

THE EIGHTH MEETING OF THE WORKING GROUP ON RCA MTS COORDINATION

4-5 February 2021

Presentation on Mid-Term Review of
the RCA MTS for 2018-2023

Dr. Prinath Dias
RCA PAC Chair

Topics

- Background
- MTS Performance Indicators
- Target criteria and achievement levels of each PI
- Conclusions
- Recommendations

Background

- The 48th RCAGCM held in 2019 requested the RCA PAC carried out the Mid-Term Review of the RCA MTS for 2018-2023
- The proposed methodology of the review and the time frame was presented to the 7th Meeting of MTSC held in February 2020
- The Mid-Term review was carried out according to the guidelines provided by the RCA MTSC, which also carried out the baseline review
- The review was carried out through virtual meetings and email communications among PAC members.
- The report of the MTR of the MTS was submitted 49th RCA GCM.

Performance Indicators of the MTS

1. Ownership (3 indicators)
2. Programme Soundness (4 indicators)
3. Programme Sustainability (3 indicators)
4. Programme Impact (2 indicators)

Ownership

PI 1.1 - Degree of GPs' commitment to RCA Governance

Target Criteria and achieved performance level

1. Depositing instruments of acceptance for the 2017 RCA (18 GPs) - Very Good
2. Attendance of NR meetings (3 GPs did not attend 2 subsequent NR Meetings) - Good

Ownership

- **PI 1.1 - Degree of GPs' commitment to RCA Governance**
 - **Comments**
 - % of NRs who hold consultations with NPCs prior to NRMs and GCMs for more active participation at NR Meetings
 - % of GPs that have established the necessary internal organizations including appointment of National Thematic Sector Coordinators
- also could have been used as indicators.

Ownership

PI 1.2 - Degree of GPs' commitment to implementation of their allotted portions of the RCA Projects

Target Criteria and achieved performance level

1. Percentage completion of planned project activities.

Achievement - RTCs (Excellent), Meetings, Workshops and Expert Missions (Very Good).

2. Percentage of relevant project reports submitted by GPs by specified deadlines.

Achievement - 12 out of 22 LCCs (54.5%) submitted PPARs on time (Adequate)

Ownership

3. Percentage of NPCs or ANPCs that attend relevant project meetings.

Achievement – Overall average participation
87.2% (Very Good)

4. Nominations for RTCs are from members
from National Project Teams.

Not evaluation due to lack of data

Ownership

PI 1.2 - Degree of GPs' commitment to implementation of their allotted portions of the RCA Projects

- **Comments**

- Revision of approved work plans should be done according to an accepted procedure with a good justification
- A mechanism should be created to ensure participants of RTCs and Meetings are members of NPTs
- Possible additional evaluation criteria
 - The percentage of GPs that have established National Work Plans and National Project Teams for the projects they are participating in
 - The quality of the progress reports submitted and successful implementation of the National Work Plans

Ownership

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

Target Criteria and achievement

1. Percentage of GPs making EB contributions

Achievement - 5 GPs provided Extra Budgetary contributions in 2018 and 4 in 2019 (Inadequate)

2. Percentage of GPs making IK contributions

Achievement - 11 GPs provided information on their In-kind contributions in 2018 and all in 2019 (Adequate)

Ownership

- **PI 1.3 - Efforts made by GPs to provide additional support to RCA programme through EB or IK contributions**
- **Comment**
 - There is a need to increase EB contributions
 - All RCA GPs should be encouraged to contribute EB funds for the RCA programme
 - Availability of EB funds should be known at the time of designing projects for their effective utilization

Programme Soundness

PI 2.1 - The RCA programme is in full alignment with the MTS

Target Criteria and achievement

1. There are no projects that are not aligned to the strategic priorities of the MTS - 100 % of the projects for 2018/19 and 2020/21 are aligned with MTS
(Excellent)
2. Resources are allotted across strategic sectors based on optimum proportions defined by the GPs
Not evaluated due to lack of data

Programme Soundness

- **PI 2.1 - The RCA programme is in full alignment with the MTS**
- **Comments**
 - 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.
 - 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.

Programme Soundness

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

Programme Soundness

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

Achievement

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 – Very Good

Programme Soundness

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

Programme Soundness

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

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

Programme Soundness

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

- Target criterion and achievement
 - Next- and/or end-users are identified for every GP in the Project Design documents and PPFs
 - 53 PPFs from 5 RCA Projects in the 2020/21 cycle were reviewed. 44 PPFs (83%) contained information on the end-users

Achieved Performance Level - Good

Programme Soundness

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

- 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.

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.

Programme Sustainability

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

Achievement

- 2018/19 TC cycle - The percentage of projects with more than 25% EB funds is 25%.
- 2020/21 TC cycle -The percentage of projects with more than 25% EB funds is 29%.
- Achieved Performance Level -Inadequate

Programme Sustainability

- **3.1 Required financial resources available for the full implementation of the RCA activities**
- **Comments**
- 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.

Programme Sustainability

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

Target Criterion

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.

Programme Sustainability

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

Achievement

Not evaluated due to lack of data

Comment

All NRs should be aware of the need to appoint NPTs and to ensure RTC and Meeting participants are members of the NPT and the nominees are recommended by the NPCs.

Programme Sustainability

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

Programme Sustainability

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

Achievement

- 12 PPFs out of a sample of 53 from 5 RCA GPs (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

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

Programme Sustainability

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

Comments

- The number of GPs with necessary infrastructure to implement the projects they are participating in
 - 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 used as indicators.

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)

Achievement – Not assessed due to lack of data

4. Programme Impact

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

Achievement – Not assessed due to lack of data

Conclusions

- The review showed that while the level of achievement of some of the aspects of the MTS was good, some required improvement.
- 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.
- Achievement levels of most PIs matched well with the baseline review.

Conclusions

- PI 3.2 was not evaluated due to lack of data. Information related to this item 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).
- Pls 4.1 and 4.2 were not evaluated. However, they represent the final outcome of the RCA programme, and MTSC may consider focusing the future evaluations on these Pls.

Recommendations

- 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 MTSC may look into the means of developing a methodology for evaluating achievement of Pls 4.1 and 4.2 .
- 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.**

Recommendations

- The RCA Strategic Priorities for 2024-2029 should be better focused and more detailed and should be in the form of a Regional Programme Framework.
- 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.

Recommendations

- Allocation of resources across sectors should be reconsidered.
- The requirement that all RCA Projects should have a 25% EB component could be counter-productive.
- All GPs should consider providing at least nominal EB contributions to the RCA programme.

Thank you for your attention