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Process and Result Evaluation 2016/2017

- Legislation requirements (CPR)
  - Relevance of development needs (Article 52 a))
  - Relevance of complementary and synergy links (Article 52 d))
  - AIR 2016 (part B)
  - 1st Progress Report of PA

- Duration of evaluation: November 2016 – April 2017

- Contracted external evaluator: 35 650 EUR
Process and Result Evaluation
2016/2017

• Inception report
  – Detailed plan of evaluation (methodology, data, stakeholders…)

• Verification study
  – Relevance of complementary links and development needs (SWOT, theory of change)
  – Verification of monitoring system (indicators)

• Pre-evaluation study
  – Definition of methodology for evaluation in 2019 (before FAME guidelines)
Process and Result Evaluation
2016/2017

• Result evaluation
  – No results achieved – no evaluation
  – Assessment of potential to meet milestones and specific objectives (analysis based on registered projects)

• Process evaluation
PROCESS EVALUATION 2016/2017

Reasons why:

• Low absorption capacity in first calls
• To avoid implementation failure
• To find bottlenecks
• To improve the implementation
PROCESS EVALUATION 2016/2017

Process areas

• Call preparation
• Announcement of the call, preparation and registration of applications
• Acceptation of aid applications, check of admissibility and formal requirements
• Evaluation and selection of projects
• Control of tendering procedures
• Issuance of a legal act / rejection letter
• Project implementation
• Request for payment and reimbursement to the beneficiary
• Sustainability of projects
• Interest in planned calls (measures)
• Evaluation of communication activities
PROCESS EVALUATION 2016/2017

Methodology used

• Analysis of internal management documentation
• Content analysis of calls, rules and other related documents addressed to clients (applicants, potential applicants, beneficiaries = OP clients)
• On-line survey among clients
• Quantitative and qualitative data analysis of information system
• Interviews with project managers of managing authority and intermediate body.
• Interviews with representatives of clients
PROCESS EVALUATION 2016/2017

Process areas were assessed from the perspective of:

- Management Authority
- Intermediate body
- Clients
- Data analysis from information system

Principle of triangulation = whenever possible, evaluation questions should be looked at from different viewpoints and by different methods.

(Guidance Document on Monitoring and Evaluation, European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund)
Electronic on-line survey

- Anonymous

- Three groups of clients: potential applicants, applicants/beneficiaries

- Preparation of questionnaire
  - caution when choosing evaluation questions
  - pilot survey after programming the questionnaire
PROCESS EVALUATION 2016/2017

Conclusions:

Preparation of calls and project registration

- No significant discrepancy between needs of clients and conditions and content of calls
- ¾ of clients assessed calls conditions positively
- Information is available, in time and sufficient
- Quality and clarity of the information is rather low
Conclusions:

Projects acceptance, selection and evaluation of projects

- Process effectiveness is lower due to high rate of returned applications (to correct mistakes) - time consuming for clients and IB
- High rate of cancelled applications – low effectiveness of process
- Inappropriate term for call realization (harvesting period)
- Requests for correction of applications were delivered in X-mass period (the applications were terminated)
- Significant part of clients (more than 1 third) believed that selection criteria were not understandable and concrete
- Lack of sophisticated evidence of good and bad practice was mentioned
PROCESS EVALUATION 2016/2017

Conclusions:

Project implementation

- Not enough time for tendering procedure
- Process can be considered as effective
- No significant barriers were detected

Early stage of implementation - only a few projects had been already paid
PROCESS EVALUATION 2016/2017

Weak interest in following measures:

- Diversification of aquaculture
- New farmers
- Creation of producers organisation
- Marketing and production plans
**PROCESS EVALUATION 2016/2017**

- Image of Managing Authority and Intermediate body is positive

- OP Fisheries is focused on narrow and homogeneous target group (about 500 potential clients knowing each other)

- Any negative experience or obstacle can have a serious impact on the whole target group

  RISK for OP implementation
EVALUATOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- Increase of absorption capacity
- Increase of communication activities (newsletters, brochures)
- Simplify rules and documentation
- Change evaluation and selection criteria
- Make an overview of good and bad practice
- Reduce the error rate in applications
- Include new indicators (coming from 1st OP revision)
- Up-date complementary links (in OP document)
ACTIONS TAKEN

• Each recommendation was inserted into the information system (MS2014+)

• Drawing up a list of recommendation use:
  – Detailed description of each action (task)
  – Task schedule
  – Responsible person or department
ACTIONS TAKEN

• Simplification of rules, applications and other forms
• Extension of period for the application submission and for the tendering procedure
• Adjustment of some evaluation and selection criteria
• Change in the eligibility of certain expenditures (at the request of respondents)
• Including new indicators into the monitoring system
• Increase of calls frequency (twice a year)
• Developing an overview of good and bad practice
• Drawing up a communication strategy and realization of communication activities
ACTIONS TAKEN

• Organisation of seminars for applicants
  – Calls
  – Tendering procedure in OP Fisheries
  – Producers organisations (representatives of the Commission and POs)

Action planned
• Revision of OP – on the agenda of Monitoring Committee 22. 11. 2018
ACTIONS TAKEN

Report on the progress of the Evaluation Plan

- Presentation to the Monitoring Committee once a year
- Providing basic information on evaluations
- List of recommendations from evaluations and their use
- Report is generated from the coordinating’s body information system
LESSONS LEARNT

Recommendations

• Not to rely on external company (many mistakes, permanent control)
• Set up regular meetings (monthly) and process minutes from the meeting
• More time for approval of the outputs
• Set minimum level of methodology in contract
• Ask in advance for questionnaires and interviews scenarios (approval procedure)
• Building your own capacity (training at methodology, data collection and analysis)
Thank you for your attention