

**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF)**  
**ARAL SEA BASIN PROGRAM**  
**Water and Environmental Management Project**  
**Component B 'Public Awareness'**

**Report**  
**on Evaluation of National Strategies &**  
**Assessment of National Working Groups Potential**  
**Comparative Analysis of NWGs & their**  
**National Strategies**

**National Public Awareness Strategies on Water  
& Environmental Resources Management**  
**(Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)**

**Prof. dr. Frank L.W. Thevissen**

University of Brussels - University of Antwerp (Belgium)  
Centre for Applied Marketing and Communication Research, MACO  
Pleinlaan 2 - 1050 Brussels - Belgium  
Universiteitsplein 1 - 2610 Antwerp - Belgium  
Tel. +32-(0)496-542.988 - fax +32-(0)2-629 23 74.  
e-mail: ftheviss@vub.ac.be

**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF)  
ARAL SEA BASIN PROGRAM  
Water and Environmental Management Project  
Component B 'Public Awareness'**

**Report**  
on Evaluation of National Strategies &  
Assessment of National Working Groups Potential

**ANNEXES**

National Public Awareness Strategies on Water  
& Environmental Resources Management  
(Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)

**Prof. dr. Frank L.W. Thevissen**

University of Brussels - University of Antwerp (Belgium)  
Centre for Applied Marketing and Communication Research, MACO  
Pleinlaan 2 - 1050 Brussels - Belgium  
Universiteitsplein 1 - 2610 Antwerp - Belgium  
Tel. +32-(0)496-542.988 - fax +32-(0)2-629 23 74.  
e-mail: ftheviss@vub.ac.be

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF) • ARAL SEA BASIN PROGRAM  
**Water and Environmental Management Project - Component B 'Public Awareness'**

**Report**  
on Evaluation of National Strategies &  
Assessment of National Working Groups Potential

**ANNEX 1:**  
Start-up Evaluation  
Characteristics & Approaches of the National  
Strategies

National Public Awareness Strategies on Water & Environmental Resources Management  
(Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)

## General Comment

Over the last period (2000) each NWG worked out their (draft) strategy document on public awareness regarding rational water use in relation to the Aral Sea Basin Crisis, to be implemented during the period 2001 - 2002.

The initial draft strategy documents clearly show that the NWGs got familiar with elementary notions related to strategic communications management enabling them to put these concepts together into a country-specific strategic framework.

A first general evaluation of these strategic communications plans are shown in table 1, based on the evaluation of the presentations of the 'strategy' by each of the team leaders of the NWG. This evaluation was based on 5 criteria, namely;

- (1) IMC: 'Integrated Marketing Communication'-Approach;
- (2) E&M: Evaluation & Monitoring activities included in the Communication Strategy;
- (3) 'Consistency': based on Reach, Repetition and Self-Reference-Character of Messages;
- (4) O.S.A.: Overall Strategic Approach;
- (5) C/E/A/B: Cognition / Emotional Appeal / Attitude (Change) / Behaviour Change;

**1.** The first criterion (**IMC**) looks at the level of integration of 'the strategy' taking into account that three 3 levels of an 'integrated approach' are distinguished;

- At a first (lowest) level, integration of communication is limited to the streamlining of content (core messages) and execution style of messages;
- At a second level, an integrated approach implies the communication policy to be streamlined at all (organisational) levels and in each phase during the implementation;
- At a third (highest) level, an integrated approach envisages the applied communication policy to be streamlined with all other components A to E.

**2.** The second criterion (E&M) takes into account to which extend evaluation and monitoring activities are systematically integrated within the strategy plan, in order to measure short term, mid term and long term impact (effects) of awareness actions and activities;

**3.** The third criterion (Consistency) takes into account the consistency of the messages disseminated (information dissemination), based on Reach, Repetition (Frequency) and self-reference character of (core) messages.

**4.** The fourth criterion (O.S.A.) looks at the overall strategic approach, where we again distinguish three strategic development levels, namely:

- a sender oriented approach, which mainly takes into account the interest of the sender;
- a media (or information dissemination) oriented approach, which mainly focuses on a series of media and means for 'information dissemination' (one-way-communication) and generally pays more attention to the quantitative aspects rather than the qualitative impact of a communication strategy;

- a receiver oriented approach is the most recommended form of strategic communications (interaction), whereby the strategy systematically takes into account - at any phase of the project - the strategic goals to be reached at receiver level. This strategic angle typically build further on the existing perception, awareness, knowledge, attitude levels and behaviour patterns of each of the observed target groups. Such overall strategic approach is generally characterised by the intensive and explicit use of feedback and interaction strategies as well as 'passive information systems'.

5. The fifth and last criterion tracks the use of communication strategies in relation to the observed effects at (1) cognitive level (knowledge), (2) affective level (emotional appeal), (3) attitude level and (4) behaviour level (behaviour reinforcement, behaviour change).

## General Overview

---

At first glance and on the basis of the reporting the Kyrgyz National Strategy made the best impression: in it's overall approach it is closest to the 'social marketing concept' and includes a clear strategy for conduction monitoring and evaluation research. Further the proposed activities are consistent in delivering key messages to several target groups, while the overall approach can be defined as an 'receiver oriented' approach, focusing on increase of knowledge and stimulating behaviour change.

### table 1

---

legend:

- (1) IMC: 'Integrated Marketing Communication'-Approach
- (2) E&M: Evaluation & Monitoring activities included in Communication Strategy
- (3) 'Consistency': based on Reach, Repetition and Self-Reference-Character of Messages
- (4) O.S.A.: Overall Strategic Approach
- (5) C/E/A/B: Cognition / Emotional Appeal / Attitude (Change) / Behaviour Change

Other countries stress on information dissemination (Kazakhstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan). Their general approach is less consistent, dominantly focus on media and means of information (Kazakhstan, Tajikistan) or takes into account organisations' point of view, rather than considering the interests and views of the target audiences (Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan). Further strategies focus on increase of knowledge and to some less extend attitude change within the observed target groups.

It must be stressed that this general evaluation represents first impressions based on the reporting of the team leaders of their approach to the National Strategies. Furthermore, the overview pictures the situation before the Regional Seminars of February and March were held and that in most cases, the NWGs to a significant extend adjusted and improved the quality of their approach on the basis of the discussions held during the seminars. For a more detailed assessment of the NWGs potentials and the strengths and weakness of the proposed National Strategies we refer to the outcomes of the Audit 1 and Audit 2 conducted during the seminars in February and March 2001.

---

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF) • ARAL SEA BASIN PROGRAM  
Water and Environmental Management Project - Component B 'Public Awareness'

# Report on Evaluation of National Strategies & Assessment of National Working Groups Potential

## ANNEX 2: Philosophy of suggested approach

National Public Awareness Strategies on Water & Environmental Resources Management  
(Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)

### Philosophy of the suggested approach

The core philosophy of the recommended strategy/approach is that the project will be more effective in decreasing the gap between its goals and the realisation of these goals in the field if the NWGs communicate effectively with all external and internal stakeholders. Communication enables an organisation to start a dialogue, trying to create awareness, understanding and appreciation for its strategic goals, ideally resulting in the satisfactions of the interest of both the organisation and its environment. Recent experiences with other organisations and companies reveal that purely one way 'communication' (information dissemination) can be considered as ineffective, while two way communication (often labelled as bridging strategies) are seen as necessary in order to establish a dialogue with stakeholders (potentially) critiquing organisations.

Stakeholders will in our view be more receptive towards corporate messages if they perceive the contents of this communications as appealing (contributing to their personal advantage, above all not irritating them) and consistent. One could therefore claim that communication will be more effective if organisations can rely on a so-called 'sustainable corporate story' (C. Van Riel) as a source of inspiration for all internal and external communication programs. A sustainable corporate story connects thoughts about:

- what the organisation / project has been (continuity);
- where it is going (explaining its inspiration and aspiration)
- which resources are widely spread and rooted (centrality)
- where it can rely on to guarantee stakeholders the achievability of the projects' goals;
- and finally what differentiates the project from others and why this is appealing to external audiences (distinctiveness)

A corporate story will only become 'sustainable' if all internal and external audiences recognise and support (or at least accept) the key features of such a story. A sustainable corporate story can be written down in a formal document or embedded in an image campaign (a corporate brochure, a website page, internal

publications, etc.). Above all a story should be told: the act of storytelling is more important than the written proves of its existence. Such stories can serve as a source of inspiration for internal purposes (setting implicitly the rules regarding desired behaviour of organisational members) and it can provide guidelines for external aspirations (enabling a company to get entrance to all resources they depend upon)

---

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF) • ARAL SEA BASIN PROGRAM  
Water and Environmental Management Project - Component B 'Public Awareness'

# Report

## on Evaluation of National Strategies & Assessment of National Working Groups Potential

### ANNEX 3: General Approach to the Strategy Implementation

National Public Awareness Strategies on Water & Environmental Resources Management  
(Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)

#### An Integrated Approach to Communication for the implementation of National and Regional Strategies

The actual trend away from traditional communication strategies, based largely on mass communication delivering generalised messages, has started to give way to more personalised, tailor-sized and technology-driven approaches, referred to as **integrated communications** (IC). This development is marked by an increased realisation that multidisciplinary approaches are required to achieve the organisation's (project's) objectives. To that end the synergistic benefits are perceived as not only achievable but also desirable.

One of the more popular and intrinsically satisfying views of integrated communications is that the message conveyed by each of the communication tools should be harmonised in order that audiences perceive a consistent set of messages. An interpretation of this perspective, at one level, is that the **key visual triggers** used in communication and/or information outputs should be replicated across the range of promotional tools used. A further interpretation, at a deeper level, is that the theme and set of core messages used in any campaign or undertaken communication action should be determined initially and then developed across the communication mix (often referred to as synergy). One of the differences is the recognition that mass media (advertising) campaigns are not the only and definitely not the most appropriate ways (in terms of effect and impact) to launch informative and/or image related communication actions and that a consideration of the most appropriate mix of communication forms might be a better starting point when formulating campaigns.

What runs through both these approaches is the belief that above-the-line (theme-related) and below-the-line (action relation) communications need to be moulded into one cohesive bundle, from which tools can be selected and deployed as conditions require.

The consultant presenting this proposal therefore strongly believes in an integrative, synergetic long-term strategy, of which the short-, mid- and long-term results are evaluated and monitored using an appropriate set of scientific instruments to measure effectiveness of past and newly developed communications actions.



## General Implementation Strategy

A great deal of the successful implementation of the project will depend upon the co-ordination efforts between the different partners involved in the project. These co-ordination efforts are critical to the outcomes of the project. Their 'internal co-operation relations' and interdependence as well as their 'overall co-ordination relation' capacity with key opinion leaders and (political) decision makers is therefore crucial. In accordance with the assigned Terms of References we therefore developed an approach enabling to conduct an overall evaluation of communications actions that were executed in the past. Based upon the findings the international consultant indicates strengths and weaknesses of past actions and indicate (potential) gaps in communication and informational strategies. During the implementation period further assessment of quality of information activities, used media, messages, results, impact, effectiveness, etc. will take place in order to adjust and improve the implementation of the strategy on a continuous monitoring and tracking, resulting into recommendations based on the findings. These recommendations have to put into action by NWGs responsible for the development of communication actions.

Besides this, the evaluation of the activities that were done so far, may reveal the need for additional information and/or data to develop an overall strategy. In this respect the results of the evaluation (base-line survey) that was carried out by the social research research experts might give an impulse in updating public opinion-research (topics and target groups). Therefore the importance of the interactions between the implementation process and the monitoring and evaluation of the foreseen activities should be stressed.

In this respect, while providing recommendations to optimise the communication strategy, social research experts have to take into account the outcomes of the evaluation of existing polling data (base-line survey) carried out by the NWGs for the update of public opinion research.

This interdependency clearly shows the need for a strong co-ordination and interaction between the five NWGs involved in this project. By concretising this interaction all team-leaders will provide a synchronised input to the component B-director, Mr. K. Bozov.

- The NWGs should review and evaluate the performance of their various activities. Many undertake formal mechanisms, while others review in an informal ad hoc manner, but the process of evaluation or reflections is a well-established management process. The objective is to monitor the often diverse activities so that one can exercise control. It is through the process of review and evaluation that the NWGs have the opportunity to learn and develop. In turn, this enables management to refine its position and to provide for higher levels of (cost-)effective implementation of communication actions.

The use of research techniques for the monitoring and evaluation of communication actions is a management activity, that requires rigorous scientific research and testing procedures in addition to continual evaluation. This is

necessary because planned communications have the potential to consume a vast amount of resources.

The evaluation of planned communication actions consists of two distinct elements. The first element is concerned with the development and testing of individual messages and or 'communication outputs' (see scheme attached). An informative action that is materialised in the form of one or another communication actions, has to achieve a balance of several characteristics in order that the communication objectives and message strategy be achieved. To accomplish this, testing is required to ensure that the intended messages are encoded correctly and are capable of being decoded accurately by the target audience.

The second element concerns the overall impact and effect that communication actions have on a target audience once a communications plan has been released. The post-test factor is critical, as it will either confirm or reject management's and donor's judgement about the viability of the designed communication strategy. The way in which the individual components of the communications mix work together needs to be understood in order that strengths be capitalised on and developed and weaknesses negated.

- The evaluation process is a key part of implementing communication strategies. The findings and results of the evaluative process feed back into the next communication action and provides indicators and benchmarks for further decisions upon future actions. The primary role of evaluating the performance of a communications strategy is to ensure that the communications objectives have been met and that the strategy has been effective.

The secondary role is to ensure that the strategy has been executed efficiently, that the full potential of the NWGs has been extracted and that resources have been used economically.

The proposed approach of the research activities undertaken by NWGs have two objectives: the first is guidance and development. The second is prediction and evaluation. Guidance takes the form of shaping future strategies as a result of past (negative as well as positive) experiences. Development is important in the context of determining whether the communications worked as they were intended to.

Prediction and evaluation require information about options and alternatives. For example, did the informative approach A (technique, medium, message, etc.) prove to be more effective than 'B', and if so , what would happen if 'A' was applied to another target group. Predictably, the use of quantitative techniques is more prevalent with this latter set of reasons.

More specific, the range of public relations cues or methods available to organisations is immense (publicity, press releases, press conferences, interviews, events, corporate advertising, etc.). However, these instruments are not mutually exclusive and the activities of one form of communication impact upon the other; they are 'self'-reinforcing.

To achieve this goal, the NWGs must be put in a dependant relation to the Communication research and Public Opinion Research Experts. This approach (structure) also optimises the conditions for a rational use of the available financial resources. The NWG - via the monitoring and evaluation specialists - will provide outputs in terms of clear recommendations/strategic advise and data (information) that serve as an input (framework) on which concrete communication actions will be based. In addition all key partners will need to be involved in the process of developing communication actions so that a clear, standardised set of indicators for the monitoring of the implemented actions can be established. In this respect the international expert will closely supervise the implementation process by monitoring and tracking the actions so that all of the actions carried out can be evaluated in terms of effectiveness (short-term and mid-term impact analysis). Whenever necessary, the international consultant involved in the process needs to provide the monitoring and evaluation-experts of the NWGs with recommendations in order to improve or adjust the strategy during the implementation.

For the draft of their National Strategy, NWGs responsible for the implementation of the project were to decide upon the following questions:

1. Who should receive the messages (priority setting in terms of target audiences)?;
2. What the messages should say (priority setting in terms of content and goals of the distributed messages)?;
3. What image of the organisation are to form and retain?;
4. How much is to be spent establishing the communication goals?;
5. How the messages are to be delivered?;
6. What actions the receivers should take (response strategies, interactive communication, etc.)?;
7. How to control the whole process once implemented (criteria setting for the monitoring of communication actions undertaken)?;
8. Deterring what was achieved (evaluation of communication actions);

These tasks need to be undertaken within the framework of the GEF/IFAS project to improve co-ordination and optimisation of the operational collaborations between the different NWGs responsible for the implementation of the project on location. Note that several actions are to be undertaken (parallel actions to various target audiences). This is important, as recognition of the need to communicate with multiple audiences and their different information requirements, often simultaneously, lies at the heart of effective and efficient communication management. The project should generate and transmit messages which clearly represents the organisation's goals to their various target audiences, encouraging them to enter into a dialogue and relationship (involvement). These messages must be presented consistently and they must address the points stated above. It is the skill and responsibility of the NWG-team leaders leading this project, to blend the communication tools and create a mix that fully satisfies these elements.

Proposed approach and implementation of the evaluation and monitoring strategy of communication actions.

To assist the project in the need to develop successful objectives, we use a set of guidelines, commonly referred to as SMART objectives. This acronym stands for Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant (Realistic), Targeted and Timed.

The process of making objectives SMART requires those who have to co-operate on this project to consider exactly what is to be achieved, when, where, and with which audience. This clarifies thinking, sorts out the logic of the proposed activities and provides a clear measure for evaluation of the proposed actions.

- **Specific:** What are the actual variables that are to be influenced while executing the proposed communications actions (key information projects about IFAS)? Is it awareness, perception, attitudes or some other element that is to be influenced? Whatever the variables are, it must be clearly defined and must enable precise outcomes to be determined.

- **Measurable:** The foreign consultant will set the measures of activity against which performance can be assessed. For example, this may be a percentage level of desired promoted awareness in the target audience.

- **Achievable:** Objectives need to be attainable, otherwise those responsible for their achievement will lack motivation and a desire to succeed.

- **Realistic:** The actions must be founded in reality and be relevant to the ToR and the context in which they are set.

- **Targeted and Timed:** Which target audience are the communication actions targeted at, how precisely is the audience defined and over what period are the results to be generated?

---

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF) • ARAL SEA BASIN PROGRAM  
Water and Environmental Management Project - Component B 'Public Awareness'

# Report on Evaluation of National Strategies & Assessment of National Working Groups Potential

## ANNEX 4: MISSION REPORTS (including programs of conducted workshops)

National Public Awareness Strategies on Water & Environmental Resources Management  
(Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)

### 1. Introduction and Terms of Reference

The international consultant visited Tashkent from 24 January till 28 January 2001 upon the invitation of the GEF Agency of the International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea to take part in the work of Component B «Public Awareness» of the Water and Environment Management Project in Tashkent.

The Consultant was requested to fulfil the following tasks (see Terms of Reference Annex A):

- 1. To revise and amend the drafts of the national public awareness strategy on (1) water saving & rational water use and (2) the Aral Sea basin crisis within the framework of the «Water and Environmental Management Project» of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan in provision for the Component B Terms of Reference approved by the World Bank on January 4, 1999.*
- 2. To assist in developing the working programs on strategy implementation (2001 - end 2002) for the National Teams;*
- 3. To prepare a budget for the national strategies implementation;*
- 4. The evaluation of the National Teams potential and their ability to implement the strategies;*
- 5. Develop proposals to strengthen the National Teams potential;*
- 6. Submit progress Report by March 31st. 2001.*

**In order to discuss the draft of the progress report (evaluation analysis and recommendations) with the team leaders, an additional contract (mission 6 - 14 April 2001) was provided to the International Consultant stipulating the Tasks (see Terms of Reference Annex A):**

*1. To conduct a Region Seminar for discussion and final approval of the Progress Report (assessment of the National Group's capacity and proposed National Strategies and Work Programs) in view of the World Bank Supervision Mission*

## **2. Preparation of Mission (Seminars/Workshops)**

---

In order to fulfil these tasks within the given time frame (February 2001 till the end of March 2001), the consultant was given two missions:

- (1) A one-week-mission to Tashkent from February 9 till February 17, 2001;
- (2) A one-week-mission to Tashkent from March 16 till March 24, 2001;
- (3) An additional one-week-mission to Tashkent from April 6 till April 14, 2001;

The first mission (Regional Seminar/Workshop) was prepared in Brussels during the week from February 5, 2001 till February 8, 2001 and was conducted on the bases of the following documents:

(1) Project Documents:

- The World Bank, GEF (Global Environment Facility), Aral Sea Basin Program (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan). Water and Environmental Management Project. Project Document, May, 1998. 36 p.

- The World Bank, GEF (Global Environment Facility), Aral Sea Basin Program (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan). Water and Environmental Management Project. Project Document, May, 1998. Volume II - Supplementary Report, 36 p.

- BDPA Consultants, Public Awareness Strategy Design for the Aral Sea Basin, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, November 2000. 21 p.

- Aral Sea Basin Program - Water Resources and Environment Management Project. Component B «Public Awareness». IV. Appendices - Appendix A - Description of the Services (pp. 27 - 39).

- Thevissen, F. Aral Sea Basin Program - Component B «Public Awareness», Mission Report (second and third mission), October 2000, 24 p.

- Terms of Reference for International Consultants on services for National Teams on completion of the Public Awareness Strategy (January - March 2001), Annex A (1 p.)

(2) Draft of Seminar/Workshop proposal;

(3) Selection of training materials (set of evaluation criteria and project audit methods) to be used during the seminar;

### **3. Framework of the Seminar/Workshop Activities**

---

The aim of the two seminars with the NWG Team Leaders consisted of the following:

- 1. Evaluation of the (draft) strategic communication plans and the overall strategy of the several NWG;**
- 2. Improvement of the (draft) strategic communication plans documents, based on;**
- 3. Joint proposals and recommendations from the International Consultant**

According to the Terms of Reference and given the work to be executed within the view and time frame for completing the progress report, the following framework (structure and methodology) for conducting the Seminar / Workshop Activities was designed and executed by the international consultant:

## GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF)

---

---

# ARAL SEA BASIN PROGRAM

Water and Environmental Management Project  
Component B 'Public Awareness'

---

---

### Regional Seminar

National Public Awareness Strategies on Water  
& Environmental Resources Management  
(Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)

Tashkent, 12 - 16 February 2001

#### Seminar Program

Regional Seminar with Team Leaders of National Working Groups  
(NWG) on revision of submitted drafts of National Public  
Awareness Strategies of the five Central Asian States



## Regional Seminar, Tashkent 12 - 16 February 2001

### Day 1: Monday, February 12, 2001

0. Arrival in Tashkent (Uzbekistan)
1. Co-ordination Meeting of International Consultant, Component B Director, Mr. K. Bosov and Team Leaders of NWG: preparation of Regional Seminar

### Day 2: Tuesday, February 13, 2001

0. Introduction and Overview of Seminar/Workshop Program: outline of objectives and procedures
2. Round Up Presentations by the Team Leaders:
  - A. content: brief summary of past achievements, actual status of National Strategy Report and overview of activities scheduled for the (near) future ('Communication Plan');
  - B. structure: overview of general structure of National Strategy Report;
  - C. strengths and weaknesses: estimation of project strengths and weaknesses, including positive and negative experiences in the past;

**Objectives:** to overview and estimate the work accomplished by each of the NWGs (National Working Groups) in order to allow the International Consultant to make a first overall evaluation of the content and structure (including strengths and weaknesses) of the work and Communication Plan of each NWG.

### Day 3: Wednesday, February 14, 2001

0. Overview of the Seminar/Workshop daily Program: outline of procedures and objectives
3. Task for the leaders of the NWG (to be prepared and presented by each team leader): Regional issues to be included and integrated as part of the National Awareness Strategy proposed by each country.
 

**Issue 1 (prepared by Mrs. V. Kasymova, NWG Team Leader, Kyrgyzstan):** Standardisation of monitoring and evaluation research activities throughout the Region (criteria, systems, methodology, software, etc.)

**Issue 2 (prepared by Mr. T. Baylimov, NWG Team Leader, Kazakhstan):** Strategy for structure and management of Information Exchange Systems between components A to E in relation with component B.

**Issue 3 (prepared by Mr. T. Salimov, NWG Team Leader, Tajikistan):** Strategy for joint, regional actions and activities (regional events, TV-productions, conferences, etc.)

**Issue 4 (prepared by Mr. B. Nazarov, NWG Uzbekistan\*):** Strategy for setting up a standardised planning and evaluation system for the actions and activities as foreseen in the strategy of each NWG;

**Issue 5 (prepared by Mr. U. Saparov, NWG Team Leader, Turkmenistan\*\*):** Draft of Budget, including standardised items, for the implementation of the actions and activities as foreseen in the strategy of each NWG;

\* The issue was not properly prepared and presented due to frequent changes of representatives of the Uzbek NWG who attended the seminar;

*\*\* Since the team leader of Turkmenistan was unable attend the last day of the seminar, the issue was prepared earlier by all the team leaders;*

**Objectives:**

- to rationalise and optimise the implementation of National Strategies by each of the NWG by developing standardised procedures and joint initiatives at Regional Level.
- to enable standardised monitoring and evaluation assessment during the implementation period of the National Strategies.

4. 3.1. Preliminary evaluation on the Communication Plan of the NWGs based on the following criteria:

- Level of integration of communication (awareness) activities and actions;
- Planning of Monitoring and Evaluation activities during strategy implementation;
- Consistency of communications strategy based on reach, frequency and 'self-reference' of disseminated information;
- Overall Strategic Approach;
- Strategy focuses on Cognition level, Emotional Appeals, Attitude Change and/or Behaviour Change;

3.2. Presentation of the first findings, comments and recommendations (see annex 3)

**Objectives:** to provide a first evaluation, from a comparative, out-sider perspective, of the National Strategies in order to determine the overall approach and general positioning of the National Strategy within each country.

5. «Project Evaluation Audit» by means of 40 standardised questions, conducted for each country separately. The results are based on the self-declaration of each National Team Leader, overlooking 6 criteria relevant in order to determine the potentials and the chances for successful implementation of the proposed strategies. In a second phase, the data were checked and evaluate by the international consultant on the basis of the National Strategy drafts for the five CA-countries.

Besides an overall estimation of the quality of the work, the «Project Evaluation Audit» can be split out into 6 clusters, measuring six separate criteria:

- 4.1. quality of previous work performed by the NWG
- 4.2. to which extend the National Strategy Document is meeting the international standards;
- 4.3. potentials and capacity of the team and team management;
- 4.4. quality of overall strategic approach;
- 4.5. overall (internal and external) breakdown risks;
- 4.6. estimation of successful strategy implementation and achieving results

**Objectives:**

- to identify strengths and weaknesses of the defined strategies and estimate the relevance and potential impact (success) for the implementation of the National Strategies;
- to determine the capacity of the national teams for effective and timely implementation;

**Day 4: Thursday, February 15, 2001**

0. Overview Seminar/Workshop daily Program: outline of procedures and objectives

6. Presentation by the consultant of the findings, comments and recommendations based on the outcomes of the «Project Audit 40» (see table 2 below)

**Objectives:**

- to formulate and discuss general recommendations in order to adjust, extend and improve the «Strategy Implementation» design;

7. Reporting by each of the Team Leaders of the NWG of the outcomes, proposals of the general strategic issues defined under point 2:

- Presentation of Issue nr. 1 by **Mrs. V. Kasymova**, NWG Team Leader of Kyrgyzstan;

**Objectives:**

- to formulate and discuss specific recommendations in order to develop standardised procedures and joint initiatives «Strategy Implementation» design;

**Day 5: Friday, February 16, 2001**

0. Overview of the Seminar/Workshop daily Program: outline of procedures and objectives
8. Presentation by the consultant of the findings, comments and recommendations based on the presentation on 'Standardisation of monitoring and evaluation research activities throughout the Region (criteria, systems, methodology, software, etc.)' prepared by Mrs. V. Kasymova, NWG Team Leader of Kyrgyzstan.
9. Presentations by each of the Team Leaders of the NWG of the outcomes, proposals of the general strategic issues defined under point 2 (continued)
- Reporting of Issue nr. 3 by the **Mr. T. Salimov**, NWG Team Leader of Tajikistan;
  - Reporting of Issue nr. 2 by the **Mr. Baylimov**, NWG Team Leader of Kazakhstan;
  - Reporting of Issue nr. 4 by **Mr. Nazarov** NWG Team Leader of Uzbekistan;
  - Reporting of Issue nr. 5 by all NWG Team Leaders
10. - Conclusions by Mr. K. Bozov, Component B Director;  
- Proceedings, planning and preparations within the view of the follow-up seminar in March 2001 (Mr. F. Thevissen, International Consultant);
11. Debriefing and evaluation meeting (Mr. R. A. Giniyatullin, PMCU Leader, Mr. K. Bozov, Component B Director and Mr. F. Thevissen, International Consultant);

**Day 6: Saturday, February 17, 2001**

Return of Foreign Consultant to Brussels

12. **follow-up Brussels: 21 - 24 February 2001\***

(\*4 additional working days in Brussels not included in the contract / not invoiced)

- Reading and further evaluation on the basis of the drafts of the (translated) National Strategies  
- Further Analysis of «Project Evaluation Audit 1»  
- Draft of Progress Report

- Preparation of next mission to Tashkent - Regional Seminar March 2001

## GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF)

---

---

# ARAL SEA BASIN PROGRAM

Water and Environmental Management Project  
Component B 'Public Awareness'

---

---

### Regional Seminar

National Public Awareness Strategies on Water  
& Environmental Resources Management  
(Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)

Tashkent, 19 - 23 March 2001

#### Seminar Program:

Regional Seminar with Team Leaders of National Working Groups  
(NWG) on revision of submitted drafts of National Public  
Awareness Strategies of the five Central Asian States

## Regional Seminar, Tashkent 19 - 23 March 2001

### Day 1: Monday, March 19, 2001

0. Overview Seminar/Workshop Program: outline of objectives and procedures

#### morning program

1. Regional Issues to be included as part of the Regional Strategy: proposals to be prepared jointly by all the Team Leaders of the NWG (continuation of Seminar 1: Regional Issues)

#### **Issue 6**

- 6.1. Training needs assessment of NWG Team Leaders (training abroad)  
6.2. Priority Issues for establishing and strengthening International Relations in regard to the awareness of the project water and environmental Resources Management (via Conferences, Media Relations, P.A. and Lobbying)

#### **Issue 7**

System for setting up a standardised **planning** and **reporting** system in regard of the actions and activities as foreseen in the work plans of the NWGs

#### **Issue 5 (see February Seminar)**

Draft of Budget, including standardised items, for the implementation of the actions and activities as foreseen in the strategy of each NWG (continued);

#### **Objectives:**

- to rationalise and optimise the implementation of National Strategies by each of the NWG by developing standardised procedures and joint initiatives at Regional Level.
- to enable standardised monitoring and evaluation assessment during the implementation period of the National Strategies.

2. Summary of results Audit 1 (February 2001)

#### afternoon program

3. Further evaluation of National Strategies (drafts) by the International Consultant
4. «Project Evaluation Audit - part 2»: **Mr. T. Salimov, NWG Team Leader, Tajikistan**

#### **Objectives:**

- to further identify strengths and weaknesses of the defined strategies and estimate the relevance and potential impact (success) the implementation of the National Strategies;
- to determine the capacity of the national teams for effective and timely implementation;
- to further adjust and expand the National Strategies (drafts) in order to improve the chances for their successful implementation;
- to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the National Strategies in regard of:
  - the proposed Media Strategy
  - the proposed Awareness Strategy towards (political ) Decision-Makers

### Day 2, Tuesday, 20 March 2001

#### morning program

5. Kyrgyz National Strategy: revision and discussion with **Mrs. V. Kasymova, NWG Team Leader, Kyrgyzstan** and International Consultant

6. «Project Evaluation Audit - part 2» **Mrs. V. Kasymova, NWG Team Leader, Kyrgyzstan**  
afternoon program

7. «Project Evaluation Audit - part 2» **Mr. U. Saparov, NWG Team Leader, Turkmenistan**  
«Project Evaluation Audit - part 2» **Mr. T. Baylimov, NWG Team Leader, Kazakhstan**  
«Project Evaluation Audit - part 2» **Mr. B. Nazarov, NWG Team Leader, Uzbekistan**

**Day 3: Wednesday, 21 March 2001**

8. Analysis and reporting of Results: Audit - part 2 (prepared by the International Consultant)

**Day 4: Thursday, 22 March 2001**

morning program

9. Presentation of Results: «Project Evaluation Audit - part 2» (all National Strategies) followed by discussion

afternoon program

10. Presentation of Regional Strategy Issues (see point 1) by the Team Leaders of the NWG
- Reporting of Issue nr. 6 - part 1 by **Mr. Nazarov**, NWG Team Leader of Uzbekistan;
  - Reporting of Issue nr. 6 - part 2 by **Mr. T. Baylimov**, NWG Team Leader, Kazakhstan
  - Reporting of Issue nr. 7 by **Mrs. V. Kasymova**, NWG Team Leader of Kyrgyzstan;
  - Reporting of Issue nr. 5 by **Mr. T. Salimov**, NWG Team Leader of Tajikistan

**Day 5: Friday, 23 March 2001**

11. Seminar Evaluation - Seminar debriefing (Mr. K. Bosov and International Consultant)
12. Draft of Progress Report World Bank

**Day 6: Saturday, 24 March 2001**

Return of Foreign Consultant to Brussels

13. **follow-up Brussels: 29 - 30 - 31 March 2001 and 4 - 5 April 2001\***  
*(\*5 additional working days in Brussels not included in the contract / not invoiced)*

- Analysis of «Project Evaluation Audit 2»
- Reading and further evaluation on the basis of the drafts of the (translated) National Strategies (adjusted versions and annexes)
- Finalisation of draft version Progress Report (30 March 2001)
- Preparation of next mission to Tashkent - Regional Seminar March 2001

---

# GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF)

---

---

## ARAL SEA BASIN PROGRAM

### Water and Environmental Management Project Component B 'Public Awareness'

---

#### Regional Seminar

#### National Public Awareness Strategies on Water & Environmental Resources Management (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)

Tashkent, 9 - 10 April 2001

#### Seminar Program:

Regional Seminar with Team Leaders of National Working Groups (NWG) on revision of submitted drafts of National Public Awareness Strategies of the five Central Asian States

#### **Regional Seminar, Tashkent 8 - 10 April 2001**

#### **Day 0: Saturday April 7, 2001**

- 
0. Arrival in Tashkent - Co-ordination meeting with Component B director Mr. K. Bosov.  
Preparation of Regional Seminar

#### **Day 1: Sunday April 8, 2001**

#### morning program

- 
1. Summary of «Project Evaluation Audit» (part 1 & 2)
  2. Discussion with Team-Leaders regarding Progress Report (Evaluation Results)

#### afternoon program

- 
3. Discussion with Team-Leaders regarding Progress Report (Recommendations)



---

## Day 2: Monday April 9, 2001

---

### morning program

---

4. Meeting with **Mr. U. Saparov, NWG Team Leader, Turkmenistan**

**Objectives:**

- to discuss the Turkmen National Strategy approach and Teams' functioning on the basis of the results and recommendations of the «Project Evaluation Audit»: measures to increase the potential of the Turkmen NWG and strategy.

5. Meeting with **Mr. K. Bosov, Component B Director** (in order to discuss final version of Progress Report)
6. Meeting with **Mr. N. B. Desinov**, Head of Unit, Environmental Reporting and Indicator of GRID, Arendal

**Objectives:**

- to explore the potential of joint co-operation on information dissemination and public awareness issues during the implementation process  
- follow up meeting will take place in Geneva (Switzerland) and Brussels (Belgium)

### afternoon program

---

7. Implementation Process: Monitoring and Evaluation (see scheme)

**Objectives:**

- to identify a selected medium in each country in order to conduct monitoring research

---

## Day 3: Tuesday April 10, 2001

---

### morning program

---

8. Revisions of draft version of Progress Report
9. Meeting with **Mr. Patrick J. Ludgate** (Training Co-ordinator Winrock International) **and Mrs. Elena Telnaya** (Project Specialist, PA Consulting), **USAID** - Central Asia Natural Resource Management Project

**Objectives:**

- to explore the possibilities for joint co-operation on training issues on public awareness during the implementation process  
- follow up (draft of proposal for training issues) is foreseen in April (Brussels - Tashkent)

### afternoon program

---

10. Further revisions of draft version of Progress Report - draft of annexes
11. Meeting with **Mr. R. A. Giniyatullin**, PMCU Leader (brief reporting on proceedings and progress of work)

---

## Day 4: Wednesday April 11, 2001

---

12. Final version Progress Report - further draft of annexes

**Day 5: Thursday April 12, 2001**

---

13. Further draft of annexes of Progress Report - Finalisation of Mission Reports

**Day 6: Friday April 13, 2001**

---

14. Finalisation of annexes of Progress Report

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF) • ARAL SEA BASIN PROGRAM  
Water and Environmental Management Project - Component B 'Public Awareness'

# Report

## on Evaluation of National Strategies & Assessment of National Working Groups Potential

### ANNEX 5: Applied Evaluation Criteria (Audit 1 + Audit 2)

National Public Awareness Strategies on Water & Environmental Resources Management  
(Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)

- 4 1. Estimation of previous tasks performed by NWGs (April - December 2000)
- 4 2. Extend to which Communication Plan meets professional standards
- 4 3. Team's (NWG) potential and teams' working and management procedures
- 4 4. Quality/professionalism of overall strategic approach proposed in the Communication Plan
- 4 5. Potential successfulness of implementation / achieving results, including breakdown risks
- 4 6. Impact of last seminar (February 2001) on approach, proceedings, insights
- 4 7. Self-estimation of strengths & weaknesses of Communication Plan
- 4 8. Media (relations) strategy
- 4 9. (Political) Decision Makers Strategy

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF) • ARAL SEA BASIN PROGRAM  
Water and Environmental Management Project - Component B 'Public Awareness'

# Report

## on Evaluation of National Strategies & Assessment of National Working Groups Potential

### ANNEX 6: Survey Questions Audit 1 + Audit 2

National Public Awareness Strategies on Water & Environmental Resources Management  
(Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)

**Water and Environmental Management Project**  
**Component B**  
**«Public Awareness»**

**Audit - PART I (conducted February 2001)**  
**Communication Plan of NWG**

**PART I covers:**

- 1. The parameters to estimate the quality of previous work performed by the NWG;**
- 2. The extend to which the content of the 'implementation strategy' (Communication Plan) meets the professional standards;**
- 3. Teams' potential (NWG) and teams' management procedures (part I);**
- 4. The professionalism/quality of the overall strategic approach;**
- 5. The overall quality of the strategic approach described in the 'implementation strategy' (Communication Plan);**
- 6. The potential for successful implementation of the strategy and achieving results including risk factors (part I);**

Q1. "Does your 'communication plan' (strategy document) clearly defines measurable goals and objectives?"

**Y| 1    N| 0**

**> 2. meeting standards (content communication plan)**

Q2. "Does your 'communication plan' (strategy document) includes a detailed budget of all of the foreseen actions/activities to be implemented till the end of 2001?"

**Y| 1    N| 0**

**> 2. meeting standards (content communication plan)**

Q3. "Within your 'communication plan' (strategy document) are your target groups clearly defined by means of operational definitions?"

**Y| 1    N| 0**

<b>&gt; 2. meeting standards (content communication plan)</b>	
Q4.	<i>“Within your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document) are the awareness actions and activities clearly prioritised?”</i>
	<b>Y  1 N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 2. meeting standards (content communication plan)</b>	
Q5.	<i>“Do you estimate your National Team to have enough potential (capacity strength, manpower) in order to carry out (implement) the ‘communication plan’?”</i>
	<b>Y  1 N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 3. potential team &amp; management</b>	
Q6.	<i>“By rough estimation; which amount of the awareness activities foreseen in your ‘communication strategy’ (strategy document) is directed via the media (radio, TV, press)?”</i>
	<b>Y  1 N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 4. quality of overall strategic approach</b>	
Q7.	<i>“By rough estimation; indicate the percentage for which you will depend on third parties in order to fulfil (implement) your ‘communication plan’ (outsourcing)”</i>
	<b>Y  1 N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 5. overall (internal and external) breakdown risks</b>	
Q8.	<i>“Does your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document) includes an overview of core messages for each target group?”</i>
	<b>Y  1 N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 2. meeting standards (content communication plan)</b>	
Q9.	<i>“Are all actions included in your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document) timed?”</i>
	<b>Y  1 N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 2. meeting standards (content communication plan)</b>	
Q10.	<i>“Does your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document) include a detailed media plan?”</i>
	<b>Y  1 N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 2. meeting standards (content communication plan)</b>	
Q11.	<i>“Within your team, is there actually enough know-how (knowledge, expertise) available in order to perform the actions/activities which are foreseen in your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document)?”</i>
	<b>Y  1 N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 3. potential team &amp; management</b>	
Q12.	<i>“Does your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document) include a separate plan for promoting (GEF)/IFAS?”</i>
	<b>Y  1 N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 4. quality of overall strategic approach</b>	
Q13.	<i>“Will there be enough financial resources available to implement the proposed ‘communication plan’ (strategy document)?”</i>
	<b>Y  1 N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 5. overall (internal and external) breakdown risks</b>	
Q14.	<i>“At this stage, do you have a clear picture about the results (outcomes) of actions that were performed so far (up to December 2000) and if ‘yes’; can you quantify them?”</i>
	<b>Y  1 N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 1. quality of previous work performed by the NWG</b>	
Q15.	<i>“Does your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document) takes into account size and geographic dispersion of the target audiences?”</i>

<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 4. quality of overall strategic approach</b>
Q16. <i>“Does your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document) include one or more small scaled pilot projects on public awareness?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 4. quality of overall strategic approach</b>
Q17. <i>“Do you consider the achievement of the overall objectives of your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document) to be realistic or rather ideal?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 6. potential successfulness of implementation and achieving results</b>
Q18. <i>“Does your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document) include a methodology in order to conduct communication research?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 6. potential successfulness of implementation and achieving results</b>
Q19. <i>“Insofar the social research has been performed, have the results been reported?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 1. quality of previous work performed by the NWG</b>
Q20. <i>“Have you foreseen (included) feedback-systems in your communication with target groups?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 4. quality of overall strategic approach</b>
Q21. <i>“Are the tasks, responsibilities and duties of staff of the NWG clearly defined in your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document)?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 3. potential team &amp; management</b>
Q22. <i>“Does your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document) include specific actions directed to political decision-makers?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 4. quality of overall strategic approach</b>
Q23. <i>“Regarding awareness-activities directed to the public at large; which percentage of the population will be reached by the end of 2002”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 6. potential successfulness of implementation and achieving results</b>
Q24. <i>“Do you have sufficient computer capacity (hardware!) available within your team in order to conduct the activities foreseen in your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document)?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 5. overall (internal and external) breakdown risks</b>
Q25. <i>“Do you have sufficient computer software available within your team in order to conduct activities foreseen in your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document)?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 5. overall (internal and external) breakdown risks</b>
Q26. <i>“Does your team include an permanent responsible for media-relations?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 3. potential team &amp; management</b>
Q27. <i>“Does your team include a permanent responsible for social and communication research?”</i>

<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 3. potential team &amp; management</b>
Q28. <i>“Does your strategy clearly divide between awareness about the «Aral sea basin crisis» in general and knowledge, attitude and behaviour change towards «rational water consumption» in specific?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 4. quality of overall strategic approach</b>
Q29. <i>“Does your strategy include a plan/methodology for the systematic monitoring of media-activities?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 4. quality of overall strategic approach</b>
Q30. <i>“Do you, as a team leader, feel the need for further training (abroad) about public awareness?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 3. potential team &amp; management</b>
Q31. <i>“By rough estimation; which percentage of the foreseen activities in your previous work plan, were carried out / implemented?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 1. quality of previous work performed by the NWG</b>
Q32. <i>“Do you have a complete list <u>available</u> (!) of activities which were <u>performed</u> during last period (as foreseen in your previous work plan)?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 1. quality of previous work performed by the NWG</b>
Q33. <i>“Are you familiar with the ‘social marketing concept’?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 3. potential team &amp; management</b>
Q34. <i>“Did the campaign materials (advertisements, leaflets, brochures, radio and TV-announcements) which were produced so far systematically include telephone number(s) and/or address to whom the target audiences could address remarks, questions? If ‘yes’: who was responsible for answering (contact person)?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 4. quality of overall strategic approach</b>
Q35. <i>“Which percentage of the total budget did you foresee for the monitoring and evaluation of your activities?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 5. overall (internal and external) breakdown risks</b>
Q36. <i>“Within your team, do you possess a media database of ‘frequently asked questions’ (FAQ’s)?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 4. quality of overall strategic approach</b>
Q37. <i>“Does your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document) include a clear plan for the dissemination of information materials (magazines, booklets, leaflets...) in order to reach the target groups envisaged?”</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 6. potential successfulness of implementation and achieving results</b>
Q38. <i>“Does your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document) include information input and output systems with other project components (A up to E)?”</i>

Y  1    N  0
<b>&gt; 4. quality of overall strategic approach</b>
Q39. “Does your ‘communication plan’ (strategy document) include incentive and reward systems connected to the foreseen awareness activities?”
Y  1    N  0
<b>&gt; 4. quality of overall strategic approach</b>
Q40. “Has your team established clear, systematic and regular reporting lines with other national teams?”
Y  1    N  0
<b>&gt; 3. potential team &amp; management</b>

### Audit - PART II (conducted March 2001)

#### Communication Plan of NWG

#### PART II covers:

**3. Teams’ potential (NWG) and teams’ management procedures (part II);**  
**6. The potential for successful implementation of the strategy and achieving results, including risk factors (part II);**

-----  
**7. Impact of last seminar (February 2001) on approach, proceedings, insights ...;**

**8. Self-estimation of Strengths / Weaknesses of ‘Implementation Strategy’;**

**9. Media Relations and Media Coverage;**

**10. Potential of strategy related to (political) decision-makers;**

Q41. “From last year up to now, if any, how many press conferences did you organise about issues regarding the Component B? - How many journalist on average attend these press conferences”
# conferences  ...                      # journalists  ...
“When did you organise your last press conference?”
date/period  ...
<b>&gt; 9. Media Relations and Media Coverage</b>
Q42. “During last year up to now, has there ever been any negative news coverage in the media regarding component B and/or GEF-project?”
Y  x    N  x
“If YES, on what?”
...
<b>&gt; 9. Media Relations and Media Coverage</b>
Q43. “Does your strategy (communication plan) include any concrete ‘call for actions’?”
Y  1    N  0
“If YES, please illustrate with a concrete example”
<b>&gt; 2. meeting standards (content communication plan)</b>
Q44. “What percentage of the envisaged target groups in your country is <u>not</u> covered by the media?”
% coverage  ...
<b>&gt; 9. Media Relations and Media Coverage</b>



Q45. “Do you foresee any actions/activities towards the target audience not covered by the media??”
Y  1 N  0
<b>&gt; 9. Media Relations and Media Coverage</b>
Q46. “Since last seminar; did your NWG made any <u>changes</u> or <u>adjustments</u> to the issues that were already included in the National Strategy of your country?”
Y  1 N  0
<b>&gt; 7. Impact of last seminar (Feb. 2001) on approach, proceedings, insights ...</b>
Q47. “If YES, describe the major changes/adjustments (with a maximum of 3)”
Y  1 ...
Y  2 ...
Y  3 ...
<b>&gt; 7. Impact of last seminar (Feb. 2001) on approach, proceedings, insights ...</b>
Q48. “Since last seminar, did your NWG somehow <u>extend</u> the National Strategy of your country (new issues that were not included before)?”
Y  1 N  0
<b>&gt; 7. Impact of last seminar (Feb. 2001) on approach, proceedings, insights ...</b>
Q49. “If YES, describe the major extensions (with a maximum of 3)”
Y  1 ...
Y  2 ...
Y  3 ...
<b>&gt; 7. Impact of last seminar (Feb. 2001) on approach, proceedings, insights ...</b>
Q50. “Do you (plan to) run the awareness campaign in your country under a PARTICULAR SLOGAN or PAY OFF?”
Y  1 N  0
<b>If YES  (quote) : ...</b>
<b>&gt; 2. meeting standards (content communication plan)</b>
Q51. “Do you have or do you plan to set up / construct a website in your country regarding the project during the implementation?”
Y  1 N  0
<b>&gt; 9. Media Relations and Media Coverage</b>
Q52. “Actual figure of permanent team members of component B (NWG)?”
# TEAM NWG  ...
<b>3. Teams’ potential (NWG) and teams’ management procedures</b>
Q53. “If not done before (see Q21), did you defined tasks and responsibilities of each of the members of the NWG?”
Y  1 N  0
<b>3. Teams’ potential (NWG) and teams’ management procedures</b>
Q54. “Were there any recent changes of persons/functions within your NWG?”
Y  1 N  0
<b>If YES, specify:</b>
<b>&gt; 3. Teams’ potential (NWG) and teams’ management procedures (part II)</b>
Q55. “Do you posses a database (DB) of regional, national and local DM of your country?”
<b>Regional</b> Y  1 N  0
<b>National</b> Y  1 N  0
<b>Local</b> Y  1 N  0

<i>"Total number of DM included in your DB"</i>
# DM  ...
<b>&gt; 10. Strategy towards (political) decision-makers;</b>
Q56. <i>"Are you aware of any other P.A.-Programs on WATER SAVING in your country? If YES, name"</i>
Y  1 N  0
<b>If Y  (name)</b>
<b>&gt; 6. Potential for successful implementation of the strategy and achieving results, including risk factors (part II)</b>
Q57. <i>"If YES, are you in any way linked to this/these project(s) e.g. collaboration?"</i>
Y  1 N  0
<b>&gt; 6. Potential for successful implementation of the strategy and achieving results, including risk factors (part II)</b>
Q58. <i>"Indicate with KEYWORDS the WEAKEST points of the Public Awareness strategy drafted by the NWG of your country"</i>
-  1
-  2
-  3
<b>&gt; 8. Self-estimation of <u>Strengths</u> / <u>Weaknesses</u> of 'Implementation Strategy'</b>
Q59. <i>"Indicate with KEYWORDS the STRONGEST points of the Public Awareness strategy drafted by the NWG of your country?"</i>
+  1
+  2
+  3
<b>&gt; 8. Self-estimation of <u>Strengths</u> / <u>Weaknesses</u> of 'Implementation Strategy'</b>
Q60. <i>"Do you consider any additional financial sponsorship during the implementation?"</i>
Y  1 N  0
<b>If YES, specify: ...</b>
<b>&gt; 6. Potential for successful implementation of the strategy and achieving results, including risk factors (part II)</b>
Q61. <i>"If any, # of TV broadcasting (free publicity) from last year up to now?"</i>
Y  1 N  0
<b>if Y, #  ...</b>
<i>"If any, # of TV commercials (paid publicity) from last year up to now?"</i>
Y  1 N  0
<b>if Y, # </b>
<b>&gt; 9. Media Relations and Media Coverage</b>
Q62. <i>"If any, # of radio programs (free publicity) from last year up to now?"</i>
Y  1 N  0
<b>if Y, #  ...</b>
<i>"If any, # of TV commercials (paid publicity) from last year up to now?"</i>
Y  1 N  0
<b>if Y, # </b>
<b>&gt; 9. Media Relations and Media Coverage</b>
Q63. <i>"If any, # of news paper coverage/articles (free publicity) from last year up to now?"</i>
Y  1 N  0

<b>if Y, #  ...</b>
<i>"If any, # of newspaper advertisements/announcements (paid publicity) from last year up to now?"</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>if Y, # </b>
<b>&gt; 9. Media Relations and Media Coverage</b>
Q64. <i>"If any, # magazine coverage/articles (free publicity) from last year up to now?"</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>if Y, #  ...</b>
<i>"If any, # of magazine advertisements (paid publicity) from last year up to now?"</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>if Y, # </b>
<b>&gt; 9. Media Relations and Media Coverage</b>
Q65. <i>"From last year up to now, did you use any outdoor media?"</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>if Y, total #  ...</b>
<b>&gt; 9. Media Relations and Media Coverage</b>
Q66. <i>"From last year up to now, did you use disseminate any mailings, leaflets, postcards ..."</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>if Y, total circulation #  ...</b>
<b>&gt; 9. Media Relations and Media Coverage</b>
Q67. <i>"From Last year up to now, did you organise any sweepstakes, competitions, contest?"</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 9. Media Relations and Media Coverage</b>
Q68. <i>"What do you consider to be the most important/highest risk factor for the successful implementation of the NATIONAL strategy in your country?"(define with key words)</i>
<b>Most important risk factor  ...</b>
<b>&gt; 6. Potential for successful implementation of the strategy and achieving results, including risk factors (part II)</b>
Q69. <i>"Name the 3 most important criteria which will be used in order to evaluate the overall success of the strategy implementation on Public Awareness"</i>
<b>criteria 1 </b>
<b>criteria 2 </b>
<b>criteria 3 </b>
<b>6. The potential for successful implementation of the strategy and achieving results, including risk factors (part II);</b>
Q70. <i>"Of all the functions which should be covered within your NWG, are there for the moment any functions uncovered or not well covered?"</i>
<b>Y  1    N  0</b>
<b>if YES, define  ...</b>
<b>3. Teams' potential (NWG) and teams' management procedures (part II)</b>
Q71. <i>"Of all the functions/positions which are actually available within your NWG, which one do you consider to be the STRONGEST"</i>
<b>Strongest position  ...</b>
<b>3. Teams' potential (NWG) and teams' management procedures (part II)</b>

Q72. “Of all the functions/positions which are actually available within your NWG, which one do you consider to be the WEAKEST”
<b>Weakest position  ...</b>
<b>3. Teams’ potential (NWG) and teams’ management procedures (part II)</b>
Q73. “How often does your NWG meet?”
<b>frequency  ...</b>
<b>3. Teams’ potential (NWG) and teams’ management procedures (part II)</b>
Q74. “During NWG meetings, what is the average absenteeism?”
<b>absenteeism  ...</b>
<b>3. Teams’ potential (NWG) and teams’ management procedures (part II)</b>
Q75. “Did previous seminar (Feb. 2001) made YOU change your personal view on objectives and/or strategic approach of the project?”
<b>Y  1 N  0</b>
<b>if YES, define MAJOR CHANGE  ...</b>
<b>&gt; 7. Impact of last seminar (Feb. 2001) on approach, proceedings, insights ...</b>
Q76. “Do you apply a specific logo (name) in order to enabling the identification of the source (sender) in your information materials (leaflets, advertisements, flyers ...)?”
<b>Y  1 N  0</b>
<b>&gt; 4. quality of overall strategic approach</b>
Q77. “What is the dominant language used in your information materials?”
<b>1  Local Language 2  Russian 3  Other(s)</b>
<b>9. Media Relations and Media Coverage;</b>
Q78. “On a scale from 0 to 10, how do you estimate the ACCESS of the NWG to local, national decision makers?”
<b>scale  0 - 10</b>
<b>&gt; 10. Potential of strategy related to (political) decision-makers;</b>
Q79. “On a scale from 0 to 10, how do you estimate the COLLABORATION WILLINGNESS of local and national decision makers?”
<b>scale  0 - 10</b>
<b>&gt; 10. Potential of strategy related to (political) decision-makers;</b>
Q80. “On a scale from 0 to 10, how would you rate the overall quality of the national strategy of your country?”
<b>scale  0 -10</b>
<b>&gt; 8. Self-estimation of <u>Strengths</u> / <u>Weaknesses</u> of ‘Implementation Strategy’;</b>

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF) • ARAL SEA BASIN PROGRAM  
**Water and Environmental Management Project - Component B 'Public Awareness'**

**Report**  
on Evaluation of National Strategies &  
Assessment of National Working Groups Potential

**ANNEX 7:**  
Issues for further training  
(Regional Training & Training abroad)

National Public Awareness Strategies on Water & Environmental Resources Management  
(Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)

In order to further improve the capacity of the NWGs and improve the chances for successful implementation of the National and Regional Strategies the following training issues were identified:

1. General Communication effect research models and methods
2. Monitoring and Evaluation Research (Design, execution, analysis and reporting)
3. Media tracking and media monitoring
4. Media Planning
5. Issues management
6. Strategies on Image building
7. Creative Strategies
8. Response and feedback systems
9. Software training (SPSS, DDP, File Maker)
10. Image communications

The foreign consultant explored possibilities of setting up a Regional training program (for example: two training workshops of one week) for NWGs Media, Social Research and Public Affairs and Public Relations experts in collaboration with other international organisations (see mission report - March 2001 seminar) to cover the issues mentioned above.

Besides such Regional training program, NWGs team leaders should link to the International Community in order to get exposed to 'good practices' and state-of-the-art examples of Public Awareness campaigns abroad and to increase awareness (at public, political and media level) regarding the Aral Sea Crisis issue.

In order to achieve this goal, the International consultant will draft a concrete proposal for a work visit of the NWGs team-leaders to Europe (Belgium, The Netherlands), consisting of a training module and a seminar level. The following components will be included and further worked out:

1. Presentations of the problems and solutions regarding the Aral Sea Basin Crisis at the European Parliament;
2. Report to the European Committee for Central-Asia (headed by Mr. Staes, MEP);
3. Workshop with Prof. dr. R. Petrella, professor UCL, president of the Group of Lisbon and Secretary General of the World Committee for the World Water Contract;
4. Visit of a Public Affairs and Public Relations Agency (including Workshop in collaboration with Hill and Knowlton Brussels)
5. Visit of Advertising Agencies (including Workshop in collaboration with Ogilvy and Mather)
6. Visit of Communications Depts. of Belgian and Dutch Universities (University of Brussels (VUB), University of Antwerp (UIA) including 'Corporate Communication Centre' of the Erasmus University of Rotterdam headed by Prof. dr. Cees Van Riel (including Workshop on Communication Research in the field of Public Awareness and Campaigning)

7. Report to the Belgian Club for Central Asia (headed by Mr. Goffin, General Director of the Belgian Service for Foreign Trade, BDBH)

8. Visit of the Public Information Services of the Belgian and Dutch Government (Federal Information Service (FVD) in Belgium and Dutch Information Service (RVD) in Den Haaghe, The Netherlands)

9. Visit of (Public Opinion Research Agencies (for examples, INRA, *quantitative research* in Brussels, Belgium and SENSYDIAM *qualitative research* in Antwerp, Belgium)

10. Meeting with Mr. Guy Verhofstadt, Prime Minister Belgium and Mr. Louis Michele, Foreign Affairs Minister (to discuss themes and collaboration related to the Aral Sea Basin Crisis);

11. International Press Conference to be organised at the Brussels International Press Centre (Belgium) regarding IFAS and the Aral Sea Basin Crisis

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF) • ARAL SEA BASIN PROGRAM  
Water and Environmental Management Project - Component B 'Public Awareness'

# Report

## on Evaluation of National Strategies & Assessment of National Working Groups Potential

### ANNEX 8: Proposals for the Implementation of the Regional Strategy

National Public Awareness Strategies on Water & Environmental Resources Management  
(Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)

#### Some suggestions for the approach and development of the Regional Strategy

1. Visibility. Apply an identity strategy for IFAS: this enhances the visibility and improves a source-decoding comparable to other organisations) and add to the logo/brand name an appropriate pay-off line (non existent) which summarises the projects' core message.
2. Draft a short, clear, realistic and comprehensible mission statement for IFAS (inspired by and based upon the IFAS task and regulations) to become the basis for the awareness campaign in general. A strategy should be developed (by training of the NWG) to propagate the key message of this mission statement in a consistent and persistent way to all target groups.
3. Images campaign (billboards, TV, a general corporate brochure/leaflet) might be an appropriate solution to contribute to fade away from a purely 'technical'-connotation IFAS has become associated with. By designing such a campaign for the public at large (including all target audiences), such an approach could improve the visibility as well as the image of IFAS. The approach should appeal to the hearts, more than the brains of the (target) audience creating the desirable IFAS-image, reflecting its corporate core message.
4. The importance of direct interaction with the public at large (and their opinion leaders) in the CA-countries should not be neglected. In the CA-countries IFAS should - besides creating an overall consistent image at a larger scale than in the past - create/organise informational events (adapted to different target groups) to deliver the above mentioned 'core message'. Main goal is to establish awareness, acceptance, legitimisation, relationships improvement, etc. Therefore IFAS might think of organising regional events to deliver the philosophy and core message of IFAS in a adapted format appealing to the public at large (in villages, small communities): one could think about a 'IFAS' Theatre Tour Bus' (a concept that is successfully applied by large companies like Proctor and Gamble) which has proven to be an potentially excellent format to pass the message, for interaction and discussion.



5. The mission of IFAS can also be introduced via the development of an educational game (type Monopoly or Trivial Pursuit) so that people can become aware of IFAS-activities, it's projects, achievements and future directions. Such 'communication vehicles' can be not only an adequate an effective way to achieve informative and learning goals (meanwhile improving the acceptance of the message), but also an excellent promotional item (to be distributed during road shows, exhibitions ...).

An adapted version especially designed for children can be introduced and used as learning material in schools and institutes.

6. The production of video (in corporation with TV-stations) material providing an overview of the several IFAS-activities (it's achievements, problems) in the different countries, might strongly contribute to the objectives of this project in terms of passing and understanding the IFAS-mission (at political level, inter-information-exchange between the several components). At the same time, this material can be uses during exhibitions and road shows, as a promotional tool, as learning material in schools, etc.

---

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF) • ARAL SEA BASIN PROGRAM  
Water and Environmental Management Project - Component B 'Public Awareness'

# Report

## on Evaluation of National Strategies & Assessment of National Working Groups Potential

### ANNEX 9: Standardisation of Monitoring & Evaluation activities performed by the NWGs

National Public Awareness Strategies on Water & Environmental Resources Management  
(Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)

In order to start the implementation of monitoring and evaluation activities, standardised procedures were worked out in order to generate monitoring and tracking data regarding the successfulness of the strategy implementation.

To start with the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation research, each country selected a medium relevant to their communication strategy, as follows:

tasks:	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyzstan	Tajikistan	Turkmenistan	Uzbekistan
start-up monitoring research (pilot projects)	Leaflets	Newspaper articles ('free publicity')	Posters	Instruction Manuals (farmers)	short TV messages
monitoring method & research design + training	Standardised Leaflet impact testing	'Mediascore'	Standardised Billboard impact testing	Instruction Manuals (farmers)	'eSMT-test' (extended Sender Message Identification Test)
reporting of audit research					
strategy adjustment					

Besides media related tracking and monitoring data, we recommend to conduct two general, standardised monitoring researches during the implementation period in order to assess the overall effectiveness of the implemented strategies.

These assessments will measure:

- general awareness
- knowledge
- attitude and involvement
- behaviour intentions
- behaviour patterns

and will focus on:

- IFAS
- the Aral Sea Basin Crisis
- water consumption patterns

Regarding media specific monitoring and tracking data we recommend the following measurement criteria:

A. Output measurement of media coverage (radio, TV, press)

B. Impact measurement of media output (see A) via a media monitoring methodology called 'Media Score'

C. Communication Impact measurement for specific 'outputs':

- advertisements: OMI-test<sup>1</sup> (sample 100)
- short TV messages: OMI-test (sample 100)

D. Standardised (File Maker) Data-base to make an inventory of response to applied feedback systems (Who, Where, What, via Which channel, to Whom)

E. Impact measurement of strategies applied at education level

F. Impact measurement in regard of water consumption patterns (behaviour change):

- in the agriculture sector (main target group in terms of water volume consumed)
- general population, households (main target group in terms of size)

Measurement of possible changes in water consumption pattern will take place via small scaled pilot projects (with the help of water meters) to trace (changes) in patterns of water consumption.

---

<sup>1</sup> Organisation and Message Identification Test developed by MaCo (Centre for Applied Marketing and Communication Research). OMI-test measures (1) recall - memorisation, (2) message likability, (3) sender identification (4) identification of core messages and (5) degree of message exposure).

<b>media</b>	<b>advantages</b>	<b>disadvantages</b>
<b>Television</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mass coverage</li> <li>High reach</li> <li>Impact of sight, sound and motion</li> <li>High prestige</li> <li>Low cost per exposure</li> <li>Attention getting</li> <li>Favorable image</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low selectivity</li> <li>Short message life</li> <li>High absolute cost</li> <li>High production cost</li> <li>Clutter</li> </ul>
<b>Radio</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local coverage</li> <li>Low cost</li> <li>High frequency</li> <li>Flexible</li> <li>Low production cost</li> <li>(Well-segmented audiences)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Audio only</li> <li>Clutter</li> <li>Low attention getting</li> <li>Fleeting message</li> </ul>
<b>Newspapers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low cost</li> <li>Short lead time for placing ads</li> <li>Ads can be placed in interest sections</li> <li>Timely</li> <li>Reader controls exposure</li> <li>Can be used for coupons (responses)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Short life</li> <li>Clutter</li> <li>Low attention-getting capabilities</li> <li>Poor reproduction quality</li> <li>Selective Reader Exposure</li> </ul>
<b>Outdoor</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location specific</li> <li>High repetition</li> <li>Easily notices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Short exposure time requires short messages</li> <li>Poor image</li> <li>Poor distribution</li> </ul>
<b>Direct mail</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High selectivity</li> <li>Reader controls exposure</li> <li>High information content</li> <li>Opportunities for repeat exposures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High cost/contact</li> <li>Poor reach</li> </ul>
<b>Internet</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>User selects information</li> <li>User attention and involvement</li> <li>Interactive relationship</li> <li>"call for action" -potential</li> <li>Flexible message platform</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited creative capabilities</li> <li>Access speed</li> <li>Technology limitations</li> <li>Very limited reach</li> <li>Few valid measurement techniques</li> </ul>

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF) • ARAL SEA BASIN PROGRAM  
**Water and Environmental Management Project - Component B 'Public Awareness'**

**Report**  
on Evaluation of National Strategies &  
Assessment of National Working Groups Potential

**ANNEX 10:**  
Proposed contributions of the foreign consultant during  
the implementation of the National & Regional  
Strategies

National Public Awareness Strategies on Water & Environmental Resources Management  
(Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)

## Contributions of the foreign consultant in respect to the overall approach to the implementation of the National and Regional Strategies

The foreign consultant can contribute to the project in various ways, according to the rules of the SMART approach (see supra), by providing the following (outputs):

- Providing latest state-of-the art know-how and expertise in communication evaluation research techniques;
- Providing evaluation data and information on gaps in the communication strategy and shortcomings of previous information activities on the basis of detailed research on information needs;
- Assist in conducting adequate research in those areas defined by the assessment as unsatisfactory;
- Advising on content and methodology on additional communication research ;
- Defining (new) target groups, including a clearly defined picture of their information needs;
- Formulating recommendations for the development and implementation of communication actions;
- Monitoring newly developed communication actions (immediate, short-term and mid-term impact) in terms of efficiency, effectiveness and impact of these actions, including results of monitoring assessments;
- Supervising the overall communication strategy and providing IFAS with recommendations for long-term communication strategies and policy on public awareness issues related to water management

The key criteria governing NWGs' selection and use of different communication tools are as follows:

1. The degree of control required over the delivery of the message;
2. The financial resources available to transmit messages;
3. The level of credibility that each tool bestows on the organisation;
4. The size and geographic dispersion of the target audiences;

To enable the NWGs to bring together the various communication elements into a cohesive plan, which can be communicated to the beneficiary, an overall framework is required. The Communication Planning Framework (CPF) that is proposed by the international consultant seeks to achieve this by bringing together the various elements into a logical sequence of activities where the rationale for communication action decisions is built upon information generated at a previous level in the framework. Another advantage of using the CPF is that it provides a suitable checklist of activities that need to be considered.

The CPF represents a sequence of decisions that communication managers undertake when preparing, implementing and evaluating communication strategies and plans. The CPF will be used to show first the key elements, second some of the linkages and third the integrated approach that is required in this project.

The process of communication planning, however, is not linear, as depicted in the framework but integrative and interdependent.

**scheme 5:** Proposed Communication Planning Framework (CPF) by the International Consultant

