



## **Příloha 11. Vyhodnocení podle Metodiky evaluace průřezových principů ZRS ČR a komentář k pilotnímu použití metodiky**

**A) Vyhodnocení podle Metodiky evaluace průřezových principů ZRS ČR**

# PROCESS AND CONTEXT CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

## GOVERNANCE

### STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT & PARTICIPATION

Context indicator is not relevant.

GGP1  
GGP2  
GGP4  
GGP5

### TRANSPARENCY, ACCOUNTABILITY AND THE RULE OF LAW

Regular monitoring and data publication (e.g., water quality data, health statistics etc.) is taking place in the intervention area.

GGP6  
GGP7  
GGP8  
GGP9  
GGT  
No

**GGT** The thematic focus of the project falls under the area of Good Governance.

**GGP6** Information about the project is available on the website of project implementers and their local partners. Information is available in local languages.

**GGP1** An appropriate stakeholder analysis was carried out at the beginning of the project.

**GGP7** Implementation partners and/or subcontractors were selected based on clear and transparent processes and criteria.

**GGP2** Identified stakeholders have been consulted in the project planning phase.

**GGP8** Target groups / institutions (e.g., schools, villages) were selected based on clear and transparent processes and criteria.

**GGP3** Input from stakeholders was NOT reflected in the final project proposal.

**GGP9** Project implementers and their partners clearly divided their responsibilities and were adequately fulfilling them during the project implementation.

**GGP4** Input from stakeholders was reflected in the project implementation.

**GGP5** Stakeholders have been informed about the results, success and challenges of the project.

## ENVIRONMENT

### ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE

Environmental sustainability forms part of partner country development strategies (e.g., Country Programme Papers, national government strategies, Agenda 2030 strategies etc.).

EEP2

EET

Yes

**EET** The thematic focus of the project falls under the area of Environment.

**EEP1** Potential negative environmental impacts of the project implementation were NOT identified in a timely manner and appropriately eliminated or mitigated.

**EEP2** Waste generated as a result project activities and outputs has been disposed of in accordance with accepted safety and environmental standards.

## HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENDER EQUALITY

### HUMAN RIGHTS

None of context indicators is relevant.

HRT

No

**HRT** The thematic focus of the project falls under the area of Human rights.

**GET** The thematic focus of the project falls under the area of Gender Equality.

**HRP1** In the stage of project planning, rights of all potentially affected stakeholders, and specifically of those belonging to traditionally marginalized and excluded groups, were NOT taken into account.

### GENDER EQUALITY

In project partner organizations, women and men share equally decision-making responsibilities and power.

GET

No

**Note:** green colour indicates that all relevant context indicators have been fulfilled; orange colour indicates that at least one of the relevant context indicators has been fulfilled; red colour indicates that none of the relevant context indicators have been fulfilled; grey colour indicates that none of context indicators is relevant; in grey cells are presented positively evaluated project-related indicators

# EVALUATION OF PROJECT RESULTS

RELEVANCE (0=impossible to judge; 1=not at all relevant, 10=very highly relevant)



Note: Improvement: 0=none, 1 to 3=partial, 4 to 5=high; Deterioration: 0=none, -3 to -1=partial, -5 to -4=high

# 1. Characteristics of the project

Area of assessment		Evaluation**	Description
1.1	Availability of project results	available	District heating plant and the related network are working in line with requirements of the environmental permit
1.2	Project implementation phase	terminated	
1.3	Relationship to other projects	first of its kind	
1.4	Context of other projects	isolated	
1.5	The project had positive influence on implementation or results of another project	No	
1.6	The project had negative influence on implementation or results of another project	No	

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the relevant evaluation.

## 2. Process and context characteristics of the project implementation

GOVERNANCE			
	Area of assessment	Evaluation**	Comments
	GGT The thematic focus of the project falls under the area of Good Governance.	No	
Stakeholder engagement and participation	GGP1 An appropriate stakeholder analysis was carried out at the beginning of the project.	Yes	Partly covered by the feasibility study, partly by meeting with beneficiaries (Nemita inhabitants), partly during planning of preparing and obtaining all relevant permits
	GGP2 Identified stakeholders have been consulted in the project planning phase.	Yes	According to the statement of project coordinator Nemita households were consulted partly in the planning phase, but mainly in the inception phase of the project.
	GGP3 Input from stakeholders was reflected in the final project proposal.	No	
	GGP4 Input from stakeholders was reflected in the project implementation.	Yes	input from beneficiaries and other stakeholders was reflected during the course of the project (e.g. by changing of the number and type of connected buildings)
	GGP5 Stakeholders have been informed about the results, success and challenges of the project.	Yes	
	GGC1 National and local government partners provide a formal mechanism for stakeholder engagement and policy dialogue.		not relevant
Transparency, accountability and the rule of law	GGP6 Information about the project is available on the website of project implementers and their local partners. Information is available in local languages.	Yes	
	GGP7 Implementation partners and/or subcontractors were selected based on clear and transparent processes and criteria.	Yes	in accordance with applicable Czech and Bosnian legislation
	GGP8 Target groups / institutions (e.g., schools, villages) were selected based on clear and transparent processes and criteria.	Yes	criteria for selection of households for connection to heating lines are listed in findings of the evaluation report
	GGP9 Project implementers and their partners clearly divided their responsibilities and were adequately fulfilling them during the project implementation.	Yes	responsibilities were specified in the contract between MEVOS and Zenica Municipality
	GGC2 Regular monitoring and data publication (e.g., water quality data, health statistics etc.) is taking place in the intervention area.	Yes	monitoring of air emissions is carried out according to the permitting requirements (1x year). But data are not published
	GGC3 The country has improved its rating in World Governance indicators (Rule of Law, Control of Corruption, Government Effectiveness).		not relevant

**Note:** GGT – good governance thematic focus (crosscutting theme or key project focus), GGP – good governance project-related indicator, GGC – good governance context indicator

\*\* Select an answer from the dropdown menu. If the context indicator is not relevant, leave the cell empty.

## ENVIRONMENT

	Area of assessment	Evaluation**	Comments
EET	The thematic focus of the project falls under the area of Environment.	Yes	
EEP1	Potential negative environmental impacts of the project implementation were identified in a timely manner and appropriately eliminated or mitigated.	No	the project aimed at decrease of air pollution
EEP2	Waste generated as a result of project activities and outputs has been disposed of in accordance with accepted safety and environmental standards.	Yes	ash from the combustion of biomass is disposed at the landfill
EEP3	A project life cycle assessment with an emphasis on sustainability of the project and resources it uses was carried out.		partly in the feasibility study - considering of biomass sources
EEP4	The carbon footprint of the project was being measured and appropriate measures to redress/compensate for it were adopted.		not relevant
EEC1	The majority of inhabitants in the intervention area have access to safe drinking water.		not relevant
EGC1	There is a waste management plan and corresponding infrastructure in place in the intervention area.		not relevant
EGC2	Environmental sustainability forms part of partner country development strategies (e.g., Country Programme Papers, national government strategies, Agenda 2030 strategies etc.).	Yes	

**Note:** EET – thematic focus (crosscutting theme or key project focus), EEP – environmental effects project-related indicator, EEC – environmental effects context indicator, EGC – environmental governance context indicator

\*\* Select an answer from the dropdown menu. If the context indicator is not relevant, leave the cell empty.

## HUMAN RIGHTS & GENDER EQUALITY

	Area of assessment	Evaluation**	Comments
HRT	The thematic focus of the project falls under the area of Human rights.	No	
HRP1	In the stage of project planning, rights of all potentially affected stakeholders, and specifically of those belonging to traditionally marginalized and excluded groups, were taken into account.	No	not needed
HRC1	At the national or local level (as appropriate), there is an official body charged with the protection of human rights and rights of minorities.		not relevant
HRC2	There are NGOs active in the area of human rights advocacy and protection in the intervention area.		not relevant
HRC3	Human rights (civil, cultural, economic, political and asocial) form part of partner country development strategies (e.g., Country Programme Papers, national government strategies, Agenda 2030 strategies etc.).		not relevant
GET	The thematic focus of the project falls under the area of Gender Equality.	No	
GEP1	A gender (poverty) analysis was carried out at the beginning of the project or during its implementation and its conclusions were reflected in the project design.		not relevant
GEP2	Gender-sensitive indicators were developed for the monitoring and evaluation of the project's impact on women and men and on gender relations.		not relevant
GEP3	Sex-disaggregated data have been collected for every major project activity.		not relevant
GEP4	The project worked effectively with gender analyses and integrated them into its activities.		not relevant
GEC1	Project partners (NGOs, national or local government entities) have internal gender equality and/or gender mainstreaming strategy.		dont know, not relevant
GEC2	In project partner organizations, women and men share equally decision-making responsibilities and power.	Yes	
GEC3	Gender equality and/or women empowerment form part of partner country development strategies (e.g., Country Programme Papers, national government strategies, Agenda 2030 strategies etc.).		not relevant

**Note:** HRT – human rights thematic focus (crosscutting theme or key project focus), HRP – human rights project-related indicator, HRC - human rights context indicator GET – gender equality thematic focus, GEP – gender equality project-related indicator, GEC – gender equality context indicator

\*\* Select an answer from the dropdown menu. If the context indicator is not relevant, leave the cell empty.

### 3. Evaluation of project results – GOVERNANCE

#### EVALUATION OF PROJECT CONTRIBUTION TO GOOD GOVERNANCE

In what way, if any, has the project contributed or worsened the following subdimensions?

Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
1. Participation 1.1 Stakeholder engagement & participation 5 - somewhat relevant	GGO4: Evidence of consultations carried out by project recipient with other project key stakeholders.			3	0	Consultation with project beneficiaries were carried out in the inception phase. Confirmed by the recipient, local project coordinator and beneficiaries. Formal evidence does was not presented.
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
Total for subdimension 1.1				3	0	
Average evaluation				3,00	0,00	

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: GGO – Good Governance Output indicator; GGR – Good Governance Result indicator

Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
2. Transparency & accountability of government and other actors 2.1 Transparency and accountability of government and other actors 5 - somewhat relevant	GGO26: Extent to which government entities and/or other partners fulfilled their project-related obligations.			5	0	all relevant permits were obtained, public consultations carried out
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
Total for subdimension 2.1				5	0	
Average evaluation				5,00	0,00	

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: GGO – Good Governance Output indicator; GGR – Good Governance Result indicator

Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
3. Rule of Law 3.1 Open government and corruption	1 - not at all relevant					
		Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator		
		Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator		
Total for subdimension 3.1				0	0	
Average evaluation						

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: GGO – Good Governance Output Indicator; GGR – Good Governance Result Indicator

Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
3. Rule of Law 3.2 Regulatory enforcement	1 - not at all relevant					
		Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator		
		Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator		
Total for subdimension 3.2				0	0	
Average evaluation						

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: GGO – Good Governance Output indicator; GGR – Good Governance Result indicator



Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
3. Rule of Law 3.3 Justice  1 - not at all relevant						
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
Total for subdimension 3.3				0	0	
Average evaluation						

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: GGO – Good Governance Output indicator; GGR – Good Governance Result Indicator

### 3. Evaluation of project results – ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

#### EVALUATION OF PROJECT CONTRIBUTION TO ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

In what way, if any, has the project contributed or worsened the following subdimensions?

Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
1. Environmental Effects 1.1 Biodiversity, land, soils and forests 5 - somewhat relevant	EEO3: Land converted to other uses with project support.			1	0	land used for heating plant and storage of biomass; the land used was not for agricultural or forestry purposes
			EERN2: Land permanently converted to other uses as a direct or indirect consequence of project.	0	-1	1200 m2
	EEO13: Project used local resources and technologies.			3	-1	construction material and fuel (biomass) has been ensured by local resources; technology imported from CR
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
Total for subdimension 1.1				-1	-2	
Average evaluation				1,33	-0,67	

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: EEO – Environmental Effects Output indicator; EER - Environmental Effects Result indicator

Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
1. Environmental Effects 1.2 Atmosphere and clean air 10 - Very highly relevant		EERL20: Degree, to which a project has contributed to the increase/decrease of concentrations of major air pollutants.		5	0	Decrease of concentrations of dust, SO2, CO, NOx,
			EERN20: Levels of air pollutants in the intervention area.	3	0	improvements occur during heating season, some connected households still partly use their former heating sources
		EERL21: Evidence of use of products or technologies purchased/installed that lower emissions.		5	0	Energy efficient boiler with abatement techniques to lower the emissions
		EERL22: Perceived improved quality of air		4	0	88 % of connected households perceive improved air quality
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Levels of greenhouse gas emissions from residential and communal heating	3	0	improvements occur during heating season, some connected households still partly use their former heating sources
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
Total for subdimension 1.2				20	0	
Average evaluation				4,00	0,00	

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: EEO – Environmental Effects Output indicator; EER - Environmental Effects Result indicator

Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
1. Environmental Effects 1.3 Water and sanitation  4	EEO40: Evidence of measures put in place to ensure efficient use of water in all project-related activities.			3	0	the water used for heating is circulated
			EERN42: Annual freshwater withdrawals for project-supported activities after project end.	2	0	0,5 l / day during heating season vs. water used for heating in three public buildings before project implementation
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
Total for subdimension 1.3				5	0	
Average evaluation				2,50	0,00	

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: EEO – Environmental Effects Output indicator; EER – Environmental Effects Result indicator

Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
1. Environmental Effects 1.4 Waste and waste management  6		EERL53: Evidence of correct handling of all waste (regular and hazardous).		4	0	the ash produced by combustion is landfilled
			EERN54: Generation, treatment and disposal of industrial waste before and after project.	3	0	the amount of ash is smaller than ash from individual heating sources for coal or wood and the combustion technology is better
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
Total for subdimension 1.4				7	0	
Average evaluation				3,50	0,00	

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: EEO – Environmental Effects Output indicator; EER – Environmental Effects Result indicator

Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
10 - Very highly relevant	EEO70: Degree, to which a project supported the production and use of energy from renewable sources.			5	0	the heating plant used only biomass as a fuel
	EEO71: Extent, to which a project relied on renewable sources of energy.			5	0	100%
			EERN71: Use of renewable energy before and after.	3	0	the district heating replaced some boilers for coal and heating oil
		EERL73: Change in energy use patterns in project-affected communities / facilities.		3	0	29 % of connected households still partly use the former type of heating as it is cheaper, but all public buildings uses only the new district heating system
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
Total for subdimension 1.5				16	0	
Average evaluation				4,00	0,00	

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: EEO – Environmental Effects Output indicator; EER - Environmental Effects Result indicator

Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
3		EGR6: Evidence of effective enforcement of environmental rules, regulations and policies.		3	0	the heating plant operator complies with env. permit requirements which are enforceable
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
Total for subdimension 2.1				3	0	
Average evaluation				3,00	0,00	

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: EGO – Environmental Governance Output indicator, EGR – Environmental Governance Result indicator

### 3. Evaluation of project results – HUMAN RIGHTS

#### EVALUATION OF PROJECT CONTRIBUTION TO HUMAN RIGHTS

In what way, if any, has the project contributed or worsened the following subdimensions?

Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
1 - not at all relevant						
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator				
Total for subdimension 1.1				0	0	
Average evaluation						

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: HRO – Human Rights Output indicator; HRR – Human Rights Result indicator

Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
5 - somewhat relevant		HRR120: All members of the community regardless of income level, ethnicity, religion etc. have had equal benefits from project / equal access to project-generated goods and services.		4	0	all households had equal access to possibility to connect to the heating network, but they had to pay affordable fee for the connection to the network
		HRO28: Members of underprivileged groups have equal benefits from project-supported infrastructure, services and training as members of other groups.		4	0	the possibility to connect was offered to all community households
	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator				
Total for subdimension 1.2				8	0	
Average evaluation				4,00	0,00	

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: HRO – Human Rights Output indicator; HRR – Human Rights Result indicator

**1. Human Rights**  
**1.3 Minors in armed conflict and emergency situations**

Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
1 - not at all relevant						
	<i>Other, type in your own indicator</i>	<i>Other, type in your own indicator</i>	<i>Other, type in your own indicator</i>			
	<i>Other, type in your own indicator</i>	<i>Other, type in your own indicator</i>	<i>Other, type in your own indicator</i>			
<b>Total for subdimension 1.3</b>				0	0	
<b>Average evaluation</b>						

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: HRO – Human Rights Output indicator; HRR – Human Rights Result indicator

### 3. Evaluation of project results – GENDER EQUALITY

#### EVALUATION OF PROJECT CONTRIBUTION TO GENDER EQUALITY

In what way, if any, has the project contributed or worsened the following subdimensions?

Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
1. Decision-making 1.1 Capacity for public participation 6		GERL1: Women have had equal benefits from project / equal access to project-generated goods and services.		5	0	the possibility to connect was offered to all community households
		GEO2: Women had equal opportunity to participate in project and all its activities.		2	0	no differentiation was pursued by any project partner, but for manual digging and heavy construction work naturally only men were searched.
		Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator		
		Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator		
Total for subdimension 1.1				7	0	
Average evaluation				3,50	0,00	

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: GEO – Gender Equality Output indicator; GER – Gender Equality Result Indicator

Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments	
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high		
1. Decision-making 1.2 Participation in decision-making 2							
		Degree of consideration of gender equality in selection of households for connection to central heating	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	3	0	All households were invited for consultation about possibility to connect to CH; there were no discrimination criteria for households
		Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
Total for subdimension 1.2				3	0		
Average evaluation				3,00	0,00		

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: GEO – Gender Equality Output indicator; GER – Gender Equality Result Indicator

	Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
		A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
1. Decision-making 1.3 Institutional capacity and policy change	1 - not at all relevant						
		Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
		Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
Total for subdimension 1.3					0	0	
Average evaluation							

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: GEO – Gender Equality Output Indicator; GER – Gender Equality Result Indicator

	Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
		A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
2. Rights and Security 2.1 Public awareness	1 - not at all relevant						
		Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
		Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator			
Total for subdimension 2.1					0	0	
Average evaluation							

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: GEO – Gender Equality Output Indicator; GER – Gender Equality Result Indicator



Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
2. Rights and Security 2.2 Personal security and response to gender-specific rights violations	1 - not at all relevant					
		Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator		
		Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator		
Total for subdimension 2.2				0	0	
Average evaluation						

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: GEO – Gender Equality Output indicator; GER – Gender Equality Result Indicator

Degree of relevance*	Indicators used**			Impact		Comments
	A. Output	B.1 Outcome (qual.)	B.2 Outcome (quant.)	Improvement 5 = high, 0 = none	Deterioration 0 = none, -5 = high	
3. Distribution of Development 3.1 Basic needs, livelihoods and productive assets	1 - not at all relevant					
		Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator		
		Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator	Other, type in your own indicator		
Total for subdimension 3.1				0	0	
Average evaluation						

\* Evaluate the degree of project relevance to the subdimension.

\*\* Select from the dropdown menu the indicators you used to evaluate this subdimension.

Note: GEO – Gender Equality Output indicator; GER – Gender Equality Result Indicator



## B) Komentář k pilotnímu použití metodiky evaluace průřezových principů ZRS ČR

Hlavním přínosem konceptu metodiky je podchycení průřezových principů pomocí široké škály indikátorů, ze kterých může evaluátor vybírat ty relevantní a v případě potřeby doplnit své vlastní.

*Při hodnocení evaluační tým hodnotil princip životního prostředí pomocí 17 indikátorů, z čehož byl jeden doplněn nad rámec indikátorů obsažených v metodice. Princip řádné správy věcí veřejných jsme hodnotili 2 indikátory, nicméně jeden indikátor z principu životního prostředí se týká správy v oblasti životního prostředí. Princip dodržování lidských práv včetně rovnosti žen a mužů byl hodnocen 5 indikátory, z čehož jeden byl doplněn nad rámec indikátorů obsažených v metodice.*

Metodika je dosti obsáhlá, a proto je dobré, že autoři zpracovali manuál k jejímu použití. Velmi pozitivně hodnotíme kapitolu 5.1 manuálu (proces použití metodiky v deseti krocích). Nicméně některé části metodiky vykazují určité pojmové a obsahové nesrovnalosti (viz dále).

Některé kvantitativní indikátory obsahují zároveň kvantitativní o kvalitativní úroveň, což lze obtížně vyjádřit „jedním číslem“ (např. EGRN7: Size and significance of areas declared as protected area and its significance, nebo EGO9, GGRN1 – GGRN5). Z metodiky není patrné, jak kvalitativní část indikátoru uchopit. Nejvhodnější by patrně bylo rozdělit kvantitativní a kvalitativní část.

Presentace výsledků hodnocení ve schématu „evaluation results“ je přehledná - zejména zobrazení vyhodnocení indikátorů týkající se výsledků projektu („evaluation of project results“).

Následující komentáře a doporučení se týkají převážně principu životního prostředí, vzhledem k tomu, že záměr projektu byl tematicky zaměřen na zlepšení životního prostředí.

### 1. Doplnit výklad terminologie

Některé použité termíny nejsou jasné, proto by bylo vhodné je definovat či vysvětlit, např.:

- v tabulce „characteristics of the project“ oblast 1.4 „context of other projects“
- v tabulce „proces and context“, část „environment“, oblast EEP3 „project life cycle assessment“
- obdobně doporučujeme zpracovat vysvětlení jednotlivých indikátorů, které se podle informací od zástupců INESAN již zpracovává.

2. Tabulka „proces and context“, část „environment“, oblasti EEP2 – EEP4, EEC1, EGC1 jsou úzce definovány a pro mnoho projektů zaměřených na zlepšení životního prostředí nebo využití OZE nevytvírají nic o jejich kontextu. Chybí zde oblasti: vliv na kvalitu ovzduší, přírodu, energetická účinnost a OZE, které jsou dále uvedeny jako „impact subareas“ v tabulce indikátorů v části Environment and sustainable development.

Návrh úpravy a rozšíření oblastí (EEP2 – EGC2):

- EEP2 - Positive impact on nature preservation (including for example increasing biodiversity, or rehabilitation of polluted soil, or prevention of soil erosion)
- EEP3 - Positive impact of the project on air quality or climate change
- EEP4 - Positive impact of the project on water quality or sustainable use of water resources
- EEP5 - The project resulted in decrease of waste generation or improvement of waste management
- EEP6 - The project improved energy efficiency or replacement of fossil fuels by renewable resources
- EEC1 - Applied methods and technology for project implementation are sustainable from the environmental point of view
- EEC2 - In case of installation of technology which is operated after the project implementation ended, the operation is running in sustainable way in relation to environment.

### 3. Šíře a specifikace indikátorů



Navrhujeme upravit stejné indikátory, které jsou specifikované pro různé vybrané sektory. Např. EERN22 „total and proportion of greenhouse gas emissions from transportation sector“, stejně je definován EERN23, který je zaměřen na zemědělství a EERN24 pro domácnosti. Chybí mezi nimi sektory podporované ZRS ČR výroba energie a její dodávky (energetika a teplárenství). Oproti tomu sektor dopravy není mezi sektory podporovanými ZRS ČR. Navrhujeme zevšeobecnit tyto indikátory na „total and proportion of greenhouse gas emissions“. Podobně indikátory EERL33 až EERL35.

Tímto zevšeobecněním dojde ke sladění úrovně detailnosti Indikátorů. V daném kontextu evaluace je vždy zřejmé, o jaký jde sektor.

V části 1.4 „Waste management“ navrhujeme přesunout indikátor EERT57 a EERT58 do části 1.2 Atmosphere and clean air, neboť se týkají emisí do ovzduší. Obdobně indikátor EER72.

V části 2.1 „Government commitments to environment and climate change“ navrhujeme přesunout indikátory EGRL8 a EGRN10 do oblasti „Participation“ (Stakeholder engagement and participation).