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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>International Organisation for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Government Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sida</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>United Nations programme on HIV/AIDS</td>
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<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITER</td>
<td>Ukraine National Initiatives to Enhance Reforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Ukrainian Evaluation Association is an all-Ukrainian non-governmental professional network in the field of monitoring and evaluation. In February-October 2012, it conducted a baseline study of the “State of Evaluation Capacity Development in Ukraine: Demand, Supply, and Institutionalisation” as part of the Association’s strategic activities for 2012.

The purpose of the study was to identify the stage of development of the monitoring and evaluation capacity in Ukraine in three sectors (public, donors and technical assistance projects and third sectors) and more specifically to (1) figure out the understanding of the terms “monitoring” and “evaluation”, (2) determine demand and supply of M&E and (3) evaluate the extent of institutionalisation of M&E. The study covered a five year period (2007-2011). Desk review of thirty nine documents and twenty seven in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with representatives and experts from state institutions, donor agencies and non-governmental organisations.

The study showed that the state of evaluation capacity development in Ukraine is on the quite low level, where scarcity of manpower and financial resources limit the scope, and where donor needs for accountability and program management are the main driving force.

The understanding of the terms “monitoring and evaluation” vary across three sectors. The terms “monitoring” and “evaluation” are often confused with “control” and “audit” in public sector; meanwhile donors and technical assistance projects have a good understanding of these terms as well as those NGOs that conduct M&E.

The degree to which evaluation is used and the availability of qualified staff and financial resources also differ considerably across sectors.

Legislation on monitoring and evaluation exists in public sector of Ukraine; however evaluative practices are not conducted regularly and done in a formal way. There is also certain lack of clear and efficient indicators and mechanisms for data gathering. State bodies do not commission external evaluation of public programs on their own initiative. There is low political will towards evaluation development in Ukraine. The value of evaluation has not been fully understood and broadly recognized by executive senior managers in the civil service and policy makers. Therefore, the findings of monitoring and evaluation are often not used for making policy decisions. The M&E budgets are absent as well as designated M&E personnel. In addition, there is insufficient local expertise. International evaluators are valued more than national experts. Final evaluation results of public programs are not available to the public.

Evaluation culture in NGO sector of Ukraine is not very well developed, although there is a trend for its growth. Demand in monitoring and particularly in evaluation is predominantly formed by international donor organizations. Financial and human resources are scarce in the sector. Monitoring is more often used since it usually does not require external financing and is done by the project personnel. Evaluation is mostly funded by international donors and done by external consultants, mainly international as well. Evaluation use depends on commissioner and goals of evaluation. When evaluation is done for project management, these reports are rarely public because they are used for internal management decisions. Some evaluation reports are available to the public but many of them are in English.

In brief, the demand for M&E is mainly formed by international donor organisations and technical assistance projects both in public and third sectors. These organisations provide for supply of international experts to conduct evaluations. The donors and technical assistance sector have a good expertise in the field
of M&E (usually different donors have their own M&E standards and procedures) and use it for making strategic management decisions in the public and NGO sectors. The evaluation findings are publicly available and distributed internally and externally for learning and follow-up actions and to ensure transparency; however, most of them are in English. Donors generally allocate a suitable amount of resources for M&E. This amount depends on a donor, scale of the intervention and thematic area. But in the situation of the donors’ reducing their assistance to Ukraine, this supply will not stay forever. Moreover, difference in donors’ standards brings to unsystematic commissioning and use of evaluation results by the representatives of the public and third sectors.

As a result, the state of evaluation capacity development in three sectors is different: 1) in public sector – evaluation demand and supply are moderately satisfactory, while the level of institutionalization is unsatisfactory; 2) in third sector - evaluation demand and supply are moderately satisfactory, while the level of institutionalization is satisfactory; and 3) in donors and technical assistance projects - evaluation demand, supply and the level of institutionalization are satisfactory.

Consequently, **there is an urgent need in Ukraine to strengthen the demand in M&E within public and third sectors and increase the number of local experts and expertise in the country.**

Therefore, it is recommended to promote M&E culture and establish a professional platform in the country through:
- Increasing awareness and understanding of M&E in public and NGO sectors;
- Creating M&E structure at national level;
- Learning international experience and adapt it to country realities;
- Developing and coming to an agreement on Ukrainian glossary of definitions among main players and use it as a standard;
- Initiating professional discussions among national and international experts;
- Institutionalizing and formalizing evaluation network in Ukraine;
- Increasing evaluation potential through training and education;
- Developing the follow-up mechanism in evaluation; demonstrating how M&E recommendations are used for organizational and institutional growth.

This baseline study will be widely disseminated within representatives of all three sectors and presented at international conferences. It will be also a foundation for further Ukrainian Evaluation Association’s work and development in the upcoming years.
II. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Background

There is growing awareness in both developed and developing countries of the potential role that evaluation can play in improving the quality of public sector decision-making. Evaluation is becoming recognized as particularly important in promoting transparency and accountability; in some instances, it is even viewed as an integral part of responsible civic action and civil society development. In other words, evaluating the performance of public policy is an important instrument for good governance.

At present, evaluation capacity in Ukraine has not been well developed. Evaluations and assessments are conducted infrequently, and the few carried out are mostly the result of demand by donor agencies and development organisations. Thus, there is a need for development of the evaluation culture in Ukraine in order to assess which public initiatives work well, which do not work well and most importantly, why. But before doing that, it is important to figure out the current stage of evaluation capacity development.

In this context, the baseline study about “State of Evaluation Capacity Development in Ukraine: Demand, Supply, and Institutionalisation in Ukraine” was commissioned. The study focuses on understanding of existing demand and supply for monitoring and evaluation as well as on identification of whether monitoring and evaluation is institutionalised in government, international donor organisations and civil society. This assessment is also intended to set a framework for required areas of assistance in this field, and has therefore been primarily an information-gathering exercise. It will provide information to be used by different sectors in the process of defining strategies and specific initiatives aimed at promoting and institutionalisation of the evaluation culture in Ukraine.

The baseline study was carried out by the Ukrainian Evaluation Association (UEA) as a mandatory activity planned under its strategic objectives for 2012. The Ukrainian Evaluation Association is an all-Ukrainian non-governmental professional network in the field of evaluation, established in July 2011 and with more than 100 members on the board by September, 2012. It is dedicated to develop and strengthen evaluation capacity of public, private and third sectors in Ukraine as well as to promote evaluation use as an instrument of good governance supporting transparency, accountability, effectiveness and efficiency of public administration and development of civil society and private sector. The conclusions of the baseline study will be the basis of the UEA initiatives to support evaluation capacities development in Ukraine.

The findings of the study will be widely disseminated. More specifically, the evaluation results will be presented (1) at the international conferences - IPEN in Astana, Kazakhstan (September 26-28, 2012) and 10th EES Biennial Conference in Helsinki, Finland (October 3-5, 2012); (2) at the official presentation of the present study for officials of public sector, donors and NGOs at the National Academy of Public Administration, Office of the President in Kiev, Ukraine (November 14, 2012); (3) on different internet resources including Facebook, Life Journal, GURT Resource Centre, Public Space Portal, (4) at the workshop “Evaluation Alphabet for Charitable Projects and Programmes” for representatives of the third sector in Kiev, Ukraine (October-December 2012); as well as (5) in the newsletter Centre of Political Studies and Analysis Digest and IPEN in October 2012.
2.2. Objectives of the study

The baseline study aims at identifying the stage of development of the monitoring and evaluation capacity in Ukraine.

The study targets the following objectives:

- To define understanding of key stakeholders of the terms “monitoring” and “evaluation”;
- To identify demand and supply of M&E by sectors (public, donors and NGOs sectors);
- To evaluate the extent of institutionalisation of M&E by different stakeholders (types, functions, procedures, requirements, etc.);

2.3. Structure of the report

This paper is structured along with the following sections:

Section 1 outlines summary of findings of the baseline study;
Section 2 describes the objectives of the study and the methodology used;
Section 3 offers a treatment of key concepts and terms in evaluation capacity development field, considering the language use as important component for avoiding possible confusions;
Section 4 provides general description of the main findings on evaluation capacity in three sectors (public, donors/technical assistance projects and NGOs);
Section 5 presents general conclusion on the state of evaluation capacity development in Ukraine and summarizes main recommendations.

The Appendices list sources for the information summarized in this report and include the list of interviewers.
III. EVALUATION DESIGN

The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the methodological approach utilized in this study.

Scope of Evaluation
This research covered different sectors both on evaluation demand and supply. It also analysed “facilitators” of evaluation capacity development (evaluation conferences, trainings and publications), products (characteristics of evaluation studies), and effects (how evaluation studies have been used). The baseline study covered three sectors: 1) public sector, 2) donor agencies and technical assistance projects as well as 3) NGO sector in Ukraine. The 5 year-period was under consideration, i.e. years 2007-2011.

Evaluation Timeframe
The evaluation took place through February-October 2012. The assessment went through four steps described here below:

- Step 1: Development of the Terms of Reference (February-April 2012);
- Step 2: Analysis of the relevant documentation (February – July 2012);
- Step 3: Data collection (June-August 2012);

Evaluation methods
The baseline study used purely qualitative data collection methods to gather data and information from main stakeholders in each sector on the state of evaluation capacity development in Ukraine. In particular, the evaluation was based on the following sources of information:

1. Desk review;
2. Key informant interviews with knowledgeable parties.

Desk review
Desk review was used to collect and analyse available factual information related to evaluation capacity development. It consisted of the reviewing the following:

1.1. Policy documents developed by the central public authorities (strategic working plans of central executive authorities, annual working plans of central authorities, state budget, action plan on the implementation of the programme of the Cabinet of Ministers);
1.2. Progress reports by the Ministries;
1.3. Analytical studies developed by experts in this area;
1.4. Statistical data published by the Ministries and the National Bureau of Statistics;
1.5. Evaluation Policies of different donor agencies;
1.6. Legislation on NGOs functions in Ukraine and analytical reports on their work.

A detailed list of documents reviewed is provided in Annex 1.

Key informant interviews
In-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with representatives of each sector along with experts from state institutions, donor agencies and non-governmental organisations. In total 27 face-to-face and telephone interviews were held, particularly:
Public sector:
- **5 interviews** with representatives of the Secretariat of Secretariat of Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, Ministry of Finance, Ukrainian Centre for Aid Development
- **4 expert interviews** with the representatives of Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education, Centre of Political Studies and Analysis, Centre of Policy Analyses and Strategies

Donors:
- **8 interviews** with representatives of CIDA and USAID-funded technical assistance projects, UNICEF, UNODC, IOM
- **2 expert interviews** with representatives of the European External Action Service and UNITER

NGOs:
- **5 interviews** with representatives from International HIV/AIDS Alliance in Ukraine, Counterpart Creative Centre, Foundation for Development of Ukraine and the Ukrainian Centre for Common Ground
- **3 expert interviews** with representatives from Creative Centre Counterpart, Ukrainian Philanthropy Forum and Democratic Initiatives Foundation

Annex 2 presents the full list of interviewees.

**Data collection tools and data analysis**

As a reference for development of the data collection instruments for this baseline study, polish experience in analyses the development of evaluation capacity in the EU member states was taken into consideration.

Two separate interview forms were developed; one for representatives of three sectors under review and the other one for experts (see Annex 5). The interview form was structured in four main parts to capture all relevant information and consisted of the following: (1) understanding of the terms “monitoring” and “evaluation”; (2) assessment of the evaluation demand-side dimension; (3) reviewing evaluation supply-side dimension; and (4) finding out the status of evaluation institutionalisation.

The findings were analysed appropriately to the used data collection tools and opinion about the state of evaluation capacity development in public sector, donor agencies and NGOs were formed based upon the established evaluation capacity development criteria framework, which is described in Annex 3.

Moreover, for comparability purposes, the 4-point rating scale was adopted for the assessments of each dimension of evaluation capacity development, i.e. demand, supply and institutionalisation (where 4 was the highest rating and 1 - the lowest rating). The detailed rating scale matrix is presented in Annex 4.

---

Limitations of the baseline study
The present baseline study has a list of limitations due to the following factors:

- Methodological instruments were newly developed and were only piloted during the initial assessment phase.
- The study had limited human resources and complete absence of financial resources, which influenced the size of the sample. All interviewees were selected on the basis of the availability of professional contacts within representatives of different sectors.
- The analysis of legal documents in public sector was limited to reviewing the key laws, regulations, decrees that regulate the work of the public agencies on the functional level, excluding line level.
- M&E systems at local and regional level have not been covered by the evaluation, because it requires separate in-depth research.
- The study covered only the state of evaluation capacity development for project, programme, policy and strategy levels. It did not include evaluation of the state of organisational assessment within three sectors.
- Private sector was not included into this study.
IV. KEY CONCEPTS

For the purpose of this study, the term monitoring and evaluation (M&E) will be understood as described in OECD/DAC glossary, i.e. “monitoring” is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data to ensure that the project/programme achieves its defined objectives within a prescribed timeframe and budget and “evaluation” is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results, which is carried out to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. In turn, “monitoring and evaluation system” was viewed as a set of organisational structures, management processes, standards, strategies, plans, indicators, information systems, reporting lines and accountability relationships that interact to provide timely information for authorized decision-makers.

Meanwhile, under the definition of evaluation capacity development was meant the process of setting up the systems and infrastructure necessary to undertake evaluation and composed of three dimensions: (1) *evaluation demand* - the capacity and commitment of organizations both to commission and to use evaluation, either when organizations are persuaded as to the benefits of evaluation, or when there is pressure from external donors of assistance; (2) *evaluation supply* - focuses on whether the necessary resources, skills and information infrastructure are available to effectively respond to demand pressures; and (3) *institutionalisation* - the creation of a monitoring and evaluation system, which produces monitoring information and evaluation findings judged valuable by key stakeholders, and which are used in pursuit of good governance and where there is sufficient demand for the function of monitoring and evaluation to ensure its funding and sustainability for the foreseeable future.

Understanding dimensions of evaluation capacity requires a mix of criteria to be taken into consideration. The demand dimension was analysed through four criteria: architecture, evaluation resources, and quality of monitoring systems; while supply dimension was assessed over: quality of external socio-economic data sources and availability and quality of evaluation expertise; in the meantime, institutionalisation was scrutinized against: dissemination and utilisation.

---


Baseline Study Report
V. FINDINGS

This section describes the main findings of the baseline study. The data was separately compiled on each sector (evaluation capacity in public sector, donor sector and technical assistance projects, plus NGOs) and structured as follows: a) short summary on literature review, b) understanding of the terms “monitoring” and “evaluation”, c) analysis of evaluation capacity dimensions, d) general conclusion on the sector and e) general recommendations. An overall assessment of three sectors is also presented at the end of the section.

A. Evaluation Capacity in Public Sector
   a) Short-summary on literature review

Analysis of evaluation in the public sector of Ukraine was conducted on the basis of analysis of current legislation that forms the legal-organisational mechanism of evaluation of public policy in Ukraine. It includes both (1) legal principles of functioning of evaluation and (2) institutional/organisational mechanism. Legal principles of evaluation of public policy were considered at the analysis of normative-legal documents in relation to the evaluation of strategic documents and budgetary programmes, while the institutional mechanism of evaluation of public policy included the analysis of public institutions that have an authority to initiate and conduct the evaluation of public policy and programmes. Therefore it was important to analyse powers of public authorities in the field of the evaluation of public policy and programmes and to consider basic preconditions necessary for functioning of institutional mechanism of evaluation.

The literature review showed that public policy in Ukraine is conducted through many strategies, programmes and action plans. Its implementation is assessed mainly on the level of outputs. Reasons of success or failure of laws and programmes are not properly analysed. Evaluation is fragmentarily used at all stages and on levels of the public sector in Ukraine. Evaluation is fragmentarily used at all stages and on levels of the public sector in Ukraine. Only some elements of the evaluation utilisation are present in strategic planning, policy analysis, regulatory acts impact analysis, decision making and budget process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Decision making process</th>
<th>Control over the usage of public resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic level</td>
<td>Utilisation of the of evaluation results</td>
<td>Policy analysis; Performance audit, Impact evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning and forecasting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional planning and development of local government acts</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation of government projects and programmes; impact assessment of regulatory acts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First of all, the Constitution of Ukraine and the Budget Code are making the basis of government legal act of the utilisation of evaluation in Ukraine.

Secondly, some elements of the evaluation utilisation in strategic planning are regulated by such government acts as:

- The Public Forecasting and Social- Economic Programmes Development Law, - regulates the development of forecast and programme documents of economic and social growth in short and middle term period.
- The Region Growth Stimulation Law – describes the mandatory utilisation of social-economic efficiency of the realization of government programme that are used for depression regions recovery.
- Due to the Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine №621 26.04.2003 “Development of forecasting and programme documents of social-economic and project of government budget”
programmes of social-economic development on short-term period have to implement economic development tendency evaluation.

- **Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine №504-p 4.10.2006 “Improvement of Forecasting and Programme Documents of Social-Economic Development Concept Acceptance”** – defines the list of strategic documents and lays the basis of strategic planning development and the demand for evaluation.

Thirdly, some of the government acts conditionally could be attributed to **policy analysis** category that is based on the evaluation:

- **National Programmes Law** – defines the mandatory programme performance evaluation in economic, social and ecological dimensions.
- **Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine №538-p “Result orientated method concept acceptance”** implements the evaluation of the activities of budget process participants, analysis of the degree of goal accomplishment.
- **Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine №106 31.01.2007 “Ratification of government programmes development and execution rules”** – contains the order of government programme development and government programme passport which must have the evaluation block.
- **Order of the Ministry of Finance №608 17.05.2011 “Ratification of methodological recommendations about the performance evaluation of government programmes”** – regulates the performance evaluation of government programme in the process of state budget compilation and directly during its execution.
- **Order of Ministry of Finance №1536 10.12.2010 “Performance indicators of government programme”** approves the general requirements for government programme performance indicators of key spending units (Ministries and others.)

In addition, there are some laws that are regulating the key state control bodies that should conduct performance evaluations like **Order of the President of Ukraine about the Ministry of Finance** – to provide the analysis of financial-economic condition of the state; **Accounting Chamber of Ukraine Law** – to provide analysis of external financial control for the state budget resources utilisation; **State financial inspection of Ukraine** – to exercise internal control of efficiency utilisation of budget resources, reliability and accountability of financial reporting, budget programmes passports and reports on their implementation.

Fourthly, to some extent the Secretariat of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine uses elements of the previously conducted evaluation in drafting regulations. Explanatory note to the draft legal act contains grounds, justification, problem analysis, financial calculations and expected social and economic results that flow from the **Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine №712 8.07.2009.**

The Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine №508 11.03.2004 “Approval of Methodology of Regulatory Acts Impact Analysis” approves the methods of decision making process and regulatory acts’ impact analysis.

By the **Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine №888-p “Approval of the Strategy for public finance system modernization”** defines that decision making must be made based on the evaluation results,
experience and evaluation of possible impact. Procedures must be clear, transparent and available for media and civil sector.

This list of legal acts is not complete; it is intended to give a basic view to the extent of the legal provision of evaluation in Ukraine in various areas of public sector. Taking into account the absence of some laws like the law for strategic planning, internal control law, and coming back to the 1996 Constitution that blocks the Accounting Chamber’s access to the income of budgetary institutions, it could be concluded that there is insufficient use of evaluation in the work of public authorities.

b) Understanding of the terms “monitoring” and “evaluation”

The term “monitoring” is understood reasonably well by the interviewed state officials who are covering qualitative as well as quantitative aspects of their work and are doing it systematically. Many respondents are very close to clear understanding of evaluation as assessment of efficiency, effectiveness, impact of programs and measures, correlation of results with planned goals and indicators. However, the accurate understanding of the term “evaluation” is absent among representatives of the public authorities. Specific features of evaluation, e.g. periodic and systematic independent assessments are not understood; evaluation is confused with audit and control. There is no understanding that evaluation is regular learning and management tool.

In order to have understanding it is necessary to do few things. The first step – to have relatively stable personnel in these public institutions, who would not change annually or biannually. The second step - to ensure proper training of this personnel in the field of M&E, but first they have to learn how to conduct evaluations, what evaluation technologies/tools exist, and only then, when he will pass this first step he needs to begin to study monitoring, its methods and types, after that it is necessary to choose the most capable for doing such job, give them the positions and allow them to take part in monitoring researches. Without that the process of state administration of any industry and the country as a whole is impossible.

c) Analysis of the Dimensions of Evaluation Capacity Development

- Demand Dimension
  1.1. Architecture, Evaluation resources, Quality of monitoring systems

All respondents consider that evaluation helps effective implementation and improvement of a project/programme/policy and their organisations do undertake evaluations of policy/programme/project. External experts are more sceptical and they consider there is practically no evaluation culture and evaluation demand on the side of public managers in Ukraine.

Most of representatives of state institutions and external experts agree that monitoring is more developed in public sector comparing to evaluation. Each policy area has its own indicators that are monitored. The most of indicators used by state institutions are quantitative, not qualitative. Very few bodies do have qualitative indicators.

Evaluation is applied less frequently. Only some programmes have M&E system. But there is system of control of implementation of public plans, programmes, and different tasks. The main task of this old-fashioned Soviet system is to record implementation of different measures. It is hardly possible to speak about modern monitoring system that may enable to forecast and evaluate short, mid-term and long-term outcomes.

M&E requirements are set either by legal requirement, internal necessity, and/or decisions of the Cabinet of Ministers. Some experts say that there is no internal necessity; there is only legal and donor requirement.
But evaluation is done mainly formally. Very often it is formal evaluation with non-binding findings and recommendations. In cases when evaluation is applied, it doesn’t influence programme or policy. There is a huge gap between the monitoring and evaluation process and the decision-making. Experts tell that some new programmes start when previous programmes were implemented by less than 8, 10, 12 % without any evaluation of its efficiency and effectiveness. Many problems are caused by change of political course, staff turnover. There is also a lack of qualified experts and methodologies. Education and healthcare are exceptions that are more developed and have their own M&E systems, partly as a result of donor requirements.

As for external public monitoring and evaluation, experts observe that state institutions do not use results of monitoring and evaluation, prepared by NGOs. Public monitoring may discover corruption risks. NGOs may formulate their proposals and find violations but there is no legal mechanism for direct influence of monitoring results. There is no political will to use results of public monitoring.

Representatives of state institutions and experts consider that practically all types of evaluation are used in public sector. More often internal, mid-term and final assessment are applied to projects. External and impact evaluation are used rarely as it may reveal poor implementation of the projects. When possible, external evaluation is tried to be avoided.

For programmes, both internal and external evaluation is applied. But sometime external evaluation is understood as control function of the superior bodies such as the President’s Administration or the Cabinet of Ministers. Final evaluation of programmes is applied most often. Ex-ante, mid-term, and impact assessment are rarely applied.

For policies, most experts underlie that monitoring is applied, but expertise less often. The most popular is internal evaluation of policies, rarely external. Many respondents pointed out that impact assessment is applied for policies. Experts also named ex-ante, mid-term and final evaluation of policies. In some answers evaluation is associated with research.

The following examples of evaluation were listed:

- evaluation of results of functioning of separate working areas or state bodies on the compliance with defined tasks and goals, analyses of implementation of budget taking into account qualitative and quantitative indicators;
- evaluation of drafts of legal acts, calculations by Ministry of trade and economic development of readiness of economy to implement measures and outcomes for economy (prognostic/ex-ante impact assessment);
- implementation of National action plan for 2011 – 2012 years for implementation of the Programme of economic reforms for 2010-2014 “Reach society, competitive economy, efficient state” has some monitoring requirements;
- evaluation of the state’s so-called “targeted” programmes; evaluation of any government decision or draft law on budget indicators, impact and costs of a draft law on budget; taking into account internal and external factors during policy formulation; preparation of budget and other legal acts is evaluation to some extent of appropriateness and necessity of its decision;
- Intermediate and final evaluation of the state target programme of HIV infection.

There are no common standards for evaluation of quality of reports. There are no clear criteria to the structure of reports. There are requirements to the structure of reports on state targeted programmes and budget programmes. Still, there is no practice for evaluation the quality of reports. Reports do not have any
standardized format. Usually the funder of evaluation sets up the required structure and format for the report. Budget reports are prepared as evaluation of budgeted expenses through description of qualitative and quantitative indicators of budget programmes, level of financing in this reporting period and reasons of non-financing.

Moreover, reports try to show situation in a more positive way. More attention is paid to successful areas and less to unsuccessful. Usually reports describe facts, bright examples that demonstrate success of this activity. They are lacking specifics, tendency analyses, statistic material, analyses of dynamics of the processes, general picture of the programme implementation.

In most cases, public institutions do not have special software for M&E. In some cases prognostic models are used for impact assessment. Ministry of Finance has programme software for budget (АІС). The other examples are DevInfo - National M&E framework indicators in HIV infection. Besides SPSS is used for the analysis of biological and behavioural surveillance. Some grants and projects have their own monitoring systems.

The allocation of financial and human resources for monitoring was assessed as adequate. Meanwhile, the allocation of financial and especially human resources for evaluation were evaluated as inadequate.

All ministries and agencies have control units, but rarely monitoring units. Practically each structural unit within its competence has monitoring specialists. Ministry of Finance has a separate monitoring department. Each policy area has about 2-3 persons responsible for monitoring. There are no evaluation units in the ministries. Exception is Monitoring and Evaluation Center as structural unit of Ukrainian center for AIDS Prevention of the Ministry of Health of Ukraine.

Many experts mentioned that there is no sufficient number of qualified evaluators able to evaluate public programmes and policies. There are also a limited number of special training programmes. Experts require also methodological support. So, specialists stressed the timeliness of establishing the Ukrainian Evaluation Association.

A big step is a creation of the association of evaluation, which marks that there is certain amount of people with progressive views, who are ready to do something for changes. In UEA there are representatives of different sectors, and it creates a synergy.

➢ Supply Dimension

1.2. Availability and quality of evaluation expertise
The majority of interviewed representatives of the public sector think that the level of supply in the sphere of M&E depends on the sector and M&E type. Some experts estimate the level of supply as mediocre.

Main characteristics necessary for evaluation mentioned by the experts are:

- Transparency (all the conclusions are available to the society, if some important reasons do not contradict this policy);
- Accountability (information on the resources used is also open to the society);
- Participatory approach (society has a possibility of being involved and express its opinions);
- Inclusiveness (traditionally excluded interests are represented through M&E).

This requires a range of resources: human, financial, legislative and access to data. According to those criteria, and taking into account still highly bureaucratic state management system, evaluation supply in Ukraine is quite weak, lacking objective data from the state institutions, poor involvement of civil society
representatives. Nevertheless, the main obstacle consists in the perception of the role of evaluation. Experts’ recommendations are not mandatory for implementation and rarely serve as a basis for decision-making in strategic planning and policy development. Support at the higher level of state leadership is required.

Involvement of international organisations specialized on M&E in Ukraine is considered as very limited. Some experts do not see any presence of external evaluators in Ukrainian public sector. Similar situation is observed with the involvement of universities, think tanks and analytical centres.

As noted earlier, evaluation recommendations are not mandatory for implementation, and their impact on decision-making process is quite low. Simultaneously, the quality of external evaluation reports by national and international experts is not highly estimated. The difference in estimation is quite small, and represents 2.6 for national and 3.2 for international level (where 5 is the highest) correspondingly.

Although experts have different opinions about current tendencies in evaluation supply in Ukraine for the last 5 years, they do agree, in their majority, that M&E is considered in public sector as element of control and its development largely depends on political will to support performance-oriented management policy. Some intensification lately noticed in this sphere is, according to interviewees, related to bureaucratic activity.

Few experts underline also a small, but positive progress in this sphere, as for instance, development of control system of National action plan for 2011 – 2012 years for implementation of the Programme of economic reforms for 2010-2014 “Rich society, competitive economy, efficient state” with evaluation elements. At the same time, dissemination of M&E techniques in public sector is much slower than in NGO or donor organisations.

- Institutionalisation Dimension

1.3. Dissemination, Utilisation

Evaluation results in the public sector are mainly produced for Ministries’ leadership at different levels. According to some respondents, those results are used during the decision-making process or budgetary planning by structural units of a ministry. Others say that they serve as accompanying recommendations or clarification information on a particular subject. Reports might be also available for the society in compliance with the Law on the access to public information. The main channel of communication of evaluation results is web-site of a ministry or state agency. One expert told about a monitoring bulletin available in hard and e-copy on the web-page.

As an outcome, while evaluation results are used as recommendations, not mandatory for implementation, it is impossible to track to which extent those results were useful and influential for the development of state programmes and policies. All the experts are unanimous in their position underlining the absence of a system or procedure that would allow following up the implementation of the recommendations in the framework of conducted evaluation.

In contrast with the third sector and donor organisations, dissemination process of evaluation results in public sector is a subject of strict bureaucratic procedures. Therefore, M&E reports are mainly communicated through official letters and assignments, internal memoranda and are rather of internal use of the ministry and other stakeholders. Some information may be published on a ministry’s web-site, although the majority of documents are not available to the public. New law on the access to public information does facilitate the access to official documents.
Adoption of evaluation standards is assessed by all the respondents as an important step to the development of evaluation and ensuring the quality of evaluation results. Those standards should include verifiable indicators and the way of dissemination within the society (media, civil society). To develop such standards it is necessary to involve various experts: practitioners, scientists, civil servants, businessmen). In addition, one of the key steps is a need to increase interest in evaluation.

Conducting evaluation faces numerous difficulties and obstacles. The main problems are related to the lack of need for evaluation in state agencies, and therefore lack of willingness of the civil servants to participate in evaluation. Often, evaluation is perceived as an additional burden. There are no special evaluation procedures for the preparation of documents by ministries or governmental agencies. Delays in providing information are often observed; in some cases data is incomplete and requires additional analysis to ensure adequate conclusions. Some experts mention also tangled legislation and shaking political situation in the country among negative impacts of evaluation. Even if evaluations are conducted, there is a lack of evaluation “tradition”, they are not provided on a regular basis and don’t allow to see the dynamics in the developments in a selected area.

Institutionalisation of evaluation practice in Ukraine is currently very weak. According to some experts, it is important to ensure licensing/certification of evaluation activity with a set of formal features and special education and/or training (similarly to auditors). Development of evaluation culture and its growing importance in Ukraine is related, according to experts’ opinion, to competitiveness and direct link to decision-making, based on evaluation results.

Crucial for evaluation progress in Ukraine is a promotion and creation of few centres that would allow unifying professionals in the sphere of M&E to facilitate development of evaluation culture and promotion of evaluation services, as well as demonstration of best practices and successful case studies.

According to experts’ opinion, the main factors that defined general development of evaluation in Ukraine in the last 5 years (2007-2011) are external requirements (foreign clients and donors) to projects and programmes being implemented in Ukraine. Donors are guided by the willingness to have an objective picture on the developments in particular spheres of the public sector in Ukraine. Therefore, in order to be granted with a technical assistance projects or financial support from the World Bank, European Union, IMF, Ukrainian authorities were providing evaluations.

d) General conclusion for the public sector

✔ Evaluation of public policy and programmes is fragmented. Some elements of the evaluation utilisation are present in strategic planning, policy analysis; regulatory acts impact analysis, decision making and budget process.

✔ The term “monitoring” is understood reasonably well. Most of respondents are very close to clear understanding of evaluation as assessment of efficiency, effectiveness, impact of programs and measures, correlation of results with planned goals and indicators. But such characteristics of evaluation as periodic and systematic independent assessments are not listed by the representatives of the public sector and quite often evaluation is seen as either audit or control function. There is no understanding that evaluation is regular learning and management tool. It leads to misunderstanding in value and purpose of evaluation and results in unwillingness of public officials to participate in evaluation and is perceived as an additional burden.
✓ Monitoring is more widespread in public sector comparing to evaluation. Each policy area has its own indicators that are monitored. Only some programmes have M&E system. But there is system of control of implementation of public plans, programmes, and different tasks. M&E requirements are set by legal requirement, internal necessity, and decisions of Cabinet of Ministers.

✓ Public sector in Ukraine concentrates on processes rather than on results and policy implications.

✓ Public sector in Ukraine lacks both evaluation culture and evaluation demand, has weak supply and absence of institutionalisation due to lack of political will to support performance-oriented management policy.

✓ Evaluation is done mainly formally. It lacks qualified experts and methodologies as well as reliable data.

✓ Evaluation findings are not properly used by ministries leadership at different levels. Evaluation recommendations are not mandatory for implementation, and their impact on decision-making process is quite low. Moreover, a system or procedure that would allow following up the implementation of the recommendations in the framework of conducted evaluation is absent in Ukraine. Therefore, M&E reports are mainly communicated through official letters and assignments, internal memoranda and are rather of internal use of the ministry and other stakeholders. In the area of HIV-AIDs a monitoring bulletin is distributed.

✓ Utilisation of special software for M&E is rather low.

✓ Standards for evaluation of quality of reports are absent. There are no clear criteria to the structure of reports; as a result, prepared reports try to show situation in more positive way, without demonstrating dynamics, tendencies, general picture of the project. There are no special evaluation procedures for the preparation of documents by ministries or governmental agencies. Evaluations are external requirements.

✓ The overwhelming majority of evaluation documents are not available to the public.

e) General recommendations

○ First of all evaluation development starts from the evaluation demand on the side of political leaders, management and civil society. Public administration requires “cultural change” that perceive evaluation as management tool and part of policy circle. In addition, one of the key steps is a need to increase interest for evaluation on the side of government and society. It requires public awareness campaign about evaluation.

○ When there is an evaluation demand it is very important to find such “evaluation champions” or “points of growth”. Such points of growth of evaluation culture might be Administration of President and Secretariat of Cabinet of Ministers as they require consolidated information about programmes and policies. The other important actors and champions might be Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, Ministry of Finance responsible for proper planning, programming and budgeting of development of Ukraine. Ministry of Education and Ministry of Health has more developed M&E system due to donor requirements and internal need.
o It would be advisable to initiate international project on diagnosis of evaluation functions in Ukrainian government with the use of methodology of World Bank and development of action plan of evaluation capacity building in public sector. This project might be developed in cooperation and support of international organisations.

o International projects on sharing experience and best practices on evaluation capacity building in public sector should be developed.

o It is very important to develop special evaluation training programmes and courses for different target groups using, commissioning and conducting evaluation in public sector.

o Adoption of evaluation standards was assessed by all the respondents as an important step to the development of evaluation and ensuring the quality of evaluation results.

o According to interviewees, evaluation culture could be built in public sector due to the following elements that are still missing today:
  - Introduction in the legislation of a special clause that determines evaluation as part of decision-making process at national, regional and local levels in public sector (it assumes also a passage from formal status of evaluation to a real one);
  - Qualified professionals in M&E in the state institutions;
  - Development of evaluation methodologies in different branches of public sector evaluation;
  - Additional bonus system for the high quality reports;
  - Visible advantages of evaluation and practical benefits;
  - Creation of competitive market of evaluation services;
  - Ensuring of the sufficient level of understanding of evaluation at the top level of state institutions structure;
  - Promotion of evaluation practice in the large circle of non-governmental organisations in order to create an active environment that would stimulate public organisations to evaluation;
  - International experience (in particular through structural funds);
  - Making the evaluation documents available to the public on-line.
  - Advocating evaluation to the wide public as the instrument of good governance, instrument that makes public sector more transparent and accountable.

o Crucial for evaluation progress in Ukraine is promotion and creation of several centres that would allow unifying professionals in the sphere of M&E to facilitate development of evaluation culture and promotion of evaluation services, as well as demonstration of best practices and successful case studies.
B. Evaluation Capacity in Donor Agencies and Technical Assistance Projects  
a) Short-summary on literature review

There are up to thirty donors and assistance providers in Ukraine. An overall volume of international assistance is USD 500 million in 2012 and the following portfolio structure (65% of ITA projects are in the area of nuclear safety, energy efficiency, 14% - national security; 9% - economic competitiveness and investment environment; 5% - social society development, local governance, judicial reform, anti-corruption, etc. 42% of international finance assistance goes to the area of transport, 40% - energy and energy efficiency)\(^3\). The US government and the European Commission take the lead in terms of the amount of assistance provided. They are followed by bilateral Western donors such as Canada, Germany, the United Kingdom, Sweden and the Netherlands. Ukraine is also supported by international organisations present in the country: namely the Council of Europe, the OSCE and the United Nations. The external assistance goes to variety of areas to help advance governance and living standard improvement as well as humanitarian aid.

In general, bilateral and multilateral aid agencies have a long tradition of evaluation beginning in the fifties and becoming institutionalised and systematic in the mid-sixties of the XX century. However, the evaluation of official development programmes has even grown more over the past two decades, as the public and taxpayers increasingly demand credible, impartial assessments of the results of public spending on aid. The scaling up of aid, and new modalities and approaches to development assistance have also contributed to the increase in demands on evaluation as a key component of the accountability, management and learning structures of development agencies.

As a result, evaluation units have been established at the headquarters in most key aid agencies. Different donors introduced their own evaluation guidelines and principles and here are only some of them: EU (Evaluating EU Activities a Practical Guide for the Commission Services), Europe Aid (Project Evaluations Guidelines for the Evaluation Team), USAID (Evaluation Guidelines for Foreign Assistance), World Bank (Monitoring and Evaluation: Some Tools, Methods and Approaches), UN (Standards and Norms for Evaluation in the UN System), UNDP (Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results and Evaluation Policy), UNAIDS (A Guide to Monitoring and Evaluation), UNICEF (Guide for Monitoring and Evaluation), Global Fund (Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines and Tools), IOM (Evaluation Guidelines), CIDA (Evaluation Guide), SDC (Evaluation policy of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation) and Sida (Evaluation Manual "Looking Back, Moving Forward).

Moreover, the M&E budgets vary across development agencies significantly and depend on the M&E system in place, scale of the project/programme/policy, type of evaluation and its methodology. Usually thumb budget range of 5 – 10%, in particular UNDP guide mentions 5% for monitoring and $35,000 to $40,000 for a project evaluation; UNDEF guidelines mention 10% of the project budget - capped at $25,000 for projects over $250,000; UNEP guidelines mention usual 5-7%; USAID indicates 3% to external performance and impact evaluation, excluding costs for monitoring. Nonetheless, the experience shows that it is difficult to convince resource decision makers to reach that level, and usually end up with some 3%.

Additionally, it should be marked that aid agencies on the country level, particularly in Ukraine do not have independent evaluation units on the organisational level. M&E operates only on project/programme level. It means that general assessment of interventions and aid effectiveness on institutional level is not performed.

\(^3\) Notes of the meeting “Ukraine-Donors' Senior Experts Consultations on Development Assistance to Ukraine”, 12 October 2012
by donor agencies; the analyses are done on project by project basis or thematic area. Further, M&E responsibility often lays on programme manager in addition to his other functions; especially it could be very well seen in technical assistance projects. It is also clear that in such situation there could be a lack of suitable M&E skills by personnel, which limits appropriate and qualified guidance in M&E on project/programme level. The inadequacies of the latter put at risk the possibility to make proper evaluation and captured all the outcomes achieved. Furthermore, a bunch of evaluation guidelines introduced by different donors contribute sometimes to confusion at the recipient level due to usage of different terms and jargon.

b) Understanding of the terms “monitoring” and “evaluation”
Representatives of donor agencies and technical assistance projects have a decent understanding of the terms “monitoring” and “evaluation”. Monitoring is viewed by them as an integral part of each project/programme without which it is impossible to analyse the achievements of the results, outcomes and objectives. Meanwhile, evaluation seen as a management tool for gathering information and generating knowledge for illuminating feasibility, implementation issues and/or project/programme effectiveness at multiple levels including impact and outcomes for participants.

Monitoring is a constant control, the so-called “efficiency”, i.e. whether a project timely performs set goals within approved budget, so it tracks more technical process of implementation. Meantime, evaluation is measurement of “effectiveness”, i.e. to what extent the project achieve its goals/objectives and why.

f) Analysis of the Dimensions of Evaluation Capacity Development

- **Demand Dimension**
  1.1. **Architecture, Evaluation resources, Quality of monitoring systems**
  Representatives of donor agencies and technical assistance projects are of the same opinion in relation to usefulness of monitoring and evaluation.

There is a stable trend that all projects/programmes of donors have M&E system in place and undertake frequently all types of evaluations, both internal and external. They allocate sufficient budget for that and usually invite a team of independent consultants to do it. Most donor agencies have their own standards on the assessment of the quality of evaluation reports and they are used it to assess the quality of the reports prepared by both internal and external experts. Typically, M&E system requirements are formed by the headquarters and used by the country offices. The surveyed donors do not have an independent evaluation unit on the organisational level, except IOM; therefore M&E budget is formed for each project separately and its amount depends on the standards and norms followed by the aid agency. M&E requirements are usually an internal necessity and include legal requirements in the country of operation as well as strategies of cooperation with the host governments. In general, donor agencies have plans on staff development; therefore, usually M&E focal points within a project or a programme undergo M&E trainings and workshops, which is in the most cases developed by the donors itself (headquarters or regional offices) and serve as requirement for participation due to explanation of organisational rules and procedures in the field of M&E.

In the meantime, there is a slightly different picture with technical assistance projects. They are well acquainted with monitoring systems, as projects have the monitoring systems in any case. However, evaluation they conduct less frequently and it depends predominately on donor requirements. Technical assistance projects are using different evaluation mechanisms. First of all, they practice evaluation of the project or its components always on donor’s request. Secondly, they conduct or invited for the assessment of effectiveness of public policies and local authorities in the certain spheres of public and economic life.
technical assistance projects carry out the evaluation of efficiency of policies or collect statistical data that is used for evaluation of the level of problems on the country or regional level (e.g. World Drug Report, which is formed by WHO). Moreover, technical assistance projects use practically all types of evaluations, except ex-ante. Large projects that work on large territories and with communities use not only an internal evaluation but also impact evaluation, at least some of its elements. Smaller projects pass mid-term or final external evaluations requested by donors. The results of such evaluations quite often influence on a decision about support of the next phase of a project, or project extension. Thus standards for the evaluation of the quality of reports are absent. The biggest standard of quality lies within project management (i.e. sufficiency and adequacy of evaluation taking into account the necessities of the project management). In all projects there are certain amount of resources allocated for monitoring, but there is no a separate M&E budget. In most case, evaluation is not included into the project’s budgets and it is done on special donor’s request. The special software for monitoring and evaluation, as a rule, is not used. The internal informative systems and databases are sometimes used. In a word, in all technical assistance projects the M&E system is influenced by donors’ requirements and internal necessity. Standardisation of requirements of donor is different, but in any case the system of monitoring of project is combination of requirements of donor and internal necessity dictated by a structure and aims of project.

➢ Supply Dimension

1.2. Availability and quality of evaluation expertise

There is a common belief among the interviewees of donor agencies and technical assistance projects that the supply of local evaluation services and expertise on the national market of Ukraine is insufficient. The availability of national experts depends mostly on the sector, project/programme scale and/or goals of evaluation. It was mentioned that supply of national evaluators improved for the last 5 years in such sectors as health, education and border management. Also, those of them who have experience in cooperation with both national and international experts think that the last have better qualification. The quality of evaluation reports carried out by external international evaluators was rated as “very good”; national evaluators were assessed just as “good”.

Foreign consulting companies to a limited extent involved in providing evaluation services in the national evaluation market. Interviewed respondents are not aware of any universities / research institutes involved in providing evaluation services in Ukraine.

Trends in development of evaluation supply-side in Ukraine for the last 5 years are not very clear. Evaluation in public sector is slowly developing, “data is collected, but the problem exists with data analyses and its usage. Generally, there is almost no change occurred in the public sector; it is possible to say only about some single instances of evaluation usage, but still it is not a stable practice; responsible people leave and all good practices together with them”. In addition, the evaluation in NGO sector did not practically develop too, although obviously, such necessity exist taking into account inefficiency and absence of transparency within public institutions. “Evaluation in NGO field is almost absent and merely evaluations of some projects take place as a response to donor requirements. Evaluation of NGOs does not take place; strategic planning is also on low level”. Therefore, donors see themselves only as a push factor for the development of evaluation in NGO sector.

Key official statistical data on the national and regional levels is either fully or to some extent available to evaluators. In interviewees’ point of view, “new law on public information had a positive influence on the level of responses from different public agencies”.
Institutionalisation Dimension

1.3. **Dissemination, Utilisation**

The interviewees noticed that evaluation findings are used by two major groups: project management team and different stakeholders (donors, decision makers in public and NGO sectors). Also the type of evaluation had a direct influence on the usage of its findings. If the project/programme is under the evaluation then the main user of this evaluation are project management team, senior staff and/or regional offices. If it is evaluation of policy or state programme then the major users are decision makers, state authorities and policymakers. Usually evaluation findings are discussed internally during senior management meetings or on the round tables, workshops, conferences and presentations.

There is no institutionalised system or procedures within donors and technical assistance projects to trace implementation of evaluation findings and recommendations. Usually the following two methods used to trace implementation of evaluation findings, i.e. either (1) preparation of an action plan based on the results of evaluation or making changes in the existing action plan; (2) The results of evaluation are discussed and used internally by the management without formalization.

A policy in relation to publicity of evaluation results is different. Some evaluation reports are published on organisation’s or project’s web sites or circulated through distribution list among the interested parties. Some evaluations remain closed and used only by donors and project management team.

The respondents pointed out that among main difficulties in conduction of evaluations were primarily: (1) Terms of Reference (“they are too complex — too many evaluation questions asked there is not enough prioritization”) and (2) Quality of expertise of external experts (“External evaluators sometime lack understanding about clients’ needs and goals. Moreover, in the majority of cases international consultants have low level of knowledge about local context and challenges in programme implementation. Further, there is a poor supply of evaluation expertise on the regional level”). Insufficient amount of data or outdated data as well as logistical problems were also attached to the main obstacles in conduction of evaluations, although they are not seen as very crucial.

c) **General conclusion for the donor and technical assistance projects sector**

- There is a good understanding of the M&E terms within representatives of donors’ agencies.

- Good evaluation culture exists within donors agencies, which is governed by the established set of in-house standards, norms and procedures.

- Donors form evaluation demand in other sectors, i.e. NGOs and public sector as well as in technical assistance projects. M&E function is often donor-driven and financed.

- Donors in general allocate a suitable amount of resources for evaluation. The amount depends on a donor, scale of the intervention and thematic area.

- External international consultants are usually involved in evaluation of donors’ interventions and perceived by them as more qualified in comparison to national. The market national evaluation service providers are poorly represented.

- The evaluation findings are publicly available and distributed internally and externally for learning and follow-up actions and to ensure transparency.
d) General recommendations

- Seeking ways to promote and support public and NGOs sectors, own evaluation capabilities by the following means:
  - Build capacity for evaluation among recipients of the funds through formal and informal training skills exchange, and other avenues that support professional development;
  - Support demand for evaluation among public and NGOs sectors by establishing an evaluation support fund (documentary resources and financial support);
  - Work on changing the approach towards evaluation among NGOs and public sector as an “only to do thing if it is requested by donors”;
  - Promote better collaboration between the Government, NGOs and beneficiaries as keys to the success of building effective M&E systems.

C. Evaluation Capacity in NGO Sector

a) Short-summary on literature review

According to the government statistics, there are 71,767 non-government organizations and 13,475 charity foundations registered in Ukraine by 2012. However, according to the experts from the CCC Creative Center, the number of active and continuously operating NGOs (i.e. those that exist not less than 2 years, have experience in two or more projects and are known in the region) is only 3,000-4,000 of the total amount.

As stated in the report about Ukrainian civil society, not more than 500 NGOs receive aid from international institutions and this amounts to 30.5% of the total NGO financing. This is a significant factor for M&E development in the non-profit sector. In comparison, charitable contributions of enterprises in Ukraine to NGOs in 2010 were only 15.1%, while in 2009 these contributions amounted to 20.7% of their income. The share of financial support from the state or local budgets (in the form of both grants and reimbursements for services rendered) in the budget of the average NGO Ukraine is 2-3%. The share of financial support from the state and local budgets in total revenues NGOs in Ukraine is only about 8%.

It is noteworthy that the Ukrainian government does mention monitoring and evaluation in the latest decree on providing the state financing for NGOs. Though unfortunately, there is no information about the size of this financing for M&E, nor any suggestions about types, methodology or human resources that will be used for these activities.

---

7 Decree on October 12, 2011 N 1049 Kyiv On approval of the Competition to define programs (projects, events) developed by NGOs and creative unions, for execution (implementation) of which financial support will be provided [http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1049-2011-%D0%BF](http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1049-2011-%D0%BF)
There is certain lack of specific studies on development of M&E systems in the NGO sector. The authors of this report reviewed more than 20 Ukrainian NGO annual reports. The number of organizations that make annual reports is very little. However, the fact that these reports are published makes the point that NGOs at least collect some data about their activities and makes them public.

a) Understanding of the terms “monitoring” and “evaluation”

All respondents demonstrated full and adequate understanding the terms “monitoring” and “evaluation”. But they were experts and specialists that practice M&E in their organizations. In general, experts point out that these terms are not adequately understood. While “monitoring” is a more popular notion, both monitoring and evaluation are perceived as “control” and/or “audit”. Very often organizations do not know the difference between “monitoring” and “evaluation” and confuse interpretation of these terms. Firstly, because they do not know precisely what they [the terms] mean. Secondly, there are no definitions to guide them and there is non-existent approach to monitoring and evaluation. And what does exist, still, looks more like control.

Some experts express the opinion that the organizations established in late 90s with the help of international technical assistance programs, have more understanding and expertise in M&E. In those years there was a compulsory training program on project monitoring and evaluation available to all NGOs. Nowadays access to such trainings is not as easy as each international program limits its training opportunity only to target groups of NGOs they work with. For example, GATES Foundation’ Bibliomist project conducts M&E training to libraries and NGOs it works with, Alliance limits its training opportunities to NGOs working on HIV/AIDs, etc. and there is practically no literature in Ukrainian language available for them for self-study and development.

There is more understanding of M&E in those NGOs that are funded by international donors. It is very often a donor’s requirement to conduct monitoring and evaluation of programs and projects. A non-governmental sector - they better understand that because they are constantly monitored and evaluated (especially those receiving grants) but they do not fully understand what it is.

g) Analysis of the Dimensions of Evaluation Capacity Development

➢ Demand Dimension

1.1. Characterization

Demand in monitoring and particularly in evaluation is predominantly formed by international donor organizations. In the reality of decreasing budgets in these organizations, donors would like to know whether their financing is used effectively. At the same time, with their limited budgets, donors would like to assess where to invest their funds to achieve the highest return on social investment. Ukrainian NGOs compete for this funding and this drives them to utilize evaluation somehow.

And then, when the report is for some important donors, the issue of evaluation is raised; if this problem is not worth it, then everybody does routine work and it passes by the organization.

However, there are some advanced Ukrainian NGOs that do understand the importance of M&E for their development and planning and integrate M&E systems into their operations by their own initiative. Such, for example, are the CCC Creative Center, the Foundation for Development of Ukraine, the Ukrainian Philanthropists Forum.
Because these organizations have come here for a long time, and they want to stay for a long time, and they have a clear goal what they want to achieve. They understand what they are doing, they know what they want and they will do - then comes the understanding that you need planning and evaluation to make it all developed.

1.2. Architecture, Evaluation resources, Quality of monitoring systems

By type, the most used project/program evaluation is external and midterm and ex-post. Examples of these evaluations vary from midterm evaluation of the AIDS project to evaluation of bureaucracy of the Global Fund imposed on the local NGO, to ex-post evaluation of the Peace Corps program, etc. Experts recognize that there are no approved set of quality standards for evaluation reports. Organizations and people, who order evaluation, set their own reporting requirements. But in general, such requirements should include objectiveness, independence, judgments supported by facts, all questions should be answered, and they need to show different perspectives.

Financial and human resources are scarce in the sector. Monitoring is more often used since it usually does not require external financing and is done by the project personnel. Evaluation is mostly funded by international donors and done by external consultants, mainly international as well. Budgets for evaluation vary. Many respondents could not name any particular figure. Some donors, like USAID, allocate up to 10% of the project budget for M&E. The Global Fund may do the same but in reality it is not more than 5%. In large-scale projects it may be much less. It was reported that when an organization needs to cut its expenses, the M&E funding is cut first, unfortunately.

In NGOs, internal monitoring and evaluation functions lay with the project staff; usually it is a program manager who does M&E as part of his/her job. In the private charity Foundation for Development of Ukraine there is a fully staffed Department of Analysis, Planning and Evaluation with four employees. But this is rather an exception to the rule.

Supply Dimension

1.3. Availability and quality of evaluation expertise

The supply side of M&E services and expertise in Ukrainian NGOs is represented mainly by international consultants. Only one organization – the CCC Creative Center was mentioned by respondents as a local provider of evaluation services and trainings. This is less than adequate, of course. The quality of international consultants is rated as good. The consultants are usually hired by donors or technical assistance programs or by projects that are financed by donors. They are highly professional experts but very often they lack knowledge of local environment and culture, so they may not make adequate conclusions sometimes. Ukrainian evaluators are very few, and it is hard to judge about their quality and there is practically no competition among them. Universities are not known to be involved in M&E in the NGO sector. So far, we have identified only two educational institutions that have M&E of programs and projects in their curricula – the National Academy of Public Administration under the Office of the President of Ukraine and the Kiev National University named after Taras Shevchenko. We do not know how this knowledge is utilized, since these institutions do not track it.

---

8 Short-term course “Management of Public Programs: Monitoring and Evaluation” in the Institute of In-Service Training and a course “Evaluation of Public Policy and Programs” at the specialization “Public Policy Analyses” in master's program in NAPA, Department of Public Policy and Management of Political Processes.

9 Course “Evaluation of Social Programs and Projects” at the Faculty of Sociology.
Speaking about requirements for consultants, respondents stressed not only their professionalism but also the necessity to be independent. They marked that it is hard to be independent when you are paid by the people who order evaluation.

The national research institutes are sometimes brought to provide evaluation. However, research and evaluation are different things, so these two notions need to be explained to them at the stage of writing TORs for evaluation assignments.

Official statistical data is available to evaluators from official state websites. However, quality of this data is questionable. Experts also mention lack of information and insufficient research on the civil society development in Ukraine. Some experts note that information is even less available at the regional level. Despite the fact that local supply of M&E services is poor, experts believe that the interest to monitoring and evaluation is growing. They explain it by the fact that foreign donors contributed to this by forming demand on M&E. At the same time, the number of growing and developing NGOs is increasing, so they have come to understanding that M&E systems are essential for making management decisions. Another factor is a niche that has not been taken yet, that’s why M&E is becoming more popular.

➢ Institutionalisation Dimension

1.4. Dissemination, Utilisation

The evaluation findings are used by those who order them. As said above, they are predominantly donors and, rarely, program/project management and senior management of organizations. Donors use ex-post evaluations to create new programs. Project management staff uses it to make changes in the project to make it more efficient. In the Alliance against HIV/AIDS evaluation findings are taken into account when they write the next work plan for the project. In the Foundation for Development of Ukraine evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations are presented to a project’s stakeholders and an action plan is developed based on them. The Analysis, Planning and Evaluation Department check the implementation of such plan in a month after the evaluation.

Evaluation reports that are developed for foreign donors are usually available for public and all interested stakeholders through the project websites. However, they are often in the English language and this limits their use. The reports that are done for project and organization’s management are used to make management decisions. Some experts reported that sometimes projects closed after professional evaluation.

We cut some things, focused based on evaluation and changed our activities in a certain areas.

Among obstacles that hinder M&E development there are understatement and misunderstanding of these activities. Experts recommend involving as many as possible stakeholders to development of TORs, executing evaluation and dissemination of reports. It is also important to let interested parties know about what changes have been introduced to the project after evaluation and why.

There should be a discussion, first, within the organization, to have certain questions that everyone would like to get answers. And then, the more this debate is taking place, the more stakeholders are involved, the more likely that the results will be used.

To develop evaluation culture, all experts stress the necessity of trainings and education in this area. Besides, it is necessary to encourage professional dialogue and discussion among experts. Foreign expertise should be studied and adapted to Ukrainian realities, methodology and standards need to be developed that include Ukrainian terminology.

Baseline Study Report
The appropriate level should be within the organization that concludes M & E system not as something “fashionable”, but as a tool that can help you improve. But there should be more understanding of the leader, the head of the organization in this regard.

d) General conclusion for the sector

- There is misinterpretation of the terms monitoring and evaluation in the NGO sector. Only those NGOs that conduct M&E have a good understanding of these terms;

- Demand for M&E is predominantly formed by international donor organizations and technical assistance projects. This demand is not adequate, it lacks financial and human resources;

- Supply for evaluation is formed by external foreign consultants who very often do not know local realities. There is no local market of national evaluation services providers;

- Some evaluation reports are available to the public but many of them are in English. When evaluation is done for project management, these reports are rarely public because they are used for internal management decisions;

- Evaluation culture is not very well developed, although there is a trend for its growth.

e) General recommendations

✓ Demand for M&E among Ukrainian NGOs should be formed by local experts who can adapt international expertise to the national market;

✓ Trainings and education in M&E should be introduced in a broader scale to improve supply of local experts and increase understanding about these notions in Ukrainian NGOs;

✓ Networking among specialists should occur, more local specialists need to be identified and involved in different activities;

✓ Methodological support should be provided in Ukrainian language, and this includes development of the glossary of terms;

✓ Ethical standards should be developed inherent to Ukrainian culture that take into account international standards.
D. Overall assessment

Based on the performed assessment, the following state of evaluation capacity in each sector was determined and presented in the chart below:

*Chart 1: State of Evaluation Capacity in Ukraine disaggregated by sectors*

The **state of evaluation capacity development in the public sector** is the weakest among three sectors analysed. **Demand and supply dimension** received grade “moderately satisfactory” each, while institutionalisation was ranked even lower, i.e. grade “unsatisfactory” on 4-point rating scale. This is so because the resources (financial and human) provided for the “monitoring” and “evaluation” are insufficient to ensure that the objectives of the monitoring and evaluation can be fulfilled effectively. Required monitoring and data systems are partly exist and are not available and accessible for all interested parties. The primary and secondary data collected is suitable, but not reliable in terms of their expected use. A set of quality standards against which evaluation reports are assessed is in the process of development. **Insufficient amount of qualified national evaluation supply on domestic market**, which is not able to effectively respond to demand pressures. The evaluation findings are not publicly available and are not systematically distributed neither internally nor externally. Recommendations are not systematically responded to and no action taken by the person(s)/body targeted in each recommendation. This includes absence of a formal management response and follow-up. All agreed follow-up actions are not tracked to ensure accountability for their implementation.

The **situation in the NGO sector is a bit better compare to the public sector**. **Demand and supply sides** were also graded on the level of “moderately satisfactory”, however, institutionalisation dimension was ranked much higher in comparison to the public sector and received a grade “satisfactory” due to the fact that the evaluation findings are publicly available and are systematically distributed internally and externally for learning and follow-up actions and to ensure transparency. Recommendations are systematically responded to and action taken by the person(s)/body targeted in each recommendation. This includes a formal management response and follow-up. All agreed follow-up actions are not always tracked to ensure accountability for their implementation.

Meanwhile, the **state of evaluation capacity in donors sector** was rated as highest in terms of **demand, supply and institutionalisation** with grade “satisfactory” for each dimension. Only the demand-side in technical assistance projects could be ranked on the level of “moderately satisfactory” caused by the fact that demand in most cases is driven by donors, which supported their work. All other aspects of evaluation capacity in donor sector and technical assistance projects were assessed on the same level.
VI. CONCLUSION

The state of evaluation capacity development in Ukraine is on the quite low level, where scarcity of manpower and financial resources limit the scope, and where donor needs for accountability and program management are the main driving force. The degree to which evaluation is used and the availability of qualified staff and financial resources differ considerably across sectors, mainly completely insufficient in public and NGOs sectors. Evaluative practices are not conducted regularly or continuously. There is low political will towards evaluation development in Ukraine. The value of evaluation has not been fully understood and broadly recognized by executive senior managers in the civil service, policy makers and programme managers.

Key issues for consideration on evaluation capacity development in Ukraine are as follows:

1. Lack of understanding of the M&E terms by the representatives of public and NGOs sectors;
2. Poor incentives for good M&E within public sectors because of the unwillingness to support the move to a results oriented M&E, and managing for results as well as the lack of a learning culture;
3. Most evaluations are donor driven, more resources are spent—as a way of fulfilling the donor conditionality—on gathering information rather than using these resources for improved decision-making;
4. Lack of demand for evaluation in public and NGOs sectors. M&E often addresses donors’ concerns for the accountability of project inputs and outputs, rather than local related to broader development issues. The disproportionate element of donor initiative reduces local commitment to, and ownership of, M&E efforts.
5. Insufficient resources (human, financial and technical) dedicated to the evaluation in public and NGOs sectors;
6. Lack of suitable feedback arrangements to make adequate use of M&E findings;
7. Poor evaluation capacity at both individual and systemic levels, partly a result of the little attention given to evaluation at the strategic level;
8. Predominance of project and programme evaluations over policy evaluations.

As a result, all three sectors covered by the assessment have to:

1) strengthening evaluation demand (ensuring that there is an effective and well managed demand for evaluations)  
2) strengthening evaluation supply (ensuring that there are enough experienced evaluators or people trained in the field to support)  
3) institutionalising evaluations (building in of evaluation into policy making systems and across the broader policy system).
VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations have been formed as a result of the analysis:

i. To support the establishment of M&E structure on institutional level in Ukraine through elaboration of mechanisms and instruments for implementation of legislation requiring M&E of public programs and policies. International experience shows that M&E institutions created through legislation appear to acquire greater permanency and stability than those created through executive action.

ii. Advocate at political and policy level to raise awareness about the importance of results-based monitoring and evaluation and ensure its acceptance and use in key decision-making centers of the government to create local demand for monitoring and evaluation. To work on finding a powerful champion — a powerful minister or senior official who is able to lead the push to institutionalize M&E through conduction of presentations to senior decision-makers in Government explaining the use, standards and benefits of evaluation.

iii. To strengthen the professional evaluation capacity within the public and third sectors through continuous staff training in the field of M&E.

iv. The mechanisms of evaluation feedback should also be created and it should not be limited to bureaucratic channels only, but must also consider options that inform the public at large. In any democratic society people have the right to know how their money is being spent and what benefits they are deriving from it.

v. Promotion of evaluation practice in the large circle of non-governmental organisations in order to create an active environment that would stimulate public organisations to evaluation.

vi. To promote professionalism in evaluation by defining common standards and guidelines to evaluation practice.

vii. To work on creation of competitive market of evaluation services in Ukraine.

viii. Formalizing the network of evaluators in Ukraine in order to promote an evaluation culture and create a pull of qualified professionals in the field of M&E.
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### Annex 8.3. Evaluation Capacity Development Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sub-criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMAND SIDE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Architecture</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation responsibility</td>
<td>Location of responsibility for evaluation function within the managing authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of dedicated evaluation function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of an evaluation strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Coordination</strong></td>
<td>Existence of formal mechanisms for evaluation coordination across the programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation resources</strong></td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>M&amp;E budgets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Staffing</strong></td>
<td>Number of evaluation staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation experience and skills of evaluation staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Evaluation flow and coverage</strong></td>
<td>Number of evaluations carried out / time period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency of evaluation management</strong></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Existence of evaluation plans at national and programme level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Terms of Reference</strong></td>
<td>Quality and clarity of evaluation Terms of Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of core or mandatory evaluation questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality Assessment</td>
<td>Existence of approved set of quality standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Monitoring Systems</strong></td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Quality and reliability of indicator data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of socio-economic data</strong></td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Availability of key socio-economic indicator data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability and quality of evaluation expertise</strong></td>
<td><strong>Availability of evaluation supply on domestic market</strong></td>
<td>Number of firms active in the market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement of research institutes in evaluation practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of internal evaluation unit capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of evaluation training/education options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissemination</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ease of access to evaluation outputs</strong></td>
<td>Public access to evaluation reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilisation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Procedures for addressing evaluation and follow-up procedures</strong></td>
<td>Existence of follow-up procedures where evaluation recommendations are agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demand Dimension | Explanation | Supply Dimension | Institutionalisation Dimension
--- | --- | --- | ---
**Rat
   ng** | **Demand Dimension** | **Explanation** | **Supply Dimension** | **Institutionalisation Dimension**

4=Highly satisfactory
The resources (financial and human) provided for the “monitoring” and “evaluation” are adequate to ensure that the objectives of the monitoring and evaluation can be fulfilled effectively. Required monitoring and data systems exist and are available/accessible for all interested parties. The primary and secondary data collected are suitable and reliable in terms of their expected use. A set of quality standards against which evaluation reports are assessed is established and used.
Availability of sufficient number of qualified national evaluation supply on domestic market, which is able to effectively respond to all demand pressures. Low amount of foreign consulting companies involved in providing evaluation services in the evaluation market of Ukraine. Key official statistical economic and social data are publicly available both at national and regional levels.
The evaluation findings are publicly available and are systematically distributed internally and externally for learning and follow-up actions and to ensure transparency. Recommendations are systematically responded to and action taken by the person(s)/body targeted in each recommendation. This includes a formal management response and follow-up. All agreed follow-up actions are tracked to ensure accountability for their implementation.

3=Satisfactory
The resources (financial and human) provided for the “monitoring” and “evaluation” are adequate to ensure that the objectives of the monitoring and evaluation can be fulfilled effectively. However, required monitoring and data systems exist, but are not available/accessible for all interested parties. The primary and secondary data collected is suitable, but partly reliable in terms of their expected use. A set of quality standards against which evaluation reports are assessed is developed, but not used.
Availability of some number of qualified national evaluation supply on domestic market, which is able to effectively respond to most demand pressures. Medium amount of foreign consulting companies involved in providing evaluation services in the evaluation market of Ukraine. Key official statistical economic and social data are publicly available at national level and some at regional level.
The evaluation findings are publicly available and are systematically distributed internally and externally for learning and follow-up actions and to ensure transparency. Recommendations are systematically responded to and action taken by the person(s)/body targeted in each recommendation. This includes a formal management response and follow-up. All agreed follow-up actions are not always tracked to ensure accountability for their implementation.

2= Moderately satisfactory
The resources (financial and human) provided for the “monitoring” and “evaluation” are insufficient to ensure that the objectives of the monitoring and evaluation can be fulfilled effectively. Required monitoring and data systems are partly exist and are not available/accessible for all interested parties. The primary and secondary data collected is suitable, but not reliable in terms of their expected use. A set of quality standards against which evaluation reports are assessed is in the process of development.
Insufficient amount of qualified national evaluation supply on domestic market, which is not able to effectively respond to demand pressures. High amount of foreign consulting companies involved in providing evaluation services in the evaluation market of Ukraine. Key official statistical economic and social data are not publicly available only at national level.
The evaluation findings are not publicly available and distributed only internally for learning and follow up actions. Recommendations are not systematically responded to, management response is rather informal. All agreed follow-up actions are not usually tracked to ensure accountability for their implementation.

1= Unsatisfactory
The resources (financial and human) provided for the “monitoring” and “evaluation” are absent. Required monitoring and data systems do not exist and are not available/accessible for all interested parties. The primary and secondary data collected is neither suitable nor reliable in terms of their expected use. A set of quality standards against which evaluation reports are assessed is neither established nor used.
Absence of qualified national evaluation supply on domestic market, which is able to effectively respond to demand pressures. Only foreign consulting companies involved in providing evaluation services in the evaluation market of Ukraine. No key official statistical economic and social data are publicly available neither at national nor at regional levels.
The evaluation findings are not publicly available and are not systematically distributed neither internally nor externally. Recommendations are not systematically responded to and no action taken by the person(s)/body targeted in each recommendation. This includes absence of a formal management response and follow-up. All agreed follow-up actions are not tracked to ensure accountability for their implementation.

**Baseline Study Report**
Annex 8.5. Interview Forms

Interview form for representatives of three sectors

1. Your Name

2. What is the name of organisation you represent?

3. What is the type of organisation you represent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic / Research institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy firm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What is your position held?

5. What are your total years of experience in the field of M&E?

6. How many evaluations (policy/programme/project) have you conducted in Ukraine *(disaggregated by sectors)*?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. In your view, how key stakeholders from public sector, donor agencies, technical assistance projects, and NGOs in Ukraine understand the terms:
   A) “MONITORING”
   B) “EVALUATION”

8. What are the main reasons for such interpretations of these terms? What should be done to change this situation?
In this Section A, we kindly ask you to reply to the following questions with regard to the “evaluation demand” in Ukraine. “Evaluation demand” means the capacity and commitment of governments both to commission and to use evaluation, either when governments are persuaded as to the benefits of evaluation, or when there is pressure from external donors of assistance.

A. DEMAND SIDE

9. How would you characterize overall evaluation practices in Ukraine?

10. What type of evaluations usually organisations from public sector, donor agencies, technical assistance projects, and NGOs in Ukraine undertake? (please mark all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For projects</th>
<th>A) Internal  □  External □  Ex-post □</th>
<th>B) Ex-ante □  Mid-term □  Impact □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For programmes</td>
<td>A) Internal □  External □</td>
<td>B) Ex-ante □  Mid-term □  Ex-post □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For policies</td>
<td>A) Internal □  External □</td>
<td>B) Ex-ante □  Mid-term □  Ex-post □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For strategies</td>
<td>A) Internal □  External □</td>
<td>B) Ex-ante □  Mid-term □  Ex-post □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Do you see any trends in the number, scope, topics or size of executed evaluation studies and reports by different stakeholders in Ukraine for the last 5 years?

12. Is there an approved set of quality standards against which evaluation reports are assessed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>MONITORING</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Less than adequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Less than adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Do you consider that the financial and human resources devoted to “monitoring “and “evaluation” (policy / programme / project) in Ukraine are adequate (disaggregated by sectors)?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>MONITORING</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Less than adequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Less than adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance Projects</td>
<td>MONITORING</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Less than adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Less than adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>MONITORING</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Less than adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Less than adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- an average budget for “monitoring” and “evaluation” of a project/programme/policy (in % from total budget of a project/programme/policy) in the following sectors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>In 2007</th>
<th>In 2011</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How would you describe the quality of M&E systems in different sectors in Ukraine using a 5-rating scale?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>5=Excellent</th>
<th>4=Very good</th>
<th>3=Good</th>
<th>2=Fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>1=Poor</td>
<td>1= Poor</td>
<td>1= Poor</td>
<td>1= Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>1=Poor</td>
<td>1= Poor</td>
<td>1= Poor</td>
<td>1= Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td>1=Poor</td>
<td>1= Poor</td>
<td>1= Poor</td>
<td>1= Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 “M&E System” is a set of organizational structures, management processes, standards, strategies, plans, indicators, information systems, reporting lines and accountability relationships that interact to provide timely information for authorized decision-makers.
In this Section B we ask about the “evaluation supply” in Ukraine. “Evaluation supply” focuses on whether the necessary resources, skills and information infrastructure are available to effectively respond to demand pressures.

B. SUPPLY SIDE

15. By whom M&E requirements usually are established?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Legal requirement</th>
<th>Donor requirement</th>
<th>Internal necessity</th>
<th>Compliance with international standards</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. What are the main characteristics of the supply side in Ukraine?

Note:

**Characteristics:**
- Transparency (All findings are publicly available unless there are compelling reasons otherwise)
- Accountability (Use of resources is open to public scrutiny)
- Participation (Voice is provided to the people)
- Inclusion (Traditionally excluded interests are represented throughout M&E processes)

**Resources:** Financial, human resources, legislation requirements, data

17. Do you consider that the local evaluation services’ correspond to the national market’s supply? Please

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1=Poor</th>
<th>2=Fair</th>
<th>3=Good</th>
<th>4=Very good</th>
<th>5=Excellent</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Are foreign consulting companies involved in providing evaluation services in the national evaluation market?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a limited extent</th>
<th>To a significant extent</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Are universities / research institutes involved in providing evaluation services in Ukraine?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a limited extent</th>
<th>To a significant extent</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. In general, how would you rate the quality of evaluation reports carried out by external evaluators over last 5 years? Please use a scale from 1 to 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1=Poor</th>
<th>2=Fair</th>
<th>3=Good</th>
<th>4=Very good</th>
<th>5=Excellent</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National experts</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International experts</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
21. Is key official statistical economic and social data (e.g. GDP, employment, R&D investment, etc.) available to evaluators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data at national level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data at regional level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. In overall, how would you assess the quality of the data using a 5 rating scale?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Poor</th>
<th>2 Fair</th>
<th>3 Good</th>
<th>4 Very good</th>
<th>5 Excellent</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data at national level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data at regional level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Do you see any trends in changes of the supply side during last 5 years in Ukraine? If yes, what are the reasons behind these changes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. In general, how evaluation findings are used in Ukraine, and, by whom (disaggregated by sectors)? Who is the main audience, target group? Who are main receivers and readers of the evaluation studies?

Note: Please specify how they are used in decision-making. Be precise. Ask if these reports go beyond programme managers, that is are noticed by any politicians, journalists or general public.

25. Do you aware of any system or procedures that trace implementation of evaluation findings and recommendations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. How usually findings from evaluation studies are shared in Ukraine? What are the main channels of communicating evaluation findings and results? Are there reports accessible to general public?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Which evaluation from Ukraine would you choose as a study with the highest quality? Why this one? Can you provide us with a link or copy of the report?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Based on your experience, what were the main obstacles/difficulties in conduction of evaluations in Ukraine?

29. How do you think the quality of evaluation expertise could be strengthened in Ukraine?

30. In your opinion, how institutionalisation of evaluation function could be improved?

31. Could you identify main factors that determined the development of overall evaluation practice in Ukraine for the last 5 years (2007-2011)?

32. How do you think evaluation culture could be further developed in Ukraine? What are the potential growing points of evaluation culture?

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!
8.1. Interview form for experts

1. Your Name

2. What is the name of organisation you represent?

3. What is the type of organisation you represent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public sector agency</th>
<th>☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor agency</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance project</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental organisation</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic / Research institution</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy firm</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What is your position held?

5. What are your total years of experience in the field of M&E?

6. How many evaluations (policy/programme/project) have you conducted in Ukraine (disaggregated by sectors)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. In your view, how key stakeholders from public sector, donor agencies, technical assistance projects, and NGOs in Ukraine understand the terms:

C) “MONITORING”

D) “EVALUATION”

8. What are the main reasons for such interpretations of these terms? What should be done to change this situation?
In this Section A, we kindly ask you to reply to the following questions with regard to the “evaluation demand” in Ukraine. “Evaluation demand” means the capacity and commitment of governments both to commission and to use evaluation, either when governments are persuaded as to the benefits of evaluation, or when there is pressure from external donors of assistance.

C. DEMAND SIDE

9. How would you characterize overall evaluation practices in Ukraine?

10. What type of evaluations usually organisations from public sector, donor agencies, technical assistance projects, and NGOs in Ukraine undertake? (please mark all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For projects</th>
<th>A) Internal ☐ External ☐</th>
<th>B) Ex-ante ☐ Mid-term ☐ Ex-post ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For programmes</td>
<td>A) Internal ☐ External ☐</td>
<td>B) Ex-ante ☐ Mid-term ☐ Ex-post ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For policies</td>
<td>A) Internal ☐ External ☐</td>
<td>B) Ex-ante ☐ Mid-term ☐ Ex-post ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For strategies</td>
<td>A) Internal ☐ External ☐</td>
<td>B) Ex-ante ☐ Mid-term ☐ Ex-post ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Do you see any trends in the number, scope, topics or size of executed evaluation studies and reports by different stakeholders in Ukraine for the last 5 years?

12. Is there an approved set of quality standards against which evaluation reports are assessed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Do you consider that the financial and human resources devoted to “monitoring “and “evaluation” (policy / programme / project) in Ukraine are adequate (disaggregated by sectors)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONITORING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- an average budget for “monitoring” and “evaluation” of a project/programme/policy (in % from total budget of a project/programme/policy) in the following sectors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>In 2007</th>
<th>In 2011</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How would you describe the quality of M&E systems in different sectors in Ukraine using a 5-rating scale?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>5=Excellent</th>
<th>4=Very good</th>
<th>3=Good</th>
<th>2=Fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 “M&E System” is a set of organizational structures, management processes, standards, strategies, plans, indicators, information systems, reporting lines and accountability relationships that interact to provide timely information for authorized decision-makers.

Baseline Study Report
15. By whom M&E requirements usually are established?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Legal requirement</th>
<th>Donor requirement</th>
<th>Internal necessity</th>
<th>Compliance with international standards</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance Projects</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this Section B we ask about the “evaluation supply” in Ukraine. “Evaluation supply” focuses on whether the necessary resources, skills and information infrastructure are available to effectively respond to demand pressures.

B. SUPPLY SIDE

16. What are the main characteristics of the supply side in Ukraine?

**Note:**

**Characteristics:**
- Transparency (All findings are publicly available unless there are compelling reasons otherwise)
- Accountability (Use of resources is open to public scrutiny)
- Participation (Voice is provided to the people)
- Inclusion (Traditionally excluded interests are represented throughout M&E processes)

**Resources:** Financial, human resources, legislation requirements, data

17. Do you consider that the local evaluation services’ correspond to the national market’s supply? Please

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1=Poor</th>
<th>2=Fair</th>
<th>3=Good</th>
<th>4=Very good</th>
<th>5=Excellent</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Are foreign consulting companies involved in providing evaluation services in the national evaluation market?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a limited extent</th>
<th>To a significant extent</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Are universities / research institutes involved in providing evaluation services in Ukraine?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a limited extent</th>
<th>To a significant extent</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. In general, how would you rate the quality of evaluation reports carried out by external
In this Section C, we explore a range of more general issues related to institutionalisation of M&E. “Institutionalisation” implies the creation of a monitoring and evaluation system, which produces monitoring information and evaluation findings judged valuable by key stakeholders, and which are used in pursuit of good governance and where there is sufficient demand for the function of monitoring and evaluation to ensure its funding and sustainability for the foreseeable future.

D. INSTITUTIONALISATION

24. In general, how evaluation findings are used in Ukraine, and, by whom (disaggregated by sectors)? Who is the main audience, target group? Who are main receivers and readers of the evaluation studies?

Note: Please specify how they are used in decision-making. Be precise. Ask if these reports go beyond programme managers, that is are noticed by any politicians, journalists or general public.

25. Do you aware of any system or procedures that trace implementation of evaluation
### 26. How usually findings from evaluation studies are shared in Ukraine? What are the main channels of communicating evaluation findings and results? Are there reports accessible to general public?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Public sector</th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>Technical Assistance Projects</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 27. Which evaluation from Ukraine would you choose as a study with the highest quality? Why this one? Can you provide us with a link or copy of the report?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Public sector</th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>Technical Assistance Projects</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 28. Based on your experience, what were the main obstacles/difficulties in conduction of evaluations in Ukraine?

### 29. How do you think the quality of evaluation expertise could be strengthened in Ukraine?

### 30. In your opinion, how institutionalisation of evaluation function could be improved?

### 31. Could you identify main factors that determined the development of overall evaluation practice in Ukraine for the last 5 years (2007-2011)?

### 32. How do you think evaluation culture could be further developed in Ukraine? What are the potential growing points of evaluation culture?

### ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!