Apart of this project, a smaller TA project is envisaged to animate the evaluation network mentioned in chapter 4.2 Coordination mechanisms. The annual estimated budget is around 50.000 EUR.
All these TA activities will be funded under 2014-2020 Technical Assistance Operational Programme.

4.5 Communication and follow-up strategy

Once a final evaluation report is issued, a debriefing meeting will be organised with the members of the Evaluation Steering Committee in order to discuss the evaluation main findings and recommendations. During the meeting, a follow-up action plan with institutional responsibilities and deadlines will be elaborated and agreed. The plan will be taken over by the monitoring function of the Partnership Agreement in order to monitor the achievements of the action plan during its implementation.
The evaluation report will be disseminated to the members of the thematic sub-committees and their findings discussed during regular meetings organised throughout the programming period.
The evaluation report will be uploaded in SFC2014 and in the online evaluation library containing all evaluation reports elaborated since 2007, www.evaluare-structurale.ro.

Annexes

Annex 1 - The methodology used in answering the evaluation questions

The methodology followed for the ex-ante evaluation was fully detailed in the technical proposal and inception report for the assignment and included all necessary methods to ensure a consistent and objective approach to the individual evaluation questions.
The following is details of the evaluation tools used throughout the process
The methodology followed for the ex-ante evaluation was fully detailed in the technical proposal and inception report for the assignment and included all necessary methods to ensure a consistent and objective approach to the individual evaluation questions.
The following is details of the evaluation tools used throughout the process

I.1 Is there any appropriate analysis in place related to disparities and development needs, with reference to the thematic objectives and the key actions defined within the Common Strategic Framework and the targets established in the recommendations included under article 121 (2) of the Treaty and the Council's recommendations according to Article 148 (4) of the Treaty? How was the partnership principle taken into consideration within the drafting of the PA?

The methodological tools used to answer this question are summarised in the below table.

Tool	Contribution of the tool
Desk research	Review of EU (draft) regulations, templates and guidelines. Review and analysis of other MS (draft) PAs. Gather data on the arrangements between different stakeholders and participation in ICPA. Review of 2007-2013 NSRF for Romania to provide a comparison of the needs identified in the two programming periods
Stakeholder Analysis through the Stakeholder Matrix	Stakeholder analysis to identify the participation, interest and activity of stakeholders in the PA development process. Structure the data on the perceptions on the application of the Partnership principle
Checklist	Compliance checklist used to assess the state of completion and compliance of the PA against the requirements of the CSF, PA (PA) template, Common Provision Regulation (CPR), Direction General (DG) guidance papers
Coherence tables	Identified the coherence and link between the CSR, the analysis and the strategic response. Tables were developed for all main challenges identified in the CSR document.
Interviews	Interviews, discussions and workshops with staff members of MEF, programmers, representatives of line Ministries and other stakeholders to establish the internal coherence and external coherence and causal links.
Interviews with stakeholders of finalised TA projects	Collect and confirm data and findings
Online questionnaire	Collect data on the perceptions of the respondents on the process and

	preliminary results of the PA development (Partnership principle)
Venn Diagrams	Visualize the data on the perceptions on the application of the Partnership principle Contained in first interim report on internal and external coherence.
Theory of change	Analysis of the needs
Expert Panels	Expert Panels are used to provide an outside opinion to the findings and conclusions of the ex-ante evaluators.

I.2 Does the Partnership Agreement includes proposals for the most appropriate operational programs and thematic objectives?

The methodological tools used to answer this question are summarised in the below table.

Tool	Contribution of the tool
Desk research	Review of regulations, guidelines and templates, Previous and current versions of PA, Collection of PA data from other Member States
Logical Framework	Review of intervention logic of PA
Quantified SWOT Analysis	In-depth review and recommendations for the SWOT analysis Utilised and updated throughout the process based upon changes to PA SWOT
Focus group	Collect opinions of key stakeholders on the SWOT analysis. Establish link between needs and objectives
Member State comparisons	Analysis of PA preparation in selected Member States with finding providing basis of comparison for QI.4.
Expert Panel	Review of findings and conclusions of ex-ante evaluators

I.3 The results selected for each thematic objective are the most appropriate to each fund of the Common Strategic Framework?

Below is a list of the tools used for the analysis of question I.3.

Tool	Contribution of the tool
Desk research	Review of the expected results and EC guidance Elements/abstracts from quoted documents – quotations, tables, graphs, Document inventory updates (introduction of new studies etc.), Previous studies and analyses
Quantitative Analysis	Descriptive statistics and modelling, Theory of change database, Administrative capacity database, Quantitative SWOT analysis Collection of information and opinions through interviews, focus groups, CIAP minutes, checklists and benchmarking, stakeholder analysis and observers in meetings and forums

Online questionnaire	Collect data on the perceptions of the respondents on the process and preliminary results of the PA development (priority and objective identification/selection, allocations)
Checklist	The checklist was developed for the Third evaluation report and applied in order to assess the appropriateness of the results for the Fourth evaluation report
Theory-of-change database	The database was developed to gather information about the logic and results of previous interventions in the areas of the 11 EU thematic objectives.
Interviews	Interviews, discussions and workshops with staff members of MEF, programmers, representatives of line Ministries and other stakeholders to establish the internal coherence and external coherence and causal links.
Expert panels	Verification of findings of ex-ante team, commentary of PA. These forums were used as a tool to establish the broad priorities to be financed and the expected results. They include expert panels on smart growth, sustainable growth and on inclusive growth.

I.4 The allocations proposed for each OP and thematic objective are appropriate?

Below is a list of the tools used for the analysis of question I.4.

Tool	Contribution of the tool
Desk research	Review of EC guidance and requirements, previous studies and draft Partnership Agreements for 2014-2020 of peer countries Elements/abstracts from quoted documents – quotations, tables, graphs, Document inventory updates (introduction of new studies etc.), Previous studies and analyses
Descriptive statistics and modelling	Analysis of the distribution of financial allocations per thematic objective and peer countries Descriptive statistics and modelling, Theory of change database, Administrative capacity database, Quantitative SWOT analysis Collection of information and opinions through interviews, focus groups, CIAP minutes, checklists and benchmarking, stakeholder analysis and observers in meetings and forums
Online questionnaire	Collect data on the perceptions of the respondents on the process and preliminary results of the PA development (priority and objective identification/selection, allocations)
Benchmarking	Comparisons with peer countries

Interviews	Collect additional information and validate preliminary information
Expert Panels	Verification of findings of ex-ante team, commentary of PA

I.5 Is territorial development approached in an appropriate manner?

Below is a list of the tools used for the analysis of question I.5.

Tool	Contribution of the tool
Desk research	Review of EU regulations, guidelines and studies. Review and analysis of existing and draft plans strategies and studies on regional and territorial development in Romania
Interviews	Verification, explanation and enhancement of research and analysis
Expert Panels	Verification of findings of ex-ante team, commentary of PA

I.6 How are the specific needs of the geographical areas most affected by poverty or of the target groups at risk of discrimination or exclusion approached, considering the marginalized communities?

Below is a list of the tools used for the analysis of question I.6.

Tool	Contribution of the tool
Desk research	Review of EU regulations, guidelines and studies. Review and analysis of existing policies and strategies on poverty and social exclusion in Romania
Benchmarking	Analysis of 14 overarching indicators based upon EUROSTAT over a 5 year period (where available)
Interviews	Verification, explanation and enhancement of research and analysis
Expert Panels	Verification of findings of ex-ante team, commentary of PA

I.7 How will the new support forms (financial instruments) be used?

Below is a list of the tools used for the analysis of question I.7.

Tool	Contribution of the tool
Desk research	An inventory of the FIs used in the MS in 2007-2013 and the lessons learnt Lessons learnt from the FIs funded from Cohesion policy (including pre-accession) , EARDF and EFFMA Assessment of the availability of information regarding market failure situations to support decisions The desk research has been updated for the 3rd and the 4th

	Evaluation Reports.
Case studies	Examples of FI used in EU and non EU countries highlighting specific features advantages and disadvantages with a focus on new instruments; benchmarking the potential FIs in Romania against other countries practices
Interviews	Confirmation of preliminary findings, understanding of the lessons learnt and needs for 2014 2020, stage of analysis for identification of market failure situations, coordination with the national policies Additional interviews have been conducted for the 3rd evaluation reports in order to detail the use of FIs in rural development and agriculture.
Benchmarking analysis	A selection of examples of FIs funded from public funds from EU MS and non EU states highlighting the potential benefits for the types of FIs identified as potential options based on the existing information regarding market failure situation and favourable environment. Detailed analysis was presented in first coherence evaluation report.
Expert Panels	Verification of findings of ex-ante team, commentary of PA in-depth insights in the particular areas of FIs: capital markets, venture capital, interest and capacity of key players from the banking system, other financial institutions, private funds, understanding the demand and the latent demand, other factors influencing FIs in Romania

I.8 Are the policies necessary to fulfil ex-ante conditionalities appropriate? How do these policies contribute to the efficient implementation of interventions? Is there any coherence and synergy among these policies?

Below is a list of the tools used for the analysis of question I.8.

Tool	Contribution of the tool
Desk research	Review of EU (draft) regulations, templates and guidelines. Review and analysis of other MS (draft) PAs. Review existing and draft Romanian strategies, policies and regulations
Checklist	Compliance checklist used to assess the state of completion and compliance of the ex-ante conditionalities against the requirements of the CSF, PA template, CPR, DG guidance papers
Assessment Grid	EC requirements for fulfilment of ex-ante conditionalities
Expert Panels	Verification of findings of ex-ante team, commentary of PA
Workshops	Understanding of programmers and line ministry approach to ex-ante conditionalities and their understanding of the process for fulfilment and assessment criteria

II.1 Is the authorities' and beneficiaries' administrative capacity sufficient for an appropriate implementation of CSF funds?

Below is a list of the tools used for the analysis of question II.1.

Tool	Contribution of the tool
Desk research	Review of previous studies and evaluations, the existing strategies that deal with the administrative capacity and the annual reports on the 2007-2013 OPs implementation
Checklist	Compliance checklist used to assess the full range of administrative factors that are relevant to the successful implementation of CSF, separately for authorities and beneficiaries. The first is based on Structures, People and Systems while the latter is based on capabilities on phases of the project cycle.
Questionnaires	Designed for beneficiaries and authorities, which are a part of the EU fund management system
Interviews	Confirmation of preliminary findings from desk research and questionnaires with beneficiaries and authorities of CSF funds.
Focus Group	Focus groups, one with beneficiaries and one with representatives of the authorities, to conduct an in-depth analysis and validation of the desk research, interviews and questionnaires
Database regarding administrative capacity of Authorities and beneficiaries	Using information collected though desk research, interviews, questionnaires and focus groups, the database contains the most important parameters of the checklist

III.1 Are there enough regulations and procedures in force for the data exchange required by the new regulations? To what extent are electronic systems comprehensive enough? To what extent do electronic systems meet the elements in the checklist to be drafted by evaluators (ease of use, reduced administrative burden, data aggregation, data quality, research options, data availability in due time, data security, etc.?)

Below is a list of the tools used for the analysis of question II.1.

Tool	Contribution of the tool
Desk research	Review new regulations, the procedures and regulations that are in force and the documentation on the electronic systems for data exchange
Checklist	Compliance checklist used to assess the full range of administrative factors that are relevant to the successful implementation of CSF, which covered ease of use, reduced administrative burden, data aggregation, data quality, research options, data availability in due time, data security etc
Questionnaires	Designed for MIS coordinators and users (both Contracting Authorities and beneficiaries of CSF funds)

Interviews	Confirmation of preliminary findings from desk research and questionnaires with administrators of the electronic systems/SMIS coordinators will be added. Also interviews to verify the updated status of the analysis for the second iteration of the Analysis
Focus Group	Focus groups with representatives of all institutions managing various electronic systems and also with representatives of CSF funds' beneficiaries, to conduct an in-depth analysis and validation of the desk research, interviews and questionnaires