



# Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General  
25 September 2012

Original: English

---

## Economic Commission for Europe

### Committee on Economic Cooperation and Integration

#### Seventh session

Geneva, 5 - 7 December 2012

Item 5 of the provisional agenda

#### Programme of Work and Draft Strategic Framework

## Biennial performance evaluation of the subprogramme for 2010-2011

### Note by the secretariat

#### *Summary*

This note contains revisions to document ECE/CECI/2011/6 which had been submitted to and had been discussed at the Sixth Session of the Committee on Economic Cooperation and Integration in December 2011. The reason for the revisions is to make the note fully compliant with requirements of the UNECE Executive Committee for evaluation reports to show the exact correlation of the logical framework used for the evaluation with the strategic framework of the sub-programme. The Committee is invited to take note of the revised evaluation report at its seventh session.

The original note was prepared pursuant to the decision of the Commission (document E/2004/37-E/ECE/1416), requesting Sectoral Committees to conduct biennial performance evaluations of their work programmes.

The note provides the 2010-2011 biennial performance evaluation report for the programme of work of the UNECE Subprogramme on Economic Cooperation and Integration. The evaluation follows the 2010-2011 biennial evaluation plan (document ECE/CECI/2010/CRP.2/Rev.1), which was endorsed by the Committee at its fifth session. A correlation between the 2010-2011 Strategic Framework and the logical framework of the Biennial Evaluation is provided in the annex to this note for ease of reference.

The biennial performance evaluation report establishes links between the expected accomplishments (EA) and indicators of achievement (IA) of the 2010-2011 Strategic Framework, and divides the Committee's areas of work in four clusters.

## **Cluster 1: Creating a supportive environment for innovative development (policies for innovation, innovative entrepreneurship and the financing of innovation)**

### **Expected accomplishment A**

1. Increased knowledge of authorities of good practices and policy options facilitating innovative development and innovation-driven competitiveness

#### **Indicators of achievement:**

(i) The number of policy recommendations and guidelines resulting from policy-oriented meetings held under the auspices of the UNECE Team of Specialists on Innovation and Competitiveness Policies, the networks of experts on entrepreneurship and enterprise development and on financing innovation

#### *Performance measures:*

Baseline 2008-2009: 5

Target 2010-2011: 5

Actual 2010-2011: 7

(ii) Per cent of respondents finding these documents useful

#### *Performance measures:*

Baseline 2008-2009: not available

Target 2010-2011: 85

Actual 2010-2011: 97

### **Expected accomplishment B**

2. Enhanced implementation of UNECE policy recommendations

#### **Indicator of achievement:**

(i) The number of cases where countries have implemented policy recommendations or have taken practical steps to implement them

#### *Performance measures:*

Baseline 2008-2009: 3

Target 2010-2011: 3

Actual 2010-2011: 4

#### **Statement of Accomplishments**

3. Seven sets of policy recommendations were prepared on the following topics: promoting innovation in the services sector, addressing financial and entrepreneurial challenges in high-growth innovative firms, promoting innovation-driven start-ups and academic spin-offs (these recommendations resulted from a cross-cutting policy conference which also covered Cluster 2), fostering the financing of clean technologies, promoting eco-innovation, and improving innovation policies in Belarus and Kazakhstan. They resulted from the exchange of good practices and policy experience among member States

and leading national and international experts from the public and private sectors during a series of sessions and conferences of the Committee on Economic Cooperation and Integration and the Teams of Specialists on Innovation and Competitiveness Policies.

4. 71 percent of respondents who identified the present cluster as their area of expertise considered the value added of the activities in the present cluster to be "high" or "unique/indispensable", and more than 97 percent considered it "significant" or higher.

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

#### **Lessons learned**

6. In addition to questions about the usefulness of CECI publications, the implementation of policy recommendations, the follow-up to capacity-building activities, and the added value of various CECI activities, the questionnaire provided room for members of CECI, its Teams and networks of experts to provide suggestions on how to further improve the impact of CECI's work. Many of these centered on improving dissemination of CECI's publications and recommendations (including through newsletters and electronic means, by involving national and regional agencies, and by ensuring availability of material in Russian) and on the nature of the content to be provided (more practical examples, also negative examples). Many comments also called for continuing or expanding existing policy advisory activities.

## **Cluster 2: Facilitating the effective regulatory protection of intellectual property rights**

### **Expected accomplishment A**

7. Increased knowledge of authorities of good practices and policy options facilitating the effective protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights

#### **Indicators of achievement:**

(i) The number of policy recommendations and guidelines resulting from policy-oriented meetings held by the UNECE Team of Specialists on Intellectual Property

#### *Performance measures:*

Baseline 2008-2009: 0

Target 2010-2011: 2

2010-2011: 2

(ii) Per cent of respondents finding these documents useful

*Performance measures:*

Baseline 2008-2009: not available

Target 2010-2011: 85

Actual 2010-2011: 93

**Expected accomplishment B.**

8. Enhanced implementation of UNECE policy recommendations

**Indicators of achievement:**

(i) The number of cases where countries have implemented policy recommendations or have taken practical steps to implement them

*Performance measures:*

Baseline 2008-2009: 1

Target 2010-2011: 2

Actual 2010-2011: 4

**Statement of Accomplishments**

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

10. 73 percent of respondents who identified the present cluster as their area of expertise considered the value added of the activities in the present cluster to be "high" or "unique/indispensable", and more than 93 percent considered it "significant" or higher.

11. Four respondents who self-identified as having expertise on the present cluster stated that CECI policy recommendations and good practices had been "incorporated in legislation or regulations or in proposed drafts of such". In addition, almost all respondents indicated that some of the other steps had been undertaken to implement CECI recommendations, such as incorporating CECI recommendations into national policy documents or using them as guidelines in developing such documents; using them as a reference for good practice in reviewing working procedures of government agencies; disseminating them to stimulate and inform policy debate; or using them as a reference in internal policy discussions and seminars.

**Lessons learned**

12. As on cluster 1, questionnaire respondents called for improving the dissemination of recommendations and documents and for including more practical examples, but also expressed demand for more activities under this cluster.

## Cluster 3: Promoting best practice in effective public-private partnerships

### Expected accomplishment A

13. Increased knowledge of authorities of good practices and policy options in promoting efficient public-private partnerships

#### Indicators of achievement:

(i) The number of policy recommendations and guidelines resulting from policy-oriented meetings held by the UNECE Team of Specialists on Public-private Partnerships

#### *Performance measures:*

Baseline 2008-2009: 1  
Target 2010-2011: 1  
Actual 2010-2011: 2

(ii) Per cent of respondents finding these documents useful

#### *Performance measures:*

Baseline 2009: not available  
Target 2010-2011: 85  
Actual 2010-2011: 95

### Expected accomplishment B

14. Enhanced implementation of UNECE policy recommendations

#### Indicators of achievement:

(i) The number of cases where countries have implemented policy recommendations or have taken practical steps to implement them

#### *Performance measures:*

Baseline 2008-2009: 1  
Target 2010-2011: 3  
Actual 2010-2011: 10

#### Statement of Accomplishments

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

16. 70 percent of respondents considered the value added of the activities in the present cluster to be "high" or "unique/indispensable", and 95 percent considered it "significant" or higher.

17. Ten respondents who self-identified as having expertise on the present cluster stated that CECI policy recommendations and good practices had been implemented by incorporating them " in legislation or regulations or in proposed drafts of such". In addition, almost all respondents indicated that some of the other steps listed above had been undertaken to implement CECI recommendations.

#### **Lessons learned**

18. As on clusters 1 and 2, questionnaire respondents called for improving the dissemination of recommendations and documents and for including more practical examples, but also expressed demand for more activities under this cluster.

### **Cluster 4: Capacity-building activities carried out within the three clusters above**

#### **Expected accomplishment A**

19. Strengthened national capacity in countries with economies in transition to implement CECI policy recommendations

##### **Indicators of achievement:**

(i) Per cent of participants finding the capacity-building activities useful for their work

##### *Performance measures:*

Baseline 2008-2009: 85

Target 2010-2011: 90

Actual 2010-2011: 92

#### **Expected accomplishment B**

20. Improved national policymaking as a result of capacity-building and training in these areas

##### **Indicators of achievement:**

(i) Number of country-level follow-up activities resulting from training and capacity-building activities

##### *Performance measures:*

Baseline 2008-2009: 3

Target 2010-2011: 10

Actual 2010-2011: 25

**Statement of Accomplishments**

21. During the course of the biennium, over 30 demand driven capacity-building events were organized in member States under the auspices of the Committee on Economic Cooperation and Integration and its subsidiary bodies in close cooperation with national government partners as well as with other international organizations. Satisfaction levels at individual capacity-building events ranged from 75 to 100 percent, with an aggregate average of 92 percent. Many individuals and institutions participated in events repeatedly. Capacity-building events also regularly generate additional demand from participants who would like similar or follow-on events to be organized in their countries.

22. There were (at least) 25 cases where countries followed up on CECI capacity-building activities by using or adapting materials provided by CECI for use in national training/capacity-building activities, including in Albania, Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan. These follow-up country-level capacity-building was undertaken in the following thematic areas: innovation and competitiveness policies, intellectual property rights, public private partnerships, financing innovative development or entrepreneurship and enterprise development.

**Lessons learned**

23. In the evaluation survey of the members of the Committee on Economic Cooperation and Integration and its subsidiary bodies, over half the respondents rated capacity-building activities as among the Committee's main added value. This is the second highest-rated answer after "networking opportunities" (79 percent). Moreover, 45 percent also considered the materials produced by, and used in CECI capacity building activities as a main added value. Among the recommendations from the evaluation questionnaire was to further intensify cooperation with national authorities, local authorities, NGOs, and multilateral organizations, but also to further expand capacity building activities.



		<p>Actual 2010-2011: 2</p> <p>IA 2 (ii) Per cent of respondents finding these documents useful</p> <p><i>Performance measures:</i></p> <p>Baseline 2008-2009: not available Target 2010-2011: 85 Actual 2010-2011: 93</p>
	3.a. Promoting best practice in efficient public-private partnerships	<p>EA 3. Increased knowledge of authorities of good practices and policy options in promoting efficient public-private partnerships</p> <p>IA 3 (i) The number of policy recommendations and guidelines resulting from policy-oriented meetings held by the UNECE Team of Specialists on Public-private Partnerships</p> <p><i>Performance measures:</i></p> <p>Baseline 2008-2009: 1 Target 2010-2011: 1 2010-2011: 2</p> <p>IA 3 (ii) Per cent of respondents finding these documents useful</p> <p><i>Performance measures:</i></p> <p>Baseline 2008-2009: not available Target 2010-2011: 85 Actual 2010-2011: 95</p>
<p>EA(b) Enhanced implementation of policy recommendations</p> <p>IA(b) Increased number of practical steps taken by Governments and other stakeholders to implement the policy recommendations</p> <p><i>Performance measures</i> 2008-2009: 9 practical steps Estimate 2010-2011: 8 practical steps Target 2012-2013: 10 practical steps</p>	<p>1.b. Creating a supportive environment for innovative development (policies for innovation, innovative entrepreneurship, financing innovation)</p> <p>2.b. Facilitating the effective protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights</p>	<p>EA 4. Enhanced implementation of UNECE policy recommendations on innovative development</p> <p>IA 4. The number of cases where countries have implemented policy recommendations on knowledge-based development or have taken practical steps to implement them</p> <p><i>Performance measures:</i></p> <p>Baseline 2008-2009: 3 Target 2010-2011: 3 Actual 2010-2011: 4</p> <p>EA 5. Enhanced implementation of UNECE policy recommendations on regulatory protection of intellectual property rights</p>

		<p>IA 5. The number of cases where countries have implemented policy recommendations on intellectual property rights or have taken practical steps to implement them</p> <p><i>Performance measures:</i></p> <p>Baseline 2008-2009: 1 Target 2010-2011: 2 Actual 2010-2011: 4</p>
	<p>3.b. Promoting best practice in efficient public-private partnerships</p>	<p>EA 6. Enhanced implementation of UNECE policy recommendations for effective public-private partnerships</p> <p>IA 6. The number of cases where countries have implemented policy recommendations for efficient public-private partnerships or have taken practical steps to implement them</p> <p><i>Performance measures:</i></p> <p>Baseline 2008-2009: 1 Target 2010-2011: 3 Actual 2010-2011: 10</p>
<p>EA (c) Strengthened national capacity in countries with economies in transition to promote the good practices and implement the aforementioned ECE policy recommendations</p> <p>IA (c) The number of country-level follow-up activities resulting from training and other capacity-building activities</p> <p><i>Performance measures</i> 2008-2009: 3 follow-up activities Estimate 2010-2011: 10 follow-up activities Target 2012-2013: 12 follow-up activities</p>	<p>4. Capacity-building carried out within the three clusters above</p>	<p>EA 7. Strengthened national capacity in countries with economies in transition to implement CECI policy recommendations</p> <p>IA 7. Per cent of participants finding CECI capacity-building activities useful</p> <p><i>Performance measures:</i></p> <p>Baseline 2008-2009: 85 Target 2010-2011: 90 Actual 2010-2011: 92</p> <p>EA 8. Improved national policy making as a results of capacity-building and training in these areas</p> <p>IA 8. Number of country-level follow-up activities resulting from training and capacity-building activities</p> <p><i>Performance measures:</i></p> <p>Baseline 2008-2009: 3 Target 2010-2011: 10 Actual 2010-2011: 25</p>