

CARDS Committee-
11/06/2004

Results of the CARDS and EAR Evaluations

Douglas Carpenter, Evaluation Unit

EuropeAid Co-operation Office

<http://europa.eu.int/comm/europeaid/evaluation/index.htm>

Status of the reports

- Final versions submitted to the Board of AIDCO 3 June
- Transmission to Member States via CIRCA
- Transmission to European Parliament
- Publication on internet 4 June

Reminder: 2 legal obligations

*Evaluation of CARDS (2666/2000)

*Evaluation of Agency Regulation (2667/2000)

Both to be prepared to serve proposals for the future of the Regulation (CARDS) and future status of the Agency by 30 June 2004

***Overseen by the RELEX Family Evaluation Unit,
reporting to the RELEX Commissioners***

The Purpose of Evaluation

- Accountability
 - Lesson learning
 - Participation
-
- Strengths – Transparency, clarification, independence
 - Limitations – Can be naïve, can be misread, not sensitive to recent change

Process, not simply a production – interpretation, feedback and reply part of the process

- If in doubt, read the reports!!!

Reminder: main issues to assess in the CARDS Evaluation:

- Programme design and partnership and the place of the European Commission
- Key clusters: human rights and democracy, governance and civil society
- Key clusters: regional co-operation, economic development and trade
- Horizontal and cross-cutting issues
- Partner commitment and long-term viability
- Delivery mechanisms (see next slide)

Reminder: main issues to assess in the Agency Evaluation

- Summary of activities: historical narrative (Part A – Volume II)
- Confirmation of legal obligations and functioning (Part B- Volume II)
- “Main Evaluation” (Part C- Volume I)
- Governing arrangements and stakeholder relations
- Planning and management
- Organisation and culture
- Operational aspects (financial and human resources, information etc)
- 17 Specific Questions
- NB EAR not always the actor who will have to react

Evaluation work phases – CARDS and EAR

1. Desk Phase - Launch, inception, report

2. Field phase - case studies, interviews, report

3. Report-writing and synthesis

CARDS: Main Findings (1)

- Programme has been and remains highly relevant for the W Balkan countries: important successes in reconstruction and improving alignment towards SAP. Commission recognised as upholder of the *acquis* and as most important partner even where other donors give more aid
- CARDS programming and project cycle management do not sufficiently involve local partners – reduced sense of ownership and consequences for sustainability
- Keeping an appropriate mix of institution building and development investment remains a challenge
- CARDS Regional dimension is weak

CARDS: Main Findings (2)

- CARDS strategic programming does not fit well with procedures
- The two devolved implementation models both have important strengths and weaknesses
- Comprehensive sector approaches, led by government, have not been set in place or supported in CARDS.
- Sectoral and cross-sectoral results: a number of specific findings (described in final report)

CARDS – Main Findings (3)

- Cross-cutting issues:
 - low consideration of gender mainstreaming, with limited exceptions (Kosovo CSOs and housing)
 - relatively comprehensive approach to environment, including institutional aspects
 - Institution building: some partner governments still wish more support

CARDS: Delivery issues (specific)

- The dual implementation model shows strengths and weaknesses of both approaches:
- EAR strengths:
 - autonomy of operations as a precondition for successful implementation
 - specific practices
 - access to resources necessary for recruitment of needed staff
 - technical co-ordination facilitated
 - capacity to think and act as a regional body
- EAR weaknesses:
 - Lack of formal input for policy dialogue. Weak policy link more important where govt gives high priority to integration

CARDS: Delivery issues (general)

- Logic of decentralisation and capacity building
- Regional networks
- Reorganise management of the regional programme to a devolved body “with characteristics similar to those of the EAR”
- Extend policy link of the devolved delegations to the EAR – extend EAR operational autonomy to devolved delegations

CARDS – Recommendations (1)

- Decentralise CARDS, gradually and in accordance with actual capacity
- Shift focus to capacity development
- Specific instruments – regional cohesion and regional investment facility
- Enhance regional strategic guidance, re-organise regional programme
- Review programming cycle to suit new strategic framework

CARDS – Recommendations (2)

- Return Policies
- Democracy
- JHA
- PAR
- Economic and Social Development
- Infrastructure
- Gender and ethnicity
- Environment

EAR - Overall assessment

- “The Agency is an asset that has permitted the Commission to exercise leadership in effectively and efficiently coordinating and stimulating stakeholder efforts towards the initial reconstruction in the countries-entities where it operates”
- “Its dismemberment before a better more regionally integrated and well-designed structure is put in place would be detrimental...to the good work done up to now”

EAR: Findings (1) - Global

- “Administratively sound and managerially responsive”
- “Devolution of responsibility”, but “accountability of staff”
- Evolving focus of CARDS requires change management to link better to SAp/policy process
- EAR has given increased attention to quality of programmes
- Measuring activities need to adapt to sector-level goals
- Agency model could evolve to allow more participation from partners in project cycle
- Governing Board added value limited (advisory, not governing)
- NB ***Specific findings for each of the 17 questions and analysis for each OC***

EAR – Recommendations (1)

- 1. Separate programming and operational GB meetings
- 2. Regional donor meetings
- 3. Capacity building plan for each country-entity
- 4. From 2007, new approach to “programming”, moving away from CSP/MIP – more stakeholder consultation at strategic level

EAR – Recommendations (2)

- 5. Annual HR deployment plan
- 6. Strengthen monitoring and evaluation to emphasize links to higher objectives, sector evaluation and across countries-entities
- 7. Identification of sector leaders to promote effective regional co-ordination
- 8. Specific recommendations on training

Follow-up

- Legislative proposals: immediate priority
- Programming and management issues – more time for reflection
- “Fiche contradictoire”
- Ad-hoc workshops and discussions