

**MULTI-COUNTRY INITIATIVE “GOVERNMENT
ACTION IN RESPONSE TO ECONOMIC DOWNTURN
Workshop on Functional Reviews**

- Event report -

| Date of the document | Report prepared by | Status |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 22 February 2010 | Valentyna Afanasyeva, Center for Adaptation of Civil Service to the Standards of the European Union, Main Department of Civil Service of Ukraine | Draft #1 |
| Report reviewed by | | MCA Coordinator |
| <i>Panos Liverakos, Anne Caroline Tveoy and Nenad Rava, RCPAR</i> | | Inese Vaivare, MCA Coordinator |
| MCA partners | | |
| 1. State Chancellery, Latvia 2. Center for Adaptation of Civil Service to the Standards of the European Union, Main Department of Civil Service of Ukraine 3. Ministry of Finance, Estonia | | |

General information

| | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Full title | Workshop on Functional Reviews | |
| Location/s | Ukraine, Kyiv, Prorizna street, 15, 6 floor | |
| Key dates | Starting date | 18 February 2010 |
| | Ending date | 19 February 2010 |
| | Other dates (if relevant) | N/a |
| Purpose / Objectives | The main purpose of the workshop was to enhance knowledge and facilitate the sharing of experiences amongst public sector representatives of selected countries in the area of functional reviews/audits as the possible response of the government to the economic crisis. | |
| Number of participants | Total number | 25 |
| | Per country | Albania – 1 Estonia – 2 Hungary – 2 Kazakhstan – 1 Kyrgyzstan – 1 Latvia – 2 Moldova – 1 Russian Federation – 1 Ukraine - 12 |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | United Kingdom – 1 Uzbekistan – 1 |
| List of lecturers / trainers / external experts | Peter J. Reed, Independent consultant (keynote speaker) Serghei Ostaf, Independent consultant (researcher) |
| Brief summary of the event | The two-day workshop consisted of a) a keynote presentation looking at functional and management reviews in the context of economic downturn - possible objectives of functional reviews, lessons learned from international experience and key success/risk factors; b) individual country presentations, based on a template provided by the consultant engaged by the RCPAR to perform a comparative study; c) presentation of the draft methodology for the study, and d) plenary discussions following all the presentations listed above. The target audience was primarily government officials with experience in functional reviews. A few representatives of academia and non-governmental organizations/think-tanks were also represented. |

Agenda

| Day 1 | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Date and location | 18 February, 2010, Prorizna street, 15, Kyiv, Ukraine | |
| List of main sessions / working groups | Title | Person in charge |
| | Functional and management reviews in the context of economic downturn (keynote speech) | Peter Reed, FR Expert, UK |
| | Country Presentation – Latvia | Valerijs Sturis & Inese Vaivare, Latvia |
| | Country Presentation – Estonia | Tiina Tamm & Jogiste Kadri, Estonia |
| | Country Presentation – Hungary | Richard Adorjan & Hortenzia Hosszu, Hungary |
| | Country Presentation – Ukraine | Ivan Presniakov & Valentyna Afanasyeva, Ukraine |
| Country Presentation – Moldova | Serghei Ostaf, FR expert, Moldova | |
| Results / Learning points | <p>The keynote speaker has described the main issues and obstacles regarding preparation and implementation of FR, as well as the implementation of results and recommendations.</p> <p>The country presenters have shared their FR experience using the template prepared by the consultant and in line with the draft methodology for comparative analysis of the FR application as response to the crisis.</p> <p>The experience of FR is diverse and controversial within the region. The FR methodology was used for different purposes – including for political reasons. Nevertheless, it the use of FR methodology prove to be of considerable effectiveness and efficiency. The most difficult stage for the FR, is related to</p> | |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | implementation of the recommendations. | |
| Day 2 | | |
| Date and location | 19 February, 2010, Prorizna street, 15, Kyiv, Ukraine | |
| List of main sessions / working groups | Title | Person in charge |
| | Presentation of the draft methodology for comparative FR analysis | Serghei Ostaf, FR expert, Moldova |
| | Country Presentation – Russia | Tatyana Ignatova, Russian Federation |
| | Country Presentation – Kazakhstan | Meruert Makhmutova, Kazakhstan |
| | Country Presentation – Kyrgyzstan | Nuripa Mukanova, Kyrgyzstan |
| | Discussion on the draft methodology for comparative research on FR | Serghei Ostaf, FR expert, Moldova |
| Results / Learning points | <p>The country presenters have shared their FR experience using the template prepared by the consultant and in line with the draft methodology for comparative analysis of the FR application as response to the crisis. Presentation of the draft methodology has been followed by the discussion on its improvement and approval by all participants. It was agreed that the questionnaire would be circulated among the participants after the workshop in order to provide input to the the comparative study to be conducted by consultant.</p> <p>Taking into account the diversity and different approaches to FR methodology, it seems possible to conduct a comparative research on FR experience in the region because fairly similar methods have been used. Furthermore, there was a common background for the FR, with similar historical and international experiences.</p> <p>The draft methodology for the comparative research was discussed and agreed upon.</p> | |

Materials / Outputs

| Title | Author/s | Format of the document |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <p>All presentations are available on www.rcpar.org. They have been distributed electronically and in hard copy to the participants:</p> <p>Functional and management reviews in the context of economic downturn (keynote speech)</p> <p>Presentation of the draft methodology for comparative FR analysis</p> <p>8 country presentations</p> | <p>Peter Reed, FR Expert, UK</p> <p>Serghei Ostaf, FR expert, Moldova</p> | <i>Ppt and hardcopy</i> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

Summary of the achievements

(comparison with relevant aspects of the MCA Action plan)

| Intended Output | Relevant Activities | Performance Indicators | Results achieved |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Output 2: Selected public administrators have received in-depth training on specific issues of restructuring the government – workshops</i> | 2.1. Agreement on agenda and participants of workshops 2.2. Selection of lecturers and participants 2.3. Organisation of events 2.4. Workshop 1“Functional audits” takes place in Ukraine 2.6. Evaluation of results | 1.At least 15 public administrators from region have increased their knowledge 3.At least 30% of participants have been agents of change in their public administrations | 1. 21 public administrators, 2 think-tank representatives and 1 academia from the region (11 countries) have increased their knowledge on FR experience and methodology (according to the evaluation 100% of the participants gained the new information from the seminar and 90% increased their knowledge on FR) 2. Nearly 80% of the participants have been agents of change in their public administrations (according to the evaluation this number of the participants indicated that the workshop has increased their commitment to the PAR) |
| <i>Output 3: Public administrators in the region and abroad have an access to the information of countries on selected topics – questionnaires and comparative reviews</i> | 3.3. Work on questionnaires in the workshop 3.4. Work on comparative issues in workshops | | |

Evaluation

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Did the event delivery upon its original objectives? And if no, why? | The event took place according to the agenda and plan of preparation. |
| Did the event meet the expectations of the participants? And if no, why? | On the whole the expectations of the participants were met because they became accustomed with the FR experience in the region (according to the evaluation 100% of the participants were satisfied with the overall content of the workshop). The only issue, which seems to have presented a problem is the presentation skills of some presenters, as their style made it difficult to concentrate on the topic (according to the evaluation nearly 30% of the participants only indicated the excellent level of the presenters). |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| How effective were the trainer/s, facilitator/s, expert/s? | The experts, as professionals, presented an in-depth view of the FR methodology and inter-regional practice, thus their input contained the general summarizing view. This vision and the country cases created the whole picture of FR in the region and beyond (according to the evaluation the overall presenters' effectiveness was excellent – 30%, good – 60%, fair – 10% only). |
| How useful in general was the whole event? What may be the effect of this event? | The usefulness of the event may be rated as high, because it became obvious for many participants, that their own efforts in the field go in line with other experience (according the evaluation 94% of the participants (strongly) agree that the information within the seminar was very useful for their daily work). On the other hand, the general discussion indicated that there are things, which have to be researched further especially the implementation plans for the FR results. An additional and quite valuable effect of the event was the informal establishment of the community of practice. |
| Other comments and remarks | Due to the limited number of the participants (according to the project design) the whole regional experience was not presented. It is a challenge to develop the community of practice in the sphere. |

Please, describe the follow-up to the event (if any)

- Comparative research on FR methodology prepared on the questionnaires provided by the hired consultant and discussed during the workshop

Please, describe eventual challenges and problems regarding organization of the event

1. Some difficulties occurred with the payments for catering, transfer and printing because of the tradition for pre-payment in Ukraine, which goes against the UNDP policy of not allowing pre-payments. The problem was solved by organizing local payments through the UNDP Country Office, which were effected very quickly after the services had been delivered.
2. The high hotel rates in the Kyiv city center caused some difficulties in finding an appropriate hotel. The quality of the rooms of the chosen hotel was not satisfactory. For future events, the UNDP Country Office could be contacted and asked for advice, in particular as the CO may have agreements with certain hotels, securing a better rate/quality.

Please, indicate suggestions and recommendations for future organization of similar events

1. In order to avoid any misunderstanding, the local organizers should be provided with relevant information on budget lines and payments procedures within the UNDP.

2. In order to avoid any emergencies, the organizers have to have the clear and detailed plan for the event, and send it out to all participants at least four days prior to the start of the event.

List of annexes:

- A. Agenda
- B. List of participants
- C. Presentations
- D. Evaluation forms