

**MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE RCA MEDIUM TERM STRATEGY FOR 2018-2023  
BY RCA PROGRAMME ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

As requested by the 48<sup>th</sup> RCAGCM, the RCA PAC carried out the Mid-Term Review of the RCA MTS for 2018-2023, according to the guidelines provided by the RCA MTSC. The report of the PAC is herewith submitted for the consideration of the 49<sup>th</sup> RCA GCM.

The report contains recommendations related to,

1. Future reviews of the RCA MTS
2. Preparation of the MTS for 2024-2029
3. Development of RCA Strategic Priorities for 2024-29 in the form of a Regional Programme Framework, similar to the strategic priorities developed for 2012-2017
4. Timely submission of high quality PPFs, NPC Progress Reports and PPARs
5. Reconsideration of allocation of resources across sectors
6. The allocation of EB funds for RCA Projects
7. Provision of EB funds and reporting in-kind contributions by RCA GPs

**Proposed Action**

Adoption of the report by the 49<sup>th</sup> RCA GCM subject to any revisions and a decision on the recommendations made

**RCA PROGRAMME ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)**

**REPORT ON THE MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE  
RCA MEDIUM TERM STRATEGY FOR 2018-2023**

**Submitted to the 49<sup>th</sup> RCA GCM**

**18<sup>th</sup> September 2020**

## Table of Contents

I. Introduction .....	1
II. Findings of the Mid-Term Review .....	1
1. Performance Indicator 1 - Ownership .....	1
2. Performance Indicator 2 – Programme Soundness .....	4
3. Performance Indicator 3 – Programme Sustainability .....	7
4. Performance Indicator 4 – Programme Impact .....	9
III Conclusions.....	10
IV Recommendations.....	11
Annex 1 Sources of Information.....	13
Annex 2 Performance Indicators of the RCA MTS for 2018-2023.....	15
Annex 3 Comparison of the Baseline and the Mid-Term Reviews .....	16
Annex 4 RCA Strategic Documents .....	26

## **RCA PROGRAMME ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)**

### **REPORT ON THE MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE RCA MEDIUM TERM STRATEGY**

#### **I. Introduction**

The 48<sup>th</sup> RCA GCM held in 2019 requested the RCA Programme Advisory Committee (PAC) to carry out the mid-term review of the RCA Medium Term Strategy for 2018-2023 (MTS) and present the findings to the 49<sup>th</sup> RCA GCM. This report is submitted in pursuant of this decision of the 48<sup>th</sup> RCA GCM.

The purpose of this review is to undertake a systematic evaluation of the RCA's performance against agreed indicators and performance levels for the period of 2018 to 2020, and to identify the ways and means of improving the RCA Programme in the future years. It is submitted for the information and necessary actions of the National RCA Representatives.

The mid-term review was carried out by PAC according to the guidelines provided by the Working Group on RCA Medium Term Strategy Coordination (MTSC). The guidelines contain target criteria for assessment of the achievement of each of the Performance Indicators and the definitions of performance levels.

Section II of this report contains the findings of the review, Section III the Conclusions and Section IV the Recommendations of PAC.

The sources of information used are given in Annex 1 and the Performance Indicators of the MTS in Annex 2. The MTSC had carried out a baseline review according to the guidelines it had prepared and a comparison between the baseline review and the mid-term review is given in Annex 3. Annex 4 contains information on past RCA strategic documents.

#### **II. Findings of the Mid-Term Review**

##### **1. Performance Indicator 1 - Ownership**

###### **1.1 Degree of GPs commitment to RCA Governance**

###### **Target Criteria**

1. All the GPs deposit Instruments of Acceptance for the 2017 RCA
1. No GPs absent for 2 subsequent NR meetings

### Achievement

1. As of April 2020, 18 GPs out of 22 or 81.8 % of the GPs had deposited the Instruments of Acceptance of the Regional Cooperative Agreement of 2017. 15 GPs deposited their Instruments of Acceptance in 2017 and 3 GPs in 2018/19.
2. 3 GPs (13.6%) did not attend two subsequent NR meetings (Meetings held in 2018-2020)

### Time Periods Considered

1. Up to April 2020, when the latest report on the status was available
2. The period of the review (2018-2020)

### Achieved Performance Level

1. Very Good
2. Good

### Comment

The percentage of GPs that have established the necessary internal organizations including appointment of National Thematic Sector Coordinators (GOR Section 1.1 (h)) and the percentage of NRs who hold consultations with NPCs prior to NRMs and GCMs (GOR Section 1.1 (r)) also could have been used as indicators. Evaluation would have to depend on the information provided by the GPs.

## **1.2 Degree of GPs' commitment to implementation of their allotted portions of the RCA Projects**

### Target Criteria

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.

### Time Periods Considered

1. 2018-2019. Data for 2020 will be available at the end of the year.
2. 2019 – A sample year for which data was available
3. 2018-2019. Data for 2020 will be available at the end of the year.
4. Not evaluated

### Achievement

1. The Work Plans of 13 RCA Projects for 2018 and 2019 and the events implemented during this period given in the RCA Annual Reports were compared. The totals of planned and implemented events in 2018 and 2019 are given in the table below

Regional Training Courses		Meetings and Workshops		Expert Missions	
Planned	Held	Planned	Held	Planned	Held
21	27	41	34	32	25

2. Submission of PPARs  
12 out of 22 LCCs (54.5%) submitted PPARs on time.
3. Participation of NPCs at Project Meetings  
The participation of NPCs in the 22 Project Meetings held in 2018 and 2019 under 12 RCA projects varied from 52.4% to 95.0%. The overall average (the total number that participated in all the meetings as a percentage of the total number of participants if all participating GPs were represented at all the meetings) was 82.7%.
4. Not evaluated in the baseline review due to lack of data

### Achieved Performance Level

1. RTCs (Excellent), Meetings, Workshops and Expert Missions (Very Good).
2. Adequate
3. Very Good (based on average participation in all Meetings)
4. Not evaluated

### Comment

The Target Criteria in the MTSC Guidelines refer to “percentage of project reports submitted by GPs” while the Quantitative Result is based on the PPARs which are submitted by LCCs. The achievement given in this report is based on the percentage of LCCs who submitted PPARs on time rather than on the GPs who submitted their individual progress reports.

Mismatches between the Work Plans of the projects given in PCMF and the activities reported in the RCA Annual Reports were observed. It is not clear whether it was due to the revision of the Work Plans of the project during the implementation stage or due to incorrect data. If any revisions to the Work Plans are to be made during the implementation stage, it should be done according to an agreed procedure and with a good justification, since arbitrary revision of the Work Plans could affect the achievement of outputs and the outcomes of the projects.

The percentage of GPs that have established National Work Plans and National Project Teams for the projects they are participating in could also have been used as indicators.

### **1.3 Efforts made by GPs to provide additional support to RCA programme through EB or IK contributions**

#### Target Criteria

1. Percentage of GPs making EB contributions
2. Percentage of GPs making IK contributions

#### Time Periods Considered

1. 2015-2019, the time period of baseline review and 2018-2019 the period of the MTR.
2. 2015-2019, the time period of baseline review and 2018-2019 the period of the MTR.

#### Achievement

1. 5 GPs provided Extra Budgetary contributions in 2018 and 4 in 2019.  
During the past five years (2015-2019), 1 GP provided EB contributions in all 5 years, 2 GPs provided EB contributions in 4 out of 5 years, 1 GP in 3 years, 2 GPs in 2 years and 2 GPs in 1 year. 14 GPs (63.6%) did not provide any EB contributions during the past 5 years.
2. 11 GPs provided information on their In-kind contributions in 2018 and all in 2019.  
11 GPs (50%), 8 GPs (36.4%), 11 GPs (50%), either did not report or provide in-kind contributions in 2016, 2017 and 2018 respectively. All GPs made in-kind contributions in 2015. Also, all GPs made in-kind contributions in 2019 as calculated by the Chair of the RCA PAC and RCARO according to agreed formulae.

#### Achieved Performance Level

1. Inadequate
2. Adequate (based on the average of 3 years)

## **2. Performance Indicator 2 – Programme Soundness**

### **2.1 The RCA programme is in full alignment with the MTS**

#### Target 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

#### Time Periods Considered

1. 2018-2019 (time period of the MTR) and 2020/21
2. Not evaluated.

#### Achievement

1. 100 % of the projects for 2018/19 and 2020/21 are aligned with MTS
2. Not evaluated due to lack of data on allocation of resources across strategic sectors (optimum proportions of resources had not been defined by the NRs. See the comment below )

#### Achieved Performance Level

1. Excellent
2. Not evaluated

#### Comment

The RCA Strategic Priorities should be more specific and better focused. Almost any project in RCA Thematic Sectors could be considered as aligned with Strategic Priorities if they are too broad.

Allocation of resources across sectors should be reconsidered. The allocation of resources should depend on the budgets of individual projects and allocation of funds to Thematic Sectors could result in some projects having excess funds and some projects not having sufficient funds.

### **2.2 Alignment of RCA projects to national programmes in all participating recipient GPs**

#### Target Criteria

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

#### Time Periods Considered

1. TC cycles 2018/2019 and 2022/23

#### Achievement

1. According to the information provided by the GPs in the prioritization forms for the TC cycle 2020/21, the alignment of the RCA Projects with the national priorities varied from 66.7% to 100%. (Average 88.9%). National priorities for TC cycle 2022/23 varied from 42.86 % to 100%. (Average 86.7%).

#### Achieved Performance Level

1. Very Good (based on the average)

#### Comment

The RCA GOR does not classify GPs as donors and recipients. All GPs are expected to benefit from their participation in RCA. It was noted that MTSC had classified GPs with CPFs as recipient GPs and had used the CPFs to determine alignment of RCA Projects with their national priorities. PAC used information provided by all GPs in the forms submitted for prioritization of RCA Projects to determine the alignment with national priorities.

### **2.3 Well-identified and defined project activities, outputs and outcomes**

#### Target criterion

Final Project Designs approved by NRs include high-quality LFMs, incorporating appropriate activities for HRD, TCDC and Resource Mobilization

#### Time Periods Considered

The TC programme for 2020/21 (developed during 2018-2019)

#### Achievement

The average ratings of the Quality Review carried out by the IAEA TC Division for Programme Support and Coordination (TCPC), for the seven RCA Projects approved for implementation in 2020/21, varied from 3.2 out of 5 (64%) to 4.8 out of 5 (96%) with an overall average of 4.1 out of 5 (82%).

#### Achieved Performance Level

Good

### **2.4 Well-identified and defined next-users and end-users for each Project, and their integration into the Project activities\***

#### Target criterion

Next- and/or end-users are identified for every GP in the Project Design documents and PPFs

#### Time Periods Considered

RCA Projects for 2020/21 (PPFs submitted in 2020)

#### Achievement

53 PPFs from 5 RCA Projects in the 2020/21 cycle (RAS5087, RS6096, RAS6097, RAS7037 and RAS9042) were reviewed. 44 PPFs (83%) contained information on the end-users. It was not possible to ascertain their roles in development and implementation of the projects.

#### Achieved Performance Level

Good (Based on the no. of GPs who had identified end-users)

#### Comment

End-users should be involved in project development and implementation and should be represented in the National Project Teams and should attend meetings and RTCs relevant to them.

### **3. Performance Indicator 3 – Programme Sustainability**

#### **3.1 Required financial resources available for the full implementation of the RCA activities**

##### Target criterion

Project designs identify at least 25% of budgeted components or activities as extra budgetary supported.

##### Time Periods Considered

TC cycles of 2018/19 and 2020/21

##### Achievement

Out of the 8 projects approved for implementation in the 2018/19 TC cycle 5 projects had EB components (RAS0082, RAS1022, RAS5081, RAS5084 and RA6093). The total EB funds are 14% of the total budget of the new projects. (Total budget is 3.63 million Euros and EB funds 0.516 million Euros). The percentage of projects with more than 25% EB funds is 25%.

Two new RCA Projects in the 2020/21 TC cycle have EB components of 65% (RAS0086) and 100 % (RAS9042). The other five projects do not have any EB funds. The total EB funds are 21% of the total budget of the new projects. (Total Budget is 2.88 million Euros and EB funds 0.6 million Euros). The percentage of projects with more than 25% EB funds is 29%.

### Achieved Performance Level

Inadequate (based on the percentage of projects with at least 25% EB funds)

### Comment

The EB funds as a percentage of the total budget in a given budget year could have been a better indicator.

The requirement that all RCA Projects should have a 25% EB component could be counter-productive. Assigning activities for implementation with EB funds that are not assured could result in those activities not being implemented affecting the outputs and the outcomes of the projects. Instead, one additional project could be identified to be implemented with EB funds if they become available. Funds for all the other projects should be from assured sources.

## **3.2 Required human resources available for the full implementation of the RCA activities**

### Target criteria

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.

### Time Periods Considered

Not evaluated

### Achievement

Not evaluated in the baseline review due to lack of data

### Achieved Performance Level

Not evaluated

## **3.3 Required physical resources, nuclear and associated infrastructure available for the full implementation of the RCA activities**

### Target criterion

RRUs or in-country facilities are available and used to meet the requirements of RCA Projects for every GP

### Time Periods Considered

2020/21 TC cycle

Achievement

1. 53 PPFs from 5 RCA Projects in the 2020/21 cycle (RAS5087, RS6096, RAS6097, RAS7037 and RAS9042) were reviewed. 12 PPFs (22%) did not contain information on the support that can be provided to other GPs in project implementation. The levels of support indicated in most PPFs were intermediate or basic and may not be adequate for implementation of the project activities.

Achieved Performance Level

1. Adequate (Based on the percentage of GPs (78%) that provided information on the support that can be provided to other GPs for project implementation)

Comment

The percentage of the planned regional activities that were conducted in the RCA GPs and the percentage of experts that were recruited from RCA GPs could have been better indicators. (Some activities may have to be conducted in non-RCA IAEA Member States if RCA GPs do not have necessary infrastructure. Similarly, Experts may have to be recruited from non-RCA MSs if the required expertise is not available in RCA GPs.)

It is also necessary to identify whether the GPs participating in a particular RCA project have the necessary infrastructure to implement their national work plans.

**4. Performance Indicator 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)**

Target criterion

Baseline is known, and information is available to detect improvement (of any magnitude) against baseline.

Time Periods Considered

Not evaluated

Achievement

Not evaluated in the baseline review due to lack of data

Achieved Performance Level

Not evaluated

**4.2 The RCA programme is 10 recognized as an effective partner contributing to achievement of socio-economic development and environmental protection for the region (in relation to SDGs)**

Target criterion

Baseline is known, and information is available to detect improvement (of any magnitude) against baseline.

Time Periods Considered

Not evaluated

Achievement

Not evaluated in the baseline review due to lack of data

Achieved Performance Level

Not evaluated

**III Conclusions**

1. The review showed that while the level of achievement of some of the aspects of the MTS was good, some required improvement.
2. Some of the PIs could not be evaluated due to lack of data.
3. The Guidelines prepared by MTSC were very detailed and thorough and made it possible for PAC to complete the Mid-Term Review within a reasonable time period. However, PAC noted that evaluation of some of the PIs were tedious and time consuming and not commensurate with their contribution to achieving the vision and mission of RCA.
4. PI 3.2 was not evaluated due to lack of data. Information related to these items should be reported by NPCs in their reports to LCCs and the LCCs should present a summary in their reports to the NRM. (IAEA PPARs do not cover these aspects). PAC has prepared a revised guideline for development, implementation and monitoring of RCA Projects, which cover these aspects.

5. PIs 4.1 and 4.2 were also not evaluated. However, they represent the final outcome of the RCA programme, and MTSC may consider focusing the future evaluations on these PIs. This would require the development of a detailed method of assessment (see recommendation 1)

#### **IV Recommendations**

1. Since the objective of the MTS should be to enable implementation of the RCA Programme in a manner that would maximize socio-economic benefits to the RCA GPs, the evaluation of the impacts and outcomes of the RCA projects would be a more appropriate way of assessing the successful implementation of the RCA MTS. In this regard the MTSC may look into the means of developing a methodology for evaluating achievement of PIs 4.1 and 4.2 . This review maybe carried out based on project areas (eg. Radiotherapy, Water Resources Development) rather than individual projects. The LCC reports that should be submitted within 6 months after the completion of projects according to 1.2.1 (g) of the GOR would be a useful source of information. The review period could be 3 TC cycles.
2. The need for a final assessment of the MTS on the same basis as the Mid Term Review should be decided after reviewing how the outcomes of the Baseline and Mid-Term Reviews could be used to improve the implementation of the RCA Programme.
3. In preparing the MTS for 2024-2029, the Working Group may take into consideration that the current RCA MTS is a revised and updated version of the RCA MTS for 2012-2017, which in turn is a revised and updated version of the MTS for 2006-2011.
4. The RCA Strategic Priorities for 2024-2029 should be better focused and more detailed similar to the Strategic Priorities for 2012-2017 and should be in the form of a Regional Programme Framework.
5. RCA NRs should ensure the PPFs and Progress Reports submitted by the NPCs are complete and accurate. The NRs of LCs should ensure the quality and accuracy of the PPARs submitted by the LCCs.
6. Allocation of resources across sectors should be reconsidered. The allocation of resources should depend on the work plans and budgets of individual projects and allocation of funds to Thematic Sectors could result in some projects having excess funds and some projects not having sufficient funds.
7. The requirement that all RCA Projects should have a 25% EB component could be counter-productive. Assigning activities for implementation with EB funds that are not assured could result in those activities not being implemented affecting the outputs and the outcomes of the

projects. Instead, one additional project could be identified to be implemented with EB funds if they become available. Funds for all the other projects should be from assured sources.

8. All GPs should consider providing at least nominal EB contributions to the RCA programme and annually report their in-kind contributions according to the simplified new format.

## **Sources of Information**

### **1.1 Degree of GPs commitment to RCA Governance**

- i. IAEA web site-  
[http://www-legacy.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Conventions/rca\\_status.pdf](http://www-legacy.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Conventions/rca_status.pdf)
- ii. Reports of Meetings of RCA NRs

### **1.2 Degree of GPs' commitment to implementation of their allotted portions of the RCA Projects**

- i. Work Plans of the selected projects
- ii. RCA Annual Reports
- iii. Information received from RCA Focal Person

### **1.3 Efforts made by GPs to provide additional support to RCA programme through EB or IK contributions**

- i. RCA Annual Reports

### **2.1 The RCA programme is in full alignment with the MTS**

RCA Projects for 2020/21 cycle, project Concepts for 2022/23 cycle and the priorities given in the RCA MTS for 2018-2023.

### **2.2 Alignment of RCA projects to national programmes in all participating recipient GPs**

Project prioritization forms for the 2022/23 cycle.

### **2.3 Well-identified and defined project activities, outputs and outcomes**

Quality review of the RCA Projects conducted by TCPC on 10 aspects covering compliance with TC Central Criterion, relevance, ownership, sustainability, problem analysis, log frame approach (results chain – outcome, outputs, activities), indicators and risk assessment.

### **2.4 Well-identified and defined next-users and end-users for each Project, and their integration into the Project activities**

Project Participation Forms (PPFs)

### **3.1 Required financial resources available for the full implementation of the RCA activities**

IAEA Programme Cycle Management Framework (PCMF)

**3.2 Required human resources available for the full implementation of the RCA activities**

Not evaluated

**3.3 Required physical resources, nuclear and associated infrastructure available for the full implementation of the RCA activities**

Project Participation Forms (PPFs)

**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)**

Not evaluated

**4.2 The RCA programme is recognized as an effective partner contributing to achievement of socio-economic development and environmental protection for the region (in relation to SDGs)**

Not evaluated

**Performance Indicators of the RCA MTS for 2018-2023**

Performance indicators and milestones will be utilized to assess performance in implementing the RCA MTS. These key performance indicators are designed to be measurable, either through the evaluation of the performance of the RCA or through feedback from key stakeholders. Where possible, progress against these indicators should be recorded in the RCA Annual Report and used for ongoing improvement.

**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 outcomes and beneficiaries
- 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 recognized as an effective partner contributing to achievement of socio-economic development and environmental protection for the region (in relation to SDGs)

**Comparison of the Baseline and the Mid-Term Reviews**

**Performance Indicator: Ownership**

**Title:** 1.1. Degree of GPs' commitment to RCA Governance

Target Criteria	Baseline Review		Mid Term Review	
	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level
1. All the GPs deposit Instruments of Acceptance for the 2017 RCA	1. Seventeen (77%) of GPs already deposited the Instruments of Acceptance of the 2017 RCA.	Good	18 GPs out of 22 or 81.8 % of the GPs had deposited the Instruments of Acceptance of the Regional Cooperative Agreement of 2017 up to April 2020. 15 GPs deposited their Instruments of Acceptance in 2017 and 3 GPs in 2018/19.	Very Good
2. No GPs absent for 2 subsequent NR meetings	2. Two countries (9%) are unrepresented two subsequent NR meetings.	Good	4 GPs (18%) did not attend two subsequent NR meetings (GCMs of 2018 and 2019)	Good

**Performance Indicator: Ownership**

**Title:** 1.2. Degree of GPs' commitment to implementation of their allotted portions of the RCA projects

Target Criteria	Baseline Review		Mid Term Review	
	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level
1. Percentage completion of planned project activities.	Project achievement rates of 85-100%.	Good	RTCs – planned 21, held 27. Meetings – Planned 41, held 34 Expert missions – Planned 32, implemented 25	RTCs (Excellent), Meetings, Workshops and Expert Missions (Very Good).
2. Percentage of relevant project reports submitted by GPs by specified deadlines.	60% of PPAR submitted on time	Good	12 out of 22 GPs (54.5%) submitted PPARs on time	Adequate
3. Percentage of NPCs or ANPCs that attend relevant project meetings.	35.3%-66.7% of NPC/ANPC participation rate at relevant project meetings (NPC/ANPC lists were sometimes incomplete).	Good	The participation of NPCs in the 22 meetings held in 2018 and 2019 under 12 RCA projects varied from 52.4% to 95.0%. The overall average (the total number that participated in all the meetings as a percentage of the total number of participants if all participating GPs were represented at all the meetings) was 82.7%.	Very Good (based on average participation in all Meetings)

Target Criteria	Baseline Review		Mid Term Review	
	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level
4.Nominations for RTCs are from members from National Project Teams.	NPT data not available.	Inadequate data	Not evaluated	Not evaluated

**Performance Indicator: Ownership**

**Title:** 1.3. Efforts made by GPs to provide additional support to RCA programme through EB or IK contributions

Target Criteria	Baseline Review		Mid Term Review	
	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level
1. Percentage of GPs making EB contributions	50-66% of GPs did not report, or reported zero IK contributions.	Inadequate	During the past five years (2015-2019), 1 GP provided EB contributions in all 5 years, 2 GPs provided EB contributions in 4 out of 5 years, 1 GP in 3 years, 2 GPs in 2 years and 2 GPs in 1 year. 14 GPs (63.6%) of the GPs did not provide any EB contributions during the past 5 years.	Inadequate
2. Percentage of GPs making IK contributions	40% of GPs made EB contributions during the last five years.	Inadequate	11 GPs (50%), 8 GPs (36.4%), 11 GPs (50%), either did not report or provide in-kind	Adequate (based on the average of 3 years)

			contributions in 2016, 2017 and 2018 respectively. All GPs made in-kind contributions in 2015 and 2019 as calculated by the Chair of the RCA PAC and RCARO according to agreed formulae.	
--	--	--	--	--

**Performance Indicator:** Programme Soundness

**Title:** 2.1. The RCA programme is in full alignment with the MTS

Target Criteria	Baseline Review		Mid Term Review	
	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level
1. There are no projects that are not aligned to the strategic priorities of the MTS	100% of the project designs are aligned to the MTS	Excellent	100% of the project designs are aligned to the MTS	Excellent
2. Resources are allotted across strategic sectors based on optimum proportions defined by the GPs	Not evaluated	Inadequate data	Not evaluated due to lack of data on allocation of resources across strategic sectors	Inadequate data

**Performance Indicator:** Programme Soundness

**Title:** 2.2. Alignment of RCA projects to national programmes in all participating recipient GPs

Target Criteria	Baseline Review		Mid Term Review	
	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level
1.For Recipient GPs: data indicates strong alignment between the RCA Projects/Programme and their respective CPFs.	100% of the RCA programme is aligned with national priorities of the developing GPs	Very Good	According to the information provided by the GPs in the prioritization forms for the TC cycle 2020/21, the alignment of the RCA Projects with the national priorities of developing countries varied from 66.7% to 100%. (Average 88.9%)  (This applies for all GPs)	Very Good (based on the average)
2.For Donor GPs: data indicates strong alignment between the RCA Projects/Programme and their respective national priorities/strategies	96% of the RCA programme is aligned with the national priorities of the developed GPs	Very Good		

**Performance Indicator:** Programme Soundness

**Title:** 2.3.Well-identified and defined project outcomes and beneficiaries

Target Criteria	Baseline Review		Mid Term Review	
	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level
1.Final Project Designs approved by NRs include high-quality LFMs, incorporating appropriate activities for HRD, TCDC and Resource Mobilisation	100% of approved project designs have well-identified and defined project activities, outputs, and outcomes	Excellent	Overall average assigned by the TC Quality Review of the RCA Projects was 82%	Good

**Performance Indicator:** Programme Soundness

**Title:** 2.4 Well-identified and defined next-users and end-users for each Project, and their integration into the Project activities

Target Criteria	Baseline Review		Mid Term Review	
	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level
1.Next- and/or end-users are identified for every GP in the Project Design documents and PPFs	Five of the seven (71%) 2020/21 project designs had specifically identified and named potential end-users or beneficiaries. All of the seven ongoing projects have specifically identified and named next-and/or end-users.	Good	53 PPFs from 5 RCA Projects in the 2020/21 cycle were reviewed. 44 PPARs (83%) contained information on the end-users.	Good (Based on the no. of GPs who had identified end-users)

	Overall percentage was 85%.			
--	-----------------------------	--	--	--

**Performance Indicator:** Programme Sustainability

**Title:** 3.1. Required financial resources available for the full implementation of the RCA activities

Target Criteria	Baseline Review		Mid Term Review	
	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level
1. Project designs identify at least 25% of budgeted components or activities as extra-budgetary supported.	25% of project designs contain at least 25% of budgeted components or activities as extra-budgetary supported.	Inadequate	Two new RCA Projects in the 2020/21 TC cycle have EB components of 65% (RAS0086) and 100 % (RAS9042). The other five projects do not have any EB funds. The total EB funds are 21% of the total budget of the new projects. The percentage of projects with more than 25% EB funds is 29%.	Inadequate (based on the percentage of projects with at least 25% EB funds)

**Performance Indicator:** Programme Sustainability

**Title:** 3.2. Required human resources available for the full implementation of the RCA activities

Target Criteria	Baseline Review		Mid Term Review	
	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level
1. Recipient GPs have identified their workforce requirements (e.g. NPC, ANPC, NPT) in PPFs.	Not available due to insufficient or incomplete data in PPFs and PPARs	Inadequate data	Not evaluated	Inadequate data
2. RTC participants are from NPTs.	Not available due to insufficient or incomplete data in PPFs and PPARs	Inadequate data	Not evaluated	Inadequate data
3. Knowledge is shared after attending RTCs as evidenced in PPAR.	Not available due to insufficient or incomplete data in PPFs and PPARs	Inadequate data	Not evaluated	Inadequate data

**Performance Indicator:** Programme Sustainability

**Title:** 3.3. Required physical resources, nuclear and associated infrastructure available for the full implementation of the RCA activities

Target Criteria	Baseline Review		Mid Term Review	
	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level
1. RRUs or in-country facilities are available and used to meet the requirements of RCA Projects for every GP	100% of RRUs or in-country facilities are available and used to meet the requirements of RCA Projects for every	Excellent	53 PPFs from 5 RCA Projects in the 2020/21 cycle were reviewed. 12 PPFs (22%) did not have information on the	Adequate (Based on the percentage of GPs (78%) that provided information on the support that can be

	GP (note limited sample size).		support that can be provided to other GPs in project implementation. The levels of support indicated in most GPs were intermediate or below, any may not be adequate for implementation of the project activities.	provided to other GPs for project implementation)
--	--------------------------------	--	--	---

**Performance Indicator:** Programme Impact

**Title:** 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)

Target Criteria	Baseline Review		Mid Term Review	
	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level
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)	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.	Insufficient data	Not evaluated	Insufficient data

**Performance Indicator:** Programme Impact

**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 Review		Mid Term Review	
	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level	Quantitative Result	Achieved Performance Level
Baseline is known, and information is available to detect improvement (of any magnitude) against baseline.	No data presently available.	Insufficient Data	Not evaluated	Insufficient data

**RCA Strategic Documents**

The first RCA Medium Term Strategy (MTS) was adopted in 2006 for the period 2006-2011 and was prepared by a Working Group comprising NRs of Australia (Dr. Ron Cameron-Chair), India (Dr. K. Raghuraman), Malaysia (Dr. N. Rashid) and New Zealand (Dr. Frank Bruhn). It contained RCA Vision and RCA Mission statements, RCA Core Values, RCA Strategic Directions and Performance Indicators. An Implementation Plan was also prepared <sup>(1)</sup>

The second MTS for the period 2012-2017 <sup>(2)</sup> adopted in 2009 was an updated version of the MTS for 2006-2011. It was prepared by a Working Group comprising representatives of Australia, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia and New Zealand and contained an implementation plan.

The RCA GPs also adopted a document titled, “RCA Strategic Priorities for 2012-2017” <sup>(3)</sup> in 2010, which was prepared by a group of experts in each Thematic Sector, based on information provided by GPs on their priorities, needs and capabilities in response to a survey. This document had been used to identify priority areas in the development of the RCA Programme in 2012-2017.

The current MTS for 2018-2023<sup>(4)</sup> was developed by the Working Group on Medium Term Strategy and contains inputs of the Working Group on Human Resources Development and the Working Group on Finance and Resource Mobilization.

**References**

1. RCA Medium Term Strategy for 2006-2011
2. RCA Medium Term Strategy for 2012-2017
3. RCA Strategic Priorities for 2012-2017
4. RCA Medium Term Strategy for 2018-2023