projects

Security and Development Research within the Wider Europe Initiative Security Cluster, Pan Europe Institute, 2010-2011	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the first Security Cluster activities.</li> <li>• The relevance from the perspective of WEI was clear.</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WEI funding 111 000 Euro</li> <li>• The biannual review was a milestone deliverable. However, its content was underwhelming.</li> <li>• More networking and collaborative should have been arranged besides the two seminars.</li> <li>• Value for money should have focused more on starting the security cluster research with a well planned and focused project.</li> <li>• The list of deliverables and their quality do not indicate a good value for the money.</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project was a pioneering one. However, it managed to publish a biannual review titled 'Wider Europe – Regional Security Report'. The wide scope of the review made it less successful as a focused research endeavour.</li> <li>• One off exercise that should have continued in a more refined form as it developed situational awareness over the whole of WEI.</li> <li>• The deliverables were qualitatively satisfactory/weak. They did not have any lasting benefit</li> <li>• According to the interviews in the field and in Finland, the project did not lead to significant lasting benefits</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collection of knowledge on WEI and building of networks as well as research capacity.</li> <li>• Strengthening of collaborative circles.</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The idea of forming overall awareness concerning the regions of WEI as well as the Finnish expertise should have been sustainable. However, the project seems to have had no sustained design.</li> <li>• A project of this type could have been a reflection of WEI's research activity in the future. It included significant potentials for collaborative network development. Yet, these potentials were left partially unfulfilled when the funding stopped.</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project design and its implementation were weak in ambition.</li> <li>• The project could have been a seed investment into wider collaborative circle that could have benefited all the other projects.</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project developed some research networks with the regional experts that are still ongoing.</li> <li>• It also brought together researchers in Finland.</li> </ul>

### Strategy – is the strategy clear?

The strategy fit well into the basic goals of WEI. The initial mapping of the key issue was a good way of starting the security cluster activities.

### Is there a Logframe?

The application and plan did not include a well detailed logframe.

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** The monitoring activities seem to have been limited to the usual reporting. The reiterative process seemed to have been disregarded in favour of implementing the minimum one-off activities.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** Although this project could have provided a framework for a networking support structure, it became one-off exercise with no lasting benefit.

**Gaps in documentation or information?** No significant gaps.

**Areas of concern?** The sustainability aspect should have been more clearly spelled out. This project could have been a strategic milestone project.

**Key documents considered:**

Biannual reviews Wider Europe – Regional Security Report (Special edition on energy security, Special edition on socioeconomic development)

Project's webpages

Final report covering the project period 2010-2011.

Laaturyhmäkäsittely 2.10. LAAJEMMAN EUROOPAN ALOITE: TURVALLISUUSKLUSTERITOIMINTA JA TURVALLISUUS JA KEHITYS-TUTKIMUS 2009-2013.

Turvallisuuskusteri, presentation, ITÄ-20

Seurantayhteenvedo. 20.11.2010. WEI/Turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus.

List of ongoing projects 2012.

List of events during 2012.

Memo of Advisory board meeting. 9.2.2012.

3.12.2010. Turvallisuuskusteri ja turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus 2009-2013.

Laaturyhmän käsittely. 2.10.2009. Laajemman Euroopan aloite: turvallisuuskusteritoiminta ja turvallisuus ja kehitys -tutkimus 2009-2013. ITÄ20.

Kehitysyhteistyön laaturyhmä 25/2009.

<b>Post-Graduate Diploma in International Relations and European Integration</b> <b>Estonian School of Diplomacy</b> <b>Analysis, issues arising</b>	
<b>Evaluation criterion</b>	
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finland funds the program for students from Moldova and Georgia.</li> <li>Students receive intensive training in Tallinn and a field trip to Helsinki. The experience is likely to foster knowhow concerning good governance and European open democratic societies.</li> <li>Relevant for the capacity building dimension of WEI</li> <li>High synergies between EU's eastern partnership program and Sweden's (Sida) contribution to the same project.</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For 2010-11, the proposal was to support 5 students for one year, at 14385 Euro/per student. For 2011-2014, proposal was to provide scholarship for 15 students at 15984 EUR/student.</li> <li>Cost benefits of repeating the programme in theory, but in practice it seems that the costs are slightly increasing due to additional support costs.</li> <li>The value for money is high. However, the project should hand over the responsibilities for funding to the Estonian authorities in the near future.</li> </ul>

<b>Post-Graduate Diploma in International Relations and European Integration</b> <b>Estonian School of Diplomacy</b> <b>Analysis, issues arising</b>	
<b>Evaluation criterion</b>	
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has been ongoing for a number of years with the same if not identical program structure.</li> <li>• The education of decision makers to the practices of good governance is a highly important activity.</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction of further conflicts by building capacity for good governance.</li> <li>• Educating a new generation of decision makers gives new promise.</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diploma programme requires outside funding if the Estonian government is not going to fund in full.</li> <li>• The contribution from the participant countries might lead to better sustainability and sharing of the ownership. If the countries benefit from the program and value it, they should also contribute to it.</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Schools management and administration are well tested.</li> <li>• Smoothly run nimble operation.</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Finnish contribution is visible in the program leaflets.</li> <li>• The Finnish added value could be made better by including more Finnish experts in the teaching and by investing in the marketing of the program.</li> </ul>

#### **Strategy – is the strategy clear?**

The basic idea of linking education to security is generally well tested. The program has a relatively long history and high success rate.

#### **Is there a Logframe? No**

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** The reporting seems to be functioning efficiently. Multiple other donors are participating as well. Much oversight and reporting.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** The program has remained basically the same since it was started in 2006. Finland decided to participate a few years later. The reporting is adequate and evaluations are listened to.

#### **Gaps in documentation or information?**

**Areas of concern/ suggestions?** The Finnish funded students should receive an internship in the Finnish institutions over the summer after the program ends. This would be relatively easy to arrange and would bring much Finnish added value to the benefit of the students.

#### **Key documents considered:**

Agreement between the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Eesti Diplomaatide Kooli Sihtasutus 26.7.2010.

Project proposal to the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, March, 2010.

Final report covering the project period 2010-2011. June 6<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

Final report covering the project period 2008-2010, June 7<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

Laaturyhmäkäsittely 2.10. LAAJEMMAN EUROOPAN ALOITE: TURVALLISUUSKLUSTERITOIMINTA JA TURVALLISUUS JA KEHITYS-TUTKIMUS 2009-2013.

Turvallisuusklasteri, presentation, ITÄ-20

Seurantayhteenveto. 20.11.2010. WEI/Turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus.

List of ongoing projects 2012.

List of events during 2012.

Memo of Advisory board meeting. 9.2.2012.

3.12.2010. Turvallisuusklasteri ja turvallisuus ja kehitys –tutkimus 2009-2013.

Laaturyhmän käsittely. 2.10.2009. Laajemman Euroopan aloite: turvallisuusklasteroiminta ja turvallisuus ja kehitys -tutkimus 2009-2013. ITÄ20.

Kehitysyhteistyön laaturyhmä 25/2009.

Wider Europe – regional Security Report. Western CIS – South Caucasus – Central Asia Biannual Review. Issue No. 1, 11 Feb 2011.

## **FinWater WEI – Component of Support to the Water Sector**

### **Analysis of individual activities**

<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Assessment of Transboundary Rivers, Lakes and Groundwaters Analysis, issues arising</b>	
<b>Evaluation criterion</b>	
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good synergy with Fin Dev Policy &amp; WEI, working regionally on environment and security</li> <li>• Good synergies with Central Asia water sector policy</li> <li>• Cross-cutting objectives reflecting by environmental protecting and water resources development</li> <li>• Potential for links to other WEI activities due to working with water</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Euro 533 000 budget from MFA</li> <li>• Most of project costs were for seventh "Environment for Europe" Ministerial Conference (21-23 September 2011) in Astana, Kazakhstan, as well as bringing technical experts together for international meetings, working groups and publishing costs</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 2<sup>nd</sup> Assessment has been highly praised by participating countries &amp; the international community</li> <li>• Broad reach of the activities with more than 140 transboundary rivers, 25 lakes, 200 groundwater occurrences and 25 wetlands were assessed in the pan-European region</li> <li>• A number of promotion and dissemination activities have been undertaken since the publishing.</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall objective was to support to better understanding water resources situation in the Central Asia – this better understanding is now used as a platform for the future development – including the 2013-2015 Water Convention work platform. New work will build on the current findings – for instance a move into work on the water-food-energy nexus.</li> <li>• The assessment led to increased awareness at political and public level, as well as capacity development among technical experts – including opportunities to build relationships across borders</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many of EECCA countries will be continuing assessment of their national water budgets</li> <li>• A new international assessment will be undertaken in some years' time</li> <li>• The project results will strengthen country economic and environmental plans</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full 450-page report and a 20-page Executive Summary, published both in English and in Russian, as well as a CD-ROM containing both publications delivered</li> <li>• Link to Finnish KGZ-water, ICI project</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link to Finnish ICI projects</li> <li>• Finnish expert working in UNECE on the assessment coordination</li> <li>• Director of SYKE is head of Monitoring Committee in UNECE</li> <li>• Good support from Finnish Embassy in Astana, including participation in the 'Environment for Europe' Ministerial Conference (21-23 September 2011).</li> </ul>

<b>Evaluation criterion</b>	<b>Analysis, issues arising</b>
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feasible fit with Fin Development Policy (economic development, environmental protection)</li> <li>• Link with WEI very clear</li> <li>• Good collaboration with UN WHO and FinWaterWEI Capacity Building on Water monitoring and management in Georgia and</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget is 0.3 mEuro from MFA</li> <li>• MFA support contributes to good coordination</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparation Chu River Management plan in Kyrgyzstan is very positive</li> <li>• Revision of Water Code in Georgia to help with development of national water policy</li> <li>• Georgia should be ratifying UNECE Water Convention, but delays are damaging progress</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Kyrgyzstan Chu River basin has been established and will be disseminated for other river basins</li> <li>• In Georgia the legislative and water policy changes are going slowly. Due to radical changes in the Government, organization of the first Steering Committee meeting was delayed</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Kyrgyzstan IWRM will be sustainable if Chu River basin plan would be implemented in an accurate manner</li> <li>• In Georgia IWRM implementation depends on the political will of the government</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding from MFA Finland administered through SYKE</li> <li>• Directly implemented by UNECE in the both countries, with reports going to SYKE</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Georgia would be potential role because Finland has strong reputation in water monitoring issues</li> <li>• In Kyrgyzstan it well-demonstrated by TA for Finnish IWRM approach</li> <li>• SYKE has provided Finnish technical advisors to processes</li> </ul>

<b>Evaluation criterion</b>	<b>EUWI/NDP-WSS Support to Water Management Analysis, issues arising</b>
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was already running prior to WEI and very closely with OECD</li> <li>• Well aligned with Fin Dev Policy 2009</li> <li>• Project sounds good on paper. Having 2 components and 5 activities, the project well argued EECCA country demands</li> <li>• Cross-cutting objectives are reflected by environment, disaster risks and governance</li> <li>• Countries like Azerbaijan have sufficient budget for preparation NWRM strategy by advisory services of this programme</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget is 0.7 mEuro</li> <li>• Cost effective issues raised by country inputs, especially WSS infrastructure development and market-oriented instruments adapted to water planning and management processes</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lots of institutional problems, partly due to structural adjustment in mainline ministries</li> <li>• Real implementation only beginning now</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objective well-demonstrated - best practices for “polluter pay” principles</li> <li>• Water legislation objective will help support institutional changes</li> </ul>

EUWI/NDP-WSS Support to Water Management Analysis, issues arising	
Evaluation criterion	
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible if all activities assigned would be successfully implemented</li> <li>• Activity 2.3 already implemented in Azerbaijan but outcomes still remain very weak</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding from MFA Finland administered through SYKE</li> <li>• OECD/EAP Task Force prepares reports for SYKE</li> <li>• Directly implemented by Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Azerbaijan</li> <li>• Ukraine WSS services provision required urgent improvement specially in the eastern part secondary towns in the heavy industrialized and urbanized areas by decentralization, restructuring and PPP development</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None evident, except the involvement of Finnish experts from SYKE in workshops and consultancies (for instance, for the National Water Strategy development process in Azerbaijan by commenting the draft Water Strategy and by providing consultation to national experts and officials on further development of the strategy during the field visit to Azerbaijan)</li> </ul>

Promoting adaptation to Climate Change in Transboundary Waters in the EECCA region Analysis, issues arising	
Evaluation criterion	
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both components have coherent with Fin Dev Policy and WEI objectives. These components focus on environment and security overall objectives</li> <li>• Good synergy with ENVSEC Neman River pilot projects</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finnish budget is 0.55 mEuro over 3 years</li> <li>• Partially funded by International Water Assessment Centre (IWAC)</li> <li>• Seems quite efficient but budget will not be enough for pilot stage</li> <li>• Low money – high advisory services, no procurement of goods</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good platform for information exchange on Neman river in the on-line regime</li> <li>• Main focus on sharing of data and practices between Belarus, Lithuania and Russia</li> <li>• Knowledge management facilities are provided by feasibility study for river basin management</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main objectives of both components are to support joint river basin management between three countries</li> <li>• It would be easy to achieve data exchange on transboundary level but it will difficult to join decision making if climate change will be damaged riparian countries</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quite sustainable because long-term riparian cooperation should be provided in the future</li> <li>• The outcomes of project will be to strengthen Belarus, Lithuania and Russian Neman River basin cooperation</li> <li>• All three countries should be able to harmonize their own legal and regulatory frameworks</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding from MFA Finland administered through SYKE</li> <li>• Project outcomes of the baseline study were presented and discussed in the project meeting held in Bratislava</li> <li>• Valuable inputs from MFA sector advisor</li> <li>• For administrative support sub-basins units establishing required</li> </ul>

Promoting adaptation to Climate Change in Transboundary Waters in the EECCA region Analysis, issues arising	
Evaluation criterion	
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MFA has monitoring &amp; control role</li> <li>• The Neman River project was presented also in the meeting of the UNECE core group of climate change adaptation pilot projects, held in Geneva 23-24 November 2011.</li> </ul>

Capacity Building on Water Monitoring and Management in Georgia (ICI) Analysis, issues arising	
Evaluation criterion	
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well aligned with Finnish Dev Policy 2009 and WEI, keeping environment and security issues</li> <li>• Similar project in Kyrgyzstan on water quality monitoring</li> <li>• Well-provided the coherence with Finnish &amp; Georgian government policy, ENVSEC, the MDGs, complementarily with other donor initiatives</li> <li>• Cross-cutting objectives mentioned only in passing – in terms of ensuring access to information</li> <li>• Continuing to work on synergies and joint activities with UN, OSCE and OECD</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Euro 0.5 mill budget from Finland over 4 years</li> <li>• Significant part of aim was delivered for equipment purchasing and trainings</li> <li>• Potentially increasing the capacity building of NEA for service provided commercialization</li> <li>• NEA pay salaries for own staff trained abroad, project covers overhead</li> <li>• For the ICI projects there is an admin loading of 1,8 * daily salary of SYKE staff</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expected outcomes very positive according to most stakeholders</li> <li>• On-site demonstrations and study tours have been very useful</li> <li>• By study tour trained NEA staff is provided training for trainers for their young professionals</li> <li>• Combination of country-driven needs inside with transboundary water management on Jandar Lake outside</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential to achieve intergovernmental political dialogue via transboundary water project.</li> <li>• Objective to reduce environmental and security risks and increase the regional cooperation opportunities</li> <li>• Project creates opportunities for institutional strengthening water sector in Georgia and adapting “best practice” for other neighbour countries</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part of activities will be sustainable</li> <li>• Similar capacity building in the EECCA countries</li> <li>• Information exchange between Georgia and Azerbaijan will be continued</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No organizational changes in NEA</li> <li>• Government interested that NEA becomes independent body</li> <li>• Capacity building will be continuing for NEA equipment repairing department</li> <li>• NEA’s own training center should be established</li> </ul>

Capacity Building on Water Monitoring and Management in Georgia (ICI)	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FinWaterWEI is working in Georgia with UNDP and ENVSEC that took its assignments for own activities</li> <li>• Finnish specialists and environment institutions have very good reputation among Georgians that promoting name SYKE on regional level</li> </ul>

Water quality monitoring in the Kyrgyz Republic (ICI)	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good collaboration with UNDP GEF project</li> <li>• Coherent links to Kyrgyz sector policy as well as the Comprehensive Development Framework</li> <li>• Almost no consideration of cross-cutting objectives</li> <li>• Potential for links to other WEI activities due to working with water</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0,5 mEuro budget from Finland</li> <li>• Majority of project cost is for technical assistance, but changes are needed to increase budget for lab equipment and upgrading QA/QC performance</li> <li>• Aim delivered for TA for indicator preparing and field works. For the ICI projects there is an admin loading of 1,8 * daily salary of SYKE staff</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutionalized water quality monitoring for wastewater and cross-border water-borne substances is difficult due to political conflicts</li> <li>• International study tour &amp; training to increase human resources development of NWQMP</li> <li>• Progress now good with improving administrative and legislative backup</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objective is to increase capacity of National IWRM policy dialogue and water quality monitoring to provide information, lab quality assurance and environmental protection</li> <li>• Too early to comment</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TA for preparing indicator-based assessment and relevant reporting will sustainable</li> <li>• QA/QC water quality lab will be sustainable if it timely have surveillance and auditing provided by international accredited body</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most difficult issue is administrative support and organizational constraints by governmental institutions created. Also money transactions between Finland and Kyrgyzstan have been problematic and have increased the administrative workload substantially</li> <li>• UNDP local office together with EU Delegation in Almaty supervises the project,</li> <li>• Good support from Finnish Embassy in Astana, incl. participation</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial project design done by Finnish expert, and close link with SYKE</li> <li>• Link to IWRM NPD process</li> </ul>

Improving Water and Health in EECCA region	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising

Improving Water and Health in EECCA region	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good collaboration with FinWaterWEI project</li> <li>• Coherent links to Fin Dev Policy</li> <li>• Almost no consideration of cross-cutting objectives</li> <li>• Potential for links to UNDP activities due to working with water</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Euro 0.3 mill budget from Finland but total budget is 0.44 mEuros</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with local funds to increase effectiveness</li> <li>• The project has proceeded as planned. The first interim report of the UNECE will be completed in March 2012.</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overall objective is to strengthen capacity of countries to implement the Protocol on Water and Health and in particular to set targets and target dates under the Protocol and to implement measures to achieve them</li> <li>• Too early to comment</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Water and Health project implemented by UNECE will be help to achieve sustainability the EECCA countries in their efforts to improve their water and health situation</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding from MFA Finland administered through SYKE</li> <li>• Each country involved would be improving administration and strengthening management capacity</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designed by FinWaterWEI</li> </ul>

Supporting transboundary dialogue between Kazakhstan and the People's Republic of China on the Ili-Balkhash River Basin	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well aligned with Fin Dev Policy 2009</li> <li>• Very good synergy with 2<sup>nd</sup> Assessment of Transboundary rivers, lakes and groundwaters project</li> <li>• Reasonable match with Finnish Dev policy and ENVSEC programme</li> <li>• Lowest consideration cross-cutting objectives</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Being the component of Promoting Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) and Fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia with total budget 5.4 mUSD co-financed by EU and UNDP</li> <li>• Component budget is 0.1 mEuro from FinWaterWEI</li> <li>• Potentially big water saving by IWRM implementation</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge management and sharing under the Joint Commission and among different stakeholders to improve their awareness of existing issues and to provide a sound base for IWRM.</li> <li>• Results very positive for set up ground for ongoing discussions on water-sharing arrangements and intensified cooperation activities in the basin.</li> <li>• However this is a high risk project as Chinese counterparts not very committed to collaboration yet</li> <li>• Enough flexibility for combination with ENVSEC frameworks</li> </ul>

Supporting transboundary dialogue between Kazakhstan and the People's Republic of China on the Ili-Balkhash River Basin	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main objective of the component is to strengthen the work of the joint Kazakh-Chinese Commission which is designed to carry out the management of transboundary basins.</li> <li>• Potentially sensitive for security issues by transboundary dialogue</li> <li>• The whole seems to be bigger than parts, i.e. there is potential for refunding added value by EU and UNDP</li> <li>• Rational water sharing between Kazakhstan and China</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many activities relating directly with transboundary river basin dialogue will be sustainable</li> <li>• The joint Kazakh-Chinese Commission will be interested to provide permanent bilateral river basin-based cooperation owing to water scarcity rising in the projecting area</li> <li>• Methods of working and IWRM plan between stakeholders in riparian countries will be valuable for conflict mitigation &amp; should be sustainable gains</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding from MFA Finland administered through SYKE</li> <li>• UNDP implementing the project</li> <li>• New institution of JKCC will take responsibility for administrating the dialogue process</li> <li>• Very problematic to get more donors</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FinWaterWEI has been involved to co-funding of project</li> </ul>

Administration and Support programme by SYKE	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly relevant Fin Dev Policy 2009 &amp; WEI, as touching on issues of environment &amp; security</li> <li>• Considerable synergy with other WEI activities, eg. ENVSEC &amp; GTK ICI</li> <li>• Close involvement with UN organisations &amp; other donors via water convention activities &amp; others</li> <li>• General suited to participating governments, although there are some conflicts</li> <li>• Relevant inputs to Astana Environment for Europe Ministerial Meeting and in particular for the preparations of its Finnish side event "Finnish Water Forum" as well as Stockholm Water Week</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Euro 0.7 from Finland is 4 years budget</li> <li>• Total Budget of 4 895 000 Euro over 2009-13, including the separate indicative budget of approx 0,7 mEuro for the support &amp; admin services</li> <li>• Expenditure by end 2011 was 2 612 644€ (53,4 % of planned)</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main focus monitoring of the activities through assessment of activity reports received from the implementing organizations, through participation in relevant meetings and through regular contacts with the implementing organizations</li> <li>• The Kyrgyz ICI has been delayed, but is now proceeding</li> <li>• Political situation in Georgia has meant some delays in National Policy Dialogues and Water Convention work</li> </ul>

Administration and Support programme by SYKE Analysis, issues arising	
Evaluation criterion	
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The overall objective is to provide monitoring of activities of all key players by reporting, meeting and regular contacts</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Probably quite sustainable as too limited budget to create dependency</li> <li>The project outcomes should serve as good networking opportunities between stakeholders</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local actors are involved in individual projects. The ICI projects are implemented directly by SYKE</li> <li>Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE) is responsible for program management &amp; consulting services. The MFA has a monitoring &amp; control role. There is some involvement of the MFA Water Advisor, but not much.</li> <li>The project steering group are MFA, Ministry of Environment &amp; SYKE. A broader Advisory Group includes Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Social Affairs, Helsinki University of Technology, Finnish Water Forum &amp; other agencies &amp; institutions</li> <li>FinWaterWEI has supported the Astana Environment for Europe Ministerial Meeting.</li> <li>Also the World Water Week in Stockholm in August and its side event required both preparations and participation from the Administration Unit</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Involvement of SYKE brings direct link to Finnish experience via experts and twinning of institutions</li> <li>SYKE experts are directly involved as experts in FinWaterWEI activities</li> </ul>

### List of background documents reviewed

Lähte, Laajemman Euroopan aloite; vesisektorin strategisen vaikuttamisen ohjelma 2009-2013; hallinnointisopimus Suomen ympäristökeskus SYKE:n kanssa 20.5.2012, HEL8207-36

Assignment for the Services of Governmental Authorities/Institutions, Contract 1.1.2010-31.12.2013, 10.5.2010, HEL8207-33

Annex 6:1 Project Brief Second Assessment of Transboundary Rivers, Lakes and Groundwaters in the UNECE Region HEL8207-36\_2\_2010

Annex 7 Summary of the Programme Results 2011, FinWaterWEI One Pager

EECCA Strategy Framework Programme, Logical framework, ANNEX 1, HEL8207-56\_2\_2009

The Water Sector in the EECCA countries Annex 4, HEL8207-56\_5\_2009

Water & Environmental Policy situation in the EECCA countries, Annex 5, HEL8207-56\_6\_2009

Proposal for Administration and Support of the EECCA Water Sector Cooperation Programme under the Wider Europe Initiative, Annex 6, 3.10.2009, HEL8207-56\_7\_2009

Laaturyhmän pöytäkirja, Laajemman Euroopan aloite: vesisektorin strategisen vaikuttamisen ohjelma 2009-2013, 17.11.2009, HEL7219-48

Laaturyhmän hanke esitys, Laajemman Euroopan aloite: vesisektorin strategisen vaikuttamisen ohjelma 2009-2013, 4.11.2009, HEL8207-56

Kokousmuistio, EECCA strategisen vaikuttamisen vesiohjelman ohjausryhmän kokous, 24.4.2010 (1 /2010), 30.4.2010

EECCA Water Sector Support Strategy Framework Programme, Logical framework;

EECCA Countries, Basic Facts (source: BBC Country Profile), 2007;

EECCA countries Water Support Strategy, The Water Sector in the EECCA countries, 2007;

Progress of the ongoing activities and the links to the strategy and cross-cutting objectives, FinWaterWEI Strategic Cooperation Programme and its bases, including cross-cutting themes of the Finnish development policy, EUWI, 2009;

Progress of the ongoing activities, EUWI, 2011;

Water & Environmental Policy situation in the EECCA countries, EUWI, 2008;

Project Brief Second Assessment of Transboundary Rivers, Lakes and Groundwaters in the UNECE Region, UNECE, 2009;

Project Brief National Policy Dialogues on Integrated Water Resources Management Under the EU Water Initiative's Component for EECCA in Kyrgyzstan and Georgia, UNECE, 2009;

Project Brief OECD/EAP Task Force Support to Water Management Policies in Eastern Europe, Caucasus And Central Asia, OECD, 2009;

Integrated Water Resources Management in Central Asia and Southern Caucasus: Capacity Building of New Generation of Experts and Researchers, GWP/CACENA, 2009;

Project Brief, Improving Health in Armenia Through Target Setting to Ensure Sustainable Water Management, Access to Safe Water and Adequate Sanitation, FinDPP, 2007;

Project Brief, Promoting adaptation to climate change in transboundary basins in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA), UNECE, MFA, 2010;

Minute of the Second Board and Working Groups Meeting of donors in Georgia, UNDP, Feb 2011;

Project Brief, GWP CACENA Network Activities - in the context of the GWP Strategy 2009-2013;

Project Brief, Environmental Monitoring and Assessment in Central Asia (Kyrgyz Republic), MFA, 2009;

Project Brief, Rehabilitation and Modernization of Water Monitoring System in Georgia (Needs Full ICI Project Document Development), SYKE, 2009;

Strategic Programme for Water Sector Support to EECCA countries, MFA, 2009-2013;

Administration and Support Programme, MFA, Annex 6, 2011;

Administration And Support of the Strategic Cooperation Programme for Finland's Water Sector Support to The EECCA Countries, 1 Interim Report, FinWaterWEI, 2010;

Administration And Support of the Strategic Cooperation Programme for Finland's Water Sector Support to The EECCA Countries, 2 Interim Report, FinWaterWEI, 2010;

Administration And Support of the Strategic Cooperation Programme for Finland's Water Sector Support to The EECCA Countries, 3 Interim Report, FinWaterWEI, 2011;

Administration And Support of the Strategic Cooperation Programme for Finland's Water Sector Support to The EECCA Countries, 4 Interim Report, FinWaterWEI, 2011;

Strategic Cooperation Programme for Finland's Water Sector Support to the EECCA countries 2009 – 2013, MFA, 2009;

Training in Flood Mapping for Georgians in SYKE, February 2012;

Capacity Building on the Water Monitoring and Management in Georgia, 2010-2013 (Georgia Waters);

Georgian waters – Capacity building on the water monitoring and management in Georgia, 2010-2013 (Georgia Waters), Component III; Institutional developing of the NEA on environmental monitoring (Quality assurance team);

Progress of the ongoing activities, Progress on ongoing activities, Second Assessment of transboundary rivers, lakes and groundwaters in the UNECE region (UNECE), 2011;

Water quality monitoring in the Kyrgyz Republic (KGZ-Water), SYKE, July 2011;

Project Document Georgia Waters - Capacity Building on the Water Monitoring and Management in Georgia, 2010-2013 (Georgia Waters), SYKE, 2010;

Terms of Reference, Revision of the project document of the proposed project "Protocol on Water and Health – Improving Health in Armenia Through Target Setting to Ensure Sustainable Water Management, Access to Safe Water and Adequate Sanitation";

Improving health in Armenia through target setting to ensure sustainable water management, access to safe water and adequate sanitation, Revised proposal – 14 May 2010;

Task Force for the Implementation of the Environmental Action Programme for Central and Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia Regulatory Environmental Programme Implementation Network Liability For Environmental Damage In EECCA: Implementation Of Good International Practices Final Draft, February 2012 5-6 March 2012, Warsaw, Poland;

Convention of the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes Task Force on Water and Climate, Fifth meeting, Geneva, Switzerland, 27 April 2012, Agenda item 6, Future Work On Climate Change Adaptation;

Promoting adaptation to climate change in transboundary basins in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA), Funds utilization report for the period 1 January – 31 December 2011;

“Promoting IWRM and Fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia” (CAIWRM), Sub-component on data collection and sharing, financed by Finland, 29 February 2012, This project, funded by the Government of Finland, is applied as a subcomponent to the project, “Promoting Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) and Fostering

Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia” (CAIWRM), co-funded by the European Union and UNDP. This project is financed by the European Union INTERIM REPORT, (October 2011 – February 2012);

Draft Semi-annual progress and financial report, Water quality monitoring in the Kyrgyz Republic (KGZ-Water)

Semi-annual progress and financial report, Capacity Building on the Water Monitoring and management in Georgia, 2011-2013 ("Georgia Waters"), 12/2011-5/2012

Standard operating procedures for river macroinvertebrate sampling- from site selection to data management, Kristian Meissner, Finnish Environment Institute, 2012

Standard operating procedures for lake littoral and profundal macroinvertebrate sampling- from site selection to data management, Kristian Meissner, Finnish Environment Institute, 2011

Programme Completion Report, Second Assessment of Transboundary Rivers, Lakes and Groundwaters in the UNECE Region, 7.2012

## The Environment and Security Initiative – Transforming risks into cooperation in Central Asia, South Caucasus and Eastern Europe

ENVSEC - Environment and Security Initiative – Transforming risks into cooperation in Central Asia, South Caucasus and Eastern Europe	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good match to Finnish Develt Policy &amp; WEI – working regionally on environment &amp; security.</li> <li>• Good synergies with other WEI projects – eg. FinWaterWEI, Security Cluster, ICIs</li> <li>• Fits well to UN &amp; local priorities also, as well as being in line with the European Neighbourhood Policy and the Eastern Partnership</li> <li>• Finland is separately providing funding to South-Eastern Europe activities of ENVSEC via EUR-40 Unit (2,5 mEuro 2009-12)</li> <li>• Finland's work in supporting ENVSEC is very much in line with Paris Declaration principles of aid harmonisation, although perhaps less supportive of the principles of ownership by participating countries</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finnish contribution to budget for Phase I – 2 600 000 Eur</li> <li>• Total budget for Phase II – 5 580 000 Euro, Finland's share 3 500 000 Euro</li> <li>• There is a lot of funding going to administration costs, with so many organisations involved &amp; high cost of Secretariat – questionable whether the most recent set-up of Secretariat provides sufficient added value for the cost?</li> <li>• Management fee is 8% but the cost of the Secretariat makes the administrative cost much higher.</li> <li>• Various organisations are bringing in their own funds – either cash, reimbursables or in-kind – eg. staff work, etc.</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results very positive according to most stakeholders</li> <li>• Combination of small scale local projects (eg. Aarhus centres,), risk assessments &amp; larger scale cross-border interventions</li> <li>• Flexibility is an advantage – using the most appropriate combination of ENVSEC partners depending on the local political situation &amp; the type of project</li> <li>• MFA support contributes to good donor coordination and improved effectiveness</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objective to reduce environmental &amp; security risks &amp; increase cooperation, seems to be achieved to some extent, although facing very difficult challenges to cooperation between some countries</li> <li>• Using the topic of environment allows potentially sensitive security issues to be dealt with</li> <li>• The whole seems to be bigger than the parts – ie. there is seemingly added value to funds going via ENVSEC rather than to individual orgs – maximising benefits of each org eg. OSCE &amp; UNDP giving UNEP local level ideas and access to partners, UNEP bringing global environmental policy exp, while OSCE brings security expertise, UNDP good at projects, etc... And sometimes UNDP can act when it is politically difficult for OSCE to act</li> <li>• However, some chance that the brand of ENVSEC is not so evident – more the individual organisations</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many activities will be sustainable</li> <li>• Technical capacity building in partner countries</li> <li>• Methods of working, and building relationships between stakeholders in neighbouring countries will be valuable for continuing conflict minimisation</li> <li>• However, at present the high dependence on Finland as a donor is a threat for sustainability</li> <li>• An exit strategy is critical</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most difficult question. At present Finland is main donor to the ENVSEC Trust Fund - &amp; is frustrated with this. Problematic to get more donors</li> </ul>

ENVSEC - Environment and Security Initiative – Transforming risks into cooperation in Central Asia, South Caucasus and Eastern Europe	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 partner organisations &amp; Secretariat based in UNEP Geneva, plus 3 regional coordinators supported by partner organisations, &amp; national focal points in participating countries. Active involvement of Annual Chair from one of partner orgs.</li> <li>• Questions regarding the need for Secretariat, or at least so much funding to it</li> <li>• MOU defines role of Secretariat</li> <li>• Own reporting systems. Secretariat doesn't have any power over regional coordinators. Some delays initially due to coordination of procedures of different organisations</li> <li>• Problems have arisen with financial budgeting, transfers &amp; administration (UNOPS)</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was Finnish JPO in Central Asia working with UNDP &amp; ENVSEC. However, UNDP took new JPO to own tasks</li> <li>• Finnish expert in UNEP in Secretariat gives good contacts to MFA</li> <li>• Finland is able to influence the choice of projects to some extent, &amp; earlier evaluations have provided useful inputs</li> <li>• But probably insufficient branding or involvement of Finland, considering the heavy funding – it is likely that downstream project participants are not aware that Finland is main donor</li> </ul>

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?** Yes, well argued strategy. There has been some consultation/presentation of the aims of the project in the countries. In general it fits with the interests of the countries, although they would often prefer to work on individual basis rather than regionally.

**Is there a Logframe?** Yes, by region.

**Cross-cutting Objectives** When dealing with several different implementing organisations – and with funding coming from several donors – it is reasonable that the specific cross-cutting objectives of the Finnish Development Policy are not necessarily addressed. However, most donors and multilateral organisations consider gender, as a minimum. HIV/AIDS is not touched within ENVSEC. Ethnic conflict and human rights issues would be relevant topics however these are usually sensitive issues for the national governments, which resist involvement by outside organisations. Naturally environment is a main topic of ENVSEC and is being addressed in the projects by their nature. However, the logical frameworks for each ENVSEC regional programme make no mention of even gender in the anticipated outcomes or indicators. A useful Gender Mainstreaming checklist is provided as part of the 'ENVSEC Programme and Project Guidelines' and at least in theory, the ENVSEC Management Board reviews the gender mainstreaming plans. The gender mainstreaming guidelines of the individual organisations should be applied to the individual projects (eg. those of UNDP, OSCE and UNEP should be applied to the projects running under their coordination). However, this is not very evident – at least the overall logframe and reports do not consider cross-cutting objectives. There is no mention at all of cross-cutting objectives in the UNOPS report. However, the individual project reports may include more consideration – one CASE report, for instance, did discuss involvement of women and youth.

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** Overall Logframe has performance indicators, though these are fairly general in nature. Individual partners are responsible for monitoring of their own activities. There have also been several independent evaluations and reviews of the overall programme.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** Programme and Project Guidelines exist. Different processes used by the implementing partners. UNOPS & Secretariat has

produced one consolidated report for 2010, however, this does not consider OECD criteria of effectiveness, efficiency, etc, but rather is a concise description of the activities and the funding. Report for 2011 is under work. Also regional snapshots are produced by the Secretariat, and a range of reports, maps, and other materials for the website.

[www.envsec.org](http://www.envsec.org)

**Areas of concern?** There is probably more project planning happening within the partner organisations, rather than at local level, therefore this may interfere with ownership. Would be good to have more national-level consultations including focal points of Ministries, and donors, civil society, etc. to ensure that all are aware of what is in pipeline and what is ongoing – currently there is uncertainty how decisions are made at high level.

**Key documents considered:**

Laaturyhmän hanke esitys, Ympäristö ja turvallisuusaloite (ENVSEC) - Ympäristö- ja turvallisuusriskien muuntaminen yhteistyöksi, 12.5.2009, HEL8189-11  
 Laaturyhmän hanke esitys, Ympäristö ja turvallisuusaloite (ENVSEC) - Ympäristö- ja turvallisuusriskien muuntaminen yhteistyöksi, 17.11.2010, HEL8189-43  
 ENVSEC Programme and Project Guidelines (Pilot version) 1 Nov. 2010  
 Addendum & Renewal of Memorandum of Understanding, ENVSEC, 31.3.2010  
 Project plan under the Wider Europe Initiative of Finland, Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC) Transforming Environmental and Security Risks into Cooperation, Phase I, July 2009 – Dec 2010  
 Draft Proposal under the Wider Europe Initiative of Finland, Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC) Transforming Environmental and Security Risks into Cooperation, Phase II, Jan 2011 – Dec 2012  
 ENVSEC Work Programme Jan 2007-Dec 2009, Jan 2009  
 ENVSEC Work Programme 2010-2012, May 2010  
 Contribution Arrangement between the Government of Finland and the United Nations Office for Project Services for ENVSEC, 30 Sept. 2009  
 Contribution Arrangement between the Government of Finland and the United Nations Office for Project Services for ENVSEC, 16 Dec 2010  
 Gaia Consulting Oy, Evaluation Environment and Security Initiative, 17.11.2010  
 Strategic Review of the ENVSEC Initiative, Final Report, Matthias Stiefel, Geneva, June 2009  
 Budget Allocation of Phase I, Revision June 2011  
 Budget Allocation of Phase II Funds, July 2011  
 UNOPS, Consolidated Narrative and Financial Progress Report on ENVSEC Trust Fund, 2010, August 2011  
 ENVSEC in the South Caucasus: An overview of projects. OSCE and ENVSEC  
 Many documents on the ENVSEC website – [www.envsec.org](http://www.envsec.org)

Georgian Forest Restoration - Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in Georgia	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both the original and the revised proposals were coherent with Finnish Develt Policy &amp; WEI objectives. The original focus was on environmental objectives, &amp; the new focus strengthens sustainability, poverty reduction, economic development elements</li> <li>Was included to ENVSEC although a single partner project (UNDP)</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finnish Budget of 1,5 mEuro over 2010-2015 (Georgian part additional 100 000 Euro), however work now only commencing in April 2012.</li> <li>Budget incl. 7% for UNDP overhead &amp; 1% for communication</li> </ul>

Georgian Forest Restoration - Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in Georgia	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost effectiveness questions raised by the Quality Group – only a small target group</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lots of problems, partly due to structural problems of forestry moving from Min. Environment to Min. of Energy</li> <li>• Real implementation only beginning now</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Original objective to demonstrate best practices of rehabilitation for forest damaged during fires started in Borjomi Park during conflict, &amp; to raise awareness &amp; build local capacities</li> <li>• Revised objective – enhancing sustainable livelihoods in adjacent villages, disaster risk reduction &amp; environmental education</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited possibilities</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directly implemented by UNDP Georgia</li> <li>• Valuable involvement of the Finnish Roving Ambassador in negotiation through difficulties</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None evident, although originally the idea of using Finnish experts &amp; institutions was presented as an option</li> <li>• Would be potential role, as Finland has strong reputation in forest issues, however, it would only be possible if there were a tender for TA services, which is unlikely</li> </ul>

#### Strategy – is the strategy clear?

Finland offered 2 mEuro to the reconstruction of Georgia in the donor conference of 10.2008 organised by the WB and EU, tagged to the environmental sector, however there were problems with channelling the aid. Decision to channel the funds via ENVSEC. Solid justification for the original project, based on and the World Bank Joint Needs Assessment (JNA) carried out at request of Govt of Georgia, and followed up by a team of international experts under the joint OSCE/UNEP assessment sponsored by ENVSEC, following request of the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Georgia (MoE) in 2008. Weak policy and institutional framework. Georgian political regime favours private enterprise & limits role of environmental legislation & regulations. Changes during the project period have weakened the Ministry of Environment Protection.

**Cross-cutting objectives** No cross-cutting objectives described in first prodoc. Somewhat increased coverage of gender in new proposal, though not mainstreamed. It should be possible, in a local development project of this kind, to ensure involvement of men, women, young and old. At the technical level it was more problematic as most Georgian foresters are men (although one of the main staff involved is a woman).

**Is there a Logframe?** Yes, a quite good Results and Resources Framework though in a slightly unusual layout, combining workplan, budget and Logframe in one. Indicators are not listed, but outputs clearly listed

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** Work only now beginning. Activities are well defined, and supported by relevant background reports. Work will be evaluated by UNDP – no external evaluation planned.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** Clear description of monitoring and reporting in Annex of project document - Quality Management for Project Activity Results.

**Areas of concern?** The project start-up was stalled due to structural and legislative changes introduced by the Georgian Government in 2011. The forest management was transferred from the Ministry of Environment Protection to the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources. The project main partner was changed consequently. The new Forest Code was introduced that aims to increase gain from economic use of forests, and the focus of the project was changing. Quick capacity assessments of the forestry service and its nursery were carried out by UNDP in 2010 and 2011. Results of the assessment showed that both forestry service and the nursery had limited organizational as well as human capacities to manage an international project of this size independently. After long negotiations, the project concept was changed to sustainable livelihoods and environmental education and transferred back to the Ministry of Environment Protection in 2012.

**Key documents considered:**

Laaturyhmän hanke esitys, UNDP/Metsäekosysteemien kunnostaminen Georgiassa osana Suomen jälleenrakennustukea, 26.11.2009, HEL7248-205  
 Laaturyhmän pöytäkirja, UNDP/Metsäekosysteemien kunnostaminen Georgiassa osana Suomen jälleenrakennustukea, 10.12.2009, HEL7219-51  
 Lausunto; Laaturyhmä, UNDP/Metsäekosysteemien kunnostaminen Georgiassa osana Suomen jälleenrakennustukea, 07.12.2009, HELM266-26  
 Initial Project document - United Nations Development Programme, 'Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in Georgia' 2009, plus revisions of 2011, and various annexes, TOR, and reports, such as Pathological Survey of the forest, etc  
 Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in Georgia, Substantive Project Revision, Oct 2010 (changes in budget and work plan)  
 Third Party Cost Sharing Agreement between the MFA Finland (the Donor) and UNDP, April 2010  
 Draft Project Concept Note, Sustainable livelihoods and environmental education, Feb 2012  
 Assessment of the Project Document 'Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in Georgia, August 2008' Summary Report, 29.3.2010 Pasi Rinne, Gaia Consulting  
 Minutes of Project Executive Board Meeting, 20.10.2010  
 Minutes of Extended Project Executive Board 1st Meeting, Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in Georgia, 27.10.2010  
 Working Group meeting minutes, October and November 2011  
 Inception Report of the International Project Monitoring Technical Adviser, Winfried Suess, 29.9.2010  
 Capacity Assessment, LEPL Agency for Natural Resources, LEPL Basic Sapling Forestry, (Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources of Georgia), September, 2011, UNDP, Georgia, Ivane Shamugia, Capacity Assessment and Evaluation Specialist  
 Mission Report, International Consultant on project GIS forest inventory, ecosystem monitoring, 29th November 2010, Ralf Ludwig  
 Reports by Ecovision (Union for Sustainable Development) - Initial Rural Needs Assessment Report for Consultancy Services for Rapid Rural Assessment and Local Livelihood Opportunities, Public Awareness including recommendations for public outreach actions, Rapid Rural Appraisal and Local Livelihood Opportunities, and Socio-Economic and Livelihoods Assessment, all from 2011

IFC – Ukraine Cleaner Production Project	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well aligned with Finnish Dev Policy 2007</li> <li>• Similar project in Russia in machinery sector</li> <li>• Well argued project document on the coherence with Finnish &amp; Ukraine govt policy and the MDGs, and complementarity with other donor initiatives</li> <li>• IFC is collaborating closely with the World Bank in Ukraine and with relevant Govt ministries to promote energy efficiency and develop policy</li> </ul>

IFC – Ukraine Cleaner Production Project	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netherland also funding energy efficiency, and their funds are pooled with those of Finland.</li> <li>• The Ukrainian State Agency for Energy Efficiency has worked with IFC to develop their energy efficiency strategy and carry out a survey and assessments in the agricultural sector. Initially this topic wasn't of great interest to the government, but now that the project and Agency have demonstrated that with small inputs very great energy savings could be made, agricultural energy efficiency has become a high priority.</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 mill USD budget from Finland from total of 3,3 mill USD (other funding from the Netherlands, the Free State of Saxony and the clients)</li> <li>• 5% administration fee on top of the budget is used for internal IFC activities</li> <li>• Average salary/staff person/working mth reasonably efficient</li> <li>• Aims to deliver \$45 of cleaner production investments &amp; avoid 0.7 tons of lifetime carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) emissions per dollar of donor funds</li> <li>• Potentially big savings in energy imports</li> <li>• Majority of the costs are for consultants and staff. Plus 5% overhead for IFC.</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On-site demonstrations and study tours have been very popular</li> <li>• Training for the State Agency on strategy development has been highly appreciated – this training is being replicated via cascade training to the regions – the experience in Ukraine will be replicated in Russia as a good practice.</li> <li>• Work with local finance sector to increase understanding</li> <li>• Obviously environment is a core part of the project. However, when selecting the beneficiary clients, IFC carries out an assessment of their organisational integrity and looks at eight performance standards, including environmental and social risk management; treatment of biodiversity, minority rights and human rights (no child labour, OSH, etc); and environmental protection. However, while hopeless cases will be ruled out, they are prepared to accept some companies that have achieved in some areas but not others, and then set a timeline for improvement (with financial penalties for non-compliance)</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes in attitude in the government and industry have been the most significant impacts, and this is likely to be sustainable.</li> <li>• the National Programme of Energy Efficiency has included an objective of increasing the share of renewable energy to overall energy use to 10%, and increasing energy efficiency by 20%</li> <li>• Potential for one of the companies to achieve very large CO2 savings via straw-to-cellulose project. However, also risk that the uptake may take long time. So focus on work with other clients also &amp; on disseminating info on straw use to others.</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In theory sounds good, if there is finance available to follow up future investments</li> <li>• So far there has been interest from local firms, but it may take a long time to see sustainable results</li> <li>• 50% co-funding from clients means should be sustainable</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports are quite limited</li> <li>• Administration done by Moscow Cleaner Production office of IFC – via teleconferences and regular visits. They meet with MFA Finland once/year</li> <li>• Locally two technical staff recruited to manage activities – committed &amp; enthusiastic. They visit the clients to analyse their resource potentials, carry out energy efficiency audits, collect best practices, and provide general support. They also work with the State Agency for Energy Efficiency</li> <li>• Meeting once per year with MFA</li> <li>• Finnish Embassy interested and active in Ukraine. IFC has also tried to collaborate with Finpro as much as possible</li> </ul>

IFC – Ukraine Cleaner Production Project	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several links to CleanTech and Nordic finance were speculated on in statement by MFA sectoral experts, but no evidence yet</li> <li>• IFC informs Finpro &amp; Finnish companies if tenders coming out</li> <li>• a tender was won by Pöyry to provide advice on transformation of cellulose from straw -&gt; paper</li> <li>• Project staff have worked with Finpro &amp; the MFA to produce a brochure to try to link to Finnish companies. They are interested in Finnish expertise, however have had difficulty finding interested counterparts</li> </ul>

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?** Yes, the prodoc is concise but clearly spells out the strategy of working with private sector to improve clean production and energy efficiency. Ukraine has a large potential for agribusiness (currently 15-20% of GDP & most of export revenues) and at present there are potentials to improve energy efficiency and use of agricultural biomass and wastes. There are two project components to be funded by Finland and one component funded by the Netherlands. The prodoc refers to lessons learned from earlier projects - including an earlier evaluation by the World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group in 2007 of IFC's Advisory Services operations in the CIS region that confirmed the effectiveness of the programmatic approach. The evaluation stated that "Sector-wide initiatives achieved higher development effectiveness and wider impacts than interventions designed to facilitate specific IFC investments." The prodoc also refers to the IFC's own post-completion evaluation of its Corporate Governance projects to businesses and financial institutions (2010), noting the importance of using peer pilot clients to motivate other businesses to uptake improved corporate governance, and to other lessons learned from earlier cleaner production projects of IFC.

**Is there a Logframe?** Yes, though it is fairly basic. There is also a simple risk assessment and mitigation plan.

**Cross-cutting objectives** When selecting the beneficiary clients, IFC carries out an assessment of their organisational integrity and looks at eight performance standards, including environmental and social risk management; treatment of biodiversity, minority rights and human rights (no child labour, OSH, etc); and environmental protection. Cross-cutting objectives mentioned only in passing in reports – in terms of ensuring access to information. Earlier IFC looked at HIV/AIDS but they have now stopped as they don't consider they have the capacity. Gender is part of the corporate strategic direction – both supporting women's entrepreneurship and participation in workshops and training, and in staff recruitment. They have tried to promote women's success stories in the project. In practice, however, most managers of agribusiness are men. However, when the project and State Agency work with small and medium enterprises there is more opportunity to encounter women.

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** Almost entirely quantitative indicators in Logframe. Not clear definition of how they would be monitored. However, IFC staff in Moscow inform that they are checking on monthly basis

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** Not clear.

**Gaps in documentation or information?** There is no financial report on first report. The financial report on the most recent report has been scanned in poorly and is illegible. No evidence of annual meetings or discussion with MFA. The IFC staff visited Helsinki this spring, so presumably there were discussions held.

**Areas of concern?** Cross-cutting objectives are weakly addressed, and this is a topic that could, for instance, address gender. Also, the Logframe and indicators are weak. These issues were raised in the Quality Assurance Group but the reports do not seem to address the concerns. The financial report on the second report shows some wild overspends on

budget – for instance 1619% as a % of budget for one line item?! Most items were overspent, indicating that there were problems with the initial budget estimates and there could be difficulties in coming in within budget later on. This raised concerns with the evaluators initially, however in discussion it became clear that it was a temporary glitch. Funds from Finland were used to cover a shortfall in some budget lines when IFC was balancing availability of Finnish and Dutch funding. In the next report the budget would balance out – they aim for spending targets of +/-5%.

#### Key documents considered:

Ukraine Cleaner Production Project – Advisory Project Document

Administration Agreement between the MFA Finland and the IFC for the Financial Support of IFC Advisory Services in Europe and Central Asia (ECA) Region, Nov 10, 2010

Laaturyhmän hanke esitys ja käsittelyyn, 10.9.2010 - IFC/Puhtaan tuotannon edistäminen Ukrainassa - HEL7248-58

Laaturyhmän pöytäkirja, 10.9.2010 - IFC/Puhtaan tuotannon edistäminen Ukrainassa - HEL7219-31

Lausunto; Laaturyhmä 8.9.2010 - IFC/Puhtaan tuotannon edistäminen Ukrainassa - HEL7377-58

IFC Ukraine Semi-Annual Progress Report: 1 July 2010 – 31 December 2010

IFC Ukraine Semi-Annual Progress Report: 1 January 2011 - 30 June 2011

IFC Ukraine Semi-Annual Progress Report: 1 July 2011 – 31 December 2011

FAO Kyrgyz Fish - Support to Fishery & Aquaculture Management in the Kyrgyz Republic	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was already running prior to WEI and was simply joined in. Not very clear link to the aims of WEI as this isn't a regional project.</li> <li>• Good fit with Finnish Develt Policy (poverty reduction, rural development &amp; food security, private sector develt)</li> <li>• Very good collaboration with UNDP GEF project – formal MOU signed and joint activities undertaken with sharing of resources as needed.</li> <li>• Coherent links to Kyrgyz sector policy as well as the Comprehensive Development Framework</li> <li>• Almost no consideration of cross-cutting objectives, except environment. Gender and HIV/AIDS would be topics that could be followed, but the reporting format doesn't even allow for reporting on these topics.</li> <li>• Potential for links to other WEI activities due to working with water – but no evidence that this is happening in practice. There are links on fishing activities however</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2,2 mill USD budget from Finland from total budget of 2,6 mill USD</li> <li>• 13% support costs (overhead) - 246870 USD or 82290 USD/yr. TA costs in budget include FAO Tech support at a high monthly rate, Team leader in Bishkek, &amp; Int ST consultants &amp; Course coordinator in Kuopio on much lower monthly rates – FAO cost is reasonably high, but others are quite competitive. Generally speaking the cost of implementation in Kyrgyzstan appears appropriate.</li> <li>• The Masters program was not a success. The total cost of the Masters course was anticipated to be 220 000USD or 44 000 USD/student. Re-adjustment &amp; cuts to implementation budget were needed to fund changed &amp; lengthened program for students, and Kuopio University has spent a lot of own time and money on the students.</li> <li>• Department pays salaries of their own staff. Project covers reimbursable costs</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Masters student program very problematic – no theses finalised yet despite intensive support. Of the original 5, only 3 are likely to graduate, and</li> </ul>

<b>FAO Kyrgyz Fish - Support to Fishery &amp; Aquaculture Management in the Kyrgyz Republic</b> <b>Analysis, issues arising</b>	
Evaluation criterion	
	<p>even they have taken several years. Poor choice of students at the start (poor English language skills, academic levels not adequate to cope with Finnish system, weren't holding jobs in Fisheries Dept and limited interest in fisheries). Strangely, the Directorate of Fisheries didn't allow department staff to apply for the scholarships – which would have been the most logical approach for effectiveness and sustainability. Seems unlikely that the students will return to work in fisheries in Kyrgyzstan and may not continue in the fisheries sector in Kyrgyzstan. No obligation for the students to return to work in the fisheries department. Project has obtained assurance that jobs available to them, but seems unlikely they will accept. Some questions regarding transparency in the selection process also.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very slow start due to problems with technical assistance. Project suspended but new Team Leader recruited and progress has been excellent since then.</li> <li>• Progress in other activities now good, with exception of the fish processing plant. Significant support given to fisher associations, capacity building, awareness raising on fish as a source of nutrition, research, development of fish farming as alternative to capture fisheries, etc. Beneficiaries interviewed were very positive regarding results. Fishing ban in the lake has inhibited progress in fisheries, but the project has continued activities.</li> <li>• Facing difficulties with cage fishing on the Lake as it is a protected area. Escaping rainbow trout, pike perch and others are causing considerable damage to the environment. Sanitary fishing is needed to remove these species from the lake, otherwise they will overwhelm native species. This is being supported by the project in conjunction with GEF.</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objective is to increase capacity of capture fisheries &amp; aquaculture to provide food, employment &amp; economic development</li> <li>• Given that capture fisheries is currently subject to the fishing ban, it is difficult to progress. But the project is organising and training the fishers in readiness for the anticipated lifting of the ban. The project is carrying out advocacy with the government on issues related to fishing, and encouraging the establishment of a sustainable licensed fishing system. It is also working on promotion of aquaculture, although most of the beneficiaries are farmers rather than fishers.</li> <li>• Too early to record a significant impact. Project will end in 12/2012 but there was political instability as well as internal project problems, leading to the period of shut down, which meant the implementation only really began in late 2010.</li> <li>• Some of the products of the project – such as the EIA guidelines for aquaculture in Kyrgyzstan, training manuals on pond farming and a booklet of the principles of aquaculture – have been shared in regional workshops. The EIA guidelines will be accepted as regional guidelines by CACFish.</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FAO have presented a proposal for a second phase, including fish food production, etc</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many problems at start – allegations of corruption, etc. MFA froze funds wisely, giving an opportunity to take stock of the situation. Project now re-started with new Team Leader, and now seems to be smoother progress.</li> <li>• Current Team Leader seems very enthusiastic &amp; competent and program running ok now, but future is unclear – how much independence he has from FAO office is unclear</li> <li>• FAO sub-regional office in Turkey supervises the project, also some involvement from Bishkek national correspondent office of FAO, payments and fund transfers through the UNDP Bishkek office</li> <li>• Good support from Finnish Embassy in Astana, incl. participation in SC meetings</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial project design done by Finnish expert, and close link with Kuopio University continues</li> <li>• Link to Finnish aquaculture-based fish marketing system</li> <li>• Masters students have been trained in Finland &amp; continuing inputs by one Finnish expert</li> </ul>

FAO Kyrgyz Fish - Support to Fishery & Aquaculture Management in the Kyrgyz Republic	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study tour of Kyrgyz contacts to Finland to visit fish processing, companies, etc.</li> <li>• Long term staff are not Finnish &amp; project is run by FAO</li> </ul>

### Strategy – is the strategy clear?

Supports the implementation of the Strategy for Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector Development and Management in Kyrgyzstan (2008-2012), Collapse of the capture fisheries and aquaculture industries after the fall of the Soviet Union (by 90% in Kyrgyzstan), and an increase in illegal fishing, is the setting for the project. Theory was that Kyrgyz could pilot this project & would potential give basis for others in region. Finland & FAO are supporting Kazakhstan fisheries and also the Fisheries Commission for Central Asia & Caucasus

**Is there a Logframe?** Yes, with reasonable indicators. The project document was prepared partly by a Finnish expert and follows the normal structure.

**Cross-cutting Objectives** Almost no consideration of cross-cutting objectives in prodoc, nor in the report format. Surprisingly this wasn't commented on in Quality Group. Fisheries is a sector with a lot of potential for discussion of issues such as gender and HIV/AIDS. HIV/AIDS, while having relatively low incidence in Kyrgyzstan, is increasing rapidly. This is a topic that could be discussed at least with fishing groups. The fisher & aquaculture beneficiaries are mainly men, however it would be possible to design side activities with respect to fish processing, fish food production, etc. to specifically target women.

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** The sources of verification are specified in detail in the project document, with a clear description of the means of internal monitoring.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** Very comprehensive project reports produced by the new CTA. He is using the formats agreed to by the two governments & FAO – however, no requirement in format to report on cross-cutting objectives.

**Areas of concern?** Quality Group commented that the role of University of Finland in project implementation, as well as the budget for training, needed clarification. Also a serious difficulty is the fishing moratorium currently in place on the lake, which completely blocks much of the planned work. Slow progress initially – project signed 3.2009, activities started 9.09, activities suspended 3.2012, activities restarted fully 2.11. Will run until 4.2013. Some problems of motivation of Dept staff due to low salaries.

### Key documents considered:

Project Document - Support to Fishery and Aquaculture management in the Kyrgyz Republic  
 Project Performance Evaluation Report 1 September 2009 – May 2011  
 Project Performance Evaluation Report 18 May 2011-31 January 2012  
 Laaturyhmän hanke esitys ja käsittelyyn, FAO/Kalasektorin kehittäminen Kirgisiassa, 21.11.08 - HEL6247-155  
 Laaturyhmän pöytäkirja, 21.11.2008, FAO/Kalasektorin kehittäminen Kirgisiassa - HEL7219-20  
 Laaturyhmän lausunto, FAO/Kalasektorin kehittäminen Kirgisiassa - HELM125-11  
 Minutes of the Fifth Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting 9.12.2010  
 Minutes of the Eighth Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting, 14.10.2011

Suomen Suurlähetystö Astana, Muistio, 12.1.2011 - AST7053-3  
 Suomen Suurlähetystö Astana, Muistio, 28.4.2011, AST7053-20  
 Suomen Suurlähetystö Astana, Muistio, 24.10.2011, AST7053-46  
 Suomen Suurlähetystö Astana, Muistio, 27.1.2012, AST7053-3

GTK ICI Central Asia - Geo-Sector Information Management System Development and Capacity Building in Central Asian Countries Project	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project in line with Finnish Develt Policy (developed from meeting with earlier Minister of Development)</li> <li>• In line with development policies of participating countries</li> <li>• Synergies with other projects, including those supported by Finland, such as ENVSEC. There have been joint meetings with ENVSEC on climate risk and environment project, and they will co-host some local workshops. Working together on issues such as environmental protection, uranium mining &amp; processing and melting glaciers</li> <li>• Some links to other ICI projects also (Meteorology, Statistics &amp; SYKE), &amp; FinWaterWEI (participated in Board meeting). Have shared contacts &amp; ways of working, but so far only limited overlap</li> <li>• There are several other donors (Norway, Russia, Iran, Germany, Denmark, China) working in the geo-sector, but all with different approach or focus.</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total budget almost 3 m Euro – approx 700 000 Euro/ country for Kyrg., Tajik., and Uzbekistan, &amp; 471 000 Euro for Kazakhstan (as already further advanced in digitalisation)</li> <li>• This project is much bigger than normal ICI projects (normally &lt; 500 000 Euro), as it involves several countries. In accordance with ICI project rules, most of budget is going to Finnish salaries &amp; reimbursable costs. Admin loading of 3,15 * daily salary of staff . The participating governments provide salaries for local staff, office space and, in the case of Kazakhstan, computers.</li> <li>• Quite early to be able to comment on relationship between means and results</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Follows a preparatory stage (2009-10)</li> <li>• Useful regional networking opportunity – for instance, staff of local agencies getting to meet for 1st time and construct joint web portal</li> <li>• Some of these countries don't need the money but they appreciate the chance to share expertise. Major focus of project is capacity building.</li> <li>• Successful study tour in spring 2012 to begin joint work on the geo portal. Practical sessions with all participants designing parts of the portal, with advice from GTK staff.</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too early to comment – project only started in 8.2011</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasis on 'learning-by-doing methodology likely to produce sustainable results. Very strong focus on stepping back and getting the locals to do the work to ensure that they understand well – should produce more sustainable results</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Run by GTK in Helsinki under ICI contract.</li> <li>• Staff very experienced in region, although they have faced some difficulties in finding technical staff with Russian language skills, so need to use interpreters</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involvement of GTK brings direct link to Finnish experience via experts and twinning of institutions</li> <li>• Finnish experts are valued by locals for quality work, transparency, historical links and high tech. Study tour participants commented on the</li> </ul>

### Strategy – is the strategy clear?

Mineral exports are critical for the countries involved. PRSPs support involvement in this sector. GTK has based this project on earlier work in Kyrgyzstan. They used their existing contacts to identify key decision-makers and technical experts in each of the other Central Asian countries. They have focused on a bottom-up approach, working with the local experts in each country and then building up to regional work, in an effort to be more effective and sustainable (and not lose too much time in high level wrangling)...

**Is there a Logframe?** Yes, though quite simple

**Cross-cutting objectives** Insufficient consideration of cross-cutting objectives noted in appraisal. GTK have commented that there are male dominated countries, but they are trying to encourage women to participate. However in the study tour there were 6 men only.

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** Indicators & SoVs are defined though they are fairly vague

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** Normal ICI procedures, with reporting by the organisation to the MFA, & reports checked by ICI consultant. No specific evaluation.

**Areas of concern?** Quality Board decided the project should go to Appraisal to improve definition of impact, cross-cutting objectives, reporting, etc. Also, fact that GTK is in driver's seat – however this is common to most ICI projects. Slow progress in Uzbekistan as they are reluctant to participate in regional project. Difficult to see the link between the results and the overall objective. Turkmenistan pulled out of the regional programme but GTK is planning an individual programme for them.

### Key documents considered:

Agreement between MFA & GTK - Assignment for the services of governmental authorities & institutions, 29.8.2011, HELM553-42 – including final project document, Geo-Sector Information Management System Development and Capacity Building in Central Asian Countries Project, July 20th, 2011  
 Appraisal Report Slide show – Golder Associates, Geo-Sector Information Management System Development and Capacity Building in Central Asian Countries Project, 30.6.2011  
 Appraisal Report – Golder Associates, Geo-Sector Information Management System Development and Capacity Building in Central Asian Countries Project, 5.7.2011  
 Laaturyhmän hanke esitys, 17.3.2011, Geologian alan tiedonhallintajärjestelmän kehittäminen ja kapasiteetin vahvistaminen Keski-Aasiassa, HELM553-10  
 Laaturyhmän pöytäkirja, 1.4.2011, Geologian alan tiedonhallintajärjestelmän kehittäminen ja kapasiteetin vahvistaminen Keski-Aasiassa, HEL7219-8  
 Lausunto; Laaturyhmä, 21.3.2011, Geologian alan tiedonhallintajärjestelmän kehittäminen ja kapasiteetin vahvistaminen Keski-Aasiassa, HELM519-4  
 Minutes of the tutelage group meeting, Geo-Sector Information Management System Development and Capacity Building in Central Asian Countries Project, 10.1.2012  
 Terms of reference for expert missions for the period of January – June 2012, Geo-Sector Information Management System Development and Capacity Building in Central Asian Countries Project  
 Work plan for 2012  
 Semi-annual progress and financial report 1/2011, 20.12.2011 (29.8 – 31.12.2011), Geo-Sector Information Management System Development and Capacity Building in Central Asian Countries Project

GTK ICI Ukraine - Capacity Building for Development of European-type Geo-Information Management Infrastructure in the Geological Sector of Ukraine	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project consistent with Ukrainian govt. policy, strategy &amp; needs</li> <li>• Project in line with Finnish Develt Policy</li> <li>• Synergies with other projects, including those supported by Finland, such as ENVSEC</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mainly capacity building, limited procurement</li> <li>• Considerable time wasted due to problems with procurements &amp; administrative problems in Ukraine</li> <li>• Budget 496 629 Euro over 2½ years. Approx 30% from Ukrainian budget for dissemination.</li> <li>• In accordance with ICI project rules, most of budget is going to Finnish salaries &amp; reimbursable costs. Admin loading of 3,15 * daily salary of staff.</li> <li>• Quite early to be able to comment on relationship between means and results</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aim to develop new Ukrainian geo-portal</li> <li>• Very early stage only – mainly only procurements so far, and a small amount of training plus study tour to Finland</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To enhance &amp; increase the availability of mineral &amp; geoscientific data &amp; support investment</li> <li>• Should enable good governance practices &amp; transparency of the licensing system &amp; thus minimize corruption.</li> <li>• Too early to say as project hasn't been underway for long</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a capacity building project it should be sustainable, providing the local authority implements the technologies, &amp; maintains the staff</li> <li>• However, to date many problems with institutional set-up</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managed by GTK under ICI contract</li> <li>• Previous experience working in Ukraine</li> <li>• Prodoc is based on a preparation phase, which allowed staff to get to know each other.</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involvement of GTK brings direct link to Finnish experience via experts and twinning of institutions</li> </ul>

#### Strategy – is the strategy clear?

In line with the Strategic Development Plan (2006-2030) of the Ministry of Environment Protection of Ukraine, the Mineral Resource Development Plan (2006-2030) and the National Vision of the Ukrainian Euro-Integration. Geological data is important for the mining sector as well as others, and can support job creation, disaster prevention and environmental protection.

**Is there a Logframe?** Yes, but the indicators & SoVs are described in very basic form, very little quantification or time-links

**Cross-cutting objectives** Very little consideration of cross-cutting objectives, although there are both men and women as direct counterpart staff in Ukraine.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** Normal ICI procedures, with reporting by the organisation to the MFA, & reports checked by ICI consultant. No specific evaluation. Initially reports were quarterly, but now 6 monthly.

**Areas of concern?** Given that the project mainly involved mainly technology, the Quality group queried whether this should be implemented via an ICI project, rather than competitive tendering. However the decision was taken to proceed with GTK, based on strategic discussions. Some difficulties with slow progress due to local bureaucracy, lack of

a framework agreement between Finland and Ukraine, & change in local partner – the local counterpart has been moved from organisation to another. There have been almost weekly changes in local legislation concerning taxation (with regard to procurement of specialised equipment), difficulties with corruption and staff reductions locally. Cross-cutting objectives dealt with very summarily in prodoc (“Cross cutting issues like HIV/AIDS and gender equality will be brought up by Finnish consultant in the form of a lecture”).

**Key documents considered:**

Project Document, 14.10.2010, Capacity Building for Development of European-type Geo-Information Management Infrastructure in the Geological Sector of Ukraine

Laaturyhmän hanke esitys, 22.10.2010, Geologian alan tiedonhallintajärjestelmän kehittäminen ja kapasiteetin vahvistaminen Ukrainassa (IKI-hanke), HEL8207-64

Laaturyhmän pöytäkirja, 5.11.2010, Geologian alan tiedonhallintajärjestelmän kehittäminen ja kapasiteetin vahvistaminen Ukrainassa (IKI-hanke), HEL7219-40

Quarterly progress and financial report 01/2011 (1-3.2011)

Quarterly progress and financial report 02/2011 (4-6.2011)

Third progress and financial report 03/2011 (7-11-2011)

STUK ICI Ukraine - Nuclear Safety and Security Capacity Building in Ukraine	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasonable fit to aims of Finnish Develt Policy (environmentally safe &amp; sustainable develt) &amp; security &amp; environment sections of WEI</li> <li>Synergies with other radiation projects funded by Finland– eg. Chernobyl Shelter Fund &amp; EBRD Nuclear Safety Account, &amp; earlier support through STUK in Ukraine to mobile lab SONNI</li> <li>Links with other donor funded activities, eg. IAEA, bilaterals</li> <li>Further support has been received in 2012 from the EU in coordination with STUK project</li> <li>Timing of the project was important for Ukraine – provided added security during Euro 2012 Football Championships</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget 208 089 Euro for one year</li> <li>Seems quite efficient, &amp; work of STUK has encouraged addition of funds by EU</li> <li>Almost all funds are from Finland – very little co-funding from Ukraine</li> <li>In accordance with ICI project rules, most of budget is going to Finnish salaries &amp; reimbursable costs. Mark-up of 2,62*staff salaries.</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalisation of earlier work funded with STUK</li> <li>Very technical – Ukrainians appreciate the exchange of experience</li> <li>Training activities have been effective</li> <li>Delays in import of equipment due to customs issues</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The overall objective is ‘Improved safety and nuclear security in Ukraine. More efficient protection of environment and people’ – it is a challenging (and perhaps overly optimistic) objective with such a short and limited project.</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In theory the project should support the Ukrainian partners to be self-sufficient, &amp; have a strong skill base. However, the sector is quite donor dominated</li> <li>Questions raised regarding the sustainability for maintenance of this expensive equipment. Hardware always has a shelf-life. The local partners are aiming to extend the functions &amp; work with local government bodies as paying clients</li> </ul>

STUK ICI Ukraine - Nuclear Safety and Security Capacity Building in Ukraine Analysis, issues arising	
Evaluation criterion	
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managed by STUK under ICI contract</li> <li>• Assigned was planned by STUK under a separate contract during 2011</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finnish technology highly valued by the Ukrainians</li> <li>• Finnish companies also being utilised apart from twinning – they are providing equipment and expertise</li> <li>• Involvement of STUK brings direct link to Finnish experience via experts and twinning of institutions</li> </ul>

#### Strategy – is the strategy clear?

Yes, this is simply the final phase of support to an earlier implemented project – the mobile lab SONNI was funded and handed over in 2010. Due to taxation problems, it wasn't possible for Finland to import Sonni directly, but the solution was to donate it to the IAEA (who have tax-free status), who in turn, donated it to the Ukrainian authorities. IAEA undertook to bear all the costs associated to the delivery, certification and training of the crews responsible for the operation of the mobile laboratory. However, it became clear that IAEA didn't have sufficient funding and there was insufficient local capacity to operate it. Further resources were needed for instrumentation and training of the operative personnel in order to ensure that the mobile laboratory SONNI could be used by mid 2012. Finland and Ukraine have worked together on the topic since the 1990s. This latest work supports the IAEA Country Action Plans for protection of the UEFA EURO 2012 football championships.

#### Is there a Logframe? Yes

**Cross-cutting objectives** There was an annex to the project plan regarding treatment of cross-cutting objectives in the project. This is a quite realistic estimation of the difficulty of covering these issues in a technical project of this type, and at least demonstrates a recognition of their importance. In practice there is good gender balance of the staff working with the project in Kiev and both women and men have travelled to Finland, and have participated in training. HIV/AIDS is not a significant issue for this project. By using the lab as a means of identifying radiation sources, the project has the opportunity to reduce contamination of the environment and local populations.

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** Most indicators are fairly simple, as the project mainly involves delivery of training & equipment.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** Normal ICI procedures, with reporting by the organisation to the MFA, & reports checked by ICI consultant. No specific evaluation.

**Areas of concern?** Quality group noted the somewhat general level treatment of cross-cutting objectives. Maintenance of the equipment may be problematic in the future. It is unclear how sustainable the use of the equipment will be without Ukraine committing budget to this. Customs difficulties have arisen when importing equipment, as Finland doesn't have tax-free agreement with Ukraine. Project is using IAEA to assist with imports.

#### Key documents considered:

Project Document, Nuclear Safety and Security Capacity Building in Ukraine (1.8.2011 Rev.1)

Loppuraportti, Mittausajoneuvon toimittaminen Ukrainan ydinturvallisuusviranomaisen käyttöön, Ulkoministeriön poliittisen osaston rahoittaman osuuden loppuraportti, Doc No. 1/770/2009, 24.2.2010

Note - Addressing the cross-cutting themes of the Finland's development policy in the Project plan 'Nuclear Safety and Security Capacity Building in Ukraine'

Annex – Logical Framework

Laaturyhmän hanke esitys, Säteilyturva-alan kapasiteetin vahvistaminen Ukrainassa (IKI), 12.9.2011, HELM553-48

Laaturyhmän pöytäkirja, Säteilyturva-alan kapasiteetin vahvistaminen Ukrainassa (IKI), 30.9.2011, HEL7219-33

Lausunto; Laaturyhmä, Säteilyturva-alan kapasiteetin vahvistaminen Ukrainassa (IKI), 27.9.2011, HELM519-13

MOU between STUK & SNRIU, 28.4.2011

Planning Phase Report, Assignment for the Services of Governmental Authorities / Institution, Intervention Code of the Project: 89846801, Title: Nuclear Safety and Security Capacity Building in Ukraine, 2011

Report, Nuclear Safety and Security Capacity Building in Ukraine, Activity 1.1 Training of the Crews at STUK in Helsinki, 12-16 September 2011

Report, Nuclear Safety and Security Capacity Building in Ukraine, Activity 1.2 Training of the Crews at SSTC in Kiev, 24-28 October 2011

Progress Report, Nuclear Safety and Security Capacity Building in Ukraine, 1.9-30.11.2011

FMI ICI - Promoting Modernisation of Meteorological and Hydrological Services in Central Asia	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large need identified for updating of infrastructure &amp; capacities – needs multi-donor support</li> <li>• Fits within WEI &amp; Finnish Develt Policy with regard to environmental sustainability</li> <li>• Also synergy with ENVSEC activities, and close tie to other ICI projects, especially GTK</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget 526 225 Euro over 2 years</li> <li>• In accordance with ICI project rules, most of budget is going to Finnish salaries &amp; reimbursable costs. Admin loading of 1,885*daily salary of staff</li> <li>• Quite early to be able to comment on relationship between means and results</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working mainly with Uzbekistan but bringing in regional participants (semi-regional). Theoretically increasing effectiveness, although in practice there has been only limited regional participation.</li> <li>• Very slow to start – official start 11.2011</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall objective is Increased capacity of Uzhydromet &amp; other National Hydrometeorological Services in Central Asia to produce sustainable &amp; end-user driven public &amp; private services and adapt to climate change</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As work is based on capacity building, should be strong opportunity for sustainability</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managed by FMI under ICI contract</li> <li>• Planning work conducted in 2008-9</li> <li>• Seemed to need the intervention of the Finnish Roving Ambassador to assist with getting the MOU signed and the work beginning</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involvement of FMI brings direct link to Finnish experience via experts and twinning of institutions</li> <li>• Opportunity for future link to Finnish business</li> </ul>

#### Strategy – is the strategy clear?

Economy in Central Asian countries is based on weather sensitive sectors such as agriculture, energy, construction, transportation and communication. There has been a deterioration in meteorological and hydrological professional capacities & data sharing since the breakdown of the Soviet Union. Weather is not a single country issue and doesn't

stop at borders, therefore it is beneficial to work as a region (as in the Nordic region) and share information. However in practice this is quite difficult, due to different technical capacities and also lack of trust. After a lot of wasted time when aiming for a regional project it was decided to move to a bilateral agreement, focused on Uzbekistan as the IMO training centre is there.

**Is there a Logframe?** Yes, and quite good indicators.

**Cross-cutting Objectives** Consideration is given to some cross-cutting objectives, although it is recognised that this is a technical & male dominated field. Attempt to include women in the study tour and in training.

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** Quite good quality project document.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** Normal ICI procedures, with reporting by the organisation to the MFA, & reports checked by ICI consultant. No specific evaluation planned.

**Areas of concern?** Considerable problems experienced in getting the MoU signed, leading to a slow start-up. Some administrative difficulties also due to the limited English language possibilities, needing translators.

**Key documents considered:**

Project Document, 29.3.2011, Promoting Modernisation of Meteorological and Hydrological Services in Central Asia, 29.3.2011, and subsequent version in 11.2011, plus annexes  
Laaturyhmän hanke esitys, 30.12.2010, Meteorologian ja hydrologian alan modernisaatio Keski-Aasiassa (IKI-hanke), HEL8207-67

Laaturyhmän pöytäkirja, 21.1.2011, Meteorologian ja hydrologian alan modernisaatio Keski-Aasiassa (IKI-hanke), HEL7219

Draft Cooperation Agreement between The Centre of Hydrometeorological Service at Cabinet of Ministries of the Republic of Uzbekistan and Finnish Meteorological Institute on  
Implementation of 'Promoting Modernization of Meteorological and Hydrological Services in Central Asian countries' Technical Assistance Project

Draft FINUZ Memorandum of Understanding, 1.4.2011 and 30.12.2009

Laaturyhmän hanke esitys, 30.12.2010, HEL8207-67

Laaturyhmän pöytäkirja, Meteorologian ja hydrologian alan modernisaatio Keski-Aasiassa (IKI-hanke), 21.1.2011, HEL7219-2

Lausunto; Laaturyhmä

Minutes of the first Project Board Meeting, FINUZ, 17.11.2011

Statistics Finland (Tilastokeskus) ICI - Kyrgyz Technical Co-operation in the Area of Statistics	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In line with the goals of the Kyrgyz National Statistical Committee, and the staff are enthusiastic and committed</li> <li>• Fully in line with WEI framework, strengthening social sustainability &amp; good governance</li> <li>• Synergies with other projects funded by other donors – keep an eye on avoiding duplication. Statistics Norway has been operating in Kyrgyzstan since 2006 in a bigger project, and they have a long term staffer there, however there doesn't appear to be any overlaps</li> </ul>

Statistics Finland (Tilastokeskus) ICI - Kyrgyz Technical Co-operation in the Area of Statistics Analysis, issues arising	
Evaluation criterion	
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 400 000 Euro budget over 2009-12, finalising in spring 2012</li> <li>• In accordance with ICI project rules, most of budget is going to Finnish salaries &amp; reimbursable costs. Admin multiplier of 2,8 * daily rate of staff</li> <li>• Very short visits – only approx. 1 week each visit – some of the Finnish experts consider that this is probably adequate, while others commented that there was insufficient time for meetings with the wider range of counterpart organisations</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on capacity building – achieved via study tour of Kyrgyz stakeholders to Finland, where there were theoretical lectures on statistical frameworks, as well as visits, and joint discussions of the specific difficulties in Kyrgyz Republic. Also field visits by Finnish staff to hold meetings and agree on protocols for data sharing between wide range of local institutions, and to guide the compilation of data, hands on</li> <li>• Very technical project – Project purpose: Improving the capacity of human resources, strengthening the statistical infrastructure and improving individual subject matter programs and methodologies as well as the existing data outputs.</li> <li>• Anticipated results: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Improved concept for strategic planning</li> <li>2) Better cooperation with other departments and effective use of administrative data for statistical purposes (eg. Population Register, Business Register, Agricultural Register)</li> <li>3) Development of the National Accounts</li> <li>4) Improved capacities and data quality in various statistical domains</li> </ol> </li> </ul> <p>There has been varying effectiveness. The work on the Financial Accounts has been successful. There has been a lot of enthusiasm and progress on the Business and Agricultural Register activities. The Population Register has been problematic due to collaboration issues between the local agencies.</p>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall objective is relevant, timely &amp; reliable information to support decision-making by government – this should support aims of good governance, transparency, etc. It is critical that the Government has the data available in order to deal with international institutions such as the IMF and EU</li> <li>• Presumably as the different domains are relatively independent, slow progress in one should not interfere with other parts of the support</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Threatened by changes to government &amp; staffing</li> <li>• Capacity building good in general but is only working with a small group of staff. It is up to NSC to implement the recommendations in the long term. The Kyrgyz staff have definitely benefited from the capacity building and they know what is now needed, the sources of data and structures. But it will take time to implement.</li> <li>• Kyrgyz staff would like further support but this is unlikely</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managed by Statistics Finland under ICI contract – their staff travel to the country &amp; provide mission reports &amp; progress reports. The Finnish support to the different domains operate quite independently – never brought together for any coordinating meetings or assessment of overall progress.</li> <li>• There is only limited experience in development cooperation within Statistics Finland – most international experience comes from EU, accession countries or Nordic twinning arrangements. This may have limited the effectiveness.</li> <li>• There is a need to work through interpreters and this has somewhat inhibited the flow of information both formally and informally, although the interpreters were of good quality</li> </ul>

Statistics Finland (Tilastokeskus) ICI - Kyrgyz Technical Co-operation in the Area of Statistics	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involvement of Statistics Finland brings direct link to Finnish experience via experts and twinning of institutions – Finnish/Nordic statistics systems are highly valued internationally, and serve as best practice, from which the Kyrgyz partners are interested to learn</li> <li>• Considerable technical inputs from Finland, including those from Information Centre of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry in Finland (TiKe) – to the Agricultural Register</li> </ul>

**History of the project** The initiative for the project came from the MFA. The Ministry suggested or 'urged' Statistics Finland to begin an ICI project. In 2008 the MFA had financial support available for development work with the region. The Kyrgyz Republic was 'chosen' (by the MFA), partly because anticipated financial support from the World Bank had not come through. It was considered that there were similarities between the countries (eg. population) that supported collaboration. The Kyrgyz Statistics Institute received support from the EU and IMF approx 10 years ago for similar work on Financial Accounts but it wasn't completed satisfactorily. The EU encouraged the Kyrgyz participants to address the topic again. The contents and activities of the project were determined by the Kyrgyz from the point of view of their needs – there was a visit by a group of staff from Finland (2009), to consult on the needs and design the project accordingly. The Kyrgyz were very keen to utilise Finnish expertise as Finnish systems are renowned for their high quality, and they were keen to learn from them.

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?** Not a particularly strong prodoc. The project was aimed to support the National Statistics Committee of Kyrgyzstan, and the implementation of the Statistical Master Plan (SMP) for the development of the State Statistics and Information System in the Kyrgyz Republic (2006-2009). This should support the economic development of the country in line with the Country Development Strategy. The project aims to develop Kyrgyzstan's strategic planning of statistical activities, as well as to increase the efficiency and effectiveness. The project develops the statistical methods of data collection, classification and analysis of data. This was one of the first ICI projects and wasn't required to have the same quality of prodoc as normal.

**Is there a Logframe?** Not in framework format, only objectives and components and a description of the planned activities

**Cross-cutting objectives** Quality Group encouraged better incorporation of cross-cutting themes, in particular sex-disaggregated data & data on ethnic minorities. This is not particularly evident in the reports, however, as they are focused on very technical issues regarding statistical data collection & handling, although in some cases the results of the improved statistics might be of benefit to different groups. However, in practice there seems to be reasonable gender and ethnicity balance within the staff and stakeholders of the project. If anything this is a female dominated field in Kyrgyzstan (probably due to low public service salaries).

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** Unclear – there was no clear Logframe, and no clear indicators at outcome level. Some general indicators regarding information and knowledge developed at output level.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** Normal ICI procedures, with reporting by the organisation to the MFA, & reports checked by ICI consultant. No specific evaluation.

**Areas of concern?** Political situation in the country and changes in staffing in the partner organisation have caused concern and last minute changes and delays. Many different types of statistics, from different sectors, are being collected – this is challenging, but responds to the needs of the partner. It is also sometimes difficult to get adequate sharing of information between government agencies and departments in Kyrgyz Republic – particularly in the Population Register. However, during 2012 there appears to have been

good progress and agreements made on data sharing in some other topics. The old Population Register has not been updated for years, and there is no clear lines of responsibility, as it falls between the Statistics office, the Ministry of the Interior and the Police. The other components fall more clearly under the Statistical Central Office and they are a priority, therefore they are progressing.

The Kyrgyz side has requested one additional field visit during autumn 2012, prior to finalising the assignment, to assist with the practical implementation of the financial accounts system. The main difficulty is in the practical implementation, as it is quite technically difficult to compile the data and they appreciate having hands-on assistance. To ensure completion of the work, this would be recommended.

It is a concern that some of these topics – eg. Financial Accounts – already received support from EU & IMF some years ago, but were not successful. Therefore it is important to follow-through and ensure that this work is now completed.

#### Key documents considered:

Project proposal for Finnish - Kyrgyz Technical Co-operation in the Area of Statistics, Statistics Finland, 9.2.2009

Laaturyhmän hanke esitys, 15.5.2009, Tilastoalan kehittämishanke (IKI) Kirgisiassa, HEL8207-24

Laaturyhmän pöytäkirja, 4.6.2009, Tilastoalan kehittämishanke (IKI) Kirgisiassa, HEL7219-21

Lausunto; Laaturyhmä, 25.5.2009, Tilastoalan kehittämishanke (IKI) Kirgisiassa, HELM178-11

Mission reports

Quarterly progress and financial reports

ILO Decent Work Country Programme in Central Asia and the Southern Caucasus	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly relevant – especially to the 2011 Finnish Develt Policy (human rights, disability, gender, democracy, etc), but also to the 2007 policy, as well as MDGs</li> <li>• In line with the WEI framework, supporting socially sustainable development</li> <li>• Also in line with the countries' national long term development plans</li> <li>• Continuing to work on synergies &amp; joint activities with other organisations (eg. UN organisations such as UNDP Georgia)</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low money – high advisory services. Very little procurement of goods. Much of budget goes to services – 43% of total Finnish budget is TA and support services</li> <li>• 4 000 000 Euro from Finland of total budget of 4,4 mEuro over 4 years, over 8 countries (budget increased by 10 x during preparation &amp; Caucasus were added). There is an in kind contribution of the participating countries on average 10 % of the total budget on an annual basis, including organisation of joint seminars, events, printed promotional material, brochures and publications.</li> <li>• Inputs from ILO (staff time, travel, materials), leverage of other funding from recipient governments &amp; other donors. Sub-regional office of ILO is providing approx 50 000 Euro/ year in staff costs and technical support.</li> <li>• The budget is not strictly allocated by country but is used flexibly.</li> <li>• Inputs from Finnish Min Social Affairs (expert's time) are continuing.</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good activity for leveraging more funds from recipient and ILO and other donors</li> <li>• Main focus on sharing of ideas, influencing recipient governments</li> </ul>

ILO Decent Work Country Programme in Central Asia and the Southern Caucasus Analysis, issues arising	
Evaluation criterion	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very positive so far, although in some countries (eg. Georgia) the govt is not very supportive, despite signing up to international labour agreements</li> <li>• High value comes from regional nature – some countries can provide good examples and some provide examples of ‘bad practice’! In addition, when local circumstances may hold up work in one country the project can push ahead with activities in another</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main objective is to support security in the society, social sustainable development and promote the Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) taking into account the priorities set by the ILO and the tri-partite constituents in each country</li> <li>• This could be difficult to achieve given the economic crisis &amp; political changes in beneficiary countries (esp. difficult in Turkmenistan &amp; Uzbekistan)</li> <li>• However, impact seems to be good so far</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Probably quite sustainable as too little money to create dependency</li> <li>• The results of the project should strengthen country procedures &amp; legislation</li> <li>• Many of these countries have sufficient budget but need advice &amp; reminders on topics so national bodies can take ideas forwards</li> </ul>
Management and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managed from ILO’s Moscow office, with local administrators and coordinators employed in each country in Sth Cauc and C.Asia</li> <li>• CTA employed, based in ILO’s Moscow office</li> <li>• Was some discussion about location of central office, but Moscow is pragmatic decision – easier transport links to all countries &amp; avoids complaints re basing in one of target countries</li> <li>• Valuable inputs from MFA sector advisor, MFA staff and roving ambassadors</li> <li>• Is serving as a useful project for replication – now initial steps being taken in Africa by MFA and Finnish Min Social Affairs expert, together with ILO</li> </ul>
Finnish added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was Finnish expert in Moscow ILO office, closely involved with prodoc preparation</li> <li>• He is no longer in post, but working in Finland. Ministry of Social Affairs has agreed to his continuing involvement</li> <li>• Sectoral advisor of MFA closely involved</li> <li>• Has been some use of translated Finnish brochures on OSH</li> </ul>

#### Strategy – is the strategy clear?

Yes, the project falls under the tripartite (government, employers and workers) declaration - the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization (unanimously adopted in June 2008), and ILO has worked on this topic since 1999. The Global Economic Crisis has made it even more important, and this project is designed as a response. The three main priorities 1) promotion of employment (employment opportunities), 2) occupational safety and health systems reform, 3) social protection and social improvements. The priorities have been derived from the countries national long-term development plans (though not all countries are fully supportive). The project is aimed at assisting the national partners (Government, Trade Unions and Employers’ Organisations) in eight CIS countries, consisting of the five Central Asian and three Caucasian countries, to put into practice the priorities that they have themselves identified in the pursuit of Decent Work. ILO has worked for many years in these countries, and Finland has also a history of working with ILO and on labour issues in these countries.

**Is there a Logframe?** Yes, with very clear definition of objectives, outputs and indicators. Seems that the prodoc and Logframe was improved during the preparation process, based on the comments from the MFA.

**Cross-cutting objectives** The project covers these issues well. For instance, includes topics such as supporting incorporation of disabled people to workplaces, or the access and legal protection of women (including pregnant women) and youth to employment. These are clear targets in the project document and Logframe.

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** Quite detailed indicators in prodoc, although no separate Logframe attached so not clear where the SOVs are from.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?** Monitoring and reporting procedures are listed in prodoc. Good first report provided. A MTR anticipated during 2012.

**Gaps in documentation or information?** No Project Advisory Board minutes, no financial expenditure reports. Only have progress report for 2-10.2010. After that?

**Areas of concern?** Quality group noted that the project environment is difficult and the goals are very ambitious and wanted them to be followed up carefully in reports. This is being done.

**Key documents considered:**

Project Document 'From the crisis towards Decent and Safe jobs- Sustainable regional development for job generation and social justice in the framework of Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs)'

Agreement between the MFA and ILO regarding the project RER/09/05/FIN 'From the crisis towards Decent and Safe jobs in Central Asia and Southern Caucasus'

Laaturyhmän hanke esitys 11.11.2008, ILO/Työterveys- ja työturvallisuusjärjestelmät Keski-Aasiassa, HEL6247-134

Laaturyhmän pöytäkirja, 18.11.2008, ILO/Työterveys- ja työturvallisuusjärjestelmät Keski-Aasiassa, HEL7219-20

Lausunto; Laaturyhmä 19.11.2008, ILO/Työterveys- ja työturvallisuusjärjestelmät Keski-Aasiassa HELM121-28

Laaturyhmän hanke esitys ja käsittelyyn, 6.11.2009, ILO/Työterveys- ja työturvallisuusjärjestelmät Keski-Aasiassa ja Etelä-Kaukasiassa, HEL8175-121

Laaturyhmän pöytäkirja, 17.11.2009, ILO/Työterveys- ja työturvallisuusjärjestelmät Keski-Aasiassa ja Etelä-Kaukasiassa, HEL7219-48

Lausunto; Laaturyhmä, 10.11.2009, ILO/Työterveys- ja työturvallisuusjärjestelmät Keski-Aasiassa ja Etelä-Kaukasiassa, HELM438-7

Varainmyöntöesitys, 25.11.2009, ILO/Työterveys- ja työturvallisuusjärjestelmät Keski-Aasiassa ja Etelä-Kaukasiassa, HEL7248-206

Inception & Progress Reports, April 2011 (for the period 2-10.2010) & annexes, April 2012 (for the period 1-12.2011)

Some project-produced or adapted materials – for instance on Occupational Safety and Health in Kyrgyzstan and Georgia

Eurasia Foundation of Central Asia - Equal Before the Law - Access to Justice in Central Asia	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	<p>The project maps well on to WEI overall objectives – of promoting good governance, security and stability. Its emphasis on vulnerable citizens, including children, maps closely onto cross-cutting priorities.</p> <p>The project has been developed on the basis of extensive consultation, needs assessment and initial research, which appears to guarantee a close fit with the needs of beneficiaries (though less with local stakeholders in Govt and NGOs).</p> <p>Finland has a good reputation in the sector and region – similar legal systems and history, shared legal tradition, which makes it easy to have collaboration with Finnish universities and authorities</p>

Eurasia Foundation of Central Asia - Equal Before the Law - Access to Justice in Central Asia	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
	<p>The topics are very relevant – only a small query about the relevance of including the local research component, when WEI already has the Security Cluster – might have made more sense to link to those institutions.</p> <p>This is the largest Justice project for Finland, and Finland coordinates closely with the EU, Germany and France (the other key donors in Central Asia). Finnish representatives participate in donor coordination meetings, which have improved coordination, complementarity and avoided overlaps, as well as developing a shared policy position</p>
Efficiency	<p>Total budget – 4 775 782 EUR (of which 3 188 024 remaining as of report from 1 December 2011). The size of certain grants awarded to local partner organizations seems large – e.g. 258 000 Euro to a Bishkek based legal clinic. (In another case, a contract was stopped after due diligence report.) This seems a potential risk – investing such large sums of money into NGOs. To follow up - how were grants awarded? How are funds being disbursed? No details received regarding the budget for these activities, the justification for the level of funding, the guarantees regarding funding, etc. Input is required from MFA Finland as to the mechanisms by which such issues are monitored by them. Charging personnel time on actual time used - unclear how this is limited. International TA fringe benefits 40% of salary. National TA fringe benefits of 25%, 28% and 35% by country on top of salary. Salaries seem quite high for an NGO.</p> <p>Two organisations are involved with separate budgeting. EFCA Charges 7% indirect rate on total direct costs. EF charges 18% indirect rate on total direct costs.</p>
Effectiveness	<p>Activities conducted to date – survey on which project based, preliminary activities since award of main funding in 2011. Many activities at preparation stage at present. Difficult to judge (seems to be taking time to get activities into progress).</p> <p>The design is over-complicated, with too many elements. It would benefit from more focus.</p>
Impact	Too early to tell – activities at an early stage.
Sustainability	Not clear what the strategy is – and of concern is the lack of reference to engaging with governments (which can be an issue regarding sustainability). Will the trained staff stay on?
Management and administration	Issues have arisen relating to management by the Eurasia Foundation; and by MFA Finland – with regard to e.g. reporting, financial oversight, unclear chains of command. This appears to be partly a cultural issue, and EF/EFCA not having earlier experiences working with the MFA.
Finnish added value	Study tour planned to Finland, conference in Finland planned, funds for Finnish lecturers to visit Central Asia, student exchanges. (How much has been put in place so far?)

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?** The rationale for the project is quite clear. However, there is probably not enough local ownership from governments and civil society organisations. The document has had insufficient participation from them, although there was considerable consultation of vulnerable people in the preparation phase. There does seem to be improvements in the ownership gradually, and the MFA representatives have worked closely with the Governments to involve them.

**Is there a Logframe?** Yes

**Cross-cutting objectives** The Human Rights Based Approach could be increased by including greater participation of beneficiaries, but otherwise strong involvement of cross-cutting objectives.

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?**

Indicators included – will be used in reporting.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed?** How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?

Report submitted on activities for first 6 months (up to end 2011), no further reports seen. The report lacked specific details with regard to actual outputs achieved, problems encountered, timetable for delivery of subsequent activities.

**Issues arising / Areas of concern** – See above – financial issues, management and reporting issues, interaction with government sector in beneficiary countries, etc.

If there is another phase, there may need to be a competitive tendering process, or alternatively the MFA would need to work with a multilateral organisation, in order to comply with procurement rules

**Key documents considered:**

- EBL Budget Narrative 20 June 2011
- EBL Newsletter March 2012
- EBL Project document June 2011
- EURASIA FOUNDATION Equal Before the Law - Access to Justice in Central Asia Interim Financial Report 15 July 2011 - 31 October 2011
- Feedback on the Venice Commission's proposed trainings, November 2011
- Kimep Law School Educational Needs Assessment Report
- Needs Assessment Of Kyrgyz State Law Academy
- Tajikistan National University Law School Needs Assessment

PATRIR – Crimea Policy Dialogue	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	This activity appears, on the basis of the documents consulted, to have strong relevance on several planes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• contributing to security and good governance, linked with sustainable development;</li><li>• responding to identified needs of Crimea and its populations;</li><li>• contributing to broader dialogue and interaction at the international level, and complementing EU policy</li></ul>
Efficiency	Finland contributes total of € 1.2 million for the project. A small budget was approved during 2009-10, and when good progress was evident, this was increased. From reports submitted to date, project appears to be implemented according to budget, on schedule (delays encountered are explained – e.g. impact of external factor, changeover of leadership in Crimea)
Effectiveness	The project has been meeting its targets with regard to numbers and categories of participants engaged in the process; the events planned and conducted; capacity-building activities; communications activities The project started in September 2009 and the project has progressed according to plan. In 2011, three thematic international dialogues were implemented: identity-politics dialogue, a Crimean country dialogue and a language dialogue. Twelve research activities were also begun

PATRIR – Crimea Policy Dialogue	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
	dealing with eg. land use, identity, security, and autonomy of minorities, the EU and Crime, multilingualism in different countries, etc. The project has achieved a lot of media coverage.
Impact	So far the impact has been kept, on purpose, at the level of policymakers, experts, opinion shapers – before expanding out to broader community impacts in due course. The positive feedback received for project reports appears to demonstrate that impacts already being felt. The Ukrainian Ministry of Education has begun to use the multilingual education model of PATRIR in Crimea.
Sustainability	The project has well conceived plans for ensuring sustainability, through the development of strong ownership among the participants of the dialogue. There appear to be strong prospects for continuation of activities undertaken, following the ending of donor support. There are good prospects for applicability to other regions/countries, which are actively being explored by the project team.
Management and administration	Project is working with an INGO, the Peace Action, Training and Research Institute of Romania. This was recommended by the EU, following earlier good work. It was felt that an NGO might be more effective at bringing together conflicted parties than others. From the content of the reports, proposal, the management and administration of the project appears to be very competent. To look into – how this is achieved notwithstanding locations of project team, distance from target communities in Crimea, etc.
Finnish added value	Involvement of Finnish Institute of International Affairs, the Åland Islands Peace Institute and Crisis Management Initiative (CMI). Study visit to Finland, November 2011. Co-operation with Finnish experts is planned, for example for the training of researchers, support in some thematic issues, to evaluate the progress of the project and the wider Black Sea peace-building activities

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?** The project includes a clear and comprehensive strategy, which maps on to the WEI goals explicitly.

**Is there a Logframe?** A logframe of sorts is included – but it is not developed as a proper logframe.

**Cross-cutting objectives** The project is dealing with issues of religious, ethnic and language difference, as a means of conflict prevention and peace-building. However, there is no mention of gender or youth, or other potentially disadvantaged groups as sub-sets of these overall topics, within the project proposal or reports. There was no discussion of this within Quality Group

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?**

Clear set of indicators are in place, reporting reflects these targets, explains under and over attainment

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?**

Monitoring is conducted after each dialogue, with feedback from participants (project consistently achieves high scores, well above the target level of 70%), further feedback from surveys; external evaluation planned for each stage (mid-term evaluation due in 2012)

**Gaps in documentation or information?** Logframe. Need to receive examples of the research, press and other materials produced. Not clear how far cross-cutting objectives are addressed (clear scope to do so).

**Issues arising / Areas of concern**

Why was Romanian organization contracted – lack of Finnish capacity / expertise in this sphere? What are plans for expanding on this experience, to other WEI sub-regions? Are synergies with other WEI components (esp. Security Cluster) identified, exploited?

**Key documents considered:**

- AGREEMENT between The Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Peace Action, Training and Research Institute of Romania (the Agency) - Implementation of the Crimea Policy Dialogue project, II phase
- Application for Finnish Government support for international non-governmental organisations' development co-operation programmes and/or projects (2009/10)
- Interim Operational Report – 2009 - Crimea Policy Dialogue project
- Crimea Policy Dialogue Project Operational Report 2009 – 2010
- Crimea Policy Dialogue Project Progress Report 2011
- Crimea Policy Dialogue Project Event report - 7-10 November, 2011, Helsinki, Finland

EBRD Chernobyl Shelter Fund	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	How relevant is this activity to WEI? In the context of promoting environmental security in WEI region?
Efficiency	3.1 million Euro in WEI contribution (following 4.88 million 1999-2009). Concerns raised at times over Ukrainian contribution, and other issues related to attitude of Ukrainian authorities towards e.g. sub-contractors, PIU team, VAT payments, etc.
Effectiveness	Reports include details of progress made in this long-term activity, problems encountered.
Impact	
Sustainability	Ongoing donor funding required – Finland's position on this?
Management and administration	Managed by EBRD Chernobyl Shelter Fund on behalf of Assembly of Contributors. The administration in the MFA falls outside of ITÄ-20
Finnish added value	Not clear from reports – more information to be elicited from interview.

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?** Yes, in layman terms;

**Is there a Logframe?** Not received

**Cross-cutting objectives** The agreement and the report do not include cross-cutting objectives at all. Naturally it could be considered that the overall objective of making the Chernobyl site safe, has implications for health and safety, particularly of children.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?**

Periodic updates to assembly of contributors, technical reports, financial reports.

**Issues arising / Areas of concern** This project was already receiving Finnish funding for many years. When the final tranche of funding was needed, the MFA utilised the WEI framework to obtain funding. It was not designed as a planned part of the framework and in reality should not be considered within it.

**Key documents considered:**

- Chernobyl Shelter Fund – Assembly Of Contributors Project Update February 2011
- Chernobyl Shelter Fund – Assembly Of Contributors Project Progress Report November 2011
- Chernobyl Shelter Fund – Shelter Implementation Plan – Integrated Report September 2007
- Chernobyl 25 years on
- Nuclear Safety Account Overview Report 1993-2008
- Rules Of The Chernobyl Shelter Fund Of The European Bank For Reconstruction And Development (amended December 2005)

EBRD TC (Technical Cooperation) Fund	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	The components of this programme show good relevance to the overall WEI objectives (economic development, environment, water and sanitation, regional policy, information and communications technology.). The extent of regional cooperation engendered is not so evident, although activities in the communications regulatory training activity are common/very similar in the countries covered – an issue to follow up. The activities appear to be demand driven – but this question should be followed up with local beneficiaries – and to respond to capacity-building needs identified in the communications sector in these countries.
Efficiency	Finland contribution = €3,8 million (supporting 8 component activities, in the following WEI countries: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine). Reports indicate that regulatory training programme has been delivered efficiently; Kyiv traffic infrastructure project less so (problems encountered in cooperation with beneficiary authorities); other planned TC Fund activities delayed because of various factors (Belarus, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan).
Effectiveness	Communications Regulatory Training activities delivered on time and to budget, according to documentation reviewed. Programme has received excellent rating by EBRD, and local beneficiaries. Kyiv traffic management project unable to meet the declared aims, due to delays and problems encountered in dealing with the beneficiary authorities (despite effective work of the Finnish consulting company).
Impact	Regulatory training: Have participants been able to apply skills and knowledge acquired? Any impact at the level of organizations in the countries covered? Kyiv traffic project – no evidence in report of the impact of the project.
Sustainability	Regulatory training: Follow-on activity (broadband policy) being implemented in Georgia by Kanervisto consulting. Further training planned?
Management and administration	Regulatory training: Implemented by Kanervisto consulting in collaboration with EBRD; Kyiv traffic management – implemented by Finnish consulting company Traficon.
Finnish added value	Finnish consulting companies (Kanervisto, and Finnish consulting company Traficon) has been employed for the project – need to investigate how much actual Finnish expertise involved, how the assignment was awarded to this company, beneficiary perceptions. (EBRD report states that beneficiaries are aware of donor identity.)

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?** Rationale for the interventions clearly laid out in EBRD documentation.).

**Is there a Logframe?** Not received.

#### Cross-cutting objectives

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** Regulatory training: In terms of number of courses provided, numbers of participants, levels of satisfaction; Kyiv traffic management: Should lead to improvement in congestion, traffic management, parking conditions.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?**

Summary report on TC fund activities supported by Finland received (for 2010 and 2011 received).

**Gaps in documentation or information?** Logframe, information on project budget and expenditure. Reports on activities in Tajikistan, Ukraine, Armenia, Azerbaijan.

**Issues arising / Areas of concern** – Have opportunities for regional cooperation been exploited?

#### Key documents considered:

- Agreement Between Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs and The European Bank For Reconstruction And Development In Respect Of The Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs EBRD Technical Cooperation Fund (2007)
- 2010 CAR report – FIOD – p. 13
- EBRD Legal Transition Team Proposal for a Regional Communications Regulatory Training Programme - Finland's Wider European Initiative
- Final project report – Georgia Communications Regulatory Training (2010)
- Georgia – Communications Policy and Regulatory Training – Terms of Reference (May 2011)
- Laaturyhmä Pöytäkirja, 4.10.2009, EBRD/Teknisen avun alueellisen rahaston täydentäminen, HEL7219-45

EBRD Water Fund	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	Access to clean, safe water supply and sanitation facilities. Relevant to WEI objectives of supporting sustainable development, human security, good governance in regions covered by initiative.
Efficiency	Finnish contribution 2010-13 – 1 million Euro.
Effectiveness	All projects stated in the report were ongoing at time of report publication: Karabalta water supply project, Kyrgyz Republic; North Tajik water Rehabilitation Programme; Central Tajik Water Feasibility Study. Early indications were of satisfaction by EBRD and beneficiary partners.
Impact	Too early to tell.
Sustainability	Aim is to facilitate sustainable management of resources – too early to tell how effective this is.
Management and administration	Donor funds managed by EBRD Water Fund

EBRD Water Fund	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Finnish added value	Not clear – to follow up (not evident from documents)

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?** The rationale for the establishment of the fund, the need for the activities envisaged, and the long-term anticipated impacts of the activities are clear.

**Is there a Logframe?** Not received

#### Cross-cutting objectives

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** Activities mainly at present appear to be in the format of feasibility studies, knowledge transfer (exposure to best practice), awareness raising among stakeholders.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?**

**Issues arising / Areas of concern** How does Water Fund interact with other water-related activities under EBRD, in which Finland also involved under WEI? Synergies with FinnWaterWEI?

#### Key documents considered:

- General Conditions Of The European Bank For Reconstruction And Development – EBRD Water Fund, June 2010
- EBRD Water Fund – Progress and Completion Report for Activities Undertaken in 2010 (April 2011)

UNDP Aid for Trade	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	Very strong relevance for WEI – mapping onto core priorities (sustainable development, economic stability), across all WEI countries, also addressing cross-cutting themes explicitly (gender, environment, appropriate technology). Most countries have based their program on initial trade needs assessment in Phase I. Phase I has functioned as a pilot phase, testing the relevance and viability of approaches, before full implementation in Phase II. Some very strong synergies with other programs evident. For instance, in Georgia, AfT brought in 3mEuro project from EC on agricultural development. Well integrated with work of other donors, avoiding replication and supporting partner country activities (for instance, Ukraine AfT assisting with WTO and bilateral trade negotiations).
Efficiency	6.2 million Euro 2009-13. Reports indicate high level of efficiency (though with variation by country/project).

UNDP Aid for Trade	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
	Fairly high overhead costs, from the regional office in Bratislava – in Phase II this was 27% of the total budget. The cost of the Project Manager and Assistant are not so high but associated costs make this much higher. There are also a Project Officer and Project Assistant/Specialist in each participating country.
Effectiveness	Reports indicate high level of effectiveness overall for the programme (variations by country/region). Programme designed to cater for the needs of the target beneficiary population in the country/sub-region of country, while working within framework of the regional and global AfT programme. Appears to be effective formula – although in practice there is variation in the extent of regional cooperation, among beneficiaries as well as the perception locally of its value. Lessons learned from the OECD 2011 review <i>Strengthening Accountability in Aid for Trade</i> ?
Impact	Reports indicate strong level of impact among beneficiaries. To explore – how is the balance between achieving results compared with the size of target population? To what extent are cross-cutting objectives monitored, integrated into projects in the field?
Sustainability	Not evident from the reports. From the field visits there is some evidence of sustainability among beneficiaries, but this varies. For instance, the training provided in Georgia and the strong buy in of the regional government makes it quite likely to be sustainable. In Armenia the focus on one small cooperative with very few beneficiaries may be a risky investment. In Ukraine the policy activities are quite high level and likely to be very sustainable. Support for business information centres in many countries beyond the life of the project is problematic as most farmers are not willing to pay for services. In Tajikistan the microfinance component has difficulties due to the provision of subsidised loans with interest rates often lower than inflation. UNDP has been advised of the move to focus Finnish support on Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan from 2014.
Management and administration	UNDP Bratislava + country offices of UNDP
Finnish added value	Visibility of Finnish funding apparent (logo of MFA on reports and brochures, for instance) – but not much expertise present.

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?** Yes, part of global strategy, with specific adaptations for the EECCA region, and countries.

There is a variation in approaches for each country, depending on specific needs. For instance, in Ukraine there has been work on trade policy level with the government (WTO negotiations, analyses, policy setting, etc) and at the local level with SMEs and business support organisations, providing information dissemination and training. In Kyrgyzstan the approach has been to focus on a specific region (Batken) and work with local SMEs, cooperatives and Batken Market Information Centre, providing training, establishing a web site, and a trademark, writing a manual for entrepreneurs and providing training, and supporting poverty reduction. In Georgia, there is also a regional focus (in the Adjara semi-autonomous region), and a focus on trade development (both goods and services). UNDP has supported a business development centre to support to agriculture and tourism, prepared manuals and business forms, established a certified training course for tourism staff with a local college and the Adjara Tourism Agency etc. In Armenia the project has worked with national level trade promotion but also at local level in Tavush region, and supported cross-border study tours and information sharing. It has also supported an agricultural processing cooperative.

**Is there a Logframe?** Yes, per country, as well as the overall project.

**Cross-cutting objectives:** defined in the text of the project document but not always evident in the logframes or in practice. In practice, treatment of gender is quite variable depending on the country. In the countries visited it was clear that although the staff are aware of the importance of gender, it is not easy to reconcile quotas for women to participate alongside the interest to prioritise good progress of implementation. There seems to also be local variation in attitudes towards women. In Armenia, there is a problem of high levels of male migration from the countryside, yet the project doesn't appear to be able to focus on the women who remain. The regional focus of many of the activities, has meant a focus on poorer areas, and often worked with ethnic minorities (eg. Oralmen in Kazakhstan, Ajara people in Georgia). In Kyrgyzstan, by working in an area with a recent history of ethnic violence, and ensuring that all groups are included, there is an opportunity to improve local harmony – this has been quite successful in practice. The project also has laid the ground for improved regional relationships. eg. Tajik and Kyrgyz local offices are working closely on AfT over the border. Environment was specifically targeted in only some cases. For instance, Tajikistan has produced a demonstration, booklet and training on environmentally friendly cotton-growing techniques. In Armenia, the country office has chosen a 'do no harm' approach on gender and environment, rather than specific activities.

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?** Bratislava Regional Centre has responsibility for coordination and monitoring, with each UNDP country office doing local monitoring. Each office has employed local staff and consultants as needed.

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?**

UNDP standard reporting procedures, handled through Bratislava; additional reporting to MFA Finland. Reports are quarterly. They are interesting though as the different country offices provide their own feedback, they are quite varied in style and content. There are no annual reports but there is an excel sheet (2011 Results Matrix) giving analysis and reporting of progress against the logical framework (although it is only partially filled, and the budget data is unfilled). Regional focus seems to be beneficial for sharing of lessons.

**Key documents considered:**

- CONCEPT NOTES, WORKPLANS, LOGICAL FRAMEWORKS FOR COUNTRIES COVERED BY WEI - CENTRAL ASIA, SOUTH CAUCASUS, AND WESTERN CIS
- Third Party Cost-Sharing Agreement between the Government of Finland and UNDP (2009 and 2010)
- AID FOR TRADE FOR CENTRAL ASIA, SOUTH CAUCASUS AND WESTERN CIS: Promoting Trade Development and Poverty Reduction in Partnership with Finland's Wider Europe Initiative (2011-13)
- Quarterly financial reports (2011)
- Quarterly progress reports (2011, 1-3/2012)
- Evaluation of Component II of phase I of the Wider Europe Aid for Trade Project, Aid for Trade in Central Asia: Support to Economic Development Along Trade Corridors, 2011
- Laajemman Euroopan aloite; UNDP/Kauppa tukeva kehitysyhteistyöohjelma, johtoryhmän kokous 23.4.2012 ja neljännesvuosiraportti I-III/2012, HEL7248-24
- 2011 Results Matrix
- HEL7203136 Decision 1.7.2009
- HEL 7216-13 Quality group meeting minutes 16.6.2009

Evaluation criterion	InfoDev World Bank Analysis, issues arising

InfoDev World Bank	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	Clear and explicit linkage to Finnish policy, including WEI, developed in collaboration between Finland, InfoDev, Nokia. Addresses priority issues in the sphere of economic development, sustainable development of entrepreneurial activity.
Efficiency	Total value of the programme for 2010 – 2013 in the region is € 3 million. Certain amount of delay encountered in launch of the programme in 2010; issues encountered due to fall of value of Euro against USD How efficient is implementation through local partners? Need to investigate during field visits.
Effectiveness	Late 2011 progress report notes significant progress and achievements. Central Asian city not selected among the hubs – is this an issue, regarding regional coverage? (Tashkent problematic – but e.g. Almaty?). How is implementation in Belarus, given increased restrictions on social networking, etc?
Impact	Does the selection of the Enterprise Incubation Foundation in Armenia represent the best option, in terms of extending impacts, sustainability? Given that EIF already has substantial contact e.g as Microsoft Centre, resources available? Need to explore rationale for selection
Sustainability	Clear plans for sustainability incorporated in logframe, programme – but to what extent dependent on availability of resources, support, from local and international sources? Progress report mentions level of job creation achieved – long-term posts?
Management and administration	InfoDev (Washington DC) + partnership with MFA Finland, Nokia – to explore how this relationship functions in practice
Finnish added value	“Joint initiative between Finland’s Ministry for Foreign Affairs, infoDev, and Nokia, with inputs from Finland’s private sector” – to what extent is this evident in the projects being implemented, to date? (Little mentioned in the progress reports) 4 <sup>th</sup> Global Forum on Innovation & Technology Entrepreneurship held in Helsinki, June 2011

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?** Clear and comprehensive strategy for implementation in several regions around the world, including EECCA.

**Is there a Logframe?** Yes

**Cross-cutting objectives**

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?**

Comprehensive set of indicators relating to project implementation

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?**

Regular progress reports submitted. No evaluation conducted to date?

**Issues arising / Areas of concern**

- Explicit reference made to affording priority to certain key target groups (women, youth, people with disabilities) – is this being followed up in project implementation?
- Are synergies with other WEI activities (e.g. ILO, Aid for Trade, EBRD telecoms activity) being exploited?
- Role of Nokia, other Finnish private sector companies – how evident in implementation of projects?

**Key documents considered:**

- Creating Sustainable Businesses in the Knowledge Economy - Draft programme document, 8 July 2009
- Creating Sustainable Businesses in the Knowledge Economy' – Consolidated Program Document, January 2010
- Annex on Implementations: Country, Regional and Global Implementations in Africa, Asia and Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (ECCA)
- Results Framework - Creating Sustainable Businesses in the Knowledge Economy Program (undated)
- Logframe Finland InfoDev Nokia 7 July (year?)
- "Second Progress Report: June 2010 to date - Information Document (This document, which is presented to the steering committee for information, is relevant for those portions of the program already launched during 2010. Information on the 2011-12 work plan is presented in Doc/E/5)"
- "Interim Report – August, 2010 - Information Document (This document, which is presented for information, is relevant for those portions of the program already launched, or due to be launched in 2010)"
- "Progress Report - Focus on ECA (This document, which is extracted and updated from the overall progress report discussed at the fifth steering committee, focuses specifically on progress in the ECA region)" Undated – late 2011?
- "Progress Report - Information Document (This document, which is presented to the steering committee for information, is relevant for activities carried out up to November 2011, with a focus on activities completed since the last steering committee in June 2011, especially those in the ECA region)"
- Budget and workplan for 2011-12 (for endorsement)
- FINLAND-Infodev-NOKIA GROUP JOINT PROGRAM ON CREATING SUSTAINABLE BUSINESSES IN THE KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY - RISK ANALYSIS

Venice Commission	
Evaluation criterion	Analysis, issues arising
Relevance	Very strong relevance to WEI overarching priorities – including the cross-cutting themes – through focus on rights of women, children, persons with disabilities. Regional approach – and linked to the work of the Eurasia Foundation WEI activity
Efficiency	Budget is 250 000 Euro for 2012-2013
Effectiveness	Not yet implemented – work began in June 2012
Impact	Not yet implemented.
Sustainability	Not yet implemented.
Management and administration	Council of Europe – Venice Commission
Finnish added value	Not yet clear from documents – presumably linkages to Finland-connected work with EFCA?

**Strategy – is the strategy clear?** Clear strategy, linked to the work of Venice Commission in capacity-building, awareness raising with regard to relevant conventions on rights. Clearly linked to WEI priorities, and work of EFCA.

**Is there a Logframe?** Yes

**Cross-cutting objectives**

**How are the expected results of activities defined, and how are they being measured and evaluated?**

Logframe

**What are the reporting and evaluation procedures in place per component, and their constituent parts? Are these clear? Are they being followed? How are issues raised in any relevant evaluations being responded to?**

**Issues arising / Areas of concern**

**Key documents considered:**

- DRAFT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE PROJECT “REFORM OF THE JUDICIARY AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE IN THE COUNTRIES OF CENTRAL ASIA” Implemented by the Venice Commission with EU funding (subject to availability of funds) Level Description Indicators Means of verification Assumptions
- Project proposal by the Venice Commission “Equal before the law: Access to Justice in Central Asia”

### **Finpro**

Although Finpro is referred to in WEI documentation, documents relating to the linkage between WEI and Finpro were not received. The evaluation team made contact with Finpro directly, during the course of the evaluation

## ANNEX 4 –EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The following questions were developed on the basis of the evaluation questions included in the TOR (which are shown in black). The text in red indicates the target respondent groups; the text in green shows the set of sub-questions; and the text in brown highlights issues addressed/borne in mind during interviews.

### SECTION 1: GENERAL EVALUATION QUESTIONS (BY CRITERIA)

#### CRITERION 1: RELEVANCE

Q1: is the regional approach of the WEI relevant? Is it consistent with the policies of the partner countries?

Respondents: MFA / Component coordinators and Finnish partners / International organizations / local partners

- How is the regional approach implemented in practice? What do you understand it to mean?
- Are partners committed to / aware of the regional approach?
- How are the policies of partner countries taken into account?
- What happens in cases of discord/clash between Finnish policy and that of the partner country? (How are such clashes revealed?)
- To what extent are the viewpoints of civil society in partner countries taken into account?

Q2: Are the objectives and achievements of the country specific WEI programmes consistent with the policies of the partner country?

- How are the programmes/projects identified to start with?
- How are the policies of the partner country identified, and taken into account?
- How is the consistency evaluated (and by whom?)
- Is there any awareness-raising locally regarding achievement?

Q3: Are the objectives of the programme consistent with Finland's development policy and regional priorities, sectoral and thematic priorities? Whose poverty and inequality is the programme focused to reduce? Whose sustainable development is it promoting?

- How was the Programme developed (what were the driving factors, key goals)? To what extent were broader stakeholder communities in Finland (e.g. parliament, media, public, NGOs) consulted?
- What was the situation within the ITÄ-20 during the WEI's development? Was there a clear idea on the priorities in the region?
- How were the priorities for the partner countries identified? How much consultation took place with partner countries (government / non-governmental sectors); Finnish or international partners?

Q4: Has the situation changed since the approval of the programme?

- To what extent has Finland's policy approach, MFA resources and its priorities remained constant / changed since the launch of the Programme?
- Has the level of support / acceptance of the policy and priorities among political elites, general public, seen changes in this period?

- What impact have any changes had / likely to have? (for example, climate change impact of water-related disasters such as floods, droughts, conflicts)
- What impact have developments within the EU (e.g. Eurozone crisis); with relations with Russia; with EU-Belarus relations; protests and civil unrest in Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, etc – had / likely to have on WEI?

Q5: To what extent has the WEI complemented the EU strategy in the region?

**Respondents:** MFA / EC (EEAS? EUDs?) / International organizations / local partners

- What is the EU strategy in the region? To what extent has it remained the same / changed during this period? Where do complementarities or overlaps exist with Finnish policy and strategies?
- How has the coordination between Finnish and EU policies been identified, and worked towards? How has coordination and cooperation between MFA policies and IFOs acting in the regions?

## CRITERION 2: EFFICIENCY

Q6: How efficient is the multilateral approach? Can the costs of the programme be justified by the results?

- How is efficiency being measured? What are the comparative parameters (bilateral approach?)?
- Does data exist on the relative costs and efficiency of multi-lateral compared with bi-lateral approaches?
- What results are referred to regarding assessment of the programme's impact, efficiency?
- Could the results achieved by the individual projects, or the overall WEI, have been achieved more efficiently by another method of implementation?

Q7: Has the role of the MFA been that of a development entrepreneur as recommended in the evaluation in 2009?

- How does the MFA define / understand the notion of 'entrepreneur'?
- To what extent has this approach been embraced, accepted within MFA?
- What measures have been taken towards achieving this role?
- What indicators are used to assess the extent to which the role is that of an entrepreneur?
- What evidence is there regarding this issue?

Q 8: Quality of technical assistance?

- What procedures are in place for monitoring quality of assistance?
- Are the Steering Committees or other supervision bodies able to adequately monitor the projects?
- How does MFA cope with the challenge of monitoring a complex programme, with multiplicity of implementation partners? Is the MFA too far from actual implementation?
- What are the results of evaluation of quality to date?
- What measures are being taken to address any issues of concern?

Q9: Have the contributions by the partner country and the donor(s) been provided as planned?

#### MFA and Finnish implementing partners

- What procedures are in place to monitor contributions?
- What are the results of this monitoring to date?
- Is there any difference in the provision of the contributions between the different methods of implementation? (eg. ICI, multi-bi...)
- What measures are being taken to address any issues of concern?

#### Donors and partner country respondents

- How was the nature and extent of contribution agreed upon?
- How do they assess the Finnish contribution?

### CRITERION 3: DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS

Q10. To what extent has the programme achieved its purpose or will it do so in the future?

- How is MFA / Finnish government monitoring and evaluating the programme delivery and impacts? Are there any indicators for the overall WEI achievements, or is the MFA only following the individual projects? What level of feedback is being received from Finnish, international donor, and local partners?
- How do changes in the external environment (e.g. budget cutbacks) impact on the programme's achievement of its goals?

Q11. Do the interventions support the thematic objectives of the programme?

- Do they support the objectives IN PRINCIPLE (e.g. according to the design of the interventions)?
- Do they support the objectives IN PRACTICE (e.g. according to the implementation, perceived impacts)?

### CRITERION 4: DEVELOPMENT IMPACT

Q12. Has the WEI made progress towards achieving its objectives: security; trade and development; information society development; energy and social sustainability?

- What mechanisms are in place for monitoring this progress? (If no logframe at programme level – then logframes from components, projects?)

Q13. Which indicators show that the intended changes are starting to take place?

- How strong is the evidence of these indicators?
- Are there indicators that show lack of change, negative results?

Q14. Through which transmission channels (prices, employment, access, authority, assets) are the programme impacts supposed to be transmitted to the lives of the poor women and men?

- *To be found in logframes of components and projects*
- What are the perceptions of beneficiaries as to whether these channels are appropriate, effective?
- Is there any disaggregation of the results and impacts of the individual projects? (by gender, poverty levels, etc)?

## CRITERION 5: SUSTAINABILITY

Q15. What are the possible factors that enhance or inhibit sustainability, including ownership/commitment, economic/financial, institutional, technical, socio-cultural and environmental sustainability aspects?

- What measures have been put in place by MFA, Finnish implementing partners, international partners, local partners, with regard to sustainability?
- How is progress towards sustainability being monitored and measured?
- What steps are being taken to address any issues of concern?
- How have changes in the external environment (e.g. funding cutbacks, political changes in the partner countries or in Finland) impacted on the sustainability front?
- Have constraints relating to sustainability been observed at various administrative levels in the partner countries, and how have such issues been addressed?

Q16. Who will take over the responsibility of financing the activities, or have they become self-sustaining?

- Has this been considered from the start?
- To what extent has this issue been discussed with international and local partners?
- In the case of activities that have become self-sustaining, what are the prospects for long-term sustainability?

Q17. What would be the appropriate exit strategies to ensure sustainability?

- To what extent have these been identified? Discussed with partners?

## SECTION 2: PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

### **Focus 1: Sound management in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the partner organizations**

Q18. What is the quality of WEI management, incl. monitoring and reporting, resource and personnel management, financial management, cooperation and communication between stakeholders?

- What is the management structure in MFA for the WEI programme?
- How are the activities of the management structure monitored, evaluated?
- Have the concerns about personnel resources raised in the 2009 evaluation been responded to? Have the problems raised been resolved effectively?

Q19. Are the roles and responsibilities between the involved institutions clear and appropriate?

- *Need to triangulate, by asking each respondent group to clarify, from their perspective, what the respective distribution of roles and responsibilities are*
- Do the organisations feel independent, or part of a larger programme (WEI/ Finnish funding)?
- How are the relationships with the other members of the chain – is there smooth communication or gaps? Does each level understand what the others' need?

Q20. Have important assumptions been identified? Are risks appropriately managed, including flexible adaptation to unforeseen situations (e.g. political changes)?

- What key assumptions are in place? (in absence of Logframe for overall programme)

- What risks were identified?
- How have these been mediated? (and how effectively?)
- Which unforeseen situations have arisen, and how have these been responded to?

### **Focus 2: Aid Effectiveness = Effectiveness of Aid Management and Delivery**

Q21. How has donor coordination been carried out in initial identification and planning and during implementation?

- What procedures were followed to ensure coordination?
- Were the same procedures followed for all components of the programme / with all donors?
- How effectively has this coordination been? (perspectives of MFA, international donors, local partners)
- Is there continuing coordination between donors?
- Are local reporting and monitoring procedures used? Is there much additional burden from the requirements of Finland?
- Who is perceived to be the 'owner' of the project, particularly in the multi-bi projects?

Q22. Does the programme improve complementarity and division of labour among donors?

- What indicators are used to measure this?

### **Focus 3: Finnish Value Added**

Q23. What is the added value provided by the Finnish support?

- How is this defined?
- How was it built into the planning (including in consultations with beneficiaries)?
- How is it monitored, evaluated?
- What impact is there on sustainability, ownership among beneficiaries?

Q24. What are the distinctive features of Finland's support?

## **SECTION 3. SPECIFIC QUESTIONS FOR CASE-STUDY COMPONENTS**

### **Security Cluster**

MFA / Institute / universities awarded projects / advisory board and steering committee members / local partner institutions and researchers / research community in EU

- The procedure by which the priorities for the Security Cluster were identified;
- The procedures for managing the call for proposals (including the selection of projects, monitoring and reporting from projects);
- The issue of the extent to which an effective balance is achieved, between the promotion of policy-relevant research and collaboration between academic institutions and policy bodies (including MFA), and the maintenance of academic independence;
- The extent to which the goals of capacity-building, both inside Finland, and in the partner countries, has been achieved / is being achieved;

- The extent to which synergies between the work of the Security Cluster and other components of WEI are being identified and exploited (and the means by which this does/should take place)

### **Administration:**

Q25. From the perspectives of the MFA and the institutions carrying out the research projects, how has the outsourced administration worked?

- What procedures are in place to manage this relationship, coordinate activities, maintain information sharing?

Q26. How effective has it been and has it reduced the administration of the MFA?

- What criteria are used to assess effectiveness?

Q27. Is the administrator's capacity in line with the requirements?

- How was this assessed prior to awarding the contract?

Q28. Is the outsourcing agreement cost-effective?

### **Effectiveness:**

Q29. Has the capacity of the research institutions to carry out WEI related work increased both in Finland and in the region?

- How is this monitored and evaluated? What targets are in place as indicators?
  - Indicators: numbers of researchers; training activities; research outputs; etc

Q30. Has the capacity of individual researchers benefiting from the programme increased?

- How is this monitored and evaluated? What targets are in place as indicators?
  - Indicators: language training; travel to target region / to Finland; involvement in research activities; research outputs; career prospects, etc

Q31. Has the networking led to more permanent professional relationships between the parties?

- Between parties in Finland?
- Among partners in the region?
- Between Finnish and local partners?
- Between Finnish and EU-region research institutions?
- How is this monitored and evaluated? What targets are in place as indicators?
  - Indicators: moving towards more permanent relations (MOUs, joint activities, exchange programmes, knowledge and experience sharing, etc)

Q32. Is the programme leading to more stable cooperation between the institutions in Finland and in the region including possible synergies with research institutions within the EU?

- How is this monitored and evaluated? What targets are in place as indicators?
  - Indicators: moving towards more permanent relations (MOUs, exchange programmes, knowledge and experience sharing, etc)
  - Cooperation with EU based research institutions initiated as a result of, or strengthened by, activities of WEI

Q33. Has the research information been useful for MFA? Has it been utilized in policy/strategy building and programming?

**MFA**

- How extensively do they use research outputs? Consult with research teams? Involve research teams in e.g. visits of delegations, policy debates?
  - Indicators: presence of research teams in MFA meetings, events; references to research in MFA documents, statements, etc

**Research centres (Finland and beneficiaries)**

- To what extent do they feel involved in policy debates, are their views listened to? (Concrete examples)
- To what extent do they feel that they should engage in *policy-relevant research* (e.g. cf with more conceptual work)? Is this a requirement?
- To what extent are they free to decide the research topic, engagement with subject? Do they feel any obligation / expectation to adopt any particular position vis à vis Finnish policy?
- To what extent, and how, do they observe the criterion about 'taking EU and Russian interests' into account?

Q34. How well the cluster is known in the region (academia, civil society, donor community, state bureaucracies)?

- Indicators: websites (including information on use); references to outputs, activities in mass media, academic journals, policy publications and statements, etc
- Sources: feedback from representatives of these user communities

Q35. Seminars have been organized in the region to raise the awareness – has this been a useful tool?

- Indicators: materials from workshops; feedback from participants (if received) references to workshops in mass media, academic journals, policy publications and statements, etc

Q36. How well do the research interventions fit into the overall objectives of the programme (i.e. are there synergies between the research work and the WEI programme as a whole)?

**MFA / Institute / Research teams**

- How were research priorities identified?
- To what extent was the broader WEI programme taken into account?
- What activities take place linking projects in this cluster with work of other components of WEI?
  - Evaluation team to map research project topics against WEI programme
  - Indicators: evidence of joint activity, communication to other components

Q37. How well do they support other research and objectives of the partner countries?

- How closely does the content of the research interventions correspond to identified objectives of the partner countries with regard to the development of research capacity in this sphere? To what extent were local stakeholders (governmental, academic/research) consulted with regard to the priority themes adopted for the research interventions?

Q38. Have the cross-cutting themes been included thoroughly into the programme?

- Which cross-cutting themes are being considered?
- What procedures (including indicators) are in place for monitoring and evaluating this (at application / implementing / reporting stages of projects)?
  - Indicators: e.g. coverage of cross-cutting themes in research projects; gender, social background, ethnic balance of project teams, junior visiting researchers; treatment of human rights issues in research and dissemination activities, etc

#### ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

- How were the research priorities identified (by whom? By which process? To what extent were beneficiary country researchers involved?)
- How effective are the processes of applying for funding, evaluating proposals, awarding projects, reporting and evaluating?
- Sustainability: What are the prospects within Finland? In the regions covered?

#### **FinWaterWEI**

MFA / SYKE / implementing partners / advisory board members / local partner institutions

#### ***Administration:***

Q39. From the perspectives of the MFA and the international organizations and local stakeholders, how has the outsourced administration worked?

- What procedures are in place to manage this relationship, coordinate activities?

Q40. How effective has it been and has it reduced the administration of the MFA?

- What criteria are used to assess effectiveness?

Q41. Is the administrator's capacity in line with the requirements?

- How was this assessed prior to awarding the contract?

Q42. Is the outsourcing agreement cost-effective?

Q43. Is there certain additional Finnish value-added in such arrangement (in terms of administrative arrangements)?

- How is this defined?
- How is it monitored and evaluated?

#### ***Effectiveness:***

Q44. Has the Finnish contribution given added value to the water sector cooperation in the region?

Q45. Does FinWaterWEI have a specific niche in the region?

SEEN FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF FINNISH / INTERNATIONAL / LOCAL RESPONDENTS

Q46. Does the selection of activities under the FinWaterWEI support the Strategic Cooperation Programme for Finland's Water Sector Support to the EECCA countries 2009-2013 (published 29.10.2009)?

- Verification through reference to this programme, cross-checked against responses of stakeholder groups

Q47. Have the cross-cutting themes of the Finnish development policy been included thoroughly into the programme?

- Which cross-cutting themes are being considered?
- What procedures (including indicators) are in place for monitoring and evaluating this (at application / implementing / reporting stages of projects)?
  - Indicators: e.g. coverage of cross-cutting themes in projects; gender, social background, ethnic balance of project teams,

**Sustainability:**

Q48. How sustainable FinWaterWEI's outcomes can be expected to be (also in terms of local ownership)?

- How is sustainability planned for in the logframes, implementation of activities?
- How extensively has it been discussed with local, international partners?
- Are there risks that changes in external environment (funding, political changes) can impact on sustainability prospects?

Q49. Which kinds of capacity enhancements the program is expected to lead to, and for whom?

- Indicators: evidence of capacity development among local partners; development of regional collaboration, long-term relations between partners

Q50. Achieving the set objectives & development impact: Is FinWaterWEI on its way to achieving the objective, results and development impacts set in its strategic project document (29.10.2009), particularly in its Logical Framework? If not, what should be done?

- How is this being monitored and evaluated?
- What are the results?
- How are any shortcomings being addressed?

**Relevance:**

Q51. To what extent are projects relevant BOTH to WEI objectives AND to local needs on national and regional levels?

Q52. How were the priorities for FinWaterWEI identified and agreed between SYKE and MFA?

Q53. How effective is the coordination between FinWaterWEI and the work of other donors (including donors implementing water related activities that fall under WEI)?

**ENVSEC**

**Administration:**

- From the perspectives of the MFA and the international organizations and local stakeholders, how has the outsourced administration worked? How effective has it been and has it reduced the administration of the MFA?

- What is the division of labour amongst the 6 organizations + UNOPS, and its effectiveness?
- Is the Secretariat's capacity in line with the requirements? Has it added to the functioning of the ENVSEC coordination?
- How do different stakeholders feel the secretariat+ coordination unit are performing, including the individual program staff?
- Is there any Finnish value-added or even visibility in the ENVSEC arrangement? Should there be?
- Is there any likelihood of more funding from other donors?
- Have there been improvements in the reporting and monitoring since the evaluation of 11.2010?
- How is the experience of collaboration between 6 organizations viewed within the Secretariat, and by other stakeholders involved in ENVSEC activities?

#### **Efficiency:**

- Is the outsourcing arrangement with the Secretariat cost-effective?
- Are there added funds brought to the programme by the different partner organisations that are not budgeted? Should the 6 organizations invest in ENVSEC more? Are the focal points in the 6 organizations functioning well within their own structures?
- What would the costs be of not coordinating via ENVSEC?

#### **Effectiveness:**

- Has the Finnish contribution given added value to the environmental and security cooperation in the region?
- Does ENVSEC have a specific niche in the region?
- Does the selection of activities under the ENVSEC support the WEI objectives?
- Are there any cross-over or links with the other Finnish initiatives within WEI?
- Have the cross-cutting themes of the Finnish development policy been addressed in the programme, either in the choice of activities or in the monitoring/reporting?
- Are the member organisations of ENVSEC achieving added value through networking and joint activities?
- Are the member organisations promoting ENVSEC themselves? How actively?
- What is the relevance of the annual chair? Does it add to effectiveness and how? How is the communication strategy working?

#### **Sustainability**

- How sustainable can ENVSEC's outcomes be expected to be (also in terms of local ownership)?
- Which kinds of capacity enhancements the program is expected to lead to, and for whom?
- Achieving the set objectives & development impact – is ENVSEC on its way in achieving the objective, results and development impacts set in its strategic project document, particularly in its Logical Framework? If not, what should be done?

#### **Relevance**

- How does ENVSEC Secretariat ensure that the needs and priorities of partner country beneficiaries are identified and responded to?
- Does the multi-stakeholder nature of the ENVSEC collaboration help or hinder maintaining linkages with beneficiary country partners, and the development of ownership among final beneficiaries of activities implemented under ENVSEC?

#### **Impact**

- How great is the impact of ENVSEC activities, from the perspective of the various stakeholder groups?
- How does this level of impact compare with non-ENVSEC activities addressing similar issues in this region?

- What has been the thematic impact; is awareness raising regarding links between environment and security?

**Complementarity**

- How does ENVSEC complement thematically Finnish development policies in this field?
- To what extent are the 6 organizations are learning from / benefitting from the ENVSEC initiative? Are they adopting lessons learned, regarding the issues covered under ENVSEC? Do they see scope for building on this collaborative experience further, in other priority areas?

## ANNEX 5 – ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

Dear Respondent,

We would be extremely grateful for your cooperation in completing this survey – we have asked for your response, as your organization has participated in the implementation of activities funded under the Wider Europe Initiative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland.

Your answers to the following questions will assist us greatly in our task of evaluating the range of activities implemented in this Initiative. Your responses will be totally confidential – they will only be available to the evaluation team members and will not be shared in this form with any other persons. Any information used in the report will be anonymous.

After each question space is provided for your additional comments, if you wish to add them. We encourage you to provide as much written feedback as possible as this will enable us to provide feedback that could improve the project activities and overall Wider Europe Initiative.

If you have any questions regarding the survey, or the evaluation, please contact the Team Leader of the Mid-Term Evaluation, Dr Stephen Webber – [Stephen.lwebber@btinternet.com](mailto:Stephen.lwebber@btinternet.com)

If you have any questions regarding the Wider Europe Initiative, please contact Ms Kristiina Hope of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland – [Kristiina.Hope@formin.fi](mailto:Kristiina.Hope@formin.fi)

### Section 1 – About you and your organization

Name: (IF YOU PREFER NOT TO GIVE YOUR NAME, PLEASE LEAVE BLANK)

Email address: (IF YOU PREFER NOT TO GIVE YOUR EMAIL ADDRESS, PLEASE LEAVE BLANK)

Please indicate:

Your gender                      Female                      Male

Your job function / role in project implementation (FREE TEXT ANSWER)

Is your organization:

- a) A ministry / government agency in the country where the project being implemented
- b) A non-governmental organization in the country where the project being implemented
- c) An international organization? (Please specify which organization .....)
- d) A university / research institute / think tank
- e) Other (please specify)

## Section 2 – Your involvement with project implemented under the Wider Europe Initiative

- 1) Which project(s) have you been involved in implementing? (please specify – FREE TEXT)
- 2) Which country / countries have you been working in, in the implementation of this project? (FREE TEXT)
- 3) How long have you been involved in the implementation:
  - a) Since the project's inception (please give month/year)
  - b) If not since the inception, please specify at what stage you became involved (FREE TEXT)

## Section 3 – Your opinions regarding the project implemented under the Wider Europe Initiative

Please tick the answers below that most closely reflect your opinion

### Relevance

4) The project matches closely the needs of the local community in which it is implemented

1.Strongly disagree	2.Disagree	3.Neither agree nor disagree	4.Agree	5.Strongly agree
---------------------	------------	------------------------------	---------	------------------

Comments:

5) The project matches closely the needs of the country as a whole

1.Strongly disagree	2.Disagree	3.Neither agree nor disagree	4.Agree	5.Strongly agree
---------------------	------------	------------------------------	---------	------------------

Comments:

### Demand driven

6) The final beneficiaries of the project's activities (i.e. the persons/communities/organizations towards which the project is targeted) were consulted with regard to the need for the project, its content and delivery

YES  
DON'T KNOW  
NO

Comments:

### Effectiveness

7) The project has successfully delivered / is successfully delivering positive results / outcomes

1.Strongly disagree	2.Disagree	3.Neither agree nor disagree	4.Agree	5.Strongly agree
---------------------	------------	------------------------------	---------	------------------

Please comment on the key factors influencing the results of the project - e.g. which factors have been a major influence on the course of implementation and the nature of the project outcomes?

Were any significant challenges / obstacles encountered in the course of implementation, and what measures were taken to adapt to / mediate these challenges?:

### Efficiency

8) The project has been / is being implemented in a cost-efficient manner

1.Strongly disagree	2.Disagree	3.Neither agree nor disagree	4.Agree	5.Strongly agree
---------------------	------------	------------------------------	---------	------------------

Comment (e.g. Could it have been done more efficiently – if so, how? ):

### Impact

9) The project has had / is having a positive impact on the lives/work/environment of the final beneficiaries

1.Strongly disagree	2.Disagree	3.Neither agree nor disagree	4.Agree	5.Strongly agree
---------------------	------------	------------------------------	---------	------------------

Comment (e.g. can you provide any examples of positive or negative impacts?):

### Regional synergies

10) The work of the project has included substantive interaction / collaboration with similar projects/activities in neighbouring countries

1.Strongly disagree	2.Disagree	3.Neither agree nor disagree	4.Agree	5.Strongly agree
---------------------	------------	------------------------------	---------	------------------

Comment:

### Complementarity

11) The work of the project effectively complements activities in the same / related spheres implemented by other donor organizations in this country / region

1.Strongly disagree	2.Disagree	3.Neither agree nor disagree	4.Agree	5.Strongly agree
---------------------	------------	------------------------------	---------	------------------

Comment:

### Finnish visibility and added value

13)Finnish expertise (e.g. through involvement of Finnish consultants, companies, institutions) has been applied in the implementation of this project:

DO NOT KNOW

## Sustainability

1.Strongly disagree	2.Disagree	3.Neither agree nor disagree	4.Agree	5.Strongly agree
---------------------	------------	------------------------------	---------	------------------

## Ownership

1.Strongly disagree	2.Disagree	3.Neither agree nor disagree	4.Agree	5.Strongly agree
---------------------	------------	------------------------------	---------	------------------

Comments:

204

**Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland,  
Department for Russia, Eastern Europe and Central Asia,  
Unit for Eastern Europe and Central Asia  
September 2012**



MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN  
AFFAIRS OF FINLAND