

RCA 2019-2023 Medium Term Strategy

MTSC WG Guidance for PAC on 2020 Mid-Term Review

BACKGROUND

The RCA Medium Term Strategy 2018-2023 (MTS) was approved by the RCA National Representatives at the 44th GCM in 2015. This document is the key strategic plan for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the RCA programme. It articulates how the RCA can effectively discharge its mission and apply the instruments and processes at its disposal to maximize its contribution to the development goals of its Governing Parties.

At the 38th National Representatives Meeting (NRM) in 2016, the RCA Programme Assessment Committee (PAC) was tasked with conducting a mid-term review of the MTS in 2020, as they were sufficiently removed of the National Representatives to conduct an independent review. The Medium Term Strategy Coordination Working Group (MTSC WG) was established at the 45th GCM in 2016 to, inter alia, develop a framework for PAC to assist them in conducting the mid-term review of the MTS.

The MTSC WG met six times from 2017 to 2019 to develop this framework. Full meeting reports outlining discussions of the MTSC WG in this time are available on the RCARO web site. The below document summarises the framework developed by the MTSC WG for the MTS mid-term review to be conducted by PAC.

PURPOSE

This document describes the framework that should be used by RCA PAC in conducting their mid-term review of the RCA MTS for 2018-2023 to be conducted in 2020. It describes the metrics that should be measured, what data will be needed, and provides an initial baseline of results against the metrics (for example purposes only).

It is acknowledged that during actual conduct of the review by PAC, new data and challenges may arise that the MTSC WG was not aware of when formulating this framework. Due pragmatism by PAC is encouraged when they are conducting the review.

PHILOSOPHY

The MTS set out a series of 12 Performance Indicators (PI) across four functional areas (Ownership, Programme Soundness, Programme Sustainability, and Programme Impact) to measure the success of the RCA Programme. These were used as the basis for developing the framework for the mid-term review.

These PIs are:

1. Ownership

- 1.1. Degree of GPs' commitment to RCA Governance
- 1.2. Degree of GPs' commitment to implementation of their allotted portions of the RCA projects
- 1.3. Efforts made by GPs to provide additional support to RCA programme through EB or IK contributions

2. Programme Soundness

- 2.1. The RCA programme is in full alignment with the MTS
- 2.2. Alignment of RCA projects to national programmes in all participating recipient GPs
- 2.3. Well-identified and defined project activities, outputs and outcomes*
- 2.4. Well-identified and defined next-users and end-users for each Project, and their integration into the Project activities*

3.1. Programme Sustainability

- 3.1. Required financial resources available for the full implementation of the RCA activities
- 3.2. Required human resources available for the full implementation of the RCA activities
- 3.3. Required physical resources, nuclear and associated infrastructure available for the full implementation of the RCA activities

4. Programme Impact

- 4.1. Contribution of projects to overall sustainable development in the region, through assessable impacts in socio-economic development and environmental protection (in relation to SDGs)
- 4.2. The RCA programme is recognised as an effective partner contributing to achievement of socio-economic development and environmental protection for the region (in relation to SDGs)

* It is noted that PIs 2.3 and 2.4 were expressed as one single PI in the MTS, however, the MTSC proposed that it would be more effective to measure if it were split into two PIs.

To measure the performance of the RCA programme against the PIs, a series of attributes were identified for each PI. These are described in general terms below and are more fully described as they apply to each PI in the annexes to this report.

Target Criteria

Where they could be defined, a series of quantitative criteria were identified that could be physically measured to assess RCA performance against the PI.

Summary of WG Discussions

This is a summary of discussions on each PI over the course of its six meetings.

Performance Level Definitions

Five plain language Performance Levels (Excellent, Very Good, Good, Adequate, Inadequate) were identified to describe RCA performance against the PIs. While the names of the Levels are consistent between PIs, the description of what each Level means in terms of performance naturally varies from PI-to-PI. Where possible, similar quantitative bands have been applied to the Levels across PIs.

A sixth Performance Level (Insufficient Data) was included for each PI in the case that insufficient data may be available to be able to make a meaningful assessment.

Possible Information Sources

These are sources of data that have been identified by the MTSC as being potentially useful for PAC in the review process. They may not have necessarily been used or available to the MTSC WG in their initial baseline assessments.

Initial Baseline Results

In defining the mid-term review framework, the MTSC WG undertook some initial baselining activities to test the usefulness of the framework. These initial results are recorded against each PI, indicating the measurement period, the result, the Performance Level, the information sources used, and, importantly, challenges experienced.

These results are not the mid-term review results and should be used as a guide and proof-of concept only. The WG notes that for some PIs, this baselining was a difficult process due to the limited information available at the start of the MTS period.

Further Actions Required for Implementation

These are recommendations from the MTSC WG on possible actions that could be implemented to close any initial perceived low performance of the RCA Programme against the PIs.

SUMMARY OF INITIAL BASELINE RESULTS

PI	Result	Performance Level
1.1	<ol style="list-style-type: none">Seventeen (77%) of GPs already deposited the Instruments of Acceptance of the 2017 RCA.Two countries (9%) are unrepresented two subsequent NR meetings.	Good
1.2	<ol style="list-style-type: none">Project achievement rates of 85-100%60% of PPAR submitted on time35.3%-66.7% of NPC/ANPC participation rate at relevant project meetings (NPC/ANPC lists were sometimes incomplete)NPT data not available.	Good
1.3	<ol style="list-style-type: none">50-66% of GPs did not report, or reported zero IK contributions.40% of GPs made EB contributions during the last five years.	Inadequate
2.1	100% of the project designs are aligned to the MTS	Excellent
2.2	<ol style="list-style-type: none">100% of the RCA programme is aligned with national priorities of the developing GPs96% of the RCA programme is aligned with the national priorities of the developed GPs	Very Good
2.3	100% of approved project designs have well-identified and defined project activities, outputs, and outcomes	Excellent

2.4	85% of projects had well-identified and defined next-users and end-users for each Project, and their integration into the Project activities	Good
3.1	25% of project designs contain at least 25% of budgeted components or activities as extra-budgetary supported.	Inadequate
3.2	Not available due to insufficient or incomplete data in PPFs and PPARs	Insufficient Data
3.3	100% of RRUs or in-country facilities are available and used to meet the requirements of RCA Projects for every GP (note limited sample size).	Excellent
4.1	Outcome monitoring process is continuing to be developed.	Insufficient Data
4.2	Further work required after outcome monitoring process finalised.	Insufficient Data

REVIEW PERIOD FOR MID-TERM REVIEW

Projects that were active in 2018 or were developed from that year up until the time of the review.

CONCLUSION

The MTSC WG has developed a framework that can be used by PAC to undertake a review of the MTS in 2020 as planned. This framework should be used as a guide only, and amended as needed if more information comes to hand.

The results of the review conducted by PAC should in turn be reviewed by the MTSC WG before they are sent to the appropriate meeting of the National Representatives for final approval.

ANNEXES

#	Title
1	Performance Indicator 1.1
2	Performance Indicator 1.2
3	Performance Indicator 1.3
4	Performance Indicator 2.1
5	Performance Indicator 2.2
6	Performance Indicator 2.3
7	Performance Indicator 2.4
8	Performance Indicator 3.1

9	Performance Indicator 3.2
10	Performance Indicator 3.3
11	Performance Indicator 4.1
12	Performance Indicator 4.2

ANNEXE 1

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DETAILS	
Group	Ownership
Number	1.1
Title	Degree of GP's commitment to RCA governance
Target Criteria	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All the GPs deposit Instruments of Acceptance for the 2017 RCA 2. No GPs absent for 2 subsequent NR meetings
SUMMARY OF WG DISCUSSIONS	
<p>The WG identified the two target criteria as representing GP commitment to the RCA and both relatively easy to measure.</p> <p>As of July 2019, 77% of GPs had deposited Instruments of Acceptance for the 2017 RCA. The WG noted that GPs who had not yet deposited should be encouraged to do so as quickly as possible. At the same point in time, only two countries were absent from the last two consecutive meetings of NRs. The WG noted that it may be necessary to identify if there are specific difficulties in participating in meetings for these GPs to ensure that no RCA country is left behind.</p>	
PERFORMANCE LEVEL DEFINITIONS	
Excellent	All the GPs deposited Instruments of Acceptance for 2017 RCA, and no GPs is unrepresented at two subsequent NR meetings.
Very Good	At least 80% of the GPs deposited Instruments of Acceptance for the 2017 RCA, and less than 10% of GPs are unrepresented at two subsequent NR meetings.
Good	At least 60% of the GPs deposited Instruments of Acceptance for the 2017 RCA, and less than 15% of GPs are unrepresented at two subsequent NR meetings.
Adequate	At least 50% of the GPs deposited Instruments of Acceptance for the 2017 RCA, and less than 20% of GPs are unrepresented at two subsequent NR meetings.
Inadequate	Less than 50% of the GPs deposited Instruments of Acceptance for the 2017 RCA, or more than 20% of GPs are unrepresented at two subsequent NR meetings
Insufficient Data	N/A. Data is available.
POSSIBLE INFORMATION SOURCES	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deposits of acceptance of the 2017 RCA 2. List of Participants at NRMs and GGMs 	

INITIAL BASELINE RESULTS	
Measurement Period	2017-2019
Quantitative Result	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seventeen (77%) of GPs already deposited the Instruments of Acceptance of the 2017 RCA. 2. Two countries (9%) are unrepresented two subsequent NR meetings.
Achieved Performance Level	Good
Information Sources Used	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deposits of acceptance of the 2017 RCA 2. List of Participants at NRMs and GGMs
Challenges Encountered	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access to latest list of instruments of accession
FURTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NRs should keep encouraging GPs who have not yet deposited the Instrument of Acceptance to do so as quickly as possible. 2. Need to identify what prevents GPs from participation in the NR meetings in order to improve the situation, and to make sure that no GPs left behind. 3. Note suggestion for briefing programme for new NRs as suggested at 41st NRM. 	

ANNEXE 2

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DETAILS	
Group	Ownership
Number	1.2
Title	Degree of GPs' commitment to implementation of their allotted portions of the RCA projects
Target Criteria	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Percentage completion of planned project activities. 2. Percentage of relevant project reports submitted by GPs by specified deadlines. 3. Percentage of NPCs or ANPCs that attend relevant project meetings. 4. Nominations for RTCs are from members from National Project Teams.
SUMMARY OF WG DISCUSSIONS	
<p>The MTSC WG reviewed and normalised the PPARs from the most recently completed 5 projects (RAS5070, RAS5071, RAS6071, RAS6072, RAS6077). The completion rates of those projects were ranging from 85-100%. While technically falling short of the target for excellent performance, the WG group noted that it was for all intents and purposes achieving it, as any gap could be an artefact of the way the results were normalized. For better analysis, it is recommended that project completion rate be included in the PPAR by LCCs.</p> <p>On-time submission rate of PPARs, as well as the participation rate of NPC/ANPC at relevant meetings were found to be low, and it is recommend that be revisited in the future. Participation of NPT members at RTCs is not easily verifiable because of the incomplete PPFs and changing NPT members. The WG recommended that NRs and NPCs make sure that they nominate members of NPTs to RTCs, and that this instruction be included in invitation letters from the IAEA. Since the analysis of these targets are very time consuming process, it was suggested that in the future LCCs include this data into their PPARs with the support of IAEA-FP.</p>	
PERFORMANCE LEVEL DEFINITIONS	
Excellent	All of the target criteria achieved at the level of 100%.
Very Good	All of the target criteria achieved at the level of a least 80%.
Good	All of the target criteria achieved at the level of a least 60%.
Adequate	All of the target criteria achieved at the level of a least 50%.
Inadequate	Not all of the target criteria achieved at least 50%.
Insufficient Data	Insufficient data available to make an assessment against the target criteria.

POSSIBLE INFORMATION SOURCES

1. PPAR
2. Project Work Plan

INITIAL BASELINE RESULTS

Measurement Period	2014-2018
Quantitative Result	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Project achievement rates of 85-100%.2. 60% of PPAR submitted on time.3. 35.3%-66.7% of NPC/ANPC participation rate at relevant project meetings (NPC/ANPC lists were sometimes incomplete).4. NPT data not available.
Achieved Performance Level	Good
Information Sources Used	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. PPAR and Work Plans (RAS5071, RAS6071, RAS6077)2. List of NPCs/ANPCs (RAS5070, RAS5071, RAS6070, RAS6071, RAS6077)3. List of Participants relevant project meetings
Challenges Encountered	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Incomplete information of NPCs and ANPCs.2. Incomplete information of NPT members.3. Incomplete information to fully assess completion rates of project activities.4. Cumbersome work necessary to analyse the participation of NPCs, ANPCs, and NPT members.

FURTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The following recommended are made to the NRs:

1. During the development of the Project Design or Work Plans, or at First Coordination Meeting, different development stages/levels should be taken into consideration to set-up the goals of the project; also RTCs could meet the special needs of each development stages, being aware of any budgetary limitations. Scientific Visit, not RTC might be more useful for Least Developed Countries in some cases.
2. IAEA-FP are recommended to help LCCs incorporate all necessary information (achievement rate of each activities, participation rate of NPC/ANPC, nomination rate of NPT members etc.) into PPARs as annex to PPAR.
3. We need to consider how and when to incorporate impact assessment analysis into Medium-Term and Final Review.
4. Note that many factors can influence performance against these criteria leading to wide variability of results. Need to review Performance Level bands after Mid-Term Review to see if they are practical.

ANNEXE 3

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DETAILS	
Group	Ownership
Number	1.3
Title	Efforts made by GPs to provide additional support to RCA programme through EB or IK contributions
Target Criteria	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Percentage of GPs making EB contributions 2. Percentage of GPs making IK contributions
SUMMARY OF WG DISCUSSIONS	
<p>During the analysis of this PI, it was noted s significant (36-50%) of GPs have either not reported or reported zero IK contributions. In reality, the WG noted that every country has sent participants to some meetings and should have some such contributions.</p> <p>For EB contributions, it is still premature to conclude anything, given that the Declaration was only sent to GP Permanent Missions in late 2018.</p>	
PERFORMANCE LEVEL DEFINITIONS	
Excellent	100% of GPs made IK and EB contributions
Very Good	At least 80% of GPs made IK and EB contributions
Good	At least 60% of GPs made IK and EB contributions
Adequate	At least 50% of GPs made IK and EB contributions
Inadequate	Less than 50% of GPs made IK and EB contributions
Insufficient Data	N/A. Data is available from Secretariat.
POSSIBLE INFORMATION SOURCES	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. List of IK contributions annexed to Annual Report. 2. List of EB contributions annexed to Annual Report. 3. List of RCA Events Implemented annexed to Annual Report 	
INITIAL BASELINE RESULTS	
Measurement Period	2016-2018 (for EB contributions 2014-2018)
Quantitative Result	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. 50-66% of GPs did not report, or reported zero IK contributions. 4. 40% of GPs made EB contributions during the last five years.
Achieved Performance Level	Inadequate

Information Sources Used	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. List of In-kind contributions annexed to Annual Report 2. List of Extra Budgetary Contributions annexed to Annual Report 3. List of RCA Events Implemented annexed to Annual Report
Challenges Encountered	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Suspect IK contribution data does not reflect reality. All GPs make at least some IK contributions to participate in projects, but are not reporting it completely.
FURTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remind NRs to fully and accurately report IK contributions. 2. NRs to encourage GPs to consider EB contributions. 	

ANNEXE 4

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DETAILS	
Group	Programme Soundness
Number	2.1
Title	The RCA programme is in full alignment with the strategic priorities of the MTS
Target Criteria	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are no projects that are not aligned to the strategic priorities of the MTS 2. Resources are allotted across strategic sectors based on optimum proportions defined by the GPs
SUMMARY OF WG DISCUSSIONS	
<p>As an initial activity to determine the alignment of the RCA programme to the MTS, the RCA programme was analysed against the six requirements of the MTS. The project designs for the 2020/21 cycle met the six requirements. The same tests were also done for the seven ongoing RCA projects. Over the course of the WG deliberations, the WG felt the need to undertake a survey of the GPs to determine their priority areas among the strategic areas of the MTS. An alternative option to obtain the information is to utilize the data from the PPFs of the participating GPs for 7 ongoing projects categorized under Agriculture, Health, Industry, and Environment, and being implemented for 2018-2021. In the 2020/21 cycle, one project under radiation safety was included. In all bar two projects, the priority level given by the GPs is between 4 and 6. The outliers are for RAS 7031 with a priority level of 3 by one GP, and the other is RAS 5084 with priority level of 2 by one GP.</p> <p>It was noted that this ranking of projects at the project design phase was adopted upon the recommendation of the WG (2nd WG Meeting Report). Further, during its second meeting, the WG recommended several options for the GPs to address the prioritization/balancing of resources among the strategic sectors in the MTS.</p> <p>In regards to the second target criteria, the WG felt that it did not have the information required to undertake this analysis, but more importantly this was an issue that should be decided by NRs.</p>	
PERFORMANCE LEVEL DEFINITIONS	
Excellent	The RCA programme attained a 100% alignment to the MTS strategic priority areas.
Very Good	The RCA programme attained at least 90% alignment to the MTS strategic priority areas.
Good	The RCA programme attained at least 80% alignment to the MTS strategic priority areas.
Adequate	The RCA programme attained at least 70% alignment to the MTS strategic priority areas.

Inadequate	The RCA programme attained below 70% alignment to the MTS strategic priority areas.
Insufficient Data	Insufficient data available to assessment alignment to the MTS strategic priority areas.
POSSIBLE INFORMATION SOURCES	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project design papers 2. Project participation Forms (PPFs) 	
INITIAL BASELINE RESULTS	
Measurement Period	2018/2021 cycle; 2020/2021 cycle
Quantitative Result	100% of the project designs are aligned to the MTS
Achieved Performance Level	Excellent
Information Sources Used	Project design papers; PPFs
Challenges Encountered	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 20 of 22 GPs submitted the PPFs. Of the 22 GPs, 6 submitted a complete set of 7 PPFs ; one GP with 6; three with 5 ; one with 4; two with 3, two with 2, and three with 1 PPF submitted.
FURTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All participating GPs should strive to submit a complete PPFs. 2. NRs should consider why there have been no recent projects proposals in the Energy strategic priority sector of the MTS. 	

ANNEXE 5

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DETAILS	
Group	Programme Soundness
Number	2.2
Title	The RCA projects are aligned to the national priorities of the participating GPs
Target Criteria	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For Recipient GPs: data indicates strong alignment between the RCA Projects/Programme and their respective CPFs. 2. For Donor GPs: data indicates strong alignment between the RCA Projects/Programme and their respective national priorities/strategies
SUMMARY OF WG DISCUSSIONS	
<p>At the 5th WG Meeting, the WG had acquired CPFs (public versions) and a list of national TC projects for GPs that have national TC programmes. This information was cross-referenced against the MTS strategic priorities as a way to check if the RCA Programme was aligned with the national priorities as defined in CPFs and national projects. The results of the analysis showed a strong alignment of the RCA programme (Food and Agriculture, Health, Environment, Radiation Safety) to the national priorities. The sector on energy is a strong component of the national programmes of several GPs. However, there is no active energy project in the RCA programme. This sector may be fully covered by other Departments in the IAEA, thus, the concerned GPs may find it unnecessary to utilize the fund of the RCA, limited as it is presently. The information from the 79 PPFs so far gathered confirmed this strong alignment between the two programmes.</p> <p>As shown in the PPFs, the developed GPs give a high priority ranking (4-6) for all ongoing projects except for RAS 5084 which received a priority ranking of 2 from one GP. India, which does not receive TC projects, has high priority ranking (5-6) to the ongoing RCA projects.</p>	
PERFORMANCE LEVEL DEFINITIONS	
Excellent	The RCA programme is 100% aligned with the national priorities.
Very Good	The RCA programme is at least 80% aligned with the national programme.
Good	The RCA programme is at least 60% aligned with the national programme.
Adequate	The RCA programme is at least 50% aligned with the national programme.
Inadequate	The RCA programme is below 50% aligned with the national programme.

POSSIBLE INFORMATION SOURCES

1. Country Program Frameworks (public versions)
2. Lists of national TC projects supplied by NRs
3. Project designs
4. PPFs
5. IAEA Website
6. TC Pride

INITIAL BASELINE RESULTS

Measurement Period	2018/19 cycle; 2020/2021 cycle
Quantitative Result	<ol style="list-style-type: none">3. 100% of the RCA programme is aligned with national priorities of the developing GPs4. 96% of the RCA programme is aligned with the national priorities of the developed GPs
Achieved Performance Level	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Very Good
Information Sources Used	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Country Program Frameworks (public versions)2. Lists of national TC projects supplied by NRs3. Project designs4. PPFs5. IAEA Website6. TC Pride
Challenges Encountered	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In view of the confidentiality of the CPFs, only the public versions were the sources of information of the national priorities. Not all GPs submitted the complete set of PPFs for the seven ongoing projects.

FURTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION

1. GPs should strive to submit all of their PPFs.

ANNEXE 6

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DETAILS	
Group	Programme Soundness
Number	2.3
Title	Well-identified and defined project activities, outputs and outcomes
Target Criteria	Final Project Designs approved by NRs include high-quality LFMs, incorporating appropriate activities for HRD, TCDC and Resource Mobilisation
SUMMARY OF WG DISCUSSIONS	
<p>From the report of the PAC meeting preceding the WG meeting, it was noted that PAC agreed that all of the 2020/21 project designs had well-identified and defined project activities, outputs, and outcomes. Thus, the excellent performance criterion was met for this PI. This should be verified from the PPFs for these projects to be submitted after their approval.</p>	
PERFORMANCE LEVEL DEFINITIONS	
Excellent	100% of projects have well-identified and defined activities, outputs, and outcomes.
Very Good	At least 90% of projects have well-identified and defined activities, outputs, and outcomes.
Good	At least 80% of projects have well-identified and defined activities, outputs and outcomes.
Adequate	At least 70% of projects have well-identified and defined activities, outputs, and outcomes.
Inadequate	Below 70% of projects have well-identified and defined activities, outputs and outcomes.
POSSIBLE INFORMATION SOURCES	
1. Project design documents	
INITIAL BASELINE RESULTS	
Measurement Period	2020/21 programme cycle
Quantitative Result	100% of approved project designs have well-identified and defined project activities, outputs, and outcomes
Achieved Performance Level	Excellent

Information Sources Used	2020/2021 project design documents
Challenges Encountered	1. Variable LCC familiarity with project design documents and process
FURTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION	
1. Secretariat to continue training on project design documents and processes for new LCCs, NPCs and NRs through appropriate fora.	

ANNEXE 7

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DETAILS	
Group	Programme Soundness
Number	2.4
Title	Well-identified and defined next-users and end-users for each Project, and their integration into the Project activities
Target Criteria(s)	1. Next- and/or end-users are identified for every GP in the Project Design documents and PPFs
SUMMARY OF WG DISCUSSIONS	
In the WG deliberations, it was acknowledged that securing next-and/or end-users as partners, and obtaining evidence of this, may be difficult for some types of projects. However, it was suggested that this is still a useful aspirational target for the RCA as a whole.	
PERFORMANCE LEVEL DEFINITIONS	
Excellent	100% of participating GPs in a RCA project have secured at least one partnership with a potential next-user or end-user.
Very Good	At least 90% of participating GPs in a RCA project have secured at least one partnership with a potential next-user or end-user.
Good	At least 80% of participating GPs in a RCA project have secured at least one partnership with a potential next-user or end-user.
Adequate	At least 70% of participating GPs in a RCA project have secured at least one partnership with a potential next-user or end-user.
Inadequate	Less than 70% of participating GPs in a RCA project have secured at least one partnership with a potential next-user or end-user.
POSSIBLE INFORMATION SOURCES	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project Designs 2. PPFs 	
INITIAL BASELINE RESULTS	
Measurement Period	2018/2021 programme cycle; 2020/2021 programme cycle

Quantitative Result	<p>Five of the seven (71%) 2020/21 project designs had specifically identified and named potential end-users or beneficiaries.</p> <p>All of the seven ongoing projects have specifically identified and named next-and/or end-users.</p> <p>Overall percentage was 85%.</p>
Achieved Performance Level	Good
Information Sources Used	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2020/2021 project designs 2. PPFs
Challenges Encountered	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Question whether information recorded in PPFs is actually aligning with reality
FURTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATIION	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review the usability of PPFs 	

ANNEXE 8

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DETAILS	
Group	Program Sustainability
Number	3.1
Title	Required financial resources are available for the full implementation of the RCA activities
Target Criteria	1. Project designs identify at least 25% of budgeted components or activities as extra-budgetary supported.
SUMMARY OF WG DISCUSSIONS	
<p>Over the course of the WG deliberations, a number of models were proposed to achieve greater surety of financial resources for RCA projects such as lobbying the IAEA for more TCF resources, establishing an AFRA-style fund for extra-budgetary contributions, and requesting extra-budgetary funds from Governing Parties through a formal Declaration. Ultimately, it was decided that project designs themselves should include specific components that are extra-budgetary in nature. These components should add to the project and not hinder its delivery of project outcomes if extra-budgetary funding does not eventuate.</p>	
PERFORMANCE LEVEL DEFINITIONS	
Excellent	All project designs contain at least 25% of budgeted components or activities as extra-budgetary supported
Very Good	At least 80% of project designs contain at least 25% of budgeted components or activities as extra-budgetary supported
Good	At least 60% of project designs contain at least 25% of budgeted components or activities as extra-budgetary supported
Adequate	At least 50% of project designs contain at least 25% of budgeted components or activities as extra-budgetary supported
Inadequate	Less than 50% of project designs contain at least 25% of budgeted components or activities as extra-budgetary supported
Insufficient Data	Insufficient data is available to identify whether project designs contain at least 25% of budgeted components or activities as extra-budgetary supported
POSSIBLE INFORMATION SOURCES	
1. Project design papers	

INITIAL BASELINE RESULTS	
Measurement Period	2020-21 Project Cycle
Quantitative Result	25% of project designs contain at least 25% of budgeted components or activities as extra-budgetary supported.
Achieved Performance Level	Inadequate
Information Sources Used	1. 2020-21 Project Design Papers
Challenges Encountered	Some project designers indicated that inclusion of the requirement for at least 25% extra-budgetary components undermined the designs, particularly as it was introduced at a late stage of the design process (detailed design). This is a fair issue to raise, but it can be mitigated for the next project cycle (2022-2023) as this requirement can be included from the concept stage.
FURTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION	
1. MTSC WG to draft an update to GOR to include requirement for project designs to include at least 25% of budgeted components or activities as extra-budgetary supported.	

ANNEXE 9

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DETAILS	
Group	Programme Sustainability
Number	3.2
Title	Required human resources are available for the full implementation of the RCA activities
Target Criteria	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recipient GPs have identified their workforce requirements (e.g. NPC, ANPC, NPT) in PPFs. 2. RTC participants are from NPTs. 3. Knowledge is shared after attending RTCs as evidenced in PPAR.
SUMMARY OF WG DISCUSSIONS	
<p>Prior to the MTSC WG, a set of recommendations strategies on HR was prepared by the HRD-WG based on the surveyed gaps of GPs. Upon approval by the NRs at the 46th GCM 2017, the recommendation strategies were distributed to the NRs and LCCs for inclusion in the project design, implementation and management stages, and were also included in the GOR. During its deliberations, the WG looked at responses provided in completed PPFs, specifically that in Part 3C (referring to HRD needs) and Part 2 (which identified some HRD capabilities). Some apparent discrepancies were identified between claimed HRD capabilities versus needs (e.g. claimed advanced capability but seeking basic level training). A number of possible reasons for this were discussed including the design of the PPF, and incorrect completion on the part of GPs.</p> <p>The above observations were made during the 5th meeting of the WG based on a limited number of available PPFs. In the meantime, more PPFs were analysed and a similar situation was observed with incomplete PPFs were often submitted by GPs. Some even more peculiar situations were observed such as one GP requesting 50 RTCs for 3 NPTs.</p> <p>Due to these difficulties, identifying appropriate target criteria for this PI was difficult and were only completed at the 6th meeting of the MTSC WG. As such, baseline results were not possible for this PI.</p> <p>It was noted by the WG, that it would be helpful for NRs and NPCs to be reminded of the need to provide accurate information when completing project documents, including the PPF, and to ensure that appropriate members of NPTs were nominated for RTC (i.e. not over or under qualified). The Secretariat could be asked to include this later as standard practice in meeting notification and call for nominations.</p>	
PERFORMANCE LEVEL DEFINITIONS	
Excellent	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All recipient GPs identify workforce requirements in PPFs. 2. All RTC participants are from NPTs. 3. There is evidence in PPARs that knowledge is shared after all RTCs.
Very Good	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least 80% of recipient GPs identify workforce requirements in PPFs. 2. At least 80% of RTC participants are from NPTs.

	3. There is evidence in PPARs that knowledge is shared after at least 80% of RTCs.
Good	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least 60% of recipient GPs identify workforce requirements in PPFs. 2. At least 60% of RTC participants are from NPTs. 3. There is evidence in PPARs that knowledge is shared after at least 60% of RTCs.
Adequate	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least 50% of recipient GPs identify workforce requirements in PPFs. 2. At least 50% of RTC participants are from NPTs. 3. There is evidence in PPARs that knowledge is shared after at least 50% of RTCs.
Inadequate	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Less than 50% of recipient GPs identify workforce requirements in PPFs. 2. Less than 50% of RTC participants are from NPTs. 3. There is evidence in PPARs that knowledge is shared in less than 50% of all RTCs.
Insufficient Data	PPF and PPAR provide insufficient data for analysis
POSSIBLE INFORMATION SOURCES	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PPFs 2. PPARs 	
INITIAL BASELINE RESULTS	
Measurement Period	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2018/2021 cycle 2. 2020/2021 cycle
Quantitative Result	Not available due to insufficient or incomplete data in PPFs and PPARs
Achieved Performance Level	Insufficient Data
Information Sources Used	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PPFs 2. PPARs
Challenges Encountered	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incomplete or inaccurate information in PPFs. 2. Unclear if HR recommendations properly considered during the project design stage. 3. It was noted that difficulties in obtaining visa in some countries issues could potentially affect results for target criteria 2.
FURTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NRs and NPC need to provide timely and accurate information when completing PPFs and PPARs. 2. MTSC WG to review of usability of PPF. 	

ANNEXE 10

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DETAILS	
Group	Programme Sustainability
Number	3.3
Title	Required physical resources, and nuclear and associated infrastructure is available for the full implementation of the RCA activities
Target Criteria	1. RRUs or in-country facilities are available and used to meet the requirements of RCA Projects for every GP
SUMMARY OF WG DISCUSSIONS	
<p>At the start of the WG discussion, there was no existing database on the Regional Resources Unit (RRUs). As such, it was decided to review available PPFs, particularly Parts 2, 3D and 3E. However, even this proved difficult with not all PPFs from the 2018/19 project cycle requested being available (only 16 PPFs were submitted). Even those that were available were often not properly completed.</p> <p>For the 2020/21 cycle, it was decided requested that PPFs for the 202/21 project designs be completed by all GPs following the 41st NRM. Again, this did not immediately happen so information available was limited.</p> <p>The MTSC WG noted that the PPFs may be overly complicated and should be reviewed.</p>	
PERFORMANCE LEVEL DEFINITIONS	
Excellent	RRUs or in-country facilities are available and used to meet the requirements of RCA Projects for every GP.
Very Good	RRUs or in-country facilities are available and used to meet at least 90% of the requirements of RCA Projects.
Good	RRUs or in-country facilities are available and used to meet at least 80% of the requirements of RCA Projects.
Adequate	RRUs or in-country facilities are available and used to meet at least 70% of the requirements of RCA Projects.
Inadequate	RRUs or in-country facilities are available and used to meet less than 70% of the requirements of RCA Projects.
Insufficient Data	Insufficient data on RRUs are recorded in PPFs.
POSSIBLE INFORMATION SOURCES	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project Participation Forms 2. RCARO RRU DB 	

INITIAL BASELINE RESULTS	
Measurement Period	2018-19 Project Cycle
Quantitative Result	100% of RRUs or in-country facilities are available and used to meet the requirements of RCA Projects for every GP (note limited sample size).
Achieved Performance Level	Excellent
Information Sources Used	2018-19 Project Participation Form
Challenges Encountered	1. PPFs are not submitted correctly, in full, or on-time
FURTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATIION	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request GPs to ensure complete submission of PPFs with accurate information for all projects started in 2020/2021. 2. Review PPF for usability. 3. First review meetings for projects should discuss how to effectively utilize RRUs. 	

ANNEXE 11

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DETAILS	
Group	Programme Impact
Number	4.1
Title	Contribution of projects to overall sustainable development in the region, through assessable impacts in socio-economic development and environmental protection (in relation to SDGs)
Target Criteria	Baseline is known, and information is available to detect improvement (of any magnitude) against baseline.
SUMMARY OF WG DISCUSSIONS	
<p>This is a measure of actual socio-economic outcomes or impact, in accordance with the RCA Mission and Vision. WG activities and discussions with NRs and TCPC has shown that evaluating outcomes/impacts is challenging. Among the challenges is that we have no idea what the baseline is, despite several methodologies being utilised to try and extract this information. It is also often difficult to quantify the level of outcomes and impacts, particularly in a uniform manner.</p> <p>It is also noted that, by 2023, there may not yet be any measurable impacts for projects that have taken place in the 2018-23 period of the MTS. Therefore, this assessment will also evaluate project outcomes (e.g. uptake of project outputs by end-users), in addition to attempting to measure impacts.</p>	
PERFORMANCE LEVEL DEFINITIONS	
Excellent	The programme (or thematic area or project) has made a <u>material</u> contribution towards <u>significant, regional-scale</u> social or economic <u>outcomes</u> , resulting from <u>substantial and enduring</u> changes in the behaviour, activity, capacity and/or performance of <u>multiple</u> organisations, communities and/or constituencies in <u>at least half</u> of the participating GPs. The rate or breadth of change is <u>significantly</u> greater than would have been achieved without the RCA.
Very Good	The RCA programme (or thematic area or project) has made a <u>material</u> contribution towards <u>regional-scale</u> social or economic <u>outcomes</u> , as shown by <u>considerable</u> changes in the behaviour, activity, capacity and/or performance of <u>at least one</u> organisation, community and/or constituency in <u>at least half</u> of the participating GPs. The rate or breadth of change is <u>significantly</u> greater than would have been achieved without the RCA.
Good	The RCA programme (or thematic area or project) has made a <u>material</u> contribution towards <u>national</u> social or economic <u>outcomes</u> , as shown by a change in the behaviour, activity, capacity and/or performance of <u>at least one</u> organisation, community and/or constituency in <u>at least a quarter</u> of

	participating GPs. The rate or breadth of change is <u>slightly</u> greater than would have been achieved without the RCA.
Adequate	The RCA programme (or thematic area or project) has made a <u>modest</u> contribution towards <u>national</u> social or economic <u>outcomes</u> , as shown by a change in the behaviour, activity, capacity and/or performance of <u>at least one</u> organisation, community and/or constituency in <u>at least a quarter</u> of participating GPs. The rate or breadth of change is <u>slightly</u> greater than would have been achieved without the RCA.
Inadequate	The RCA programme (or thematic area or project) has contributed towards <u>national</u> social or economic outcomes in <u>less than a quarter</u> of participating GPs. The rate or breadth of change is <u>not greater</u> than would have been achieved without the RCA.
Insufficient Data	Insufficient data is available to measure outcomes.
POSSIBLE INFORMATION SOURCES	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluation of material collected through Outcome Mapping, as was performed at the final coordination meeting of RAS7029. 2. Focus group discussions or interviews among project participants. 3. Project design papers and Project Progress Assessment Reports (previous work by the WG shows these will not be sufficient on their own). 	
INITIAL BASELINE RESULTS	
Measurement Period	2000 – 2019, the period covered by RAS7029 and previous related projects
Quantitative Result	Only qualitative results are available, but these showed that the sequence of RCA air pollution projects has made modest or material contributions towards national outcomes for at least a quarter of participating GPs.
Achieved Performance Level	Insufficient Data. Further work is required to evaluate the outcomes reported for the air pollution projects, but initial indications suggest a performance level of Good or Very Good.
Information Sources Used	Final Coordination Meeting of RAS7029 and accompanying report.
Challenges Encountered	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project participants may struggle to understand the difference between outputs, outcomes and impacts. 2. There can be a long lag time between project completion and generation of outcomes/impacts. 3. It can be difficult to understand the contribution of an RCA project to a stated outcome/impact, given other factors may have also contributed.

- | | |
|--|---|
| | 4. The RCA is a regional programme, but it can be difficult to determine its regional benefit, over and above the benefits to individual GPs. |
|--|---|

FURTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION	
--	--

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="197 392 1374 459">1. Repeat Outcome Mapping exercise at final coordination meetings of other long-running topic areas.<li data-bbox="197 459 1374 564">2. Integrate rubric design into Project Design Meeting and project Kick-off meetings, to ensure all participants understand what the project is trying to achieve, and to enable appropriate information sources to be identified early. | |
|---|--|

ANNEXE 12

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DETAILS	
Group	Programme Impact
Number	4.2
Title	The RCA programme is recognised as an effective partner contributing to achievement of socio-economic development and environmental protection for the region (in relation to SDGs)
Target Criteria	Baseline is known, and information is available to detect improvement (of any magnitude) against baseline.
SUMMARY OF WG DISCUSSIONS	
<p>This is a measure of GPs perception of known or potential outcomes or impacts from the RCA programme. The RCA Vision states ‘the RCA will be recognised as an effective partner...’ so tracking the effectiveness of the MTS requires tracking of ‘recognition’. In addition, it is difficult to measure actual outcomes or impacts, so a good complementary measure is to determine GPs perception of potential impact.</p>	
PERFORMANCE LEVEL DEFINITIONS	
Excellent	<u>Multiple</u> key RCA stakeholders in <u>at least half</u> of participating GPs consider that the RCA programme (or thematic area or project) has contributed to, or may generate, <u>substantial and enduring regional-scale impacts, significantly</u> more quickly and/or more broadly than provided by national programmes.
Very Good	<u>At least one</u> key RCA stakeholder in <u>at least half</u> of participating GPs considers that the RCA programme (or thematic area or project) has contributed to, or may generate, <u>important regional-scale outcomes, significantly</u> more quickly and/or more broadly than provided by national programmes.
Good	<u>At least one</u> key RCA stakeholder in <u>at least a quarter</u> of participating GPs considers that the RCA programme (or thematic area or project) has contributed to, or may generate, <u>important national outcomes, slightly</u> more quickly and/or more broadly than provided by national programmes.
Adequate	<u>At least one</u> key RCA stakeholder in <u>at least a quarter</u> of participating GPs considers that the RCA programme (or thematic area or project) has contributed to or may generate <u>modest national outcomes, slightly</u> more quickly and/or more broadly than provided by national programmes.
Inadequate	The majority of stakeholders in the majority of participating GPs consider that the RCA programme (or thematic area or project) does not generate known or potential outcomes, above or beyond national programmes.

Insufficient Data	Insufficient data is available to make an assessment of partner impressions.
POSSIBLE INFORMATION SOURCES	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Perception Survey or focus group discussions of RCA stakeholders. 2. Project design papers and Project Progress Assessment Reports (previous work by the WG shows these will not be sufficient on their own). 	
INITIAL BASELINE RESULTS	
Measurement Period	No data presently available.
Quantitative Result	No data presently available.
Achieved Performance Level	Insufficient Data
Information Sources Used	No data presently available.
Challenges Encountered	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stakeholders may struggle to understand the difference between outputs, outcomes and impacts. 2. There can be a long lag time between project completion and generation of outcomes/impacts. 3. It can be difficult to understand the contribution of an RCA project to a stated outcome/impact, given other factors may have also contributed. 4. The RCA is a regional programme, but it can be difficult to determine its regional benefit, over and above the benefits to individual GPs.
FURTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design and implement perception survey of RCA stakeholders. 	