



# MINISTERUL ECONOMIEI ȘI FINANTELOR

Autoritatea pentru Coordonarea Instrumentelor Structurale

CABINET DIRECTOR GENERAL



## Guidelines for interim evaluation of the operational programmes in 2009

### **Title** (indicative)

Interim Evaluation of the OP XXX covering the period 1 January 2007 to 30 June 2009

### **Overall Objective** (indicative)

To contribute to the successful implementation of the OP.

### **Purposes** (indicative)

- To provide an informed judgement on the OP's progress to date and lessons learned
- To provide an input to strategic reporting under Article 29 of the Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006

### **Questions**

#### *Relevance* (indicative)

- The Socio-economic analysis for the OP is based on indicators up to 2004/05. What important changes have occurred since then and are expected in the future? How do the changes in the socio-economic context since then affect the priority axes of the OP?

#### *Consistency* (indicative)

- Is the implementation to date for the various priority axes complementary?
- Are the priority axes coherent with the latest relevant Romanian policy/ strategies (at the cut-off date)?
- Are there overlaps between the operations in the priority axes?
- Is the implementation to date adequately addressing the horizontal objectives (equal opportunity, sustainable development)?

#### *Effectiveness* (indicative)

- What is the actual implementation progress to the cut-off date? (this is primarily a monitoring question)
- What is the gap between actual and planned progress? (This will refer specifically to the results indicators at the priority axes)
- Will the progress to date (and the rate of progress) lead to the achievement of the objectives of the priority axes?
- What are the factors that are contributing to the gap between actual and planned performance?

#### *Efficiency* (indicative)

- How has the implementation of the OP to date affected the relevance of the OP?

- Is the management system (managing authority, intermediary bodies, beneficiaries) functional and operating efficiently?

Management system means planning, launching the call, quality of the project applications (and reasons for rejection), timeliness of the selection procedures, Timeliness of contracting, timeliness of processing applications for reimbursement

### **Strategic reporting (compulsory)**

- What contribution has the OP made to date towards:
  - A) implementing the objectives of cohesion policy as established by the Treaty
  - B) fulfilling the tasks of the funds as set out in the Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006
  - C) implementing the priorities detailed in the Community strategic guidelines on cohesion and specified in the priorities set by the National Strategic Reference Framework
  - D) achieving the objective of promoting competitiveness and job creation and working towards meeting the objectives of the Integrated Guidelines for Growth and Jobs (2005 to 2008)
- What are the achievements, challenges and future prospects in relation to implementation of the OP strategy?
- Could examples of good practice be identified? Which are they and their added value?

### **Methodology (indicative)**

Sample wording:

“Bidders are invited to set out on a point by point basis, how they propose to answer the evaluation questions.

In particular for questions X, Y and Z, bidders are invited to specify in detail the particular evaluation instruments they propose to use in addition to the general evaluation approach of document review, interviews and site visits.”

“In order to address the strategic reporting evaluation questions, bidders should suggest the potential topics they propose to develop as case studies (for examples of good practice) to meet this requirement and to describe the other elements of their approach to these specific questions (points (a) to (d) and achievements, challenges and future prospects).”

However, specific steps should be included in the methodology:

- kick-off seminar - the evaluation team, mandate and methodology shall be presented
- drafting the evaluation report
- Circulation of the draft report for comments
- Quality control of the final evaluation report
- Debriefing meeting.

### **Deadlines (compulsory)**

Period evaluated: 1 January 2007 – 30 June 2009

Evaluation Cut-off date: 30 June 2009

Deadline for the submission of a final debriefed Interim Evaluation report to ACIS is 30 September 2009.

Normal duration for this evaluation is about six months. For larger OPs (ROP and HRD SOP) more time will be needed.

### **Type of tender** (indicative)

Open tender

### **Indicative Criteria for Evaluation Firms** (indicative)

#### *Economic and financial situation*

- Average Turnover for last 3 years should be greater than or equal to twice the allocated budget of the project.
- Ratio of short term debt to cash and cash equivalents should be greater than one.
- Etc.

#### *Technical capacity*

- At least 2 evaluation projects (one of which with a minimum value of EUR100,000) of public funded programmes or strategies within the last 3 years.
- Proven experience in the evaluation of EU public funded programmes.

### **Experience of the experts** (indicative)

#### Team Leader

Expert knowledge of EU structural instruments proven by 5 years relevant practical experience (programming, implementation, monitoring, evaluation (minimum 2 years))  
Previous Team Leader or co-ordinator experience in two projects.  
Good spoken and written English or Romanian language skills

#### Team to include:

##### *Evaluation experts*

- Key evaluation experts with minimum 3 years experience in evaluation of EU or Member State funded public policies
- Or
- minimum 2 years experience in evaluation of EU or Member State funded public policies and
  - EU structural instruments or pre-accession instruments programming or monitoring (at least 2 years)
- Or
- Overall experience with structural instruments for 5 years of which at least 2 evaluation projects

##### *Key senior sectoral experts and*

*Junior evaluation experts* with minimum 2 years total experience divided between

- evaluation of EU or Member State funded public policies (at least 1 project) and
- EU pre-accession instruments (Phare, ISPA, SAPARD) programming or monitoring.