



Project overview

Phase 1. Opportunity for funding evaluations of public interventions offered to public institutions – central and local -

Awareness and support to public managers

Phase 2. Tendering process for evaluation contracts award and Contracting –

Assistance – preparation of tender documents

Phase 3. Implementation of contracts –

Monitoring / Support to Central Evaluation Unit/ Support to beneficiaries

Selection criteria

- Spread between levels of government;
- As many institutions as possible involved;
- Different types of evaluation;
- Technical Quality of the intervention;
- Eligibility for financing;
- Priority of the institution.



The project figures

INSTITUTION TYPE	APPLICATIONS RECEIVED	EVALUATIONS PRESELECTED	EVALUATIONS CONTRACTED / FINALISED
Total	66	15	10
Central Government	18 (27%)	5 (33%)	4 (40%)
County Councils	22 (33%)	4 (27%)	2 (20%)
Local Councils	26 (40%)	6 (40%)	4 (40%)

The project figures

EVALUATION TYPE	EVALUATIONS PRESELECTED	EVALUATIONS CONTRACTED / FINALISED
Total	15	10
Ex Ante	8 (54%)	5 (50%)
Interim	4 (26%)	2 (20%)
Expost	3 (20%)	3 (30%)

Conclusions (1)

- A **better understanding of evaluation concept is found at central level** (than at local level)
- The evaluations performed within **EU/ WB programs** enhanced awareness, skills related to evaluation in public institutions
- A reduced number of tenderers
- Tenderers problems related to qualification requirements
- The sizes of the evaluations – 15 000 Euro – 80 000 Euro - reduced attractiveness to foreign evaluation companies
- There is interest and real need for skills development in public institutions



Conclusions (2)

- **Know how transfer** - ensured by the design of the project – a requirement in each contract
 - **Learning by doing**
 - **Hands on assistance**
 - **Collection of methodology**
 - **Involvement of stakeholders**
- Pilot evaluations - large variety of **methods and techniques**
- **Ownership - key element** for successful completion (process, results)
 - **Perceived benefits (more effective learning)**
 - **Terms of reference preparation**
 - **Involvement in the process**
 - **Understanding of the intervention subject of evaluation**



Conclusions (3)

- Clear stated **interest for development** from both sides
 - Operational staff of public institutions
 - Local consultants/ evaluators
- More **awareness needed** - utility/ evaluation potential benefits for decision makers
- **Evaluation capacity** - needs support for development
 - In parallel with demand development
 - Coordinated actions (CEU active role, evaluators associations, partnerships with foreign companies)

