



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
21 September 2011

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

Committee on Economic Cooperation and Integration

Sixth session

Geneva, 30 November - 2 December 2011

Item 4 of the provisional agenda

Biennial performance evaluation of the subprogramme for 2010-2011 and review of the work under the subprogramme after the 2005 ECE reform

Biennial performance evaluation of the subprogramme for 2010-2011

Note by the secretariat

I. Introduction

1. At its fifth session held in Geneva on 1-3 December 2010, the Committee on Economic Cooperation and Integration (CECI) noted the Biennial Evaluation Plan for the Sub-programme for 2010-2011, and welcomed the enhanced opportunity for the Committee and its Teams of Specialists to review, on a continuous basis, the contribution of individual activities and their clusters to the subprogramme's objectives.¹

2. The purpose of the biennial evaluation is to give an opportunity for the members of the Committee, its Teams of Specialists and networks of experts to review and reaffirm the relevance of CECI activities in view of the subprogramme's objectives. The outcome of this evaluation should contribute to defining future subprogramme priorities and the resultant distribution of resources.

3. The present note is intended to provide an informational basis for the performance evaluation to be carried out at the sixth session of CECI. It is based on the expected accomplishments, indicators of achievement and measurement methodology presented by the secretariat at the fifth session of CECI² and further modified as a result of discussions with the Program Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit of the secretariat. It reflects information collected by the secretariat on the basis of meeting records, the results of

¹ ECE/CECI/2010/2 para.62 p. 10.

² ECE/CECI/2010/CRP.2/Rev.1.

questionnaires distributed at various CECI events, and responses to the evaluation questionnaire approved by CECI at its fifth session.³

4. The secretariat received 75 responses to the evaluation questionnaire (a response rate of 6.7 percent) from 28 UNECE member countries and from anonymous respondents. In particular, responses were received from the following countries with economies in transition: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Moldova, Montenegro, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine and Uzbekistan, as well as from Turkey. Two responses were received from outside the UNECE region as a result of the activities of the UNECE Team of Specialists on Public-private Partnerships (Japan, Lebanon). 29 respondents represent the government sector (national government ministries or national government agencies). The majority of respondents who identified their membership in CECI teams and/or networks belong to the Team of Specialists on Public-private Partnerships (20), the Team of Specialists on Innovation and Competitiveness Policies (17), and the Team of Specialists on Intellectual Property (10).

5. The present note reflects information available as of 21 September 2011.

6. The secretariat expresses its appreciation to the members of CECI, its Teams of Specialists and networks of experts who participated in this information collection effort.

7. The logical framework on which the evaluation is based is replicated as Annex I to the present document. It is structured into the following four clusters:

- (a) Creating a supportive environment for innovative development (policies for innovation, innovative entrepreneurship, and the financing of innovation);
- (b) Facilitating the effective regulatory protection of intellectual property rights;
- (c) Promoting good practices in efficient public-private partnerships;
- (d) Capacity-building activities carried out in the above three clusters.

8. For each cluster, the logical framework specifies two expected accomplishments, which are assessed on the basis of several indicators of achievement. The remainder of this note presents the findings for the four clusters and adds some additional information on the work of CECI as a whole.

II. Cluster 1 "Creating a supportive environment for innovative development (policies for innovation, innovative entrepreneurship and the financing of innovation)"

9. The first expected accomplishment under this cluster is "increased knowledge of authorities of good practices and policy options facilitating innovative development and knowledge-driven competitiveness". It is assessed by two indicators: the number of policy recommendations and guidelines resulting from policy-oriented meetings, and the percent of questionnaire respondents who find these recommendations and guidelines useful.

10. The number of policy recommendations and guidelines has been counted as the number of synopses of good practices and policies and other policy recommendations produced under this thematic cluster and tabled at CECI annual sessions. At its fourth session on 1-3 December 2010, CECI considered the following two official documents under this thematic cluster: "Policy options for promoting innovation in the services sector"

³ The questionnaire is reproduced in Annex II.

(ECE/CECI/2010/5) and "Synopsis of good practices and policies to address financial and entrepreneurial challenges in high-growth innovative firms" (ECE/CECI/2010/6). In addition, CECI also discussed the "Main conclusions and recommendations of the Innovation Performance Review of Belarus" (ECE/CECI/2010/CRP.1). At its sixth session to be held on 30 November - 2 December 2011, the following official document will be tabled under this cluster: "Policy options to foster the financing and development of clean technologies" (ECE/CECI/2011/3). In addition, CECI will be discussing the main conclusions and recommendations of the Innovation Performance Review of Kazakhstan (to be made available as a conference room paper).

11. The questionnaire asked respondents to identify their areas of expertise and then what they considered to be the main added value of CECI activities in those areas. 45 percent of the respondents who identified the present cluster as their area of expertise cited the "quality and/or thematic coverage of policy-oriented normative documents (good practices, policy recommendations, etc.)" as among the main added value of CECI activities. In addition, 31 percent of the relevant respondents cited "Policy advisory services" as among the main added value. More generally, 71 percent of respondents considered the value added of the activities in the present cluster to be "high" or "unique/indispensable", and more than 97 percent considered it "significant" or higher.

12. The second expected accomplishment is "enhanced implementation of policy recommendations" developed under this cluster. It is assessed by the number of cases where countries have implemented policy recommendations or have taken practical steps to implement them.

13. The questionnaire included a corresponding question on what practical steps had been taken to take into consideration or follow CECI recommendations (question 2). Four respondents who self-identified as having expertise on the present cluster stated that CECI policy recommendations and good practices had been "incorporated in legislation or regulations or in proposed drafts of such". In addition to this most direct measure of policy implementation, almost all respondents indicated that some other steps had been undertaken to implement CECI recommendations, such as incorporating CECI recommendations into national policy documents or using them as guidelines in developing such documents; using them as a reference for good practice in reviewing working procedures of government agencies; disseminating them to stimulate and inform policy debate; or using them as a reference in internal policy discussions and seminars.

III. Cluster 2 "Facilitating the effective regulatory protection of intellectual property rights"

14. In parallel to the first cluster, the first expected accomplishment under this cluster is "increased knowledge of authorities of good practices and policy options facilitating the effective protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights". It is assessed by two indicators: the number of policy recommendations and guidelines resulting from policy-oriented meetings, and the percent of questionnaire respondents who find these recommendations and guidelines useful.

15. At its fourth session on 1-3 December 2010, CECI considered the following official document: "Synopsis of good practices and policy recommendations on the management of intellectual property in open innovation" (ECE/CECI/2010/7). At its sixth session to be held on 30 November - 2 December 2011, the following official document will be tabled under this cluster: "Synopsis of good practices and policy recommendations on raising awareness of the role of IPRs in innovation and the damages of IPR infringements" (ECE/CECI/2011/8).

16. 27 percent of the respondents who identified the present cluster as their area of expertise cited the "quality and/or thematic coverage of policy-oriented normative documents (good practices, policy recommendations, etc.)" as among the main added value of CECI activities. In addition, 18 percent of the relevant respondents cited "Policy advisory services" as among the main added value. More generally, 73 percent of respondents considered the value added of the activities in the present cluster to be "high" or "unique/indispensable", and more than 93 percent considered it "significant" or higher.

17. The second expected accomplishment is "enhanced implementation of policy recommendations" developed under this cluster. As in the first cluster, it is assessed by the number of cases where countries have implemented policy recommendations or have taken practical steps to implement them.

18. Four respondents who self-identified as having expertise on the present cluster stated that CECI policy recommendations and good practices had been "incorporated in legislation or regulations or in proposed drafts of such". In addition, almost all respondents indicated that some of the other steps listed in paragraph 12 had been undertaken to implement CECI recommendations.

IV. Cluster 3 "Promoting best practice in effective public-private partnerships"

19. The first expected accomplishment under this cluster is again "increased knowledge of authorities of good practices and policy options in promoting efficient public-private partnerships". As above, it is to be assessed by two indicators: the number of policy recommendations and guidelines resulting from policy-oriented meetings, and the percent of questionnaire respondents who find these recommendations and guidelines useful.

20. The main focus under this cluster during the current biennium was on delivering capacity building and policy advisory services and on further strengthening the network of experts, drawing mainly on the normative work carried out in the previous biennium. The UNECE Team of Specialists on Public-private Partnerships (TOS-PPP) advanced work on a "Comparative review of PPP legislation in the countries of Central Asia and other CIS countries", on guidelines in the area of procurement in PPPs, and on a revision of the "Guidebook of Promoting Good Governance in PPP" produced in 2008. The Team also undertook a survey and evaluation of the UNCITRAL model legislative provisions on PPPs and provided policy advice to the government of the Kyrgyz Republic on the occasion of a PPP familiarization visit.

21. 48 percent of the respondents who identified the present cluster as their area of expertise cited the "quality and/or thematic coverage of policy-oriented normative documents (good practices, policy recommendations, etc.)" as among the main added value of CECI activities. In addition, 39 percent of the relevant respondents cited "Policy advisory services" as among the main added value. More generally, 70 percent of respondents considered the value added of the activities in the present cluster to be "high" or "unique/indispensable", and 95 percent considered it "significant" or higher.

22. The second expected accomplishment is again "enhanced implementation of policy recommendations" developed under this cluster and it is assessed by the number of cases where countries have implemented policy recommendations or have taken practical steps to implement them.

23. Ten respondents who self-identified as having expertise on the present cluster stated that CECI policy recommendations and good practices had been "incorporated in legislation or regulations or in proposed drafts of such". In addition, almost all respondents

indicated that some of the other steps listed in paragraph 12 had been undertaken to implement CECI recommendations.

V. Cluster 4 "Capacity-building activities carried out within the three clusters above"

24. The first expected accomplishment under this cluster is "Strengthened national capacity in countries with economies in transition to implement CECI policy recommendations". It is assessed by the percent of participants finding the capacity-building activities useful for their work.

25. 53 percent of respondents listed capacity building as among the main added value of CECI activities. This is the second highest-rated answer after "networking opportunities" (79 percent). Moreover, 45 percent also considered the materials produced by, and used in CECI capacity building activities as a main added value. In addition to the general evaluation questionnaire, separate questionnaires were distributed at a number of CECI capacity-building events to collect participant feedback. Generally between 77 and 100 percent of respondents rated these events as "good" or "excellent".

26. The second expected accomplishment under this cluster is "Improved national policymaking as a result of capacity-building and training in these areas". It is assessed by the number of country-level follow-up activities resulting from training and capacity-building activities.

27. The most frequent type of follow-on activity was that CECI capacity-building activities had resulted in materials provided by CECI being used or adapted for use in follow-on national training/capacity-building activities. 25 respondents (one third of the total) gave this answer. 23 respondents stated that participants in CECI training or capacity-building activities had disseminated new knowledge and lessons learned to peers and staff under their supervision, followed by new forms of cooperation to further improve capacities which have been initiated as a result of contacts established and insights gained at CECI activities (20 respondents). 18 respondents stated that reviews of operating procedures, rules, regulations, mandates or legislation have been initiated as a result of insights gained at CECI activities.

VI. Further findings from the evaluation questionnaire

28. In addition to questions about the usefulness of CECI publications, the implementation of policy recommendations, the follow-up to capacity-building activities, and the added value of various CECI activities, the questionnaire provided room for members of CECI, its Teams and networks of experts to provide suggestions on how to further improve the impact of CECI's work. Many of these centered on improving dissemination of CECI's work (including through newsletters and electronic means, by involving national and regional agencies, and by ensuring availability of material in Russian); on intensifying cooperation with national authorities, local authorities, NGOs, and multilateral organizations; on which topics to pursue and how to identify them (including by further strengthening the involvement of Team and network members in the selection of topics), on the nature of the content to be provided (more practical examples, also negative examples) and ways to ensure quality and sustainable impact. Many comments also called for continuing or expanding existing activities, both on policy advice and capacity building.

Annex I

Logical Framework Of The 2010-2011 Biannual Evaluation

<i>No.</i>	<i>Cluster</i>	<i>Expected accomplishments</i>	<i>Indicators of achievement</i>
1	Creating a supportive environment for innovative development (policies for innovation, innovative entrepreneurship, financing innovation)	<p>A. Increased knowledge of authorities of good practices and policy options facilitating innovative development and innovation-driven competitiveness</p> <p>B. Enhanced implementation of UNECE policy recommendations</p>	<p>(a) The number of policy recommendations and guidelines resulting from policy-oriented meetings held under the auspices of the UNECE Team of Specialists on Innovation and Competitiveness Policies, the networks of experts on entrepreneurship and enterprise development and on financing innovation</p> <p>(b) Per cent of respondents finding these documents useful</p> <p>(a) The number of cases where countries have implemented policy recommendations or have taken practical steps to implement them</p>
2	Facilitating the effective regulatory protection of intellectual property rights	<p>A. Increased knowledge of authorities of good practices and policy options facilitating the effective protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights</p> <p>B. Enhanced implementation of policy recommendations</p>	<p>(a) The number of policy recommendations and guidelines resulting from policy-oriented meetings held by the UNECE Team of Specialists on Intellectual Property</p> <p>(b) Per cent of respondents finding these documents useful</p> <p>(a) The number of cases where countries have implemented policy recommendations or have taken practical steps to implement them</p>
3	Promoting best practice in efficient public-private partnerships	<p>A. Increased knowledge of authorities of good practices and policy options in promoting efficient public-private partnerships</p> <p>B. Enhanced implementation of policy recommendations</p>	<p>(a) The number of policy recommendations and guidelines resulting from policy-oriented meetings of the UNECE Team of Specialists on Public-private Partnerships</p> <p>(b) Per cent of respondents finding these documents useful</p> <p>(a) The number of cases where countries have implemented policy recommendations or have taken practical steps to implement them</p>
4	Capacity-building activities carried out within the three clusters above	<p>A. Strengthened national capacity in countries with economies in transition to implement CECI policy recommendations</p> <p>B. Improved national policymaking as a result of capacity-building and training in these areas</p>	<p>(a) Per cent of participants finding the capacity-building activities useful for their work</p> <p>(a) Number of country-level follow-up activities resulting from training and capacity-building activities</p>

Annex II

Evaluation Questionnaire

The mandate of the UNECE Committee on Economic Cooperation and Integration (CECI) is to promote a policy, financial and regulatory environment conducive to economic growth, innovative development and higher competitiveness in the region of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, focusing mainly on countries with economies in transition.

The UNECE secretariat would be grateful if you could take a few minutes to complete this questionnaire. Your comments will help CECI and its subsidiary bodies in evaluating their activities and improving them in the future.

Your responses will be treated confidentially

1. *The UNECE Committee on Economic Cooperation and Integration has produced a number of policy-oriented analytical publications (comparative reviews, innovation reviews, guidebooks – see list of publications in the Annex) in its areas of work.*

In your opinion, how useful are these publications as a basis for sharing knowledge and experience and for informing policy makers and policy debates among CECI stakeholders (please tick one box) ?

not useful at all of limited use moderately useful useful very useful no opinion

Please provide suggestions on how to make future publications (even) more useful:

2. *The UNECE Committee on Economic Cooperation and Integration (CECI) has adopted a number of policy-oriented normative documents (good practices, policy recommendations, etc). in its areas of work, i.e. on innovation and competitiveness policies, intellectual property commercialization and protection, fostering public-private partnerships, financing innovative development, and fostering entrepreneurship and small and medium-sized enterprises (see list of publications in the Annex). Based on these good practices and recommendations, CECI offers policy advisory services.*

To your knowledge, what practical steps, if any, have been taken in your country/ in countries with economies in transition to take into consideration or follow these recommendations/ as a result of policy advisory services?

Please tick boxes as appropriate (several answers possible):

CECI good practices and policy recommendations have been ...

- incorporated in legislation or regulations or in proposed drafts of such
- incorporated in national policy documents or used as guidelines in developing such documents
- used as a reference for good practice in reviewing working procedures of government agencies
- disseminated by the Government in the country to stimulate and inform policy debate
- used as reference in internal policy discussions and seminars
- other (please specify):

no opinion

Please provide suggestions on how to improve implementation (further) in the future:

3. *The UNECE Committee on Economic Cooperation and Integration is organizing capacity-building activities based on the normative work above.*

To your knowledge, what follow-up activities, if any, have been taken in your country/ in countries with economies in transition as a result of these capacity-building activities?

Please tick boxes as appropriate (several answers allowed):

- materials provided by CECI have been used or adapted for use in national training/capacity-building activities
- participants in CECI training or capacity-building activities have disseminated new knowledge and lessons learned to peers and staff under their supervision
- reviews of operating procedures, rules, regulations, mandates or legislation have been initiated as a result of insights gained at CECI activities
- new forms of cooperation to further improve capacities have been initiated as a result of contacts established and insights gained at CECI activities (such as systematic exchanges of information, twinning programmes, staff exchanges, participation in training or capacity-building programmes with or offered by other countries/institutions/organizations)
- other (please specify):

no opinion

Please provide suggestions on how to (further) improve sustainable impact in the future:

4. Which of the thematic areas of CECI is most closely related to your area of expertise? (*Several answers possible*)

-
- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Innovation and Competitiveness Policies</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Intellectual Property</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Public-Private Partnerships</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Financing Innovative Development</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Entrepreneurship and Enterprise Development</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Economic Cooperation and Integration in general</i> |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
-

5. In your area(s) of expertise, how would you rate the relevance and added value of CECI's work?

- none low significant high unique/ indispensable
 no opinion

(Please skip question 6 if you answered "none" or "no opinion")

6. In your opinion, what is the main added value of CECI activities for targeted beneficiaries in your area(s) of expertise? (*Several answers possible*)

- Opportunities for networking and exchanging policy experiences and lessons learned
- Quality and/or thematic coverage of publications, including comparative reviews, innovation reviews, guidebooks, etc.
- Quality and/or thematic coverage of policy-oriented normative documents (good practices, policy recommendations, etc.)
- Policy advisory services (e.g. Innovation Performance Reviews or national PPP readiness assessments in requesting countries)
- Capacity-building activities in requesting countries (such as policy-oriented conferences and seminars including both learning elements and elements of knowledge sharing).
- Capacity-building/ training materials and modules
- other (please specify):

- no opinion

7. In your opinion, how can the work of CECI and its Teams of Specialists and expert networks be improved in the future?

Please tell us about yourself:

I am a member of (please tick as appropriate):

-
- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Committee on Economic Cooperation and Integration | <input type="checkbox"/> Team of Specialists on Innovation and Competitiveness Policies | <input type="checkbox"/> Team of Specialists on Intellectual Property | <input type="checkbox"/> Team of Specialists on Public-Private Partnerships | <input type="checkbox"/> Network of Experts on Financing Innovative Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Network of Experts on Entrepreneurship and Enterprise Development |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
-

I represent (please tick as appropriate):

-
- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a national government ministry | <input type="checkbox"/> a national government agency | <input type="checkbox"/> the business community | <input type="checkbox"/> the academic community | <input type="checkbox"/> an international organization | <input type="checkbox"/> a mission to the United Nations Office at Geneva | <input type="checkbox"/> other (please specify: _____) |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|
-

I am from a country with economy in transition:

- Yes No

Personal contact information (optional, will be treated confidentially, if provided)

Name: _____

Affiliation: _____

Position/job title: _____

E-mail address: _____

Please return this questionnaire either by e-mail to ceci@unece.org or by fax to+ 41 22 917 0178.

*** THANK YOU FOR SHARING YOUR OPINIONS!***
