Performance Indicator 2 = Programme Soundness

Suggestion for Performance Indicator 2.1 (The RCA programme is in full alignment with the strategic priorities of the MTS)

Existing Criteria

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

Suggested wording to be included for clarification of Criterion 2:

> "Criterion 2 under PI 2.1 evaluates the distribution of total funding (TCF, extra-budgetary and in-kind) any other quantifiable resources between the six Strategic Priority areas defined in Section C.2 MTS 2018-2023, and also between any thematic subdivisions within a single Strategic Priority area. The actual distribution of total resources among the Strategic Priority areas is to be compared to the optimum distribution of funding defined by the GPs according to a process decided by the GPs. This criterion is not intended to evaluate the distribution of funding within individual projects, proportions of project budget assigned for specific types of activities."

Suggestions for Performance Indicator 4 = Programme Impact

Recommended updates to the MTR guidance are shown in the tables below.

The actions that I recommend our WG should take prior to the next meeting are below, and I am happy to do them as part of our Annual Work Plan if agreed by NRs:

1. Request from the Secretariat any Project Reports for meetings held since last meeting of WG MTSC, and review them for the quality of outcomes they plan or have achieved (by next NRM)
2. Liaise with the Secretariat to improve the modalities for submission of the full PPAR two years after project completion as required under GOR Part 4, Section 1.1.5.n. Also consider modalities for allowing NRs to track progress on closed projects (e.g. at NRMs)
3. Undertake assessment of the outcomes reported in the pilot evaluation at the Final Review Meeting of Air Pollution project RAS7029 (by next NRM)
4. Review the reports produced by IAEA socio-economic impact evaluation two additional thematic areas, once available (by next NRM if available)

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	1. RCA projects generate outcome benefits for the region. 2. The RCA programme generates longer-term impacts for the region. 3. There is an increased capability and capacity within the RCA programme to evaluate its outcomes and impacts~~Baseline is known, and information is available to detect improvement (of any magnitude) against baseline~~.
SUMMARY OF WG DISCUSSIONS	
This is a measure of actual socio-economic ~~outcomes or~~ impacts, in accordance with the RCA Mission and Vision. Noting that impacts can take a long time to generate, this assessment will also evaluate nearer-term project outcomes (e.g. uptake of project outputs by end-users). In addition, 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. Therefore, this assessment will not only evaluate the actual impacts or outcomes delivered by the RCA programme, but also measure improvement in the RCA's capacity and capability to make these outcome/impact evaluations. ~~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.~~	
PERFORMANCE LEVEL DEFINITIONS	
Excellent	The magnitude, breadth or rate of delivery of impacts is significantly greater than would have been achieved without the RCA programme (or thematic area or project). The programme (or thematic area or project) ~~(or thematic area or project)~~ has made a material contribution towards significant, regional-scale social or economic outcomes, resulting from substantial and enduring changes in the behaviour, activity, capacity and/or performance of multiple organisations, communities and/or constituencies in at least half of the participating GPs. The RCA has significantly increased capability and capacity for outcome/impact monitoring, for example by introduction of

서식 있음: 목록 단락, 번호 매기기 + 수준:1 + 번호 스타일: 1, 2, 3, … + 시작 번호: 1 + 맞춤: 왼쪽 + 맞춤 위치: 0 cm + 들여쓰기 위치: 0.63 cm

서식 있음: 글꼴: 기울임꼴 없음

서식 있음: 밑줄

	several improved evaluation methods into its standard operations.~~The rate or breadth of change is significantly greater than would have been achieved without the RCA.~~
Very Good	The magnitude, breadth or rate of delivery of impacts is significantly greater than would have been achieved without the RCA programme (or thematic area or project). The RCA programme (or thematic area or project) has made a material contribution towards regional-scale social or economic outcomes, as shown by considerable changes in the behaviour, activity, capacity and/or performance of at least one organisation, community and/or constituency in at least half of the participating GPs. The RCA has substantially increased capability and capacity for outcome/impact monitoring, for example by introduction of several improved evaluation methods into its standard operations.~~The rate or breadth of change is significantly greater than would have been achieved without the RCA.~~
Good	The magnitude, breadth or rate of delivery of impacts is slightly greater than would have been achieved without the RCA programme (or thematic area or project).The RCA programme (or thematic area or project) has made a material contribution towards national social or economic outcomes, as shown by a change in the behaviour, activity, capacity and/or performance of at least one organisation, community and/or constituency in at least a quarter of participating GPs. The RCA has slightly increased capability and capacity for outcome/impact monitoring, for example by introduction of a small number of evaluation methods into its standard operations.~~The rate or breadth of change is slightly greater than would have been achieved without the RCA.~~
Adequate	The magnitude, breadth or rate of delivery of impacts is slightly greater than would have been achieved without the RCA programme (or thematic area or project).The RCA programme (or thematic area or project) has made a modest contribution towards national social or economic outcomes, as shown by a change in the behaviour, activity, capacity and/or performance of at least one organisation, community and/or constituency in at least a quarter of participating GPs. The RCA has slightly increased capability and capacity for outcome/impact monitoring, for example by introduction of a small number of evaluation methods into its standard operations.~~The rate or breadth of change is slightly greater than would have been achieved without the RCA.~~
Inadequate	The magnitude, breadth or rate of delivery of impacts is not greater than would have been achieved without the RCA (or thematic area or project). The RCA programme (or thematic area or project) has contributed towards national social or economic outcomes in less than a quarter of participating GPs. The RCA has no increased capability and capacity for

서식 있음: 밑줄

서식 있음: 밑줄

서식 있음: 밑줄

	outcome/impact monitoring.~~The rate or breadth of change is not greater than would have been achieved without the RCA.~~
Insufficient Data	Insufficient data is available to measure outcomes or impacts.~~s.~~
POSSIBLE INFORMATION SOURCES	
1. Evaluation of socio-economic impact evaluations for thematic sectors, as in the report "Social and Economic Impact Assessment of the RCA Programme: Mutation Breeding Case Study" prepared for the TCPC Division in 2020. 2. Evaluation of material collected through Outcome ~~Mapping~~Harvesting, as was performed at the final coordination meeting of RAS7029 or as provided in updated templates for Project Reports from Final Review Meetings.~~.~~ ~~1.~~3. Comparison of Project Progress Assessment Reports to initially envisioned project outcomes defined in the LFM (previous work by the WG shows these will not be sufficient on their own). ~~2.~~ Focus group discussions or interviews among project participants. ~~3.~~4. ~~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 or 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	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 IMPLEMENTATIION	
1. Repeat Outcome Mapping exercise at final coordination meetings of other long-running topic areas.	

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	1. Stakeholders are aware of and value the outcomes and impacts delivered by the RCA Programme. 2. There is an increased capability and capacity within the RCA programme to evaluate the stakeholder perceptions.~~Baseline is known, and information is available to detect improvement (of any magnitude) against baseline.~~
SUMMARY OF WG DISCUSSIONS	
This is a measure of GPs perception of the 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,~~ Further, it is difficult to measure actual outcomes or impacts, so a good complementary measure is to determine GPs perception of potential impact. In addition, WG activities and discussions with NRs and TCPC has shown that evaluations of stakeholder perceptions are not routinely undertaken in RCA operations. Therefore, this assessment will not only evaluate the actual perceptions of stakeholders, but also measure improvement in the RCA's capacity and capability to make assessments of stakeholder perceptions.	
PERFORMANCE LEVEL DEFINITIONS	
Excellent	Multiple key RCA stakeholders in at least half of participating GPs consider that the RCA programme (or thematic area or project) has contributed to, or may generate, substantial and enduring regional-scale impacts, significantly more quickly and/or more broadly than provided by national programmes. The RCA has significantly increased capability and capacity for assessing stakeholder perceptions of its outcomes/impacts, for example by introduction of evaluation methods into its standard operations.
Very Good	At least one key RCA stakeholder in at least half of participating GPs considers that the RCA programme (or thematic area or project) has contributed to, or may generate, important regional-scale outcomes, significantly more quickly and/or more broadly than provided by national programmes. The RCA has significantly increased capability and capacity for assessing stakeholder perceptions of its outcomes/impacts, for example

서식 있음: 목록 단락, 번호 매기기 + 수준:1 + 번호 스타일: 1, 2, 3, … + 시작 번호: 1 + 맞춤: 왼쪽 + 맞춤 위치: 0 cm + 들여쓰기 위치: 0.63 cm

서식 있음: 글꼴: 기울임꼴 없음

	by introduction of evaluation methods into its standard operations.
Good	At least one key RCA stakeholder in at least a quarter of participating GPs considers that the RCA programme (or thematic area or project) has contributed to, or may generate, important national outcomes, slightly more quickly and/or more broadly than provided by national programmes. The RCA has slightly increased capability and capacity for assessing stakeholder perceptions of its outcomes/impacts, for example by introduction of evaluation methods into its standard operations.
Adequate	At least one key RCA stakeholder in at least a quarter of participating GPs considers that the RCA programme (or thematic area or project) has contributed to or may generate modest national outcomes, slightly more quickly and/or more broadly than provided by national programmes. The RCA has slightly increased capability and capacity for assessing stakeholder perceptions of its outcomes/impacts, for example by introduction of evaluation methods into its standard operations.
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. -The RCA has no increased capability and capacity for assessing stakeholder perceptions of its outcomes/impacts.
Insufficient Data	Insufficient data is available to make an assessment of partner impressions.
POSSIBLE INFORMATION SOURCES	
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	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.

서식 있음: 밑줄 없음

	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 IMPLEMENTATIION	
1. Design and implement perception survey of RCA stakeholders.	