



Final Evaluation

V4 Aid – United support for Millennium Development Goals

Non-State Actors and Local Authorities –

Public awareness and education for development in Europe, Ref. No.: DCI-
NSAED/2009/371

Evaluation report

Hana Bendova

Inka Pibilova

2 July 2014

Contents

1	Summary	3
2	Introduction	5
3	Project background	5
3.1	Development policies in the New Member States	5
3.2	Project description	5
3.3	Key project stakeholders	7
3.4	Consortium Members	8
4	Evaluation	9
4.1	Objectives of the evaluation	9
4.2	Evaluation Approach and Methodology	9
4.3	Data collection methods	10
4.4	Methodological limits	11
5	Findings	12
5.1	Relevance	12
5.2	Effectiveness/Impact	15
5.3	Efficiency	19
5.4.	Sustainability	20
5.5.	Overall	22
6	Conclusions	23
7	Recommendations	24
8	Lessons learnt	25
9	Attachments	27
9.1	Terms of Reference	27
9.2	Timeline	31
9.3	List of key informants	32
9.4	Sources reviewed	33
9.5	Evaluation matrix	35

1 Summary

In terms of **relevance**, the project has **well addressed the pre-existing conditions** of lack of information and exposure of V4 policy makers as well as journalists to the issue of development cooperation in LDCs, by **creating unique and authentic opportunities** for these stakeholders to personally discover and learn about the benefits, realities and needs for further development activity and national commitment to these. While closer V4 cooperation in the development sector appears to be currently irrelevant due to the differing levels of maturity of development cooperation in the V4 countries as well as current lack of V4 cooperation initiatives in political and economic sectors, **historical connections among the V4 countries are undeniable and can be constructively reflected in future project design and implementation** -group visits of V4 journalists, joint focus on V4 media, LDC visits of policy decision makers all provide grounds for opinion and experience sharing as well as gradual creation of networks of change agents.

Looking at **effectiveness and impact**, the project has suffered from **overly ambitious planning and including too many activities which diverted attention and resources from more in-depth and results-oriented approach**. Despite the fact the majority of the numeric result indicators have been fulfilled, the qualitative level has been less effective. Several components of the project have, however, proven highly effective and yielded significant outputs, such as direct and educational exposure of policy makers to the reality of LDCs as well providing the journalists with access to authentic experience in LDCs.

With regards to **efficiency**, the project was **managed rather well on a financial level** though resources allocated to the conferences organized were disproportionate to the low effectiveness of these outputs. The **overall management** of the project was significantly **weakened by lack of clarity on individual partners' responsibilities** (lead agency versus EJC), mutually **inefficient conflict management and different understanding of the V4 context**. Despite this, all activities foreseen were implemented.

Sustainability was identified mainly in terms of creating clear personal commitment of the majority of participating journalists and policy makers to further promoting national development cooperation and increased assistance to LDCs. The level of commitment is directly proportionate to invested efforts of implementing partners in long-term preparatory work, follow up and support provided to the target groups.

KEY LESSONS LEARNT
Differences in organizational systems and strengths of implementing partners need to be identified and dealt with - equal conditions, such as media officers present in all partner teams, must be ensured in the project planning and budget.
Narrowed down and more focused long term target-oriented approach is more effective. Too many activities planned divert attention and resources from adopting results oriented approach.
The logic of involving a western partner as a motivational tool for V4 media has proven invalid. Future cooperation with similar partners should reflect this finding. Foreign expertise may only present an added value when taking into account local context.
Paying attention to handover processes is crucial, especially when a proposal is developed by one person and another one actually implements the project.

SUMMARY OF KEY RECOMMENDATIONS	
All partners:	
Decrease the amount of planned activities and increase the depth and systematic follow up of activities implemented. (E.g. organize separate LDC visits of V4 journalists based on the type of media work they do, focus on pre-departure preparation of the journalists etc. Do not divert your attention from activities that have proven effective and lower the number of activities where you are unsure of potential results.	HIGH PRIORITY
Improve systems of partner communication – make sure that steering group meetings provide sufficient space for mutual success stories, strategies, lessons learnt and similar knowledge and experience focused topics	
Work with identified change agents (active journalists, committed policy and other relevant decision makers etc.) and provide them with maximum support or further capacity building (if perceived necessary).	
DemNet:	
For any future projects of similar nature, make sure to hire an experienced media officer, who will be able to fully focus on working with journalists and media decision makers as well as possible campaigns and other activities. Project coordinator position does not offer possible capacity to work on this with maximum effectiveness.	
All partners:	
Allocate funds for an in-depth national or V4 cross-cutting media analysis.	MEDIUM PRIORITY
Look into individual partner organizations capacities and define expectations as well priorities in learning and growth upon the onset of the project implementation. Reflect these in the project planning and allocate sufficient time and resources for potential capacity building or similar activities.	

2 Introduction

This is a final evaluation report of the project **V4 Aid – United support for Millennium Development Goals**, Ref. No.: DCI-NSAED/2009/371. The evaluation was carried out for learning, accountability and transparency purposes and covers the whole implementation period, all countries and all project components as per the application and logical framework.

The **objectives** of the final evaluation set by the Terms of Reference were the following:

- Assess progress made towards the achievement of results at the outcome and output levels
- Assess performance in terms of the relevance of results, sustainability, shared responsibility and accountability, appropriateness of design, and informed and timely action
- Identify lessons learned and provide recommendations for future initiatives

The evaluation report will be shared with the European Commission and all project partners. The evaluation report or its summary will be published on the project website.

3 Project background

3.1 Development policies in the New Member States

International development cooperation and development policies are a relatively new phenomenon in the New Member States (NMS). Though the situation in the four countries targeted by the V4 project does differ with respect to degree of development and maturity of the national development policies, but the common denominator is that development support to the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) remains low. Despite the project efforts, a significant gap still remains between the proclaimed objectives and the actual development aid programming. Geostrategic and commercial interests play a significant role in determining the final choice of the recipient country as well as the amount of development assistance allocated. Countries of the Eastern Partnership Initiative tend to be the main focal point of national ODA in the New Member States though poverty reduction was declared as the main priority in V4 national development strategy documents. However, a significant gap still remains between the proclaimed objectives and the actual development aid programming.

3.2 Project description

The implementation of the project **V4 Aid – United support for Millennium Development Goals**, Ref. No.: DCI-NSAED/2009/371 started in February 2011 and has received a non-cost extension approval from the donor. The end of implementation period was set for June 2014 (40 months). The project was implemented in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. The project partners included People In Need (PIN, Czech Republic, lead agency), Polish Humanitarian Organisation Foundation (Poland), Foundation for Development of Democratic Rights (DemNet, Hungary) Partners for Democratic Change Slovakia (PDCS, Slovakia), Slovak NGOs Platform (PMVRO, Slovakia) and the European Journalism Centre (EJC, Netherlands). The total budget was 1.109.369,- EUR (EC co-financing 90%).

Objectives, results, activities	Indicators
<p><u>Specific Objective:</u> To achieve a stronger focus on poverty reduction in the ODA policies of the Visegrad 4 countries.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The poverty focus is increasingly highlighted in the national ODA policies. - The proportion of the national ODA targeting LDCs is increased - Division of labour among V4 countries is initiated
<p><u>Result 1:</u> The decision makers in the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary and Slovakia are committed to jointly take active steps in the implementation of Visegrad countries' development cooperation strategies, in meeting international development targets and in the effective strengthening of poverty reduction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approx. 36 discussion papers and research papers published in 4 member states. (9 per country) - At least 40 relevant decision makers participated actively in the meetings on national and V4 level and through inputs to V4 policy journal. (CZE - 10, POL - 10, HU - 10, SK - 10) - 8 relevant decision makers participated in the joint field trip to LDC and consequently became active in the dialogue with NGDO representatives. (CZE - 2, POL - 2, HU - 2, SK - 2) - Approx. 1600 relevant decision makers targeted by articles and reports on development issues and V4 role in development cooperation published in bulletins in 4 member states. (CZE - 12 issues/330 decision makers, POL - 6 issues/700 decision makers, HU - 6 issues/470 decision makers, SK - 3 issues/100 decision makers) - At least 20 reports, articles on V4 development cooperation and its synergies published per year on V4 journal.
<p><u>Result 2:</u> Journalists from the Czech, Polish, Hungarian and Slovak media have sufficient capacities and assume their role as catalysts of national debate on Visegrad countries' commitments for poverty reduction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approx. 12 media decision makers participated in meeting and discussion on development coverage in their media which consequently resulted in some kind of cooperation and increased development coverage - At least 42 journalists from main media outlets in 4 member countries trained in capacity building seminar and through distance e-learning course (12 - seminar; 30 - E-learning) - At least 60 reports and articles produced and published or broadcasted as a result of capacity building seminar, grants for journalists, distance e-learning course. - Regular online channel for development issues on min. 1 of the biggest online news portals in Hungary. - 4 thematic supplements in major printed media produced in 2 member states providing space to the journalists to publish on development issues (CZE - 2, SK - 2). - Monthly editorial series published in at least 3 wide-circulation respected newspapers. (1 in at least 3 countries).
<p><u>Result 3:</u> The population of each V4 country is better informed on the development issues and national ODA policies and newly reflects the gained knowledge in their civic, consumer, political and other decisions and actions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public events target at least 55 000 citizens in 4 member countries, (CZE - 3 public events, POL - 3 public events, SK - 3 public events, HU - 2 public events / 5 000 citizens per event) - Approx. 6 500 000 citizens of 4 participating countries will be targeted by media outputs of capacity building seminar, grants for journalists, e-learning course, and by media campaigns (CZE - 2 000 000, POL - 2 000 000, HU - 1 000 000, SK - 500 000)

3.3 Key project stakeholders

Type	Organisation
Donor	EC / DG Devco, Czech Development Agency, other donors if applicable
Lead agency	People In Need (PIN, Czech Republic)
Project partners	Polish Humanitarian Organisation Foundation (Poland) Foundation for Development of Democratic Rights (DemNet, Hungary) Partners for Democratic Change Slovakia (PDCS, Slovakia) Slovak NGOs Platform (PMVRO, Slovakia) European Journalism Centre (EJC, Netherlands)
Target group	<p>Political decision makers – total of approx.. 1600 Min. outreach to government officials and politicians per member state: Members of national Parliaments - CZE (30), POL (460), HU (386), SK (20) Line ministries officials: CZE (150), POL (30), HU (30), SK (20) Ambassadors in the priority countries of the 4 NMS and other LDCs; and the representatives at the permanent missions at international organisations: CZE – (120), POL (15), HU (25), SK (10) Members of the European Parliament: CZE (20), POL (56), HU (20), SK (13) Political consultants and parliamentary experts: CZE (10), POL (10), HU (10), SK (37)</p> <hr/> <p>Journalists and media decision makers – total of approx.215 CZE – approx. 120 journalists from major Czech printed, electronic and broadcast media (4 nation-wide dailies, 5nation wide weeklies, 5 nation-wide and regional radio stations, 2 nation wide TV stations, 1 electronic media) POL – approx. 30 journalists from major Polish newspapers, radio and TV stations and web portals (6 nationwide dailies, 4 nation-wide weeklies, 6 nation-wide radio stations and local radio stations, 5 nation-wide TV stations, 1 web portal). HU – approx. 50 journalists from the major Hungarian media (printed, electronic, broadcast), both public and commercial (4 nation-wide dailies, 1 economic dailies, 3 nation-wide weeklies, 4 radio stations, 2 nation-wide TV stations) SK – approx.. 15 journalists of major printed, electronic and broadcast media (2 nation-wide dailies, 2 nation-wide weeklies, 2 nation-wide and regional radio stations, 1 nation-wide TV station, 1 electronic media)</p> <hr/> <p>The general public across the age, social and cultural spectra of society. Min. outreach per NMS: CZE (2 000 000), POL (2 000 000), HU (1 000 000), SK (500 000)</p>
Beneficiaries	EU citizens, citizens of developing countries, namely LDCs
Others	NGO/NGDOs, International Organisations and academic experts: CZE (100), POL (40), HU (100), SK (40)

3.4 Consortium Members

People In Need – lead implementing agency, Czech Republic

People in Need (PIN) is a Czech non-profit, non-governmental organization that implements humanitarian relief and long term development projects, educational programs, and human rights programs in crisis regions all over the world. In the Czech Republic and Slovakia, PIN runs social integration programs and provides informative and educational activities. People in Need is a member of Alliance 2015, Czech Forum for Development Cooperation (FoRS), EU Monitoring Centre (EUMC), Eurostep, CONCORD and VOICE.

PIN development awareness department Rozvojovka, the lead implementing body of the V4 project, focuses on raising public awareness about various development issues as well as about the global North and South relations via working with Czech media, organising and/or participating at a range of public events and producing online and printed materials.

Polish Humanitarian Action – implementing partner agency, Poland

The Polish Humanitarian Action (PAH) is a Polish non-governmental organisation which operates in Poland and other countries. PAH focuses on mainly crisis relief projects and promoting active involvement of the Polish society in global as well as domestic poverty alleviation initiatives.

Foundation for Development of Democratic Rights – implementing partner agency, Hungary

Foundation for Development of Democratic Rights (DemNet) is a Hungarian non-profit foundation operating mainly in Hungary and aiming to empower Hungarian civil society and promote civic participation and development cooperation via public advocacy.

Slovak Non-Governmental Development Organizations Platform – implementing partner agency, Slovakia

The Slovak Non-Governmental Development Organizations Platform (MVRO) is an interest group of legal entities, an umbrella organization of 31 non-governmental organizations in Slovakia (24 regular members and 7 observers) primarily active in the area of international development cooperation and humanitarian assistance. The NGDO Platform's role is to represent the common interests of its member organizations both at home and abroad, influence policy making in the area of development cooperation and raise public awareness about issues related to development assistance. MVRO was in charge of the overall coordination of project activities in Slovakia, communication with the lead agency and policy work.

Partners for Democratic Change Slovakia – implementing partner agency, Slovakia

Partners for Democratic Change Slovakia (PDCS) is a non-governmental organization providing professional training and facilitation services, consultancy and advisory services in areas of conflict resolution, support of dialogue in the society, citizen participation and civil society development in Slovakia and abroad. PDCS was reporting to MVRO in the implementation of this project and was focusing on media and e-learning related activities.

European Journalism Centre - implementing partner agency, Netherlands

European Journalism Centre is an independent, international, non-profit foundation, aiming to promote high quality journalism through professional training, particularly in a European context. Building on its extensive international network, the Centre operates as a facilitator and partner in a wide variety of journalism related projects. EJC terminated its participation in the project on November 11th 2012.

4 Evaluation

4.1 Objectives of the evaluation

The final evaluation was conducted for accountability, transparency and learning purposes. The evaluation covers the 39 months of the implementation period (till May 2014), all countries and all project components as per the application and logical framework with the exception of result 3 where it has been determined that the data available is insufficient to evaluate progress towards that result.

The **objectives** of the final evaluation are as per the TOR:

- To identify performance level, achievements and lessons learned.
- To assess relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability (as per OECD/DAC and DG DEVCO evaluation criteria) the project
- To provide project partners with recommendations, strategies and lessons learnt possible for the project continuation

4.2 Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The evaluation adopted evidence-based approach, supported by a range of mixed quantitative as well as qualitative methods. In order to found credibility of the evaluation findings and provide sufficient grounds to build conclusions and recommendations, information gathered was triangulated (verified from 2 or more sources) when possible. In evaluating outcomes of the various project training activities (workshops, online course, field workshops) all four levels of the Kirkpatrick Model were utilized to the extent possible: 1.Reaction, 2. Learning, 3. Behaviour, 4. Results. This approach aimed to study concrete outcomes and participants`actions following the training. Learning and utilisation of evaluation findings among all project partners were fostered through participatory approach – evaluation questions and sub-questions, methodological approach as well as the findings were offered for commentary to all project partners. The evaluation findings were discussed with the lead partner agency at an evaluation session in Prague and were offered for commentary or discussed via Skype with the rest of the implementing partners. The methodology applied was in line international evaluation standards and approaches, including the EC Project Cycle Management Manual and the Devco evaluation methodology, the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and guidelines and the IDEAS standards. The main evaluation and criteria were determined by Terms of Reference drawn by the contracting agency and attached to this report (see chapter 9.1.) The evaluation team has adjusted some of the evaluation questions in order to fully correspond to international evaluations standards and has further developed a list of sub-questions along with specified data collection methods. The complete evaluation matrix is attached to this report (see chapter 9.5.)

4.3 Data collection methods

Following data collection methods were applied in the period of field research from April 4th 2014 to May 20th 2014:

- Document/project outputs review of documents (development policy and national development aid/cooperation documents, key project outputs, reports, EC monitoring, statistics, surveys, attendance sheets, steering committee meeting minutes, policy and other background documents etc. Examples of art works exhibited, examples of video spots, media publications, discussion papers, follow up articles by participating journalists, data on media monitoring (online/ printed press) were also examined. Where possible, documents were stored in a dedicated folder of Google Drive, which was made accessible to the evaluators and the project partners. Indicators were summarized in an Excel sheet and filled in by project partners. A list of documents reviewed is attached to this evaluation report.
- Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders in each country were held. This also included members of project teams of implementing partners - project managers, policy and media coordinators. Furthermore, 2-5 participating journalists/decision makers per country (11 in total) were interviewed as well as 1- 2 policy decision makers per country (5 in total). Interviews were held with a number of other key stakeholders – media specialists, academics, representatives of governmental institutions such as donor agencies or national ministries, representatives of national NGO platforms, representatives of partner institutions. Instead of interviews, group discussions were held with project teams) if useful. Interview guidelines were created by the evaluation team. Interviews were held in person or by Skype/telephone phone and lasted from 30 minutes to up to two hours depending on the person/persons interviewed and their availability. Decision makers and journalists
- 2 on-line surveys were administered via google survey sites targeting a) regular recipients of materials produced by implementing partners and b) participants of the e-learning course. Focus was placed on effects and impacts of the project on these target groups, Kirkpatrick model was considered when designing the survey for the latter group.

The survey targeting e-learning participants was sent out to 38 training participants whose email contacts were provided by the project partners. The survey was active online for two weeks, one reminder was sent. Seven response were submitted.

The survey targeting material recipients was sent out to 132 material recipients whose email contacts were provided by project partners. The survey was active online for two weeks, one reminder was sent. Seventeen responses in total were submitted.

During the final phase in May – June 2014, obtained data were analysed, categorized and synthesized as per the evaluation criteria and questions. Additional data will be collected as and when necessary to obtain enough evidence. Preliminary findings, recommendations and lessons learnt were verified at a final workshop with the lead agency. The draft and the final report were provided to the project partners for comments.

4.4 Methodological limits

Following methodological limits have occurred:

- Due to the busy and often unpredictable schedule of policy makers and journalists, it was possible to interview fewer of these stakeholders than originally planned. This varied per country. However a representative sample was collected (11 journalist and 5 policy maker interviews in total).
- Language limitations have prevented the evaluation team from a more in-depth insight into the materials and publications published in Hungarian and Polish.
- Hungarian material/publication recipients were not included in the online survey as the contact list was not submitted by the Hungarian implementing partner.
- As email contacts were indispensable for administering the online survey, only a limited number of material recipients were included in the survey – mainly members of the national working groups – as the implementing partner organizations kept contact lists with physical addresses of the recipients in order to deliver the produced materials by post.
- Low response rate to both online surveys had further limited the possibility to build sufficient information basis in order to fully evaluate the e-learning component as well as the materials produced by implementing partners
- Media monitoring data provided was inconsistent in terms of the nature of data provided. While some partners were able to provide exact statistics for online published outputs in external media, other partners focused on data acquired from the organization`s website or Facebook or only had a list of media outputs available, without data about the readership or ratings of the outputs. Furthermore, it is impossible to distinguish which outputs are related to the V4 aid project as all project partners implement a range of development awareness related projects. It was therefore not possible to fully evaluate the further impact of the media outputs produced in the framework of the project.

5 Findings

5.1 Relevance

The extent to which the objectives of the development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donor's policies. The extent to which the project is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.

1. Was the Action coherent with national strategies and other programs in development awareness?

POLICY LEVEL

Despite the historical, economic and certain cultural similarities of the V4 countries, in the sphere of development cooperation, the degree of focus on, launching and implementation of development cooperation initiatives have differed significantly both prior to the project beginning as well as in the end of the project implementation.

In **Hungary**, there was no official national development cooperation strategy prior to the project beginning with the exception of a concept paper guiding the Hungarian Development Cooperation. The current Hungarian political leadership, controlling majority of parliamentary seats, does not view development assistance as a priority and the concept is only promoted by a few representatives of opposition parties as well as professionals involved in the non-profit development sector. The Hungarian NGDO platform is an unstable institution with a very weak mandate and does not have any official strategy when it comes to development awareness. In Hungary, despite the lack of coherent national strategies and other policy documents, the action was highly relevant precisely because of the lack of development cooperation agenda in the national strategies.

In **Poland**, the Act on Development Co-operation, which further defines the Polish policy in this area, was only approved in September 2011. Prior to this date the national development policy was guided by a strategy approved by the Council of Ministers in 2003. Despite the commitment of Polish government to contribute to the Millennium Development Goals, countries of Eastern Partnership have been identified as the priority areas for development assistance with LDCs only comprising 40 percent of the allocated budget. Many Polish NGOs mainly focus on their activities on the countries of Eastern Partnership and have been actively advocating for a continuation of the funding allocation. Advocacy efforts of the Polish NGO platform – the Zagranica group – reflects this trend. The action's focus on bringing greater attention to LDC countries in Poland was highly relevant in the context of Polish international commitment to contribute to poverty alleviation initiatives and quite relevant in the context of current national strategic documents

In **Slovakia**, countries of Eastern Partnership and Western Balkans have been the main point of focus in the national development strategy despite the openly proclaimed adherence to the Millennium Development Goals, specifically the poverty alleviation initiative. In 2011, to give one example, 60% of the bilateral ODA was allocated to EP and WB countries (this figure excludes micro-grants in the overall amount of approx. 370 000 EUR). The action's focus on promoting LDCs does not fully relate to this

priority, however, is highly relevant in the context of development awareness strategy, which is specifically mentioned in section VIII. of mid-term 2009-2013 Slovak ODA strategy.

The **Czech Republic** seems to be significantly ahead of the rest of the V4 countries in terms of the financial amounts allocated to development assistance as well as the level of maturity of its development strategy and focal points. However, trade, political as well as cultural relations still play quite a determining role in the choice of Czech priority intervention countries and at this point only 2 out of 5 priority countries in the Czech development strategy are classified as LDC. The Czech national strategy, however, includes public awareness and publicity as one of its priority initiatives and specifically seeks to engage in debates on development cooperation in the Czech Parliament. The action focus in raising development awareness among parliamentary members and promoting development cooperation is therefore fully in line with the national strategy.

In terms of result planning, none of the national strategies neither interviews with relevant stakeholders in this area have proven that closer **V4 cooperation** in the development sector is a desired goal. The diverse political, economic and cultural factors in the V4 countries do not constitute an environment where possible joint initiatives in international development cooperation are realistic – this both prior and post the project timeline. Countries where development assistance is more advanced, such as the Czech Republic, now look to form strategic partnerships and initiatives with Western European partners and show no interest in closer V4 cooperation, whereas the less advanced countries in terms of development assistance, such as Hungary, look to primarily strengthen their internal development strategy and initiatives. Result 1. of the project does not reflect current priorities of the national development strategies in the V4 countries.

MEDIA LEVEL

In terms of the media environment, the V4 sector share a lot more similarities than on the policy level. Low coverage and prioritization of development topics in national public and private media mainly resulted from lack of financial resources and consequent inability of interested journalists and reporters to gather authentic material about development topics. Interest in covering development topics existed both prior as well as post the project timeline but the lack of financial resources has forced decision makers to focus on domestic issues and resort to cutting staff and expanding the scope of coverage of the remaining reporters.

2. Were there proven logic interlinks between Overall objectives, Specific objectives, Results, Outcomes, Outputs, Activities and Inputs? Were they realistic and feasible?

POLICY LEVEL

The planned result 1. has proven as unrealistic and unfeasible in terms of creating commitment to joint V4 policy effort. Numerous other factors that influence the degree and intensity of joint V4 policy cooperation and are completely out of the possible scope of the project, have been mentioned by relevant interviewed stakeholders. The factors mentioned were e.g. overall economic situation, degree of V4 cooperation in other areas, close ties of national governments, possible joint embassies abroad and joint diplomatic and economic ventures.

MEDIA LEVEL

The role of media decision makers has been viewed differently by the journalists interviewed. Very frequently, the role of a proactive and resourceful journalist/reporter who is able to convince the editor and select and communicate the topic in a manner accessible and interesting to the general public. The workshop for decision makers has failed to attract attention of the key media decision makers in the country. The logic of inviting media decision makers to travel abroad and using a workshop designed by a Western media partner as a motivational tool has proved as unfeasible. Long-term, personal and perseverant manners of communication, with lower time demands such as informal social event invitations, personal meetings etc. have been suggested by interviewed journalists as well as media coordinators as more relevant and effective. The model of identifying potentially interested journalists (instead of media decision makers) and working with them directly on an in-depth basis has proven as significantly more effective in terms of outputs as well as in establishing long term relations.

3. Did the Action address real problems identified by target groups?

On media level, the action has closely addressed the main problem identified by target groups – that is lack of finances to travel and be able to collect original, authentic and relevant material for media presentation in the V4 context. All interviewed media representatives have strongly appreciated both journalist study trip as well as the concept of journalist grants and characterized it as unique and indispensable for continued quality coverage of development issues.

In terms of policy, representatives of national ministries/donor agencies as well as decision makers already involved in development assistance initiatives have confirmed the relevance and further necessity to build parliamentary support for this issue. In their view, parliament members` awareness about and direct exposure to functional examples of development assistance is indispensable in strengthening national development policies as well as increasing the amount of assistance provided to LDCs.

4. Did the strategy of the project`s implementation really address the problem?

The strategy of the project implementation has suffered from overt focus on implementing activities rather than adopting rather results-based approach and focusing on a more narrow, in-depth and long-term approach. While some of the individual activities have proved highly effective (policy decision makers trips to LDC, journalist study trips, journalist grants provided that prior preparation and support has been provided) other components did not reflect the real situation in the V4 policy and media context and have not led to any tangible results. This is namely the number of conferences realized in the framework of this project which have met rather lukewarm reactions on the side of the participants and which have, at the same time, consumed a lot of organisational effort as well as financial investment on the side of the implementing organizations. Similarly, the activity focused on media decision makers led to no tangible results as key decision makers are more likely to participate at local, non-formal events where personal contacts can be established. Effects of activities such as public events, festivals and exhibits were not studied in this evaluation.

5. Was the Action linked with other similar actions in the certain region/country?

In all four project countries, national NGDO platforms were involved in the project – mainly in the component of national working groups. The degree of involvement varied – Slovakian NGDO platform was an implementing partner in Slovakia, Hungarian NGDO platform has been quite unstable and therefore less active during the implementation period. In Poland and the Czech Republic, the national platforms hold a stable and strong position. While the action did not contradict any other initiatives, lack of information sharing and joint policy initiatives has at times been perceived by the Czech national platform FORS, with the example of gender analysis produced in the framework of the project, never having been discussed or shared with the platform's gender working group. Topics of expert analyses were also reported as not regularly shared in the second half of the project – this might, however, also been caused by staff change in FORS, where a relatively inexperienced policy officer took over. According to PIN, communication and information with the previous policy officers was ongoing and have the evidence to substantiate this statement. In Hungary, the platform representative was unavailable for an interview therefore it is impossible to present the platform's view of the action here. In Poland, Zagranica group was actively involved in the national working groups, other project information and materials were regularly shared as well.

5.2 Effectiveness/Impact

The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. / Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. In the case of V4 Aid, it is only possible to map short-term impacts as the project would be still implemented during the evaluation.

1. To what extent were the project activities fulfilled?

Project activities were achieved to full extent with the exception activity 2.1. Meeting with media decision makers where unclear division of responsibilities among the V4 implementing partners and EJC has resulted in a hurried selection of participants and limited presence of key media makers at the event. The idea of inviting media decision makers to travel to international workshops and motivating them by presence of a Western partner with media expertise has proved as dysfunctional in creating closer ties with the decision makers and setting the grounds for further cooperation.

2. To what extent were the outputs/outcomes/results/specific objective achieved?

Result 1.

All decision makers interviewed have expressed deep commitment to support and promote development assistance in the context of parliamentary work as well as in terms of their private initiatives. The direct experience of travelling to an LDC and coming in close contact with a wide range of development projects has proven as very instrumental in creating commitment. Three of the decision makers interviewed have had their own previous experience with development assistance in LDC. In their case, the project activities have served to further enhance their commitment to the issue, clarify differences between

humanitarian aid and development cooperation and strengthen their ability to serve as change agents within the respective national parliaments. In Hungary, the direct LDC experience of a decision maker, facilitated in the framework of this project, has led to the release of the first comprehensive International Development Cooperation Strategy Framework for 2014 – 2017, elaborated by The Department of International Development and Cooperation at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DIDC, MFA) and released in February 2014. The strategy along with certain concrete steps to start its implementation was approved by the Government in a decree on the 20th March. In Slovakia, the continued lobbying of MVRO in the framework of this project has secured the position of South Sudan on the list of countries receiving development assistance as opposed to the originally intended withdrawal of the country from the list. In Furthermore, thanks to the working groups and researches published in the bulletin, the Code of Conduct on Ethics and Responsibility was adopted by the members of the Slovakian NGDO Platform in April 2014. In the Czech Republic and Poland, no direct policy changes or creation of new policy documents, deriving from the action, have been observed.

No joint V4 initiatives neither a commitment to launching these has been observed. While certain personal linkages among the decision makers participating in the field trips were formed at times, they have not led to launching or supporting any joint V4 projects nor taking active joint steps in further cooperation. As described in the relevance section, this reflects the current state of affairs within the Visegrad group – it is unrealistic to expect that joint development initiatives could be launched when the main driving forces of possible cooperation – that is economic and political ties – are stagnant. This has been mentioned by an overwhelming majority of decision makers and governmental stakeholders interviewed. Joint V4 conferences have been evaluated as ineffective as well as inefficient and lacking constructive follow up by a majority of the decision makers interviewed.

RESULT 1	CZ	SL	HU	PL	Total	Degree of achievement
Approx. 36 discussion papers and research papers published in 4 member states. (9 per country)	13	9	Not submitted	9	31	Achieved per country
At least 40 relevant decision makers participated actively in the meetings on national and V4 level and through inputs to V4 policy journal. (CZE - 10, POL - 10, HU - 10, SK - 10)	22	14	Not submitted	35	71	Overachieved
At least 20 reports, articles on V4 development cooperation and its synergies published per year on V4 journal.	61	19	33	1	156 ¹	Overachieved
Approx. 1600 relevant decision makers targeted by articles and reports on development issues and V4 role in development cooperation published in bulletins in 4 member states.	Target: 300	Target: 100	Target: 470	Target: 700	1570	Overachieved
	Achieved 250	Achieved 300	Not submitted	Achieved 1299	1849 excluding Hungary	

¹ The total includes 42 articles published on the English version of the website

Result 2.

All interviewed stakeholders have agreed, that they have observed an increased coverage of development issues in the national media in recent years – something that the project media activities have certainly been part of. No baseline data nor media analysis is available, nevertheless, to determine neither the degree of this increase nor the effect that this may have had on the level of public awareness. The level of journalist involvement is directly proportional to the time and effort invested on the side of the implementing partner in personal capacitation and support provided. While all of the journalists involved in the project have already had a pre-existing interest and motivation to cover development subjects, the extent to which this pre-existing interest was nurtured via close contact, partner cooperation with the journalists and providing support where possible has been crucial in maintaining involvement and improving the journalist capacity and skills in reporting on development topics.

RESULT 2	CZ	SL	HU	PL	Total	Degree of achievement
Approx. 12 media decision makers participated in meeting and discussion on development coverage in their media	3	1	Not submitted	1	5	Not achieved excluding Hungary
At least 42 journalists from main media outlets in 4 member countries trained in capacity building seminar and through distance e-learning course (12 - seminar; 30 - E-learning)....	13	12	9	11	45	Overachieved
.....which resulted in at least 60 reports and articles produced and published or broadcasted	47	Not submitted	Not submitted	19	66	Achieved
Establishment of a regular online channel for development issues on min. 1 of the biggest online news portals in Hungary.	N/A	N/A	Achieved ²	N/A		Achieved
4 thematic supplements in major printed media produced in 2 member states providing space to the journalists to publish on development issues	5	2	N/A	N/A	7	Overachieved
Monthly editorial series published in at least 3 wide-circulation respected newspapers. (1 in at least 3 countries).	CZ: 3 media packages					Achieved
	SL: 3 media packages created and published at the website of the Platform, YouTube of the Platform and V4 Aid site. Two of them were published in the daily SME					
	HU:3 media packages					

² Seven online portals publish a series of articles with two major ones hir24.hu and metropol.hu publishing 8 and 4 articles respectively.

PL: 3 media packages

Result 3. – not subject of this evaluation**Specific objectives**

As mentioned previously, the degree of maturity of national ODA policies differs significantly across the V4 countries. In Poland, Czech Republic as well as Slovakia, **the countries of Eastern Partnership and Western Balkans remain to play a significant role in the national development initiatives.** This is due to the local political, historical and economic context – the mentioned V4 countries do build on their authentic economic transformation experience and see this as a unique value and advantage.

The Czech Republic has increased the volume of aid provided to Ethiopia (priority country of the Czech development aid programme) in 2011, and is considering further increase for 2012 and 2013. This has mainly resulted from the country's commitment to the EU27 target to channel at least 50% of EU collective ODA increase to Africa. The role of V4 Aid has been determined as supportive in this endeavour mainly in continual work in building political and media "spawn" (characterized as such by one of the interviewed stakeholders).

Poland declared it will **not be able to reach the target** of 0.15%-0.20% ODA/GNI to LDCs by 2010 (and onwards). Focus on the countries of Eastern Partnership in Polish development assistance remains high despite relatively active Africa support groups in the Polish parliament.

In **Slovakia**, no measures were taken nor are planned to contribute to the EU27 target to channel at least 50% of EU collective ODA increase to Africa, except recognizing South Sudan as a country with special humanitarian and development needs and leaving it on list of countries officially receiving Slovak development assistance, after heavy lobbying of Slovak NGDO platform - a step appreciated by Slovakian NGDO stakeholders but characterized as rather of a symbolic nature by the donor. Similarly as Poland, Slovakia declared **not being able to reach the target of 0.15%-0.20% ODA/GNI to LDCs by 2010** (and onwards). Kenya and Afghanistan remain priority countries (together with Moldova) in the new ODA strategy for 2014-2018 which all six project countries fall within the EP/WB territory.

In **Hungary**, the level of maturity of development assistance has been observed as by far the lowest both prior to the project beginning as well as post. Significant developments have been noted, **directly linked to the V4 Aid project activities**, specifically the decision makers' field trips - the release of the **first comprehensive International Development Cooperation Strategy Framework for 2014 – 2017**, further commented in section on Result 1. above. Though basically no international development assistance is reported from Hungary, this document may be considered as the foundation stone for such initiatives in the future.

Regional cooperation and coordination in development was not encouraged in the V4 countries as a result of this project. At this point, Visegrad initiative reportedly remains stagnant on the main economic and political levels (based on stakeholder interviews) which makes it virtually impossible to launch joint development assistance initiatives. Joint development initiatives in the V4 context are also viewed as irrelevant by a majority of interviewed stakeholders due to the differing national context and level of development assistance maturity.

3. What are the impacts of the Action (positive or negative)? Are they measurable?

Due to the timing of the evaluation, only short term possible impact was possible to study. The nature of the project goals and results as such requires a significantly longer period of time to show impact. The project has brought about an increase of political support towards development cooperation in LDCs. In all V4 national parliaments as a number of parliamentarians committed to support the topic has risen. An informal V4 network between the participating parliamentarians has been created but was inactive in the time the evaluation was conducted. In Poland, Czech Republic and Slovakia, the partner organizations have identified new partner journalists and have established grounds for future active cooperation. In the Czech Republic, further impact, in terms of accessing more diversified public, was possibly limited by omitting commercial media channels – a step criticized by a majority of journalists as well as policy makers interviewed. No negative impacts have been observed.

Possible longer term impact of the action could be measured via increase of national ODA contribution to LDCs. At the same time, it is unquestionable that essential changes in national ODA policies are a result of a combination of factors and any action similar to V4 Aid can only be viewed as contributing, not as the main driving force. In terms of media, it is impossible to measure any sort of longer term impact in the absence of baseline data – initial media analysis and public opinion polls.

5.3 Efficiency

A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.

1. To what extent has the project been efficiently implemented and managed?

Major obstacles were encountered during the implementation period which finally resulted in the termination of EJC participation in the project. Several factors have brought about this situation:

- Unclear division of partner responsibilities from the start of the project. Project proposal and steering committee meeting minutes provide vague information as to which partner is responsible for what particular overall activity or individual activity components. This is namely apparent in activities related to editorial series and the media decision makers' workshop. Steering committee meeting minutes explicitly state that the lead agency project coordinator is unclear and questions the division of responsibilities, yet, no clarifications were made.
- Unclear communication roles within EJC. Initial change of project coordinators within EJC, followed by the EJC media expert taking over most of the project communication with continuous yet intermittent communication of the EJC project coordinator led to confusion as to who the main contact person within EJC is.
- Initial staff turnover within Rozvojovka and possible loss of information during handover especially between the former Rozvojovka director (and author of the project proposal) and the new staff member in charge.
- Different expectations and understanding of the V4 media context and priorities on the side of EJC and the V4 implementing partners. Absence of common understanding and agreed focal

points/strategy has further contributed to the tense partner atmosphere experienced by the project partners.

- Lack of clarity on the eligibility of Project Syndicate, whose exclusive role in the production of editorial series was mentioned in the project proposal, approved by the donor, however, tender was required later in the implementation stage. Prior clarification on this matter should have been done at the proposal writing stage in order to avoid future discord. Still with regards to Project Syndicate – communication roles were again unclear. Direct communication of the lead agency with Project Syndicate was perceived as undermining partner trust by EJC. At the same time, temporary handover of communication with PS to PIN during EJC staff change is mentioned in the steering committee meeting minutes. Initial clarification of communication flows and channels could have prevented this.

2. Were the activities/objectives achieved on time, if not, why?

The implementing partners were able to smoothly adapt to the situation following the EJC termination of their involvement in the project, despite the significant delay in project activities caused by the delay of financial instalments due to unresolved tender issues. Bridging financial support of the lead agency has somewhat eased the situation as well as the willingness of the implementing partner organizations` staff to take on extra work to ensure all planned activities and outputs were achieved in the timeframe of the project.

3. Were the results of the Action achieved in appropriate time (timeframe of the Action) and through appropriate costs (budget of the Action)?

The results of the action were only achieved partially. This was, as already mentioned, mainly due to the unrealistic and unfeasible setting of project goals and results in the policy area and, in case of Hungary, to a certain extent lack of in-depth and ongoing cooperation with participating journalists. The reported low effect of the conferences organized in the framework of the project suggests a question whether the significant financial resources spent on organizing the conferences would have about brought about a greater effect if invested elsewhere, e.g. greater number of parliamentarians visiting LDCs or further investment in media related activities.

4. Were the costs spent efficiently?

Budget was respected when planning activity costs. Significant savings were achieved in the last year of the project which led to a two-month non-cost extension of project activities.

5.4. Sustainability

Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.

- 1. To what extent are the targeted policy makers likely to actively work in promoting and enforcing development assistance to LDCs beyond the scope of the project?**

All targeted policy makers who took part in the study trips to a selected LDC have stated a commitment to continually promote and enforce development assistance to LDCs on the parliamentarian as well as other possible grounds. Some of them have, however, expressed their concerns with regards to their real power to influence and change things in the difficult national political contexts and also pointed to the issue of electoral cycles and their possible short term presence in the parliament. Despite these worries, the clear personal commitment of the parliamentarians, either created or strengthened by their involvement in the project, is likely to continue in as well as past the timeframe of their political career. Specific examples of concrete possible support to the development assistance in the parliament were given, such as ensuring that national budgets do allocate financial sums to development initiatives, supporting further elaboration and continual existence of national development cooperation acts as well as providing information to their colleagues and initiating debate on related issues in the relevant parliamentarian committees.

2. Are the journalists involved in the project activities likely to continue covering development issues beyond the duration of the project?

Answers to this differ depending on the particular V4 country and the manner of working with the journalists as well as the particular activity that the journalists were involved in. In Poland where the implementing partner strongly focuses on long-term cooperation with individual journalists and also places emphasis on pre-departure preparatory activities, follow-up and continued contact with the journalists, the commitment of journalists to further cover development issues beyond the duration of the project and thus to further contribute to raising public development awareness is significantly higher than in e.g. in Hungary, where, most likely due to limited staff capacities and lack of media expertise of the implementing partner, participating journalists express their personal interest in further covering development issues but feel relatively discouraged from continuous cooperation with the implementing partner organization. In the Czech Republic and Slovakia, the participating journalists all expressed their intent to further cover development issues but seemed less determined to do so. Some of the topics mentioned by Slovakian and Czech journalists are not strictly related to development cooperation – political issues, national transformation, genocide etc. The degree of journalist motivation as well as level of interest in development issues seems to be directly proportional to the depth and time invested in working with them.

In terms of the e-learning course participants, five out of the seven respondents currently do not work in media, four of the respondents currently produce articles, reports, documentaries or other media outputs with the topic of international development cooperation (this includes one current NGO worker and a responded who produced internal materials for an unnamed organization) Four respondents have felt either neutral about applying the newly gained knowledge/skills in real professional life. Opening the course application criteria has encouraged generally motivated young professionals or students to take part but it is, at this point to what extent the participants are likely to continue covering development issues. Lack of systematic follow up, reported by some of the respondents, could have contributed to these findings.

3. Has the project succeeded in building the capacities of the participating partners to work with the target groups in the long term?

Capacitating participating partners was not a focus point of the project from the beginning. Potential learning and capacitation needs and priorities that the partners may have had in the beginning of the project were not fully expressed and not addressed in the course of the project implementation. Organisational learning was spontaneous and not reported by all project partners. Presence of an implementing partner with media expertise and specialization has not resulted in strengthening the V4 implementing partners' capacities in working with media. Given the partners' differing levels of capacity and/or approaches to working with media, more systematic and in-depth experience sharing in this sector would have been especially beneficial. Cases of information sharing in this respect are reported but are rather random and are not representative of the overall situation. Communication among partners both during steering committee meetings as well as regular ongoing project activities was limited mainly to administrative and financial issues and implementation of the activities in the timeframe given. No space for experience sharing or other forms of knowledge/capacity building was provided.

4. Are the results of the Action useful for other actions or actors in relevant field?

Increased parliamentary support to commitment to development assistance to LDCs benefits all non-governmental development organizations and equally enhances and complements the work of relevant national ministries and development governmental institutions such as the Czech Development Agency or SlovakAid. Both NGOs as well as national ministries are equally benefiting from increased media coverage of development issues and working towards increased public support of these initiatives via popularizing the role and contribution of the national V4 actors in achieving Millennium Development Goals. Furthermore, in Poland, one of the project outputs –YouTube Film - is planned to be used in Polish schools as a tool in global education classes.

5.5. Overall

1. What are the key strengths and weaknesses of the project?

The following key strengths were identified:

- Continued positive relationship building with the political stakeholders and successful work in creating awareness and commitment towards promoting development issues amongst parliamentary members. The project evidently contributed to an increase of political will within the national parliaments to support allocation of funds as well as taking other measures towards the improvement of national development cooperation activities. The creation of the national development strategy in Hungary, directly resulting from working with Hungarian parliamentarians, is a major success of the project.
- Creating ample opportunities for V4 journalists to report on development issues and, with the exception of Hungary, establishing grounds for continued cooperation and promotion of LDC related issues in the national media. This

- Swift adaptation of national V4 partners to the situation post EJC termination of participating on the project, supported by high staff motivation and willingness to take on extra work to the difficult partnership/implementation – highly successful journalist trip

The following key weaknesses of the project were identified:

- Lack of results oriented approach. The sheer volume of activities planned prevented the implementing partners from more systematic and in-depth approach, yielding concrete results. The planning of the project was overly ambitious from the get-go and focus of the action was rather scattered, lacking coherency.
- The above mentioned large number of activities, combined with insufficient staff capacity, in the case of Hungary, resulted in a frequent lack of follow up on the activities, participants and further coordination or capacity building throughout the project.
- Unclear division of partner responsibilities from the get go of the project and lack of clarity in communication roles, resulting in termination of one of the partners in the project implementation.
- Involving western European partner without prior clarifications on the V4 specific context or creating information grounds on the context via e.g. in-depth V4 media analysis.

2. Was there a synergy between the project and other initiatives on the national or international level?

Please see section 5.1., question 5 relating to the national level.

On international level, in the Czech Republic, the project has been identified as one of the contributors to the planning to join the International Aid Transparency Initiative, following the recent country's accession to OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC). Synergies in other countries on international level have not been directly observed.

6 Conclusions

Relevance

The project has well addressed the pre-existing conditions of lack of information and exposure of V4 policy makers as well as journalists to the issue of development cooperation in LDCs, by creating unique and authentic opportunities for these stakeholders to personally discover and learn about the benefits, realities and needs for further development activity and national commitment to these. Closer V4 cooperation in the development sector has, however, proven as currently irrelevant due to the differing levels of maturity of development cooperation in the V4 countries as well as current lack of V4 cooperation initiatives in the main driving political and economic sectors. National contexts of V4 countries are significantly different in terms of development cooperation – joint initiatives in this area on more than a rhetoric basis are, at this point, irrelevant to the priorities of development policy stakeholders in the countries. Membership in the European Union and institutions such as OECD DAC (Czech Republic) is reported as a priority and the countries focus their attention on initiatives deriving from these institutions. At the same time, the historical connections among the V4 countries are undeniable and can

be constructively reflected in project design and implementation – group visits of V4 journalists, joint focus on V4 media, LDC visits of policy decision makers all provide grounds for opinion and experience sharing as well as gradual creation of networks of change agents.

Effectiveness and impact

The overall planning of the project included too many activities and was overly ambitious. The volume of activities has prevented partners from more in-depth and long-term quality work focusing on deeper achievement of project results. Despite the fact the majority of the numeric result indicators have been fulfilled, the qualitative level has been less effective. Several components of the project, such as direct and educational exposure of policy makers to the reality of LDCs as well providing the journalists with access to authentic experience in LDCs have proven to yield outputs, proportionately to the degree of long term pre and post preparatory work and follow up. Targeting media decision makers in the manner planned by the project has not presented any contribution to the achievement of the relevant results and overall project aims.

Efficiency

On a financial level, the project was managed rather efficiently with the exception of the conferences organized, which have required extensive financial and staff time investment, disproportionate to the low effectiveness of these outputs. With regards to the overall management of the project, lack of clarity on EJC versus lead agency partner responsibilities, unclear communication roles, mutually inefficient conflict management and different understanding of the V4 context have seriously undermined timely implementation of several activities and led to the final termination of EJC involvement in the project. The remaining implementing partners` flexibility as well as their will to take on extra work load has secured final implementation of all activities foreseen with a two-month no-cost project extension, as a result of significant savings in the last year of the project.

Sustainability

Clear personal commitment to further promoting national development cooperation and increased assistance to LDCs is apparent in majority of the target group members, studied in this evaluation. National findings differ in the cases of participating journalists where level of commitment as well as expertise gained during the project is directly proportionate to invested efforts of implementing partners in long-term preparatory work and follow up. The project has, overall, led to an increase in pool of committed policy decision makers and journalists who are likely remain active past the project implementation period.

7 Recommendations

HIGH PRIORITY

All partners:

- Decrease the amount of planned activities and increase the depth and systematic follow up of activities implemented. (E.g. organize separate LDC visits of V4 journalists based on the type of

media work they do, focus on pre-departure preparation of the journalists etc.) If international conferences deemed necessary, limit their number as much as possible and actively involve national NGDO platforms which are the relevant partners for national ministries as well as other institutions and may further work with the conference outputs. Do not divert your attention from activities that have proven effective and lower the number of activities where you are unsure of potential results (e.g. random exhibitions, conferences, production of high volume of materials).

- Improve systems of partner communication – make sure that steering group meetings provide sufficient space for mutual success stories, strategies, lessons learnt and similar knowledge and experience focused topics. Do not underestimate the power of informal social gatherings in the framework of the meetings where participants continue to share their experience. This may be possible by adding an additional day to the meetings. Make sure that media officers as well as policy officers attend the meetings, the project can benefit tremendously from mutual experience sharing and joint discussions of these team members!
- Work with identified change agents (active journalists, committed policy and other relevant decision makers etc.) and provide them with maximum support or further capacity building (if perceived necessary). This may entail providing journalists with information about other grant or training opportunities, providing decision makers with relevant information on ongoing basis or upon request, promoting their participation in relevant policy events, continue regular formal as well as informal contact with them and other closely focused activities.

DemNet:

- For any future projects of similar nature, make sure to hire an experienced media officer, who will be able to fully focus on working with journalists and media decision makers as well as possible campaigns and other activities. Project coordinator position does not offer possible capacity to work on this with maximum effectiveness.

MEDIUM PRIORITY

All partners:

- Allocate funds for an in-depth national or V4 cross-cutting media analysis. This will be useful a) to provide an in-depth insight into the reality of V4 media for any potential partner coming from a different context and b) to serve as baseline data analysis.
- Look into individual partner organizations capacities and define expectations as well priorities in learning and growth upon the onset of the project implementation. Reflect these in the project planning and allocate sufficient time and resources for potential capacity building or similar activities.

8 Lessons learnt

- Differences in organizational systems and strengths of implementing partners need to be identified and dealt with - equal conditions, such as media officers present in all partner teams, must be ensured in the project planning and budget.
- Narrowed down and more focused long term target-oriented approach is more effective. Too many activities planned divert attention and resources from adopting results oriented approach.

- The logic of involving a western partner as a motivational tool for V4 media has proven invalid. Future cooperation with similar partners should reflect this finding. Ensuring common understanding of the local context and clear expectations is indispensable. Foreign expertise may only present an added value when taking into account local context.
- Pay attention to handover processes when they occur – this is especially crucial when a proposal is developed by one person and another one actually implements the project. Significant information may be lost or misunderstood.

9 Attachments

9.1 Terms of Reference

**Terms of Reference
for Final Evaluation of project
“V4Aid – United Support for MDG´s”
Contract
February 1, 2011 – May 31, 2014**

1. Introduction

V4 Aid is a public awareness and advocacy project that seeks to strengthen the role of Central European countries within the context of European development assistance and international politics. This project works to open public debate in regards to the problems of less developed countries and development cooperation. It aims to raise the awareness of global problems and the role that developmental assistance can play; while increasing the capacity of decision makers, media, and general public. Building the capacity of journalists, and enhancing their ability to cover developmental issues is seen as key component of the project. The multinational spirit of the project provides space for cooperation, sharing experiences and the exchange of best practices, among these new member states in the field of Official Development Assistance.

This 3-years long project is funded by the European Union and co-funded by the Czech and Slovak Ministries of Foreign Affairs.

The overall objective of this Action is to increase the potential and to improve the performance of Visegrad 4 countries in international cooperation and thus strengthen NMS' ODA contribution towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The specific objective is to achieve a greater focus on poverty within V4 national ODA policies by encouraging regional cooperation and coordination in development on various levels in Visegrad 4 countries.

In order to reach the objectives the project *V4 Aid* works towards three expected results:

Expected Results	Indicators
<p>Result 1: Decision makers in the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary and Slovakia are committed to jointly take active steps in the implementation of Visegrad countries' development cooperation strategies, in meeting international development targets and in the effective strengthening of poverty reduction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 36 discussion papers and research papers published in 4 member states. (9 per country) • 40 decision makers participated actively in the meetings on national and V4 level and through inputs to V4 policy journal. (CZE - 10, POL - 10, HU - 10, SK - 10) • 8 decision makers participated in the joint field trip to LDC (CZE - 2, POL - 2, HU - 2, SK - 2) • 160 relevant decision makers targeted by articles and reports on development issues

	<p>and V4 role in development cooperation published in bulletins in 4 member states. (CZE - 12 issues/330 decision makers, POL - 6 issues/700 decision makers, HU - 6 issues/470 decision makers, SK - 3 issues/100 decision makers)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 reports, articles on V4 development cooperation and its synergies published per year on V4 journal.
<p>Result 2: Journalists from the Czech, Polish, Hungarian and Slovak media assume their role as catalysts of national debate on Visegrad countries' commitments for poverty reduction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 media decision makers participated in meeting and discussion on development coverage in their media which consequently resulted in some kind of cooperation and increased development coverage • 42 journalists from main media outlets in 4 member countries trained in capacity building seminar and through distance e-learning course (12 - seminar; 30 - E-learning) • 60 reports and articles produced and published or broadcasted as a result of capacity building seminar, grants for journalists, distance e-learning course. • Regular online channel for development issues on min. 1 of the biggest online news portals in Hungary. • 4 thematic supplements in major printed media produced in 2 member states providing space to the journalists to publish on development issues (CZE - 2, SK - 2). • Monthly editorial series published in at least 3 wide-circulation respected newspapers. (1 in at least 3 countries).
<p>Result 3: The population of each V4 country is better informed on the development issues and national ODA policies and newly reflects the gained knowledge in their civic, consumer, political and other decisions and actions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public events target at least 55 000 citizens in 4 member countries. (CZE - 3 public events, POL - 3 public events, SK - 3 public events, HU - 2 public events / 5 000 citizens per event) • Approx. 6 500 000 citizens of 4 participating countries will be targeted by media outputs of capacity building seminar, grants for journalists, e-learning course, and by media campaigns (CZE - 2 000 000, POL - 2 000 000, HU - 1 000 000, SK - 500 000)

Main activities:

- Result 1 - targeting the decision makers: resource papers, meetings at national and V4 level, joint filed trip to an LDC, information bulletins
- Result 2 - targeting the journalists: meeting of media decision makers, capacity building seminar, e-learning course, grants for journalists, editorial series
- Result 3 - targeting the general public: national and joint competition, media campaign

Organizational structure:

Project V4 Aid is a joint initiative of European development organisations People in Need (Czech Republic), Polish Humanitarian Action (Poland), Foundation for Development of Democratic Rights (Hungary), the Partners for Democratic Change (Slovak Republic), Slovak NDGOs platform (Slovak Republic) and the European Journalism Centre (Netherlands).

As the lead agency, People in Need is responsible for the international coordination of the project which includes the submission of the financial and narrative reports to the European Commission and the overall project and financial management. The activities are implemented both on the national level in 4 Central European countries (Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary and Slovak Republic) and on the international level. Each of the countries is represented by national coordinator. The role of the European Journalism Centre is that of media expert. The consortium partners meet regularly twice a year at the Steering groups.

2. The Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

According to the EC contract an end-of-term evaluation has to be conducted. The purpose of the evaluation is to identify performance level, achievements and lessons learned. The evaluation should also determine possible strategies and recommendations for the project continuation. Moreover, the evaluation will have to provide insight in activities and results for target groups that have been involved during the reference period. Therefore, the evaluation report will be written for the EC (accountability purposes), for the partners in the consortium (for learning purposes) and other stakeholders (for transparency purposes).

The Consultant will:

- Assess progress made towards the achievement of results at the outcome and output levels
- Assess performance in terms of the relevance of results, sustainability, shared responsibility and accountability, appropriateness of design, and informed and timely action
- Identify lessons learned and provide recommendations for future initiatives

Evaluation questions:**Relevance**

- Was the Action coherent with national strategies and other programs in development awareness?
- Did the Action address real problems identified by target groups?
- Did the strategy of the project's implementation really address the problem?
- Was the Action linked with other similar actions in the certain region/country?

Efficiency:

- To what extent has the project been efficiently implemented and managed?
- Were the activities/objectives achieved on time, if not, why?
- Were the results of the Action achieved in appropriate time (timeframe of the Action) and through appropriate costs (budget of the Action)?
- Were the cost spend efficiently?

Effectiveness and impact:

- Were there proven logic interlinks between Overall objectives, Specific objectives, Results, Outcomes, Outputs, Activities and Inputs? Were they realistic and feasible?
- To what extent were the project activities fulfilled?
- To what extent were the outputs/outcomes/results/specific objective achieved?
- What are the impacts of the Action (positive or negative)? Are they measurable?

Sustainability

- Are the outputs produced within the project accessible to the target groups beyond the duration of the project?
- Has the project succeeded in building the capacities of the participating partners to work with the target groups in the long term?
- Are the journalists involved in the project activities involved actively in covering the development issues beyond the duration of the project?
- Are the results of the Action useful for other actions or actors in relevant field?

Overall

- What are the key strengths and weaknesses of the project?
- Was there a synergy between the project and other initiatives on the national or international level?

3. Methodology

The consultant will use a balanced mix of techniques and means of verification to answer the above mentioned questions. The consultant can make use of all the project materials, documents and EU reports, including EC monitoring mission report. Besides, the consultant should discuss these questions with the consortium members. Moreover the consultant will hold interviews with the key persons involved in the campaign. Other methods can be proposed by the consultant if found relevant and effective to provide necessary inputs.

4. Work plan and schedule

The consultant will conduct the evaluation according to the following work plan and time schedule:

Mid-March 2014 – Mid-May 2014	Evaluation period
2 nd half of March, 2014:	Interviews and orientation at PIN office, interviews with partners, collecting input from key persons
1 st half of April 2014	Draft evaluation report and evaluation seminar

May 25th , 2014

Final evaluation report

5. The Report structure

The contents of the report will be at minimum:

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Background information
- Scope and Methodology
- Findings with clear evidence
- Overall conclusions and recommendations

6. Selection of the consultant

According to EC rules and regulations, service contracts must be awarded by means of negotiated procedure, in which the leading agency (PIN) consults at least three service providers of its choice and negotiates the terms of the contract with one or more of them. The contract will be awarded to the tender offering best price / quality ratio in accordance with the principles of transparency and fair competition and taking care to avoid any conflict of interest. Additionally the evaluation will be carried out by a consultant who has a wide experience in evaluating development awareness/education projects, preferably in the New Member States region. The knowledge of English is required.

9.2 Timeline

Contract signing Initial desk study of materials Coordination and planning of field evaluation	March 14 th – March 31 st 2014
Field evaluation	April 2014
Online surveys Synthesis of materials and findings	May 2014
Draft evaluation content Evaluation seminar People In Need	May 26 th 2014
Drafting report Partner organization`s comments	June 2014
Final version submitted	July 2 nd 2014

9.3 List of key informants

Czech Republic

Michala Hozáková Traplová	Project coordinator, Rozvojovka, PIN
Kateřina Gabrielová	Director, Rozvojovka, PIN
Michaela Těšínová	Policy Officer, PIN
Tereza Hronová	Media Officer, Rozvojovka, PIN
Marie Zázvorková	Representative, Czech NGDO Platform FORS
Martin Náprstek	Deputy Director, Czech Development Agency
Roman Váňa	Member of the House of Representatives, Parliament of the Czech Republic
Jan Dražan	Journalist
Adam Hájek	Journalist
Šárka Pechová	Journalist, E-learning course participant

Slovakia

Andrea Girmanová	Project coordinator, MVRO
Lenka Němcová	Director, MVRO
Tigran Aleksanyan	Former project coordinator, MVRO
Katarína Bajžíková	Project coordinator, PDCS
Peter Hulényi	Director, Department of Humanitarian and Development Aid, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Slovakia
Beáta Lipovská	Representative, SlovakAid
Peter Ivanič	Director, Slovak Center for Communication and Development
Eva Horváthová	Member of the House of Representatives, Parliament of the Slovak Republic
Matúš Krčmárik	Journalist
Mária Martiniaková	Journalist

Hungary

Eva Bördös	Project coordinator, Demnet
Reka Mihaltz	Former project coordinator, Demnet
Peter Rohonyi	Policy Officer, Demnet
Katalin Ertsey	Member of the House of Representatives, Parliament of Hungary
Balazs Szent-Ivanyi	Adjunct Professor, Corvinus University
Zsuzsa Kozak	Director, Visual World Foundation, DemNet's partner in the project activity national art competition

Ferenc Varsanyi	Journalist
Bea Belicza	Journalist
Balint Fabok	Journalist
Andras Kosa	Journalist
Blanka Zoldi	Journalist, E-learning course participant

Poland

Marta Zdzieborska	Project coordinator, PAH
Olga Blumczynska	Media Officer, PAH
Izabela Stawicka	Communications and Campaigns Officer, PAH
Izabela Wilczynska	Policy Officer, PAH
Tadeusz Iwiński	Member of the House of Representatives, Parliament of the Republic of Poland
Killion Munyama	Member of the House of Representatives, Parliament of the Republic of Poland
Barbara Mrówka	Counsellor to the Minister Development Cooperation Department Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland
Janek Bazyl	Director, Grupa Zagranica, Polish NGDO Platform
Dominika Plonska	Journalist
Adrian Kubicki	Journalist

The Netherlands

Josh LaPorte	Project Executive, EJC
Marjan Tillmans	Project Manager, EJC

9.4 Sources reviewed

- Grant application
- Annual interim project reports
- Implementing partners websites
- Websites of national NGDO platforms
- V4 project website
- Steering group meeting minutes
- A range of policy related materials including:
 - Multiannual Development Cooperation Programme 2012-2015, Poland
 - Development Cooperation Strategy 2010-2017, Czech Republic
 - Midterm development cooperation strategy 2009-2013, Slovakia
 - Midterm development cooperation strategy 2014-2018, Slovakia
 - Government Decree regarding Hungary's International Development Cooperation policy

- strategy and Humanitarian Aid policy concept (2014-2020), Hungary
- Hungary Donor Profile 2013, EuropeAid
- Poland Donor Profile 2013, EuropeAid
- Czech Republic Donor Profile 2013, EuropeAid
- Slovakia Donor Profile 2013, EuropeAid

9.5 Evaluation matrix

Evaluation sub/questions	Indicators	Key data sources	Data collection methods	Data analysis
Relevance				
1. Was the Action coherent with national strategies and other programs in development awareness?				
Proposed sub-questions				
How was the topic of development reflected in national strategies and other programs in development prior to the project beginning?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs and priorities at the project beginning 	Project partners Project application Decision makers Other NGOs (especially national platforms) Journalists Available materials re national strategies in development awareness	Interviews, desk review	Qualitative analysis, stakeholder matrix
How has the Action reflected the national strategies/development programs through its planned results and activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which priorities were reflected by the project 	Project partners Project application Decision makers, media decision makers	Interviews, desk review	Qualitative analysis, stakeholder matrix
How was the topic of development relevant to the needs and priorities of media at the project beginning and end?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs and priorities at the project beginning Needs and priorities at the project end 	Project partners, media decision makers, journalists Other NGOs (especially national platforms) Media monitoring	Interviews/with journalists online survey, desk review, media monitoring data analysis	Qualitative analysis, stakeholder matrix
2. Were there proven logic interlinks between Overall objectives, Specific objectives, Results, Outcomes, Outputs, Activities and Inputs? Were they realistic and feasible?				
Proposed sub-questions				
Were all the above stated log frame elements logically interlinked? If not, where was the link missing or	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of functional links such as degree of achievement, comparisons with best practice methods in other projects 	Best practices of similar projects, Project partners,	Interviews, desk review	Qualitative analysis,

Evaluation sub/questions	Indicators	Key data sources	Data collection methods	Data analysis
twisted?		Project proposal materials, project interim reports Internet		
How did the interlinks reflect existing conditions and challenges in project implementation? Where and how have they succeeded or failed these?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of concrete real challenges/obstacles that were likely to be encountered and selected and implemented solutions to these/ or lack of solution • Comparisons with best practice methods in other projects 	Best practices of similar projects, Project partners, Project proposal materials, project interim reports Internet	Interviews, desk review	Qualitative analysis,
	•			
3. Did the Action address real problems identified by target groups?				
<i>Proposed sub-questions</i>				
Which activities/outputs addressed the problems identified by the target groups? Which did not?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities and outputs perceived as contributing to the needs and priorities of the target groups • Activities and outputs perceived as not contributing • Suggested alternative approaches to bridge the gap 	Project partners, decision makers, media decision makers	Interviews with journalists, online survey)	Qualitative analysis, logical framework review
4. Did the strategy of the project's implementation really address the problem?				
<i>Proposed sub-questions</i>				
Was the selected strategy likely to address the problems identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of complementarity of action's selected strategy to the problems identified 	Project partners, decision makers, media decision makers, national development strategy documents, project documents	Desk review, interviews, online surveys	Project logframe review, proposal review, qualitative analysis, map of problems/strategies and its outputs and activities
What specific results/outputs/activities closely addressed the problem? Which did not?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities and outputs perceived as closely addressing • Activities and outputs perceived as not 	Project partners, decision makers, media decision makers	Desk review, interviews, online surveys	Project logframe review, proposal review, qualitative

Evaluation sub/questions	Indicators	Key data sources	Data collection methods	Data analysis
	addressing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative approaches to enhance relevance 	National development strategy documents, Project documents		analysis, map of problems/strategies and its outputs and activities
4. Was the Action linked with other similar actions in the certain region/country?				
<i>Proposed sub-questions</i>				
What other initiatives aiming at influencing development cooperation policies and media were implemented in 4 target countries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of other initiatives, their key focus, target group, added value Awareness about the other initiatives among the project target group 	Project partners, NGOs, national NGDO platforms, donors in the region Internet	Interviews, desk review	Qualitative analysis, map of initiatives / graph
To what extent was the project complementary to the initiatives above?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added value / uniqueness of the project versus the initiatives above as perceived by different project stakeholders and external Duplications, overlaps or uncoordinated efforts identified with respect to certain topics Comparison of messages of the Action vs. other initiatives 	Project partners, NGOs, national NGDO platforms, donors in the region Internet	Interviews, desk review	Qualitative analysis, map of initiatives / graph
<i>Efficiency</i>				
1. To what extent has the project been efficiently implemented and managed?				
<i>Proposed sub-questions</i>				
To what extent did the project partners respect and execute responsibilities assigned in the project planning?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level and nature of project partners' involvement and assigned responsibilities 	Project partners, project proposals, project interim reports	Interviews, desk review, budget and management structure review	Qualitative analysis. Management mapping
What challenges/obstacles and/or delays were encountered in the course of the project implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific examples of challenges, obstacles, delays 	Project partners, project interim reports, stakeholders	Desk review, interviews	Qualitative analysis.
To what extent were the project partners able to adapt project activities, planning and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific actions taken to adapt 	Project partners, project proposals, project interim reports	Interviews, desk review,	Qualitative analysis. Management matrix

Evaluation sub/questions	Indicators	Key data sources	Data collection methods	Data analysis
organization in light of encountered delays and/or obstacles?				
2. Were the activities achieved on time, if not, why?				
Proposed sub-questions				
None at this point	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timely implementation in accordance with the project proposal Explanations of any diversions 	Project partners, project proposals, project interim reports	Desk review, interviews	Qualitative analysis, comparison of original time plan vs real time implementation
3. Were the outputs of the Action achieved in appropriate time (timeframe of the Action) and through appropriate costs?				
Proposed sub-questions				
To what extent did the Action`s costs planned in the project proposal reflect the real situation and conditions of project implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of difference financial demand of the project compared to the originally allocated time periods and sums. 	Project partners, Project proposal materials, Project interim reports, Project financial reports	Interviews, desk review,	Budget and cost analysis
To what extent did the Action`s timeframe planned in the project proposal reflect the real situation and conditions of project implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of difference in real time of the project compared to the originally allocated time periods and sums. 	Project partners, Project proposal materials, Project interim reports, Project financial reports	Interviews, desk review,	Qualitative analysis, comparison of original time plan vs real time implementation
Were the results of the action achieved in accordance with the original time and financial plan? If not, why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of difference in real time and financial demand of the project compared to the originally allocated time periods and sums. Specific problems and challenges encountered and solutions adopted 	Project partners, Project proposal materials, Project interim reports, Project financial reports	Interviews, desk review,	Qualitative analysis, comparison of original time plan vs real time implementation Budget and cost analysis

Evaluation sub/questions	Indicators	Key data sources	Data collection methods	Data analysis
4. Were the costs spent efficiently?				
<i>Proposed sub-questions</i>				
Have the project partners managed to spend project funds in accordance with the best quality/price ratio? If not, why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs in line with planned budget Ability to save funds where possible and invest these into betterment/expansion of project impact 	Project partners, project proposal materials, project interim reports, project financial reports	Interviews, desk review	Budget and cost analysis
<i>Effectiveness and impact</i>				
1. To what extent were the project activities fulfilled?				
<i>Proposed sub-questions</i>				
List of activities	(Non) achievement of activities and reasons behind these	Project partners, Project proposal materials, Project interim reports, Decision makers, media decision makers	Interviews, online surveys	Quantitative and Qualitative analyses of (non) achievements
2. To what extent were the outputs/outcomes/results/specific objective achieved?				
<i>Proposed sub-questions</i>				
Result 1. – To what extent have the decision makers in the four target countries become committed to jointly take active steps in the implementation of Visegrad countries' development cooperation strategies, in meeting international development targets and in the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Non) achievement of indicators Creation of relevant policy documents, launching internal policy debates within the relevant institutions, with a contribution of the Action 	Project partners, project interim reports, meeting minutes, trip reports Decision makers, relevant policy documents	Interviews, email surveys, desk review	Qualitative analysis, policy tracking analysis

Evaluation sub/questions	Indicators	Key data sources	Data collection methods	Data analysis
effective strengthening of poverty reduction?				
<u>Result 1.</u> To what extent has this commitment, or lack thereof, stem from activities implemented in the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proven direct linkage to the project activities as perceived by the target groups Views of the decision makers 	Decision makers, relevant policy documents, internet	Interviews, email surveys, desk review	Qualitative analysis, policy tracking analysis
<u>Result 1.</u> To what extent have other factors contributed to this?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of similar actions the policy makers were involved in Degree of involvement of the policy makers in these actions 	Decision makers, relevant policy documents, internet	Interviews, email surveys, desk review	Qualitative analysis, policy tracking analysis
<u>Result 2.</u> To what extent have the journalists from the Czech, Polish, Hungarian and Slovak media served as catalysts of national debate on Visegrad countries' commitments for poverty reduction?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of media outputs that have brought about public debate Increased number of public viewers/readers of the media outputs Views of the media decision makers 	Media monitoring, internet, media decision makers/journalists	desk review, interviews, online surveys	Content analysis, Qualitative analysis,
<u>Result 2.</u> To what extent have the capacity building activities of the project impacted the journalist level of involvement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Views of the media decision makers/journalists Examples of significant increase in production of media outputs focusing on development issues (provided that baseline data is available) 	Media decision makers/journalists	interviews, online surveys	Content analysis, Qualitative analysis,
<u>Result 3.</u> To what extent has the level of public information increased in the respective countries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased presence of development issues in the public media (provided that baseline data is available) (Non) achievement of indicators Main themes appearing in campaign, media etc. 	Media monitoring Media decision makers	Desk review	Quantitative and qualitative analysis
<u>The specific objective:</u> To what extent have V4 national ODA policies adopted a greater focus on poverty?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased presence of development issues in the national ODA policies 	National ODA policy documents, Internet, decision makers, NGDO platform, project partners	Desk review, interviews	Policy tracking analysis

Evaluation sub/questions	Indicators	Key data sources	Data collection methods	Data analysis
The specific objective: How was regional cooperation and coordination in development encouraged in the V4 countries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific examples of regional cooperation and coordination activities linked to the project (e.g. initiated by targeted decision makers) with a clear project contribution 	National ODA policy documents, Internet, decision makers, NGDO platform, project partners	Desk review, interviews	Policy tracking analysis, qualitative analysis
What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the above?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of factors 	National ODA policy documents, Internet, decision makers, media decision makers/journalists, project interim reports	Interviews, online survey, desk review,	Qualitative analysis of (non) achievements, Risk Analysis
What were the limiting factors and how were they overcome?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of factors, explanation of mitigation measures Comparison with the original risk analysis in the project application 	Same as above	Interviews, online survey, desk review	Qualitative analysis of (non) achievements, Risk Analysis
3. What are the impacts of the Action (positive or negative)? Are they measurable?				
<i>Proposed sub questions</i>				
What has happened as a result of the project? Is this measurable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of intended short term impact Examples of possible unintended short term impact Measurability? 	Project partners, project interim reports, meeting minutes, trip reports Decision makers, relevant policy documents Media decision makers/journalists Media monitoring	Interviews, online surveys, desk review	Qualitative/quantitative analysis
<u>Sustainability</u>				
1. To what extent are the targeted policy makers likely to actively work in promoting and enforcing development assistance to LDCs beyond the scope of the project?				
<i>Proposed sub questions</i>				

Evaluation sub/questions	Indicators	Key data sources	Data collection methods	Data analysis
Result 1. To what extent is the level of commitment of the targeted policy members likely to persist?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressions of interest in future involvement in development issues 	Decision makers, relevant policy documents	Interviews, online surveys, desk review	Policy tracking analysis, qualitative analysis
What actions are the targeted decision makers planning to take in the future with regards to development cooperation and regional coordination?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific policy plans produced Examples of concrete actions taken 	Decision makers, relevant policy documents	Interviews, online surveys, desk review	Policy tracking analysis, qualitative analysis
What factors are hindering the targeted decision makers, from further commitment and concrete actions towards development agenda?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of factors 	Decision makers National NGDO platforms	Interviews, online surveys, desk review	qualitative analysis
2. Are the journalists involved in the project activities likely to continue covering development issues beyond the duration of the project?				
What specific professional outputs have the participating journalists produced as a result of the training and/trips?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of specific media reports produced Link to the project Likelihood of sustaining such efforts 	Media decision makers, journalists, Media reports	Interviews, desk review, online survey	qualitative analysis
To what extent are the targeted journalists likely to continue producing development focused media outputs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressions of interest in future involvement in development issues Concrete editorial plans, programming plans 	Media decision makers/relevant editorial programming documents	Interviews, online surveys, desk review	qualitative analysis
What themes are the journalists planning to focus on most? Which themes do they find less relevant or interesting?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressions of interest in future involvement in development issues Concrete editorial plans, programming plans 	Media decision makers/relevant editorial programming documents	Interviews, online surveys, desk review	qualitative analysis
What factors are hindering the targeted media decision makers and journalists from further commitment and concrete actions towards development agenda?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of factors 	Media decision makers Journalists	Interviews, online surveys, desk review	qualitative analysis

Evaluation sub/questions	Indicators	Key data sources	Data collection methods	Data analysis
3. Has the project succeeded in building the capacities of the participating partners to work with the target groups in the long term?				
<i>Proposed sub questions</i>				
What capacities of the participating partners were strengthened in the course of the project implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of capacities • Available indicators on improved performance (qualitative and quantitative) 	Project partners, interim reports	Interviews, desk review	qualitative analysis
What activities are the project partners planning on continuing in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of further developed activities targeting the same groups in the strategic plans of project partners 	Project partners, interim reports	Interviews, desk review	qualitative analysis
How can these activities be further enhanced?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of specific enhancement • Suggestions from the project partners as well as the target groups 	Project partners, project interim reports, Decision makers, relevant policy documents Media decision makers/journalists	Interviews, desk review, online survey	qualitative analysis
4. Are the results of the Action useful for other actions or actors in relevant field?				
What/who are the main actors or actions in the relevant fields	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of actors/actions 	Project partners, project interim reports, NGO national platforms Decision makers, relevant policy documents Media decision makers/journalists	Interviews, online surveys, desk review	Qualitative analysis
Have these actions/actors benefitted in concrete ways from the Action results? If yes, how? If not, why not? ☺	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of concrete benefits brought to other actions/actors (level of knowledge, information, new initiatives etc.) 	Project partners, project interim reports, NGO national platforms Decision makers, relevant policy documents Media decision makers/journalists	Interviews, online surveys, desk review	Qualitative analysis

Evaluation sub/questions	Indicators	Key data sources	Data collection methods	Data analysis
<i>Overall</i>				
1. What are the key strengths and weaknesses of the project?				
<i>Proposed sub questions</i>				
What are the key strengths of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of strengths as perceived by the different project partners and stakeholders (derived from the above) 	Project partners, project interim reports, NGO national platforms Decision makers, relevant policy documents Media decision makers/journalists	Interviews, focus groups/online surveys, desk review	Qualitative analysis
How can these strengths be further built on?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 			
What are the main weaknesses of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of weaknesses as perceived by the different project partners and stakeholders 	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
How can these weaknesses be dealt with or avoided in future? And how can further build on the strength	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestions from the different project partners and stakeholders Examples of best practices from similar projects/initiatives 	Same as above + Internet	Same as above	Same as above
2. Was there a synergy between the project and other initiatives on the national or international level?				
<i>Proposed sub questions</i>				
What other initiatives were simultaneously implemented on national or international level?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of initiatives 	Project partners NGO national platforms Donors Internet	Interviews, desk review	Qualitative analysis Initiative matrix
How have the project partners worked with these initiatives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of specific joint or complementary actions 	Project partners NGO national platforms	Interviews, desk review	Qualitative analysis Initiative matrix

Evaluation sub/questions	Indicators	Key data sources	Data collection methods	Data analysis
To what extent was synergy achieved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportionate relationship of specific joint/complementary actions to the number or scale of similar initiatives • Examples of specific joint or complementary actions • Examples of contradictory or competing actions 	Project partners NGO national platforms	Interviews, desk review	Qualitative analysis Initiative matrix