

PD-ABP-781
95632

Mid-Term Project Evaluation Report

Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project

[EUR-0004-A-00-4014-00 as amended]

HIID

Submitted by:

John H. Eriksen

*Team Leader/Economist
Ithaca International Limited
Ithaca, NY*

Wade E. Martin

*Associate Professor and
Director of the Environmental Policy Center
Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colorado*

Peter J. Bloom

*Economic Development Consultant
Bethesda, Maryland*

5 December 1995

PREFACE

The Mid-Term Evaluation of the Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project was carried out between 13 September and 5 December 1995. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the Mid-Term Evaluation Team Work Plan designed by the evaluation team members -- John H. Eriksen, Wade E. Martin and Peter J. Bloom -- and approved by the Harvard Institute for International Development (HIID) in Cambridge, Massachusetts and the United States Agency for International Development in Washington, D.C. (USAID/W). [Annex A]

Interviews were conducted in Cambridge, Massachusetts and Washington, D.C. prior to the evaluation team's departure for Eastern and Central Europe. In the region, interviews were conducted in six of the ten countries where Project activities had been undertaken -- i.e., Slovakia, Hungary, Latvia, Estonia, Romania and Poland.

The evaluation team presented its initial findings, conclusions and recommendations to C4EP Project personnel at their semi-annual conference in Sofia, Bulgaria on 26 October 1995. An initial draft of the evaluation report was completed on 10 November 1995 and circulated for comment to all concerned USAID and HIID/C4EP personnel. Comments were received and incorporated as appropriate into the final draft evaluation report between 22 November and 4 December 1995. A final debriefing was held at USAID/W on 5 December 1995.

The evaluation team itinerary is presented in Annex B. Annex C lists all persons interviewed by the evaluation team and Annex D lists all documents consulted during the evaluation.

In presenting this final report, the evaluation team wishes to acknowledge with deep appreciation the organizational efforts of Project personnel in Cambridge and in each of the countries visited. The scheduling and logistical arrangements for the evaluation team were handled in a highly professional and efficient manner. Project managers and in-country HIID personnel did everything possible, often under difficult time constraints, to see that the evaluation team's time was used effectively, without impinging upon the report's objectivity or the evaluation team's independence.

Finally, team members would like to thank all of the people who consented to be interviewed for the evaluation. The information and commentary each interviewee provided to us enabled us to broaden and deepen our understanding of the Project and the individual country programs. The comments also allowed the evaluation team to better understand the contextual factors which had affected implementation of the individual country programs over time. Without in any way wishing to implicate respondents in the evaluation team's findings, conclusions and recommendations, we would like to express our deep appreciation to each interviewee for enabling us to produce a better accounting of the Project's activities than we ever could have done without their assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Preface	
Table of Contents	
List of Acronyms	
Executive Summary	
<u>MAIN REPORT</u>	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Project Background	1
B. Implementation to Date	1
II. FINDINGS	2
A. Project-Level Performance and Achievements	2
1. Identification and Analysis of Critical Environmental Policy Issues	2
2. Operationalization of Proposed Environmental Policy Responses	2
3. Development of Measures for Assessment of Results from Policy and Institutional Reforms	3
4. Identification of Comparative Advantage in Supply of Environmental Technology and Services	3
5. Training in Environmental Economics and Related Fields	3
6. Accumulation and Presentation of Lessons Learned from Project Activities	4
B. Individual Country-Level Performance and Achievements	4
1. Slovakia	4
2. Hungary	5
3. Latvia and Estonia	6
4. Romania	7
5. Poland	8
C. Impacts of the Project	9
1. Project-Specific Indicators Contained in the Cooperative Agreement	9
a. Country-Specific Environmental Strategies Integrated with Economic Policies?	9
b. Environmental Economic Policy Reforms Developed?	9
c. Enhanced Contacts, Exchanges, and Trade and Investment Opportunities Fostered?	10

	<u>Page</u>
d. Portfolio of Public and Private Sector Project Designs and Appraisals Developed?	10
e. Set of Lessons and Experiences Documented and Disseminated?	10
f. New Institutions and Mechanisms Analyzing Problems and Implementing Policies for Sound Environmental Management?	11
g. Increased Environmental Awareness and Better Understanding of Markets Among NGOs and Local Groups?	11
h. Improved Decision-Making Process and Improved Decisions Advancing Economic Growth, Private Sector Initiatives, Resource Conservation and Environmental Protection?	12
2. Impact Indicators	12
D. Impacts of the Country Programs	12
1. Slovakia	12
2. Hungary	13
3. Latvia and Estonia	14
4. Romania	14
5. Poland	14
E. Project Management	14
1. General	14
2. HIID/Cambridge	15
3. HIID/Country Programs	16
4. USAID/Washington	17
5. USAID Representative Offices	17
III. CONCLUSIONS	18
A. Overall Project Effectiveness	18
1. Success in Meeting Stated Objectives	18
a. Identification and Analysis of Critical Environmental Policy Issues	18
b. Operationalization of Proposed Environmental Policy Responses	18
c. Development of Measures for Assessment of Results from Policy and Institutional Reforms	19
d. Identification of Comparative Advantage in Supply of Environmental Technology and Services	19
e. Training in Environmental Economics and Related Fields	19

	<u>Page</u>
f. Accumulation and Presentation of Lessons Learned from Project Activities	20
2. Formulation and Attainment of Impact Indicators	20
3. Integration with USAID's Strategic Framework for Central Europe	21
4. Management Efficiency in Delivery of Services	21
a. General	21
b. HIID/Cambridge	22
c. USAID/Washington	23
d. USAID Representative Offices	24
B. Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Country Programs	24
1. Success in Meeting Stated Work Plan Objectives	24
2. Formulation and Attainment of Impact Indicators	25
3. Integration with USAID's Strategic Framework for Central Europe	25
4. Management Efficiency in Delivery of Services	25
5. Sustainability of Country Program Activities	26
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS	27
A. HIID/Cambridge	27
B. HIID/Country Programs	28
C. USAID/Washington	28
D. USAID Representative Offices	29

Annex A -- Mid-Term Evaluation Team Work Plan

Annex B -- Evaluation Team Itinerary

Annex C -- List of Persons Contacted

Annex D -- Report Bibliography

LIST OF ACRONYMS

C4EP Project	Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy Project
COTR	Contract Office Technical Representative, a legal designation used by USAID
EAP	Environmental Action Plan for Central and Eastern Europe, as agreed to in Lucerne, Switzerland in April 1993
EAPS	Environmental Action Plan Support Project, with Chemonics International, Inc. as the prime contractor and HIID as a sub-contractor
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstitution and Development
ELI	Environmental Law Institute, Washington, D.C.
ENR	Environmental and Natural Resources Division of USAID in Washington, D.C.
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency of the United States Government
ETP	Environmental Training Project
EU	European Union
HIID	Harvard Institute for International Development
NEAP	National Environmental Action Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NIS	Newly Independent States
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PACD	Project Activity Completion Date
PAWG	Policy Analysis Working Group
PHARE	Polish/Hungarian Action to Reconstruct the Environment, as funded by the European Union
PSC	Personal Services Contractor
SEFA	Senior Environmental Finance Advisor
SEPA	Senior Environmental Policy Advisor
USAID/name of a capital city	United States Agency for International Development Mission or Representative Office in a specific country
USAID/W	United States Agency for International Development in Washington, D.C.
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
WEC	World Environment Center
WRI	World Resources Institute

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. BACKGROUND

The Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project, as evaluated in this report, began with the signing of a Cooperative Agreement between the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and Harvard University, with the Harvard Institute for International Development (HIID) as the prime implementing agency. This Agreement was finalized in December 1993 based upon a set of FY 1994 activities. The stated goal of the C4EP Project was to help ensure environmentally sound and sustainable development paths for the economies of Central and Eastern Europe by helping to design and implement national policies, laws, and regulations.

The Cooperative Agreement has been amended three times to: change the Project Activity Completion Date (PACD); to increase the total estimated amount of funds; to obligate funds; to add environmental finance as a new area of policy assistance and increase the number of countries assisted; and, to authorize a subcontract with the World Resources Institute (WRI) providing technical assistance to selected countries to help them develop National Environmental Action Plans (NEAPs). As currently constituted, the C4EP Project has a PACD of 31 July 1997 and a total estimated funding limit of \$ 19,196,320, of which \$ 9,978,017 has been obligated. As of 30 September 1995, HIID reported total estimated expenditures of \$ 4,736,587 and a carryover balance of \$ 5,241,430.

Through October 1995, the C4EP Project has placed resident Senior Environmental Policy Advisors (SEPAs) in the following countries: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Hungary. It has also placed Senior Environmental Finance Advisors (SEFAs) in Bulgaria and Slovakia. The Project has provided short-term consulting services to the Czech Republic and Albania for studies and other activities. Program direction and coordination, substantive backstopping and administrative and logistical support is provided by the HIID/C4EP Project staff in Cambridge. This staff consists of a part-time Project Director, part-time acting Deputy Director, two Project Managers, a Project Administrator, and three Staff Assistants.

In each country having a resident advisor, a Policy Analysis Working Group (PAWG), consisting of distinguished local environmental professionals, was to have been established. The PAWG was to assist the SEPA in identification and analysis of local policy issues and to facilitate interactions with government policy makers. The PAWG was seen by HIID as one of the C4EP Project's major innovations and as a primary instrument for local capacity building, leading directly to the eventual replacement of expatriate advisors, and, thereby, providing for the sustainability of the project.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The C4EP country programs have successfully identified and analyzed critical environmental policy issues fully compatible with and supportive of the major economic reform objectives of the host governments. Significant progress has been made in integrating modern economic concepts and analytical techniques into environmental policy reform processes in all country programs. Program priorities have been set in accordance with host government requests for assistance. Adoption of host government priorities in the setting of annual work agendas has greatly facilitated local acceptance of the SEPAs as trusted and effective colleagues.

SEPAs have followed rational, step-wise approaches in operationalizing their work and contributing to development of environmental policy reforms in a collegial manner. The evaluation team was very impressed with the substantial body of environmental legislation that has already been -- or soon will be -- promulgated with the assistance of the SEPAs and with the regulations being put in place to operationalize these new laws [see Section II.B of the Main Report]. SEPAs have been highly successful in their efforts to promote the use of interministerial -- even interbranch -- working groups for building consensus around policy reform strategies and specific legislative initiatives. SEPAs have also been successful in developing effective working relationships within their country programs regardless of the circumstances of their individual institutional placements.

Introduction by the SEPAs of more structured analytic procedures for policy analyses has resulted in identification

of both intermediate steps in reform processes and measurable end-points for *ex post* assessment of the impacts of policy reforms. Introduction of improved methods of financial analysis in project preparation and selection has provided the *ex ante* information needed to conduct *ex post* analyses of actual project outcomes at later dates.

Placement of long-term resident advisors is universally acknowledged by government officials and other donor representatives as the most effective Project mechanism for establishing meaningful working relationships and for changing the ways local decision makers design and implement policy reforms. The PAWG model, on the other hand, has not proven to be universally applicable to countries primarily because of the differing human resource endowments of the host countries. Creative use of local short-term consultants has, however, been an effective training mechanism in all country programs. Poland and Romania, the country programs in place for the longest time, have also been most successful in fostering the development of effective groups of environmental policy analysts. These countries have developed effective PAWGs, but they have also used *ad hoc* interministerial working groups most effectively to better inform government officials, representatives of regional organizations and NGOs, and other participants on environmental issues.

While critical masses of environmental economists have not been trained in all countries, each country program has contributed significantly to raising the level of environmental policy debate through introduction of new economic concepts and analytic methods. Seminars and workshops conducted in-country and regionally have been particularly effective as training mechanisms and as vehicles for transferring new processes and methodologies. SEPA efforts to facilitate summer workshop training at HIID/Cambridge for a wide range of host country participants, although not financed by the C4EP Project, has clearly yielded benefits and built local decision making capacities.

The evaluation team is concerned that there is no evident C4EP Project plan specifically oriented toward producing more synthesis -- i.e., lessons learned -- documents. We question whether Eastern and Central Europe, as defined by USAID/W for geographical management purposes, is an appropriate grouping of countries to use in drawing "regional" lessons learned. Interviews provided indications that sub-regional groupings -- i.e., the Danube River states and the Baltic Sea states -- might provide a more cohesive basis for development of such papers.

The evaluation team is concerned that USAID/W has made no request that HIID/Cambridge develop a set of project level impact indicators and targets directly related to the USAID Regional Strategic Framework. This omission leads to the impression that the final set of project level impact indicators and targets will be simply an aggregation of those indicators and targets formulated at the country program level. We see this approach as effectively precluding consideration of any impact indicators and targets related directly to evaluating the stated regional objectives of the Project and HIID/Cambridge's use of the regional activities core budget provided.

Formulation of country program level impact indicators and targets has been a difficult process which is still incomplete for most country programs. To date, only the Slovakia country program has formulated a set of impact indicators and targets which has been agreed to by USAID/Bratislava, the SEPA, the SEFA and HIID/Cambridge. The consequence of the late demand by USAID/W for formulation of indicators and targets in Eastern and Central Europe is that USAID Representatives and SEPAs are now trying to retrofit appropriate sets of indicators and targets to country programs which have already been terminated or are in the final stages of close down. The realistic prospects for evaluating C4EP Project impacts in Estonia, Latvia and Poland will essentially disappear with the departures from post of the two concerned SEPAs over the next five months. The feasibility of effective impact evaluations in Romania and Hungary are declining rapidly as the process of setting impact indicators and targets is drawn out. The integrity of the impact evaluation process has also been challenged by the fact that discussions of impact indicators and targets to date have focused simply on their formulation, while no effective consideration has been given to exactly what procedures and resources will be required to actually proceed with monitoring and evaluating progress against the selected impact indicators and targets.

While the lines of authority and direction for the Project were reasonably clear when full project management and funding responsibilities resided with USAID/W, subsequent delegation of financial authority to the Representative Offices has caused confusion for all parties. These difficulties center on the extent to which programmatic responsibilities must now be shared between USAID/W and the USAID Representatives to make the C4EP Project

function smoothly and what financial authority and development of annual work plans really mean for Project implementation. Nominally, procedures and authorities are in place to handle the situation, but they are being interpreted differently in USAID/W and among the field Offices.

Differing views as to whether the Project is to be implemented under the full intent of a Cooperative Agreement or as some other relationship have also created uncertainty among the participants. This uncertainty is particularly evident at HIID/Cambridge and has stifled creativity on HIID's part to the point where the Project staff is unnecessarily reactive to every demand coming from USAID/W and insufficiently aggressive in actually initiating desirable changes in Project implementation.

The FY 1996 work plan development and approval process has been much too long and complicated. It has absorbed too much time and energy of C4EP Project participants over the period from at least June 1995 to the present -- and it still appears far from completion. We see this management problem as caused by four things: general uncertainties within USAID as to FY 1996 budget levels and allocations; difficulties in implementing the comprehensive Agency-wide restructuring process; uncertainties as to operational effects of the division of programmatic and financial decision making authorities between USAID/W and the USAID Representatives; and the continuing difficulties in, first, precisely defining what is expected from USAID's system of impact monitoring and evaluating and then implementing it.

Administrative support services provided from Cambridge are generally rated as excellent since the project has been fully staffed; however, there is a problem with the Project's capacity to provide effective and timely programmatic backstopping on substantive economic and technical issues. The fact that the Deputy Director position has been staffed for less than 50 percent of the time programmed in the Cooperative Agreement has definitely contributed to the inadequacy in programmatic backstopping in Cambridge.

When actual C4EP Project expenditures through FY 1995 are compared against the accomplishments to date, we conclude that the Project has been very cost-effective in its delivery of the services envisaged in the Cooperative Agreement. The buildup of pipeline funds over the first half of the Project's life unfortunately also heightens the risk in times of declining USAID resources that USAID Representatives will elect not to provide adequate FY 1996 and 1997 funding for Project activities until they are convinced that such obligations are absolutely necessary. If such funding is obligated to other USAID activities in the interim, the reward for frugality and cost effectiveness in implementation is likely to be less, not more, resources for implementation of Project activities over its life.

We believe that HIID/Cambridge should have expended more Project resources at early stages of country program development to address and solve administrative and logistical problems faced by the SEPAs -- i.e., finding office space and equipping it properly, getting work permits, facilitating staff recruitment. On-the-ground assistance before and during the SEPAs' first few weeks in-country would have greatly facilitated the startup process and freed the SEPAs to work immediately on building relationships and formulating their work agendas.

In the same vein, we believe that more consideration should have been given to having each of the SEPAs and SEFAs participate in the pre-arrival country orientation and language initiation program in Cambridge or at some other appropriate site outside their countries of assignment. We see SEPA local language capability as having been instrumental in solidifying working and social relationships with host country colleagues in Romania and Slovakia. Conversely, lack of local language competence in the other countries has restricted SEPAs' abilities to make contacts and/or participate in policy discussions.

We believe that initial estimates of the necessary lengths of SEPAs' tours in-country before being replaced by local environmental economists were certainly optimistic. Whether the short resident stays projected were simply a function of early estimates of likely Project financial resources or reflected genuine underestimates of how quickly country programs would evolve is unclear to us. The important conclusion, however, is that the Project management was sufficiently flexible to move from these initial placement decisions and ensure that advisors were placed for more appropriate tours.

The lack of regular coordination/review meetings between senior management representatives in USAID/W and

HIID/Cambridge, as called for in the Cooperative Agreement, has not been conducive to smooth implementation of the Project or clarification of appropriate lines of responsibility between the participants. In addition, we note that there has never been an effective mechanism -- i.e., regular workshop, conference or retreat -- to permit all C4EP Project participants to meet and discuss implementation issues. The fact that USAID Representatives and/or their relevant staff members have been routinely excluded from all semi-annual Project meetings held to date has not been conducive to effective coordination of Project activities.

Frequent changes in C4EP Project direct-hire and contract management personnel and in individual job assignments in USAID/W during 1994/1995, combined with the fact that present management officers have no actual overseas experience with implementation of USAID projects, has complicated relationships with SEPAs and HIID/Cambridge staff. These factors have resulted in mixed signals in communications with both Cambridge and the field posts. It appeared to us from our interviews with USAID/W management staff that they had only a limited appreciation of the difficulties from a field perspective of implementing a complicated set of activities such as those in the C4EP Project. We perceived among current management staff a tendency to express unrealistic expectations as to the time needed to accomplish major economic reforms in the environmental sector and simultaneously generate measurable short-term impacts in situations as complicated and fluid as those being faced in Eastern and Central Europe. Whether these expressions were simply reflective of the expectations conveyed by more senior USAID/W officers or were genuinely held by C4EP Project management staff themselves is a moot point from the perspective of the evaluation team. The consequences for mutual trust and confidence among all concerned participants within the Project as observed by the evaluation team are the same.

Finally, although the evaluation team found ample evidence in its field activities that the Project to date had contributed very significantly to the progress being made on a whole range of major economic/environmental reforms in the C4EP countries, we sensed a reluctance among USAID/W staff at all levels and at some field posts to believe that USAID assistance was actually having the desired effects projected in the Cooperative Agreement.

We believe that the WRI sub-contractual agreement was poorly managed by USAID/W from the start. We think that WRI's particular expertise could have been offered to USAID Representatives in Eastern and Central Europe through the pre-existing WRI cooperative agreement with USAID's Global Bureau without ever having had to involve the C4EP Project or Harvard University. A buy-in relationship directly with a USAID country program would have provided for a much more direct and manageable two way arrangement with WRI.

Given the current mandate from USAID/W on development of impact indicators and targets and the specific requirement that C4EP country program indicators and targets be included in the FY 1996 work plans, USAID Representatives have a special responsibility to work with SEPAs on the requisite impact indicator/target sets and, thereby, take a major step toward finalizing what has been an excessively long and complicated work plan process. Given budgetary uncertainties and impending program close downs in most countries, it is particularly important that Representatives allow sufficient time in their schedules for appropriate interactions with SEPAs so that C4EP activities are implemented in a manner consistent with each country's evolving program strategy.

The C4EP Cooperative Agreement says very little about ensuring the sustainability of Project activities. There is virtually no mention of "institution building" support for host government agencies. At its core, the Project is clearly intended to be a short term exercise in the effective transfer of intellectual capital in environmental economics and related fields. No funding is provided for the types of activities USAID has traditionally used to support "institution building" processes -- i.e., provision of long-term training for government officials, logistical support for government agencies, construction of new or renovation of existing institutional facilities. In this sense, "sustainability" in the C4EP Project is much more about the sustainability of a core set of modern economic concepts and orientations and their expression in improved management of local environments, than it is about sustainability of particular local institutions.

Most of the policy reforms initiated with support from the C4EP Project have strong potential for sustainability because of the collaborative manner in which they were developed over time. The strongest evidence of this potential is the real sense of ownership of these reforms expressed by local decision makers. With respect to certain institutional innovations introduced under the Project -- i.e., interministerial and interbranch working groups,

consensus building seminars and workshops, better procedures for environmental audits, impact assessments and financial analyses -- we believe local participants have been convinced of their utility.

The sustainability of PAWGs in those countries where they actually exist appears doubtful if one anticipates maintenance of much more than loose networks of environmental specialists. There seems less doubt that the individual specialists who have participated in PAWGs or other contractual arrangements have benefitted enormously from the associations and will continue with their environmental policy work in a variety of roles -- e.g., as academics; elected officials; consultants to donors, private sector firms, or governments; or, perhaps, as appointed government decision makers. We believe that one of the important outputs of any HIID/Cambridge work plan for the balance of the C4EP Project should be a set of structured activities to address the professional needs of these emerging networks of environmental specialists as the SEPAs finish their tours and country program activities phase down.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. HIID/Cambridge

- ◆ Recruitment of a full-time Deputy Director for the C4EP Project by the end of December 1995 should be the highest priority task for HIID/Cambridge senior management. When recruited, the Deputy Director should focus on providing substantive review and feedback of the SEPA and SEFA field activities and reporting on and addressing the regional aspects of the Project envisioned in the Cooperative Agreement.
- ◆ HIID/Cambridge, in collaboration with USAID/Washington, the SEPAs and SEFAs, should prepare a detailed work plan for its activities over the life of the Project. This work plan would specify the departure dates for all SEPAs and SEFAs and, in the case of personnel returning to HIID/Cambridge, indicate how they will be occupied through July 1997. The work plan should also contain a set of impact indicators and targets which addresses the regional objectives of the Project and allocates resources provided in the regional core budget to support of specific HIID/Cambridge activities.

In development of the HIID/Cambridge work plan, the status of all on-going policy reform activities in each country program should be evaluated in detail. If more substantial benefits are seen as likely accrue to the host country and the Project from leaving a SEPA in-country for a few more months longer to work on a highly specific and urgent set of policy actions, such flexibility should be exercised by Project managers.

- ◆ In order to improve communications within the Project, senior staff from HIID/Cambridge and USAID/Washington should conduct Project review meetings on a quarterly basis starting in January 1996 and continuing through the end of the Project. The venues for such meetings should alternate between Washington and Cambridge to allow maximum staff participation. They should be used as opportunities to discuss Project activities in the broad perspective of attainment of anticipated Project outputs and impacts.
- ◆ Monthly reports from the SEPAs and SEFAs, except as deemed necessary for purposes of internal management, should be discontinued. Quarterly program reports for general distribution should be prepared with summary statements of Project activities of HIID/Cambridge and each country program. Such statements should succinctly relate progress over the quarter toward attainment of project-specific output indicators stated in the Cooperative Agreement and targets in the Project and country program impact indicator sets.
- ◆ HIID should consider producing synthesis reports on Project activities by more meaningful groups of countries -- e.g., the Baltic Sea states and the Danube River Basin states -- rather than be strictly captured by less relevant groupings like a geographically defined "Eastern and Central Europe" or the even more general rubric of "transition economies". HIID/Cambridge should also develop and disseminate a comprehensive set of papers on suggested analytic techniques to be used in monitoring and evaluating the

impacts of specific types of environmental policy reforms. Each paper should contain one or more detailed case studies drawn from the region to illustrate how various analytic techniques are applied to real data sets or other information.

- ◆ Project management should seek feasible ways to maintain regular communications with persons who have received training and/or worked with the SEPAs and SEFAs as envisioned in the Cooperative Agreement.

B. HIID/Country Programs

- ◆ Since country program activities in Estonia have already been terminated and are scheduled to be phased out in Latvia and Poland in the near term, full articulation of sets of country program impact indicators and targets for these country programs appears to us to be an unnecessary academic exercise. However, in order to capture the experiences of the three SEPAs involved in these programs, it is recommended that Dr. Larson for Estonia and Latvia and Drs. Anderson and Zylicz for Poland be requested to produce final appraisal reports on their country programs. These reports should fully detail the impacts seen from policy reform initiatives undertaken and project anticipated impacts from these initiatives in the medium term. When submitted to USAID/W and the appropriate USAID Representatives, these reports should be seen as fulfilling all C4EP Project responsibilities vis-a-vis impact indicators and targets for the three countries.
- ◆ Sets of impact indicators and targets should be fully articulated for Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria and Lithuania country programs by the end of December 1995. All negotiated sets of impact indicators and targets should be accompanied by statements indicating specifically how the indicators and targets are to be monitored and evaluated and what FY 1996 and FY 1997 USAID Representative and C4EP Project resources are to be allocated to such monitoring.
- ◆ All SEPAs prior to departure from their posts should be required to produce end-of-tour reports detailing the major activities of their country programs, the contribution of each activity to attainment of Project-specific outputs, and an estimate of the likely impacts of the policy reforms undertaken.

C. USAID/Washington

- ◆ We recommend that all Project implementation activities through July 1997 be managed by USAID/W under the spirit and letter of USAID regulations governing Cooperative Agreements. Relationships should be governed by the mutually defined and agreed to 1996/1997 HIID/Cambridge Work Plan negotiated between USAID/W and Harvard University as equal partners to the Cooperative Agreement. HIID/Cambridge should be not only permitted but strongly encouraged by USAID/W to take the lead in developing a comprehensive work plan for its C4EP Project activities in FY 1996 and FY 1997 and adjusting its management operations in accordance with such a plan.
- ◆ In the same spirit, it is recommended that USAID/W immediately take all necessary steps with USAID Representatives to clarify the precise roles and responsibilities of the USAID parties in programmatic management of the Project. Memoranda of understanding developed for each country program should then be communicated to HIID/Cambridge and to each SEPA and SEFA in the field.
- ◆ Over the balance of the Project, USAID/W should provide adequate funding to allow the C4EP Project COTR and the appropriate Project Officer to conduct at least one familiarization/supervision visit to each of the C4EP Project's country programs each year. In all cases, the COTR and Project Officer should be accompanied by the C4EP Project's Director or Deputy Director and the appropriate HIID project manager. To economize on scarce USAID funds, such visits should be timed to coincide with the C4EP Project's semi-annual meetings in the region.
- ◆ Objective 4 in the Cooperative Agreement if fully implemented by the SEPAs would pose serious issues of conflict of interest and breach of confidentiality and would be antithetical to working relationships with officials in the host governments. We recommend, therefore, that no direct efforts be expended in pursuit

of this objective and that USAID/W issue instructions with the Scope of Work for the final Project evaluation indicating that Project management should not be held responsible for non-fulfillment of this objective.

- ◆ Authorities to negotiate and approve international travel to and from C4EP countries for Project staff and contractors should be exercised by the COTR -- or another USAID direct-hire officer designated by the COTR.

D. USAID Representative Offices

- ◆ The highest priority task of USAID Representatives with respect to the C4EP Project should be finalizing the FY 1996 work plans with the SEPAs and in collaboration with USAID/W.

MAIN REPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Project Background

The Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project began in Poland, the Czech Republic, the Slovak Republic, Latvia and Estonia in early 1992. Initial activities were conducted under a grant agreement between the World Environment Center (WEC) in New York, N.Y. and the United States Agency for International Development in Washington, D.C. (USAID/W). Under this agreement, WEC was authorized to enter into a sub-grant agreement with Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts in April 1992. Under this sub-grant, the Harvard Institute for International Development (HIID) was designated as the implementing agency.

The principal objective of the WEC sub-grant was to provide consulting assistance in environmental economics to the designated governments. Integrating market-based incentives for environmental management and building the institutional infrastructure and national and local capacities required to implement this approach were seen as means of ensuring that the countries' transition processes would be environmentally sound, that environmental improvements would be achieved at the lowest possible cost, and that market-oriented economic development would be sustainable over the long term.

The HIID economic consulting assistance was initially seen as complementary to WEC's technical activities in environmental waste minimization with local plants and industries. By mid-1993, however, there was a consensus between USAID, WEC and Harvard University that the HIID assistance effort was sufficiently promising in and of itself to be continued and expanded. It was agreed that this could best be accomplished under a separate Cooperative Agreement between USAID and Harvard University, with HIID as the prime implementing agency. This Agreement was finalized in December 1993 based upon a detailed set of Fiscal Year (FY) 1994 activities.

Under this new Cooperative Agreement, the goal of the C4EP Project was to help ensure environmentally sound and sustainable development paths for the economies of Central and Eastern Europe by helping to design and implement national policies, laws, and regulations.

In May 1994, the Cooperative Agreement was amended to change the Project Activity Completion Date (PACD) from March 31, 1994 to July 31, 1997 and to increase the total funding obligated to \$ 5,331,017. Effective 29 September 1994, the Cooperative Agreement was further amended to increase the total estimated amount of funds (\$ 19,196,320) and the total obligated funds to \$ 6,531,017. This amendment also incorporated a Supplemental Program Description. This added environmental finance as a new area of policy assistance and authorized a subcontract with the World Resources Institute (WRI) of Washington, D.C.. This subcontract, also signed in September 1994, provided technical assistance to selected countries to help them in the process of formulating National Environmental Action Plans (NEAPs). The subcontract was effective for the period from 12 May 1994 to 30 June 1997. On 8 February 1995, the Cooperative Agreement was amended for a third time to obligate incremental funding in the amount of \$ 3,447,000 and to require that Harvard University provide a schedule of its billings showing a breakdown of budget line items by country.

As currently constituted then, the C4EP Project has a PACD of 31 July 1997 and a total estimated funding limit of \$ 19,196,320, of which \$ 9,978,017 has been obligated. As of 30 September 1995, HIID reports total estimated expenditures of \$ 4,736,587 and a carryover balance of \$ 5,241,430.

B. Implementation to Date

Through October 1995, the C4EP Project has placed resident Senior Environmental Policy Advisors (SEPAs) in the following countries: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Hungary. It has also placed Senior Environmental Finance Advisors (SEFAs) in Bulgaria and Slovakia. Finally, the Project has provided short-term consulting services to the Czech Republic and Albania for studies and other activities.

In each country having a resident advisor, a Policy Analysis Working Group (PAWG), consisting of distinguished local environmental professionals, was to have been established. The PAWG was to assist the SEPA in identification and analysis of local policy issues and to facilitate interactions with government policy makers. The PAWG was seen by HIID as one of the C4EP Project's major innovations and as a primary instrument for local capacity building, leading directly to the eventual replacement of expatriate advisors, and, thereby, providing for the sustainability of the project.

In all countries having resident advisors, the C4EP Project has used policy seminars, workshops, studies, position papers, and policy briefings as primary tools in implementing its work agenda. Advisors have attempted to maintain effective working relationships with government officials in relevant ministries and agencies and to liaise as appropriate with representatives of multilateral and bilateral donor agencies, international financial institutions, and their affiliated technical assistance groups.

Program direction and coordination, substantive backstopping and administrative and logistical support is provided by the HIID/C4EP Project staff in Cambridge. This staff consists of a part-time Project Director, part-time acting Deputy Director, two Project Managers, a Project Administrator, and three Staff Assistants.

II. FINDINGS

A. Project-Level Performance and Achievements

1. Identification and Analysis of Critical Environmental Policy Issues

Under the C4EP Project, SEPAs and SEFAs have met with host government officials to establish working agendas on key environmental issues. These agendas are fully reflected in the approved FY 1994 and FY 1995 work plans and are projected in the FY 1996 draft work plans. Prioritization of issues under these work plans has been primarily a function of host government concerns and wishes. HIID has seen the development of the work plans as a process for developing trust and mutual confidence with host government officials because the host governments were viewed as the primary clients for the C4EP Project.

The annual work plans and other publications produced by the Project to date indicate that substantial analysis has taken place in all country programs. Proceedings of seminars and workshops and existing intra- and inter-ministerial memoranda indicate that this identification/analysis/prioritization process has been carried out over time. In many cases, the working agendas have been developed using interactive working groups to identify and analyze specific issues.

2. Operationalization of Proposed Environmental Policy Responses

In most instances, the Project has followed a general process directed at setting an overall strategy for dealing with a specific environmental issue and contributing to the drafting of appropriate legislation related to that issue. In instances where legislation has been enacted, SEPAs, in collaboration with host government officials and legislators, are contributing to the development of regulatory mechanisms for implementation of new laws.

To date, with the exceptions of Romania and Poland, most work has centered on development of strategic approaches and assisting with the drafting of key legislation. In Romania, work is beginning to shift toward devising regulations and associated mechanisms for major pieces of legislation. Only in Poland, where the program has been in place since early 1993, are the SEPAs beginning to work with local agencies on actual implementation of new environmental legislation.

3. Development of Measures for Assessment of Results from Policy and Institutional Reforms

In general, SEPAs and SEFAs are working with their in-country colleagues to institute more detailed formal processes for analysis of proposed policy reform alternatives and/or specific environmental projects. These assessment processes have included improved methodologies for environmental impact assessments, environmental audits, financial and economic benefit/cost analyses, and introduction of contingent valuation surveys. According to government officials interviewed, these methodologies provide them with an improved base from which to monitor and analyze the results of new environmental legislation and associated projects in the medium term.

4. Identification of Comparative Advantage in Supply of Environmental Technology and Services

The evaluation team found no evidence of C4EP Project activities originated by the SEPAs to directly promote increased use of American environmental technologies and/or consulting services. The SEFA in Slovakia, however, reported that he had "promoted American manufacturers in discussions involving potential grant projects" and, as a result of the discussions, "there will be American control equipment in certain portions of the Vapenak Tisovec limestone project". The SEFA also stated that "based on discussions with the management of the Kovohuty Krompachy smelter, they are considering American suppliers for certain components of their investment project". Finally, he stated that the problem in his case was not so much a failure to promote American interests as the lack of American presence in the region and particularly in the country -- i.e., "it is impossible to promote the products of firms which have no physical presence in the country". [Smith, 1995d].

It is evident from the comments of host government officials that the placement of resident SEPAs and SEFAs has led to greater local appreciation of the value of the specific expatriate consultant expertise provided under the Project. In this regard, respondents in all countries were quite emphatic in pointing out that the consulting services under the C4EP Project were qualitatively superior to those they were accustomed to receiving from other sources. This was attributed to the fact that the SEPAs and SEFAs were seen as not having pre-conceived agendas for C4EP country programs. To the contrary, they were seen as being genuinely interested in gaining in-depth knowledge of an individual country's problems and the local approaches being developed to solve them; and as being willing and competent to present and explain a range of creative alternatives for dealing with specific environmental issues under analysis.

With few exceptions, appreciation of the value of consulting services did not extend to short-term expatriate consultants. Short-term expatriate consultants, regardless of source and origin, were generally seen as not being sufficiently aware of the unique nature of a country's problems and working conditions to function effectively in the time available. Some respondents did acknowledge, however, that some short-term expatriate consultants could be effective if engaged in two activities: providing information about other countries' approaches to mitigation of specific environmental problems or introducing new analytical methods and techniques to local technicians.

SEPAs said that their contacts with representatives of American private sector firms occurred largely on an ad hoc basis and often as the result of referrals from American Embassy and USAID personnel. They related that they have devoted no efforts to deliberately promoting the increased use of American technologies and services in their in-country activities. And, several SEPAs voiced the concern that such promotional activities would seriously conflict with their roles as advisors within host government agencies.

5. Training in Environmental Economics and Related Fields

Unlike many USAID policy reform projects in other countries, the C4EP Project has had no formal component to provide long-term training for host country people at American universities or government agencies. Rather, Project resources have been devoted to providing both in-country and regional participant training opportunities. The majority of such "training" takes place through informal, on-the-job interactions of SEPAs and SEFAs with their

government colleagues and through seminars, workshops, preparation of joint papers and reports, work in interagency groups on specific pieces of legislation, the design of surveys and follow-on analytic procedures. Reciprocal educational opportunities are also provided through SEPA and SEFA interactions with PAWG members and, in some instances, through individual SEPAs teaching at local universities and educational institutions.

Information supplied by HIID/Cambridge indicates that to date seminars and workshops sponsored by the Project have been attended by approximately 400 people. In addition, SEPAs have also participated in the selection and preparation of candidates for HIID's Summer Workshop on Environmental Economics and Policy Analysis over the past three years, although no workshop participants have actually been funded by the C4EP Project. Many of these participants have continued to work with the Project, either as members of PAWGs or in other capacities.

6. Accumulation and Presentation of Lessons Learned from Project Activities

One paper has been produced by HIID/C4EP Project staff in Cambridge which describes preliminary lessons learned from project implementation [Panayotou, T., 1995b]. Recent papers on effective financing for environmentally sustainable development in Eastern Europe and Central Asia [Panayotou, T., 1995a], optimal environmental liability policy for Central and Eastern Europe [Bluffstone and Panayotou, 1995], the state of environmental economics and training needs in Central and Eastern Europe [Chakarian, 1995], impediments to environmental investment in Central and Eastern Europe and the Newly Independent States [HIID, 1995k], and privatization, foreign investment and environmental liability [Panayotou, Bluffstone and Balaban, 1993] are further examples of HIID researchers trying to draw lessons learned from regional and interregional experiences. Workshop reports on specific environmental issues -- e.g., product charges, organization and management of environmental funds, and economic valuation of non-market goods -- also contain interesting cross-country policy comparisons. Finally, HIID/Cambridge reports that there is an edited volume in progress with the working title "Environment in Transition with Synthesis and Case Studies from the Field".

B. Individual Country-Level Performance and Achievements

While by no means comprehensive in their description of all aspects of each individual country program, the subsections below are intended to present the diversity in existing programs, relate respondents' comments about program performance, and highlight program achievements.

1. Slovakia

The country program in Slovakia is unique in that both a Senior Environmental Policy Advisor and a Senior Environmental Financial Advisor are located in the Ministry of the Environment. The SEPA focuses on the environmental economic policy issues, while the SEFA concentrates on development of bankable project proposals for funding agencies, both private and public. As the SEFA's time is divided equally between the C4EP Project and USAID's regional Environmental Action Plan Support (EAPS) Project, for which Harvard University is a sub-contractor, he also provides policy advice on removing barriers to environmental investments and facilitating the development of efficient capital markets.

The SEPA has identified a PAWG consisting of three economists from the Slovak Academy of Sciences, who are currently assigned to the Prime Minister's Office. In this position, they have provided the access to senior Slovak decision-makers which has proved critical to the incorporation of environmental policy into Slovakia's Industrial Policy. PAWG members have also published the book entitled Will Slovakia Survive the 21st Century? with the support of the SEPA. This book, presently available only in Slovak, puts forward an integrated approach to market economics, economic reforms, and environmental policy.

The work plans for the country program have been developed with inputs from the Ministry of the Environment, USAID/Bratislava, the SEPA and, more recently, the SEFA. Host government officials interviewed feel that the work plans accurately reflect the priorities of the Ministry; so much so that USAID/Bratislava and the Ministry of

Environment requested that the SEPA serve as the senior liaison person for all environmental programs jointly sponsored by USAID and the Ministry.

This coordination role within the Ministry has been a very important part of the SEPA's job responsibilities since the start of the Slovakia country program in April 1994. USAID/Bratislava believes that the SEPA has discharged this role very effectively, even when faced with three changes of national government in the nineteen months since the country program's inception. Another indicator of the excellent relationships which exist between USAID/Bratislava, the SEPA and the Ministry of the Environment is that USAID/Slovakia stated that it is the only country program in the region to have a mutually agreed set of program impact indicators and targets that are in full accord with USAID's Strategic Regional Framework and have been accepted as such by USAID/W. The Contract Office Technical Representative (COTR) in USAID/W, however, replied to this statement by USAID/Bratislava by saying that it was not correct because "none of the FY96 workplans have been approved by either USAID/W or the field. Therefore, none of the programs yet have an agreed upon set of indicators. In fact, the set of indicators proposed by Slovakia were the poorest quality in the group". [Freer, 1995b].

According to senior Ministry officials, the SEPA and SEFA have worked with them to support institutional building in four areas: development of staff analytical capability; deepening local understanding of the environmental policy approaches in Western Europe and North America; better understanding of the role of budget constraints on development of environmental policies and regulatory mechanisms; and improving capacity to understand and deal with information in English. The SEPA is also credited with assisting in prioritizing the agenda of environmental activities to be addressed by the Ministry. Another important contribution of the HIID/Slovakia team was the organization and implementation earlier this year of the first regional conference on heavy metals and leaded gasoline to be held in Slovakia. The government believes that this conference was very successful in highlighting its leadership in the region with respect to reducing air pollutants by introduction of exclusive use of unleaded gasoline.

The principal foci of the HIID/Slovakia team have been design of a revolving component in the national Environmental Fund, drafting of Freedom of Information legislation, introduction of a standardized methodology for environmental audits, and harmonization of Slovak and European Union (EU) environmental standards. The SEPA and SEFA also assisted in the identification of a multidisciplinary team of scientists, economists and industry experts to work on the Regulatory Impact Analysis process.

HIID/Slovakia team members also work closely with other groups involved in the environmental regulatory process. For example, the SEPA assisted in developing proposals submitted to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and facilitated the agreement between the Ministry and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on an environmental risk assessment program. Additionally, the HIID/Slovakia team made contributions to the materials presented by the government at the regional meetings in Sofia in October.

2. Hungary

The SEPA in Budapest is the only one of the HIID advisors to be assigned to a Ministry of Finance. He also maintains close working relationships with the Ministry of Environment and Regional Policy. The C4EP Project team in Hungary is also unique in that it is composed of the SEPA and a local Senior Policy Analyst (SPA). The SPA actually initiated several country program activities in Hungary prior to the arrival of the SEPA in September 1994 and it is anticipated that she will continue to provide continuity for FY 1996 program activities after the departure of the SEPA, now scheduled for June 1996. Respondents in Hungary credit the C4EP Project team with developing and fostering better relations between the Ministries of Finance and Environment and Regional Policy.

The C4EP Project team in Budapest has not clearly identified a PAWG. Individual specialists have been hired on a study-specific basis to contribute to the analysis of priority environmental issues.

USAID/Budapest has recently had a major turnover in personnel, including changes in both the Representative and the C4EP Project manager. At this time, the new project manager is advocating greater decentralization of C4EP program activities to have impacts at the regional and local levels where possible and, in the absence of a formal PAWG, directly including more mid-level career employees of the two ministries in analytical studies to enhance institutional capacity building.

With respect to program monitoring and evaluation, the SEPA and SPA have presented a draft set of impact indicators and targets to USAID/Budapest for consideration. It is anticipated that a final negotiated set of impact indicators and targets will be finalized for the FY 1996 country work plan.

According to some individuals interviewed, environmental protection is not a high priority of the government at this time. However, it was also stated that staff at the Ministry of Finance were developing an increased recognition that environmental issues need to be considered in the government's analyses of economic development issues. For example, as a result of the environmental auditing activities supported by the Project, the Government of Hungary has now funded an Environmental Evaluation Division within the Privatization Agency.

The activities of the HIID/Hungary team have focused on: work on the draft environmental law; preparation of an appendix to the product charge legislation; design of amendments to the Central Environmental Protection Fund; and environmental taxation issues.

The SEPA, SPA and other team members have worked with other organizations, ministries and agencies in the environmental policy area. For example, the team works with representatives from the EU's Polish/Hungarian Action to Reconstruct the Environment (PHARE) program on harmonization of Hungarian/EU environmental standards and coordinates activities when necessary with trade organizations, the Ministry of Finance or the Ministry of Environment and Regional Policy.

3. Latvia and Estonia

The SEPA for these two country was placed in the Ministry of Environment in Tallinn, Estonia in February 1994. He was then relocated to the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development in Riga, Latvia six months later, when USAID/W decided that its Estonia program activities would be phased out effective at the end of FY 1995. Ministry representatives in Estonia expressed great dissatisfaction with the abrupt termination of the C4EP Project in their country and with the way USAID in Washington and Tallinn handled the termination process. They said that during the six months the SEPA worked in Estonia he had been able to contribute effectively to the design of implementation regulations for pollution charge legislation; and that other important joint activities were being planned when they received notification of USAID's decision to terminate country program activities.

Since relocating to Latvia, the SEPA's interactions with ministry officials in Tallinn have been severely curtailed. He has managed, however, to facilitate the participation of several Estonian officials in various regional seminars and workshops. This assistance was greatly appreciated and is said to have resulted in improving the analytical capabilities at the ministry.

Although the SEPA has worked closely with several local environmental specialists on specific environmental issues over the last two years, a fully developed PAWG has not been organized in either country. Development of such groups was made more difficult by the decision to terminate C4EP Project activities in Estonia and by the lack of trained environmental economists in both countries.

In Latvia, the SEPA has been working primarily at the staff level in the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development. His activities have been focused in three areas: drafting of the Natural Resource Tax Law; contributing to a working group on environmental liability; and work on economic valuation of non-market goods. Each of these activity areas have been supported by seminars and workshops which host government officials and participants strongly endorsed as effective means to foster improved policy analysis.

At the time of the evaluation team's visits, USAID Resident Office personnel were in transition. In Latvia, the newly appointed USAID Representative -- a Personal Services Contractor (PSC) and ex-Mission Director in Botswana -- had not yet arrived at post although local contract program management specialists were in place. In Estonia, the USAID Representative had already departed post and the USAID Office was in an advanced state of close down. Under these circumstances, effective input from the USAID officers with decision-making authority was limited. Interviews with local program management staff were helpful to the evaluation team but the impression was that remaining country program activities were being directed from USAID/W to a much greater extent than in any other C4EP country.

4. Romania

Romania is the second oldest country program in the C4EP Project after Poland. The SEPA initiated program activities in November 1993. His placement is unique in that he is located at the Council for Coordination, Strategy and Economic Reform, which is a supra-ministerial agency responsible for coordinating all aspects of the national economic reform program. The Council cannot by law actually introduce environmental legislation and, therefore, the SEPA must work with line ministries and the Parliament where legislative actions are required on specific environmental policy issues.

Opinions on the desirability of placing the SEPA in the Council were decidedly mixed. USAID/Bucharest said that the reason USAID insisted that the SEPA be placed in the Council in the first place was that "the Ministry of Forests, Water and the Environment was considered to be very weak, especially Environmental Protection which had little staff or mandate. The real power lay in the Ministry of Industry (and Energy) in this very energy and mineral intensive economy". [Freer, 1995b]. The principal contact person in the Council strongly voiced the opinion that it would have been more desirable to place the SEPA in the Ministry of Waters, Forests and Environment Protection. Nevertheless, when the Council conducted a formal internal review of the SEPA's activities -- the only one presented to the evaluation team in any country -- the evaluators concluded that the SEPA's work was positively received by the host country counterparts. When government officials outside the Council were asked their opinion of the SEPA's placement, virtually all of them said that the SEPA was more effective precisely because he was positioned within the Council. One point of complete agreement among all respondents was that the SEPA's diligent efforts to learn Romanian have greatly enhanced his effectiveness and broadened his range of contacts within and outside the government.

The SEPA has been involved in a wide variety of environmental activities in Romania, but he has spent an estimated 90 percent of his time on two key issues: design and passage of the Environmental and Water Laws and the formulation of implementation regulations for these laws. During the legislative processes for both laws, the SEPA, at the request of the relevant committees, testified in Parliamentary hearings, explaining several key sections of the proposed legislation. In addition, the HIID team has begun work with local agencies to implement new environmental legislation, even in advance of the passage of the two major laws -- i.e., both have been passed by one chamber and passage by the other is expected in late 1995 or early 1996. Specific examples are: (a.) in the water sector, they are assisting a local water distributor to implement water metering and pricing; (b.) they are assisting the solid waste agency to improve its financing of containers; (c.) in the forest sector, they are assisting a local branch of a forest management authority by designing how to set starting bids for timber auctions in conformity with the draft law requirement for full value pricing of forestry products.

The SEPA has provided input into four other legislative and administrative actions. First, the SEPA worked to incorporate economic incentives into the draft Energy Efficiency Law. Second, the SEPA's comments were used to modify the Recycling Ordinance that was passed by the Parliament in 1995. Third, the SEPA has worked to include environmental considerations into the privatization process of the National Privatization Agency. Fourth, the SEPA and the PAWG, with short-term consulting advice from HIID/Cambridge, are helping to design a pricing system for setting initial bid levels for local auctions for timber rights in Romania. In addition, HIID team members are designing for the Department of Environment the country's permitting and compliance schedule regulations, which a key to environmentally sustainable enterprise restructuring.

The C4EP Project in Romania, in the opinion of government respondents, has used seminars and workshops effectively to develop a heightened awareness of environmental economic issues associated with the key legislative actions being undertaken. One major result of the seminars, workshops and daily contacts with government officials has been to increase the level of debate in environmental policy discussions and to create a more constructive tone in these discussions. The seminars and workshops have also been used to develop inter-agency and inter-branch coalitions to work on legislative and implementation issues, including working relationships with members of both chambers in the Parliament.

The SEPA has worked closely with donors, other USAID contractors, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on environmental issues in Romania. These activities have included, for example, working with EU's PHARE and Directorate General 17 programs, advising NGOs on the appropriate points of access to the government, and serving as an elected official of the Governing Council of the Romanian Energy Policy Association.

5. Poland

The C4EP country program in Poland is the oldest one in the region. The SEPA began work in Poland on a short-term consultant basis in April 1993 and on a resident basis at the Ministry of Environmental Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry in July 1993, but some initial work in-country was begun under Harvard University's sub-contract to the WEC.

The main contacts for the SEPA and the C4EP/Poland team are at the Director level within the Ministry. The team believes that focusing its activities at this level is appropriate and will ensure greater program stability in the event of governmental changes at higher levels. The SEPA position in Poland is now split equally between Dr. Glen Anderson, the original SEPA, and Dr. Tomasz Zylicz, a founding member of the PAWG. Dr. Anderson also has assumed a 50 percent assignment as the Assistant Manager and Regional Coordinator of the EAPS Project. It is anticipated that Dr. Anderson will terminate his formal relationship with the C4EP Project effective at the end of 1995 and that Dr. Zylicz will continue as the SEPA on a part-time basis through June 1996. Dr. Anderson will continue to reside in Poland while working full-time with USAID's EAPS Project.

The C4EP PAWG for Poland was formed in September 1993 with four founding members. It has since been enlarged and regionalized to include members located at universities in four major Polish cities. The PAWG has been actively involved in a range of policy analyses in support the country program. It has also worked in close collaboration with the Bureau of Experts of the Polish Parliament on environmental issues of mutual interest. The work of the PAWG is recognized by government officials as having been very effective. The PAWG members themselves believe that working with the SEPA in the PAWG relationship has significantly improved their individual skills in environmental economics. Finally, PAWG members have attended a number of international and regional meetings and conferences -- including the recent ministerial meetings in Sofia -- and thereby maintained a two way dialogue on environmental issues with very senior members of the Polish and other governments, international financial organizations, and donor agencies.

The primary focus of the SEPA has been on formulation of long-term environmental policy in Poland and not on the day-to-day activities of the Ministry. Two examples of this policy approach are: a paper prepared on economic policy and environmental management for the Environmental Commission of the Parliament; and contributions to Poland's Plan of Action in response to the Lucerne Agreements.

The SEPA and the HIID/Poland team were deeply involved in helping senior government officials prepare for the Ministers' Conference in Sofia in October 1995. This work focused on: the National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP); financing mechanisms to maintain biodiversity; a pilot project to be initiated under NEAP; economic instruments to be used in an OECD initiative; and a general statement of Poland's environmental reform policies. According to the Director of the Ministry's Economic Policy Division, the HIID/Poland team was responsible for more than 50 percent of content in the Polish delegation's presentations in Sofia.

The activities of the C4EP country program in Poland have covered a wide spectrum of issues over time. Examples of the activities include: product charges and fees legislation; joint implementation procedures and mechanisms under the Global Climate Change Convention; introduction of requirements for catalytic converters on used cars imported into Poland; and work on the various national and regional environmental funds, including the development of a project selection manual for the Krakow Voivodship Fund -- one of 49 such regional funds in Poland.

The workshops and seminars organized by the SEPA have been cited by participants as effective means for focusing environmental policy debates and introducing new issues and methodologies into the reform process. A seminar, followed by a workshop, on the pricing of non-market goods has resulted in several on-going studies which are anticipated to strengthen policy analysis in this area.

The USAID/Warsaw Representative was new to her position at the time of the evaluation team's visit and had not had time to focus on the Office's environmental program portfolio in any depth. However, the C4EP project manager spoke knowledgeably about the country program and said he believed that country program activities were fully representative of Ministry and USAID priorities, particularly with their substantial focus at the regional and municipal levels.

C. Impacts of the Project

1. Project-Specific Indicators Contained in the Cooperative Agreement

a. Country-Specific Environmental Strategies Integrated with Economic Policies?

In all country programs evaluated, respondents at USAID Offices and government ministries and agencies agreed that C4EP Project assistance had assisted the host governments in shaping appropriate environmental strategies that were integrated with and fully supportive of the major thrusts of host country economic policy reform efforts underway. The major thrusts across the region were oriented toward:

- ◆ moving from centralized administrative command controls to free market mechanisms as the economic basis for allocation of resources;
- ◆ moving from public sector domination to private sector acquisition and management of commercial enterprises and market controls on factor markets;
- ◆ developing approaches to environmental management and protection which are cost-effective and compatible with fiscal and monetary constraints on the economy;
- ◆ designing more targeted environmental fee and charge structures;
- ◆ using environmental audits to precisely determine owner liability and support privatization activities;
- ◆ developing systems and policies to support private property rights;
- ◆ introducing requirements for mandatory environmental impact assessments for projects; and
- ◆ improving methods for financial analysis of projects to improve the allocation of public and private resources.

b. Environmental Economic Policy Reforms Developed?

The evaluation team found evidence that a wide range of environmental economic policy reforms had been developed. Many of these policy reforms have been or soon will be enacted in law. In cases where legislation has

2.7

been enacted, SEPAs are working with host country colleagues to design and install implementation regulations for the new environmental initiatives. Specific examples of environmental economic policy reforms which have been developed are the Water and Environment Laws in Romania, the Freedom of Information Act and introduction of the exclusive use of unleaded gasoline in Slovakia, product charges legislation in Hungary and Estonia, work on improved forestry management in Estonia and Romania, and the efforts to improve financial and economic analysis of policy and project initiatives in all country programs.

c. Enhanced Contacts, Exchanges, and Trade and Investment Opportunities Fostered?

No deliberate actions have been initiated by the SEPAs under this objective. Most of the SEPAs expressed serious concerns about the presence of this objective in the Cooperative Agreement. They feel that deliberate attempts on their parts to attain this objective would seriously compromise them in their roles as advisors. They believe overt activities in direct support of this objective would immediately raise issues of conflict of interest and violation of confidentiality with their host country colleagues. Evidence of these concerns is tacitly expressed in the country program statements for FY 1996 by the universal omission of the objective. Since USAID Representatives in all countries evaluated have reviewed the work plans with the SEPAs, there is presumably considerable support at the country program level for deemphasizing this particular objective.

This said however, respondents in several countries did relate specific instances where policy reforms and/or specific projects to mitigate pollutant emissions would logically have the effect of creating effective demand for new environmental technologies and services. While there have been few efforts by C4EP Project staff outside of Slovakia to specifically channel such demand toward American private sector suppliers, beyond the selective use of American short-term consultants, the general opening up of the economies of Eastern and Central Europe certainly has increased opportunities for competition in the provision of such technologies and services.

d. Portfolio of Public and Private Sector Project Designs and Appraisals Developed?

The SEFA in Slovakia has been able to develop an initial listing of project proposals -- e.g., 15 to 20 possible projects for consideration -- under his joint C4EP/EAPS appointment. Several SEPAs have been involved in development of demonstration projects to introduce new processes and/or equipment in their countries. In Poland, where actual implementation of policy reforms is most advanced, the SEPAs have been working with a number of national and regional environmental funds to improve project design requirements and project selection procedures.

e. Set of Lessons and Experiences Documented and Disseminated?

One paper has been produced by HIID/C4EP Project staff in Cambridge which describes preliminary lessons learned from project implementation [Panayotou, T., 1995b]. Recent papers on effective financing for environmentally sustainable development in Eastern Europe and Central Asia [Panayotou, T., 1995a], optimal environmental liability policy for Central and Eastern Europe [Bluffstone and Panayotou, 1995], the state of environmental economics and training needs in Central and Eastern Europe [Chakarian, 1995], impediments to environmental investment in Central and Eastern Europe and the Newly Independent States [HIID, 1995k], and privatization, foreign investment and environmental liability [Panayotou, Bluffstone and Balaban, 1993] are further examples of HIID researchers trying to draw lessons learned from regional and interregional experiences. Workshop reports on specific environmental issues -- e.g., product charges, organization and management of environmental funds, and economic valuation of non-market goods -- also contain interesting cross-country policy comparisons. Finally, HIID/Cambridge reports that there is an edited volume in progress with the working title "Environment in Transition with Synthesis and Case Studies from the Field".

f. New Institutions and Mechanisms Analyzing Problems and Implementing Policies for Sound Environmental Management?

There are operative Policy Analysis Working Groups (PAWGs) in Slovakia, Romania and Poland and nascent associations of local consultants who work with the SEPAs in Hungary and Latvia. In the first three countries, respondents said that the PAWGs had provided at least five critical functions. They had:

- ◆ provided an informed forum for agenda setting and discussion of specific environmental issues;
- ◆ individually and collectively, had produced a broad range of studies and reports for use by policy makers in-country and in international fora;
- ◆ provided a wealth of country background knowledge and materials which allow individual SEPAs to be more effective in their advisory roles;
- ◆ facilitated access to senior decision makers in the host governments; and
- ◆ in a broader sense, provided opportunities to increase interaction between C4EP Project teams and the intellectual communities in the host countries.

Interviews in all countries visited revealed that the SEPAs had been very successful in helping to organize *ad hoc* groups to work on specific environmental issues and legislation. These groups were often interministerial in nature and, in some cases, were even broader in representation, including representatives from the executive and legislative branches of the host country and/or members from the private sector and the donor communities. Many government officials cited the SEPAs' work in facilitating the organization of such working groups as a major accomplishment of the C4EP Project. This was so simply because such a working style contrasted so starkly with their own ministries' tendencies to develop policy proposals in isolation until interactions with other ministries or other branches of government were absolutely forced upon them by legislative or regulatory processes.

The use of subject matter workshops for interdisciplinary discussions of policy reform proposals and developing consensus around specific courses of action was also cited by many government and donor respondents as a highly innovative and effective contribution of the C4EP Project. One of the principal characteristics of the host governments in all six countries, as they make their ways from command regimes to more open societies, is a lack of familiarity with specific techniques needed to foster more open and democratic decision making. Demonstrations of such techniques by the C4EP Project are seen by participants as needed and highly instructive.

g. Increased Environmental Awareness and Better Understanding of Markets Among NGOs and Local Groups?

SEPAs said that their interactions with NGOs had been limited and indirect. Under the sub-grant agreement with WRI, the SEPA in Slovakia has facilitated the in-country work of a WRI representative assisting a regional authority in developing a draft environmental action plan. SEPAs have also provided country briefings and other resources to representatives of the Environmental Law Institute working independently in their countries. In Romania, the SEPA worked closely with lawyers from ELI in drafting the Water Law.

SEPAs indicated that the limited contacts with international groups was often due to the absence of any local presence in the host countries. In cases where local NGOs exist, active collaboration with them was reported to be difficult because of the highly political nature of the groups in question. Such interactions were seen to carry with them a high potential for placing the advisors in untenable positions between their colleagues in the national ministries and agencies and NGOs with localized concerns. In some instances, however, SEPAs have made deliberate attempts to facilitate interactions with NGO representatives by inviting them to in-country seminars and

workshops.

Significant work has been undertaken with local municipalities and regional fund agencies in Poland and Slovakia, and with water basin authorities in Romania. Often such work has involved assistance for the development of specific demonstration projects and/or introducing methodologies to improve local decision making processes.

h. Improved Decision Making Process and Improved Decisions Advancing Economic Growth, Private Sector Initiatives, Resource Conservation and Environmental Protection?

The evaluation team found many instances where C4EP Project resources had strengthened host government decision making processes and/or improved prospects for economic growth on a sustainable basis. Examples cited by the SEPAs and host country officials include: contributions to the drafting of the Water and Environment Laws in Romania, the forestry management work in Estonia, the work on the Freedom of Information Act in Slovakia, improvements in product charge legislation in Hungary, introduction of the exclusive use of unleaded gasoline to reduce emissions and pollution problems in Slovakia.

SEPAs have also been instrumental in introducing new economic concepts and specific methodologies which government officials said they found very applicable to their work. Examples include work on: improving valuation of non-market products and resources, standardized methods for environmental audits and environmental impact assessments; design of demonstration projects for use of tradeable emissions permits; improved methods for setting initial bid levels for timber rights; and introduction of the "polluters pay" concept and moving this concept beyond large "point" pollution sites to mobile pollution sources of pollutants.

Finally, the work of the SEFA in Slovakia with public agencies and private firms in the host countries to introduce improved methods of financial analysis and facilitate development of "bankable" project proposals was seen as raising prospects for attracting much needed capital resources for economic expansion and mitigation of environmental pollution problems.

2. Project-Level Impact Indicators

As of the end of October 1995, no project-level impact indicators and targets had been formally proposed as the basis for evaluating the HIID/C4EP Project. Although several discussions have been held between USAID/W officials and HIID/C4EP Project staff in recent months, they have centered exclusively on developing appropriate indicators and targets for the individual country programs. To our knowledge, no similar attention has been devoted to formulating a set of project-level indicators and targets to specifically address the regional objectives in the Cooperative Agreement -- i.e., synergistic effects of the Project in the region, lessons learned from Project experiences.

Even though a number of criticisms were raised in interviews with USAID/W officials about the perceived lack of reporting on regional impacts of the Projects, there was no evidence that work is proceeding on development of a complete and separate set of impact indicators and targets for the C4EP Project as a whole. To the contrary, the working assumption seems to be that the impact indicators and targets negotiated for the individual country programs will simply be aggregated at the Project level to provide the basis for overall evaluation of the C4EP Project itself, even though core funds are specifically allocated to the Project for support of several regional activities.

D. Impacts of the Country Programs

1. Slovakia

Five impact indicators, with associated targets, selected from the Central Europe Strategic Framework have been mutually agreed to between the SEPA, SEFA and USAID officials in Bratislava. The impact indicators selected are:

- ◆ Establishment of policy, enactment of legislation, and development of regulatory procedures necessary to break-up monopolies, establish markets, expand the private sector and strengthen competitiveness in key economic sectors;
- ◆ Reduced uncertainty with respect to environmental risk;
- ◆ Government officials have capability to include financial analysis of projects' environmental components;
- ◆ Provide analytical framework for evaluation of environmental/economic impacts of legislation; and
- ◆ Government sector provides increased opportunities for public input into environmental policy and decision-making.

It is anticipated that these indicators and their associated targets will be used by HIID and USAID/Slovakia in FY 1996 to evaluate and report upon progress toward generating the anticipated impacts of this HIID/C4EP country program.

2. Hungary

The SEPA and USAID officers are currently formulating a set of appropriate impact indicators and targets drawn from the Central Europe Strategic Framework. The preliminary impact indicators proposed by the SEPA for consideration include:

- ◆ Market-based incentives for improved natural resources management and environmental quality are developed, tested and instituted;
- ◆ New policies, laws and regulations supporting the shift from command to free market economies address environmental quality concerns;
- ◆ Promulgation of energy standards, policies and legislation that support (a.) subsector restructuring, and (b.) commercial market development of energy efficiency and related environmental technologies and services;
- ◆ Competitive pricing for efficient use of energy resources;
- ◆ Government revenue generation systems shift to predictable, transparent, and cost-effective tax administration systems;
- ◆ Reduce air and water pollution at industrial and municipal sites;
- ◆ Government institutions are strengthened in their capacity to carry out environmental management responsibilities;
- ◆ Local government develop sustained alternative sources of revenues separate from central government and have control over their own budgets;
- ◆ Local and regional governments roles and responsibilities clarified and better executed.
- ◆ Private and public financing mobilized for specific investment projects in energy/environment; and
- ◆ Increase percent of GDP attributable to private sector activities.

3. Latvia and Estonia

According to a report received after the evaluation team had drafted its report, impact indicators and targets have now been formulated and mutually agreed to by USAID/Riga and the SEPA for the HIID/C4EP country program. [Sprong, 1995]. According to the SEPA, the development of such impact indicators and associated targets had been hampered by the departure of the last resident direct-hire USAID Representative from Riga in mid-1995. Their monitoring and evaluation in during FY 1996 will be difficult given that the SEPA is currently scheduled to depart post in March 1996.

The HIID/C4EP country program in Estonia effectively discontinued operations at the end of FY 1995 without having established a set of impact indicators and targets for program evaluation.

4. Romania

No impact indicators or targets have yet been finalized for the HIID/C4EP country program in Romania. Work on appropriate indicators has, however, been going on since the beginning of 1995 because USAID/Bucharest has been targeted by USAID as a model Office for implementation of its new management information system.

5. Poland

No impact indicators or targets have yet been formulated and mutually agreed to for the HIID/C4EP country program in Poland.

E. Project Management

This sub-section reports on the evaluation team's findings with respect to the overall management of the C4EP Project and isolates specific management issues for consideration in Section III.

1. General

When the present Cooperative Agreement was signed between USAID/W and Harvard University, succeeding the sub-grant with WEC, all projects designed for Central and Eastern Europe were based upon a regional approach, with both program and funding authorities residing with USAID/W. All parties to the Cooperative Agreement, signed in December 1993, assumed that programmatic and budgetary authorities for the Project would continue to reside in USAID/W.

Subsequent to the Project design process, USAID/W, following a policy already applied in other Regional Bureaus, transferred full funding authority for all USAID activities in the region to USAID Resident Officers in the host countries. Full authority for programmatic management of the C4EP Project, however, continued to legally reside in USAID/W. There was no redelegation of COTR responsibilities to the field.

As related in evaluation team interviews with Project participants in USAID/W, HIID/Cambridge and the field posts, this situation has had serious implications for the smooth and effective implementation of the Project. As Project activities have expanded over time in terms of the number of countries being served, the number of resident advisors in the field, and the financial resources available, the functional authorities and lines of communication in Project management are seen by participants as lacking in precise definition and as the root cause of many unnecessary tensions and personality conflicts. These problems were most evident to the evaluation team in the Slovakia country program, but it was clear that uncertainties over the division of financial and programmatic responsibilities were affecting or had the potential to affect managerial decision making in most of the other country programs. The areas where conflicts were most evident were:

28

- ◆ in the formulation of and approval process for annual work plans;
- ◆ in the rationalization of program objectives and work agendas with available funding; and
- ◆ in establishing of mutually agreed reporting systems and channels of communication.

Although no one interviewed disagreed with the fact that the legal document governing management of C4EP Project activities was a Cooperative Agreement, there was considerable variance among respondents as to the implications of the Agreement for day-to-day management of the Project. Senior management officers at USAID/W stated that they recognized the differences between project management under a Cooperative Agreement and a USAID contract, but were managing the Project as if the participant relationship was a contract. USAID officials at the field posts were split between those who said they were attempting to manage the relationship as a Cooperative Agreement between equal partners and those who said they managed all of the projects as contractual agreements. At HIID/Cambridge, the evaluation team was left with the impression that senior management initially thought implementation would follow the latitude and decision making of their other Cooperative Agreements; but they were quickly told by USAID/W that they were to be managed by USAID/W as a contractor. Faced with this situation, they became reactive to USAID/W instructions and less prone to exercise their own creativity in implementation activities, even though such independent actions are both permitted and encouraged by USAID regulations governing Cooperative Agreements.

The third major finding was the C4EP Project has built up a considerable pipeline problem through the end of FY 1995. As of 30 September 1995, \$ 9,978,017 had been obligated by USAID for Project activities and only \$ 4,736,587 had actually been disbursed against incurred expenditures. While this situation clearly demonstrates that Project managers have managed to implement a wide range of activities in ten different countries in a cost-effective manner, it also implies that the Project to date has been obligated more than twice the amount of the money it has actually needed to implement its activities.

2. HIID/Cambridge

The principal finding with respect to the management of the Project is that no substantive criticisms were raised about the current quality and effectiveness of Harvard University's administrative, logistical and financial management of the C4EP Project. To the contrary, C4EP Project staff in host countries have uniformly positive comments about the management they were now receiving from Cambridge and no criticisms were voiced in either USAID/W or the field posts on these aspects of Project management. The COTR in USAID/W did raise several criticisms with respect to HIID management in the early stages -- chiefly with respect to the clarity of financial budgeting and reporting and to "chaotic" administrative functions -- but acknowledged that these problems had disappeared since Ms. Alison Howe had been hired as Project Administrator. [Freer, 1995b]

In contrast to the overwhelmingly positive comments voiced about the current administrative, logistical and financial management of the Project, USAID/W and USAID country officers were somewhat critical of the lack of substantive backstopping for country program activities. Comments were made in USAID/W as to a perceived lack of substantive review by HIID/Cambridge of several papers either produced in Cambridge or transmitted from the field to Washington. Several SEPA's reinforced this view by saying that they were not getting sufficient critical input from Cambridge on the reports they had submitted for review and/or on their professional activities. They further stated that they did not believe HIID/Cambridge management was sufficiently aware of their felt need to devote more time at semi-annual Project meetings to in-depth discussions of the professional issues they are facing in their country program activities.

In all of these cases, the lack of professional backstopping was linked by respondents to the fact that the Project has not had the services of a Deputy Director at anywhere near the levels projected in the Cooperative Agreement. This finding was verified in a direct communication from the acting Deputy Director in which he said he actually billed for only 29 percent of his time in FY 1994 and 34 percent of his time in FY 1995, whereas the Cooperative

Agreement provides for a commitment of 75 to 80 percent of the Deputy Director's time. Since the acting Deputy Director has now assumed the position as Director of the Newly Independent States (NIS) Environmental Economics and Policy Project, it is unlikely he will spend a higher percentage of his time on C4EP Project activities in FY 1996 than he did in FY 1995.

With respect to provisions for project management in the Cooperative Agreement, the evaluation team notes that monthly technical project meeting with USAID/W are called for. Interviews and our review of project records indicate that, although there is virtually daily communication between Cambridge and Washington on individual implementation details, Project review meetings have not taken place as anticipated. When Project review meetings have taken place, they have almost always been held at USAID/W and have rarely exposed USAID/W officers to discussions with the entire HIID/Cambridge staff.

Finally, the evaluation team noted some confusion among HIID/Cambridge staff -- and with the SEPAs -- about what reporting was actually required for the Project. When it was pointed out, for example, that the Cooperative Agreement, does not mandate any monthly Project reports, neither HIID/Cambridge nor the SEPAs could explain who had imposed this requirement and why. The only explanation came from the SEPA in Poland who said that he, for purposes of documenting his activities, had started submitting monthly reports to Cambridge and filing them in Warsaw as essentially memoranda to the files. He acknowledged that he never actually had been asked to do so by HIID/Cambridge or by USAID. He assumed that the other SEPAs had simply adopted the same practice when they arrived at their field posts.

When USAID/W staff were asked about the monthly reports, only the Project Officer, since departed, stated that he usually read the reports when they were transmitted from Cambridge. He added, however, that he had recently negotiated production of a summary monthly report with HIID/Cambridge which incorporated the highlights of the SEPAs' reports in bulletized form and he found this adequate for his purposes. No one else in Washington admitted to reading the monthly report on a regular basis. In the field, all USAID staff directly involved in Project management said they did not normally read the monthly reports because they maintained sufficient contacts with the SEPAs to give them a working knowledge of country program activities before they were packaged in the monthly reports.

In the course of the evaluation, team members reviewed all monthly and quarterly program reports available to them. Cumulative financial reporting and detailed financial statements for FY 1995 were also reviewed. Our principal finding was that quarterly reports present an adequate picture of major Project activities. Monthly reports, on the other hand, are in general lengthy lists of the country program activities which are not logically linked to either the outputs anticipated in the Cooperative Agreement or any agreed sets of impact indicators and targets. Both monthly and quarterly program reports pose difficulties even for readers with some general knowledge of the Project's objectives and organization. These documents do not communicate clearly how the activities undertaken relate either to the expectations of the Cooperative Agreement or even to the annual country program work plans.

3. HIID/Country Programs

In discussions with SEPAs, it was evident that most felt that inadequate consideration had been given to the time and support requirements of setting up their offices and hiring staff in their respective countries. Several SEPAs said that they had had to devote up to 50 percent of their working time in the early stages of their assignments to finding adequate office space, getting necessary resident and work permits, securing reliable telephone, FAX and E-mail communications, and hiring office staff. They acknowledged that in retrospect these administrative tasks had seriously cut into the time and energy they had available to deal with their professional duties. This was particularly frustrating to them given the projected short-term nature of their assignments.

Several SEPAs said that they had since realized that local firms or individuals to facilitate such administrative tasks were available and, if they had been contracted with early on in the Project, could have freed them up to spend more time on professional issues of program development. Most also said that this situation was further complicated

by the fact that upon arrival they could not communicate at even rudimentary levels in the local languages and had been given only limited pre-arrival orientation on how to function in the host countries.

4. USAID/Washington

Respondents in the field, in Washington, and at HIID/Cambridge said that effective communications had been hampered by the frequent changes in USAID/W project management staff in 1994/1995. While management staffing was relatively stable during the design and early implementation of the C4EP Project, over the period from mid-1994, there have been significant changes in both direct-hire and contract management staff at USAID/W. This meant that at the time when the C4EP Project was in its maximum growth stage in terms of personnel in the region and number of countries served, USAID/W management staff was actually declining in size and country assignments were being shifted among several different project officers.

The present COTR said that lack of staff, USAID management restructuring, and assumption of other project responsibilities have limited the management time that could be devoted to the C4EP Project. She also stated that "the management burden became extremely compounded when we merged with the NIS with no new staff (in fact a loss of staff)". [Freer, 1995b]. The fact that, whereas the first two direct-hire USAID/W officers dealing with the design and initial implementation of the C4EP Project had extensive overseas project management experience at USAID field posts, none of the present managers in USAID/W -- direct-hire or contract -- have actual experience in project management at USAID field posts was also noted by the evaluation team.

The communications problem has been further complicated by the fact that current USAID/W staff have not travelled to C4EP Project sites on a regular basis. Indeed, at the time of our field interviews, some of the SEPAs and SEFAs said they had never had an in-country visit from a USAID/W C4EP Project officer, had never been able to introduce a USAID/W visitor to their C4EP host country colleagues, and had never been able to visit an in-country project activity site together with a representative of USAID/W.

It is evident from the evaluation team's interviews that the sub-contractual arrangement which put WRI under the C4EP Project has caused problems for all parties. No one interviewed in Washington, Cambridge or Slovakia was satisfied with the implementation of activities under this arrangement. Several respondents pointed out to the evaluation team that the difficulties incurred to date could have been avoided entirely if WRI's pre-existing cooperative agreement with USAID/W had been used to provide consulting services to individual countries in the region via a buy-in mechanism. Such a buy-in mechanism was seen by all parties interviewed as a more efficient way of providing the opportunity for direct working relationships between WRI and those countries in the region actually desiring its services but the current COTR in USAID/W stated that this could not have happened in the past because "the former Division Chief did not want to lose management control to the Global Bureau". [Freer, 1995b].

5. USAID Representative Offices

The major finding from interviews with USAID Representatives and their staff members is that recently they also have had limited time to devote to C4EP Project activities. This is so because they are struggling to reduce their activity portfolios to sizes more commensurate with their limited staff capabilities and declining budgetary resources, while simultaneously having to deal with increased demands generated by USAID's on-going internal management restructuring.

Since the C4EP country program in Estonia has already closed, the five SEPAs in Slovakia, Hungary, Latvia and Poland are currently scheduled to end their assignments by mid-1996, and C4EP activities are seen as phasing out in all of these countries, USAID Representatives are naturally and increasingly shifting their primary focus to portfolio activities slated to continue beyond FY 1996.

This situation has several implications:

- ◆ SEPA's in most of the countries evaluated are likely to have fewer opportunities to interact substantively with local USAID staff once the FY 1996 work plans have been finalized;
- ◆ SEPA's will have to maximize whatever opportunities are available to clearly and concisely articulate their program activities in ways that are directly relevant to the needs of local USAID officers -- i.e., demonstrating progress toward achieving the project outputs anticipated in the Cooperative Agreement and the work plans and toward addressing agreed impact indicators and targets;
- ◆ C4EP programmatic emphasis will necessarily shift toward two areas of concentration: seeking feasible ways of using remaining C4EP Project resources to sustain policy reform processes in the host countries after the SEPA's complete their resident assignments; and developing regional "lessons learned" statements on environmental issues drawn from the SEPA's' collective experiences; and
- ◆ for those countries affected, SEPA's and SEFA's will need to concentrate on affecting a smooth transition from C4EP to EAPS project activities.

III. CONCLUSIONS

This section presents the evaluation team's principal conclusions about the C4EP Project in summary form.

A. Overall Project Effectiveness

1. Success in Meeting Stated Objectives

a. Identification and Analysis of Critical Environmental Policy Issues

- ◆ The C4EP country programs have successfully identified and analyzed critical environmental policy issues.
- ◆ The issues selected for analysis are fully compatible with and supportive of the major economic reform objectives of the host governments.
- ◆ Significant progress has been made in integrating modern economic concepts and analytical techniques into environmental policy reform processes in all country programs.
- ◆ Program priorities have been set in accordance with host government requests for assistance and are not based upon a rigorous analysis of environmental risks.
- ◆ Adoption of host government priorities in the setting of annual work agendas has greatly facilitated local acceptance of the SEPA's as trusted and effective colleagues.

b. Operationalization of Proposed Environmental Policy Responses

- ◆ SEPA's have followed rational, step-wise approaches in operationalizing their work and contributing to development of environmental policy reforms in a collegial manner.
- ◆ SEPA's are well integrated into the working environments of the government agencies they are advising.
- ◆ A substantial body of environmental legislation has already been -- or soon will be -- promulgated with the assistance of the SEPA's and regulations to operationalize these new laws are being formulated often in advance of their passage.

- ◆ SEPA's have been highly successful in their efforts to promote the use of interministerial -- even interbranch -- working groups for building consensus around policy reform strategies and specific legislative initiatives.
- ◆ SEPA's have been successful in developing effective working relationships within their country programs regardless of the circumstances of their individual institutional placements.
- ◆ SEPA's in Slovakia and Romania, however, appear to have developed somewhat broader work agendas because in Slovakia the SEPA was given broad responsibilities for coordination of USAID environmental activities, and in Romania the SEPA was placed in a supra-ministerial agency with government-wide responsibilities for coordination of both economic and environmental reforms.

c. Development of Measures for Assessment of Results from Policy and Institutional Reforms

- ◆ Introduction by the SEPA's of more structured analytic procedures for policy analyses has resulted in identification of both intermediate steps in reform processes and measurable end-points for *ex poste* assessment of the impacts of policy reforms.
- ◆ Introduction of improved methods of financial analysis in project preparation and selection has provided the *ex ante* information needed to conduct *ex poste* analyses of actual project outcomes at later dates.

d. Identification of Comparative Advantage in Supply of Environmental Technology and Services

- ◆ Country program activities have created heightened local interest in new environmental technologies and consulting services but this has occurred largely as a by-product of the new legislation being promulgated.
- ◆ Whether or not this new interest will be translated into effective government and/or private sector demand for new environmental technology and/or consulting services in the near term is likely to be a function of the opportunity costs implicit in devoting limited host country resources to the environmental sector.
- ◆ There is no evidence that the C4EP Project has any deliberate strategy for either identifying unique U.S. comparative advantage in the provision of environmental technologies or services or in specifically promoting U.S. private sector contacts, exchanges and trade opportunities. The individual efforts of the SEFA in Slovakia, however, heightened the prospects that American equipment will be purchased for at least two local projects.
- ◆ Given the inherent conflict between the C4EP Project's objective of effectively delivering policy advice to host country decision makers and this objective of specifically promoting sales of U.S. products and services, the evaluation team believes the SEPA's have wisely chosen to downplay the latter activity because of its potential twin liabilities -- i.e., placing the SEPA's in positions where they are perceived by local government officials as having conflicts of interest and/or to be breaching government's expectations of confidentiality.

e. Training in Environmental Economics and Related Fields

- ◆ Placement of long-term resident advisors is universally acknowledged by government officials and other donor representatives as the most effective Project mechanism for establishing meaningful working relationships and for changing the ways local decision makers design and implement policy reforms.

- ◆ The PAWG model has not proven to be universally applicable to countries in Eastern and Central Europe primarily because of the differing human resource endowments of the host countries, particularly with respect to environmental economics. Creative use of local short-term consultants has, however, been an effective training mechanism in all country programs.
- ◆ Poland and Romania have been most successful in fostering the development of effective groups of environmental policy analysts including, but not limited to, environmental economists. These countries have developed effective PAWGs, but they have also used *ad hoc* interministerial working groups most effectively to better inform government officials, representatives of regional organizations and NGOs, and other participants on environmental issues.
- ◆ While critical masses of environmental economists have not been trained in all countries, each country program has contributed significantly to raising the level of environmental policy debate through introduction of new economic concepts and analytic methods.
- ◆ Seminars and workshops conducted in-country and regionally have been particularly effective as training mechanisms and as vehicles for transferring new processes and methodologies. Judging by respondents' comments, the more general papers developed to date may have had less impact on local decision makers.
- ◆ SEPA efforts to facilitate summer workshop training at HIID/Cambridge for a wide range of host country participants, although not financed by the C4EP Project, has clearly yielded benefits and built local decision making capacities. Many of the people trained have continued to be associated with the Project as PAWG members, environmental specialists in country offices, or consultants.

f. Accumulation and Presentation of Lessons Learned from Project Activities

- ◆ The evaluation team is concerned that there is no evident C4EP Project plan specifically oriented toward producing more synthesis documents. We also question whether Eastern and Central Europe, as defined by USAID/W for geographical management purposes, is an appropriate grouping of countries to use in drawing "regional" lessons learned. Interviews provided some indication that sub-regional groupings -- i.e., the Danube River states and the Baltic Sea states -- might provide a more cohesive basis for development of such papers.

2. Formulation and Attainment of Impact Indicators

- ◆ The evaluation team is concerned that USAID/W has made no request that HIID/Cambridge develop a set of project level impact indicators and targets directly related to the USAID Regional Strategic Framework. This omission leads to the impression that the final set of project level impact indicators and targets will be simply an aggregation of those indicators and targets formulated at the country program level. We see this approach as effectively precluding consideration of any impact indicators and targets related directly to evaluating the stated regional objectives of the Project and HIID/Cambridge's use of the regional activities core budget provided.
- ◆ Formulation of impact indicators and targets has been a difficult process which is still incomplete for all country programs according to the COTR in USAID/W. To date, only the Slovakia country program has formulated a set of impact indicators and targets which has been agreed to by USAID/Bratislava, the SEPA, the SEFA and HIID/Cambridge.

The consequence of the late demand by USAID/W for formulation of indicators and targets for all USAID projects and programs in Eastern and Central Europe is that USAID Representatives and SEPAs are now trying to retrofit appropriate sets of indicators and targets to country programs which have already been

terminated or are in the final stages of close down. The realistic prospects for evaluating C4EP Project impacts in Estonia, Latvia and Poland under the normal USAID impact monitoring process will, in the opinion of the evaluation team, essentially disappear with the departures from post of the two concerned SEPA's over the next five months. The feasibility of effective impact evaluations in Romania and Hungary are declining rapidly as the process of setting impact indicators and targets is drawn out.

- ◆ The integrity of the impact evaluation process has also been challenged by the fact that all discussions of impact indicators and targets to date have focused simply on their formulation, while no effective consideration has been given to exactly what procedures and resources will be required to actually proceed with monitoring and evaluating progress against the selected impact indicators and targets.

3. Integration with USAID's Strategic Framework for Central Europe

- ◆ The evaluation team is convinced that C4EP country program work plans are increasingly integrated with the planning documents of the USAID Resident Offices. To the extent that these plans themselves are integrated into the overall USAID Regional Strategic Framework, then the C4EP country program activities are *de facto* related appropriately to the Framework.
- ◆ The C4EP Project at the HIID/Cambridge has never been asked to develop a separate work plan for its regional activities. There is, therefore, no basis upon which we can objectively determine whether or not the specifically regional activities of the C4EP Project are integrated with USAID's Regional Strategic Framework objectives.

4. Management Efficiency in Delivery of Services

a. General

- ◆ While the lines of authority and direction for the Project were reasonably clear when full project management and funding responsibilities resided with USAID/W, subsequent delegation of financial authority to the Representative Offices has caused confusion for all parties. These difficulties center on the extent to which programmatic responsibilities must now be shared between USAID/W and the USAID Representatives to make the C4EP Project function smoothly and what financial authority and development of annual work plans really mean for Project implementation. Nominally, procedures and authorities are in place to handle the situation, but they are being interpreted differently in USAID/W and among the field Offices.
- ◆ Differing views as to whether the Project is to be implemented under the full intent of a Cooperative Agreement or as some other relationship have created uncertainty among the participants. In the opinion of the evaluation team, this uncertainty is particularly evident at HIID/Cambridge and has stifled creativity on HIID's part to the point where the Project staff is unnecessarily reactive to every demand coming from USAID/W and insufficiently aggressive in actually initiating desirable changes in Project implementation. Two examples of this problem are in not initiating work on regional synthesis reports in advance of being asked to do so by USAID/W, and in not revising the format and contents of monthly and quarterly reports to more effectively communicate Project accomplishments and impacts and/or to more effectively address the known concerns of USAID/W project managers.
- ◆ We believe that the FY 1996 work plan development and approval process has been much too long and complicated. It has absorbed too much time and energy of C4EP Project participants over the period from at least June 1995 to the present -- and it still appears far from completion. We see this management problem as caused by four things: general uncertainties within USAID as to FY 1996 budget levels and allocations; difficulties in implementing the comprehensive Agency-wide restructuring process underway;

continuing uncertainties as to operational effects of the continuing division of programmatic and financial decision making authorities between USAID/W and the USAID Representatives; and the continuing difficulties for all concerned parties of, first, precisely defining what is expected from USAID's system of impact monitoring and evaluating and then implementing it within the region.

Continued delays in approving the work plans are particularly disturbing in Latvia, Poland, Hungary and Slovakia where the SEPAs are scheduled to leave their posts in as little as two months and at the most in eight months. Dragging out the approval process means that valuable scarce C4EP resources are being diverted from their important advisory activities to draft and redraft work plans to country programs that in effect will not exist in eight months or less. In the opinion of the evaluation team, this is not an efficient use of Project resources, particularly at field posts where USAID Representatives have already decided to provide little or no FY 1996 funding for C4EP Project activities.

b. HIID/Cambridge

- ◆ Administrative support services provided from Cambridge are generally rated as excellent since the project has been fully staffed; however, there is a problem with the project's current capacity to provide effective and timely programmatic backstopping on substantive economic and technical issues.
- ◆ The fact that the Deputy Director position has been staffed for less than 50 percent of the time programmed in the Cooperative Agreement has definitely contributed to the perceived inadequacy in programmatic backstopping in Cambridge. The SEPAs and SEFAs have properly focused their individual efforts on development and implementation of their country programs. They unanimously stated they are not getting enough professional feedback on the papers and reports they have written and submitted for Cambridge review and on the substantive problems they face in program activities. Since the HIID Environment Program Director also serves the C4EP Project on a part-time basis, we believe that there is a critical need to expeditiously complete the recruitment process for a new full-time Deputy Director. When recruited, he or she should logically be charged with two major tasks: providing professional backstopping for SEPAs and SEFAs in the field and charting the course for HIID/Cambridge contributions to the Project over the last eighteen months of its existence.
- ◆ The absence of a detailed work plan for HIID/Cambridge over the life of the Project is one obvious reason why the regional objectives of the Cooperative Agreement have not been fully addressed. We believe it is essential that senior representatives of USAID/W and HIID/Cambridge meet face-to-face in the near future to develop a comprehensive plan to allocate funds from the Project's core regional budget to a detailed set of activities addressing the regional synthesis objectives. This plan should specify exactly how SEPAs returning to HIID from their field posts in 1996 will participate in these activities.
- ◆ When actual C4EP Project expenditures through FY 1995 are compared against the accomplishments to date, we conclude that the Project has been very cost-effective in its delivery of the services envisaged in the Cooperative Agreement.
- ◆ The buildup of pipeline funds over the first half of the Project's life unfortunately also heightens the risk in times of declining USAID resources that USAID Representatives will elect not to provide adequate FY 1996 and 1997 funding for Project activities until they are convinced that such obligations are absolutely necessary. If such funding is obligated to other USAID activities in the interim, the reward for frugality and cost effectiveness in implementation is likely to be less, not more, resources for implementation of Project activities over its life.
- ◆ We perceive the Project to have been based on some untested assumptions in setting out its objectives and outputs. First, there seems to have been an assumption that because the Eastern and Central European countries were grouped together as "countries in transition" that the Project and the SEPAs would be able

to advise on similar issues and have inputs and impacts at relatively similar levels. We have not found this assumption valid. To the contrary, there is clearly great diversity among the six countries evaluated which affects local absorptive capacities and dictates the potentials for work agendas and through what agencies and at what levels the SEPAs and SEFAs can work. In the functional sense, we do not see Central and Eastern Europe as any more of a region than is obtained by lumping all African or all Asian countries together as contiguous and, therefore, similar entities. If anything the reverse is true, countries in the "region" are less similar to one another because of the great variations in their stages of development and the differential effects of their experiences under Soviet occupation. Countries in the "region" clearly have many orientations in their policies other than to one another. For example, respondents in the Baltic countries and Poland were very concerned that the evolution of their environmental policies be compatible with both the EU and the western European states surrounding the Baltic Sea and much less concerned about harmonizing such policies with Hungary, Slovakia or Bulgaria. In the southern part of the "region", Danube River states appear to have much more interest in cooperating with each other in planning a river basin approach to environmental problems.

Second, the notion explicitly expressed in the Cooperative Agreement that the PAWG model, as developed in exploratory discussions with policy makers and academics from Eastern Europe and Russia in 1992 and 1993, could be made to work in each country in Eastern and Central Europe as a unique output of the Project and the major mechanism for sustaining program activities has proven fully valid in only two countries -- i.e., Poland and Romania. Results in other countries have varied widely as a function of the availability of trained environmental economists, SEPA working styles, the work agendas adopted, and relationships between government institutions and academic communities.

Third, we believe that initial estimates of the necessary lengths of SEPAs' tours in-country before being replaced by local environmental economists were certainly optimistic. Whether the short resident stays projected were simply a function of early estimates of likely Project financial resources or reflected genuine underestimates of how quickly country programs would evolve is unclear to us. The important conclusion, however, is that the Project management was sufficiently flexible to move from these initial placement decisions and ensure that advisors were placed for more appropriate tours.

c. USAID/Washington

- ◆ The lack of regular coordination/review meetings between senior management representatives in USAID/W and HIID/Cambridge, as called for in the Cooperative Agreement, has not been conducive to smooth implementation of the Project or clarification of appropriate lines of responsibility between the participants. In addition, we note that there has never been an effective mechanism -- i.e., regular workshop, conference or retreat -- to permit all C4EP Project participants to meet and discuss implementation issues. We believe the fact that USAID Representatives and/or their relevant staff members have been routinely excluded from all semi-annual Project meetings held to date has not been conducive to effective coordination of Project activities.
- ◆ We believe that frequent changes in C4EP Project direct-hire and contract management personnel and in individual job assignments in USAID/W during 1994/1995, combined with the fact that present management officers have no actual overseas experience with implementation of USAID projects, has complicated relationships with SEPAs and HIID/Cambridge staff. These factors have resulted in mixed signals in communications with both Cambridge and the field posts. It appeared to us from our interviews with USAID/W management staff that they had only a limited appreciation of the difficulties from a field perspective of implementing a complicated set of activities such as those in the C4EP Project. We perceived among current management staff a tendency to express unrealistic expectations as to the time needed to accomplish major economic reforms in the environmental sector and simultaneously generate measurable short-term impacts in situations as complicated and fluid as those being faced in Eastern and Central Europe. Whether these expressions were simply reflective of the expectations conveyed by more senior

USAID/W officers or were genuinely held by C4EP Project management staff themselves is a moot point from the perspective of the evaluation team. The consequences for mutual trust and confidence among all concerned participants within the Project as observed by the evaluation team are the same.

Finally, although the evaluation team found ample evidence in its field activities that the Project to date had contributed significantly to the process being made on a whole range of major economic/environmental reforms in the C4EP countries, we sensed a reluctance among USAID/W staff at all levels and at some field posts to believe that USAID assistance was actually having the desired effects projected in the Cooperative Agreement. We think this both inexplicable and very sad.

- ◆ We believe that the WRI sub-contractual agreement was poorly managed by USAID/W from the start. We think that WRI's particular expertise could have been offered to USAID Representatives in Eastern and Central Europe through the pre-existing WRI cooperative agreement with USAID's Global Bureau without ever having had to involve the C4EP Project or Harvard University. A buy-in relationship directly with a USAID country program would have provided for a much more direct and manageable two way arrangement with WRI.

d. USAID Representative Offices

- ◆ Given the current mandate from USAID/W on development of impact indicators and targets and the specific requirement that C4EP country program indicators and targets be included in the FY 1996 work plans, USAID Representatives have a special responsibility to work with SEPAs on the requisite impact indicator/target sets and, thereby, take a major step toward finalizing what has been an excessively long and complicated work plan process.
- ◆ Given budgetary uncertainties and impending program close downs in most countries, it is particularly important that Representatives allow sufficient time in their schedules for appropriate interactions with SEPAs so that C4EP activities are implemented in a manner consistent with each country's evolving program strategy.

B. Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Country Programs

1. Success in Meeting Stated Work Plan Objectives

- ◆ We believe that C4EP country programs were wise in deemphasizing the Project objective related to identification of American comparative advantage and promotion of contacts with U.S. private sector representatives. This objective poses a distinct risk to SEPA/SEFA relationships with host country officials and therefore is antithetical to accomplishment of the Project's overall goal and specific objectives.
- ◆ Seminars and workshops have been very effective in educating host government employees, local NGOs, and other donor organizations about unfamiliar economic concepts and specific analytic methodologies.
- ◆ SEPAs have provided high quality, objective and balanced presentations of policy options to host government decision makers, with appropriate emphasis on meeting EU entry requirements. The perceived impartiality of such presentations was a major factor in solidifying SEPA/SEFA relationships with local decision makers.
- ◆ SEPAs and SEFAs have worked effectively with representatives of other donors to provide high quality advice on relevant issues and develop effective working consensus around policy reform packages.
- ◆ Shortages of qualified environmental economists and other policy specialists seems likely to impact on the sustainability of Project initiatives in Latvia, Estonia and Hungary and, to a lesser degree, in Romania and

Slovakia. Only Poland seems to have a "critical mass" of trained environmental economists and policy analysts.

- ◆ The Project has made significant progress toward meeting most of its stated objectives; but time constraints will weigh heavily against most SEPAs being able to participate in any complete policy reform process -- i.e., from isolation of a key issue to actual implementation of a policy reform. Only in Poland and Romania do SEPAs appear to have real possibilities of doing this with major reform packages during their scheduled tours.

2. Formulation and Attainment of Impact Indicators

- ◆ Identification of impact indicators and the development of appropriate targets has been a very time consuming task, particularly for the SEPAs in country programs scheduled to close down in the near term. This process has been severely impeded by a lack of effective process guidance from USAID/W and a generalized and unrealistic resistance to the inevitable in HIID/Cambridge and among the SEPAs.

3. Integration with USAID's Strategic Framework for Central Europe

- ◆ The countries of Eastern and Central Europe appear to us to be much more oriented toward Western Europe than toward each other. To the extent they see merit in working together, it is generally in sub-regional groupings centered around specific economic and environmental situations. It appears, therefore, that more effective syntheses of C4EP Project activities could be developed if concentration were placed on sub-regional groupings where there are real confluences of economic and environmental interest -- e.g., the Baltic Sea states and the Danube River Basin countries -- rather than on Eastern and Central Europe simply because it is a geographically-defined region.

4. Management Efficiency in Delivery of Services

- ◆ We believe that HIID/Cambridge should have expended more Project resources at early stages of country program development to address and solve administrative and logistical problems faced by the SEPAs -- i.e., finding office space and equipping it properly, getting work permits, facilitating staff recruitment. On-the-ground assistance before and during the SEPAs' first few weeks in-country would have greatly facilitated the startup process and freed the SEPAs to work immediately on building relationships and formulating their work agendas.
- ◆ In the same vein, we believe that more consideration should have been given to having each of the SEPAs and SEFAs participate in the pre-arrival country orientation and language initiation program in Cambridge or at some other appropriate site outside their countries of assignment. Experiences in both this Project and many other USAID activities has demonstrated that it is not a viable strategy to expect a policy advisor to arrive in-country, set up a structured country orientation program and local language lessons, and still address his or her primary job responsibilities adequately.
- ◆ We see SEPA local language capability as having been instrumental in solidifying working and social relationships with host country colleagues in Romania and Slovakia. Conversely, lack of local language competence in the other countries has restricted SEPAs' abilities to make contacts and/or participate in policy discussions.

Our conclusion is that learning a local language is one major way of distinguishing a C4EP Project advisor from the pack of expatriate advisors host country officials must deal with every work day. While the presence of full-time local environmental specialists and/or part-time translators in C4EP country program offices certainly was positive in facilitating communications with local government officials, it was not, by the SEPA/SEFA's own statements, a wholly adequate substitute for individual competence in the local

language. In retrospect, therefore, we believe that language acquisition should have been stressed more than it was both in pre-arrival orientations and during the SEPA/SEFA tours in-country. We believe such an emphasis earlier in the Project would have yielded benefits substantially in excess of any short-time opportunity costs incurred since it clearly proved insufficient in most cases to simply have a policy in the HIID/C4EP administrative handbook which guaranteed up to \$ 1,000 per family for local language lessons if the SEPA or SEFA could arrange them over and above all his other job responsibilities.

- ◆ We believe that the process for obtaining USAID/W concurrences for travel for Project participants has been abused by at least one project manager in Washington who has deliberately held up clearances to demonstrate his personal disagreement with certain in-country program decisions taken by SEPAs and USAID Representatives.

5. Sustainability of Country Program Activities

- ◆ It should be noted that the C4EP Cooperative Agreement says very little about ensuring the sustainability of Project activities. There is virtually no mention of "institution building" support for host government agencies. At its core, the Project is clearly intended to be a short term exercise in the effective transfer of intellectual capital in environmental economics and related fields. No funding is provided for the types of activities USAID has traditionally used to support "institution building" processes -- i.e., provision of long-term training for government officials, logistical support for government agencies, construction of new or renovation of existing institutional facilities. In this sense, "sustainability" in the C4EP Project is much more about the sustainability of a core set of modern economic concepts and orientations and their expression in improved management of local environments, than it is about sustainability of particular local institutions.
- ◆ With this orientation in mind, we conclude that most of the policy reforms initiated with support from the C4EP Project have strong potential for sustainability because of the collaborative manner in which they were developed over time. The strongest evidence of this potential is the real sense of ownership of these reforms expressed by local decision makers.
- ◆ With respect to certain institutional innovations introduced under the Project -- i.e., interministerial and interbranch working groups, consensus building seminars and workshops, better procedures for environmental audits, impact assessments and financial analyses -- we believe local participants have been convinced of their utility.
- ◆ The sustainability of PAWGs in those countries where they actually exist appears doubtful if one anticipates maintenance of much more than loose networks of environmental specialists. There seems less doubt that the individual specialists who have participated in PAWGs or other contractual arrangements have benefitted enormously from the associations and will continue with their environmental policy work in a variety of roles -- e.g., as academics; elected officials; consultants to donors, private sector firms, or governments; or, perhaps, as appointed government decision makers.
- ◆ We believe that one of the important outputs of any HIID/Cambridge work plan for the balance of the C4EP Project should be a set of structured activities to address the professional needs of these emerging networks of environmental specialists as the SEPAs finish their tours and country program activities phase down.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. HIID/Cambridge

- ◆ Recruitment of a full-time Deputy Director for the C4EP Project by the end of December 1995 should be the highest priority task for HIID/Cambridge senior management. When recruited, the Deputy Director should focus on providing substantive review and feedback of the SEPA and SEFA field activities and reporting on and addressing the regional aspects of the Project envisioned in the Cooperative Agreement. Given that an excellent Project administrative staff is already in place and functioning well, the new Deputy Director should not be required to devote any of his time to the strictly administrative aspects of Project implementation.
- ◆ HIID/Cambridge, in collaboration with USAID/Washington, the SEPAs and SEFAs, should prepare a detailed work plan for its activities over the life of the Project. This work plan would specify the departure dates for all SEPAs and SEFAs and, in the case of personnel returning to HIID/Cambridge, indicate how they will be occupied through July 1997. The work plan should also contain a set of impact indicators and targets which at a minimum addresses the regional objectives of the Project and allocates resources provided in the regional core budget to support of specific HIID/Cambridge activities.
- ◆ In development of the HIID/Cambridge work plan, the status of all on-going policy reform activities in each country program should be evaluated in detail. If, in the considered opinion of all relevant participants, more substantial benefits are seen as likely accrue to the host country and the Project from leaving a SEPA in-country for a few more months to work on a highly specific and urgent set of policy actions, the evaluation team recommends that such flexibility be exercised, Project resources permitting.
- ◆ Monthly reports from the SEPAs and SEFAs, except as deemed necessary for purposes of internal management, should be discontinued. Quarterly program reports for general distribution should be prepared with summary statements of Project activities of HIID/Cambridge and each country program. Such statements should succinctly relate progress over the quarter toward attainment of project-specific output indicators stated in the Cooperative Agreement and targets in the Project and country program impact indicator sets.
- ◆ HIID should consider producing synthesis reports on Project activities by more meaningful groups of countries -- e.g., the Baltic Sea states and the Danube River Basin states -- rather than be strictly captured by less relevant groupings like a geographically defined "Eastern and Central Europe" or the even more general rubric of "transition economies". Alternatively, some of the synthesis reports could be designed around specific eco-environmental topics -- e.g., mitigation of air pollution drawing experiences from Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and the southeast Ukraine; or meeting environmental conditions for entry into the EU for near term candidates like Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Estonia.
- ◆ HIID/Cambridge should develop and disseminate a comprehensive set of papers on suggested analytic techniques to be used in monitoring and evaluating the impacts of specific types of environmental policy reforms -- e.g., water treatment, air pollution mitigation, product charges and fees, timber harvesting rights, environmental auditing and liability, etc.. Ideally, each paper should contain one or more detailed case studies drawn from the region to illustrate how various analytic techniques are applied to real data sets or other information.
- ◆ Project management should seek feasible ways to maintain regular communications with persons who have received training and/or worked with the SEPAs and SEFAs as envisioned in the Cooperative Agreement. Examples of potential linkages are maintenance of E-mail connections with ministries and universities, provision of access to library systems at Harvard University, distribution of all publications produced

through the end of the Project, and organization of seminars and workshops oriented toward sustaining skill levels in environmental economics and disseminating information on techniques for analysis of different types of environmental problems.

- ◆ In order to improve communications within the Project, senior staff from HIID/Cambridge and USAID/Washington should conduct Project review meetings on a quarterly basis starting in January 1996 and continuing through the end of the Project. The venues for such meetings should alternate between Washington and Cambridge to allow maximum staff participation. They should be used as opportunities to discuss Project activities in the broad perspective of attainment of anticipated Project outputs and impacts.

B. HIID/Country Programs

- ◆ Since country program activities in Estonia have already been terminated and are scheduled to be phased out in Latvia and Poland in the near term, full articulation of sets of country program impact indicators and targets for these country programs appears to us to be an unnecessary academic exercise. However, in order to capture the experiences of the three SEPAs involved in these programs, it is recommended that Dr. Larson for Estonia and Latvia and Drs. Anderson and Zylicz for Poland be requested to produce final appraisal reports on their country programs. These reports should fully detail the impacts seen from policy reform initiatives undertaken and project anticipated impacts from these initiatives in the medium term. When submitted to USAID/W and the appropriate USAID Representatives, these reports should be seen as fulfilling all C4EP Project responsibilities vis-a-vis impact indicators and targets for the three countries.
- ◆ Sets of impact indicators and targets should be fully articulated for Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria and Lithuania country programs by the end of December 1995. All negotiated sets of impact indicators and targets should be accompanied by statements indicating specifically how the indicators and targets are to be monitored and evaluated and what FY 1996 and FY 1997 USAID Representative and C4EP Project resources are to be allocated to such monitoring.
- ◆ All SEPAs prior to departure from their posts should be required to produce end-of-tour reports detailing the major activities of their country programs, the contribution of each activity to attainment of Project-specific outputs, and an estimate of the likely impacts of the policy reforms undertaken.

C. USAID/Washington

- ◆ We recommend that all Project implementation activities through July 1997 be managed by USAID/W under the spirit and letter of USAID regulations governing Cooperative Agreements. Relationships should be governed by the mutually defined and agreed to 1996/1997 HIID/Cambridge Work Plan negotiated between USAID/W and Harvard University as equal partners to the Cooperative Agreement. HIID/Cambridge should be not only permitted but strongly encouraged by USAID/W to take the lead in developing a comprehensive work plan for its C4EP Project activities in FY 1996 and FY 1997 and adjusting its management operations in accordance with such a plan.
- ◆ In the same spirit, it is recommended that USAID/W immediately take all necessary steps with USAID Representatives to clarify the precise roles and responsibilities of the USAID parties in programmatic management of the Project. Memoranda of understanding developed for each country program should then be communicated to HIID/Cambridge and to each SEPA and SEFA in the field.
- ◆ In order to improve communications within the Project, senior staff from HIID/Cambridge and USAID/Washington should conduct Project review meetings on a quarterly basis starting in January 1996 and continuing through the end of the Project. Such meetings should alternate between Washington and Cambridge to allow maximum staff participation and be used as opportunities to discuss Project activities

in the broad perspective of attainment of anticipated Project outputs and impacts.

- ◆ Over the balance of the Project, USAID/W should provide adequate funding to allow the C4EP Project COTR and the appropriate Project Officer to conduct at least one familiarization/supervision visit to each of the C4EP Project's country programs each year. In all cases, the COTR and Project Officer should be accompanied by the C4EP Project's Director or Deputy Director and the appropriate HIID project manager. To economize on scarce USAID funds, such visits should be timed to coincide with the C4EP Project's semi-annual meetings in the region.
- ◆ Objective 4 in the Cooperative Agreement if fully implemented by the SEPAs would pose serious issues of conflict of interest and breach of confidentiality and would be antithetical to working relationships with officials in the host governments. We recommend, therefore, that no direct efforts be expended in pursuit of this objective and that USAID/W issue instructions with the Scope of Work for the final Project evaluation indicating that Project management should not be held responsible for non-fulfillment of this objective.
- ◆ Authorities to negotiate and approve international travel to and from C4EP countries for Project staff and contractors should be exercised by the COTR -- or another USAID direct-hire officer designated by the COTR.

D. USAID Representative Offices

- ◆ The highest priority task of USAID Representatives with respect to the C4EP Project should be finalizing the FY 1996 work plans with the SEPAs and in collaboration with USAID/W.
- ◆ Since country program activities in Estonia have already been terminated and are scheduled to be phased out in Latvia and Poland in the near term, full articulation of sets of country program impact indicators and targets for these country programs appears to us to be an unnecessary academic exercise. However, in order to capture the experiences of the three SEPAs involved in these programs, it is recommended that Dr. Larson for Estonia and Latvia and Drs. Anderson and Zylicz for Poland be requested to produce final appraisal reports on their country programs. These reports should fully detail the impacts seen from policy reform initiatives undertaken and project anticipated impacts from these initiatives in the medium term. When submitted to USAID/W and the appropriate USAID Representatives, these reports should be seen as fulfilling all C4EP Project responsibilities vis-a-vis impact indicators and targets for the three countries.
- ◆ Definition of the precise roles and responsibilities of HIID personnel with joint appointments to the C4EP and EAPS Projects has been extremely difficult and posed unnecessary personal hardships on the two individuals involved in Poland and Slovakia. While we recognize that the C4EP country programs in Slovakia and Poland have provided the foundations upon which to build EAPS Project activities, we also observed confusion among government officials as to the roles and responsibilities of the SEFA in Slovakia and the SEPA/EAPS Regional Coordinator in Poland. We recommend, therefore, that the USAID Representatives in these two countries take all necessary steps to ensure that local officials recognize the differences between the two USAID projects and that the involved HIID personnel make smooth transitions from the C4EP to EAPS implementation activities.

ANNEX A
MID-TERM EVALUATION TEAM WORK PLAN

ANNEX A

WORK PLAN FOR MID-TERM PROJECT EVALUATION Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project [EUR-0004-A-00-4014-00 as amended]

I. EVALUATION TEAM SCOPE OF WORK

The evaluation team will conduct its activities in conformance with the Scope of Work presented to it in Cambridge. The principal sections of the Scope of Work are presented below.

A. Purpose

The Contractor will provide an objective, formal and external mid-term evaluation of the assistance provided under the C4EP Cooperative Agreement (No. EUR-004-A-00-4014-00 as amended). The mid-term project evaluation will assess the progress in achieving the objectives of the C4EP Project and of each of the Country Programs; the impact the C4EP Project is having in the region; and the opportunities to further advance the objectives of the Project and to improve the effectiveness with which it generates systemic change.

B. Issues for Strategic Evaluation

The Contractor's main tasks to evaluate performance are to:

- 1) a. Comprehensively assess and document the effectiveness of the overall C4EP Project in achieving its objectives. The objectives of the C4EP Project, as contained in the Cooperative Agreement, are:
 - (i) to identify and analyze critical environmental policy issues in Central and Eastern European countries, and to propose policy responses that can be integrated with the economic reform process underway without retarding economic growth;
 - (ii) to operationalize the proposed responses through a detailed design of property-rights arrangements, institutional mechanisms, and financial and fiscal instruments;
 - (iii) to develop measures for assessing the results of environmental policy and institutional reforms;
 - (iv) to identify areas in which the US has a comparative advantage (vis-a-vis Europe) in supplying environmental technology and services, and to promote contacts, exchanges, and trade opportunities between the US and Eastern European countries;
 - (v) to train a critical mass of economists, political scientists, and policy analysts in environmental economics, environmental policy reform, and natural resource management, through formal training and collaborative research; and

- (vi) to derive lessons concerning the interaction of environment protection and economic growth for countries beyond Eastern Europe and which provide a historically unique opportunity for combined economic and environmental policy reform.
- b. Comprehensively assess and document the effectiveness of each of the Country Programs in meeting its objectives as contained in the individual work plans for that country. In evaluating performance of the C4EP Project at the Country Program level, an overriding objective of the Contractor is to evaluate the match between Program service delivery and country-specific needs, taking into account that the needs, conditions, and political climates vary across countries, that each Country Program must be evaluated according to its own objectives, and that there has been an important shift of Program responsibilities within USAID from Washington to the field offices. An evaluation within this context will avoid overly simplistic cross-country comparisons.
- 2) a. Assess the C4EP Project's impacts and the impacts of the Country Program activities given that assessing the impacts of a policy project is difficult, as the potential benefits (enhanced investment and trading opportunities, improved quality of air and water, etc.) accrue gradually over the long-term. In carrying out this task, the evaluators should be guided by verifiable evidence of (among others) the following C4EP Project-specific indicators contained in the Cooperative Agreement:
- (i) country-specific environmental strategies integrated with economic policies;
 - (ii) environmental policy reforms such as introduction of market-based fiscal and financial incentives for environmental protection in privatization and market liberalization policy reforms; measures to deal with environmental liability risks constraining foreign investment; satellite environmental and natural resource accounts;
 - (iii) enhanced contacts, exchanges, and trade and investment opportunities between the private sectors in the US and Eastern Europe especially in the area of pollution prevention, reduction and abatement technologies and environmental consulting services;
 - (iv) a portfolio of public and private sector project designs and appraisals for improved environmental management (e.g., privately owned, user-financed collections and treatment facilities for hazardous wastes);
 - (v) a set of lessons and experiences that may have a wider applicability beyond Eastern Europe, especially for developing economies at the take-off stage of development;
 - (vi) new institutions and mechanisms for analyzing problems and implementing policies for sound environmental management;
 - (vii) establishment of new communication channels between the US and Eastern European on environmental policies, technologies, and investment opportunities;
 - (viii) increased environmental awareness, better understanding of markets (when they succeed and when they fail) and better appreciation and strengthening of NGOs and local groups affected by environmental impacts;

- (ix) an improved decision-making process and ultimately improved decisions that advance economic growth, private sector initiatives, resource conservation and environmental protection;
 - b. Use the insight and understanding gained from the above tasks and this mid-term project evaluation in general to determine the present and future impacts of the C4EP Project that will contribute to meeting the relevant USAID broad program objectives and accompanying indicators as contained in the USAID "Strategic Framework for Central Europe".
 - c. Assess the value and appropriateness of the impact indicators contained in the Country Program FY 1996 work plans.
- 3) Analyze why successes or possible failures have occurred in order to learn from such situations and to make recommendations on implementation of the C4EP Project and each of the Country Programs during the remaining two years of the Cooperative Agreement. In conducting this analysis, the evaluators should pay particular attention to the role of the Senior Environmental Policy Advisor (SEPA) (taking into account the expected tasks detailed in the Cooperative Agreement and in the work plans for each Country Program); field and US-based management of the Project, both by USAID and HIID; coordination with other donor activities, especially those of USAID; and country-specific factors, such as the political environment, status of economic reform efforts, and capacity in environmental economics and environmental policy analysis, management, legislation and implementation.

II. TEAM METHODOLOGY

A. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation team will use two principal methods for collecting the data and information needed to complete its mid-term evaluation report.

First, team members will conduct a comprehensive review of existing C4EP Project and country program documentation. Members will also review USAID's Strategic Framework for Central and Eastern Europe and examine the linkages between it and C4EP Project implementation activities. Other documentation on regional activities of relevance to on-going C4EP Project implementation will also be consulted.

Second, team members -- individually and/or collectively -- will interview all relevant participants in C4EP Project activities at HIID/Cambridge, USAID/Washington and at field posts in Latvia, Estonia, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania and Poland -- e.g., USAID resident personnel, SEPAs, SEFAs, PAWG members, ministerial-level representatives, local consultants, private sector participants, etc.. In addition, efforts will be made to interview representatives of donor agencies, non-governmental organizations, USAID project contractors, and other in-country organizations directing and/or participating in environmental activities in conjunction with or parallel to those being conducted with C4EP Project resources. In conducting team interviews, members will orient discussions around the list of questions presented in Section II.B. below.

Collation and analysis of the data and information garnered by team members will be conducted during the team's field operations. At the completion of each country visit, the team will develop and present a tentative list of its findings, conclusions and, as relevant, recommendations vis-a-vis the country program. The team will also organize a more comprehensive presentation of its findings, conclusions and recommendations for the C4EP Project mid-term evaluation for discussion during a one-day working session at the C4EP Project Workshop to be held in late October 1995 in Sofia, Bulgaria.

The draft mid-term evaluation report will be written for presentation to HIID/Cambridge and USAID/Washington by 10 November 1995. Upon receipt of comments and suggestions from these two sources, evaluation team

members will draft the final evaluation report. This report will be presented at team debriefings in Washington and Cambridge in early December 1995.

B. SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO BE USED IN EVALUATION TEAM INTERVIEWS

1. Impacts

- ◆ What have been the quantitative or qualitative impacts of the Country Program activities, for example new legislation, creation of environmental institutions, etc.? What factors have played a key role in influencing and determining the significance of these impacts?
- ◆ Have the willingness and ability of host-country counterpart institutions to absorb/accept/use the Country Program's outputs affected these impacts?
- ◆ Are these impacts sustainable in the longer term? Do they support a process or develop institutions that can carry on environmental policy work after the Country Program terminates?
- ◆ Do all of these impacts meet the objectives and/or goals of the Country Program, as contained in the Cooperative Agreement and the country work plan?
- ◆ Is the Country Program building the local expertise and a foundation for eventual replacement of the expatriate advisors with local experts?

2. C4EP Management/HIID Administration/USAID Management

- ◆ Is the C4EP Project managed effectively by HIID Cambridge? In what ways are HIID field staff included in the decision-making process?
- ◆ Does administrative and substantive backstopping support provided by the C4EP management team facilitate the work of field advisors? In what areas is this support efficient and effective? In what areas could this support be improved? Is the backstopping support focused on any particular type of support? If so, is this appropriate?
- ◆ How does the C4EP Project do strategic planning? Are Project meetings held with the correct frequency, with the right people, and are the meetings' recommendations implemented?
- ◆ How does C4EP management in Cambridge work to ensure that the objectives and the tasks of the Cooperative Agreement are met? Has it been successful?
- ◆ Do field staff possess the necessary experience and qualifications to undertake all aspects of the Country Program, including providing technical assistance, monitoring and evaluating on-going activities, and supporting administrative matters?
- ◆ Do C4EP Cambridge staff possess the necessary experience and qualifications to undertake all aspects of Project management and/or administration?
- ◆ What are the communications channels between the field offices and C4EP Cambridge management? Are these channels used appropriately (with the correct frequency, with a good match between the level of urgency of the matter and the channel used)? Do the field offices communicate and work effectively with one another?
- ◆ How accurate and complete are financial reports?

- ◆ What determines the percentage of resources devoted to management costs and is this appropriate for the scope and nature of the Project?
- ◆ To what extent is the management of the Project geared towards achievement of the long-term objectives of the Project?
- ◆ What is the relationship between the C4EP Cambridge management team and USAID/Washington? Are the lines of communication effective? Is the relationship conducive to timely and effective Project implementation? Is the C4EP Cambridge management team reporting to USAID on time? Is the team responsive to USAID requests?
- ◆ In general, how does the communication between USAID/Washington and USAID field office affect Project performance?

3. Field Operations

- ◆ Does the advisor have a coherent, long-term strategy and an operational work plan? Does the work plan reflect the Project objectives as contained in the Cooperative Agreement? Is the work plan properly modified when necessary to reflect changing circumstances? Does the work plan meet the needs/objectives/goals of the host country?
- ◆ What are the roles and tasks of the advisor? Do political, economic, institutional conditions shape these roles and tasks? How do these roles and tasks respond to the needs of the country?
- ◆ Are the advisors and their teams responsive to the day-to-day needs and requests of policy makers and of the USAID field and Washington offices without being sidetracked from their strategic plan for providing long-term policy advice and building capacity for more informed and effective policy-making?
- ◆ Is there a correct balance between the response to short-term policy needs and long-term policy analysis/advice, in light of the Project's objectives and the country's special circumstances?
- ◆ To what degree does the Country Program utilize short-term consultancies? For what purposes? Are these effective ways of using such consultancies? Do the selected consultants possess the necessary qualifications and experience for the assignment?
- ◆ Are the local staff and the PAWG effectively integrated into the Country Program? Has the Country Program built close working relationships with local counterparts and policy-makers to extend effective policy advice?
- ◆ What is the relationship between USAID field offices and the HIID field teams? Are the lines of communication effective? Is the relationship conducive to timely and effective implementation of the Country Programs?
- ◆ Are there major problem areas?
- ◆ Are there activities which should be expanded and/or strengthened? Are there activities which should be contracted or phased out? Are there any new activities that should be added?
- ◆ What improvements are recommended in terms of: management; counterpart relations, operations among projects, countries, agencies, etc.; communications; monitoring and evaluation; and reporting.

4. Monitoring/Evaluation

- ◆ What process is used by the in-country C4EP team to monitor the progress of its Country Program?
- ◆ What process is used by the C4EP team in Cambridge to monitor the progress of the C4EP Project and Country Programs?
- ◆ What measures have been selected for valuation and are they suitable to the goals and objectives of the C4EP Project and Country Programs?
- ◆ Who is responsible for monitoring and evaluating the Country Program in the field and is this conducted effectively?
- ◆ Who is responsible for monitoring and evaluating the Country Program at HIID Cambridge and is this conducted effectively?
- ◆ How is the coordination between the field and Cambridge in monitoring and evaluating the Country Programs?
- ◆ What are the feedback mechanisms to adjust the Country Program as necessary to improve performance?
- ◆ What are the feedback mechanisms to adjust the C4EP Project as necessary to improve performance?
- ◆ Are the lessons that are learned over time being regularly incorporated into the work of the Country Program to improve effectiveness? Are there means for Country Programs to share experience?
- ◆ What qualitative and quantitative indicators could be used by HIID and USAID to measure impacts of this type of policy project and of these types of Country Program activities in the future?

5. Coordination with Other USAID Programs and Foreign Donors

- ◆ How has the C4EP Project effectively supported the overall USAID strategic objectives for CEE?
- ◆ Has the C4EP field team taken advantage of opportunities to enhance Project success by effectively cooperating and coordinating with other USAID contractors (e.g., EAPS, ETP, WRI, WEC) and other major donors (OECD, World Bank, EU PHARE, other European governments)? How?
- ◆ Has the C4EP field team taken advantage of opportunities to enhance Project success by effectively cooperating with government-affiliated entities and academic institutions? How?
- ◆ Has the C4EP field team taken advantage of relevant opportunities to enhance Project success by effectively cooperating with NGOs working in the region?
- ◆ Has the C4EP field team taken advantage of any opportunities that might have arisen that would have benefitted the Project's success to co-sponsor events or conduct joint activities with any of the above organizations?
- ◆ Where appropriate, how has the Country Program created an atmosphere for joint activities between government agencies?

III. EVALUATION TEAM TRAVEL ITINERARY

Evaluation team activities will be conducted in accordance with the itinerary below.

<u>Work Site</u>	<u>Effective Dates</u>
HIID/Cambridge for initial discussions	18-20 September 1995
USAID/Washington for initial discussions	21-22 September 1995
HIID/Cambridge for initial discussions	25 September 1995
Bratislava, Slovakia	26-30 September 1995
Budapest, Hungary	1-4 October 1995
Riga, Latvia	5-8 October 1995
Tallinn, Estonia	9-10 October 1995
Vienna, Austria	11 October 1995
Bucharest, Romania	12-17 October 1995
Warsaw, Poland	18-24 October 1995
Sofia, Bulgaria	25-29 October 1995
USAID/Washington for follow-up discussions and production of the draft evaluation report	30 October-8 November 1995
HIID/Cambridge for follow-up discussions	9 November 1995
Team members at residences awaiting comments on the draft evaluation report	10-22 November 1995
Team members draft final evaluation report	24 November - 2 December 1995
USAID/Washington for final debriefing	4 December 1995
HIID/Cambridge for final debriefing	5 December 1995

IV. TENTATIVE OUTLINE FOR THE C4EP PROJECT MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT

Title Page
Project Evaluation Summary [PES]
Preface
Table of Contents
List of Terms and Acronyms
Executive Summary

MAIN REPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

- A. Project Background
- B. Implementation to Date

II. FINDINGS

- A. Project-Level Performance and Achievements
 - 1. Identification and Analysis of Critical Environmental Policy Issues
 - 2. Operationalization of Proposed Environmental Policy Responses
 - 3. Development of Measures for Assessment of Results from Policy and Institutional Reforms

4. Identification of Comparative Advantage in Supply of Environmental Technology and Services
 5. Training in Environmental Economics and Related Fields
 6. Accumulation and Presentation of Lessons Learned from Project Activities
- B. Individual Country-Level Performance and Achievements
1. Slovakia
 2. Hungary
 3. Latvia/Estonia
 4. Romania
 5. Poland
- C. Impacts of the Project
1. Project-Specific Indicators Contained in the Cooperative Agreement
 - a. Country-Specific Environmental Strategies Integrated with Economic Policies?
 - b. Environmental Economic Policy Reforms Developed?
 - c. Enhanced Contacts, Exchanges, and Trade and Investment Opportunities Fostered?
 - d. Portfolio of Public and Private Sector Project Designs and Appraisals Developed?
 - e. Set of Lessons and Experiences Documented and Disseminated?
 - f. New Institutions and Mechanisms Analyzing Problems and Implementing Policies for Sound Environmental Management?
 - g. Increased Environmental Awareness and Better Understanding of Markets Among NGOs and Local Groups?
 - h. Improved Decision-Making Process and Improved Decisions Advancing Economic Growth, Private Sector Initiatives, Resource Conservation and Environmental Protection?
 2. Impact Indicators

[No specific impact indicators have yet been adopted and formally approved for the C4EP Project -- to be supplied by USAID/W?]
- D. Impacts of the Country Programs
- [No specific impact indicators have yet been adopted and formally approved for the FY 1996 Work Plans]
1. Slovakia
 2. Hungary
 3. Latvia/Estonia
 4. Romania
 5. Poland
- E. Project Management
1. HIID/Cambridge Management
 2. HIID/Country Programs

3. USAID/Washington
4. USAID Missions

III. CONCLUSIONS

A. Overall Project Effectiveness

1. Success in Meeting Stated Objectives
2. Formulation and Attainment of Project-Specific and Impact Indicators
3. Integration with USAID's Strategic Framework for Central Europe
4. Management Efficiency in Delivery of Services

B. Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Country Programs

1. Success in Meeting Stated Work Plan Objectives
2. Formulation and Attainment of Project-Specific and Impact Indicators
3. Integration with USAID's Strategic Framework for Central Europe
4. Management Efficiency in Delivery of Services

C. Other Issues

1. Appropriateness of Proposed Impact Indicators
 - a. Project-Level
 - b. Country Program-Level

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. HIID/Cambridge
- B. HIID/Country Programs
- C. USAID/Washington
- D. USAID Missions

V. LESSONS TO BE LEARNED FROM THE C4EP PROJECT

REPORT ANNEXES

- ANNEX A -- EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK
- ANNEX B -- EVALUATION TEAM ITINERARY
- ANNEX C -- LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED
- ANNEX D -- REPORT BIBLIOGRAPHY

**ANNEX B
EVALUATION TEAM ITINERARY**

ANNEX B
EVALUATION TEAM ITINERARY

September 13-15 September 18	Document Review at Consultant's Residences 09:00 Team Meeting at HIID/Cambridge 11:30 T. Panayotou 14:30 J. Chakarian
September 19	10:00 L. Mandarino 14:00 A. Howe and S. Wernholm
September 20 September 21	10:00 P. Kroll, J. Ramljak and A. Brodsky 10:30 B. Macy at USAID/Washington 11:00 L. Freer at USAID/Washington 14:00 E. Petkova and T. Fox at World Resource Institute 15:30 J. Austin and S. Casey-Leftkowitz at Environmental Law Institute
September 22	09:00 B. Macy at USAID/Washington 10:00 M. Gilbert, A. Phillips and W. Breeman at the Environmental Protection Agency 13:00 J. Tarrant at USAID/Washington 14:00 P. Parks at USAID/Washington
September 23-24 September 25	Consultants at Residences 09:00 Team Meeting at HIID/Cambridge 10:00 J. Vincent 12:30 T. Panayotou, J. Vincent, L. Mandorino and J. Chakarian
September 26	Travel to Bratislava, Slovakia 14:00 L. Schulze, R. Grohs and M. Brunovsky at USAID/Bratislava
September 27	08:30 I. Zavadsky 10:00 M. Matuska 11:00 I. Mojik 13:30 T. Owen, T. Smith and D. Jassikova 15:30 A. Brunovska and M. Vagacova at Academia Istropolitana
September 28	07:45 J. Skultety 08:30 J. Myjavec 09:45 J. Zacharova 11:00 T. Mooney (Phone interview) 11:30 A. Steiner 12:30 B. Strecansky 14:00 L. Slobodnik 15:00 J. Prislupsky 15:45 P. Vozar
September 29	08:00 B. Gasparikova 10:00 P. Stanek, J. Cerna and J. Balazova 12:00 O. Trtilek 15:00 USAID Debriefing
September 30 October 2	Travel to Budapest, Hungary 07:00 G. Morris and Z. Lehoczki 09:00 A. Kemény 11:30 P. Kaderják

October 3	09:00 M. Koloszar 11:30 J. Sivak 14:00 E. Baka 15:30 G. Morris and Z. Lehoczki 16:30 Z. Boda
October 4	09:00 C. Laszlo 14:30 T. Cornell, M. Likar, B. Abrams, P. Egan and K. Okolicsanyi at USAID/Budapest
October 5	09:30 B. Abrams, G. Morris and Z. Lehoczki Travel to Riga, Latvia
October 6	07:00 B. Larson 10:30 Dagnija Kreslins at USAID/Riga 13:30 J. Bruneniaks 14:30 Z. Bruvers and B. Gaile 15:30 V. Vilnitis, I. Barkans and I. Vilka 16:30 A. Ubelis 19:00 R. Bluffstone and B. Larson
October 7	Reading documents
October 9	09:00 P. Zilgalvis 10:00 A. Melzobs and D. Hardonina 13:30 E. Sproge 14:30 J. Malzubris Travel to Tallinn, Estonia
October 10	09:00 P. Kolendi 10:00 E. Kraav 12:30 M. Tomberg 13:30 L. Gornaja 14:30 G. McDonnell 15:30 A. Gromov
October 11	09:00 O. Tammemaä 10:00 T. Gameson and D. Phillips 11:30 T. Kallaste 14:00 R. Ahas and A. Oja 16:00 A. Lääne Travel to Vienna, Austria
October 12	Travel to Bucharest, Romania
October 13	08:30 C. Zinnes 10:00 L. Ionescu 11:30 R. Hough and G. Moncea at USAID/Bucharest 13:30 C.I. Ungureanu and T. Florina 16:30 M. Velody
October 14	09:00 H. Puwak
October 16	08:30 I. Zelenco 09:45 I. Cetina 11:00 R. Dumitriu, T. Constantinescu, T. Carpen and M. Anca 14:00 C. Tarhoaca 15:00 F. Kan 16:00 F. Carcea and C. Corduneanu

October 17	09:30 I. Hortopan and C. Gajban 11:30 V. Afrasinei, A. Svoronos and M. Panait 12:30 M. Popovici 13:30 C. Zinnes 16:00 P. Dragomir and C. Ioan
October 18	08:30 L. Mara 10:00 R. Hough at USAID/Bucharest Travel to Warsaw, Poland
October 19	09:00 G. Anderson 10:00 A. Pecikiewicz and M. Jakubowicz 11:45 S. Olds at USAID/Warsaw 14:00 M. Haliniak 15:00 J. Spyrka 16:30 W. Bienkowski
October 20	10:00 B. Blaszczyk 11:00 T. Zylicz 12:30 B. Fiedor, B. Poskrobko and J. Sleszynski
October 23	09:00 C. Wieckowski 09:00 K. Bolek and M. Kociolek 11:00 M. Sobolewski 12:00 A. Czyz 14:00 S. Wajda
October 24	14:00 G. Anderson 15:30 S. Olds and G. Anderson at USAID/Warsaw
October 25	Travel to Sofia, Bulgaria
October 26	10:00 Mid-Term Evaluation Debriefing Attendance at C4EP Project Conference sessions
October 27	Attendance at C4EP Project Conference sessions Travel to Frankfurt, Germany
October 28	Travel to Boston, Massachusetts
October 29-10 November	Writing of Preliminary Draft Mid-Term Evaluation Report
11-22 November	Distribution of the Preliminary Draft Mid-Term Evaluation Report to Project participants for review and comments
22 November-4 December	Incorporation of participants' comments, editing and preparation of the Final Draft Mid-Term Evaluation Report
5 December	Final evaluation team debriefing at USAID in Washington, D.C.

ANNEX C
LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

ANNEX C
LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

I. HARVARD INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Harvard Institute for International Development -- Cambridge

Theodore Panayotou	Director of the International Environment Program and the C4EP Project
Jeffrey Vincent	Acting Deputy Director of the C4EP Project
Alison Howe	Project Administrator
Laurie Manderino	Project Manager
Janet Chakarian	Project Manager
Sally Wernholm	Project Accountant
Jonathan Ramljak	Staff Assistant
Philip Krall	Staff Assistant
Andrew Brodsky	Staff Assistant

Harvard Institute for International Development -- Bratislava, Slovakia

Thomas H. Owen	Senior Environmental Policy Advisor
Theodore R. Smith	Senior Environmental Finance Advisor
Danka Jassikova	Environmental Management Consultant
Peter Stanek	Head of the Policy Analysis Working Group/Economic Institute of the Academy of Science
Jana Cerna	Member of the Policy Analysis Working Group/Economic Institute of the Academy of Science
Jana Balazova	Member of the Policy Analysis Working Group/Economic Institute of the Academy of Science

Harvard Institute for International Development -- Budapest, Hungary

Glenn E. Morris	Senior Environmental Policy Advisor
Zsuzsa Lehoczki	Environmental Policy Advisor and Policy Analysis Working Group Member
Jozsef Fucskó	Office Manager
András Kis	Research Assistant
Éva Baka	Former HIID Contractor (through 30 June 1995) and now Environmental Affairs Manager for Tetra Pak Hungária Rt.

Harvard Institute for International Development -- Baltic States

Bruce A. Larson	Senior Environmental Policy Advisor/Latvia
Aija Kozlovska	Project Assistant/Latvia
Randall Bluffstone	Senior Environmental Policy Advisor/Lithuania

Harvard Institute for International Development -- Romania

Clifford Zinnes	Senior Environmental Policy Advisor
Adriana Dragomir	Executive Assistant
Cornel Tarhoaca	Professor and PAWG member

Harvard Institute for International Development -- Poland

Glen Anderson	Senior Environmental Policy Advisor (50 % time)
Tomasz Zylicz	Senior Environmental Policy Advisor (50 % time)
Jerzy Sleszynski	Financial Consultant
Bazyli Poskrobko	Policy Analysis Working Group Member
Boguslaw Fiedor	Policy Analysis Working Group Member
Barbara Letachowicz	Environmental Technical Advisor
Agnieszka Markowska	Administrative/Research Assistant
Sebastian Tomala	Administrative/Research Assistant

II. C4EP PROJECT SUB-CONTRACTOR

World Resources Institute [Sub-contractor to HIID under the C4EP Project], Washington, D.C.

Thomas Fox	Vice President
Elena Petkova	Senior Associate

III. UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

United States Agency for International Development -- Washington, D.C.

Lori J. Freer	Environmental Specialist/Bureau for Europe
Bonn Macy	Project Officer
Paul Parks	Project Officer
James J. Tarrent	Environment Policy Advisor

United States Agency for International Development -- Bratislava, Slovakia

Roy J. Grohs	Chief of the Economic Restructuring Division
Loren L. Schulze	Chief of the Environment, Energy, Urban Development and Agriculture Division
Martin Brunovsky	Project Advisor for Environment/Agriculture

United States Agency for International Development -- Budapest, Hungary

Thomas F. Cornell	USAID Representative to Hungary
Mary F. Likar	Project Development Officer
John A. Packer	Deputy Program Officer
Bruce Abrams	Project Specialist
Patrick T. Egan	Project Specialist
Karoly Okolicsanyi	Privatization Specialist

United States Agency for International Development -- Riga, Latvia

Dagnija Kreslins	Acting Representative to Latvia
Elita Sproge	Development Assistance Specialist

United States Agency for International Development -- Tallinn, Estonia

Peter Kohandi	Project Officer
Marika Tomberg	Former C4EP Project Officer

United States Agency for International Development -- Bucharest, Romania

Richard J. Hough	Representative to Romania
Gianina Moncea	Program Management Assistant

United States Agency for International Development -- Warsaw, Poland

Suzanne Olds	Representative to Poland
Andrzej Pecikiewicz	Project Liaison Officer
Maryla Jakubowicz	Project Liaison Officer

IV. OTHER UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

United States Environmental Protection Agency -- Office of International Activities, Washington, D.C.

Anna S. Phillips	Project Manager -- Central and Eastern Europe
William Freeman	Project Manager -- Newly Independent States
Michael H. Gilbert	Environmental Engineer/Project Manager

United States Peace Corps -- Bratislava, Slovakia

Andrej Steiner	Associate Director for Natural Resources
----------------	--

V. HOST GOVERNMENT MINISTRIES AND AGENCIES

Ministry of the Environment/Slovak Republic

Jan Prislupsky	State Secretary
Ladislav Slobodnik	Head of Office
Ivan Zavadsky	Director of the Air, Waste and Environmental Risk Division
Milan Matuska	Director of the Water Protection Department
Ivan Mojik	Acting Director of the Department of Air Protection
Alexander Institoris	Acting Deputy Director of the Department of Air Protection
Peter Vožar	Director of the Division for Environmental Economy
Jozef Skultety	Director of the International Relations Department
Jozef Myjavec	Director of the Department of Economic Instruments
Jana Zacharova	Director of the Nature Protection Department
Bozena Gasparikova	Head of the Environmental Law Department
Osvald Trtilek	Bilateral Cooperation Department

Ministry of Environment and Regional Policy/Government of Hungary

Attilia Kemény	Permanent State Secretary
József Sivák	Deputy State Secretary
Bela Donath	Acting Head of Department
Zsuzsanna Docsne Balogh	Economist

Ministry of Finance/Government of Hungary

Csaba László	Deputy State Secretary
Miklós Kolozsár	Chief Counsellor

Budapest University of Economics/Government of Hungary

Péter Kaderják Senior Lecturer/Department of Microeconomics and Policy
Analysis Working Group Member
Zsolt Boda Department of Business Economics

Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development/Government of Latvia

Janis Bruņenieks Director/Economics Department
Zigfrīds Brūvers Director/Project Department
Baiba Gaile Senior Specialist/Project Department
Valts Vilnītis Director/Environmental Protection Department
Indriķis Bārkans Deputy Director/Environmental Protection Department
Ilze Vilka Senior Referent/Environmental Protection Department
Dzidra Hardonina Director/Division of Natural Resources and State Cadastres
Andris Egle Environmental Liability and Privatization Working Group

University of Latvia/Government of Latvia

Janis Malzubris Department of Environmental Information and Management
Arnolds Ubelis Centre for Environmental Sciences and Management

Environmental Protection Committee of Ogre District/Government of Latvia

Andrejs Melzobs Director

Ministry of the Environment/Government of Estonia

Eva Kraav Vice Chancellor
Allan Gromov Head of Foreign Relations/Director of Project Management
Unit
Olavi Tammemaes Head of Department/Environmental Impact Assessment and
Normatives
Harry Liiv Head of Department/Environmental Protection
George McDonnell Project Management Unit/EU PHARE Program
Ljuba Gornaja Environmental Economics Advisor/Environment Information
Centre
Dariusz Kobus PHARE Strategy Project -- FENVIRON
Thomas Gameson PHARE Strategy Project -- FENVIRON

Tallinn Technical University/Government of Estonia

Ain Laane Environmental Engineering Department and PAWG member

Tartu University/Government of Estonia

Rein Ahas Geography Department and PAWG member
Hannes Veinla Law Faculty and PAWG member

Parliament/Government of Romania

Cretu Ioan	Senator
Popeseu I. Dragomir	Senator
C. Sandulescu	Legislative Specialist
Viorica Afrasinei	Deputy
Mihail Panait	Deputy
Andrei Svoronos	Legislative Specialist/Commission for Public Administration, Territorial Development and Environment Balance

Council for Coordination, Strategy and Reform/Government of Romania

Hildegard Purvak	Secretary of State/Reform Department
Sofia Ceacalopol	Assistant to the Secretary of State and Acting Council Contact Officer to HIID/C4EP Project
Iuliana Cetina	Former Assistant to the Secretary of State and currently at the World Trade Institute of Bucharest

National Commission for Statistics/Government of Romania

Clementina Ivan Ungureanu	General Director/General Division for Macroeconomic Synthesis, Analyses, Studies, Publications and Dissemination of Information
Tanase Florina	Director/National Accounts Division

Ministry of Industries/Government of Romania

Rodica Dumitriu	Director General for Management Legislation
Traian Carpen	Deputy Director General
Tudor Constantinescu	Deputy Director General/Romanian Agency for Energy Conservation
Marica Anca	Engineer
Mark Velody	Energy Policy Consultant/Synergy Project Office of the Department of Energy

Ministry of Waters, Forests and Environment Protection/Government of Romania

Ioan Hortopan	Counsellor to the Minister
Filimon Carcea	Forestry Advisor to the Minister
Constantin Gajban	Governmental Expert/Environment Department
Constantin Corduneanu	Director/Forestry Department
Liliana Mara	Director General/Water Department
Mihaela Popovici	Director/Strategies and Regulations Department
Herrie Heckman	PHARE Advisor

National Agency for Privatization/Government of Romania

Iacob Zelenco	President and Director General for Privatization
---------------	--

Parliament of Poland

Mirosław Sobolewski	Bureau of Experts
---------------------	-------------------

Ministry of Environmental Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry -- Government of Poland

Bernard Blaszczyk	Undersecretary of State
Czeslaw Wieckowski	Director/Department of Environmental Policy
Marek Haliniah	Vice-Director/Department of Environmental Policy
Joanna Spyrka	Senior Specialist/Department of Environmental Policy
Stanislaw Wajda	PHARE Legal Advisor

National Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management

Wojciech Bienkowski	Head of International Department
---------------------	----------------------------------

Supervisory Board of the Krakow Voivod Environmental Fund

Mr. Kociolek	Chairman
Krzysztof Bolek	President

Polish Ecofund

Andrzej Czyz	Vice President
--------------	----------------

VI. OTHER INSTITUTIONS AND AGENCIES IN HOST COUNTRIES

Academia Istropolitana Bratislava/Institute for Advanced Studies

Alena Brunovska	Director
Martina Vagacova	Program Manager

Romanian Association for Energy Conservation

Flora Kan	Administrative Officer
-----------	------------------------

VII. DONOR REPRESENTATIVES AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Canadian Embassy/Prague, Czech Republic

Terry Mooney	CIDA Representative
--------------	---------------------

World Bank Regional Mission for the Baltic Countries

Peteris Zilgalvis	Environmental Specialist
-------------------	--------------------------

Environmental Law Institute, Washington, D.C.

Jay E. Austin	Co-Director
Susan Casey-Lefkowitz	

World Wide Fund for Nature -- Latvia Program Office, Riga, Latvia

Valdis Seglins	Liepaja Project Manager
----------------	-------------------------

World Environment Center, Bucharest, Romania

Liviu Ionescu

Coordinator for Romania Technical Programs

Stockholm Environment Institute -- Estonia Office, Tallinn, Estonia

Tiit Kallaste

Environmental Specialist

65

ANNEX D
REPORT BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANNEX D
REPORT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahas, R. and B. Larson. [1995]. "The Financial Benefits of Estonian Forest Management: A Local-Level Case Study". HIID/Estonian Policy Analysis Working Group, Tallinn, Estonia
- American Embassy. [1993]. "United States SEED Act Assistance Strategy for Slovakia 1993-1995". American Embassy, Bratislava, Slovakia
- American Embassy. [1994a]. "United States SEED Act Assistance Strategy Update for Czech Republic 1994-1996". American Embassy, Warsaw, Poland
- American Embassy. [1994b]. "United States SEED Act Assistance Strategy Update for Hungary 1994-1997". American Embassy, Budapest, Hungary
- American Embassy. [1994c]. "United States SEED Act Assistance Strategy Update for Poland 1995-1997". American Embassy, Warsaw, Poland
- American Embassy. [1994d]. "United States SEED Act Assistance Strategy Update for Romania 1994-1997". American Embassy, Bucharest, Romania
- American Embassy. [1994e]. "United States SEED Act Assistance Strategy for Slovakia 1994-1996". American Embassy, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Anderson, G.. [1995a]. "Analysis of the Barriers to Environmental Investment in Poland: A Proposed Study". HIID/C4EP Project, Warsaw, Poland
- Anderson, G.. [1995b]. "C4EP Program in Poland". HIID/C4EP Project, Warsaw, Poland
- Arndtsen, M.. [1994a]. "Civil Liability for Environmental Damages in the Slovak Republic". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Arndtsen, M.. [1994b]. "Environmental Liability and Privatization in the Slovak Republic". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Baka, E.. [1995a]. "Implementation of Environmental Assessment and Performance Audits at the Hungarian State Property Agency: Final Report". HIID/C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary
- Baka, E.. [1995b]. "Final Report on Implementation of Environmental Assessment and Performance Audits at the Hungarian State Property Agency". Memorandum to Glenn Morris. C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary
- Balazova, J.. [1995a]. "Environment and Health Status in Citizens". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia. [Full text available only in local language].
- Balazova, J.. [1995b]. "Pollutants in the Food Chain". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia. [Full text available only in local language].
- Beardsley, D.P.. [1994]. "Report on the NEAP Process in Slovakia". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Bingham, T.H.. [1994]. "Application of Residuals Charges for Achieving Environmental Quality Objectives in the Czech Republic". Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.

- Bluffstone, R.A. and T. Panayotou. [1995]. "Optimal Environmental Liability Policy for Central and Eastern Europe". Environment Discussion Paper No. 7. HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Brūņeniķis, J. and B. Larson. [1995]. "Applying Economic Methods for Calculating Environmental Damages and Benefits -- Seminar Notes". HIID, Riga, Latvia.
- Budvytienė, V. et al. [1995]. The Institutional and Legal Framework for Environmental Policy in the Agricultural Sector -- Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. South Jutland University Press, Esbjerg, Denmark
- C4EP Project. [1995]. "Seminar -- Integrating Fiscal and Environmental Policy: Environmental Taxes". C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary
- CCSRE/HIID Think-tank for C4EP Project. [1995]. "Establishing an Environmental Liability Framework in Countries with Economies in Transition: The Case of Romania". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Chakarian, J.. [1995]. "Regional Review -- The State of Environmental Economics and Training Needs in Central and Eastern Europe". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Chemonics International, Inc.. [1995]. "Memorandum of Understanding between Chemonics International and the Harvard Institute for International Development -- September 1995". Chemonics International, Inc., Washington, D.C.
- Council for Coordination, Strategy and Economic Reform. [1995]. "Memorandum RE: Evaluation of the activities carried out between January through May 1995 by Mr. Clifford Zinnes, CCSRE/HIID Sustainable Development Advisor with the C4EP Project". Unofficial Translation. Government of Romania, Bucharest, Romania
- Csermely, A., P. Kaderják and Z. Lechoczki. [1994]. "Direct Impacts of Industrial Restructuring on Air Pollution in Hungary". C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary.
- Dax, P.. [1995a]. "Financing Municipal Dumps -- Field Report from Hungary". HIID/C4EP Project, Sofia, Bulgaria
- Dax, P.. [1995b]. "Links Between Environment, Privatization, and Prices". HIID/C4EP Project, Sofia, Bulgaria
- DeShazo, J.R.. [1995]. "Exhibits and Documents prepared for the Urban Environmental Services Study and Survey in the Municipality of Iasi, Romania". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- EcoFund. [1995]. "EcoFund -- Polish Debt for Environment Swap". EcoFund, Warsaw, Poland
- Ensmann, E.L., L. Gornaja and B.A. Larson. [1995]. "The Pollution Policy "Cocktail" in Estonia: Economic Incentives and Problems for Implementation". Environmental Discussion Paper No. 5. HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Environmental Action Programme Support Project (EAPS). "Environmental Action Program Support Project -- Project No. DHR-0039-C-00-5034-00 -- Regional Work Plans -- Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia". Chemonics International, Washington, D.C.
- Environmental Information Center. [1995]. Keskkond 1994 Estonian Environment. Ministry of the Environment of Estonia, Tallinn, Estonia

- Environmental Law Institute. [1995a]. "Environmental Program for Central and Eastern Europe -- Activities Report, 1988-1995". Environmental Law Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Environmental Law Institute. [1995b]. "Resource Memoranda -- Environmental Program for Central and Eastern Europe". Environmental Law Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Environmental Law Institute. [1995c]. "US NGOs' Position Paper on the Environmental Action Programme for Central and Eastern Europe". Environmental Law Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Environmental Law Institute. [1995d]. "Working Papers -- Environmental Program for Central and Eastern Europe". Environmental Law Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Farrow, S.. [1995a]. "Comparing Economic and Administrative Instruments: The U.S. Experience". Environment Discussion Paper No. 6. HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Farrow, S.. [1995b]. "The Czech Republic: Potential Cost Savings from Using Economic Instruments". Environment Discussion Paper No. 4. HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Farrow, R.S. and R. Bluffstone. [1995]. "Implementable Options for Cost Effective Air Pollution Reduction in Northern Bohemia". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Freer, L.. [1995a]. "Comments on C4EP Draft Workplans for Central and Eastern Europe". Memorandum of 3 October 1995 from L. Freer, USAID/Washington to L. Mandarino, HIID/Cambridge. USAID, Washington, D.C..
- Freer, L.. [1995b]. "Comments on Mid-Term Evaluation". Memorandum of 30 November 1995 from L. Freer, USAID/Washington to John H. Eriksen, Ithaca International Limited, Ithaca, N.Y.. USAID/Washington, Washington, D.C..
- Goldenman, G.. [1995]. "Environmental Liability and Privatization in Romania -- Stage I Report". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Government of Hungary. [1995]. Act LVI of 1995 on Environment Product Fee, as well as on environmental product fees of individual products. Government of Hungary, Budapest, Hungary.
- HIID. [1993a]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project -- Hungary Program -- Draft Work Plan". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1993b]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project -- Poland Program -- Work Statement/Work Plan". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1993c]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project -- Romania Program -- Work Plan". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1993d]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project -- Slovakia Program -- Draft Work Plan". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1993e]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project -- The Baltic Republics Program -- Draft Work Plan". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1993f]. "Quarterly Report October-December, 1993". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts

- HIID. [1993/1995]. "Hungary Monthly Report". Issues November 1993 to July, 1995". HIID/C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary
- HIID. [1994a]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project -- Poland Program -- Work Statement/Work Plan Year Two". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1994b]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project -- Romania Program -- Work Plan -- Year Two". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- HIID. [1994c]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project -- Romania -- Draft Work Plan for October 1, 1994 - September 30, 1995". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1994d]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project -- Slovakia -- Draft Work Plan for October 1, 1994 - September 30, 1995". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1994e]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project -- Slovakia Program FY 95". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1994f]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project -- The Latvia Program -- Draft Work Plan October 1, 1994 to September 30, 1995". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1994g]. "Quarterly Report January-March, 1994". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1994h]. "Quarterly Report April-June, 1994". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1994i]. "Quarterly Report July-September, 1994". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1994j]. "Poland Policy Analysis Working Group (PAWG) Quarterly Report January - March, 1994". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1994k]. "The Draft Environmental Law and the Process of Restructuring and Privatization in Romania -- Papers presented at the joint Parliamentary-Governmental seminar at Sinaia 16-17 September 1994". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- HIID. [1994/1995a]. "Estonia Latvia Monthly Report". Issues March 1994 to September 1995. HIID/C4EP Project, Tallinn, Estonia and Riga, Latvia
- HIID. [1994/1995b]. "Monthly Activity Report -- Romania". Issues February 1994 to June 1995. HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1994/1995c]. "Poland Monthly Report". Issues April 1994 to July 1995. HIID/C4EP Program, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1994/1995d]. "Slovakia Monthly Report". Issues December 1993 to July 1995 inclusive. HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- HIID. [1995a]. "Bulgaria Monthly Report". Issues March 1995 to May 1995. HIID/C4EP Project, Sofia, Bulgaria

- HIID. [1995b]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project -- Czech Republic -- Work Plan for June 1, 1995 - December 31, 1995". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1995c]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project -- Hungary Environmental Economics Policy Program -- Implementation Work Planning Period -- October 1, 1994 - September 30, 1995 Year One". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1995d]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project -- Romania -- Draft Work Plan for October 1, 1995 - September 30, 1996". First Draft. HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1995e]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project -- Romania -- Draft Work Plan for October 1, 1995 - September 30, 1996". Second Draft. HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- HIID. [1995f]. "Chronological Staff List for C4EP Project". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1995g]. C4EP NIS EEP Highlights in Environmental Economics -- Spring Issue 1995. HIID/C4EP and NIS Projects, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1995h]. C4EP NIS EEP Highlights in Environmental Economics -- Summer Issue 1995. HIID/C4EP and NIS Projects, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1995i]. "Document List September 1995". HIID/C4EP and NIS Projects, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1995j]. "FY 96 Workplan Budgets". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1995k]. "Impediments to Environmental Investments in CEE and the NIS". C4EP Project and the Newly Independent States Environmental Economics and Policy Project/HIID, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1995l]. "Latvia Draft Work Plan for October 1, 1996 - September 30, 1996 (FY 96) -- Section I - Program". HIID, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- HIID. [1995m]. "Minutes of the Project Meeting held in Budapest, Hungary April 27-28, 1995". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1995n]. "National Environmental Action Program (NEAP)". HIID/C4EP Project, Sofia, Bulgaria
- HIID. [1995o]. "Project Preparation -- Bulgaria". HIID/C4EP Project, Sofia, Bulgaria
- HIID. [1995p]. "Quarterly Report October-December, 1994". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1995q]. "Quarterly Report January-March, 1995". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1995r]. "Quarterly Report April-June, 1995". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1995s]. "Round-table on the Romanian Draft Water Law -- Papers presented at the Round-table in Bucharest 6-10 February 1995". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania

71

- HIID. [1995t]. "Scope of Work Mid-Project Evaluation -- Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project (EUR-0004-A-00-4014-00, and Amendments 1 and 2". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1995u]. "Slovakia Draft Work Plan for October 1, 1996 - September 30, 1996 (FY 96) -- Section I - Program". HIID, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- HIID. [1995v]. "Summary of Actions Agreed -- Project Meeting in Budapest, Hungary April 27-28, 1995". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- HIID. [1995w]. "Terms of Reference -- Evaluators for the C4EP Mid-Project Evaluation". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Howard, D.M.. [1993]. "Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0004-A-00-4014-00". Letter of 2 December 1993 to P. Tucker, Office of Sponsored Research, Harvard University. USAID, Washington, D.C..
- Jassikova, D.. [1995a]. "Environmental Liability". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Jassikova, D.. [1995b]. "Legislation in Water Management". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Kaderják, P.. [1995]. "Valuing Health Related Benefits from Air Quality Improvement in Hungary: A Review and Recommendations". C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary
- Lääne, A., E. Loigu, A. Vasilyev, I. Blinova and Ü. Leisk. [1995]. "Surface-Water Quality in Estonia: What Do Existing Data Show and How Do the Data Relate to Possible Ambient Quality Goals". Tallinn Technical University, Tallinn, Estonia.
- Larson, B.A.. [1995a]. "Categories of "Environmental Damages". Memorandum to Environmental Liability and Privatization Working Group. HIID, Riga, Latvia.
- Larson, B.A.. [1995b]. "Comments on background document -- Latvian International Fund for Environment -- for Donors Meeting, April 21, 1995". Memorandum to Jānis Bruņenieks. HIID, Riga, Latvia.
- Larson, B.A.. [1995c]. "Draft Estonia, Latvia Monthly Report July-August, 1995". HIID, Riga, Latvia.
- Larson, B.A.. [1995d]. "Draft Estonia, Latvia Monthly Report September, 1995". HIID, Riga, Latvia.
- Larson, B.A.. [1995e]. "Environmental Liability Related Clauses in Latvian Law". Memorandum to Janis Bruņenieks and Ruth Bell. HIID, Riga, Latvia.
- Latvian Environmental Liability Working Group. [1995]. "Summary for Discussion at next meeting on 5 July 1995". HIID, Riga, Latvia.
- Lechoczki, Z.. [1993]. "Experiences of Using Economic Instruments: Summarizing Report". Ministry of Finance, Budapest, Hungary
- Lechoczki, Z. and G.E. Morris. [1994]. "Environmental Fund Disbursement: Incentives for Performance in Central and Eastern Europe". First Draft Document. HIID/C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary
- Lechoczki, Z. and G. Peszko. [1994]. "Environmental Funds in the Transition to a Market Economy". Paper prepared for the OECD Conference on Environmental Funds, St. Petersburg, Russia, 27-28 October 1994

- Lechoczki, Z. and C.F. Zinnes. [1994]. "Financing Environmental Investment in Romania: Environmental Protection Fund". C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary
- Lechoczki, Z., P. Kaderják, M. Kopasz and L. Paizs. [1994]. "Regulating SO2 Emission through Cost Effective Policy: the Case of Hungary". C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary
- Lechoczki, Z. and G.E. Morris. [1995a]. "A Preliminary Review of Draft Product Charge Legislation for Environmental Protection". HIID/C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary
- Lechoczki, Z. and G.E. Morris. [1995b]. "Environmental Fund Disbursement: Incentives for Performance in Central and Eastern Europe". HIID/C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary
- Lechoczki, Z. and G.E. Morris. [1995c]. "The Prospects for Integrating Tax and Environmental Protection Policies in Hungary: Background". HIID/C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary
- Mertus, P.. [1995]. "The Mission of the State Environmental Fund of Slovakia". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Ministry of Environmental Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry et al.. [1995]. "Proceedings from the International Conference -- Strengthening Environmental Funds in Economies in Transition". Conference held at the Jablonna Palace, Poland 10-12 May 1995. Ministry of Environment Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry, Warsaw, Poland
- Ministry of the Environment of the Slovak Republic. [1995]. "Enviro Guide Slovakia". Ministry of the Environment, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Morris, G.E.. [1995]. "Indicators and Targets". Memorandum of 20 October 1995 from G.E. Morris, HIID/C4EP Project/Budapest to J.H. Eriksen, Mid-Term Evaluation Team Leader. HIID/C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary.
- Morris, G.E. and A. Kis. [1995]. "Estimating the Economic and Environmental Impacts of Tire Product Charges in Hungary". HIID/C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary
- Morris, G.E. and Z. Lehoczki. [1995a]. "Annotated Sections of the HIID/Hungary Project FY '95 Work Plan". HIID/C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary
- Morris, G.E. and Z. Lehoczki. [1995b]. "Environmental Taxation Background". Memorandum to Miklós Kolozsár. HIID/C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary
- Morris, G.E. and Z. Lehoczki. [1995c]. "State of Environmental Economics in Hungary". HIID/C4EP Project, Budapest, Hungary
- Office of Sponsored Research. [1994]. "New Subcontract to World Resource Institute". Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Oja, A. and B.A. Larson. [1995]. "Unexpected Pollution and Environmental Liability in Estonia: A Review of Current Policy and Problems". Research Report, June 1995. HIID, Riga, Latvia.
- Openshaw, K.. [1994]. "The Demand and Supply of Fuelwood and Other Wood/Forest Products in Albania: Their Economics and Environmental Significance". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts

- Owen, T.H.. [1994a]. "An Overview of Environmental Issues and Governmental Initiatives in Slovakia". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Owen, T.H.. [1994b]. "Conceptual Framework for the Development of the National Environmental Action Plan in Slovakia". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Owen, T.H.. [1994c]. "Memo about the Slovak Environmental Revolving Fund". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Owen, T.H.. [1995a]. "Environmental Strategy in Canada". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Owen, T.H.. [1995b]. "NEAP and the Role of Foreign Donors in Slovakia". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Owen, T.H.. [1995c]. "Letter of 22 November 1995 from Thomas H. Owen to John Eriksen". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia.
- Owen, T.H.. [1995d]. "Slovakia -- Country Overview". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Panayotou, T.. [1993]. Green Markets: The Economics of Sustainable Development. International Center for Economic Growth and the Harvard Institute for International Development, CS Press/Institute for Contemporary Studies, San Francisco, California.
- Panayotou, T.. [1995a]. "Effective Financing of Environmentally Sustainable Development in Eastern Europe and Central Asia". Environmental Discussion Paper No. 10. HIID, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Panayotou, T.. [1995b]. "Integrating Environmental and Economic Policy Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: Lessons Learned and Their Implications". HIID, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Panayotou, T.. [1995c]. "Comments on the Draft Evaluation". Memorandum to the Evaluation Team of 26 November 1995. HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Panayotou, T., R. Bluffstone and Balaban. [1993]. "Lemons and Liabilities: Privatization, Foreign Investment, and Environmental Liability in Central and Eastern Europe". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Parks, P.. [1995]. "Draft: Impacts of the Investment Initiatives (PPC) of the Environmental Action Programme for Europe". Memorandum of 2 August 1995 to Lori Freer. USAID, Washington, D.C.
- Peszko, G.. [1995]. "Overview of Environmental Funds and other mechanisms of financing environment investments in some CEE and CIS countries". Paper presented to the Third Annual World Bank Conference on Environmentally Sustainable Development -- "Effective Financing of Environmentally Sustainable Development" held in Washington, D.C. 4-6 October 1995. Cracow Academy of Economics and HIID, Cracow, Poland
- Petkova, E.. [1994]. "Bulgaria -- The Start of a Local Planning Process Local Environmental Action Programme -- or L-EAP". World Resources Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Powell, J., P. Kaderjak and F. Verkoijen. [1994]. "Empirical Benefit Estimates for Improving Air Quality in Hungary -- WTP for Clean Air in Hungary". Budapest University of Economic Sciences/Department of Microeconomic, Budapest, Hungary

- Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe/Budapest and Budapest University of Economic Sciences/Department of Environmental Economics and Technology, and the Center for Environmental Studies/Budapest. [1994]. Hungarians and the Environment in 1993. Budapest University of Economic Sciences, Budapest, Hungary.
- Ruzicka, I.. [1994a]. "Albania Private Forestry Development Project -- Design of a Forestry Policy Initiative". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Ruzicka, I.. [1994b]. "Sustainability Without a Big Stick: A Study of Forestry Policy in Albania". HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Sachs, J.. [1995]. "Keynote Address Economies in Transition: Some Aspects of Environmental Policy". Environment Discussion Paper No. 1. HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Segerson, K.. [1995]. "Environmental Accidents: An Economic Framework for Policy Evaluation". Environmental Discussion Paper No. 11. HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Semèniènè, D. and R. Bluffstone. "The Lithuanian Pollution Charge System: Evaluation and Prospects for the Future". HIID/C4EP Project, Vilnius, Lithuania
- Smith, T.R.. [1995a]. "A Concept Paper Describing the Establishment of an Environmental Economics & Finance Institute". C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Smith, T.. [1995b]. "Environmental Regulatory Impact Analysis Guideline". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Smith, T.. [1995c]. "Kovohuty Krompachy". Memorandum to Gretchen Mikeska, Chemonics. HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Smith, T.. [1995d]. "Letter of 16 November 1995 from Theodore Smith to John Eriksen". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia.
- Smith, T.. [1995e]. "The Kovohuty Krompachy Copper Smelter Environmental Investment Project". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia
- Smith, T.. [1995f]. "The Slovak Environmental Revolving Fund". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia.
- Sproge, E.. [1995]. "HIID Mid-Term Evaluation Report". Memorandum of 30 November 1995 from E. Sproge, Program Management Specialist, USAID/Riga to L.Freer, USAID/W. USAID/Riga, Riga, Latvia.
- Stadiu, F.. [1995]. "Letter to the Project Evaluation Team". Ministry of Water, Forests and Environmental Protection, Bucharest, Romania
- Stanek, P. and J. Cerna. [1994a]. "Debts and their Risk Factors in 1995-2000 in Slovakia". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia. [Full text available only in local language].
- Stanek, P. and J. Cerna. [1994b]. "Environmental Fund". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia. [Full text available only in local language].
- Stanek, P. and J. Cerna. [1994c]. "Macroeconomic Analysis of the Present SR". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia. [Full text available only in local language].

- Stanek, P. and J. Cerna. [1995a]. "Financing of the Ecological Policy in the Slovak Republic". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia. [Full text available only in local language].
- Stanek, P. and J. Cerna. [1995b]. "Interrelations Between Environment Policy/Concerns in Economic Policy". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia. [Full text available only in local language].
- Stanek, P. and J. Cerna. [1995c]. "Limited Factors for Further Development (II. Part)". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia. [Full text available only in local language].
- Stanek, P. and J. Cerna. [1995d]. "Possibilities of Environmental Projects Financing in Near Future". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia. [Full text available only in local language].
- Stanek, P. and J. Cerna. [1995e]. "Possible Risks for Future Revolving Fund". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia. [Full text available only in local language].
- Stanek, P. and J. Cerna. [1995f]. "Revolving Ecological Fund". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia. [Full text available only in local language].
- Stanek, P. and J. Cerna. [1995g]. "Some Limiting Aspects of Revitalization Process (I. Part)". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia. [Full text available only in local language].
- Stanek, P. and J. Cerna. [1995h]. "Study in Improving Environmental Policy/Concerns in Economic Policy". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia. [Full text available only in local language].
- Stanek, P. and J. Cerna. [1995i]. "What is Typical Today for the Slovak Republic and Other Transforming Economies". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia. [Full text available only in local language].
- Stanek, P. and J. Cerna. [1995j]. "Will Slovakia Survive the 21st Century?". HIID/C4EP Project, Bratislava, Slovakia. [Full text available only in local language].
- Stavins, R.N. and T. Zylicz. [1995]. "Environmental Policy in a Transition Economy: Designing Tradeable Permits for Poland". Environmental Discussion Paper No. 9. HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Tarhoaca, C. and C. Zinnes. [1995]. "Revenue Considerations for Establishing an Environmental Fund: The Case of Romania". Discussion Paper - #R9501. HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Tiderenczl, J.. [1995]. "The Hungarian Experience". Paper presented at the Workshop on Implementation of Pollution Charge Systems in Transition Economies held in Vilnius, Lithuania on 18-20 September 1995
- USAID. [Undated]. "Central Europe -- Strategic Framework". USAID, Washington, D.C.
- USAID. [1995a]. "Draft Impact Indicators, Targets, Funding Sources and Implementers". USAID, Budapest, Hungary
- USAID. [1995b]. "Impact Indicators, Targets, Funding Sources and Implementers". USAID, Bratislava, Slovakia
- USAID. [1995c]. "Program Impact Indicators, Targets and Funding Sources and Implementers". USAID, Bratislava, Slovakia
- USAID. [1995d]. "U.S. Assistance to Slovakia". USAID, Bratislava, Slovakia
- USAID. [1995e]. "USAID Slovakia Portfolio Responsibility". USAID, Bratislava, Slovakia

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. [1995]. "Strengthening Environmental Institutions and Policy Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: What Lessons Have We Learned?". Office of International Activities/U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- Vincent, J.. [1995]. "Activities as Deputy Director". Memorandum of 27 September 1995 to the C4EP Evaluation Team. HIID/C4EP Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Vincent, J., T. Panayotou and J. Hartwick. [1995]. "Resource Depletion and Sustainability in Small Open Economies". Environmental Discussion Paper No. 8. HIID/Asia Training Project, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Wos, A.. [1994]. "Agricultural Restructuring in Central Europe". Paper presented at the 3rd Regional Meeting of the International Center for Economic Growth held in Budapest, Hungary, 30 June-3 July 1994
- Zinnes, C.. [1994a]. "An alternative fuel instrument for capitalizing the environmental fund in the draft environmental law". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1994b]. "A minimum list of key changes to the Parliamentary draft environmental law". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1994c]. "Draft environmental law (strengthening the effectiveness of the national environmental fund, compliance schedules, and environmental liability)". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1994d]. "Explanation and recommendation on our hosting the EAP task force". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1994e]. "Information Brief on the Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy Project". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1994f]. "Lessons from Romania for the CIS". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1994g]. "Responses to interview questions". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1994h]. "Sustainable development considerations in the restructuring of the first six companies in the "List of Thirty"". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995a]. "Activities in Progress -- Winter 1995". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995b]. "A proposed Government strategy regarding an environmental fund for Romania". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995c]. "C4EP Project targets for USAID's Strategic Assistance Table". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995d]. "C4EP/Romania Model for Delivery of Technical Assistance". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995e]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy Project -- Summary of 1994 Success Stories". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995f]. "Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy Project -- Summary of 1995 (incomplete) Success Stories". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania

- Zinnes, C.. [1995g]. "Comments on the draft law for Recycling". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995h]. "Comments on the draft recycling ordinance". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995i]. "Course proposal, "The economics of energy and the environment"". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995j]. "Investment barriers paper". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995k]. "Marketing Research Proposal for the Environmental Service Sector". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995l]. "Needs Assessment of Draft Environmental Law". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995m]. "Overview of C4EP/Romania Activities". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995n]. "Proposal to create a "green" set of national income accounts". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995o]. "Proposal to organize a conference entitled "Trade and Environment: the CEE Perspective"". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995p]. "(i) Senate strategy for environmental fund (ii) household impact of fund charges". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995q]. "Summary of discussions on energy efficiency". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995r]. "Summary of first meeting of inter-ministerial task force working group on compliance schedules". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995s]. "Summary of the Most Polluted Sectors in Romania". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995t]. "Tentative, unofficial comments on the draft Energy Efficiency Law". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zinnes, C.. [1995u]. "Urgent action required regarding a questionable draft government ordinance". HIID/C4EP Project, Bucharest, Romania
- Zylicz, T.. [1995v]. "Costing Environmental Policies". Warsaw Ecological Economics Center/Warsaw University and HIID/C4EP Project, Warsaw, Poland