## Regional Projects within the Agency's Technical Cooperation Programme - what are they?

There are two types of regional projects under the TC Programme - the projects under Regional Agreements( e.g. AFRA, ARCAL and RCA) and those outside these Agreements.

Table 1 indicates the distribution of these projects in the various sections of TC for the 1999/2000 cycle [1].

**Table 1 : Regional Programme**

| | Agreement 1999-2000 | | | | Non-agreement 1999-2000 | | | | % of no. of project under Agreement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. of projects | Budget US$ | Budget US$ | Total Budget US$ | No. of projects | Budget US$ | Budget US$ | Total Budget US$ | |
| | | H'core | Footnote a/ | | | H'core | Footnote a/ | | |
| RAF | 14 | 5,292,750 | 2,243,950 | 7,536,700 | 14 | 9,240,340 | 4,505,265 | 13,745,605 | 50% |
| RLA | 25 | 4,552,980 | 1,822,110 | 6,375,090 | 7 | 4,542,365 | 1,628,150 | 6,170,515 | 78% |
| RAS | 26 | 5,725,755 | 3,471,515 | 9,197,270 | 11 | 4,256,915 | 601,910 | 4,858,825 | 70% |
| RER | | | | | 28 | 11,835,285 | 3,633,775 | 15,469,060 | n/a |
| RAW | | | | | 10 | 5,428,380 | 1,421,725 | 6,850,105 | n/a |
| | Agreement 2001-2002 | | | | Non-agreement 2001-2002 | | | | % of no. of project under Agreement |
| | No. of projects | Budget US$ | Budget US$ | Total Budget US$ | No. of projects | Budget US$ | Budget US$ | Total Budget US$ | |
| | | H'core | Footnote a/ | | | H'core | Footnote a/ | | |
| RAF | 20 | 5,862,650 | 2,126,500 | 7,989,150 | 20 | 11,635,005 | 6,791,415 | 18,426,420 | 50% |
| RLA | 27 | 4,754,870 | 1,470,800 | 6,225,670 | 12 | 6,774,340 | 4,195,970 | 10,970,310 | 69% |
| RAS | 30 | 5,099,180 | 3,828,550 | 8,927,730 | 13 | 4,640,280 | 3,751,440 | 8,391,720 | 70% |
| RER | | | | | 33 | 16,039,945 | 788,000 | 16,827,945 | n/a |

[1] Source: Project summary for the 1999/2000 programme(Whitebook) and pipeline projects for the 2001/2002 cycle

| RAW | | | | | | 6,992,060 | - | 6,992,060 | n/a |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|-----------|-----|
| | | | | | 11 | | | | |

Table 1: continuation  Budget Figures

| | Grand Total Budget for Regional Programme | | Agreement 1999-2000 | | Non-agreement 1999-2000 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Hardcore Budget | Total Footnote a/ Budget | Agreement % HC | Agreement % Footnote a/ | Non-agreement % HC | Non-agreement % Footnote a/ |
| RAF | 14,533,090 | 6,749,215 | 36% | 33% | 64% | 67% |
| RLA | 9,095,345 | 3,450,260 | 50% | 53% | 50% | 47% |
| RAS | 9,982,670 | 4,073,425 | 57% | 85% | 43% | 15% |
| RER | 11,835,285 | 3,633,775 | n/a | n/a | 100% | 100% |
| RAW | 5,428,380 | 1,421,725 | n/a | n/a | 100% | 100% |

| | Grand Total Budget for Regional Programme | | Agreement 2001-2002 | | Non-agreement 2001-2002 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Hardcore Budget | Total Footnote a/ Budget | Agreement % HC | Agreement % Footnote a/ | Non-agreement % HC | Non-agreement % Footnote a/ |
| RAF | 17,497,655 | 8,917,915 | 34% | 24% | 66% | 76% |
| RLA | 11,529,210 | 5,666,770 | 41% | 26% | 59% | 74% |
| RAS | 9,739,460 | 7,579,990 | 52% | 51% | 48% | 49% |
| RER | 16,039,945 | 788,000 | n/a | n/a | 100% | 100% |
| RAW | 6,992,060 | - | n/a | n/a | 100% | 100% |

**1. Why have regional projects outside and within Agreements?**

At the moment Regional Agreements exists in Africa(AFRA), Latin America(ARCAL)  and East Asia and Pacific Section.(RCA).  The earliest was RCA, which is now in its 28<sup>th</sup> year, then ARCAL with 16 years  and the latest is AFRA, which  celebrated  its 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary  in 2000.

Many Member States do not understand (and perhaps it does not matter to them) and wish to know the difference between these regional projects. To them all these projects are supported by the Agency and either the MS are participating or not.

In order to explain the distinction or difference between these projects a short table is produced below (Table 2). The comparison covers the procedures for project formulation and implementation, project accountability and function of the Secretariat.

Table 2 : Difference between regional projects within and outside the Agreements:

| Within Agreements | Outside Agreements |
| --- | --- |

| Within Agreements | Outside Agreements |
|---|---|
| **1. Project initiation:** Any MS (or the IAEA) can present a project proposal. | **1. Project initiation:** The Agency TO or Area Officer or Project Officer or any other Official of the TC Dept. Any MS can also present a proposal. |
| **2. Formulation:** MS of the Agreement formulates the projects, prioritize them and submit to agency for approval and funding considerations.<br><br>The MS normally have mechanisms for developing project proposals[2] and follow and use agency TC strategy and project design criteria. At present project proposals are developed according to the Agreement, i.e. any one MS can submit a proposal, this is circulated to MS for comments and if at least 3 MS support a proposal, this can be submitted to a meeting of national representatives for endorsement.<br><br>Projects are expected to be within the priority problem areas of the countries<br><br>Note: The Agency can submit a project proposal to MS of the Agreement but this proposal should be known by all MS of the Agreement | **2. Formulation:** the Agency formulates the proposal without the involvement of all MS of the region. Only those MS which plan to participate in the implementation of the project are involved. These countries are selected by the Agency TO or AO or PO.<br><br>Projects are developed in two ways: through national proposals and through Agency initiatives.<br><br>a) Through the national proposal. During a programming year, the agency studies the proposals submitted by MS in the region. If 2 or 3 countries submit similar proposals the agency may decide to combine these and creates a regional project. **The endorsement of the other MS in the region is not sought**. This project might not be a high priority problem area in the region, but only for the countries submitting the proposal.<br>b) Through agency initiatives. Based on agency information it perceives that certain MS needs assistance in certain areas, and thereby formulates a regional project involving these MS only.<br><br>Note: The priority here is set by the Agency , e.g. those projects related to radiation protection or nuclear safety. |
| **3. Submission.** In AFRA the official submission is done by AFRA Field Management after a review done during the Technical Working group. Meeting(TWGM). In RCA the National RCA Representatives formally endorses the proposals to the Agency for those projects proposed for Agency funding. In ARCAL the representatives also endorse the proposals to the Agency. | 3.**Submission.** No official submission. The Area Officer presents the request on behalf of selected participating countries. |

---

[2] In RCA the Lead Countries for thematic /sectoral programme/project areas are identified and they lead the formulation of project proposals; there exists an RCA Operating Rules and Guidelines governing the formulation of project proposals and CRPs. In AFRA there is a Project Formulation Committee(4 African Scientists in the field, AFRA Coordinator and IAEA TO, if necessary; in ARCAL a document containing the procedures for planning, designing, evaluation, approval and implementing ARCAL projects is in place; an independent group of experts from the region makes the initial screening of the project proposals.. Agency assistance is requested not only in formulating the proposals in some cases but also their evaluation as well.

| Within Agreements | Outside Agreements |
|---|---|
| **4.Implementation**: The MS have a big say in the implementation and the direction of the project. The regular meeting of representatives reviews the progress of the project and decides to make corrective actions if any or as necessary within the constraints of the project parameters. <u>Detailed workplans</u>: The task is facilitated by availability of detailed workplan. | **4. Implementation**: The Agency has the big say in the implementation and on the direction of the project.<br><br><u>Detailed workplans: In general the detailed workplan is not available at the beginning of the project. Implementation is initiated after the first project coordination meeting.</u> |
| **5. Monitoring and Follow-up.** Monitoring and follow up at the Agency level is ensured by the Regional Coordinator and the TO. At the regional level this is discharged by several players[3] | 5. **Monitoring.** This is ensured by the Agency AO(as manager of the project) or the PO, and the TO. It is not clear if this monitoring is done at the regional/country level. |
| 6. **Evaluation.** This is part of the project activities, and depending on the complexity of the project, is done yearly, and/or during the mid-term life ,and at the end of the project. The project committee in the case of RCA does interim assessment, and by the Gatekeeper and outside experts in the case of AFRA. The PO, TO and the participating countries  make provisional evaluation of the implementation of the project in the case of ARCAL. The Agency's Evaluation Section is also involved at end of the project. | 6. **Evaluation.** If needed, the Agency Evaluation Section performs this. |
| 7. **Reporting.**  This is done on a regular basis (yearly or semestrally) through the national coordinators and through lead countries reporting. | 7.**Reporting.** This is not specified |
| **8.Accountability**: the Agency is accountable to the Agreement's Member States for the implementation of programme. The Secretariat of the Agency is accountable to the management of the TC department | **8.Accountability**: The Agency's accountability is within TC department and to higher management |
| **6. Secretariat:** Each Agreement has a regional coordinator based at the Agency. The regional coordinator is responsible for the coordination of the programming, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and reporting of the Agreement's Programme. | **6. Secretariat:** Coordination is done by a Country Officer(CO), Area  Officer(AO) or Project Officer assigned to the regional project . Thus, there will be several "coordinators" depending on the number of these projects and number of projects assigned to a Country or Project officer. |

**2.    Should the Agency continue to have these two types of regional projects?**

This is a policy issue for decision by higher management.

If TC projects are intended to address high priority problem areas in Member States, the following questions need to be answered:

Should it be the MS who should decide their high priority problem areas or the Agency?

If an area perceived by the agency to be mandatory is not a high priority problem for the region, should the agency continue to create a regional project to address this? For example if a country only uses minimal level of radioisotopes, e.g. small amounts of RIA kits and has no other applications, should the agency insist that there should be enabling regulations on radiation protection before providing further assistance, or merely provide guidelines of good radiation protection practices to this country?

---

[3] In AFRA monitoring and follow up is done by the project gatekeeper, the AFRA Field Management and AFRA national coordinators. In RCA this is done by the lead countries, the National RCA Coordinators, the RCA National Representatives and the project coordinators. In ARCAL  similar mechanism also exist.

Is the practice of creating regional projects out of a few country submissions a cost effective way of solving the problem in the region?

Is continued support to regional projects within Agreements a cost effective way of solving their priority problems?

**3.  Are there any practical reasons to have these two types of regional projects? If the Agency and MS feel that both types of projects are needed, what should be the ratio?**

Normally, projects within an Agreement involve the participation of only the interested countries that have the capacity and possibility to implement the project. However, all the countries of the Agreement would be aware of the outcome of the project and hence benefit is spread through other MS. In non-Agreement projects a few countries are involved and only sub-regional benefit may be assured.

Referring to Table 1 it is seen that in Africa, there is an equal number of projects outside and within AFRA(50% based on 1999/ 2000 and 2001/2002 project cycle). In Latin America there are more projects within ARCAL (78%) in 1999/2000 cycle but the share is down to 69% in the 2001/2002 cycle. In the East Asia and Pacific section 70% of the projects fall within the RCA in both project cycles.

The budgetary figures indicate a different trend: In Africa for the hardcore part, for the 1999/2000 cycle, only 36% of the budget falls within AFRA; 50% in ARCAL and 57% in RCA. For the next project cycle, the share in the preliminary budget(hard-core) is down to 34% for AFRA, down to 41% for ARCAL and slightly down to 52% for RCA. For the footnote a/ component, the share of non AFRA projects is 67% and 76% in the 1999/2000 and 2001/2002 project cycles, respectively; for non-ARCAL the figures are 47% and 74% for the 2 cycles, respectively; while for RCA the share is 15% in 1999/2000 but increased to 49% in 2001/2002 cycle.

There seems to be an increasing trend in both the numbers and budget for regional projects outside the Agreement.

**4.  Can non-Agreement projects be implemented under Regional Agreements?**

Yes, as long as the projects are endorsed and approved by the MS.

**5.  Can the Agency afford to give up the creation of regional projects outside Agreements?**

This is a sensitive issue which higher management should decide. However, as countries become more mature and accountable in selecting the projects they participate in, it is foreseen that there will be a decreasing trend in number of non-Agreement projects. Maturity in this sense implies that a country is being focused on its needs and not be inclined to participate in any project which may have low priority rating in that country. Accountability would imply being able to use the available resources at its disposal, where it counts, i.e. in solving high priority problem areas.

**6.  Can the Regional Agreements be a vehicle for determining national projects in additional to regional projects?**

The Agreements are now mainly concerned with developing regional projects based on regional priority problem areas. Thus they are good vehicles for shaping regional projects.

The Agreements can also provide some insights in identifying potential projects at the national level. For example during an AGM in Agriculture[4], the participating countries identified major national problems encountered in this area; a regional problem is identified if this problem is common to many countries. If a problem is peculiar only to one country, solving this problem could be a candidate for a national TC project.

7. **Conclusions**
    a. Differences exist between regional projects within and outside the agreement in the initiation, formulation, implementation, monitoring and other aspects shown in Table 1.
    b. Project ownership by MS is more evident in  Agreement projects than in non Agreement projects
    c. Non Agreement projects can be quickly developed without passing the rigorous screening by MS nor by the appraisal process instituted by the Agency.
    d. The ratio between Agreement and non Agreement projects is not an established figure and varies according to the region.
    e. The Agreements can implement non-Agreement projects provided these have been discussed beforehand and endorsed by the parties to the Agreements.
    f. Mechanisms used in developing Agreement projects would also be helpful in identifying national project proposals

8. **Recommendations**

1.      The Agency should consider the possibility of including as much as possible, regional projects within the Agreements, leaving outside the Agreements only those regional projects that have not received the approval of MS, but the Agency considers these  as important(e.g. mandatory areas)

2.      The Agency, based on the results already made by MS should encourage the increase of regional projects inside the Agreements in the future, promoting among the TO the knowledge of the mechanisms the Agreements have i place in formulating regional projects

---

[4] For example during an RCA AGM in Agriculture held in Beijing, China in July 1999.