

## Democracy, Rule of Law and Human Rights, and Good Governance (DRG) Evaluation in Europe:

Report on the Assessment of the Current State of DRG Evaluation in Europe  
(Croatia, Greece, Macedonia, Poland, Serbia, Turkey and Ukraine)



**December 2018**

*This project was funded under the Call for Proposals 2018 IOCE/EvalPartners Small Grants Programme “Strengthening the Role of VOPEs in Democratizing Learning and Evaluation: Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance as a Showcase”*

## CONTENT

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>03</b>
<b>2. Methodology</b>	<b>05</b>
<b>3. Country reports</b>	<b>07</b>
<b>3.1 Croatia</b>	<b>07</b>
<b>3.2 Greece</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>3.3 Macedonia</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>3.4 Poland</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>3.5 Serbia</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>3.6 Turkey</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>3.7 Ukraine</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>4. Recommendations</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>5. Conclusions</b>	<b>85</b>
 Endnotes	 87

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Good governance democracy and human rights vary across Europe. In project evaluation, a key component is to include aspects of good governance, human rights and democracy (DRG). The project aim was to explore current DRG evaluation capacities across Europe and produce this report with recommendations for developing awareness for DRG evaluation. The project was implemented through networking of Voluntary Organizations of Professionals in Evaluation (VOPE) and an important component was exchange of knowledge and experience.

Europe comprises countries along spectra of economic development, democratic freedoms, human rights and approaches to governance. Broadly, the region includes a range from historical parliamentary democracies, countries formerly part of the Soviet Union, and countries that experienced the “colour revolutions”, to those recently emerged from communist dictatorships and civil war. Unsurprisingly, this rich history of governance has resulted in diverse norms of transparency and political accountability, rule of law and human rights, and government responsiveness and effectiveness – key aspects of the DRG Framework. These differences translate into a wide variation in development of an evaluation culture. In some countries, evidence-based policy making is established in society. In others, where evaluation cultures slowly develop by applying foreign practices, governance systems are less transparent and policies weakly related to the evaluative evidence. Actors and institutions that can promote and support reform vary in their strength, capacity and influence. It is well recognized that evaluation and democracy are closely related; evidence-governed countries tend to provide better socio-economic outcomes and stronger protection of human rights.

Europe is facing challenges to the democratic ideal, with right-wing and populist movements gaining traction. This also threatens the European Union. Moreover, turbulences in the Middle East, conflict in Syria, refugee problem facing European countries as well as similar humanitarian actions and programmes include multiple variables that cannot be evaluated using conventional measures. There is a need of

capacity building for creative and rigorous approaches in evaluating multiple and diverse components of DRG as well as need for working in complex environments.

In order to plan for further activities related to DRG and capacity building for DRG in Europe, this project focused on better understanding of the current status and practices and assessment of the positioning of DRG evaluation practices in Europe. The primary objective of the project was to explore the current state, awareness and understanding of DRG evaluation framework across Europe. The following questions were addressed:

1. What are the current DRG practices and tools? What is the current status of activities?
2. Which different components of DRG are already included in evaluations?
3. What are the challenges and opportunities with regards to conducting DRG evaluation in different countries across Europe?

**Figure 1. Political map of Europe**



Source: <https://mapofeurope.com/europe-political-map/>

In answering the questions outlined above, the project involved collaboration of seven countries across the Network of European Evaluation Societies (NESE) including Croatia, Greece, FYR Macedonia, Poland, Serbia, Turkey, and Ukraine. NESE was established in 2008, but collaboration between VOPEs in Europe has been limited. Opportunities to learn from each other's experiences and mutually build stronger VOPEs are rare, although the potential is very great. We witness that a side benefit of this project is the contribution to stronger network ties across NESE.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

Drawing on the steps in the DRG framework (USAID, 2014), and based on Wolfgang Beywl's<sup>i</sup> (2006) analysis on factors influencing the position of evaluation in the democratic process in a European context, there is a great need for DRG evaluation standards and guidelines. Accordingly, the following is essential for VOPE cooperation:

- **Promotion:** information on standard setting procedures employed by evaluation societies in Europe
- **Exchange:** facilitation of mutual exchange of standards
- **Plurality:** openness to ongoing developments.

The ultimate impact of the project in the longer term is to contribute to integrating the DRG component in evaluation practices across Europe. While the aim achieved was to gain insights into how government services and civil services across Europe affect DRG. This leads to the main outcome of the project that was to enhance awareness for DRG evaluation in European countries as well as globally. The project focus was on investigating DRG evaluation capacities across European VOPEs based on which recommendations for integrating DRG in evaluation practices are presented.

The specific project outputs include:

1. Overview of DRG evaluation practices across seven European countries
2. Awareness assessment in seven European VOPEs with respect to DRG evaluation
3. Exploration, discussion and identification of assessment capacity needs for the DRG evaluation within the NESE



4. Production and distribution of the “Thessaloniki Statement” across European VOPEs to build awareness for DRG in evaluation.

The intended ultimate impact of the project is to form a foundation to integrate the democracy, human rights and governance component into evaluation across Europe. The project rests upon two key cause-and-effect steps in the theory of change:

- i. *There is a need to understand the current legal and constitutional base for DRG evaluation and current DRG evaluation capacities in Europe.* Understanding the current status of DRG is a key initial step to create awareness and develop a framework for DRG evaluation in Europe.
- ii. *VOPEs play an important role in promoting and strengthening the practice and utilization of DRG evaluation in countries.* This includes improving the role of public-sector evaluation in governance and policy-making – respectively the accountability and learning functions of evaluation. The theme “DRG” served as tool to initiate the rewarding collaboration across NESE and contribute to further improvement of DRG capacities in Europe.

The two focus points of the theory of change are “understanding current practices on DRG and creating awareness for DRG in evaluation” and “documenting local solutions for DRG evaluation”. In the scope of the project, “understanding current practices on DRG and creating awareness for DRG in evaluation” is achieved through data gathered by means of focus group studies on current DRG practices across Europe. This can be considered as the first step in developing further policies and practices for training and capacity building. “Documenting local solutions” is achieved through sharing of country practices and case studies within the workshop conducted in Thessaloniki 1-2 October 2018. The country studies were presented and as a final output of the project, all country practices were documented. This report represents this second step and will serve for wider dissemination of results. In this way, the project aims contribute to awareness raising on the importance of DRG evaluation across Europe and the creation of a solid foundation for the project partner countries to start capacity building for DRG evaluation skills.

## 3. COUNTRY REPORTS

### 3.1 CROATIA

#### 3.1.1 Introduction

The Croatian Evaluators' Network (CEN) as one of the seven project partners prepared this country status reports on the current state of DRG evaluation in Croatia. The report provides an institutional overview with references to key legislation, findings on practices, challenges and constraints from the focus group discussion organized 11<sup>th</sup> September 2018 in Zagreb. The analysis and recommendations of this report are based on the conceptual framework of five basic dimensions of DRG evaluation proposed by USAID:

- *Consensus*: agreement on the questions of national identity, historical narrative, and fundamental rules of the game
- *Inclusion*: exclusion or discrimination of parts of populations from political, social and economic life
- *Competition and Political Accountability*: the extent to which political system includes competition and existence of free, fair, inclusive elections, freedom in media, vibrant civil society, presence of an adequate political rights and civil liberties
- *Rule of Law and Human Rights*: the presence or of rule of law in political, economic, social life and whether the government apply the law equitably to all citizens
- *Government Responsiveness and Effectiveness*: the extent to which public institutions respond to public needs and provide socially acceptable services and whether these services reach all citizens equally or do certain groups or populations face barriers to accessing services.

#### 3.1.2 Institutional overview of DRG evaluation in Croatia

There are numerous formal and informal institutions active in designing and implementing DRG related policies, programmes and projects. Below in table 1, is a structured overview of key institutions responsible for monitoring and evaluation of DRG policies and programmes. Evaluation encompasses here also activities of the

various ombudspersons, state audit and regulatory impact assessments. The formal institutions and their activities are monitored and evaluated by respective civil society organizations as well as dedicated international developmental organizations and funders of global evaluation studies.

**Table 1: Institutions responsible for M&E of DRG in Croatia (status 2018)**

Evaluation policy area	Responsible institution	Demand/ M&E format	Supply of formal M&E expertise	Supply of external M&E expertise
DEMOCRACY	CROATIAN PARLIAMENT	Monitoring of compliance with constitutional provisions and DRG specific legal acts	Republic of Croatia <b>Ombudspersons for:</b> Children, gender equality, human rights, people with disabilities <b>Information Commissioner of the Republic of Croatia</b>	DRG focused civil society organisations – various shadow reports available online: GONG, Centre for peace studies, BABE, RODA, Solidarna foundation, Green action (Zelena akcija), Transparency international, UNICEF and many other <b>Various evaluation reports produced by evaluation experts and academic researchers e.g.:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainable governance index 2017 – Croatia country report</li> <li>USAID report on the state of CSOs</li> </ul>
HUMAN RIGHTS & RULE OF LAW	GOVERNMENT, REPUBLIC OF CROATIA	State Audit Act <i>Reference to UN resolution A/66/209 (ref. SDGs) on Promoting the efficiency, accountability, effectiveness and transparency of public administration by strengthening supreme audit institutions</i>	State Audit Office, Republic of Croatia	
		Strategy on regulatory impact assessment 2018-2023, Act and Regulation on RIA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>prior to adoption of acts (regular procedure)</li> <li>during implementation</li> </ul>	Republic of Croatia, Government office for legislation	
		Fiscal impact assessment (FIA) prior to adoption of acts Declaration on fiscal responsibility self-evaluation	Ministry of finance  All levels	
GOVERNANCE		E-consultations – obligatory public consultations of all legal acts, strategic documents	Government office for NGOs – manages e-consultation platform All budgetary users announce draft legislation and strategic	



Evaluation policy area	Responsible institution	Demand/ M&E format	Supply of formal M&E expertise	Supply of external M&E expertise
			documents and invite comments accessible to all digitally equipped users. Responses are published in electronic format on the E-consultation website	

Source: authors.

In the table 2 below, the overview of institutions responsible for monitoring and evaluation of regional development policy is presented. An important framework for evaluation is provided by the European commission, in particular related to the implementation of ESIF plans and programmes. In Croatia, there is a national legislative framework for regional policy that includes regulations on evaluation of strategic documents on all levels of governance that do have an obligatory M&E component. This can be linked to the governance dimension as one strategic objective within the Strategy for regional development of the Republic of Croatia 2020 is explicitly targeting better governance. It also proposes indicators for monitoring and evaluation of governance on the level of the policy as well as priorities, measures, activities, programmes and projects. Institutional structures represent the formal framework, while spatial variations of practices show to what extent and how the system functions implying differences in the levels of institutional capacities across the state.

The findings of existing M&E practices in Croatia derive from the focus group discussion. Evaluation practice prior to Croatia's EU accession was random and not directly linked to policy cycles and regulated procedures. Public administration did use the support of academia in doing assessments of particular measures or programmes. There is also a tradition of institutionally driven evaluation studies that were and still are predominantly conducted within the following policy fields: education, social work, health, regional development, employment, entrepreneurship. In the process of EU accession, evaluation practice based on policy life cycle concept and intervention logic related to the theory of change was gradually introduced through international and EU consultancies.

**Table 2: Monitoring and evaluation of European structural and investment funds (ESIF), cohesion and regional policy**

Evaluation policy area	Responsible institution	Demand/ M&E format	Supply of formal M&E expertise	Supply of external M&E expertise
<b>CROATIAN EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR EUROPEAN STRUCTURAL AND INVESTMENT FUNDS (ESIF)</b>	<b>GOVERNMENT</b>	<b>Regulation on the Establishment of the Agency for the Audit of European Union (EU) Programmes Implementation System</b>	<b>Agency for the Audit of European Union Programmes Implementation System (ARPA)</b> Cooperation with Central Harmonisation Unit, and AFCOS network (dealing with irregularities)	<b>European Commission</b> <b>European Commission Anti-fraud Office (OLAF)</b> <b>International experts engaged through tender procedures</b>
	<b>Ministry of finance</b>	<b>Financial management and control system</b>	<b>Central harmonisation unit</b>	
	<b>Ministry of regional development and EU funds (MRDEUF)</b>	<b>National Strategy on Evaluation of the implementation of the ESIF 2014-2020</b>	<b>Coordination body</b> Inter-ministerial working group (representatives from MA responsible for OP implementation)	
<b>ERDF – OP Competitive-ness and Cohesion</b>	<b>MRDEUF – EU programme departments</b>	<b>Evaluation plan for OPCC</b>	<b>OPCC Evaluation unit – tender administration</b>	<b>Evaluation experts – international and national</b>
Regional development	<b>MRDEUF – national policy departments</b>	National regional development strategy, county development strategies, urban development strategies	<b>Department for regional development</b>	Evaluation experts

Source: authors.

Institution building was an important part of the pre-accession programmes up to **July 2013, when Croatia joined the EU as the 28<sup>th</sup> member state**. This process has significantly influenced the establishment of new institutions and DRG related processes and practices. In particular, influenced by EU supranational policy a new way of policy making is emerging adding horizontal policy dimensions to sectoral ones. Namely, horizontal issues such as social inclusion, innovation and

environmental sustainability must be addressed by EU related plans, programmes and projects, and are part of standard evaluation criteria.

Strengthening **civil society evaluation capacities** has been also part of the overarching institutional capacity building process of the country. For example, the parliament established the office of the Information Commissioner. It is an independent body for the protection of the right to information which, through the Constitution of the Republic of Croatia, protects, monitors and promotes the guaranteed right to access to information and to the re-use of information. The regulatory impact assessment process is obligatory as well as the financial impact assessment. The e-consultation portal has enabled better governance practice and the obligatory feedback requirement does affect a higher level of institutional responsibility towards the public.

### 3.1.3 Overview of institutional DRG evaluation practices

The overview is done based on the five basic dimensions of DRG evaluation as proposed by USAID:

- a. Evaluations involving **“Consensus”** - Agreement on the questions of national identity, historical narrative, and fundamental rules of the game:
  - There is a problem of political culture in Croatia, as there is a deep reluctance towards critical self-assessment.
  - There are fundamental national identity issues that are not to be questioned.
  - Historically, evaluations were always present, but the terminology was different. Policies and measures were analyzed by researchers and media. Assessments and analyses were common for example in political science, social work, psychology, education and economics. However, without clear policy frameworks and monitoring systems, standardization of evaluation approaches based on common criteria were never possible.
- b. Evaluations involving **“Inclusion”** - Exclusion or discrimination of parts of populations from political, social and economic life:
  - Though formally institutions that deal with inclusion are established, and policies, programmes and projects are evaluated, even all EU funded projects need to be assessed in terms of their contribution to social inclusion. However, in practice this has transformed into an administrative exercise (check box),

while real impacts should be evaluated with the help of social impact assessments of key policies or programmes.

- Equal opportunities are taken up by horizontal policy criteria – which requires policy improvements e.g. in construction it is a legal requirement to build accessibility ramps for persons with disabilities.
  - The Government office for human rights and Government school for public administration implement a training programme on how to fulfill ex-ante conditionality i.e. horizontal requirements such as social inclusion.
  - The European Social Fund (ESF) is based on horizontal principles of inclusion, while the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and Cohesion Fund (CF) apply horizontal principles in planning, implementation and evaluation of programmes and projects.
- c. Evaluations involving “**Competition and Political Accountability**” - The extent to which the political system includes competition and existence of free, fair, and inclusive elections, freedom in media, vibrant civil society as well as presence of an adequate political rights and civil liberties:
- There was an attempt to evaluate ex-post the work of public utility companies and public administration after change in government (3 political mandates ago), but it seems that the project did not work out well because of conceptual framing problems and difficulties in evaluating policies that are not well structured, and lack of structured monitoring information.
  - An interesting idea would be a report on undertaken evaluations (e.g. meta evaluation).
  - The Parliamentary Committee for Conflict of Interest has proven itself to be a good instrument of governance.
  - On political level, committees and assessment procedures are established to deal with DRG issues. However, feedback to the public is insufficient.
  - The state election committee has done one evaluation of elections more than 10 years ago. This should be done on regular basis.
  - The Parliamentary Information Officer provides opinions based on in-depth analyses.

- d. Evaluations involving “**Rule of Law and Human Rights**” - The presence or of rule of law in political, economic, and social life and whether the government apply the law equitably to all citizens:
- Human rights issues did not become an integral part of public policies. It is still a topic, which is assessed in isolation from other policies.
  - Rule of law is one of the key problems in the country. Evaluation in this context is hard to think of. The judiciary system is extremely slow, seems extremely inefficient and closed for public.
  - The National Security and Intelligence Agency has a human rights guide book.
  - EU Schengen regime – evaluations are done; Ombudspersons publish monitoring reports – however, the function of such documents is largely determined by international requirements.
  - Independent institutions, civil society evaluate issues related to rule of law and human rights. A lot of efforts are necessary that these topics become “mainstream”. In reports, the key relationship between cause and effect is often missing – e.g. why someone became homeless?
  - The fund for pluralism of media does evaluation reports.
- e. Evaluations involving “**Government Responsiveness and Effectiveness**” - The extent to which public institutions respond to public needs and provide socially acceptable services and whether these services reach all citizens equally or do certain groups or populations face barriers to accessing services.
- Evaluation is not just what is formally called evaluation – actually there are more evaluations done than actually thought of.
  - Evaluation reports lack critical views, which represent one of key weaknesses in evaluation practice. When evaluations are done without critical perspective, a large area for manipulation opens.
  - Problems exist among experts, because certain experts are preferred to others as they do not express themselves critically but positive or neutral. A large challenge is to keep objectivity and assure quality evaluation. Low quality of evaluation reports do more harm than good.
  - For the time being, evaluations are EU and donor driven.



- In Croatia, the role of audit is much stronger than evaluation, because with audits emphasis is on financial impact, the result is that primarily interventions besides financial ones are assessed.
- An interesting framework for monitoring success of public policies is offered by the European Semester<sup>1</sup>. The required quality of documents needed for this process is high.
- It is unclear what happens with evaluation findings. It is recommended that the user has the responsibility to consider the findings and they have to give feedback in form of management response.

### 3.1.4 Main opportunities in the country on evaluating DRG

The following opportunities were identified:

- With the EU accession process acceding countries face an important opportunity for their own democratic political and institutional development. Most DRG issues are thoroughly assessed during this politically and administratively demanding process, while civil society has an important role in monitoring and evaluating this process. EU and donor funded shadow reports represent alternative views on the same issues that are formally reported back to international organizations and institutions, which provide an additional quality dimension to the process of making societies better.
- Croatia has adopted a new national law on strategic planning in December 2017. Based on which the policy cycle becomes the main framework for policy management in all public policy areas, not just those exposed to EU regulation. Evaluation will be formally standardized through a Government Regulation on the System of Strategic Planning and related Evaluation Guidelines, meaning that all strategic documents will undergo evaluation – ex-ante, interim and ex-post, as of year 2021. Capacities need to be built in order to enhance the supply of evaluation expertise in the medium term. As these processes are at an early

<sup>1</sup> European Semester documents for Croatia available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/economic-and-fiscal-policy-coordination/eu-economic-governance-monitoring-prevention-correction/european-semester/european-semester-your-country/croatia/european-semester-documents-croatia\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/economic-and-fiscal-policy-coordination/eu-economic-governance-monitoring-prevention-correction/european-semester/european-semester-your-country/croatia/european-semester-documents-croatia_en)

stage, DRG evaluation topics can be proposed to be considered as horizontal evaluation criteria applicable to all public policy strategic documents.

- The Regulatory Impact Assessment - RIA process is being extended from the initial ex-ante assessment and encompasses interim and ex-post assessments. An assessment form has been created<sup>2</sup>, which has a narrative format (not administrative as the ex-ante RIA form) and includes questions that correspond with DRG and sustainable development aspects. This is clearly a good formal framework for introducing DRG evaluation in public policy evaluation practices.
- With regard to internal and external evaluations, UNICEF's approach can serve as an example – their evaluation report is being externally evaluated and added to the main report as an appendix.
- The European semester – case study report on how it is designed, who participates in the discussions, what the content is – serves as support to members in monitoring the implementation of national reform programmes that are obligatory planning documents on highest level to all EU member states.

### 3.1.5 Main constraints in the country on evaluating DRG

The following constraints were identified:

- In terms of “consensus” on key national identity issues, evaluation can be perceived as a provocation.
- Expertise exists, but is organized and connected. Individual experts have a strong knowledge base, which might not be compatible with administrative requirements that are in technical jargon EU or donor driven. There might be therefore misunderstandings between evaluation users and evaluation service providers.
- Evaluation might become just an administrative check-box exercise without real impact on learning and future policy formation. With the Europeanisation process M&E is being established as part of the standard policy and programme cycle. However, there is a tendency towards bureaucratization of this dimension, while the learning dimension is not comprehended yet. In this context, evidence based decision making is happening occasionally and depends on personal will of individual decision makers as well as their political standing and power.

<sup>2</sup> Ex-post RIA form available at the Government Legislation Office:

<https://zakonodavstvo.gov.hr/UserDocsImages//dokumenti//170607%20UPUP%20Prilog%205%20NPUP.docx>

- The existing public administration and public policy system does not reward self-criticism, or self-evaluation. In the evaluation process, a big problem refers to situations, when the client is at the same time the object of evaluation.
- There is an asymmetry in the strengths of evaluation data – the power of financial information i.e. hard data is much stronger than information on impact.

### **3.1.6 Recommendations for developing awareness of DRG evaluation in Croatia**

The following recommendations were proposed:

- Joint educational programmes and trainings for public administration and policy experts/evaluators should be organized and offered.
- Networking events for exchange of knowhow and experience among evaluation experts should be facilitated and supported.
- DRG evaluation needs to be promoted on political level.
- Media awareness raising activities about positive impacts of DRG evaluation on key societal issues should be adequately designed and implemented.
- The evaluation society/network should adopt a code of ethics including DRG evaluation criteria.
- E-consultations are a good example of public participation in the ex-ante assessment of legislative acts.
- Regulatory Impact Assessment - RIA should be done also in the interim phase and this can be regulated. Initial activities are already undertaken, and references are also made in relation to the SDGs. Practice and expertise needs to evolve in this context.
- As a responsibility of the Parliament, the role of parliamentary committees in monitoring and evaluation, as well as an obligatory follow up procedure, should be institutionalized.
- The State Audit Office already extends its scope of work beyond financial monitoring, and includes impact assessment aspects into their work. This process should be further promoted and strengthened.

- Evaluation recommendations should be implemented and need to be harmonized with the budget. Guidance documents on evaluation should include obligatory recommendations and follow up reporting.
- Legislation – prior to adoption, a situational analysis should be a standard step with reference to what has been done so far to establish baseline information and data for interim and ex-post regulatory impact assessments and policy evaluations.

## 3.2 GREECE

### 3.2.1 Overview of the existing M&E practices in the Greece

Evaluation in the country is not much endorsed, as an active element at all levels of governance. In fact, the term “evaluation” (negatively perceived due to the imposed Memoranda of Understanding (MoU), the associated reforms and the close follow-up of the progress of their implementation by the country’s creditors) is often confused with monitoring, assessment, control and audit.

Although there is mandatory requirement for all laws to be accompanied by an ex-ante impact assessment (regulatory impact assessment) as well as a provision for ex-post evaluation of all legal acts, practices reveal that there is actually no depth in the analysis nor adequate background quantification for impact assessments (see also below: the law on Better Regulation (4048/2012)).

Policies in the country do not usually rely on evaluation feedback and often, policies are repeated, overlap or are partially or wholly redundant with one another, due to lack of evidence, often deriving from lack of measurable and validated data. Similarly, reforms are not evaluated, and long term impacts are never assessed. In terms of organizational and HR management in the public sector, evaluation has been slowly introduced and cautious steps are to follow. On the other hand, common practice involves evaluation of environmental issues, mainly through Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) of infrastructure and expenditure (as imposed by law), as well as of education and health.

As regards to programmes and projects co-financed by the European Commission, for which evaluations constitute a mandatory requirement (ex-ante, evaluations

during the programming period, mid-term, impact, ex-post), the Commission's particular requirements as stipulated in the relevant regulations and associated methodological guidelines are followed. The EU Common Provisions Regulation (CPR) 1303/2013 lays down the essential requirements for evaluation in the programming period 2014-2020, which sets forth the evaluations realized for the purpose of improving quality in planning and the implementation of programmes, as well as the evaluation of their effectiveness, efficiency and impact.

The CPR 1303/2013 has been transposed into the Greek legislation (Law 4314/2014) for the management, control and implementation procedures of the Partnership Agreement (PA) 2014-2020. In the context of the programming period 2014-2020, the decision has been reached to draw up an Evaluation Plan for each Operational Programme (7 Sectoral and 13 Regional Operational Programmes) and an Evaluation Plan for the whole PA for the Development Framework (2014-2020). However, evaluation is rather implemented as a 'managerial' task instead of being a tool for deepening knowledge and studying impacts, whereas there is a significant lack of competencies and fragmentation of data.

### 3.2.2 Description of the current state of DRG evaluation in Greece

a. **Consensus:** Agreement on the questions of national identity, historical narrative, and fundamental rules of the game

Regarding this dimension, it can be claimed that in terms of policy making there is a broad consensus on issues related to national identity, historical narrative, and fundamental rules of the game. At an institutional level, EU membership has been for the greater part an important element of the Greek national consensus. Article 28 of the constitution is the foundation of the country's integration into the EU and stipulates that *"The generally recognized rules of international law, as well as international conventions as of the time they are sanctioned by statute and become operative according to their respective conditions, shall be an integral part of domestic Greek law and shall prevail over any contrary provision of the law"*.

Europe was commonly associated in public discourse with geopolitical security, democratic institutions and economic prosperity. Moreover, accession to the European Monetary Union in 2001 was celebrated as proof of a successful national course and as promise for economic growth.



---

*Within this framework, the dimension of consensus, as defined by the USAID, does not constitute a component of any evaluation of policy interventions, as it is considered as a constitutionally safeguarded principle and an integral part of the broader European acquis.*

---

Nevertheless, challenges to pro-Europeanism both from the left and from the extreme right have risen in the context of the economic crisis and the refugee influx in the country, and brought about political rhetoric that appeals to the public's growing anxiety and discontent about the effects of those on the citizens' daily lives and future prospects. While Euro-sceptical attitudes are still a minority within Greek society – but significantly increased in relation to past trends – the discursive negotiation of Europe in the Greek public debate is characterized by ambiguity and has acquired various negative connotations (e.g. austerity policies, authoritarianism, German hegemony, democratic deficit in decision-making). This is also reflected in a recent Eurobarometer Survey on European Citizenship as published in June 2018<sup>ii</sup>. According to this survey, a majority of respondents in 26 EU Member States *feel attached to Europe* (the same number as in autumn 2017), with the highest levels in Denmark (81%), and Luxembourg and Sweden (80% in both countries). However, only a minority of respondents feel attached to Europe *in Greece* (42% “attached”, vs. 58% “not attached”); this was also the case in autumn 2017. Furthermore, in all 28 EU Member States (compared with 27 in autumn 2017 when Greece was the one exception), a majority of respondents see themselves as citizens of the European Union. This is the first time since 2010 that a majority of respondents in all EU countries feel this way. *Yet, respondents in Greece and Bulgaria* (51% in both countries) *are the least likely to feel that they are citizens of the EU*, while Greece has one of the lowest proportion of citizens who said that they ‘definitely’ *feel they are citizens of the European Union* (15%).

**b. Inclusion:** Exclusion or discrimination of parts of populations from political, social and economic life

The integration of this dimension into evaluation is developed to a great extent, mostly due to the fact that there is a formal requirement set out by the European

Commission for the dimension of “inclusion” to be considered as a cross-cutting issue for all co-financed programmes and projects.

In Greece, evaluation of inclusion policies started in 2003 with the evaluation of the EQUAL programme<sup>iii</sup>. This evaluation lasted until 2008 and harvested a number of good practices. Evaluation was carried out both at programme and project level.

As regards the integration of this dimension into current evaluation processes the following practices have been identified.

---

#### *Current practices*

- *Activities and reports of the National Mechanism for Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation of policies for social inclusion and social cohesion*
  - *Evaluations conducted by the European Social Fund Coordination and Monitoring Authority (EYSEKT)*
  - *Activities and reports of the Special Secretariat for Inclusion of Roma Population*
- 

#### ➤ **Activities and reports of the National Mechanism for Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation of policies for social inclusion and social cohesion**

The National Mechanism for Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation of policies for social inclusion and social cohesion was established by law in December 2016. Its mission is described as: the planning, updating, coordinating, monitoring and evaluation of horizontal, coherent multi-sectoral policies for social inclusion and social cohesion and acting as a focal point between the Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Social Solidarity and other ministries implementing social policies, without modifying their responsibilities, in connection with the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of these policies.

The aims of the National Mechanism are to:

- Identify social needs
- Coordinate the formulation social inclusion and cohesion policies
- Monitor and evaluate their implementation
- Identify priorities for social based on current needs
- Contribute to enhancing information dissemination, transparency, efficiency and effectiveness of the social protection system

- Document and specify policies and actions, in accordance with the cumulative characteristics of individuals, those at risk of poverty, extreme poverty and social exclusion
- Design, monitor and evaluate the institutional framework for the effective implementation of the Social Solidarity Income

The National Mechanism includes structures both at central and local government level. At the centre of the mechanism is the Directorate for Social Inclusion & Social Cohesion (which includes the Planning & Evaluation Department; the Monitoring Department; the Documentation and IT Department) and the Integrated Geographical Information System (IGIS): for data recording, generation of reports and other statistical data for the monitoring of social policies and the priorities of the National Strategy for Social Inclusion.

According to the provisions of the founding regulation, the Mechanism introduces the requirement for the *systematic preparation of a number of reports* (progress reports, monitoring reports, evaluation reports, annual reports) by different actors, namely:

- Directorate for Social Inclusion & Social Cohesion
- Directorate for Combat of Poverty
- Line ministries
- National Centre for Social Solidarity
- Hellenic Manpower Employment Organisation
- National Institute of Labour & Human Resources
- Regional Directorates for Social Care
- Municipal Social Services (provision of information and data)
- Regional Observatory for Social Inclusion (yearly research on income and living standards)

#### ➤ **Evaluations conducted by the European Social Fund Coordination and Monitoring Authority (EYSEKT)**

The European Social Fund Coordination and Monitoring Authority (EYSEKT) was established in 2001 with the following mission:

- To coordinate the implementation of co-financed by the European Social Fund (ESF) interventions in Greece.

- To monitor the implementation of ESF policies through actions being realized in the country by 4 Sectoral and 13 Regional Operational Programmes.
- To coordinate the design, the implementation and the evaluation of these actions.

In this context, EYSEKT exercised its coordinating role during the 3rd CSF and the NSRF 2007-2013 programming periods, supporting at the same time the work of Operational Programmes with the preparation of studies, the organization of know-how transfer events, the production of tools and information systems.

Today, within the framework of PA 2014-2020, EYSEKT maintains and enhances its role, operating under the National Coordination Authority of the General Secretariat of Public Investment - NSRF of the Ministry of Economy, Development and Tourism.

**In the current programming period (2014-2020)** emphasis is placed on measuring the interventions' results and their impact against the targets set in the Europe 2020 Strategy. Emphasis is also placed on the development of a reliable system of indicators for monitoring of progress and assessment of results.

EYSEKT is also responsible for running the **Central Register of Evaluators (EMA)**, an important tool in the process of documented and objective evaluation of the quality of interventions being co-financed by the European Social Fund in Greece. The Central Register of Evaluators (EMA) was set up in 1998 at the Ministry of Employment and Social Protection (Ministerial Decision 106543/16.4.1998) and has since then served as a central record of experts in the human resources sector in Greece. Registered Evaluators are invited to evaluate the proposals of agencies for projects that aim to develop the country's human resources, as soon as they are submitted for approval and finance from the European Social Fund and the Greek state. Such projects include training programmes, employment actions, and programmes for the social inclusion of vulnerable groups and so on.

➤ **Activities and reports of the Special Secretariat for Inclusion of Roma Population**

The Special Secretariat for Inclusion of Roma Population was established in 2016 as a structure within the Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Social Solidarity with the aim of becoming the national contact point for Roma issues in the country.

The scope of work of the Secretariat includes:

- The formulation of guidelines for all policy areas related to the social inclusion of the Roma population and submission of relevant proposals and recommendations to the Minister for Labour, responsible for social solidarity matters.
- Close cooperation with line Ministries, bodies at national, regional and local level and with private bodies for the design and implementation of interventions on Roma issues, as well as the coordination and inter-sectoral monitoring of Roma policies, such as access to education, employment, healthcare and housing.
- The creation and development of a geographical information system for the documentation, monitoring and evaluation of relevant policies and the parallel mapping of the characteristics of the Roma population living in camps and settlements cut off from the general urban fabric.
- The provision of advice and technical support to stakeholders for the design and evaluation of Roma-related interventions and the conduct of meetings and events for this purpose.
- The conduct of field studies and studies on the living conditions of this vulnerable social group and on issues related to housing, education, health and employment.
- Request and receipt of necessary information and data from all public or private entities dealing with Roma issues, for the formulation of national policy for this vulnerable social group.

The National Contact Point for the promotion of the National Strategy for Roma Inclusion is also transferred to the Special Secretariat. The Secretariat includes three units: the Secretary Special Office, the Planning Coordination and Monitoring Department and the Documentation, Evaluation, Support and Specialisation Department. The Planning Coordination and Monitoring Department is entrusted *inter alia* with the monitoring and evaluation of implementation of the National Strategy for



the Roma Social Inclusion, whereas the Documentation, Evaluation, Support and Specialisation Department is responsible for the collection and processing of quantitative and qualitative data related to interventions for Roma inclusion, as well as for the development of evidence-based indicators for the monitoring of implementation and effectiveness of relevant interventions. Given the recent establishment and operation of the Secretariat, so far, a formal evaluation has not yet been conducted.

**c. Competition and political accountability:** The extent to which the political system includes competition and existence of free, fair, and inclusive elections, freedom in media, vibrant civil society as well as presence of an adequate political rights and civil liberties

The Greek governmental structure is similar to that found in many other Western democracies, and has been described as a compromise between the French and German models. The Prime Minister of Greece is the head of government and of a multi-party system. The Prime Minister and the cabinet play the central role in the political process, while the President performs some executive and legislative functions in addition to ceremonial duties. Voting in Greece is compulsory but is not enforced.

The constitution of Greece, which describes Greece as a "presidential parliamentary republic", includes extensive specific guarantees of civil liberties as well as provisions for freedom of speech and the press. More specifically:

Article 52 of the Greek constitution is complementing the principles regulating the electoral process by providing that: «the free and falsified expression of the popular will, as an expression of popular sovereignty, it under be guaranteed by all State officers who shall be obliged to ensure such all circumstances. Criminal sanctions for violations of this provision shall be specified by law». This provision was not to be found in previous Greek constitutions. It was intended to emphasize that no interference of state agencies falsifying the expression of the popular will shall be tolerated in the future.

Furthermore, freedom of expression is also guaranteed by the constitution. According to Article 14, everyone may express his thoughts orally, in writing and through the press in compliance with the laws. The same article establishes that the press is free,

that censorship and the seizure of publications are forbidden, and that the right to reply to errors is also guaranteed. Art. 14(9) foresees that media ownership and financing are registered, and prohibits concentration of ownership.

---

*Within this context, the dimension of competition is not evaluated, since it is considered as a constitutionally safeguarded principle*

---

**Political Accountability** - As regards the integration of political accountability into current evaluation processes the following practices have been identified:

---

*Current practices*

- *Law on Better Regulation*
  - *Opengov: portal designed to serve the principles of transparency, deliberation, collaboration and accountability*
  - *Membership in the Open Government Partnership Initiative*
  - *Interventions and reports by the Inspectors-Controllers Body for Public Administration*
- 

➤ **The law on Better Regulation (4048/2012)** entitled “Regulatory Governance: Principles, Procedures and Means for Better Law-making<sup>iv</sup>”.

This law, also known as “*a law for all laws*”, lists consultation, regulatory impact assessment (ex-ante evaluation) and ex-post evaluation of all legal acts among tools for better regulation.

Article 6. places on a statutory basis the requirement that consultation on draft bills takes place through the [www.opengov.gr](http://www.opengov.gr) website (see electronic deliberation under ‘Opengov.gr’ below). The Bureau for Legislative Initiative in each ministry is tasked with the drafting of a report on public consultation, in which all comments and proposals relevant to each proposed piece of legislation are grouped, and provides arguments for their inclusion (or non-inclusion) in the final text. This report is submitted to the Parliament together with the bill and is also published online and emailed to all participants in the consultation process.

Furthermore, the law formalises the obligation of administrative authorities to conduct Regulatory Impact Assessments (RIA) on all bills as well as regulations of “major economic and social importance”. The foreseen RIA provides a detailed and

systematic appraisal of the potential impacts of each new regulation in order to assess whether the regulation is likely to achieve the desired objectives, and is an important element of an evidence-based approach to policy making. The RIA is submitted together with the draft measure to the Better Regulation Office. The latter, the Greek Ombudsman and the Bureau for Legislative Initiative in the pertinent ministries collaborate to improve the quality of RIA, as the statutory text describes this process. With respect to bills, the RIA with the “remarks” of the Better Regulation Office are also submitted to the Parliament and published to the Parliament’s website.

In addition to the above-described ex-ante evaluation, the law introduces the ex-post evaluation of implementation of all legal acts. This should take place after three years and no later than five years subsequent to the enactment of every statute. It includes the evaluation of the cost required for the enforcement of the law, the effects and impacts, the benefits and positive results as well as the case-law findings. This evaluation is to be performed by the ministries’ competent Bureaus for Legislative Initiative taking into account the views of social partners, the academia scientific and research bodies, the ESC and is submitted to the Better Regulation Office.

Despite this cluster of legislative provisions, these initiatives still face important limitations: formal, operational as well as structural. *The lack of an enforcement mechanism* further challenges the effective implementation of these accountability mechanisms.

➤ **Opengov.gr** has been designed to serve the principles of transparency, deliberation, collaboration and accountability and includes three initiatives:

*Open calls for the recruitment of public administration officials:* Top level and mid-level openings in the public sector are available on the Internet. Applications are submitted on-line using a platform available on the opengov.gr website.

*Electronic deliberation:* Almost every piece of draft legislation or even policy initiative by the government, are posted in a blog like platform prior to their submission to parliament. Citizens and organisations can post their comments, suggestions and criticisms article-by-article.

*Labs OpenGov*: An open innovation initiative that brings together ideas and proposals from citizens, the public and the private sectors. [Labs.OpenGov.gr](http://Labs.OpenGov.gr) attempts to release the power of decentralised knowledge and explore new ways to tackle modern public administration problems. It is an open innovations web laboratory that brings together experts from the technological community and institutions that manage information technology projects for the public sector and citizens.

### ➤ **The Open Government Partnership (OGP)**

This is a multilateral initiative that aims to secure concrete commitments from national and subnational governments to promote open government, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. Participating countries in the Open Government Partnership pledge to deliver country action plans that elaborate on concrete commitments on open government<sup>V</sup>. In each country, these commitments are developed and implemented through a multi-stakeholder process, ideally with the active engagement of citizens and civil society. OGP action plans are meant to be living documents that can be updated on a rolling basis. Each country's action plan contains concrete commitments related to open government reforms that governments pledge to implement.

Greece's participation to OGP provides the unique opportunity to the Government to engage in dynamic and productive dialogue. Greece joined the OGP in 2011 and the first action plan was drafted in April of 2012. Through the 3<sup>rd</sup> action plan, the Greek government made a series of commitments (34 current commitments) to further promote open governance as a part of OGP commitments, as described in the action plan: Boosting Public Engagement, Enhancing Public Resources Management, Opening (Up) Data and Enhancing Transparency.

### ➤ **Interventions and reports by the Inspectors-Controllers Body for Public Administration (I.C.B.P.A.)**

I.C.B.P.A.'s powers and tasks for accomplishment of its mission lie in four main categories:

- Conduct of inspections, controls and investigations

- Collection of evidence for the prosecution of potential criminal offences committed by civil servants, (such as forgery, bribery, violation of the confidentiality obligation, negligence of duty, theft, blackmail, fraud, etc.)
- Conduct of inquiries/preliminary examinations after a mandate by the competent Public Prosecutor. Furthermore Public Prosecutors, inform SEEDD of any prosecution against public officials or public servants.
- Review of the assets of public officials. In this framework, according to the provisions of the Law 3213/03, as amended by law 3613/2007, the Secretary Special of I.C.B.P.A. may authorize the opening of bank accounts and the access to tax data and records of transactions in the stock market.

I.C.B.P.A does not engage in matters falling within the operation of the “independent administrative authorities”, the powers of the Directorate of Internal Affairs of the Police and the Office of Internal Affairs of the Ministry of Mercantile Marine. It does not conduct financial audits and it does not also intervene in disputes between public entities and their employees.

The following entities are subject to control:

- a) All public services
- b) First and second tier local government organisations (regions, municipalities) and their enterprises
- c) Legal entities of public law
- d) State legal entities of private law
- e) Public enterprises
- f) Enterprises whose Board of Directors is appointed by the State

*Control Reports* - After the completion of an inspection, control or survey, the competent Inspectors-Controllers and Assistant Inspectors-Controllers shall draw up a documented report and submit it to the Secretary Special. The report contains a description of the case, a depiction of the current situation, the data submitted or used, the procedures by which the case was investigated, the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The recommendations contain specific and feasible solutions, focusing on those that should be given priority for implementation, and analyse their



positive impact on the agency or service controlled. Moreover, the Inspectors-Controllers or Assistant Inspectors-Controllers may recommend, insofar as they deem it necessary, the improvements or reforms to be initiated to the institutional framework surrounding the organisational structure and operation of the service, according to the needs of maximum efficiency, and propose measures for reducing operational expenses and the cost of the services provided. The reports of the Inspectors-Controllers, are submitted to the Secretary General and after their approval by a committee, composed by the Secretary General, his substitute-Head Inspector and the Head Inspector who coordinated the inspection, are communicated to the Minister of the Administrative Reform, the relevant Ministers or Secretaries General of the Decentralized Administrations, and the services where the inspection, control or survey took place.

*Implementation of I.C.B.P.A.'s recommendations and follow-up* - The services must report within two months to the Minister of Administrative Reform, the General Inspector of Public Administration and the Secretary General of I.C.B.P.A., the actions taken towards the implementation of its recommendations and proposals. I.C.B.P.A. monitors the actions of the services controlled and draws up supplementary reports on the implementation or non-implementation of their recommendations.

*Annual Reports* - An activities' report is drawn up every year and submitted by the end of March to the Minister of Administrative Reform. The report presents the main subjects of the controls, a short outline of the most important cases and it contains the broader conclusions and recommendations for improvements in the performance and quality of public services, as well as the legislative or other regulatory changes required to be initiated in order to put such recommendations into effect. Finally, the annual reports give information on the implementation of I.C.B.P.A.'s recommendations.

**d. Rule of law and Human Rights:** The presence of rule of law in political, economic, and social life and whether the government applies the law equitably to all citizens

As regards the integration of this dimension into current evaluation processes, the following practices have been identified:

---

#### *Current practices*

- 
- *Annual and Special Reports issued by the Greek Ombudsman*
  - *Opinions issued by the Economic & Social Council of Greece*
  - *Reports issued by NGOs*

➤ **Annual and Special Reports issued by the Greek Ombudsman-Human Rights Department**

The Greek Ombudsman is an Independent Authority sanctioned by the Constitution and has been in operation since October 1, 1998. The Ombudsman acts as guardian of the people's rights in both the public and private sectors, with a special emphasis on monitoring and promoting the implementation of the principle of equal treatment and fight discrimination in the public sector based on race, ethnicity, religious or other conviction, disability, age or sexual orientation, the application of equal opportunities and equal treatment of men and women in matters of employment both in the public and the private sector and in matters of access of men and women to goods and services of the public sector, the rights of the child and the rights of vulnerable groups. Complaints are submitted by anyone, regardless of nationality, who has a problem with a Greek public service, anywhere in Greece or abroad, when some illegal action or lack of action by the public administration has infringed a right or a legal interest of individuals or legal entities. As a mediator, the Greek Ombudsman makes recommendations and proposals to the public administration but does not impose sanctions or annul illegal actions by the public administration.

*Ombudsman prepares and publishes Annual and Special reports providing assessments within each field of the body's competence and action, i.e. Human Rights, Social Protection, Quality of Life, State-Citizen Relations, Children's Rights and Equal Treatment. These reports constitute quasi evaluations in the body's fields of intervention.*

The Human Rights Department is concerned with the defence of individual, political and social rights protected by the Constitution, international agreements or by national law. Specifically, it deals with cases regarding: violations of personal freedom, freedom of religious belief and worship; discrimination on grounds of nationality or ethnic origin; violations of the rights of immigrants; equal access to public education; recognition of foreign academic titles; protection of professional rights; infringements of the right to appeal to the administrative authorities and

access to judicial protection, as well as the right to political asylum and aliens' rights to entry and residence. This Department is also entrusted with the coordination of the Ombudsman's special mandates as an equality body, a national preventive mechanism against torture and ill-treatment (OPCAT) and a monitoring body of third country nationals' return procedures.

The Special Reports prepared by Human Rights Department deal with cases regarding:

- Violations of personal freedom;
- Freedom of religious belief and worship;
- Discrimination on grounds of nationality or ethnic origin;
- Violations of the rights of immigrants;
- Equal access to public education;
- Infringements of the right to appeal to the administrative authorities and access to judicial protection
- The right to political asylum and aliens' rights to entry and residence.

#### ➤ **Opinions issued by the Economic & Social Council of Greece (ESC)**

The Greek ESC was established in 1994, based on the model of the ESC of the European Union: tripartite division of the interests represented, i.e. a division into three groups: one of employers/entrepreneurs, one of private and public sector employees, and one including other categories, such as farmers, self-employed people, consumers, environmental protection organizations, disabled people's confederation, gender equality organizations, and the local government. As of May 2001, the Greek ESC has become a constitutionally recognised institution of the Greek state.

The mission of the ESC is to conduct the social dialogue on the country's general policy and in particular on economic and social policy guidelines, as well as to formulate opinions on government bills or MPs' law proposals referred to it. Its objective is to promote social dialogue and through it to formulate mutually acceptable positions on issues of concern to society as a whole, or specific social groups. Through its proposals and opinions, the ESC also seeks to maximize the social benefit or minimise any possible negative effects of decisions taken by executive and legislative powers.

*The ESC issues opinions either on its own initiative or after receiving draft bills from the competent Minister or from Members of Parliament. These opinions include subject-matter evaluations, reflecting the concerns of economic and societal groups and providing valuable indications of the opposing arguments, the divergences of interests and the possibilities of reaching agreement at national level. The ESC opinions are communicated to the competent Minister (or to the proposing members of parliament), who may refer the case back in order for additional data to be taken into account. In addition, the ESC opinion is communicated to the members of parliament of all the political parties, so that it can be taken into consideration during the relevant parliamentary debate. However, whether they are requested or issued at its own initiative, the Committee's opinions are not binding on the institutions, a shortcoming that weakens their significance.*

#### ➤ **Reports issued by NGOs**

Country and international reports issued by NGOs dealing with the specific dimension (e.g. Amnesty International, Red Cross, etc.) provide assessments of the current situation in the specific domain, as well as factual findings, background and statistical data that could generate evidence to be used in case of incorporation of this dimension into evaluation practice.

**e. Government Responsiveness and Effectiveness:** The extent to which public institutions respond to public needs and provide socially acceptable services and whether these services reach all citizens equally or do certain groups or populations face barriers to accessing services

As regards the integration of this dimension into current evaluation processes, the following practices have been identified:

---

#### *Current practices*

- *Annual and Special Reports issued by the Greek Ombudsman*
  - *National Strategy for Administrative Reform 2017-2019*
  - *Interventions and reports by the Inspectors-Controllers Body for Public Administration*
  - *Opinions issued by the Economic & Social Council of Greece (ESC)*
  - *Statistics issued by the Unit for initiatives and coordination of actions for improvement of citizens' lives*
-

### ➤ **Annual and Special Reports prepared by the Greek Ombudsman**

The mission and scope of activities of the Greek Ombudsman is described in detail in the previous subsection.

The *Department of State-Citizen Relations* is concerned with a wide range of issues that citizens deal with on a daily basis in the following fields: local government; public utility corporations; transport and communications; agriculture; employment; trade and industry; energy; taxation and customs; public procurement and public contracts; staff recruitment for the public sector, including education (falling outside the scope of the Independent Authority for the Selection of Personnel). Based on the experience of diverse services and procedures, particular focus is laid upon the quality of public services, organization and procedures, as well as citizen's access to information.

The department investigates cases of maladministration and violation of rights, such as low quality of services, inadequate information, poor communication and unsatisfactory services, problems of organization and implementation of administrative procedures. A large number of complaints regards non-response or delayed response to citizens' requests and incomplete or inadequate justification of administrative acts.

Moreover, Ombudsman's *Department of Equal Treatment* handles complaints for discrimination on the grounds of gender or family status in the following contexts:

- Employment or access to employment;
- Establishment, execution or termination of any employment contract either in the public or the private sector;
- Vocational training for access to specific employment, acquisition or improvement of professional or practical experience;
- Self-employment;

as well as complaints for discrimination in:

- The access to and supply of goods and services in the public sector.

As is the case with the other departments of the Greek Ombudsman, the Special Reports issued by these two departments, as well as the body's Annual Reports constitute *quasi* evaluations in the specific areas of intervention.

### ➤ **The National Strategy for Administrative Reform 2017-2019**

Administrative reform is among the top priorities of the [Greek government](#) aiming to transform public administration into a key tool for economic prosperity, serving at the same time the needs of citizens and businesses. Against this backdrop, the National Strategy for Administrative Reform includes a number of provisions for the incorporation this dimension (government responsiveness and effectiveness) into current evaluation practices. Such provisions include the evaluation of public administration structures, the evaluation of civil servants' performance, the implementation of the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) and the development of the e-goal setting tool (a web platform for the evaluation of public services by the citizens through which citizens will have the opportunity to answer relevant questionnaires, submit proposals for the improvement of public services and monitor the results of the process). The Strategy also foresees the establishment of the "Public Administration Observatory" entrusted with the mission of scientific monitoring of administrative functions and the coordination of procedures for evaluation and social control over public administration. The implementation of the above-mentioned provisions is supported by the adoption of relevant legal acts.

### ➤ **Interventions and reports by the Inspectors-Controllers Body for Public Administration (I.C.B.P.A.)**

The mission and scope of activities of the Greek Ombudsman is described in detail in the subsection above. The interventions of the I.C.B.P.A. contribute to the efficient and effective operation of public administration and especially to stepping up the fight against corruption, maladministration, ineffectiveness, low productivity and low quality of the services rendered by the public organizations. The precise mission of the I.C.B.P.A. dictates the integration of this dimension into the body's interventions, as well as into the development of the content of the subsequent Control, Follow-up and Annual Reports.

### ➤ **Opinions issued by the Economic & Social Council of Greece (ESC)**

The mission and mandate of the ESC-Greece are described in detail in the subsection above. The opinions issued by the ESC incorporate aspects of evaluation



of the government's responsiveness and effectiveness, to the extent that they provide an assessment of the effects and impacts of legal acts upon different societal groups, with an ultimate goal to maximize social benefits and/or minimise any possible negative effects of decisions taken by the executive and legislative powers.

➤ **Statistics issued by the Unit for initiatives and coordination of actions for improvement of citizens' lives**

The structure was established in February 2017 under the auspices of the General Secretariat of the Government<sup>vi</sup>. It provides an online platform where citizens can report problems they face when dealing with public administration institutions and can request support in their settlement. Since its establishment, the structure has issued one flash report which includes statistical data about the cases reported/resolved, without however including any elements of qualitative evaluation.

### 3.2.3 Summary of Key Findings

The table below summarises the degree of incorporation of each dimension into current evaluation practices, the reasoning behind such incorporation or its absence, as well as the relevant established actions.

**Table 3. Overview of current situation in Greece and DRG dimensions**

Evaluation Dimension	Degree of incorporation into current evaluation practices (Advanced, Medium, Low)	Rationale for (non) incorporation	Established actions
Consensus; Competition; Rule of law and Human Rights	L	-Constitutionally safeguarded principles -EU acquis	-Monitoring & Reporting -Minutes of Action
Inclusion	M+	-Horizontal requirement according to EU (ESF) provisions and EU directives -Economic crisis	Evaluation studies (mainly addressing relevance, effectiveness, efficiency; not impact and sustainability)
Political accountability; Government responsiveness and effectiveness	L+	-Current reform requirements	-Development of appropriate institutional frameworks -Pilot actions

### 3.2.4 Recommendations on developing awareness on DRG evaluation

The present section presents a list of conclusions and recommendations on actions to be undertaken for developing awareness and increasing knowledge both on DRG evaluation and evaluation in general, as well as for adopting a sound and systematic framework for integrating evaluation (including DRG dimensions) into public policy.

**Table 4. Conclusions and recommendations on DRG evaluation in Greece**

Conclusions	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Fragmented landscape and overlapping as well as interrupted efforts and initiatives in integrating evaluation (including DRG dimensions) into public policy</b></li> <li>- <b>Absence of ownership for planning and coordination of policy evaluation</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Establishment of an integrated regulatory framework for integration of evaluation (including DRG dimensions) into public policy (top-down approach) and enforcement of relevant provisions.</li> <li>- Reinforcement of an effective and efficient evaluation governance system (evaluation eco-system).</li> <li>- Appointment of a high-level structure for the development and follow-up of a National Evaluation Plan.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Undefined processes for flow of evaluation outputs and results</b></li> <li>- <b>Limited utilisation of evaluation results/recommendations in public policy making</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adoption of a framework for institutionalising the utilisation of evaluation results.</li> <li>- Establishment of incentives for rewarding the implementation of evaluation results.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Lack of culture of application of professional evaluation methodologies in public policy-making (laws, regulations, strategies, action plans, processes, etc.) by evaluation commissioners, implementers and users</b></li> <li>- <b>Lack of clarity about the concepts of reports, assessments, evaluations</b></li> <li>- <b>Lack of awareness on the benefits of public policy evaluation</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adoption of a systematic approach towards M&amp;E through clear goal setting.</li> <li>- Focused and tailored training in collaboration with the Hellenic Evaluation Society and other key players in the sector.</li> <li>- Involvement of all relevant actors in the evaluation process.</li> <li>- Dissemination of evaluation results to all interested parties, as well as to the general</li> </ul>

Conclusions	Recommendations
	public.
- Lack of operational capacities in the public sector in undertaking policy evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Commissioning of evaluations to professional organisations with the necessary technical expertise (appointed through a transparent process).</li> <li>- A priori coordination between technical (organisations for professional evaluation) and administrative (public sector) expertise.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fragmentation/lack of data supporting policy evaluation</li> <li>- Questionable capacity of the authority responsible for validation and provision of data (Hellenic Statistical Authority-ELSTAT)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exploiting ELSTAT's mission and scope of services.</li> <li>- Data interfacing between various data repositories.</li> <li>- Reinforcement of an effective and efficient evaluation governance system (evaluation eco-system).</li> </ul>

### 3.3 FYR MACEDONIA

#### 3.3.1 Introduction

The President of MEN Danilov acting as a moderator of the Focus Group Interview (FGI) welcomed the participants and expressed gratitude to OSCE for hosting the event. In addition, he provided a brief overview of Macedonian Consultant Association and its branch Macedonian Evaluation Network. Moreover, he emphasised MEN's participation and membership in international evaluation organizations such as: Voluntary Organization for Professional Evaluation (VOPE), International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE), Western Balkan Evaluation Network (WBEN) as well its inclusion in several projects and initiatives. The project "Assessment of the Current State of DRG Evaluation in Europe" was presented to the participants, stressing the objectives, contribution of the FGI related to the situation of DRG evaluation in the country, the incorporation of FGI conclusions into the national report in DRG evaluation and its incorporation and presentation in

the Thessaloniki workshop (1-2 October), drafting of the Thessaloniki declaration by participating partners. FGI participants highlighted their individual or organizational involvement in evaluation of different policies, programmes and projects in the country either requested by national or international institution.

### **3.3.2 Assessment of general state of evaluation in Macedonia**

The Government considers the evaluation as an important aspect in the development processes. The actual situation is that on top official level there a certain request for evaluation, which is usually performed by external experts. However, the use of the conclusions deriving from the evaluation is not followed nor practiced. There are cases when the evaluation is done and the experts provide the output, the person/institution in concern does not know how (do not want) to proceed further. The question of how to use the findings and improve the work is an issue that needs to be tackled. The identified problem is that administration in general avoids responsibility, there is no follow up of performed evaluations and lack of managerial skills is noted. Emphasis should be put in raising awareness to the chiefs of staff to disseminate the information of lower levels and make evidence based advocacy.

NGOs noted that, when it comes to policy changes, the Parliament does not have the practice of requesting public hearings nor requests evidences/data/analysis from the Government or other institutions regarding proposed changes in certain policies. In general, proposals are not made based on evidence evaluation.

Lately, the Ministry of Information Society and Administration is in process of preparing a data strategy in order to provide valuable data for researchers and other relevant institutions.

In regard to the legislation in the country, the SIGMA methodology has been playing the role of a comprehensive tool for evaluation. But, still there is lack of responsibility and accountability since there is no law which regulates their duty to make performance of the evaluation of the process. There is no link enabling the measurement of the impact of a certain policy between relevant institutions.

The establishment of the Electronic National Register of Policies (ENER) is at the moment the best tracking method where the progress of policies can be seen. Although the so called systems of policy papers exists, meaning that many reports,

analysis and case studies are done, not necessary they're accepted neither followed. The majority do not respond to the effect made.

EUD representative stated that evaluation both for the Commission and the Delegation represents a very important aspect in the policy making process in order to ensure the same standard everywhere and explained the new Guidelines of evaluation, adopted in 2016, precisely the 1<sup>st</sup> principle which implies the necessity of performing an evaluation before proposing any policy change. The novelty in that regard is the introduction of the sectoral approach of IPA tool I and II, where one of the elements is the evaluation of policies in order to be able to measure its effectiveness and impact.

As a precondition to be able to perform an accurate evaluation, there is a need of proper indicators in order to be able to establish measurable effects of different policies. 5 years ago the European Commission developed a list of indicators in order to measure the impact of policies and resulted with 1200, the first revision of two years ago decreased the number to 880 while since last year the number has decreased to 150. This number of indicators will allow the country to measure all country policies.

EUD in the country and elsewhere practices two types of evaluation: (1) IPA regulation – Mid Term Evaluation is performed by external professionals but its findings are for internal use and is seen as management tool and (2) and evaluation of policies which is integrated in the annual progress report.

Performance Assessment Framework is a tool established in Macedonia which involves almost all sectors with some exceptions like health. It aims to evaluate the impact of EU funds by reporting the system of indicators mainly towards EU and not to its citizens. In relation to existing national strategies it can be said that there is a list of indicators intended to measure its success. Additionally, a web application has been introduced for the public administration, in which a list of indicators can be found. In that regard, there is a positive trend in evaluation since several public institutions in the country have done some evaluations, but unfortunately this process is not enough nor visible.

UN sees evaluations as part of a very comprehensive process starting from the data collection, monitoring, reporting and not as a separate process. Their opinion is that

the major obstacle is the lack of data, namely, institutions do not provide aggregated data in sectors, the ownership of such data is not known and the process of obtain the same is not clear. This process needs to be coordinated among relevant institutions.

OSCE representative considers the evaluation as a continuous learning process which needs to be developed. The actual situation is that there is body knowledge among administration, there is no retention capacity of administration and the institutional learning. Another important obstacle related to evaluation in the past has been the lack of systematic approach, lack of data collection and evidenced based policy evaluation. There is a need for more integrated approach in evaluation. There is a concern related to the absence of institutions in the evaluation of policy processes.

There is a law on budget methodology in regard to strategy planning. Each ministry when making its strategy and action plans, have to submit evaluation of previous years' reports presenting the indicators and the goas of the same, but what happens is that they do not send them. EU is doing a good exercise in preparing a good report on gender desegregation. By 2022 the budget will have primacies and reports according to the national priorities.

The value of evaluation should be learning, practicing inspiring and improving a certain impact. SDG goal are monitored but it's very important to pay attention as the question of ownership is missing. The distribution of date is not systematic, the optimization of resources to measure different requirements is lacking. UN supported GAP analysis two years ago related to SDG targets and indicators and the progress made by the country but there was no interest in the past. Macedonia has not reported in that regard as it's not a mandatory step. Hopefully the interest will increase in the future.

### **3.3.3 Assessment of current state of DRG evaluation in Macedonia**



a. **Consensus:** The last agreement when the most important pillars of a society were agreed in regards to democracy, inclusion and human right was done in 2001 with the Ohrid Framework Agreement (OFA). This process was supported by the international community. Proper and thorough evaluation of such consensus has not been made so far, although some reports were drafted in that regard. Probably the next agreement related to the country name issue, including the national identity, language and historical narrative will be reached on September 30<sup>th</sup> when the citizens will decided on a referendum.

b. **Inclusion:** The OFA is one of the most important documents which aim to include all groups regardless of ethnic, religious, social and of any kind. Some segments (mostly the ethnic aspect) have been monitored and evaluated by presenting evidences on employment and inclusion in public institutions, but not proper evaluation on the entire document was made whatsoever.

Evaluation of policies, programmes and projects supported by EU funds normally includes aspects of DRG evaluation, in particular, involves mainstreaming of gender, environment and inclusion.

The Ministry of Interior works on assessment and report on the status of refugees and migrants, who incorporates parts of evaluation but it's not a proper evaluation. There are a good number of institutions that do not allocate funds for evaluation whatsoever.

c. **Competition and Political Accountability:** Due to political reasons, among others, a proper census on the population has not been made since its independence. There was intent to organize it on 2011/2011 but the process was blocked. When it comes to elections, the process in general is fair and inclusive, with some isolated cases of misuses, which is confirmed by ODIHR/OSCE reports of both parliamentary y local elections. In this aspect political parties, NGOs and other relevant institutions do provide reports on the same but the findings not always are shared with the public and the media.

As per the media freedom in the past years there have been some obstructions, which can be seen by outcomes of some reports prepared and published, mostly by international monitoring agencies and organizations. Neither national evaluation nor reporting on the same is evidenced.

The aspect of the civil sector is the one which is mostly active in pointing to the accountability and transparency aspect of the political system in many occasions by providing evidence based analysis, studies and reports.

Political parties do make evaluations for their purposes, but normally for their internal use and practice.

**d. Rule of law and Human Rights:** At the moment there is no corporative analysis to see the situation of a comprehensive review of sectors. For example, in the actual Justice Reform strategy the goals are set from the previous legislations and are not based on evaluation whatsoever.

The Ministries of Interior and Justice do report to the EU Council but mostly updating the data, the last reports are from 2014 and 2016.

In cases when evaluations are performed they are always internationally driven. There is no connection between institutions. The current effort is to report to donors not to citizens. In this category, it can be said that there is partial evaluation in some sectors. Those who practice evaluation do it systematically but the consensus on indicators has yet to be reached.

**e. Government effectiveness evaluation:** One of the noted aspects is the lack of accountability of top managers to drive the process to the lower stages. The existence of SIGMA tool is something which will increase its accountability as it covers good systematic approach and offers a lot. There are cases when some issues are sensitive and as a consequence the acceptance of the results remains a question. In this regard, it can be said that as per public institutions there are much more structural tools to measure its effectiveness, like: EU Open Governance Index, Transparency International Index, just to name few. But, even though, there are cases when decisions are made based on political issues, not on facts.

**Table 5. Overview of the current situation in the Macedonia and DRG Dimensions**

	DRG Dimensions				
Current situation in the country with regards to:	Consensus	Inclusion	Competition and political accountability	Rule of law and human rights	Government responsiveness and effectiveness
<b>Practices</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation as a such is a known concept, however, its results are not always shared with the citizens.</li> <li>• DRG evaluation as such is relatively known and its elements are mostly included in the reform process in several sectors trying to comply with EU standards.</li> <li>• No evaluation experience if not requested by international community and donors.</li> <li>• The word evaluation is not used, although related documents entitled reports, analyses, assessments and so one are some of them which were used in the past</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exist some reports to monitor the implementation of OFA regarding employment of smaller ethnic groups, but are not called evaluation.</li> <li>• Institutions do prepare various monitoring reports on migrants but are not so called evaluations nor emphasise DRG aspects.</li> <li>• The aspect of gender, environment protection and non-discrimination are taken into consideration when evaluation of EU funded programmes and projects is performed.</li> <li>• Inclusion of gender balance will be taken into consideration in all policy changes in the future.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political parties do make evaluations for their purposes, but for internal use.</li> <li>• NGOs provide various formats of reports, assessments and evaluations by providing evidence based analysis, studies and reports on different subjects: elections, policy changes and other sectoral changes, but its findings have not been accepted by decision makers in many occasions.</li> <li>• International monitoring organizations have been publishing reports on media freedom in the past, but their conclusions have not been accepted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sometimes reforms related to rule of law and human rights are based on previous legislations and not on results of evaluations.</li> <li>• Relevant institutions do prepare reports to the EU Council, Government and so on, but mostly present updated data, then a proper evaluation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systematic approach by using SIGMA is of benefit for the government as its contribute towards its accountability and thus contributes to increase its efficiency.</li> <li>• Public institutions are practicing more structural tools to measure its effectiveness, like: EU Open Governance Index, Transparency International Index and so.</li> </ul>

DRG Dimensions					
Current situation in the country with regards to:	Consensus	Inclusion	Competition and political accountability	Rule of law and human rights	Government responsiveness and effectiveness
	and are still present.				
<b>Capacities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important assessments of legal, constitutional or national aspect, are performed by international experts</li> <li>• Parts of DRG evaluation are practiced when country undertake necessary reforms to comply with EU requirements.</li> <li>• DRG evaluation is used when a programme/ project is funded by international donors.</li> <li>• Political parties indirectly influencing evaluation processes instead of being independent and impartial</li> <li>• Civil and private sector not taken in consideration when</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political factor influencing the impartiality.</li> <li>• Lack of evaluation trainings and studies in the country</li> <li>• Lack of knowledge by relevant parties in regard to DRG evaluation</li> <li>• Socio-economic aspect of country leaves evaluation on the bottom line of priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are cases when conducted evaluation is not accepted by parties in power mostly in cases when they're directly criticized, on the contrary those in the opposition do accept it and use for their political agenda.</li> <li>• Sometimes evaluations are performed by institutions/individuals related to the ones requesting therefore its results are considered impartial.</li> <li>• DRG evaluation capacities are used only when there is a clear requirement by the ones financing it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is partial evaluation in some sectors and do it systematically but the consensus on indicators has yet to be reached</li> <li>• In cases when evaluations are performed they are mostly internationally driven with some exceptions.</li> <li>• Relevant institutions do not have a systematic communication between them in order to make the process more efficient and sometimes transparent.</li> <li>• The current trend is to report the findings from whatsoever analysis (report, case study or evaluation) to donors, controlling institutions and not to citizens.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishment of ENER to monitor policies.</li> <li>• Creation of the table of indicators which in future will allow to make a proper evaluation.</li> <li>• The DRG evaluation as a such is not commonly used although aspect of it are included when analyses are.</li> <li>• Enforcement of policies promoting DRG evaluation need to be emphasized.</li> <li>• Distribution of roles among relevant institutions creates confusion when an evaluation is made.</li> </ul>

	DRG Dimensions				
Current situation in the country with regards to:	Consensus	Inclusion	Competition and political accountability	Rule of law and human rights	Government responsiveness and effectiveness
	important decisions are made				
<b>Opportunities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mobilize international community to support actions on promotion of DRG evaluation</li> <li>• Promote EvalAgenda through MEN to raise awareness on DRG evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishment of a network of evaluation capacities on national and regional level</li> <li>• Change of Evaluation culture</li> <li>• Promote achievement of SDG goals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shape the cultural aspect of the importance of evaluation in public institutions</li> <li>• Building the capacities of public administration on DRG evaluation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raise awareness among public administration in judiciary system on the importance of evaluation and especially on the DRG evaluation.</li> <li>• Capacity building to promote DRG evaluation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation in international events like: Global parliamentary forum on evaluation.</li> <li>• Increase evaluation capacities among administration</li> <li>• Invest in professionalization of evaluation</li> </ul>
<b>Challenges/ constraints</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political developments could leave DRG evaluation at the bottom of agenda</li> <li>• Notable lack of agreement among political parties.</li> <li>• Citizens not believing in evaluations results.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political constraints.</li> <li>• Increase awareness among decision makers on evaluation.</li> <li>• Finalize the list of indicators in order to be able to evaluate all aspects of inclusions.</li> <li>• Institutions not allocating financial resources to perform DRG evaluation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political changes in the government level signifies changes of staff even the experienced ones.</li> <li>• Uninterested administration in incorporating new aspects of evaluation.</li> <li>• Not prepared administration to manage and implement actions related to DRG aspects in evaluation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deficiency of corporative country analysis to see the comprehensive review of sectors.</li> <li>• Lack of transparency in judicial system in the past which leaves doubts in decision.</li> <li>• No interest to perform DRG evaluation as its expected the findings to be very pessimistic, and not interested for the institution requesting an evaluation.</li> <li>• DRG evaluation could be very sensitive issue in this sector.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of statistical data available to be able to perform a proper evaluation in this sector.</li> <li>• Lack of intercommunication between relevant institutions.</li> <li>• Lack of accountability of top managers to drive the process to the lower stages.</li> <li>• Decisions on the need of evaluation are made based on political interests not on facts.</li> <li>• There are cases when some issues are sensitive and as a consequence the acceptance of the results remains a question.</li> </ul>

### **3.3.4 Conclusions**

In regard to evaluation in Macedonia, it can be concluded that the process itself has a limited view as the sectoral approach is still in its early stage, therefore, it can be said that a complete picture of the real situation is not possible. Evaluation practice in the country is present, even DRG aspects are present whenever evaluations of policies, programmes and projects are made.

However, the fact is that the demand for evaluation mostly comes as a request from EU and other donor funds, although with some exceptions. Evaluation as a such has a way to go as there is certainly a need to work more in order to have a better impact. There are institutions which do consider evaluation as an important aspect, it's worth mentioning the Secretariat for European Affairs which is one of the good examples which sees evaluation as a need and practice it more. It could be due to its nature of work – leading all country reforms and actions towards EU integration. There are other good examples too, but mostly institutions which somehow do have to present evidenced based evaluation to EU and other donors.

DRG evaluation as a such is a very new concept in the country. It has to be mentioned that improvement in this regard has been made, but it's not enough. Even more, aspects of democracy, human rights and good governance are tackled in many occasions when evaluations or even reporting is made, however their domination is different. Moreover, EU policies request to mainstream many similar aspects like: gender equality, non-discrimination, environment and other aspects in every programme and project financed by the EU Commission or the Delegation.

In Macedonia the DRG evaluation is still seen as a criticism towards the person leading the institution and not as a process from which can learn and improve its performance and effect. There are cases when evaluation is performed but its recommendations are not accepted either as it is considered impartial or complaining on the work of the individual leading the institution or the project. In order the evaluation to be accepted it's necessary to change the mind-set of the people.

It is considered that capacities related to evaluation are present in the country and can certainly provide the necessary expertise in evaluation, designing and formulation of different policies, programmes and projects both for national institutions and for international organizations present in the country.



Among the tasks of professionals of evaluation, in this case MEN, will be to put efforts to increase the awareness of evaluation among national authorities so that they can see the importance of evaluation, so that as a consequence institution will, in the future, allocate budget to engage external expertise in order to avoid overtraining of the public administration. Additionally, it's very important to include and accept the global trends related to evaluation like the EvalAgenda and take a more active role in international arena.

### 3.3.5 Recommendations

Evaluation in Macedonia should be seen and considered as a professional and external activity. DRG evaluation should be promoted as its elements are used by not properly named. Global trends should be followed in regard to DRG evaluation and EvalAgenda.

On Strategic level its considered very necessary to work on:

- Shaping the culture of evaluation.
- Increasing the level of local capacities related to evaluation.
- Improving the connection between national and local administration.
- Synergizing national strategy plans with local ones.

On Capacity level its considered very necessary to work on:

- The need to create a body of knowledge.
- To establish and create retention capacity to keep the skilled people.
- To increase evaluation capacities among administration.
- To invest in professionalization of evaluation.
- To prioritize relevant issues.

## 3.4 POLAND

### 3.4.1 Introduction

The main objective of this report is to present information on the current DRG evaluation status with reference to **Poland**. These data has been gathered during the national workshop/Focus Group Interview (FGI) that took place in Warsaw 7<sup>th</sup> of September 2018. Due to the low attendance at this meeting extensive desk research and the dyad<sup>3</sup> were carried out in order to collect additional/missing information. Interviewed respondents represented different sectors dealing with evaluation – both commissioners and contractors:

- Governmental institutions – the Ministry of Investment and Development,
- Academic/scientific institutions – the Jagiellonian University and the Centre for Evaluation and Analysis of Public Policies (research unit),
- Non-governmental organisations (NGOs),
- Business – consulting firms.

It is worth emphasizing that some participants represented more than one sector due to their varied professional experience.

### 3.4.2 Overview of the existing evaluation system in Poland

The first evaluations in Poland were conducted in the mid-90s, after reestablishment of the democratic system (in 1989). These evaluations were carried out mainly in education area by academics, NGOs and public institutions, as a result of **requirements imposed** by Western European countries and the USAID that financed the projects implemented by these entities. However, pre-accession funds that since 2004 have supported Poland in the process of becoming a member of the European Union (EU) were the trigger that enabled the **expansion of evaluation**. For the last several years Poland has been one of the main EU funds beneficiaries and also **a leader** of the Central and Eastern Europe as regards number of evaluation research. Their rapid growth and high popularity of evaluation is a result of the **law obligation** to evaluate national strategies/programmes<sup>4</sup>, activities of

<sup>3</sup> A kind of In-depth Individual Interview (IDI) that is carried out with two participants at the same time.

<sup>4</sup> Since 2006 ex-ante evaluation of strategies and programmes is mandatory (Act of 6 December 2006 on the Principles of Conducting the Development Policy, Dz. U. No 227, item 1658, along with later changes). Due to lack of adequate financing

educational institutions<sup>5</sup> and developmental cooperation<sup>6</sup>, as well as an effect of **institutionalization** of evaluation.

**Evaluation systems** in Poland refer to the process of implementing EU funds and formal education. The first one is coordinated by the National Evaluation Unit (NEU) that is embedded in the Ministry of Investment and Development. There are also evaluation units located within the institutions managing the operational programmes at the central and regional level and within so-called intermediating institutions. In 2016 there were altogether 33 evaluation units in central and regional administration<sup>7</sup>. Moreover, the activities of evaluation units are supported by other stakeholders who reinforce monitoring committees and evaluation steering groups of respective operational programmes. Since 2006 evaluation reports are published in the Evaluation Data Base<sup>8</sup>.

In turn, evaluation system in education serves institutions' activities assessment according to government-set standards concerning pedagogical supervision. External evaluation is conducted by employees of Boards of Education (inspectors), while internal one is carried out by schools (at subsequent levels of education). Evaluation reports are published online and there is also access to regularly updated data gathered by inspectors.

Regarding the **scale** of evaluation practices in 2002-2017, as much as 1.279 evaluations of Cohesion Policy were conducting and more than 3.000 external evaluations in the education sector. Almost 160 people were employed in the evaluation system on the side of public administration in 2013<sup>9</sup>.

### 3.4.3 Current DRG evaluation practices in Poland

For almost 30 last years in the Polish public debate there has been a kind of long-term agreement within the meaning of such concepts as democracy, human rights

---

a novelisation of this Act is planned - ex ante evaluation would be obligatory in regard to the strategic documents while ex-post evaluation to the programmes. The next legal framework is *The Strategy of Accountable Development 2017-2020*. One of its tasks is developing the system for evaluation of public policies in Poland.

<sup>5</sup> This kind of evaluation is mandatory since 2009 as a new strategy of pedagogic supervision.

<sup>6</sup> The Law on Development Cooperation requires evaluation of the Multiannual Development Cooperation Programme and the Civil Initiatives Fund since 2011.

<sup>7</sup> Including 16 Regional Evaluation Units.

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/strony/badania-i-analizy/wyniki-badan-ewaluacyjnych/baza-badan-w-arkuszu-kalkulacyjnym/>

<sup>9</sup> Source: Stockmann R., Meyer W., Taube L. (eds.) *Evaluation Globe* - Polish case study dealing with the current state of evaluation (to be published at Palgrave MacMillan).

and governance (DRG). Presently public debate is taking place regarding all 5 DRG factors:

- **Consensus** on national identity and historical narrative,
- **Inclusion/ exclusion** or discrimination of parts of the population due to their worldview, political, religious and racial differences, equality based on sex and sexual orientation, disability, etc.)
- **Competition and political accountability** – limits of democracy, i.e. constrains on actions of the authorities elected in free elections, freedom in media, civil society, political rights and civil liberties,
- **Rule of law and human rights** – e.g. legal equality, attitudes towards violence, refugees, women's right,
- **Government responsiveness and effectiveness** – responding to public needs, providing socially acceptable services, etc.

In Poland DGR evaluation refers to **various funds** i.e. the European Union (EU), Norwegian and the European Economic Area (EEA) Financial Mechanisms and also national funds. Most of these evaluations concern **EU funds** and have been conducting during the following financial perspectives:

- 1) **2004-2006: Transition Facility** – aimed at strengthening administration and justice and also implementing EU legislation in the new Member States; Sectoral Operational Programme (OP) **Human Resources Development; Community Initiative EQUAL** (promotion of equal opportunities for women and men),
- 2) **2007-2013: 16 Regional Operational Programmes (ROPs) and OP Human Capital (HC):**
  - a) Priority I: Employment and social integration,
  - b) Priority V: Good governance – aimed at e.g. increasing competences of public administration employees; building mechanisms for improving evidence-based policy management/communication processes and quality of public services/policies; reform of the law-making process; simplification of regulations, outsourcing and regranting<sup>10</sup>; inclusive dialogue,

<sup>10</sup> Outsourcing means cooperation with NGOs during implementation of so-called public tasks/services, while regranting aims at supporting civic activities by local self-governments.

- c) Priority VI: Open labor market for everyone – e.g. activating of unemployed people,
  - d) Priority VII: Promotion of social integration – e.g. integration of marginalized and excluded groups (homeless, disabled, unemployed persons); support for social economy institutions,
  - e) Priority XI: Development of education and competences in the regions – e.g. equalizing educational opportunities.
- 3) **2014-2020: 16 ROPs and OP Knowledge Education Development** that is a continuation of OP HC and aims at activating unemployed people up to 30 who are not in employment, education or training; reforming of public policies in the field of employment, social inclusion and innovations; good governance:
- a) Priority I: Young people on the labor market,
  - b) Priority II: Effective public policies for the labor market, economy and education – e.g. quality of measures addressing the groups at risk of poverty/social exclusion and their employment opportunities; development of the social economy; enhancement of the process of law-making and judiciary; improvement of the quality of administrative services,
  - c) Priority IV: Social innovation and transnational cooperation – e.g. development and testing of new, more efficient solutions for the existing problems in the area of labour market, social integration, life-long education and health; public administration modernisation,
- 4) **OP Food Aid** implemented by the Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Policy – reducing poverty by increasing food security for the most deprived persons and taking actions for social inclusion,
- 5) **Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)** implemented by the Ministry of the Interior and Administration – promoting the efficient management of migration flows and the implementation, strengthening and development of a common Union approach to asylum and immigration.

Some DGR evaluations that are carried out in Poland refer to **Norwegian** and the **EEA Financial Mechanisms**<sup>11</sup> that are a form of foreign aid granted to new UE Member States. These grants aim at strengthening civil society, decent work, social

<sup>11</sup> So-called Norway grants and Iceland, Lichtenstein and Norway grants.

dialogue and cooperation with representatives of the civic community, cooperation between self-governments, combating trafficking in human beings, preventing violence, judicial capacity-building and improvement of the efficiency of justice.

There are also DRG evaluations of the initiatives financed by the **national funds**:

- 1) **Polish Development Assistance** – provided by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and evaluated since 2012<sup>12</sup>. Polish Aid supports various countries in Africa, Asia, Middle East and Europe. Its three thematic priorities include Development Cooperation (e.g. in supporting democracy and human rights, good governance, human capital), Humanitarian Aid and Global Education,
- 2) **Civic Initiatives Fund** – run by the Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Policy since 2005. The main goal of this Programme is to increase the involvement of citizens and NGOs in the public life through increasing activity and awareness of citizens and local communities, developing the potential of the NGO sector and increasing its commitment to social services in the field of social integration, activity and security, as well as supporting the Polish model of social economy.

It is worth mentioning that majority of the Polish NGOs dealing with DRG issues (e.g. Batory Foundation, Foundation for the Development of Civil Society, Centre for Citizenship Education, Polish Humanitarian Action) instead of conducting systematic evaluation<sup>13</sup> **occasionally** evaluate **selected projects**. An example worth recommending is the Polish-American Freedom Foundation that in 2005 launched the programme of Monitoring, Evaluation and Analyses<sup>14</sup> in order to examine their activities in more **systematic way** and to develop implemented programmes.

### 3.4.4 Quantitative analysis of DRG components in Polish evaluations

In Polish evaluation practice, initiatives with DRG components that are financed by UE funds are implemented mainly in relation to 3 **strategic issues**: good governance, social inclusion and the **labour market** (in the area of social and vocational activation). Most evaluations were related to the latter topic, in total 145 of them have been conducted since 2004 i.e. 35 in 2004-2006, 108 in 2007-2013 and in 2014-2020. Human rights components are mainly present in programmes regarding

<sup>12</sup> Evaluation reports and summary of evaluation results are available <https://polskapomoc.gov.pl/Evaluation,2033.html>

<sup>13</sup> 63% of interviewed NGOs did not conduct a systematic evaluation of their activities/effects of their work (Stowarzyszenie Klon/Jawor 2012).

<sup>14</sup> <https://en.pafw.pl/monitoring-evaluation-and-analyses-meva/>



**social inclusion** of marginalized groups. In total 39 such evaluations have been carried out so far – 6 in 2004-2006, 29 in 2007-2013 and 4 in 2014-2020. Social exclusion issues are also combined with the labour market, because both these activities are one of the priorities of every EU financial perspective. **Good governance** was also important element of the Cohesion Policy. Since 2004, a total of 15 evaluations regarding this issue have been carried out (at both central and regional level): 2 in financial perspective 2004-2006, 12 in 2007-2013 and 1 in 2014-2020. There was only 1 evaluation concerning the **democratization** of the political system in Poland in the context of the EU Cohesion Policy<sup>15</sup>. It should be also emphasized that in 2013-2017 there were conducted 4 **meta-evaluations** regarding all above mentioned issues.

**Table 6. A summary of the number of DRG evaluations conducted in respective EU financial perspectives.**

Topics	2004-2006	2007-2013	2014-2020	In total
Labour market	35	108	2	145
Social inclusion	6	29	4	39
Good governance	2	12	1	15
Meta-evaluation	-	2	2	4
<b>In total</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>203</b>

### 3.4.5 Current DRG evaluation capacities in Poland

In 1989-2004 there was **relatively small** evaluation potential including legal framework and financial resources, evaluation awareness and competences, as well as educational activities and the opportunities to learn in practice. Evaluation capacities **increased significantly** in 2007-2015 in response to the demand caused by a large number of programmes financed by EU, law requirements concerning evaluation of these initiatives and also activities of educational institutions and development cooperation (financed by national funds). In this period many participants of the evaluation market, both commissioners and contractors, have

<sup>15</sup> Study entitled "Evaluation of the implementation system of Cohesion Policy in the 2004-2006 perspective".

acquired evaluation competences according to the rule “learning by doing”. Then in 2016 the scale of evaluation regarding EU funds has been **suddenly reduced** as evaluation costs at the project level became non-eligible, unless being approved by managing authorities. Although this change resulted in **diminishing** the evaluation potential in terms of number of firms and experts, as well as post-diploma studies, it had **quantitative** not qualitative character, so it seems that at present evaluation capacities are **stable** and they should stay so at least until 2020.

The following factors influencing the DRG **evaluation potential** in Poland were identified:

- Legal requirements concerning conducting evaluation of the EU and Polish funds, and the larger number of commissioning entities,
- Decentralization – operational programmes financed from EU funds are implemented/evaluated regionally,
- Increasing level of awareness and competences of the commissioners,
- More qualified and experienced evaluators,
- On-line database including evaluation reports concerning EU funds,
- Access to various educational opportunities, such as:
  - academic courses in evaluation run as a part of 2-year master’s programme,
  - post-diploma evaluation studies (including “Academy of Evaluation” free of charge studies for public administration employers),
  - evaluation trainings (e.g. 60-hours stationary workshop “Forge of Evaluation” and blended learning “Take a course on evaluation” developed by the PES, 50-hours summer school “Evidenced-based Public Policies” concerning counterfactual methods and theory-based evaluation approach),
  - conferences, seminars, workshops,
  - tutoring for NGOs (PES project),
- Increasing number of various materials/publications concerning evaluation,
- “The Evaluation Standards” developed by PES in 2008,
- More efficient process of evaluation commissioning and selecting the best tender – rejection of low-quality offers due to extremely low prices, taking into account substantive criteria, more restrictive requirements for bidders who can participate in the tender,

- Recommendation Implementation System that is obligatory for all evaluation of EU funds – since 2007 this innovative tool is used to monitor the process of recommendation implementation and it contributes to the promotion of the practical and pro-development dimension of evaluation.

All above mentioned evaluation capacities **enhance** the use of DRG evaluation. Nevertheless, rapid growth of the evaluation research was not accompanied by equally dynamic development of **evaluation culture, quality** and the **use of evaluation results**. Their main users are employees of the commissioning institutions. So, the key issue is not so much the number of evaluations as **dissemination** and **the use** of their findings. Among factors that weaken evaluation use is its **quality**, which is influenced mainly by lack of legitimate **certification system** of proving evaluation competences, as well as insufficient commissioners' competences and prevailing importance of the price criterion in public procurements in the past financial perspectives.

### 3.4.6 Main opportunities for integrating DRG into evaluating Polish government policies

Two main changes in the field of evaluation took place in 2007-2013. One of them was implementation of system project **selection mode** (non-competitive one), which is very useful in case of public tasks/services (e.g. education, social inclusion, health care, social and professional activation). The second change was **decentralization** of the implementation and evaluation of operational programmes financed from EU funds<sup>16</sup>. Both these factors have led to the increased number of evaluations at the project level.

Currently we can indicate the following **opportunities** for integrating DRG into evaluating government policies:

- Providing the financial basis for evaluation,
- Better cooperation and larger openness – more commissioners and stakeholders have favorable attitude towards evaluation, thanks to positive experiences they no longer perceive it as a form of control,

<sup>16</sup> In addition to centrally managed programmes, 16 regional programmes are managed, implemented and evaluated by the voivodship self-government authorities (Marshal Offices).

- Modifications of the public procurement law (e.g. recognition as unlawful reliance solely on the price criterion),
- Increase of evaluation quality through growing requirements of commissioners and the application of new methodologies (e.g. counterfactual methods, theory-based evaluation) which forces constant learning,
- Closer cooperation of public institutions that aggregate and share various data (e.g. Statistics Poland, The Polish Social Insurance Institution),
- Implementation of evaluation into Regulatory Impact Assessment – a pillar of law making and manifestation of evidence-based governance, aimed at raising the level of social/citizenship inclusion,
- Development of digital technologies (ICT) and globalization enable faster conducting and cost reduction of evaluation research, as well as sharing good practices regarding DRG evaluation,
- The demand for long-term evaluation research (so-called rolling evaluation),
- New potential areas for conducting evaluation – national security, business (Corporate Social Responsibility), local authorities of the biggest cities,
- Promotion of senior experts in evaluation – evaluation pioneers currently hold decision-making positions in public administration, which may stimulate the demand for/development of evaluation,
- Rebuilding of the evaluation market in Poland – some experienced evaluators from fallen companies presently work in public administration and local government institutions, while some experts set up new consulting firms as a result of withdrawal of international/foreign companies from Poland.

### 3.4.7 Main constraints on evaluating democracy, human rights and governance in Poland

Constraints on evaluating the DRG evaluation in Poland have **diverse character** – social, legal, financial, administrative/organizational, business and informational:

#### 1) *Social constraints:*

- Low level of social trust<sup>17</sup> resulting in understanding evaluation as a form of control – this factor has historical nature and causes unwillingness to reveal weaknesses of run activities because of fear of consequences,
- Relatively low level of participatory approach causing negative attitudes towards evaluation and inadequate use of evaluation results i.e. not for learning purposes but for the assessment and control of the project team,
- Lack of interest in evaluation results resulting, among others, from poor evaluation quality, useless recommendations and also not sufficient disseminating evaluation results.

## 2) Legal/financial constrains:

- Restricting regulation concerning EU project evaluation – in 2014-2020 evaluation cost at the project level is not eligible and requires the approval of the managing authority. This requirement resulted in the cessation of project evaluation.

## 3) Administrative/Organizational constrains:

- Not enough integration of evaluation with planning and implementation of public policies,
- Lack of evidence-based management at the level of local self-governments,
- Inappropriate evaluation planning – not sufficient resources (e.g. time, budget),
- Disbursement of national budget funds – evaluations must be finalized in a given year.

## 4) Personnel constrains:

- “Passion for evaluation” features specific people – such experts play important role in promotion of evaluation, because of their personal involvement,
- Staff turnover in public administration in recent years (institutions that deal with implementation and evaluation of EU programmes),

<sup>17</sup> Only 23% of Poles trust in government (OECD, 2016) and 22% report interpersonal trust (source: World Value Survey, 2014 <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSDocumentationWVL.jsp>). Trust in the political and legal system is also below average (source: Eurostat (2014), European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions) [http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=ilc\\_pw03&lang=en](http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=ilc_pw03&lang=en), [https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/society-at-a-glance-2011/trust\\_soc\\_glance-2011-26-en](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/society-at-a-glance-2011/trust_soc_glance-2011-26-en)

- Staff shortages due to low salaries in public administration – difficulties in hiring people with high competences in evaluation,
- Currently less people are involved in evaluation after elimination of project evaluation in 2015 and evaluation market collapse in 2016 – the number of evaluation companies has decreased.

#### 5) *Business constraints:*

- Less competition on the evaluation market – in 2016 some companies have ceased their activity (particularly Polish branches of foreign consulting firms).

#### 6) *Informational constraints:*

- Weak PR activities of evaluation contractors who do not inform the public opinion about their goals, activities and their benefits for the clients,
- No media presence of evaluation or ephemeral one – in the nationwide mass media evaluation is almost absent.

Some of above mentioned constrains can be very difficult to overcome, particularly those related to staff turnover/shortages, as well as to mentality (such as the low level of social trust), while other social, organizational and informational limitations result from insufficient evaluation awareness and competences that can be foster through education.

Legal obstacles are the result of two factors. The first is **evaluation inflation** in 2007-2013 when there was a very high demand for evaluation that led to the entry into the evaluation market some companies and people who offered low quality for a low price, which was often the dominant criterion of their choice. On the other hand, many commissioners had no **sufficient competences** to require proper evaluation quality. The second factor that has led to change of regulations concerning project evaluation is introducing new approaches to evaluation in 2014-2020 i.e. theory-based evaluation and counterfactual methods that require increased resources (funds saved from project evaluation have been transferred to the evaluation of operational programmes).

Personnel constrains are connected with specificity of evaluation services that require **high level of expertise** and are based on high-qualified employers who need long-term education, training and experience. Staff turnover, resulting from the high



volatility of the number of evaluation conducted and the breakdown of the evaluation market in 2016<sup>18</sup>, as well as unattractive and uncompetitive remuneration in public administration resulted in leaving the evaluation market by some specialists who cannot be easily replaced.

### 3.4.8 Challenges related to DRG evaluation in Poland

Presently Poland meets various **challenges** to DRG evaluation:

- Lacking or insufficient evaluation competences, including evaluators' knowledge of the specific areas including DRG,
- Insufficient evaluation awareness at the local self-government level – a balance between evaluations conducted at the regional and central level concerns only EU funds,
- Weak interest in evaluation which is associated with control – evaluations are often carried out as a result of an external, imposed requirement rather than an internal need for information,
- Overloaded project teams and public institutions staff with many formal requirements and duties – they often perceive evaluation as an additional/unnecessary task,
- Evaluation staff turnover,
- Lacking resources in NGOs, such as competences, staff, time and finance that enable them to carry out project evaluation. However, NGOs seem to have more positive attitude towards it in comparison with other sectors – they are more aware of the value and benefits of evaluation than local administration or educational institutions,
- Formulating useful recommendations that are possible to implement – specific, practical, specialistic,
- Very limited number of evaluations conducted by universities research institutes,
- Very slight spin over effect of EU funds evaluation into other sectors,
- Lack of a formally approving profession of evaluator,
- Lack of legitimate certification system of proving evaluation competences that could enhance evaluation quality.

<sup>18</sup> Due to political change and a breakthrough between two programming periods (2007-2013 and 2014-2020), as well as elimination of projects evaluation.

Although, evaluation is **legally embedded** and **strongly present** in some areas (such as EU funds, public education, developmental assistance) it still faces challenges that are encountered by relatively young democracies which just commenced the process of institutionalization of evaluation. However, compared to the pre-accession period there are presently much more educational opportunities (e.g. studies, publications) and also more experienced evaluators and commissioners (at the central and regional level).

Regarding **future challenges**, the most likely one is reduction of EU funds after 2020 and decentralization of evaluation that can result in decreasing number of evaluation research (demand limitation), as well as less popularity of evaluation in the regions. The **best scenario** would be increasing demand for evaluation research at the local level, which is unlikely to happen. Evaluation practices penetrate very slowly local policies and development of evaluation culture encounters many obstacles that were discussed in the previous chapter. So, the **worst scenario** is retreating from evaluation and returning to pre-2004 state of affairs. Thus, promotion of evaluation, as well as emphasizing its advantages and disseminating best practices could help to make this pessimistic vision not come true.

### 3.4.9 Overall assessment of DRG evaluation and recommendations in Poland

The evaluation potential has developed in Poland on a **large scale**, especially during the last several years. Prevailing amount of DRG evaluations is connected with the **EU funds** (mainly European Social Fund), Norwegian and EEA Financial Mechanisms and also national funds, in terms of **the topics** of the implemented policies and programmes. The most present issues in DGR evaluations in Poland are government responsiveness and effectiveness (“good governance”), human rights, rule of law and inclusion (e.g. “equalizing opportunities”, “social integration”, “social inclusion”, “labour market”), while political accountability, competition (“civil society”) and particularly consensus are taken into account to a lesser extent.

It is very difficult to precisely assess evidence-based **impact** that evaluation have on DRG area, because no such research have been conducted so far. This impact is certainly enhanced by **Recommendation Implementation System** that includes all evaluations concerning EU funds. However, substantive influence on DRG issues

have **activities** taken by the parliament and the government, which are not the subject of DGR evaluations – the macro level is neglected in Poland.

### Recommendations:

- Raising awareness of DRG evaluation – this issue should be a subject of a broader public debate involving various stakeholders (commissioners, evaluators, politicians, NGOs, etc.)
- Building a grass-roots DRG evaluation culture and stimulate the demand based on the real need to obtain reliable information, instead of the one stemmed from externally imposed requirements – encouraging and rewarding DRG evaluation practices instead of forcing it, increasing awareness of its benefits,
- Increasing the level of social trust and enhancing civil society,
- Promoting evaluation as a useful tool for managing DRG activities – evaluation should not be a casual action referring to selected projects but systematic procedure,
- Educating commissioners in using right criteria in the public procurements, as well as in analysing and assessing of evaluation reports in order to increase their quality,
- Providing adequate resources for the DRG evaluation – quality and need for evaluation can rapidly decrease in case of insufficient competences, staff, financing and time,
- Promoting stronger integration of DRG evaluation with the project/programme cycle management,
- Regarding the macro level – evaluating activities taken by parliaments and governments regarding 5 cross-cutting dimensions of DGR,
- Increasing emphasis on evaluators' specialization/expertise in DRG area that can contribute to improving the evaluation quality and formulating more useful recommendations,
- Reflecting on the specific of DRG evaluation (e.g. in a sense of its purposes, questions and criteria),
- Promoting closer and real cooperation between commissioners and evaluators in order to agree mutual expectations and possibilities,

- Promoting multiannual DRG evaluation contracts that enable both commissioners and contractors learning in action and better cooperation,
- Eliminating incorrect criteria from tender procedures (e.g. price as the dominant criterion, high scores for shortening evaluation deadline),
- Promoting dissemination of DRG evaluation reports, providing online summary of evaluation results and information on implemented recommendations and their effects,
- Sending short summaries concerning DRG evaluation results to politicians, members of the government, parliamentarians, think tanks, media,
- Increasing DRG evaluation presence in the media – this activity could contribute to raising awareness of what DRG evaluation is and what benefits it brings. It would help wider public in discerning differences between evaluation, control, monitoring and audit,
- Increasing the role of universities research institutes in DRG evaluation,
- Increasing of the PES role in the process of building DRG evaluation capacity in Poland e.g. through encouraging the use of non-standard evaluation criteria, modernization of Evaluation Standards, popularization of the blended-learning course on evaluation, extension of the training offer, developing effective methods for the selection of evaluators in public procurement.

## 3.5 SERBIA

### 3.5.1 Overview of the existing monitoring and evaluation practices in Serbia

*Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) practices in Serbia are, in general, not sufficiently developed.* M&E has been mainly led in unsystematic manner and to a large extent, applied when assessing projects funded by international donors. Over the recent years, as a part of public administration reform, there could be noticed certain systematic improvements, which might result in a wider use of M&E concepts and practice in the future.

*In terms of supply,* it could be noticed several important initiatives aimed at encouraging public institutions to adopt M&E as a regular activity, which might result in important benefits and improvement of the decision making processes of the

country. Those have been advocated by the civil society and/or research organisations already familiar with the M&E concept and practice, being aware of the potential benefits M&E could have for the society wellbeing.

*In terms of demand*, most of the evaluations have been conducted for international donors and for the purpose of evaluation of internationally funded projects that included local experts/institutions as a support to their staff being well informed on the local environment. There have been several attempts of the state institutions to engage experts in order to assess impact of the programmes/projects funded from the state budget. Unfortunately, given the relatively undeveloped awareness of the importance of the process and potential use of the results, coupled with low capacity of the administration, envisaged financial resources or time for task completion were often planned at a relatively modest level.

*From the institutional point of view*, policy makers in Serbia are mainly using ex-ante assessment of the policy effects for the purpose of preparation of strategic documents (national and local strategies) and laws. Those have been conducted in a relatively unsystematic manner and without precisely defined or publicly available methodology, without consulting other related strategic documents, and also often without real consultations with the research community and other interested stakeholders. Additional problem represents the fact that strategic documents in later phases have been rarely evaluated. Ideas of responsibility for the achieved results or learning from the past experience have been relatively strange for the policy makers in Serbia. For that reason, it seems that even the ex-ante assessment practice has been conducted to fill the form rather to be really used in the following phases of the decision making process.

*Public administration reform as well as regulatory reform that have been adopted as a part of the process of the EU accession represent important basis for the future activities towards wider implementation of the M&E practice.*

**Republic Secretariat for public policies - RSJP (established in 2014)** represents institution responsible for:

- Support in defining Government priorities in the implementation of strategic goals as well as monitoring the results of achieving goals and coordinating the implementation of particular public policies;

- Analytical support to the planning of strategic goals and the monitoring of the Government's public policy effects, the result of which can serve as a support to the creation of more efficient public policies;
- Support the quality of public policies and regulations with the help of quality evaluation mechanisms, analysis of the effects of public policies and regulations on the economy and citizens, which are required to implement state administration bodies entitled to propose a strategic document of the Government;
- Support the alignment of the entire plan system and consistency of the contents of the Government's strategic documents;
- Processing and submitting to the Government for consideration of the initiative of the economy and citizens to solve problems in the application of unnecessary or ineffective regulations;
- Continuous implementation of regulatory reform in order to simplify the regulatory framework and abolish unnecessary administrative procedures.

Although still lacking adequate political support, RSJP officials are important source of knowledge and support in terms of putting evaluation practice at the policy agenda.

An important step forward in the process of implementation of M&E practice in the state administration has also been recent adoption of the Law on Planning System (April 2018) that defined ex-post assessment of the public policy effects as mandatory, including preparation of the official publicly available reports on the conducted activities. It has been adopted as a part of the Strategy of Regulatory Reform and Improvement of the Public Policy Management System for the period 2016-2020. Real effects of the adopted legislation still need to be assessed in the months and years to come.

### **3.5.2 Brief overview of the DRG evaluations according to the five dimensions**

a. **Consensus** - Although there exists overall consensus on the fundamental rules of the game and the EU integration as a foreign policy priority, country is still characterized by the political turbulences and relatively low level of political culture. This represents an important challenge for conducting DRG evaluations often putting focus of the main political actors to “every day politics” rather than real reforms.



Consensus on the necessity of conducting regular M&E activities in the DRG field has still not been achieved.

b. **Inclusion** - Important groups of stakeholders (i.e. civil society, think tanks) are still not involved in the policy making process. Some of them are taking participation in the process in a formal rather than substantial manner being members of working groups or committees without real influence.

c. **Competition and Political Accountability** - The extent to which the political system includes competition and existence of free, fair, and inclusive elections, freedom in media, vibrant civil society as well as presence of an adequate political rights and civil liberties is still questionable. This reflection has been also supported by the relevant reports of the international institutions.

Since the legislation regulating political accountability over the M&E has been adopted in early 2018, it is still early to assess results in terms of participation and competition.

d. **Rule of Law and Human Rights** - Poor practice and deteriorations referring to institutional deficiencies, weak rule of law and lack of good governance.

e. **Government Responsiveness and Effectiveness** – Though at a satisfying stage, there is still a need for improvement and it is expected that this will be driven by the EU integration reform process.

Overall, the concept of evaluation is still relatively unknown not only for the state administration, but also for the other stakeholders (i.e. research institutions, higher education institutions, etc.)

### 3.5.3 Main findings on DRG evaluation in Serbia

#### ➤ Current DRG evaluation capacities

Current level of the evaluation capacities is relatively solid given the relatively modest evaluation culture. There are solid capacities within think tanks and individual experts indicating solid base for further development of the evaluation practice. There are local experts/institutions that have been engaged by international partners as a local support for the evaluation. Also, there are civil servants that possess adequate knowledge and capacities to support further reforms. Existing knowledge could be further developed through establishment of the state master programme on public

policy evaluation which is to be set next year (jointly by two civil society organisations Secons and FREN).

➤ **Main opportunities for integrating DRG into evaluating government policies**

Main opportunities stem from the recently adopted Law on Planning System. They could be fuelled by the requirements related to the EU integration process and analytical support that is particularly important for the effective reform process.

➤ **Main constraints on evaluating democracy, human rights and governance**

Relatively poor culture of evaluation and lack of awareness of the state officials on the potential benefits from evaluation which might result from the evidence based policy making including regular application of the M&E concepts. In general, evaluation experts in Serbia are still facing problems related to insufficient and low quality data.

➤ **Challenges related to DRG evaluation**

- Serbia does not have (fully) systematically regulate access to policy monitoring and evaluation; the policy planning system is not sufficiently consolidated;
- The hierarchy of planning and strategic documents of the RS Government was not clearly established;
- Functional relations between strategic documents are not defined;
- Resource ministries develop sectoral strategies without considering their involvement in the mid-term or long-term development goals of the state.
- More than 100 effective strategies, with different time frames, non-harmonized goals and more difficult implementation;
- Most of the strategic documents are not linked to the budget framework, nor have a financial framework for implementation nor clearly defined performance indicators;
- Inability to track progress in implementing the strategy.

**Table 7. Assessments of the state of DRG evaluation in Serbia**

SERBIA	DRG Dimensions				
Current situation in the country with regards to:	Consensus	Inclusion	Competition and political accountability	Rule of law and human rights	Government responsiveness and effectiveness
Practices	S/S	P/S	P/P	P/P	S/S
Capacities	S/S	P/S	P/S	P/P	S/S
Opportunities	S/S	P/S	P/P	P/P	S/S
Challenges/ constraints	S/P	P/P	P/S	P/P	S/S

Scale: P-Poor, S-Satisfactory, G-Good, E-Excellent

### 3.5.4 Recommendations for developing awareness of DRG evaluation in Serbia

The following recommendations are proposed:

- Improve capacities for the public policy evaluations through development and implementation of comprehensive training programmes throughout the public administration (planning techniques, analysing effects and using data for measuring results, monitoring and evaluation, etc.);
- Raise evaluation capacities of the research institutions and civil society organizations through realization of seminars, workshops, conferences and other capacity building events;
- Respecting the already adopted guidelines (*Guidelines for the involvement of the research community in the process of creating and implementing public policies adopted by the Republic Secretariat for public policies, 2017*), enable the systematic involvement of the research community and analysts outside the public administration in the process of creating and evaluating public policies;
- Development of the pilot evaluation projects with an aim to assess effectiveness of the Government programmes and realization of strategic documents.

## 3.6 Turkey

### 3.6.1 Overview of the existing M&E Practices in the country

Established in 2013, TMES aims to bring together professionals to practice and foster monitoring and evaluation culture across all institutions. Since then, TMES aspires to develop a network of evaluators in Turkey as well as share knowledge on evaluation.

Initial efforts on the practical use of evaluation in Turkey were started by several EU funded capacity building projects as well as projects financed by the World Bank. Later, evaluation efforts started to be shaped by the Ministry of Development (MoD) in order to monitor and evaluate public investment and regional development programmes. Since 2002, with Interim Evaluation Team and followed by Result Oriented Monitoring teams, EU funded projects are subject to evaluation to a certain extent. Several M&E capacity building projects were financed either by the World Bank or by the Government. MoD coordinated several M&E trainings and produced guidelines and roadmaps for public sector. Additionally, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) departments were set at the public institutions to monitor certain components of Instrument for Pre Accession (IPA) projects. Furthermore, infrastructural projects for towns and villages (BELDES and KOYDES) directed by the Ministry of Interior created an additional capacity for evaluation in Turkey. Although the phrase of “monitoring and evaluation” (M&E) was used to name the activities summarized above, the main focus was on monitoring. The ongoing activities had limited component that can be regarded as evaluation.

There is a lack of awareness on the significance of evaluation, lack of evaluation practices and misunderstanding of the purpose of evaluation as opposed to auditing. The results of an explanatory study conducted at Dokuz Eylul University with 71 Government officers and managers of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) reveal that there is confusion *with regards to the understanding of the practice and use of evaluation in organizations*. Evaluation is commonly confused with strategic planning and activity reporting. When asked why organizations do not conduct evaluation, 27% of the respondents gave lack of awareness on the significance of evaluation as the main reason. Other reasons were lack of top management request for evaluation, lack of stakeholder demand for evaluation, limited time and budget.

There is confusion *with regards to practice*. Evaluation is usually confused with periodic activity reports, strategic plans and internal auditing system. Moreover, there is confusion *with regards to use of evaluation*. Evaluation is regarded as a necessity arising from the strategic planning and obligations related to financial control. Preliminary analysis reveals three broad problem areas with regards to evaluation in Turkey:

- Problem area 1 is low demand for evaluation by organizations due to lack of awareness.
- Problem area 2 is that evaluation is not considered as a profession in Turkey.
- Problem area 3 is that the capacity to do evaluation is weak.

### 3.6.2 Brief overview of the DRG evaluation in the country

With the situation defined above in mind, TMES conducted a focus group with regards to integration of DRG components into present evaluation practices. The focus group was held in September 22, 2018 in Ankara.

General remarks on the current status of evaluation in Turkey:

- The evaluation trainings are usually delivered with no change through capacity development programmes in the Government organizations.
- There is a problem with capacity building both with respect to supply and demand. There is insufficient demand and insufficient supply for evaluation capacity building.
- Another problem with regards to evaluation is lack of access to data.
- Some NGOs and small number of think-tanks produce valuable data that can be used for different evaluative purposes. The data in general is currently publicly available. However, there is a need for more sophisticated data which can be produced, customized and sold to the researchers as well as evaluators.

a. Evaluations involving “**consensus**”: *Consensus is defined as “Agreement on the questions of national identity, historical narrative, and fundamental rules of the game.*

There is no specific evaluation practice with a focus on consensus except for some public opinion surveys in Turkey with a motivation to elicit citizen’s viewpoints on identity. The focus of the identity surveys is usually related to Europeanization and

Turkish people's perception on EU membership. There are other but few public opinion surveys on cultural, ethnic and religious identity.

b. Evaluations involving “**inclusion**”: *Inclusion is defined as “Exclusion or discrimination of parts of populations from political, social and economic life.” (improving the terms on which individuals and groups take part in society—improving the ability, opportunity, and dignity of those disadvantaged on the basis of their identity.)*

The DRG component that is most relevant to current practices is related to inclusion. The inclusion component is required for many of the private sector companies with ties to export markets as well as firms that are traded in Istanbul Stock Exchange. However, the focus group participants stated that the process is more related to monitoring than evaluation.

Along with requirements from the stakeholders such as importers and donors, there are also several voluntary practices in local governments, NGOs and private sector companies with regards to inclusion as well as accountability. These practices are commonly regarded as social impact / social compliance monitoring. Some of these practices are:

- Sustainable Apparel Coalition (SAC) and the HIGG index. The HIGG Index that is developed by SAC monitors DRG components (mostly inclusion and accountability) within the supply chain. The aim is to protect the well-being of the workers, local communities, and the environment.
- Woman Empowerment Principles (WEPs) are used by NGOs with specific focus on women's empowerment. For example, KAGİDER (The Women Entrepreneurs Association of Turkey) has a certificate of certificate of equal opportunity model (FEM) which requires monitoring of the organizations for implementing a model for equal opportunity.
- Additionally, there are standards developed by Global Reporting Initiative (GRI). The emphasis of GRI is related to monitoring of the practices in relation to governance structure, human rights, work conditions, unionization, gender mainstreaming, child labor, forced labor. The standards are suitable for private sector firms as well as government organizations and NGOs.
- Other tools/organizations in the supply chain with emphasis on inclusion:



- Fair Labour Association
- Rain Forest Alliance
- UTZ
- Labor Voice
- Fair Wear
- Better Cotton Initiative (IPUD in Turkey (Better Cotton Practices Association))

c. Evaluations involving **“competition and political accountability”**: *Competition and Political Accountability is defined as “The extent to which the political system includes competition and existence of free, fair, and inclusive elections, freedom in media, vibrant civil society as well as presence of an adequate political rights and civil liberties. “*

In Turkey, there are NGOs with a specific focus on free, fair and inclusive elections such as Oy ve Ötesi (Vote and Beyond) since 2014. As far as the participants know, existing evaluations do not have a specific focus on issues related to the “competition and political accountability” as specified above.

d. Evaluations involving **“rule of law and human rights”**: *Rule of Law and Human Rights is defined as “The presence or of rule of law in political, economic, and social life and whether the government apply the law equitably to all citizens.”*

Evaluations with a focus on human rights are wide ranging and are related to monitoring of the supply chain. The evaluations that are defined under the subheading “inclusion” contains components on human rights specifically related to protection of rights in the supply chain (child labor, women labor, forced labor and similar rights).

e. Evaluations involving **“government responsiveness and effectiveness”**: *Government Responsiveness and Effectiveness is defined as “The extent to which public institutions respond to public needs and provide socially acceptable services and whether these services reach all citizens equally or do certain groups or populations face barriers to accessing services.”*

The practices with regards to issues related to Government responsiveness are held in Government itself within the parliament through commissions. There are also

shadow reports that are prepared by NGOs with emphasis on DRG components (to supplement and / or present alternative information on human rights treaties).

There is a system in the Government with a particular focus on internal auditing. The audit system includes, along with financial accountability, other components of the DRG (few).

### **3.6.3 Opportunities for DRG evaluation in Turkey**

The standards initiated by Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) are suitable for all organizations, including government and non-government sector. The standards are used by private organizations as well as several local governments. These standards can be a good opportunity for the evaluators to use in programme/project evaluations.

Another opportunity is the implementation of 2030 Global Goals in the Government sector. SDGs are corresponding to the development agenda in Turkey. This requires all organizations to be monitored and evaluated according to the SDGs. The Turkish Courts of Accounts is preparing protocols for SDG evaluation for Government organizations. The framework will follow the rules and reporting procedures of the International Organization of Supreme Court of Audits (INTOSAI).

### **3.6.4 Constraints for DRG evaluation in Turkey**

There are so many M&E tools (standards) as specified above. The standards in supply chain, MDG standards, standards that are generated by various NGOs (such as women empowerment) creates so many and independent tools thus creating confusion. A more holistic approach is needed. The M&E practices in the Government is primarily financial control oriented (audit).

An important problem with regards to monitoring of supply chain is related to the presence of large number of subcontractor. At some points, we see “subcontractor” of a “subcontractor”.

Sharing of costs of monitoring the supply chain is also another constraint that limits the effectiveness of the procedures in relation to evaluation.

There is a lack of access to Government data and reports with regards to evaluations that have DRG components.

Another constraint is related to low human capacity in relation to evaluation. Similarly, there is a low capacity in Universities with regards to evaluation training as a whole. Academics with sufficient knowledge on evaluation as well as DRG components is very hard to find.

Moreover, the mechanisms that monitor NGOs are missing. The binding factor is primarily requirements of international organizations. System mostly depends on the necessity of foreign firms, international donors. The strategic plans of the organizations do not have any evaluation component that includes DRG evaluation. Specific targets are missing.

### **3.6.5 Recommendations for DRG evaluation in Turkey**

The primary problem related to evaluation in Turkey on demand and supply of evaluation capacity. The problem refers to the evaluation practices as a whole and DRG evaluation is no exception. Moreover, the DRG components of evaluations are mostly related to issues related to supply chain and mostly driven through demands from the foreign buyers and international donors/organizations.

The following recommendations summarize the results of the focus group that is held in Turkey on DRG evaluation:

- There is a need of a more holistic approach when including the DRG component in evaluations. So many different organizations have different components that resemble DRG but they are diverse and have different standards.
- Internal control and audit mechanisms are in use in the governmental organizations. Even though those mechanisms and practices currently cover only the financial measures, they can be extended to include DRG issues. In this way, internal control and audit can create data and environment for DRG evaluation studies..
- There is a need for trained evaluators. There is a need to create an evaluation capacity in Turkey including private sector, Governments sector and NGOs.
- The capacity trainings should have DRG component
- Istanbul Stock Exchange has a tool called BIST Sustainability Index. The index aims to provide a benchmark for companies traded in Istanbul Stock Exchange on sustainability including environmental, social and governance (ESG) issues. Similar approach can be generalized to include all five dimensions of DRG.

**Table 8. Overview of current situation in DRG Evaluation in Turkey**

What is the current situation in the country with regards to:	DRG DIMENSIONS			
COUNTRY EVALUATIONS INVOLVING:	<b>Practices:</b> concepts, methods, research, results	<b>Capacities</b>	<b>Opportunities</b>	<b>Challenges/ constraints</b>
<b>Consensus:</b> <i>agreement on the questions of national identity, historical narrative, and fundamental rules of the game</i>	Poor  Perceived benefits of EU membership. European identity; Turkish identity.	Poor	SDGs  Should be reflected in macro level plans  Macro level plans needed  For every dimension there is an address in the Government.  Syrian refugees in Turkey	Not reflected in macro level plans.  A National strategy, action plan, coordination is missing.  Need targets
<b>Inclusion:</b> <i>exclusion or discrimination of parts of populations from political, social and economic life</i>	Private sector: Good NGOs: Good (in certain aspects poor: such as religious beliefs) Government: Poor	Poor in Government Good in NGO  Standard based evaluations in NGOs  Good in private sector due to external factors  Poor in evaluation of religious beliefs due to its sensitive content.	SDGs  Should be reflected in macro level plans  For every dimension there is an address in the Government.  Local Governments are interested in the issue  There is a need to add DRG component to the value chain / supply chain.  Syrian refugees in Turkey	Was not reflected in macro level plans.  A National strategy, action plan, coordination is missing.  Need targets
<b>Competition and Political Accountability:</b> <i>the extent to which</i>	Poor	Poor in Government	SDGs	Was not reflected in

What is the current situation in the country with regards to:	DRG DIMENSIONS			
COUNTRY EVALUATIONS INVOLVING:	Practices: concepts, methods, research, results	Capacities	Opportunities	Challenges/ constraints
<i>political system includes competition and existence of free, fair, inclusive elections, freedom in media, vibrant civil society, presence of an adequate political rights and civil liberties</i>		Good in NGO	Should be reflected in macro level plans  For every dimension there is an address in the Government.	macro level plans.  A National strategy, action plan, coordination is missing.  Need targets
<b>Rule of Law and Human Rights:</b> <i>the presence or of rule of law in political, economic, social life and whether the government apply the law equitably to all citizens</i>	Poor	Poor in Government  Good in NGO	SDGs  Should be reflected in macro level plans  For every dimension there is an address in the Government.  Syrian refugees in Turkey	Was not reflected in macro level plans.  A National strategy, action plan, coordination is missing.  Need targets
<b>Government Responsiveness and Effectiveness:</b> <i>the extent to which public institutions respond to public needs and provide socially acceptable services and whether these services reach all citizens equally or do certain groups or populations face barriers to accessing services</i>	Poor  No consensus with regards to the subject matter.  No “enabling environment”	Poor in Government	SDGs  Should be reflected in macro level plans  For every dimension there is an address in the Government.  Syrian refugees in Turkey  International organizations and funding sources require evaluation on these issues	Was not reflected in macro level plans.  A National strategy, action plan, coordination is missing.  Need targets

## 3.7 Ukraine

### 3.7.1 Introduction

**The country report for the Ukraine is based on the** national Focus Group Interview (FGI) meeting with national stakeholders on issue of DRG evaluation capacities in the country, conducted by Ukrainian Evaluation Association on September 12, 2018 in Kyiv, Ukraine. The meeting was attended by 9 participants of 21 registered, representing donor organizations, university sector and NGOs. This meeting is a part of international project of seven European countries (Greece, Turkey, Macedonia, Croatia, Serbia, Ukraine and Poland) which have joined efforts to create awareness and induce evaluation professionals to integrate DRG in evaluation practices across Europe. The joint recommendations for developing awareness of DRG evaluation in the countries listed were presented at the EES Biennial Conference in Thessaloniki from 1-5 October, 2018.

### 3.7.2 Overview of Existing Monitoring and Evaluation Practices in the Ukraine

According to the FGI discussion:

*Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Practices of Donors:*

- Donor Organizations as Demanding Power for Integrating M&E in Ukraine: Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) practices is continually developing in Ukraine. The demand from international donors has been remaining “the main driving force” of applying and widening M&E to the work of NGOs and state authorities in the country within last ten years<sup>19</sup>.
- Different approaches to building M&E system: Per different areas of operations, donor organizations in Ukraine tend to build its own M&E systems, what create differences in defining the key M&E terms and approaches used; as a result, there is current absence of agreed system of M&E practice in the country;
- Large international expertise but limited knowledge/ understanding of local realities: Donor organizations bring extensive international expertise in M&E theories, tools and methods to Ukraine, where M&E practices are only developing; however, per limitations in understanding of local realities and for

---

<sup>19</sup> See: State of Evaluation Capacity Development in Ukraine: Demand, Supply, Institutionalization (baseline study). – UEA, 2012. – P. 5; Resolution of the First All-Ukrainian Conference on Practices of Monitoring and Evaluation in Ukraine.- UEA, March, 2018. – P.1-2.



objective research conclusions, donors have to involve local experts into M&E scope here as a must.

- Absence/ Insufficiency of Formative Evaluations: Donor organizations mostly are ordering/ implementing external/ internal final evaluations of their programmes and projects in the country, according to budget limits and funding priorities. Because of country's political and economical instability, this situation is influencing on the chances to correct results expected before the end of activities being implemented.
- Language Issues: Donor's evaluation reports are often published, but accessible mostly in English language. There is a need to disseminate this information on local language for public, business and third sector authorities to support the institutionalization and professionalization of evaluation in the country.
- Applicability of Evaluations Done: There is no institutionalized system in tracking the application of the results of evaluation/s done.

#### *M&E Practices of State Authorities:*

- Lack of systemic political will: State authorities have no systemic approach in applying M&E practices in its activities and mostly dealing with M&E due to donor's requirements in specific areas.
- Lack of knowledge and incorrect interpretation of indicators and M&E terms: The sections of the M&E in the state development strategies for the regions and cities contain incorrect indicators and do not describe the methodology for monitoring the implementation of these programmes. This underlines the necessity to create a normative base and M & E structure at the state level.
- Lack of appropriate legislation approved: There is yet no acting law regulating the monitoring and evaluation approaches in evaluating the work of public administration; however, the central governmental authorities have already established the first methods of monitoring and evaluation for its development programmes and the references to M&E were included into legislative documents under the assessment of regional development programmes<sup>20</sup>.

---

<sup>20</sup> See: Resolution #931 of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine On Approval of the Procedure for the Development of the State Strategy of Regional Development of Ukraine and the Plan of Measures for its Implementation, including Strategies of Monitoring and Evaluation to Define Effectiveness of the Strategy and Action Plan's Implementation. - Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, 2015. – <http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/931-2015-%D0%BF>

- Lack of local staff and M&E expertise: There is a growing need to train public officials in M&E practices and have M&E experts employed to work in state authorities in Ukraine.
- Applicability of Evaluations Done: There is no institutionalized system in tracking the application of the results of evaluation/s in public sector. In most cases, monitoring and evaluation of administrative and social services do not affect their quality improvement that is why the final results of state programme evaluations are mostly used only for reporting to donors and remains not available to the civilians.

#### *M&E Practices of the Third Sector (NGO):*

- Growing Interest and Usage of M&E Practices: However the demand in M&E practices is formed initially by international donor organizations in the third sector, currently there is the growth in demand for M&E knowledge/trainings and M&E experts from local organizations. The main customers of M&E education in Ukraine or abroad (mostly, via donor's funding) are representatives of non-governmental organizations (NGOs).
- Ukrainian Evaluation Association is operating as a national network platform for M&E specialists and related experts, large number of which are working at NGOs or representing higher education institutions. Since 2011, Ukrainian Evaluation Association, the voluntary organization of evaluators and experts in the M&E field, mostly from donor's organizations and universities, has been acting in the country to promote M&E practices as a tool of civil society for measuring transparency, accountability, effectiveness and efficiency of state authorities and social programmes and projects in Ukraine. In particular, within last five years, two ways of research assessing M&E Capacity Development in Ukraine (2012; 2018) were conducted by UEA members; the Ukrainian-language M&E Glossary (2014; updated in 2016)<sup>21</sup> and a Guide on Professional Evaluation Standards (2016)<sup>22</sup> were published; mid-term study programme on M&E practices for the workers of public and third sector developed, as well as a large set of related events and projects in the field have been implemented for

---

<sup>21</sup> See: Glossary of M&E. – UEA, 2014. - <http://www.ukreval.org/images/Glossary.pdf>

<sup>22</sup> See: Specialist in Evaluation: Evaluation Standard and Standards of Legislative Defining of Profession. – UEA, 2016. - <http://www.ukreval.org/images/publikacii/standards.pdf>

the wider promotion of evaluation among public, private and third sectors in Ukraine<sup>23</sup>.

- Limited Financial and Human Resources: Local NGOs has very low financial and human capacity to implement M&E practices in accordance with international standards and requirements. Usually, programme/project monitoring is done by the programme/project personnel of NGOs, and the evaluation is carried out by international consultants.
- Coordination in M&E approaches: There is a continued need to strengthen coordination and interaction/s among M&E specialists from local and international NGOs, as well as between third, business and public sector in M&E area for further developing a system of professional development in M&E and expert's certification in the country.

### **3.7.3 Overview of Existing M&E DRG Practices In Ukraine**

DRG Evaluations conducted by local organizations in Ukraine are not available as in most cases the full reports of these evaluations are not in open public access.

*DRG Evaluations conducted by international organizations in Ukraine:*

In 2017, Social Impact (SI), a global development management consulting, providing monitoring, evaluation, capacity building services to development organizations worldwide<sup>24</sup>, has done performance mid-term evaluation research, per request of the Office of Transition Initiatives at USAID, on assessing the effectiveness of the Ukraine Confidence Building Initiative, working “*to increase citizen support for and participation in the development of a modern, inclusive Ukrainian identity and improve the confidence and engagement in local reform processes*”<sup>25</sup>. More details on the methodology used and results obtained please see following the link: <https://socialimpact.com/portfolio-items/ukraine-confidence-building-initiative-ucbi/>

In 2017, the Council of Europe's Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) published fourth-round evaluation report regarding corruption prevention in respect of members of parliament, judges and prosecutors. The study “*encourages Ukrainian*

---

<sup>23</sup> See: Website of Ukrainian Evaluation Association (UEA) - <http://ukreval.org/ua/news?start=4>

<sup>24</sup> See: Social Impact website, Ukraine section: <https://socialimpact.com/portfolio-items/democracy-human-rights-governance-learning-evaluation-research-activity/>

<sup>25</sup> See: Social Impact website, Ukraine Confidence Building Initiative: <https://socialimpact.com/portfolio-items/ukraine-confidence-building-initiative-ucbi/>

*authorities to pursue anti-corruption reform efforts it had launched following the Revolution of Dignity and calls for effective results to be delivered in practice”<sup>26</sup>.*

More details on the methodology used and results obtained please see following the link: <https://rm.coe.int/grecoeval4rep-2016-9-fourth-evaluation-round-corruption-prevention-in-/1680737207>

In 2006, Democracy International, a US-based organization working with governments, ministries and NGOs in democracy and governance projects<sup>27</sup>, conducted a *“comprehensive local government assessment in Ukraine, including an evaluation of the relevance and execution of seven current USAID local government projects, and made recommendations for future technical assistance to local governments”<sup>28</sup>*. More details on the methodology used and results obtained please see following the link: <http://democracyinternational.com/resources/ukraine-local-government-assessment/>

### **3.7.4 Current DRG Evaluation Capacities in Ukraine**

According to the FGI discussion:

- Absence of agreed and systematised information on DRG Evaluation Approach/es: Democracy, Human Rights and Good Governance (DRG) programmes in Ukraine are being implementing by the large number of international donors (DANIDA, Council of Europe, USAID, OSCE, UNDP, UNISEF, USAID, World Bank, and others) in the country. However, the concept of DRG evaluation is not yet clearly defined and understood by M&E community in Ukraine. There is the necessity observed in developing DRG evaluation knowledge and clarifying the methodological differences between DRG evaluation and other programme/project evaluations in the country.
- USAID’s knowledge base for growing DRG Programme Evaluation capacities: To advance DRG programme goals worldwide, since 2012 USAID launched

---

<sup>26</sup> See: Council of Europe website: [https://www.coe.int/en/web/greco/home/-/asset\\_publisher/lxOP5Yph48Zi/content/ukrai-1?\\_101\\_INSTANCE\\_lxOP5Yph48Zi\\_viewMode=view/](https://www.coe.int/en/web/greco/home/-/asset_publisher/lxOP5Yph48Zi/content/ukrai-1?_101_INSTANCE_lxOP5Yph48Zi_viewMode=view/)

<sup>27</sup> See: Democracy International (DI) website: <http://democracyinternational.com>

<sup>28</sup> See: DI website, Ukraine Local Government Assessment: <http://democracyinternational.com/resources/ukraine-local-government-assessment/>

the [Center of Excellence on Democracy, Human Rights and Governance](#)<sup>29</sup> which provides “*technical advice and support to USAID missions implementing programmes in democracy, human rights and governance; generates and disseminates knowledge to build the evidence base for global advancement in the area; and elevates the role of DRG in key USAID, U.S. Government, and multilateral strategies*”.<sup>30</sup> According to this, it was observed that USAID is a one of the leading customer of DRG programme evaluations in Ukraine.

- In addition, USAID representative office in Ukraine has a separate chapter on the website in English and Ukrainian languages listing DRG programmes which the organization is implementing currently in the country and revealing the meaning of its DRG programmatic concept in Ukrainian context in particular: “*USAID helps Ukraine become more democratic by supporting participatory, transparent, and accountable governance processes. Working with the Ukrainian parliament, USAID improves legislative processes and increases public engagement and accountability, strengthens the rule of law by improving judicial accountability and independence, builds a foundation for decentralization and local government accountability, and supports programmes that prevent trafficking in persons and help victims. Civil society is critical to sustaining democracy in Ukraine. USAID develops the capacity of non-governmental organizations to monitor the government, protect human rights, and ensure that citizens have a voice in government decision making. By training Ukraine’s independent media, USAID enhances journalistic professionalism, ethics, and monitoring capabilities. USAID political processes programmes ensure that elections are free and fair, at the same time making political parties and elected officials more accountable to their constituents*”<sup>31</sup>.

### **3.7.5 Opportunities for Integrating DRG into Evaluating Government Policies**

According to the FGI discussion:

- There is a growing need to train public officials in M&E practices and have M&E experts employed to work in state authorities in Ukraine.

---

<sup>29</sup> See: USAID’ Center of Excellence on Democracy, Human Rights and Governance:

<https://www.usaid.gov/who-we-are/organization/bureaus/bureau-democracy-conflict-and-humanitarian-assistance/center>

<sup>30</sup> See: USAID website: <https://www.usaid.gov/democracy>

<sup>31</sup> See: USAID, Ukraine chapter: <https://www.usaid.gov/ukraine/democracy-human-rights-and-governance>

- In 2019 Ukraine has presidential elections that is why DRG issues will be in trend for the government.

### **3.7.6 Constrains for Integrating DRG into Evaluating Government Policies**

According to the FGI discussion:

- Integrating of DRG approaches into evaluating government policies is not supported by political will of the state and current legislation of Ukraine
- Different state ministries are developing its own indicators and M&E systems to the variety of strategies what limits creation of the unified M&E system and unified DRG evaluation approach at the country.
- Lack of M&E experts to implement the integration of DRG evaluation approaches into evaluating public sector
- There is no institutionalized system in tracking the application of the results of evaluation/s in public sector. In most cases, monitoring and evaluation of administrative and social services do not affect their quality improvement that is why the final results of state programme evaluations are mostly used only for reporting to donors and remains not available to the civilians.
- Evaluation of projects and programmes by donors are done separately; the absence of donor's coordination in evaluating (including DRG evaluation) the specific areas of NGOs or state activities in the country.

### **3.7.7 CHALLENGES RELATED TO DRG EVALUATING**

According to the FGI discussion:

There is an absence of knowledge and access to information in Ukrainian language of defined glossary and systematized theory of DRG evaluation.

Problems of standardization of M&E terms and approaches:

- International donor organizations in Ukraine have different approaches to structuring its M&E systems (Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E); Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) as a part of programme management circle; Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) system; Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Learning (MERL), what makes difficult to unify M&E terms and their usage, including in DRG evaluations.

- The similar challenge with standartization of M&E terminology is present in variety of Ukrainian legislative documents, related to M&E part of different state policies and strategies, produced by Ukrainian state authorities. This creates confusion and misunderstanding in defining of indicators targeted and planned and underlines the necessity to create a normative base and M&E structure at the state level also.
- In addition, DRG evaluation system & terminology in documents of USAID's contractor is defined as a part of DRG Learning, Evaluation, and Research (LER) system<sup>32</sup>. However, access to this information is limited in Ukraine and, even if available, is only in English.

### **3.7.8 Recommendations for Developing Awareness of DRG Evaluation in the Ukraine**

- To learn the DRG evaluation approaches (including glossary, methodology and strategy) from other international donors and VOPEs across Europe
- To develop resource library of DRG programme and evaluation apparatus on the website of Ukrainian Evaluation Society for raising awareness on DRG evaluations for local M&E community in Ukraine
- To promote and support coordination among donor organizations, NGOs and state authorities in developing standardized approaches in DRG evaluations in the country and all over Europe.
- To promote the DRG evaluation approach/es to government authorities in the country for its integration into state evaluation practices.
- To raise the awareness of society on DRG evaluation results via public events, workshops and training sessions, with involvement of USAID experts, on DRG evaluation topics that includes political economy analysis, local solutions, academic evidence reviews, and defining political indicators.

---

<sup>32</sup> See: <http://giw2017.org/innovations/drg-learning-evaluation-and-research>



## 4. SYNTHESIS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Evaluation Dimension	Practices *	Challenges	Constraints	Recommendations
Consensus	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EU accession</li> <li>• Migration and refugee flows</li> <li>• Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA)</li> <li>• Open governance</li> <li>• Civil society (role in M&amp;E)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation expertise not organised and not consistent</li> <li>• Evaluation seen as an administrative exercise</li> <li>• Absence of ownership for planning and coordination of policy evaluation</li> <li>• Absence of an established framework for evaluating NGO effectiveness and activities' impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education</li> <li>• Networking</li> <li>• Involvement of the political level</li> <li>• Establishment of an integrated regulatory framework for integration of evaluation (including DRG dimensions) into public policy (top-down approach) and enforcement of relevant provisions</li> <li>• Dissemination of evaluation results to all interested parties, as well as to the general public.</li> <li>• Media awareness raising</li> <li>• Focus on global trends related to evaluation like the EvalAgenda</li> </ul>
Inclusion	Advanced			
Competition and Political Accountability	Medium			
Rule of Law and Human Rights	Low			
Government Responsiveness and Effectiveness	Low			

Scale: Advanced, medium, low

Note: Presented at Thessaloniki workshop, October 2018.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS ON DRG EVALUATION IN EUROPE

The project team accomplished a set of important objectives, but has also contributed to the following:

- **Evaluation skills development for local activists, civil society organizations, evaluation practitioners and/or members of voluntary organizations for professional evaluation (VOPE)**

In all seven partner countries, the focus group participants identified challenges and limitations of DRG evaluation in their respective countries. The focus groups identified training needs for local activists, civil society organizations, evaluation practitioners and/or members of voluntary organizations for professional evaluation (VOPE) for better integrating DRG focus on evaluations.

The ultimate aim of the workshop in Thessaloniki was accomplished and created a significant networking effect. As expected, the joint efforts helped to share practices across 7 countries and to summarize the main challenges for DRG capacity building in Europe. This report represents a starting point for the development of joint trainings to integrate the DRG component in evaluation. At the Thessaloniki workshop VOPEs discussed possibilities to mobilize additional resources for revision and translation of an online training platform that is already bringing evaluation skills for local activists, civil society organizations, evaluation practitioners and/or members VOPEs in Poland (created by PES). As an additional result a meeting was organised during the European Evaluation Society Conference in Thessaloniki, where options for establishing joint training programmes in Central, Eastern and Southern Europe were discussed. In addition, the American Evaluation Society has expressed interest in supporting these efforts.

- **Organization of peer learning or exchanges to share and document best practices in implementing, monitoring and evaluating DRG programmes in conflict and fragile states, or in complicated or complex environments.**

The focus group discussions in each country contributed to a better understanding of DRG practices and documented current practices in their respective countries. Country reports involved examples of country experiences and practices, in conflict and fragile states, or in complex environments. Good practices are shared among

project participants as well as through global distribution of this report, worldwide audience will have access to these findings, results and recommendations. This project has fulfilled one of the key results, namely it has enabled learning from each other and sharing experiences. Synergies for further work on developing training for DRG evaluation has been created and joint activities will continue.

- **Supporting human rights advocates and/or VOPEs to advocate for the use of evidence-based policies, which use research and evaluative findings, to better inform national and international agendas on human rights.**

A set of recommendations for developing a DRG capacity building programmes has been proposed in this report. All involved partner associations as well as on the European level through the Network of European Evaluation Societies (NESE) the use of DRG evaluation will be promoted actively, with the aim to increase awareness of the tools for DRG evaluation across Europe and wider.

#### ***SPECIAL THANKS TO ALL DRG EVALUATION RESEARCH TEAM MEMBERS:***

<b>Name</b>	<b>Country/ Affiliation</b>
Vlatko Danilov	FYR Macedonia/ MEN
Josko Ivanovski	FYR Macedonia/ MEN
Venera Gudacci	FYR Macedonia/ MEN
Monika Bartosiewicz Niziołek	Poland/ PES
Jakub J. Wróblewski	Poland/ PES
Dr. Svetlana Stanarević	Serbia/ NEMES
Mihajlo Djukić	Serbia/ NEMES
Tetyana Narchynska	Ukraine/ UEA
Olga Schetinia	Ukraine/ UEA
Dalibor Dvorny	Croatia/ CEN
Dr. Marijana Sumpor	Croatia/ CEN
Dimitra Ioannou	Greece/ HES
Katerina Asimaki	Greece/ HES
Prof. Sedef Akgungor	Turkey/ TMES
Dr Volkan Erkan	Turkey/ TMES
S. Guray Celik	Turkey/ TMES

---

<sup>i</sup> Beywl, W. (2006). The Role of Evaluation in Democracy: Can it be Strengthened by Evaluation Standards? A European Perspective. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, Number 6, pp 10-29.

<sup>ii</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/S TANDARD/surveyKy/2180>

<sup>iii</sup> EQUAL was a Community Initiative within the [European Social Fund](#) of the [European Union](#). It concerned "*transnational co-operation to promote new means of combating all forms of discrimination and inequalities in connection with the labour market*". It ran from 2001 till 2007 with a budget of some €3 billion of EU resources, matched by a similar sum from national resources.

EQUAL was part of the European Union's strategy for "more and better jobs" and for ensuring that no-one is denied access to them. The initiative focused on supporting innovative, transnational projects aimed at tackling discrimination and disadvantage in the labour market. These projects were created to generate and test new ideas with the aim of finding new ways of fighting all forms of discrimination and inequality within and beyond the labour market. EQUAL co-financed activities in all 27 EU Member States. Two calls for proposals for EQUAL projects in the Member States took place, the first in 2001 and the second in 2004. Responsibility for the implementation of the Community Initiative programmes in the Member States lay with the national authorities.

EQUAL projects were classified into the five main pillars of the European Employment Strategy: i) increasing employability, ii) encouraging inclusive entrepreneurship, iii) facilitating adaptability, iv) promoting gender equality and; v) integrating asylum seekers.

<sup>iv</sup> Law 4048/2012 addresses the various ministerial bodies and seeks *inter alia* to limit legal inflation and to streamline legislation, to increase the quality of regulations, to improve the transparency of legislative processes by timely public consultations and the submission of adequate explanatory documents to the parliament and so on; it also provides for the creation of a special Commission for codification and reform of the Law responsible for ensuring the implementation of Law 4048 through overall monitoring of the situation, the elaboration of methodologies and for proposing twice a year to the government initiatives to be taken to fulfil the goals. A Better Regulation Office is also established to implement the overall policy together and in contact with the legislative departments of the ministries.

<sup>v</sup> Each commitment should have its own short paragraph identifying what the commitment is using the SMART principles; how it will contribute to greater transparency, accountability and/or citizen engagement; who will be involved in implementing the commitment and; what the government hopes to accomplish by making this commitment. There should also be a brief discussion of how specific commitments respond to public feedback generated through consultation. Where possible, commitments should also identify key implementation benchmarks and related timelines, indicating what will be accomplished during each year of implementation.

<sup>vi</sup> The General Secretariat of the Government is subject to the Prime Minister's Office. It supports the Prime Minister and the government in the performance of their duties, and provides secretarial support to the cabinet, other collective governmental bodies and inter-ministerial committees. It also coordinates and monitors the implementation of these bodies' decisions.