

Annexes

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

SECTION II - TENDER BOOK: TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACSI	Authority for the coordination of Structural Instruments
RDA	Regional Development Agency
MA	Managing Authority
MA ROP	Managing Authority for the Regional Operational Programme
PCC	Project Coordination Committee
EC	European Commission
MC	Monitoring Committee
MC ROP	Monitoring Committee of the Regional Operational Programme
MEC	Management Evaluation Committee
RCSEC	Regional Committee for Strategic Evaluation and Correlation
NSRF	National Strategic Reference Framework
PMED	Program Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate
ENEPI	European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument
CF	Cohesion Fund
ERDF	European Regional Development Fund
ESF	European Social Fund
IPA	Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance
MDPH	Ministry of Development, Public Works and Housing
MEF	Ministry of Economy and Finance
MSMETTLP	Ministry for Small and Medium Enterprises, Tourism, Trade and Liberal Professions
MESD	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development
MLFEO	Ministry of Labour, Family and Equal Opportunities
IB	Intermediate Body
AP	Action Plan
AEP	Annual Evaluation Plan
MAEP	Multi-annual Evaluation Plan
ROP	Regional Operational Programme
VAT	Value added tax
CEU	Central Evaluation Unit
EU	European Union

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

Title of the project

Interim evaluation of ROP for the period 1st of January 2007 - 30 June 2009

1.1. Beneficiary state

Romania

1.2. Contracting Authority

Ministry of Development, Public Works and Housing

Str. Apolodor no. 17, North side

050741, Bucharest - 5, ROMANIA

Tel: +40372111412. Fax: +40372111630

1.3. Relevant general information

The European non repayable funds that have been allocated to Romania as European Union member state for the period 2007-2013 amount to almost 28 billion Euro. From this amount, over 19,66 billion euros are allocated by structural funds, respectively *European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)*, *Cohesion Fund (CF)* and *European Social Fund (ESF)*. Almost 98% of the entirety of these funds is allocated for seven Operational programmes within the framework of the *Convergence Objective*³⁵, and 2% are allocated for six Operation Programmes under the *Objective "European Territorial Cooperation"*³⁶.

The strategic document establishing the intervention priorities of the Structural Instruments for the programming period 2007-2013 is the *National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF)*. NSRF provides the compliance of the interventions of structural instruments with the community strategic orientations on cohesion and national development priorities, as well as the connection between priorities at community level and national development priorities as established by the *National Development Plan 2007-2013* and *National Reform Programme*.

As established by the fundamental objectives of *NSRF*, in the period 2007-2013 the European Funds will be invested in reducing discrepancies in the economic and social development between Romania and

³⁵ Objective that focuses on the reduction of economic and social development disparities between the EU regions by accelerating economic development for the regions remained behind, by investments in human capital and basic infrastructure

³⁶ Objective that focuses on the strengthening of cooperation at cross border, transnational and inter regional level

other member states by generating, until 2015, an increase of 15-20% of the *Gross Internal product (GIP)*.

The implementation of the strategic actions envisaged by NSRF 2007-2013 and implicitly the actual accession of Structural Instruments is carried out by means of Operational Programmes within the two above mentioned objectives. The Operational Programmes elaborated by Romania for the period 2007-2013, as well as the institutions responsible for the management and implementation of these programmes are presented in *Annex A*.

The attributions of the institutions involved in managing and implementing Structural Elements (*SI*) in Romania are established by **Government Resolution no. 457/2008** on the institutional framework for the coordination and management of structural instruments³⁷. The coordination at national level of *SI* management is incumbent upon the Ministry of Economy and Finance by the *Authority for the coordination of Structural Instruments (ACSI)*. The strategic coordination is insured by the *National Committee for the Coordination of Structural Instruments*.

1.4. The current situation in the relevant activity sector

1.4.1. Managing Authority and Intermediary Bodies for the Regional Operational Programme

The Ministry of Development, Public Works and Housing (MDPH) is the *Managing Authority (MA)* for the *Regional Operational Programme (ROP)*. *The Intermediary bodies (IB)* that implement the programme are appointed within the eight Agencies for Regional Development (*see Annex E*) established according to the Law 315 of the 28th of June 2004 on the regional development in Romania³⁸, with the subsequent amendments and supplements, as well as the *Ministry for Small and Medium Enterprises, Trade, Tourism and Liberal professions - MSMETTLP* (for priority axis 5 „Sustainable development and tourism promotion”)

ROP Managing Authority (MA ROP) holds the entire responsibility for the management and implementation of ROP, in accordance with the provisions of EU Regulations and principles of a solid financial management. The most important responsibilities of MA ROP in relation to the potential applicants are: the elaboration of the selection criteria of financing requests, of the evaluation methodology, the conclusion of contracts with the selected applicants, by means of the Intermediate Bodies.

ROP Intermediary Bodies are implementation units at regional level, who have been delegated a part of MA ROP responsibilities, based on a *Framework Agreement*. The Intermediate Bodies have the direct contact with the RP financing applicants. The Intermediate Bodies guide the applicants in the elaboration of projects, launch the process of submission by the applicants of the financing requests, receive and record the financing requests, organize, participate and guide the selection process, notify the applicants regarding the results of the evaluation process, sign the financing requests on behalf of *MA ROP* and follow the entire implementation process of the financed projects.

³⁷ OJ no. 364 of the 13th of May 2008.

³⁸ OJ Nr. 577 of the 29th of June 2004.

1.4.2. Monitoring Committee and the Regional Committee for Strategic Evaluation and Correlation

RP Monitoring Committee (MC ROP) - is set up in accordance with the provisions of Regulation (CE) no. 1.083/2006 of the Council of the 11th of July 2006 for establishing the general provisions de on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and for the abrogation of Regulation (CE) no. 1.260/1999³⁹ and is responsible for the control and insurance of efficiency and quality of implementation of this program. **MC ROP** is composed of representatives of the authorities/institutions of central public administration, regional bodies and social and economic partners directly or indirectly involved in the economic development process.

Regional Committees for Strategic Evaluation and Correlation (RCSEC) are set up, within each development region, based on the Government Decision number 764 of the 11th of July 2007⁴⁰ with the subsequent amendments⁴¹. **RCSEC** represent consultative bodies, without legal personality, within which public investment priorities at regional level are discussed and analyzed, with financing from community funds or local budgets in order to reach the objectives of the region's development strategy.

1.4.3. Regional Operational Programme⁴²

ROP strategic objective is to support the balanced and sustainable economic, social and territorial development of the regions in Romania, in accordance with the specific needs and resources of each of them, by supporting urban growth poles, the improvement of regional and local transport infrastructure, the improvement of social infrastructure, the support of the development of regional and local business environment, as well as by sustainable development and tourism promotion in order to transform these regions and particularly those remained behind, into more attractive zones for fishing, visiting and investing.

ROP Strategy reflects Romania's regional development policy and the decentralization process by taking into consideration in the same time the Community Strategic Orientations on Cohesion for the period 2007-2013, as well as Lisbon Strategy that particularly focuses on promoting competitiveness and creating jobs.

The programme finances projects in the field of transport infrastructure, social infrastructure, business and tourist infrastructure, with a major impact on regional and local development and whose development creates conditions for the valorisation of the current material and human resources, by means of the following priority axes:

³⁹ Official Journal of the European Union, series L No. 210 of the 31st of July 2006

⁴⁰ OJ No. 545 of 9th of August 2007

⁴¹ GR no.1383/2008 on the amendment of GR no. 764/2007 for the approval of setting up regional committees for strategic assessment and correlation and of the framework regulation for their functioning and organization, published in OJ, Part I, no. 761 of the 11th of November 2008

⁴² Romania's Regional Operational Programme 2007 – 2013 was approved by Decision of the European Commission C (2007) 3470/2007 of the 12th of July 2007.

Priority axis and indicative percentage allocated from ERDF contribution to RP financing	Major intervention fields	Calendar for launching project requests	Progress of ROP implementation on 10.10.2008 Nr. projects ⁴³ /total value /requested value (Euro)
Priority axis 1: Support of cities' sustainable development - urban growth poles - 30%	1. Urban development integrated plans	Estimated for November 2008	-
Priority axis 2: Improvement of regional and local transport infrastructure - 20%	2.1. Rehabilitation and modernization of the network of county roads; urban streets - including the construction/rehabilitation of ring roads	10.09.2007	126 /1,543 /1,252 mld.
Priority axis 3: Improvement of social infrastructure - 15%	3.1. Rehabilitation/modernization/fitting of infrastructure of health services; 3.2. Rehabilitation/modernization /development and fitting of social services infrastructure; 3.3. Improvement of equipment fitting of the operational bases for intervention in emergency situations; 3.4. Rehabilitation/modernization /development and fitting of pre-university, university educational infrastructure and of the continuous professional training infrastructure.	22. 01.2008 28. 01.2008 31. 10.2007 29 .02.2008	12/34,05 /27,93 mil. 15/12,86 /10,26 mil. 1/13,01 /10,71 mil. 21/80,03 /65,16 mil.
Priority axis 4: Enhancing the regional and local business environment- 17%	4.1. Sustainable development of structures for support of business with regional and local importance; 4.2. Rehabilitation of polluted and unused industrial sites and preparation for new activities; 4.3. Support of micro enterprises	25.04.2008 25.04.2008 13.03.2008	6/71,82 /39,36 mil. - 474/87,19 /48,25 mil. ⁴⁴

⁴³ Projects in various phases of the evaluation and contracting process

⁴⁴ On the submission deadline 777 projects were recorded

Priority axis 5: Sustainable development and tourism promotion - 15%	5.1. Restoration and sustainable valorisation of the cultural assets and setting up /modernization of related infrastructures;	14.03.2008	18/154,35 /115,65 mil.
	5.2. Setting up/development/modernization of specific Infrastructures for the sustainable valorisation of natural resources and for the increase of the tourist services' quality;	29.04.2008	36/157,43 /83,98 mil.
	5.3. Promotion of the tourist potential and the setting up of necessary infrastructure for Romania's increase in attraction as tourist destination.	11.09.2008	-
Priority axis 6: Technical assistance - 3%	6.1. Support of implementation, management and evaluation of the Regional Operational Programme; 6.2. Support of advertising and information activities regarding the Regional Operational Programme.	16.08.2007	4/3,22 mil (financing requests)

The main categories of ROP beneficiaries are: authorities of local and central public administration, Inter community Development Associations, Partnerships between the local public authorities, suppliers of social services (accredited under the conditions of the law), state higher education institutions, public institutions suppliers of continuous professional training services, small and medium enterprises, Trade and industry Chambers, cult institutions, NGOs.

1.4.4. Evaluation of the Regional Operational Programme and Multi-annual evaluation Plan

The evaluation that is to be performed within this contract is included in the **Multi-annual Evaluation Plan** (MAEPE) of the Regional Operational Programme 2007-2013 approved by ROP Monitoring Committee (MC ROP) within the reunion of the 22nd of April 2008 (http://www.inforegio.ro/index.php?page=PUBLICATIONS_REPORTS).

The Evaluation Plan for 2009 of ROP, that details the evaluations envisaged in MAEP for this year, was approved by ROP Monitoring Committee within the reunion of the 27th of October 2008 (<http://www.inforegio.ro>) and refers to the intermediary evaluation of ROP 2007-2013 for the purpose of supporting the programme's management process by analyzing the issues that might occur during

the implementation and proposal of some specific solutions for the improvement of the implementation and management system functioning.

1.5. Other relevant documents:

The relevant documents for the survey the Contractor⁴⁵ is to carry out for the purpose of achieving RP intermediary evaluation within this contract are presented in **Annex B**. Other relevant documents for ROP may be consulted at the Internet address: <http://www.inforegio.ro>.

2. OBJECTIVE, PURPOSE AND EXPECTED RESULTS

The evaluation project entitled „Interim Evaluation of ROP for the period 1st of January 2007 - 30th of June 2009” focuses on improving the quality, relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of programme management and implementation, as well as the evaluation (preservation) of relevance and consistency, at national level, of the programme’s strategy, within the framework of social and economic changes.

2.1. General objective

The general objective of the project is to contribute to the successful implementation of the Regional Operational Programme 2007-2013 by evaluating the progress and performances registered in its management and application, for the period ranging between the 1st of January 2007 and the 30th of June 2009.

2.2. Purpose of the project

The purpose of the project on the carrying out of the intermediary evaluation survey of the Regional Operational Programme making the object of the contract consists of:

1. The examination of the extent to which ROP strategy (priority axes, objectives, etc.) continues to be relevant and coherent within the framework of the social and economic changes;
2. The analysis of the recorded progress in the programme implementation/reach of the objectives and the identification of external and internal factors that have an influence on the performances of the Managing Authority and of ROP Intermediate Bodies in managing and implementing it;
3. Evaluation of the efficiency of ROP implementation system;
4. The supply of information that answer the requirements of strategic reporting corresponding to article 29 of Regulation no. 1083/2006;
5. Identification of the learned lessons and of the necessary measures for carrying out ROP objectives including those regarding the development of relevant capacities.

2.3. Expected results

⁴⁵ Within the meaning of the hereby project, in the text of these Technical Specifications, the Contractor may be also found under the denomination of “Evaluator”

The activities to be developed by the Contractor under this project result in providing the Management Authority of Regional Operational Programme with an evaluation study substantiated by detailed, relevant, reasonable and competent analyses on the Regional Operational Programme.

The analyses will substantiate the conclusions and useful recommendations for MA ROP, including possible proposals for technical and financial adjustments to the programme, required for achieving ROP objectives. The analyses accompanied by the resulting conclusions and recommendations will be described in *Final Evaluation Report* - according to **point 3.1.6.** of these Technical Specifications

The evaluation will address the following questions:

1. To what extent do the priorities and objectives defined in ROP strategy keep their relevance within the context of inter-current social-economical changes in relation to the period of programme preparation?
2. Does the progress made in ROP implementation lead to the achievement of the programme's objectives?
3. Which are the major external and internal factors that could influence or have influenced the performance of the MA and ROP IB within the programme management and implementation?
4. Is the ROP implementation system appropriate for the selection, contracting and monitoring of the projects launched at the level of each development region and within each key area of intervention⁴⁶?
5. How are the performances of ROP implementation system reflected at the level of reimbursement claims?
6. Which is the ROP contribution during the evaluated period to the implementation and achievement of strategic objectives?

The Bidder will consider in preparation of his proposal that the questions mentioned in the above mentioned points 1 - 6 (see also their detailed description in point 3.2.4) represent and substantiate the activities to be developed by the Contractor and the Expert's Team, inferentially forming parts of the evaluation study and the Final Evaluation Report as well.

2.4. Assumptions and risks

2.4.1. Assumptions

- No changes in institutional and legislative framework will occur that could affect the objective and the results of the ROP assessment study
- The continuous submission, during the implementation of assessment study, of a sufficient number of projects and financing requests for all priority axes of the Regional Operational Programme 2007-2013
- The permanence of the personnel within Management Authority and Intermediary Bodies of ROP, which ensures a continuous development of appropriate capacities by consistency of activities.

⁴⁶ According to GD 457/13.05.2008, the key area of intervention represents the scope of activity in a priority axis where various operations with similar objectives can be financed.

2.4.2. Risks

- The over-tasking of personnel or reduced availability of target groups which may lead to non-involvement and lack of interest for evaluation activities;
- Lack of institutional cooperation and inefficient communication including between MA ROP and/or IBs and the assessor experts' team;
- Lack of and/or inconsistency of certain data and information which are relevant for timely and efficient completion of the ROP's interim assessment study during 2009, including the quality of some monitoring reports and data or of other similar documents;
- Human and financial resources which are inaccurately estimated.

3. PROJECT'S SCOPE OF ACTIVITY

3.1. General aspects

3.1.1. Scope of regulations

Community regulations and relevant national legislation

The main Community regulations applicable to the programming period 2007-2013, the main working papers prepared by the European Commission in the field of evaluation and the national legislation relevant to this project are presented in Annex B to these Technical Specifications.

3.1.2. Scope of the evaluation

The Contractor will carry out the **strategic and operational evaluation** of the performances recorded in ROP 2007-2013 management and implementation in close correlation with the objectives and purpose of the project. The evaluation study will cover all programme's priority axes, as well as the entire management, implementation and monitoring systems, analyzing the ROP strategy and progress during **January 1, 2007 - June 30, 2009**. The evaluation will provide recommendations in order to support the Management Authority to achieve the programme's objectives.

Furthermore, the interim evaluation study of the Regional Operational Programme 2007-2013 will provide the necessary information for strategic reporting which each member state must carry out at the end of 2009, pursuant to the provisions of article 29 of the (EC) Regulation no. 1.083 on July 1, 2006, setting out the general provisions regarding the European Regional Development Fund, European Social Fund and Cohesion Fund and annulment of (EC) Regulation no. 1260/1999.

3.1.3. The financial dimension of the area to be assessed

The entire allocated amount to ROP 2007-2013 from European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the national contribution and co-financing rate, on priority axes, expressed in EUR, is described in **Annex C**.

The detailed financial plan of ROP on an annual basis, on priority axis and key areas of intervention is included in the Framework Document of ROP Implementation (ROP Programme Complement)⁴⁷.

3.1.4. Target groups

The study on interim evaluation of ROP 2007-2013 being carried out via this project will represent a management tool for **decision-makers**, for all **actors involved in programme management and implementation**, and for the **partners involved** in preparation of national strategy for regional development as well.

Thus, this evaluation will address the following categories of target groups:

- The decision-making and executive personnel within MA ROP,
- The decision-making and executive personnel within Intermediary Bodies for ROP (from the 8 RDAs and from MIMMTCPL),
- Members of ROP Monitoring Committee,
- Members of RCSEC,
- beneficiaries.

The target groups will be directly involved by the Contractor in the information gathering and analysis process, information required for preparation of the Evaluation Report and they will be consulted by Contractor in such way that would ensure the participative and partnership process and the transparency of the entire evaluation exercise.

3.1.5. Territorial coverage of the evaluation

The geographical region covered by the interim evaluation of ROP is the entire territory of Romania, as the project includes all eight development regions set out by Law 315/2004, with further amendments and supplements.

3.1.6. Final result of evaluation

The final result of the evaluation study is the **Final Evaluation Report**, which will include the following chapters, at least:

- A **Summary**, of approximately 4-5 pages, which should emphasize the key aspects of the assessment, the primary analytical issues, as well as the conclusions and recommendations resulted from the assessment process;
- **Applied methodology**;
- **Analyses addressing each of the evaluation questions**;
- **Conclusions and recommendations** regarding the changes and adjustments, including the financial ones, required to achieve the objectives and interventions set forth in ROP.

The recommendations of the **Final Evaluation Report** must be impartial, realistic and enough detailed in order to be implemented and will set forth in a distinct annex drafted as a **tabel a minimum set of measures and actions (“Action Plan”)** necessary for the improvement of ROP management and

⁴⁷ http://www.inforegio.ro/index.php?page=PUBLICATIONS_POR_2007_2013

implementation process and for the development of suitable capacities at regional and central level. The recommendations and measures will be set in groups and prioritized where available.

The Consultant will also draft a **summary of the evaluation**, in a manner appropriate for a wide dissemination and use by the public. The summary will use a language which is accessible to non-professionals. Other annexes of the Final Evaluation Report will be laid down by mutual agreement between Contracting Authority and Evaluator.

The Final Evaluation Report, including Annexes, will be drawn up both in Romanian and English.

The quality of the **Final Evaluation Report** must be assured by the Contractor through its own internal quality control system. MA ROP⁴⁸ will perform the analysis of Final Evaluation Report quality using the evaluation criteria described in Annex D.

3.2. Methodology and project-specific activities

3.2.1. Project launch

The Contractor will organize a **kick-off meeting**, within maximum **seven days** after commencement of activities⁴⁹, meeting that will be attended by guests from: MA ROP, IB ROP, Central Unit of Evaluation of ACSI, members of MC ROP, presidents and vice-presidents of RCSEC, or designated representatives hereof, members of the Management Committee for ROP Evaluation within MDPWH. The representatives of the European Commission will also be invited to attend. The final list of attendees will be discussed and agreed by the Contractor and Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Department from Directorate General of MA ROP.

During the kick-off meeting, the Contractor will introduce the team of evaluators (the experts' team), the objectives, purposes and activities of the project, the questions to be addressed by the evaluation, the special requirements, if any, its internal evaluation report quality assurance and control systems, evaluation methodology, as well as the general/guiding schedule of the evaluation activities.

For the purpose of kick-off meeting, the Contractor will prepare the relevant materials, the meeting material portfolios, in Romanian, and a number of portfolios including the translation of the texts from Romanian to English language.

3.2.2. Preparation of Evaluation Report

As the evaluation is a participative and transparent process, the Evaluator and the team of experts will be in permanent contact and dialogue with the parties involved in the assessed programme for the optimum performance of the evaluation study. Furthermore, the Evaluator will initiate discussions with the stakeholders/parties involved, during all preparation stages of the Evaluation Report, as the

⁴⁸For the purpose of these Technical Specifications and this project, the Management Authority for Regional Operational Programme is the direct beneficiary of the technical assistance to be contracted for the execution of programme assessment study; The Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Department from MA ROP supervises the contract implementation.

⁴⁹ In the event that the kick-off meeting day is a legal holiday, such activity will be held in the next following business day.

information will be collected, assembled and analysed, in order to make sure that there are no inconsistencies between used data and information.

Considering the essential principle of independence of evaluation process and of the evaluators in relation to the direct and indirect beneficiaries of the study, the Evaluator may agree or not with the received comments. When different and/or divergent opinions cannot be accepted by the Evaluator due to strictly professional and justified reasons, a punctual and detailed explanation on the reasons for not including such opinions in the Report's drafts will be submitted in writing by the Evaluator

Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Department (PMED) will monitor how the comments and proposals submitted by the parties involved in the process have been assumed, analysed and integrated in the Report as the case may be, by the Evaluator. PMED will analyse the quality of all presented documents using "**Evaluation Report Quality Control Grid**" provided in Annex D, during all stages of Evaluation Report preparation.

The quality analysis of the report submitted by the Evaluator shall be subject to discussion and approval of the **Management Committee for ROP Evaluation**.

The Contractor must provide his own **Internal Evaluation Report Quality Control System** (both for drafts and for **Final Evaluation Report**).

The Evaluation Report (drafts and final report) will be drawn up by the Contractor in Romanian and English, in a number of copies and standard format to be discussed and agreed upon by the parties (MA ROP and Contractor). The estimated volume of the report, except for annexes⁵⁰, shall be of maximum 90 text pages, including tables and charts. The font used will be 'Times New Roman' size 12. The margins of each page will be of 2,5 cm, and line spacing shall be one and a half space.

All drafts of the Evaluation Report will be submitted both on paper support and electronic support (in Word and pdf format), in a number of copies to be agreed upon by both parties.

3.2.3. Final debriefing reunion for the evaluation results

At the end of the activity, the Evaluator will organize a final project reunion, with the participation of actors involved in the ROP evaluation process, with the following purpose:

- to present, in detail, the results, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation, as well as a set of proposed actions and measures;
- to prepare the presentation of the evaluation results within the POR Monitoring Committee.

The Contractor will also provide the POR MA a presentation (in PowerPoint) of the Final Evaluation Report both in Romanian and English.

The Final Evaluation Report will be also presented by the Contractor during the first reunion of the ROP Monitoring Committee held after the final debriefing reunion for the assessment results.

⁵⁰ Annexes to Assessment Report will be agreed by the Contractor with MA ROP

3.2.4. Specific activities that will be conducted by the Contractor within the ROP interim evaluation project

In order to perform the interim evaluation study for the ROP 2007-2013 and to compile the Final Evaluation Report, the Contractor must answer in a clear and concise manner to all questions related to the evaluation, related to the pertinence and consistence of the provided support, the efficiency of actions conducted during the assessed programming period. Analysis will be performed on national and regional level.

1 To what extent do the priorities and objectives defined in ROP strategy keep their relevance within the context of inter-current social-economical changes in relation to the period of programme preparation?

In order to achieve this evaluation component, the Contractor will conduct the following activities:

- Analyze the validity of ROP strategy, by examining all socio-economic changes occurred in Romania during the assessed period;
- Identify the effects of all changes in the socio-economic context having an impact on the performance of the ROP strategy, as well as present and explain these changes with their future directions;
- Examine the pertinence of the ROP indicators in order to achieve its objectives, in the context of the occurred socio-economic changes.

2. Does the progress made in the ROP implementation lead to the achievement of the programme's objectives?

In order to achieve this evaluation component, the Contractor will conduct the following analysis activities for each of the priority axes and for each developing region:

- Analyze the process effectiveness, from the moment the financing applications are submitted, until the financing agreement is signed, including project implementation;
- Analyze the effectiveness and the impact of the PR and advertising system related to the ROP;
- Analyze the project portfolios within each priority axis as well as each Key Area of Intervention, in order to determine whether the activities and indicators set forth through ROP will be achieved (current level of indicators and their achievement perspectives in order to achieve the ROP strategy objectives).

3. Which are the major external and internal factors that could influence or have influenced the performance of the MA and ROP IB within the programme management and implementation?

In order to achieve this evaluation component, the Contractor will conduct the following activities:

- Conduct an analysis covering all ROP priority axes to identify and explain the repetitive internal and external factors having influenced the program management and implementation performances, on the level of each developing region/IB and within each Key Area of Intervention, including those factors related to the administrative capacity on regional and central level;
- Conduct an analysis of the context in which these factors have occurred and developed, relieving the directions for the next period;
- Identify and present a set of practical measures and actions that could be immediately implemented, with the aim to improve the effects of the factors identified within the performed analysis.

4. Is the ROP implementing system appropriate for the selection, contracting and monitoring of the projects launched at the level of each development region and within each Key Area of Intervention?

In order to achieve this evaluation component, the Contractor will conduct the following activities:

- A detailed analysis of the selection and contracting process, conducted on the level of each developing region and within each Key Area of Intervention, including:
 - an analysis of the method in which the system and period of the project evaluation and selection could influence the achievement of the program strategic objectives, with possible changes /adjustments of the implementing system;
 - an analysis of the method in which the selection criteria have been applied and major causes for project rejection;
- an analysis on the level of each IB and MA of the efficiency of the project monitoring system as well as the method in which it provides necessary information to monitor the degree in which program indicators are achieved.

5. How are the performances of the ROP implementing system reflected at the level of reimbursement claims?

In order to achieve this evaluation component, the Contractor will conduct the following activities:

- Analyze the efficiency of the financial circuit, including the current and predicted financial situation to see in which way the Managing Authority can comply with rule „n+3” and „n+2”;
- Analyze the use of pre-funds for the reimbursement of expenses within priority axes, correlated to the impact of the compliance with rule „n+3” and „n+2”, including on the level of each developing region;
- The impact on payment efficiency and achievement of program objectives to support, from the state budget, the VAT equivalent value related to the eligible expenses made within the financing agreements.

6. Which is the ROP contribution during the evaluated period to the implementation and achievement of strategic objectives?

In order to achieve this evaluation component, the Contractor will conduct the following activities:

- Analyze ROP contribution with the following aims:
 - implementing objectives of the cohesion policy as determined in the Treaty establishing the European Community;
 - accomplishing ERDF tasks/mission established through Regulation 1083/2006;
 - implementing detailed priorities within the Community Strategic Directions related to Cohesion and specified in the priorities established through the National Strategic Reference Framework;
 - achieving the competition promotion objective and creation of jobs leading to the achievement of objectives Integrated Directions for Occupation and Development (2005-2008);
- Identify achievements, opportunities and future perspectives related to strategy implementation;
- Present good practice examples identified by the evaluator.

As for question 6 of the evaluation, the Contractor will consider that the Final Evaluation Report must include a distinct chapter, dedicated to the analysis of this question and that will represent contributions to the Strategic Report compiled by ACSI according to the provisions of Art. 29 of Regulation 1083/2006.

The Bidder will present and describe in detail in the Technical Proposal his own method of approach, the proposed strategy to achieve the specific project activities, the proposed methodology to answer to each question/evaluation component, including the specific instruments that will be used, a structure proposition of the Evaluation Report, as well as its project improvement proposals.

In order to answer to the question (no 6) related to the strategic report, the Bidder will present the method in which he will select and perform case studies as good practice examples and will describe the specific elements to approach all aspects included in this question.

In order to provide an **Internal Quality Control System for the evaluation reports** (both for the versions as for the *Final Evaluation Report*), the Bidder will describe in detail his own internal quality control system procedures, that will be used to provide the quality standards stipulated in the relevant documents of the European Commission, assumed through the criteria used by the Contracting Authority.

4. MANAGEMENT, ORGANISATION, LOGISTICS AND PLANNING

4.1. Organisational Issues

The Ministry of Development, Public Works and Housing, as Contracting Authority, shall be responsible for project management.

The direct Beneficiary of this project shall be *the Managing Authority for the Regional Operational Programme* (MA ROP), established within the Ministry of Development, Public Works and Housing. The task of monitoring the technical implementation of the project shall lie, on behalf of the Contracting Authority, with the *Department for Programme Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME)* within the Directorate General of MA ROP, which shall appoint a Project Officer.

DPME shall facilitate, with support from the other departments within the MA ROP and, as the case may be, within the MDPWH, the contacts between the Contractor/evaluation experts and the target

groups, as well as the contacts with other relevant institutions and organisations in Romania, according to the project needs, also establishing the contact point, through the designated Project Officer.

The Contracting Authority (*MDPWH*) and/or the direct Beneficiary (*MA ROP*) shall provide all the information available, whenever required by the Contractor and/or experts, and shall cooperate fully with a view to obtaining the best results.

The Management Committee for ROP Evaluation (MC - ROP) - is established within the MA ROP and generally verifies the quality of the Evaluation Reports. It is chaired by the Head of the Managing Authority of the ROP (Managing Director), and its members are the heads of the following departments: Department for Programme Strategy and Coordination, Department for Programme Management, Directorate General of Programme Authorisation and Payments, Department for Programme Monitoring and Evaluation, the Project Officer and representatives of the academic environment. According to the issues discussed and the project requirements, the meetings of the MC-ROP may be attended, as the case may be, by representatives of other specialised departments within the MDPWH, of the Evaluation Central Unit within ACIS and of other institutions or organisations, as observers.

The Project Coordinating Committee (PCC) - is a technical committee, which is set up for each evaluation project, and it is mostly responsible for the general project coordination, the analysis and monitoring of the technical and financial progress recorded per each stage of project implementation, as well as for the overall project, in relation to the progress recorded in achieving the general objectives and the purpose of the project. The *PCC* shall analyse and approve the project reports, and comment on the draft and final versions of the *Evaluation Report*.

This Committee shall convene for each important project stage, according to the schedule provided at **point 4.2.2.** of these Terms of Reference, in order to analyse the activity of the Contractor, comment on and approve the project reports, and make recommendations on project implementation.

It is made up of the members of the *Management Committee for ROP Evaluation*, representatives of the *ROP Intermediary Bodies*, as well as others, according to the needs. At its meetings, there may be also invited to attend representatives of the *Evaluation Central Unit within the ACIS*. The Chairman of the *Project Coordinating Committee (PCC)* is the Head of the *Department for Programme Monitoring and Evaluation* or a substitute designated by him/her. The Secretary of the Committee is the Project Officer, designated from this department for each evaluation project.

4.2. Project Monitoring

4.2.1. Reporting requirements regarding the technical and financial implementation of the project - Project Reports

Apart from the *Final Evaluation Report*, which is the final output of all the activities carried out throughout the project, the Contractor shall regularly prepare and submit to the *Project Coordinating Committee*, for analysis and approval, according to the schedule provided at **point 4.2.2.**, the following reports on the progress of the activities carried out within the project:

1. Inception Report - This report shall confirm the project objectives, present and describe:

- the organisation arrangements proposed by the Contractor;
- the staff, their qualifications and location;
- the methodological approach specific to each question of the evaluation, including the method of selecting and building case studies as examples of good practice, the structure of the Evaluation Report, as well as the suggestions of the Contractor for improving the project;
- the Evaluation Activities Plan (Work Plan)⁵¹ prepared in detail and also drafted as a Gantt-chart⁵²;
- the logframe⁵³, which shall specify the objectives, the results and the activities, as well as the performance indicators;
- a detailed presentation of the risks, including the risk management measures.

For preparing and submitting the **Inception Report**, the Contractor shall agree, together with the direct Beneficiary of the project, on the detailed work procedures.

2. Interim Progress Report - it is a report on the technical and financial progress/implementation of the project, which shall supply information on (without limitation to):

- a presentation of all the activities carried out from project commencement to the date of the interim report, their current status, as well as the results obtained;
- details regarding the number of experts who have worked in the project during this time period, the distribution of tasks and time (days) spent by each expert for their fulfilment, the number of trips to regions within the project and the duration of such trips, including per each expert used during that time period;
- the indication of the target groups and, potentially, of other consulted actors, as well as the description of the relationships with them;
- the description of certain procedure and methodological issues (e.g. use of questionnaires, interviews, method of selection and determination of representative samples, organisation of presentation and information sessions, etc);
- highlighting potential delays, as well as the measures proposed for their prevention/remedy;
- the amount of expenses incurred within the project;
- any other details regarding the technical and financial implementation of the Evaluation Activities Plan (Work Plan);
- the preparation status of the Evaluation Report (by submitting a first draft version of the Evaluation Report), including the compliance with the deadlines set for that stage.

⁵¹ The deadline term for achieving the project results according to the terms mentioned in the Technical Specifications regarding the elaboration and elaboration phases of the Evaluation Report, must be clearly identified and identifiable through the Evaluation Activities Plan, together with: all essential phases of achieving the activities of the evaluation study; human and financial resources allocated according to activities and in time (estimated expenditures), number of days -expert (working days) allocated to each activity; rate of travel of the experts, etc

⁵² Gantt chart annexed of the Evaluation Activities Plan must represent a detailed projection on days and months of the: activities during the execution period of the project; connection and relations between activities and their sequential aspect, **activities** delivered to each expert on the entire execution period of the project, number of days -expert (working days) allocated to each activity, etc.

⁵³ See Section III/Forms, Form19 “Logical Framework Matrix” from Award Documentation.

3. Final Progress Report - will include:

- A detailed description of the activity developed by the contractor / experts;
- A presentation of the technical, financial and administrative details of project implementation;
- A description of the obtained results according to project scope and objective
- A presentation of the Final Evaluation Report and its conclusions and recommendations.

All three reports are implementation reports of the project and represents monitoring instrument for the activities of the Contractor and of the evaluator experts and each of them are presented, debated and approved in the **Project Coordination Committee** meetings. .

All project reports will be concisely, clearly and correctly written in Romanian language, providing real and documented information. There will be written in A4 format and presented on hard and electronic copy. The tables and planning (Gantt chart) will be written in A3 format. The document origin will be identified either on top of page, or on the bottom of the page. Project reports must have a guard page, which must contain the identification data of the project, project title, elaboration date and covered period, Contractor's name and address. The Contracting Authority / MA ROP will provide to the Contractor, after the activities inception, the recommended structure of these reports. The Contractor may propose changes of these structures which must be agreed upon in advance with DMEP.

The reports are written in a number of copies agreed between DMEP and Contractor, and will be transmitted to the members of the Project Coordination Committee in electronic format (Word 2000), with at least three working days before the meeting date of the PCC.

Also, for a better monitoring of the project, the Contractor will write a Progress Technical Report every month in which there will be presented the development stage of each activity, experts involved, working days for each expert⁵⁴, etc. Standard format and the containing of these reports will be agreed upon with DMEP.

4.2.2. Indicative calendar of elaboration and presentation of Project Reports, Evaluation Reports (versions and final version) and correlation with Payment Calendar

REPORT	DAY ⁵⁵	Payments (percent of the total contract value)
1.Presentation of the Inception Report 2. Approval of the Inception Report	30	10
3.Presentation of the Progress Interim Report, Including the presentation of the first working version of the Evaluation⁵⁶ Report 4. Approval of the Interim Report	90	30
5.Presentation of the advanced working version of the	150	30

⁵⁴ Working days

⁵⁵ Counted from the inception day of the project activities. If the indicated days are legal holidays, the respective activity, will be organized/developed in the next working day

⁵⁶ Preliminarily advised, from quality point of view, by the management Committee for ROP Evaluation

Evaluation Report (second version)⁵⁷		
6. Presentation of final version of the Evaluation Report	180	
7. Quality endorsement of the Final Evaluation Report		
8. Organizing Final Reunions of evaluation results (<i>Debriefing meeting</i>) and presenting the Final Evaluation Report⁵⁸ and Final Project Progress Report	200	
9. Approval of the Final Progress Report		30
10. Presenting the Final Evaluation Report within MC ROP⁵⁹		

4.3. Logistics and planning

4.3.1. Localization

This project will be made integrally in Romania - no kind of activity will be realized outside the country. The activities of the project imply official trips/visits at the target group offices. The operation base for this project will be in Bucharest, where the Contractor must have/or rent an adequate working space for which he must ensure, during the entire activity development period, the material and human resources necessary for the implementation of the project in good conditions.

The Contractor will cover all general expenses related to this office (working space) and its functioning for the purpose of developing the project. These costs are considered as included within the price of the contract.

4.3.2. The beginning date of the activities and their period of execution

The estimated date for the beginning of the activities of the project is February/March 2009, and the execution period will be of maximum 7 months from their beginning date. The execution period of the activities within this contract cannot, under any circumstances, exceed the date of September 30, 2009. See articles 4 and 5 of the Contract, for the identification of the beginning date of the activities and the execution period.

The Contract will enter into force beginning with the date when it is signed by both parties, but its duration can not exceed December 31, 2009.

4.4. Activity evaluation calendar

The orientating calendar for the elaboration of the *Final Evaluation Report*, as well as other reports concerning the activity of the project is presented at *pct. 4.2.2*. Without exceeding the time limits mentioned in this Technical Specifications, and depending on the requirements of the project, the final calendar can be agreed upon by the Contracting Authority/AM POR and the Contractor,

⁵⁷ Idem

⁵⁸ Idem

⁵⁹The Contractor will be invited to present the conclusions of the evaluation during the meeting of the Monitoring Committee of ROP, organised at the closest date from the project finalization date

immediately after the beginning of the project activities, but until the presentation of the Inception Report.

5. REQUIREMENTS

5.1. Personnel

In its offer the Bidder will present a team of experts who must have all competencies and general and specific experience necessary to the integral fulfillment of the tasks stipulated in these Technical Specifications and that can work coordinated and efficiently in the process of project implementation in order to obtain the expected results.

The team of experts will include and will be led by a **Project Coordinator** (Team Leader). The number of experts will be proposed by the Bidder in its bid, depending on the analyses of the project's complexity.

All experts will have a key role in the making of the objectives and the purpose of the project of intermediary evaluation of POR 2007-2013, in the integral implementation of the specific activities, as well as in the activity of elaboration and compilation of the Final Evaluation Report, according to the requirements within these Technical Specifications.

All experts must be independent and not be in any kind of conflict of interests with the responsibilities given to them and/or the activities they will develop within the project.

In order to execute the services, the Contractor is obliged, according to the contract, to take all necessary measures to avoid any conflict of interests for the experts involved in the project, ensuring, among others, that the proposed experts (including the Project Coordinator) are not in any of the situations listed below:

- Are part of the administration board / management body or supervision body and/or own social parts/shares from the subscribed capital of an office/consultancy company that has elaborated the projects handed in and/or pending implementation at the date of making the intermediary evaluation study of POR;
- Have been/are involved in the preparation of projects, including the elaboration of feasibility studies and technical projects, that are or will be the object of financing requests and/or those projects that are pending selection and/or are in the implementation phase at the date of making the intermediary evaluation study of POR;
- Have contractual working and/or collaboration relations with any of the target groups mentioned at pct. **3.1.4**;
- Have any other interest, patrimonial or non-patrimonial related to this project.

Moreover, during the entire period of implementing the project, the Contractor will take all necessary measures to prevent any situation that can compromise the impartial and objective development of the intermediary evaluation study of POR 2007-2013 and the activities developed for the realization of the project's objective and purpose.

Regardless of the period of development of the proposed expert's activities, the Contractor will ensure and strictly follow that they know very well and understand the requirements, purpose and the objectives of the project, requirements of the rules and regulations of the European Union, and

relevant Romanian legislation, the specific of the activities that they will develop within the project and their structure, in which they are directly involved, as well as their attributions.

The Bidder must ensure to guarantee that all experts proposed for this project are available for the entire execution period for the development of the stipulated activities, regardless of the working days scheduled per expert and/or the period he/she develops his/her attributed activities.

The number of days that will be worked by each expert will be proposed by the Bidder depending on the analysis of the project's complexity and will be proposed both in the Technical Proposal, and in the Financial Proposal.

5.1.1. The Project Coordinator

The responsibilities of the project coordinator include, without being limited, the following:

- Ensuring and following to achieve the project's objectives and the expected results, according to those requested through these Technical Specifications;
- Ensuring that the Contractor makes available the equipment and logistics necessary to the team of experts for the good development of the activities, as well as financial resources necessary for the fulfillment of the activities within the project, also ensuring the experts will be paid regularly and in time during the entire execution of the project, so that there is no risk of interrupting the activities;
- Ensuring the connection and collaboration with the Contracting Authority (MDLPL), with the direct beneficiary of the present contract (AM POR), with the target groups, as well as all Romanian institutions and organizations involved;
- Organization and coordination of the team of experts, ensuring the quality of the activities unfolded by them, according to the requirements from the Technical Specifications;
- The elaboration of the **Evaluation activity Plan** and of the working schedule;
- Ensuring the organization of working meetings, including in the regions, the **Kick-off meeting**, the final reunion for the communication of the project's results (**Debriefing meeting**), of the sessions for the presentation of the versions **Evaluation Report** as well as **the Final Evaluation Report** and its recommendations;
- Ensuring that all versions of the **Evaluation Report and the Final Evaluation Report** are elaborated and presented at the stipulated times, as well as the quality standards required by the Contracting Authority;
- Ensuring quality control made by the Contractors, by using own internal systems of quality control for the evaluation reports;
- Elaboration and presentation of the **Progress Reports** of the project within the meetings of the **Project Coordination Committee**, at the scheduled times, as well as elaboration and presentation of the **Monthly Progress technical reports**;
- Exercising in the name of the Contractor, his exclusive authority in all problems related by the day to day implementation of the contract.

Minimum requirements for the Project Coordinator

- University diploma in Economical Sciences, Social Sciences, Public Administration or other relevant fields for the objective and purposes of the project;
- Excellent knowledge of the English language: writing, speaking and reading;
- Very good communication abilities;

- Very good abilities of elaborating in English some documents and/or complex synthesis report;
- Data analysis and interpretation ability, proved through the elaborated studies and socio-economical analyses;
- Very good knowledge of the general and specific Romanian legislation in the field of economic and social cohesion;
- Very good knowledge of the National legislation, relevant for the objectives and purposes of the project;
- Minimum 5 years practice experience in the field of managing or implementing programs and/or projects financed through the structural instruments or of pre-adhesion to the EU;
- Specific practical experience in evaluation, proved through the direct participation in at least 2 evaluation projects of some politics or programs of socio-economical development financed by public funds;
- Experience in managing projects and coordination of some teams of experts, proved by participating as **Project Coordinator** in at least two projects finances from public funds.

5.1.2. Experts

Description of the main responsibilities of the Experts

The experts' responsibilities include, **without being limited**, the implementation of the day to day specific activities of the project, following to achieve the expected objectives and results according to those requested through these Technical Specifications, organization and fulfillment meetings with target groups, as well as with all involved Romanian institutions and organizations, in order to elaborate the evaluation study, to elaborate and compile the Progress Reports, including the monthly reports concerning the technical and financial implementation of the project, the organization of working meetings, of the kick-off meetings and the final project results communication , the elaboration of the Evaluation Report (working and final versions) through the realization of the activities necessary for the answer to the evaluation questions.

Minimum requirements for the Experts

- University diploma in Economical Sciences, Social Sciences, Public Administration or other relevant fields for the objective and purposes of the project;
- Excellent knowledge of the English language: writing, speaking and reading;
- Very good communication abilities;
- Abilities in compiling in Romanian and English some synthesis materials, analysis reports and evaluation and/or monitoring reports;
- Very good knowledge of the general and specific Romanian legislation in the field of economic and social cohesion;
- Very good knowledge of the community legislation, relevant for the objectives and purposes of the project;
- Solid knowledge in the field of economic and social cohesion politics of the European Unions, proved through a minim 3 years practical experience of some program and/or projects financed through the structural instruments or of pre-adhesion of the EU;
- Specific practical experience in evaluation, proved through the direct participation in at least one evaluation project of some politics or program of socio-economical development financed by public funds;

- Very good knowledge of the Romanian socio-economic context;
- Very good knowledge of the management system, implementation and financial control of the Structural Funds in Romania;
- Computer operation ability (Word, Excel, Power Point).

5.2. Auxiliary personnel and backstopping

The Contractor will provide auxiliary personnel (administrative staff, secretariat, as the case may be) needed for the proper performance of his obligations under this contract. The auxiliary personnel costs are deemed to be included in the contract price. The backstopping costs and the costs on the logistic support for the team are also included in the contract price.

In his offer, the bidder will describe the manner in which he will assist the project team with the needs for auxiliary personnel, logistics and backstopping.

5.3. Assistance to be provided by the Consultant

The Contractor will satisfy himself that the experts are adequately supported and properly endowed. In particular, he will ensure that there exist proper resources in terms of administrative personnel, secretariat and interpretation so that the project experts be able to carry out their activity in the best conditions. As well, he must provide for the necessary financial resources in order to support the experts' activities under this contract and ensure that they are constantly paid in due time.

In case of on-site traveling, the Contractor must provide for his team, throughout the travel duration, the entire necessary logistics and equipment, as well the transport of the experts to regions and/or different regional locations. The costs on these activities, including the daily allowance and accommodation costs for the Contractor's team members are deemed to be included in the contract price.

All costs on the international transport of the foreign experts, if any, daily allowance accommodation in Romania are also deemed to be included in the contract price.

The costs on the making up, copying and circulation of documentation and any other materials, reports etc. made up by the experts are deemed to be included in the contract price.

Should the bid be submitted by multiple associated organizations, the association agreement will provide for maximum flexibility in the implementation of the project. Therefore, it is recommended to avoid those agreements that allocate to each partner in the joint venture a fixed percentage of the activities to be carried out under the contract. In case the bid is submitted by a joint venture, the Bidder will include a detailed description of the individual tasks and responsibilities distribution among the associates and the collaboration between the associates in the performance of the contract.

5.4. Equipment

Purchase of equipment on behalf of the Contracting Authority / beneficiary state or the transfer of such equipment at the end of the contract to the Contracting Authority / beneficiary state are not allowed under this contract. Any contract-related equipment that must be purchased by the Contracting Authority / beneficiary state will be purchased through other contracts.

5.5. Other expenditures

Provisions for “Other expenditures” include eligible expenditures arisen from the project activities and, in this project, cover:

- Translations and interpretation expenditures;
- Expenses on seminars, conference, information sessions, work groups, project kick-off meeting and final result communication meeting, other meetings organized according to the project’s needs.

The amount provided for such expenditures will be max **32,000 lei**, VAT not included, and included by the Bidder as such, without any change, in the Financial Proposal.

This amount may not be used to cover the costs that are on the Contractor’s under the contract. Such expenses will be arranged by the Contractor in compliance with the national regulations on public procurement (OUG 34/2006 as amended and added to) and secondary laws.

5.6. Expenditure auditing

The Contractor has the full obligation to provide for the auditing of the expenditures related to the implementation of the POR intermediary evaluation project.

The auditor will be in charge of checking the expenditures on the implementation of this contract, in order to certify them as being made in compliance with the contractual provisions. **The report produced by the auditor will be attached with the final payment request by the Contractor.**

The checking the expenditures will be made by an independent auditor who will perform that activity under a contract aimed to settle the payments in compliance with the law. The Contractor will incur that expense in compliance with the national regulations on public procurements (OUG 34/2006 as amended and added to).

The costs on auditing the expenditures are deemed to be included in the contract price.

6. AWARDING CRITERIA

The awarding criterion for the public procurement contract for the technical assistance in the completion of the intermediary evaluation study on the Regional Operational Program for 1.01.2007 to 30.06.2009 as under these Technical Specifications is the most economic bid.

Therefore, the assessment of the Technical Proposal will account for 70% and the assessment of the Financial Proposal will account for 30%.

6.1. The assessment of the technical proposal

The quality of the technical proposal will be assessed based on the following minimum criteria and reasons

1. The extent of the understanding of the context, the objectives, the purpose and the expected results of the project= 15%
2. The methodology and the specific activities of the project= 29%
3. The management, organisation, the logistics and the planning of the activities related to the project= 26%

The assignment criteria and the assessment factors of the Technical Proposal are being addressed in the Technical Data- The Data Sheet of the acquisition

6.2. The Assessment of the Financial Proposal

The Financial proposal will ponder 30%.

7. THE PROJECT BUDGET

7.1. The price of the contract

The price of the contract amounts to 885.000 lei, total expenses, including the VAT.

7.2 Conditions regarding the fulfilment of payments

The payments will be carried out in four steps, as follows:

- **the first amount of 10%** of the total value of the contract will be paid within 30 days since the register to the Contracting Authority of a valid payment application, **if the Inception Report has been previously approved by the CCP.**
- **the payment of the second amount of 30%** from the total value of the contract will be carried out within 30 days since a valid payment application was filed to the Contracting Authority, **if the Interim Progress Report has been previously approved by the CCP, and if the quality of the first working version of the Evaluation Report has been certified by the *Management Committee for the Evaluation of ROP*;**
- **the third amount, of 30%** from the total value of the contract will be carried out within 30 days since a valid payment application was filed to the Contracting Authority, **if the quality of the second working version of the Evaluation Report has been endorsed;**
- **the payment of the last amount of 30%** from the total value of the contract will be carried out within 30 days since a valid payment application was filed to the Contracting Authority, and if the following conditions are being fulfilled:
 - organising of the ***Final Reunion for the Communication of the evaluation results (Debriefing Meeting)*** and the presentation within this frame of the ***Final Evaluation Report***
 - ***The Final Evaluation Report has been estimated and found qualitative acceptable***, by the ***Management Committee for the Evaluation of ROP***,
 - presenting and approval by the ***Project Coordination Committee*** of the ***Progress Final Report***
 - Presenting a ***report regarding the audit of the expenses resulting due the project.***

In the event in which, by the last payment results that the expenses of the Contractor are lower than the value of the contract, the final payment will be reduced accordingly.

The payments will be carried out in lei. For this purpose, the Contractor must open a bank account in lei. All the payment claims of the Contractor will be made in lei.

8. Other requirements.

8.1. Minimum mandatory confidentiality clauses

The contractor must take into consideration that all the information, data, reports, analyses as well as any other materials that he and the expert team have elaborated are considered confidential, unless the Contracting Authority does not provide otherwise.

The various versions of the Evaluation Report and of the Final Evaluation Report, formulated according to the specifications of the Technical Sheet, as well as any other materials prepared by the Contractor and used for the Evaluation Reports are exclusive property of the Contracting Authority, and shall not be made public until a written permission from the Authority has been granted.

During the whole duration of the project, the Contractor will make sure that the experts abide this mandatory minimum confidentiality clauses, corroborated with other contract provisions in the same area.

8.2. The contracts with the mass media

With regard to the relationships with the media, the Contractor and the experts team are not authorised to make declarations, to have interviews, to answer questions or to communicate by any means that are used in the media, informations concerning the analyses, data and documents that they will use and work with during the current project, unless they have the previous written approval from the Contracting Authority.

The contractor and/or the experts shall immediately inform the Contracting Authority concerning any requirement made by/with the mass media connected to this project.

After concluding the contract, the Contractor and the experts that were involved in this project will not keep any of the materials, the documents, the data and informations that they elaborated within the frame/and for this project, and will ensure the Contracting Authority that they have fulfilled this compulsory requirement.

Annex 2: Results of the Survey Questionnaire

The questionnaire was issued to 120 beneficiaries in local public authorities covering all 42 counties in Romania. 55 responses were received. This annex summarises the responses and also provides the general comments received from beneficiaries for each question.

Results of the Survey Questionnaire addressed to ROP Beneficiaries

	Total		
	Yes = 1	No = 2	
1. 1. Knowledge of ROP 1.1 Are you aware with the key areas of intervention (KAI) financed through ROP?	55	0	55

1.2 What are the main information sources used in collecting information about ROP? Please prioritize the options below on a scale from 1 to 5 (1 - the most used; 5 - the less used).	Total					
	1	2	3	4	5	x
Ministry website	33	5	1	2	1	10
Information sessions organized by RDAs	7	26	5	1	2	11
Information provided in the mass media (national and/or local)	1	3	9	11	16	6
Information/promotion done by MDRL/City Councils	1	5	23	10	2	3
Other type of events organized at central/regional/local level (e.g through the multipliers network)	0	1	5	14	19	3

	Total		
	Yes = 1	No = 2	0 = I don't know
2) Modifications of the general socio-economic conditions	26	21	8

The most frequent socio-economic conditions mentioned were:

- Economic crisis - changing of the economic context;
- Legislative modifications
- Delay in launching of the guide for Priority Axis 1;
- Reanalyzing the role of CRESC and introducing of independent experts in the evaluation
- Ensuring the necessary funds for the projects within the conditions of reimbursement principle
- Improving the roads infrastructure through projects financed from ROP leads to strengthening of the capacity of the institutions in preparing and implementing similar projects
- Implementation capacity was reduced due to the lack of co-financing resources, respectively the financial incapacity to prepare the technical documentation (feasibility studies, DALi etc)
- Considering the actual economic context, some projects prepared to be financed from ROP, especially priority axis 4, are no longer a priority for the beneficiaries (e.g Industrial Park in Corabia, Ilt county);

- Implementaion capacity is also affected by the limited budgetary resources due to the financial crisis. Therefore at the level of public institutions is no longer encouraged the submissions of investment projects
- 1. Blocking of the vacant positions from public amdinistration 2. Reducion of the incentives for those involved in preparing the implementing projects; 3. Financial crisis had effects on the private environment that bid with underestimated prices within the public procurement tenders launched by the contracting public authorities, fact that affects the quality of the services and works
- Insufficient co-financing resources for the projects submitted within ROP (especially Priority Axis 4, KAI 4.1 where the co-financing is 50%), fact that leads to difficulties in ensuring the co-financing rate from the local budget, determining in the end the municipalities to contract banking credits for ensuring the necessary co-financing for these projects.
- Lack of funds for paying the minimum contribution as well as for the elaboration of the Feasibility Studies and Tehnical Projects
- Co-financing funds reduced compared to the previous years
- Unpredicted legislative changes, crisis local budget due mainly to the actual financing crisis
- Economic crisis = lack of budgetary resources - lack of own funds- insufficient qualified staff
- Lack of funds for co-financing projects - national and international crisis; political instability at the national level;
- Lack of specialized staff for preparing/accesing structural funds at the level of local public administration;
- Inexistence of an institutional framework that allows the public private partnerships within ROP projects
- Major evolution registered at the level of Romanian society as a whole reflected at the level of living standard, citizens' expectations that imposed the permanent revision of project portofolio;
- Economic uncertainty

	Total		
	Yes = 1	No = 2	
3) Project Portofolio: Please mention if your institution intends to submit project applications to be financed from ROP?	55	0	55

	Total		
	Yes = 1	No = 2	
4) Tehnical Assistance Please mention if you have benefited from governmental support or from other donors' support in preparing the tehnicl documentation through GD 811/2006 and GD 1424/2007	34	21	

						Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
g5) Prepatation of the Financing Application Please characterize the process of elaboration of an application submitted for financing under ROP, having in view the following aspects						

(1 - Excellent; 2 - Very good; 3 - Good; 4 - Satisfactory ; 5 Unsatisfactory)						
Clarity of the Guideline for Applicants in defining the eligible activities and expenditure - please exemplify	2	21	24	2	4	
Complexity of the documentation requested through the Applicants' Guideline	1	12	25	10	5	
Availability of human/material resources within your institution necessary for preparing the application form	7	17	19	7	3	
Modifications (e.g Corrigenda) occurred during the period of preparing the application form	1	5	19	18	9	
Other (please exemplify)						

Specific comments:

- Poor implementation process of the technical assistance contracts concluded by the ministries for the elaboration of the technical-economical documentations having as beneficiaries the local public authorities- e.g KAI 3.1
- Application forms are poorly translated - many modifications occurred through Corrigenda in the last moment (e.g : Axa 1.1.c)

						Total
6) Evaluation, selection and contracting process (1 - Excellent; 2 - Very good; 3 - Good; 4 - Satisfactory ; 5 Unsatisfactory)	1	2	3	4	5	
Difficulties in answering the clarifications' requests	2	10	31	10		
Duration of the evaluation and selection process		12	15	18	7	
Duration of the contracting process		6	21	12	5	
Others						

Specific comments:

- 1) In case of modification of the project value within the evaluation process at the pre-contracting visit it is requested a new decision for approving the project expenditure. In the case where the co-financing resulted following the evaluation process is lower than the one initially approved, we consider enough the decision adopted for a higher value
- 2) During the pre-contracting visit it is requested the presentation in original of some documents such as: financial documents (balance sheets including the patrimony account, budgetary execution accounts), decision regarding the establishment of the administrative-territorial unit etc. We consider irrelevant the request of these documents in original (time and financial resources spent)
- Relative short time for clarifications

						Total
7) Implementation process (1 - Excellent; 2 - Very good; 3 - Good; 4 - Satisfactory ; 5 Unsatisfactory)	1	2	3	4	5	
Public procurement process	1	7	11	13	3	

Effectiveness of the prefinancing mechanism for compensating the lack of financial resources at the level of beneficiaries	9	11	4	4	2	
Expenditure reimbursement procedures		7	9	8	2	
Monitoring and reporting procedures (including the monitoring of the achievement of project indicators)		8	15	6		
Other (please specify)						

Specific comments:

- For the projects under implementation not too many reimbursement request were elaborated because the works and services contracts were just signed
- There are not clear instructions and procedures for monitoring the horizontal issues requested by the EU. It is irrelevant to evaluate the compliance of the principle of equal chances after the composition of the evaluation team (number of women in total persons) because the implementation team was nominated based on the future availability of the persons and their experience. Also as long as at the level of the institutions/organizations where the implementation team will come from, the number of women employees is not equal with the male employees, this cannot be further reflected in the implementation team.
- Most of the projects submitted under ROP are still in the technical and financial evaluation stage therefore there are not too many elements to characterize the implementation process.

						Total
8) Other aspects related to ROP implementation	1	2	3	4	5	
Please signal any other aspect that you consider important as regarding the elaboration and implementation of ROP that was not mentioned in the previous sections						
No responses were received						

- The procedure for approving the addenda is slow and difficult and it leads to delays in development of the activities according to the approved planning,
- The modifications occurred within the period of submitting the project applications and signing the contracts, lead to disfunctionalities in the project implementation (e.g modification of the Visual Identity Manual)

Annex 3: Summary of Points emerging from the Regional Workshops

Preface

As part of the evaluation process, regional workshops were organised with the support and involvement of each of the RDAs, attended by a selected sample of beneficiaries from each region.

The following workshops were held:

Timisoara	RDA West	13 August 2009
Cluj	RDA North-West	17 August 2009
Alba Iulia	RDA Centre	18 August 2009
Braila	RDA South-East	20 August 2009
Craiova	RDA South-West	24 August 2009
Calarasi	RDA South	30 September 2009
Bucharest	RDA Bucharest Ilfov	28 September 2009

Attendance

The regional workshops were attended by representatives of local public administration (county councils and city halls), NGOs, private enterprises as actual beneficiaries of the Regional Operational Programme. The local public administration was, in all of the situations, a multiple beneficiary in the sense that each institution attending the workshops had a portfolio of projects covering different ROP Axis, in different stages - projects application under preparation, already submitted and under evaluation, or already contracted and during implementation.

For the Bucharest Ilfov workshop, there was a specific focus on private sector micro enterprises.

Organisation and logistics

The workshops were organised as 2-3 hours sessions according to the following agenda:

- Introduction by the RDA
- Presentation of the purpose of the meeting, by the evaluators
- Open discussions on the participants' experience of preparing project applications and implementing ROP-financed projects
- Conclusions

In each of the regions, the workshops were held at the premises of the respective RDAs.

Key emerging aspects

Positive elements perceived by the beneficiaries

The Guides for applicants are appreciated and considered to be clear.

Simplifications and improvements to the application process and procedures have been brought in time - eg there are now less documents required in the application phase. However, the

beneficiaries believe that the number of permits required at the application phase is still too big, time investment needed to obtain the permits is very high, the validity of the permits is too limited in time.

Transparency of the selection process and communication between the applicants and the ROP institutions during the process is perceived to be good

Difficulties faced by the beneficiaries

Corrigenda to the Guides

It is very difficult to read the Guide for Applicants and all of the subsequent corrigenda. Instead, a much friendlier solution is to prepare an updated Guide that reflects all of the changes.

Delays during the implementation phase

One of the main elements that is raising difficulties is the appeal procedure during the procurement process, as it is very time consuming and inevitably leads to delays in implementation, by at least 3 months each time such appeals from tenderers are put forward. This is perceived to be a very serious issue, with no obvious or simple solution.

Duration of the selection and contracting process

Many of the beneficiaries have previous experience with applying for Phare funds with various other projects. As a consequence, they are used to the relatively long time periods required by the selection process. Nevertheless, the expectation was that in the case of the ROP the selection process would be up to 8 months, whereas in practice it went up to 1 year

Definition of the eligible expenses

The beneficiaries perceive it is often difficult to understand what is eligible and what is not. When seeking clarifications, some were confronted with differences in opinions between different parties (eg between departments in MAROP or between evaluators and MAROP).

It is felt that the spirit of the Guide is somewhat lost, as the order of expenses is often very narrow, for unclear reasons.

Major difficulties for private companies beneficiaries of the KAI 4.3

Business prospects are worsening due to the crises, so opportunities to create new jobs, as originally envisaged, are more slim.

Financing the project implementation phase creates great difficulties for private companies. When they were preparing their project applications one year ago banks were reassuring them of their support once the contract was signed. Now banks are very reluctant to do this so the prospects for most of the beneficiaries are very worrying. They are asked for high collateral which they are unable to provide. They cannot guarantee with the equipment itself that is being purchased under the project due to the ROP procedural restrictions. They try to get loans that can be guaranteed by the

National Guarantee Fund which is now overloaded by such requests, so that approval of dossiers takes many months, meanwhile the project implementation schedule falls behind.

Even without the cash difficulties and resulting delays, most of the projects under 4.3 have very ambitious implementation schedules, with almost no margin for slippage. It is very likely that most of the projects will not be able to finish on time, due to the natural slippage of any project, compounded by the current difficulties to secure financial support which leads to additional delays.

The change of the exchange rate EURO-RON means a significant loss for those applicants who need to purchase equipment from abroad and generally it is perceived as a lost opportunity to have more funds available even by those of the beneficiaries who do not necessarily import goods. A significant risk of making mistakes in the public procurement processes is perceived by the beneficiaries, due to their inadequate experience with the procurement legislation.

Extending the pre-financing facility to applicants under KAI 4.3 may not have the expected level of impact, as the applicants are required to submit a bank guarantee for the pre-financed value, which can be obtained either by cash deposits or by mortgaging assets, both of the options in fact cancel the pre-financing benefits.

Communication between the IBs and the MAROP

One of the key re-emerging conclusions is that communication between the MAROP and the IBs needs to be improved. Many of the difficulties faced by the beneficiaries must be directly discussed between the central and the regional level to find the best solutions or compromise. At present there is no strict schedule of regular management meetings between the MA and the IBs. Examples were given when the IB requested clarifications from the MA and sometimes the answer comes back quickly, sometimes it takes one month, sometimes there is no answer.

Other points raised during the workshops

- A Manual prepared at the MAROP level on how to prepare a reimbursement claim would be a useful tool.
- Still not solved - the difference between the General Budget and the Budget in the Financing proposal : eg the General Budget does not include expenses for publicity and audit.
- Communication between the beneficiary and the evaluators in writing only is ineffective. Often the second request for clarification repeats the same questions, meaning that the first round of clarifications, in writing only, was not as effective as expected.
- Even for the public authorities, where the level of project co-financing is relatively small, difficulties can be anticipated with regard to cashflow.
- The SMIS is perceived by the RDAs as very unfriendly and very slow.

Annex 4: Objectives of the National Communications Strategy

The regulations state that:

“A communication plan, as any major amendments, must be conceived by the managing authority (a communication plan for the operational programme is responsible for) or by the Member State (a communication plan that will cover several programs or all the operational programs co-financed from European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), European Social Fund (ESF) or Cohesion Fund.

2. The communication plan will comprise at least the following:

- (a) objectives and target groups
- (b) strategy and content of informative and publicity measures that must be taken by the Member State or by the managing authority, targeted on beneficiaries, potential beneficiaries and public, reflecting the added value brought by the EC assistance at national, regional and local level;
- (c) indicative budget for the implementation of the communication plan
- (d) administrative departments or responsible organisms for the implementation of information and publicity measures
- (e) an indication of the evaluation procedure of information and publicity measures on visibility and awareness on operational programs and the role of Community”

According to the Article 2 as mentioned above and further developed in Article 5, 6 and 7 there is a clear requirement to focus on three target groups - potential applicants, applicants, and the general public. At a minimum, the necessary information that should be provided by the Managing Authority to these 3 target groups is identified as:

For the potential beneficiaries: eligibility conditions for receiving funding under specific operational program, description of selection procedures for applications and time requested, selection criteria for different operations, contact persons and organisms at national, regional and local level, that could offer information on operational programs.

For the beneficiaries: “The Managing Authority will inform the beneficiaries that the acceptance of the funding implies also an acceptance of registering in the list of beneficiaries...”

For the general public: Various actions that should be taken by the Managing Authority aiming large mass-media audience: extended public information activities occasioned by the launching of the operational program, even in the absence of the final version of the Communication plan, at least one information activity on the achievements of the operational program, including the main projects, if relevant, unfurling EU flag for one week starting with 9 of May in front of each Managing Authority establishment, electronic publishing or other way of the list of beneficiaries, titles of the operations and the amount of public funding allocated to the operations.

Objectives in the National Communications Strategy:

General objectives

- To support the recognition of EU contribution to the modernization of Romania, roles and results achieved following the funding under Structural Instruments
- To inform constantly and in a correct manner all the target groups on the funding opportunities available to Romania through Structural Instruments, about reasons for starting this process, about objectives and benefits of implementation
- To ensure the transparency, for supporting the absorption of the SCF in Romania and implicitly the modernization of Romania and integration process in EU

Specific objectives

External communication:

- To inform correctly and constantly the general public on the role, significance and expected results/ achieved through the implementation of SCF in Romania
- To communicate the procedures for funding requests under the European funds by using a terminology accessible to everyone
- To inform the general public on the mechanism and institutions responsible with the administration of Structural and Cohesion Fund
- To create and maintain a high level of confidence for the general public and potential beneficiaries, regarding the transparency and correctness of administration process of SCF
- To create and maintain the confidence in administration system of SCF.

Internal Communication:

- To create and improve continuously the coordination mechanism for the communication strategy
- To support a better understanding of SCF at institutional and individual level
- To create an efficient internal system common for all Managing Authorities, Interim Bodies and Common Technical Secretariats

Annex 5: Analysis of Indicators in the Communications Plans

Project indicators TA Contract 6.2			Indicators Regional Communication Plan			Evaluator comments
Code	Description	Value	Type of actions	Indicators	Target indicators (2007-2013)	
North East						
700	Studies, analysis, reports, strategies	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	
701	Guidelines and other methodological documents	1	Applicant / beneficiary manual	N/A	N/A	The manual has been produced.
708	Communication and promotion events	69	conferences, information sessions, other events	no. of regional conferences, no.of regional information sessions, no.of launching/ promotion seminars, no.of participants/ 1 regional event, no. of press articles published, no. materials distributed	1 regional conference/ year, 5 regional information sessions/ year (0 in 2007), 16 launching/ promotion seminars (2010), 30 participants/ regional event (2010), 3 press articles published/ event (2010), 30 materials distributed/ event (2010)	The CP includes indicators for all information and promotion actions (12); not all are considered for reporting according to the project indicators of the TA contract; there is no clear correlation between all the CP's indicators and contract indicators.
709	Information and publicity materials	18,000	publications	no. of publications annually distributed (from MAROP); no. of publications produced and distributed (RDA)	1500 publications distributed (from MAROP) (2010), 10.000 publications edited and distributed (RDA - 2010)	
South East						

Project indicators TA Contract 6.2			Indicators Regional Communication Plan			Evaluator comments
Code	Description	Value	Type of actions	Indicators	Target indicators (2007-2013)	
708	Communication and promotion events	137	regional conferences, information sessions (mass-media, potential beneficiaries, beneficiaries, internal public),	no. of conferences/ no. of participants/ 1 event, no. of press articles published, o. of information sessions, no. participants to information sessions, increased degree of awareness on ROP,	1 conference in 2007, 12 conferences(2010)/ 100 participants/event, 6 press articles published, 100 materials distributed, 13 information sessions in 2007, 45 information sessions (2010), 10% increased awareness on ROP in 2010	The CP includes indicators for all information and promotion actions (9); not all are considered for reporting according to the project indicators of the TA contract; there is no clear correlation between all the CP's indicators and contract indicators.
709	Information and publicity materials	1,000	publications	no. of publications distributed	16401	
710	Mass-media campaigns	1	mass-media campaigns	no. of campaigns, no. of participants, no. of radio-TV spots, no. of press articles issued	3 campaigns, 150 participants, spots (3 TV, 4 radio), 100 press articles published	
South						
708	Communication and promotion events	38	regional conferences, information sessions (mass-media, potential beneficiaries, beneficiaries, internal public)	no. of press articles issued/ event, no. participants/ 1 event, no. of sessions, increased level of awareness on ROP	80 participants/ event (2007), 100 participants/ event (2010), 10-15 press articles issued/ event, 80-100 materials distributed/ event, 2 information sessions (2007), 80 information sessions (2010), 10% level of awareness on ROP (2010)	The CP includes indicators for all information and promotion actions (9); not all are considered for reporting according to the project indicators of the TA contract; there is no clear correlation between all the CP's indicators and contract indicators.
709	Information and publicity materials	2,000	publications	no. of publications distributed	10.000 (2010)	

Project indicators			Indicators			Evaluator comments
TA Contract 6.2			Regional Communication Plan			
Code	Description	Value	Type of actions	Indicators	Target indicators (2007-2013)	
710	Mass-media campaigns	1	Mass-media campaigns	no. of participants, no. radio-tv spots, no. of press articles published	30 participants (2007), 150 participants (2010), 1 radio-tv spot, 300 press articles published(2010)	
711	Web page access	100,000	RDA website	no.of visitors, no.of subscriptions	120.000 (2010), 1000 subscriptions (2010)	
South West						
708	Communication and promotion events	42	regional launching conferences, information sessions for potential beneficiaries, beneficiaries, mass-media, internal public	average no. of participants, average no. of information sessions	25 participants/ conference, 2 conferences in 2008, 2 in 2010, 10-15 participants/ information session	The CP includes indicators for all information and promotion actions(10); not all are considered for reporting according to the project indicators of the TA contract; there is no clear correlation between all the CP's indicators and contract indicators.
709	Information and publicity materials	8	publications, distribution of MAROP publications	no.of publications edited and distributed, no. of MAROP publications distributed	4 / year, 2000/ year (MAROP publications)	
710	Mass-media campaigns	1	mass-media campaigns	no. of radio spots, no. of radio and tv shows, no. press articles issued	2 radio spots in 2010, 2 radio-tv shows/ year, 4 press articles inserted/ year, 2 press interviews/ year	
West						

Project indicators TA Contract 6.2			Indicators Regional Communication Plan			Evaluator comments
Code	Description	Value	Type of actions	Indicators	Target indicators (2007-2013)	
708	Communication and promotion events	41	regional conferences information sessions for potential beneficiaries Information session for press information sessions for beneficiaries	number of participants/ event , number of sessions, number of press articles released/event,	40 participants/ regional conference, 10 press articles published/ event, 50 participants/ information session for potential beneficiaries, 4 information sessions for press, 100% out of final beneficiaries as participation rate to information sessions for beneficiaries	The CP includes indicators for all information and promotion actions (9); not all are considered for reporting according to the project indicators of the TA contract; there is no clear correlation between all the CP's indicators and contract indicators.
709	Information and publicity materials	35,000	Publications	number of publications issued, number of publications distributed	100%out of materials produced 35,000 publications produced	
711	Web page access	40,000	website section	number of visitors	15.000/ month	
North West						
700	Studies, analysis, reports, strategies	11	annual evaluation of communication activities	evaluation study	1 evaluation study/ year	The CP includes indicators for all information and promotion actions (22); not all are considered for

Project indicators TA Contract 6.2			Indicators Regional Communication Plan		Evaluator comments	
Code	Description	Value	Type of actions	Indicators	Target indicators (2007-2013)	
708	Communication and promotion events	33	regional launching events, local and regional conferences, press conferences, press releases, training and information sessions for local and regional mass-media, training and information sessions for potential beneficiaries, beneficiaries, mass-media	no. of regional and county launching events, no. of regional and county conferences, no. of press conferences	11 regional launching events, 45 county launching events, 1 regional conference in 2008, 30 county conferences in 2008 and 2009, 11 press conferences	reporting according to the project indicators of the TA contract; there is no clear correlation between all the CP's indicators and contract indicators.
709	Information and publicity materials	15	production of brochures, movies on success stories on ROP, elaboration and distribution of information materials	no. of brochures, movies on success stories on ROP, information materials (guidelines, CDs), folders	2 movies, 1 brochure elaborated, 7000 folders (2008-2010), 4500 personalized CDs	
710	Mass-media campaigns	2	mass-media campaign	media-plans, media campaigns on ROP	5 annual media-plans implemented, 5 media campaigns on ROP	
Centre						
700	Studies, analysis, reports, strategies	14	N/A	N/A	N/A	The CP includes indicators for all information and promotion actions

Project indicators TA Contract 6.2			Indicators Regional Communication Plan			Evaluator comments
Code	Description	Value	Type of actions	Indicators	Target indicators (2007-2013)	
708	Communication and promotion events	87	regional conferences, information sessions (mass-media, potential beneficiaries, beneficiaries, internal public)	no.of press articles issued, no.participants/ 1 event, no. of sessions	12 press articles in 2007, 24 articles issued (2010), 30 participants/ conference in 2007, 40 participants/ conference in 2010, 150 participants/ 5 information sessions in 2007, 300 participants/12 information sessions (2010)	(9); not all are considered for reporting according to the project indicators of the TA contract; there is no clear correlation between all the CP's indicators and contract indicators.
709	Information and publicity materials	100	publications	no. of distributed publications	27500 publications distributed (2010)	
711	Web page access	25000	website RDA	no.of visitors, no.of subscriptions	150000 visitors and 1500 subscriptions (2010)	
716	Level of awareness of population	0	information sessions	increased level of awareness on ROP	3% in 2007, 8% in 2010	
Bucharest Ilfov						
708	Communication and promotion events	41	conferences, information sessions, special promotion events	number of participants, number of sessions, participation to special promotion events	1300 participants/ conferences, 3420 participants/ 33 information sessions,	The CP includes indicators for all information and promotion actions (10); not all are considered for reporting according to the project indicators of the TA contract; there is no clear correlation between all the CP's indicators and contract indicators.
709	Information and publicity materials	35,000	publications	number of distributed publications	47100	
711	Web page access	40,000	website page Regio	number of visitors, number of subscriptions	100.000 visitors , 27.100 subscriptions	

Annex 6: Region by Region Summary of Socio-Economic Changes

The main indicator used for regional allocation was the regional GDP capita at the level of 2002, 2003 and 2004 adjusted with a population density index. Nevertheless the ROP presents a socio-economic analysis of all the eight regions based on a number of indicators. The rationale for this socio-economic analysis on a regional level stemmed from the fact that a development perspective constitutes the initial step in the development programming approach. Also the general levels of regions' development are decisively determined by their economic development.

As regarding the general level of economic development, the interregional differences still remain obvious. The Center and West regions are industrially developed regions with a high GDP per capita. In opposition, there are North-East and South-West regions that are predominantly agricultural regions with the lowest levels of economic development. Between the two extremes, there are the South-Muntenia and North-West regions, the former having a more numerous rural population, the latter having a higher number of population employed in services. A distinct position is that of the South-East region which combines aspects of economic development with aspects of economic underdevelopment.

All the eight regions presented their own particularities that makes that some sectors to play a decisive role in the future development, meaning that their economic evolution to be influenced by the degree of using this potential. For example the regions from the south of the country (South-East, South Muntenia and South-West Oltenia) are influenced by the evolution of the agriculture sector, others by the use of the touristic potential (e.g Bucovina area from North-East region and Danube Delta in the South-East) and by the industrial and financial sector evolution in all of the regions especially in the context of the actual crisis.

The main indicators that we will use for making a global synthetic characterization of the eight 2005-2008 are GDP growth rate, GDP/capita in euro, total active employed population, unemployment rate, average number of employees and average income/employees and FDI/capita.

National interregional differences at the level of the seven regions are obvious if we consider the level of regional GDP per capita and its evolution.

The detailed tables for each region show that all the regions registered an economic increase of the GDP, on average of over 5% in the period 2005-2008 (the data for 2007 and 2008 are estimated figures from the National Commission for prognosis) compared to the previous year.

As regarding the growth rate of the active employed population at the end of the year compared to the previous year, almost all the regions have had a very small increase in some regions also the values were slight reduction compared to the previous year. The average number of employees show an increase in all the eight regions and also an increase of the average income/employee.

From the point of view of number of unemployed people at the regional level it was registered a decrease in the unemployment rate in the period 2005-2008, followed by an abrupt increase trend estimated at the level of 2009.

From a territorial point of view the FDI went mainly to Bucharest-Ilfov region (64.3% in 2007), followed by Centre region (8.3%), South Region (6.9%), South-East region (5.7%) and West region (5.5%).

North-East Region				
	2005	2006	2007e	2008e
North-East Region				
GDP/capita (euro)	2,526.8	2,942.7	3,333.2	3,733.6
GDP growth rate (%)	0.8	4.5	4.1	7.2
Active employed population at the end of the year (%) (modification compared to the previous year)	1.0	-1.5	1.3	0.0
Average number of employees	566.4	564.3	579.1	583.7
Unemployment rate (%)	6.8	6.2	5.1	5.3
Average income/employee	663	765	938	1107
Balance of FDI/region	292	411	672	-

Source: Statistic Yearbook, Territorial statistics - INS;2008,2009 - prognosis National Commission for Prognosis

The North-East region remains one of the lowest developed areas of Romania. The historical and geographical conditions have determined a serious delay from the socio-economic point of view of the North East Region;

By analysing the GDP/inhabitant in North East Region it can be noticed that the region has the lowest level comparatively to the other regions from Romania, representing 68.4% of national GDP/inhabitant in 2008, even if the GDP/capita has registered a growth in the period 2005-2008 (within this region all the counties have a GDP/capita below the average per country). Within the current economic context the prognosis for 2009 shows a decrease of 5.1 of the GDP growth rate.

Despite the attractiveness of the labour force low cost, as a main competitive advantage, North-East region records one of the lowest level of foreign direct investments (FDI) per inhabitant, and Being the least attractive destination for the foreign investors.

The period 2005-2008 is characterized by a decrease and stagnation of the he total active employed population due to the restructuring and lay offs. At the level of 2009 it is envisaged that the active employed population will decrease by 3.9% although in the context of the current economic crisis it is very possible that this figure will increase by the end of 2009.

As regarding the average number of employees and the unemployment rate, the region registered a slight increase in the average number of employees and implicitly a reduction of the unemployment rate in the period 2005-2008, but at the level of 2009 this indicators have a negative evolution

South-East Region

	2005	2006	2007e	2008e
South-East Region				
GDP/capita (euro)	3,137.0	3,651.4	4,124.4	4,609.3
GDP growth rate (%)	-1.8	6.0	5.0	6.8
Active employed population at the end of the year (%) (modification compared to the previous year)	0.6	0.7	2.0	0.1
Average number of employees	551.2	559.1	575.3	581.6
Unemployment rate (%)	6.4	5.6	4.4	4.7
Average income/employee	702	817	963	1160
Balance of FDI/region	1,838	2,653	2,448	-

Source: *Statistic Yearbook, Territorial statistics - INS;2008,2009 - prognosis National Commission for Prognosis*

By tradition, this is an agriculture area, the agriculture sector having a great contribution to the regional GDP (over 17% compared to the national average of aprox 13%).

In 2005, South -East region registered a decline in the economic growth followed by in the period 2006-2008 by a constant growth rate of aprox 6%. From the point of view of GDP/capita , South Region is situated over the average at the national level, the GDP/capita in 2008 representing 84.5% of the national GDP.

After 2005 when the region registered reduction in total active employed population due to restructuring process and massive layoffs, the period 2005-2008 has set the region again on an ascending trend. At the level of 2009 it is expected again to have a reduction of this indicators, especially due to the important industrial units present in this region (siderurgical industrial site from Galati, ship building yards, pulp and paper factories from Celhart, Donaris Braila etc).

The unemployment rate in South-East region had a decreasing trend from 6.4 in 2005 to 4.7 in 2008 but at the level of 2009 the prognosis is to reach 7.4%. The average income/employee has also increased from 702 lei in 2005 to aprox 1160 in 2008).

South Region

	2005	2006	2007e	2008e
South Region				
GDP/capita (euro)	3,018.8	3,519.9	3,984.6	4,454.2
GDP growth rate (%)	4.5	8.7	6.2	7.8
Active employed population at the end of the year (%) (modification compared to the previous year)	0.5	-0.4	2.6	0.03
Average number of employees	571.1	566.5	597.0	600.6
Unemployment rate (%)	7.3	6.4	5.1	5.1
Average income/employee	716	835	974	1136
Balance of FDI/region	1,388	2,228	2,942	-

Source: Statistic Yearbook, Territorial statistics - INS;2008,2009 - prognosis National Commission for Prognosis

From the point of view of geographical and socio-economic characteristics, South Muntenia region can be divided in two parts: northern part (Arges, Prahova and Dambovota counties) which is more developed and the southern part (Teleorman, Giurgiu, Călărași și Ialomița counties) that is less developed, the agriculture being the dominant sector).

The GDP growth rate has registered a spectacular increase in 2006 compared to 2005 and until 2008 has maintained the same level of approx 81.6% from the national GDP (slightly above the national average). Also in South region there were registered important FDI inflows that contributed to the increase of the regions' productivity, becoming in 2007 the third FDI recipient after Bucharest Ilfov and West region.

From the point of active employed population, the region has registered reductions in 2006 due to restructuring process, followed by a slight recovery period in 2007 and 2008 (due to the low rhythm of industrial recovery, slow development of SMEs sector and the existence of a „black market”).

The unemployment rate in South region was situated on a descending trend in the period 2005-2008 from 7.3% in 2005 to 5.1 in 2008. The average income/employee has also registered a positive trend from 716 lei in 2005 to 1136 Ron in 2008, but still below the national average.

South -West Region

	2005	2006	2007e	2008e
South-West Region				
GDP/capita (euro)	3,087.2	3,606.2	4,074.8	4,546.8
GDP growth rate (%)	-1.8	8.1	6.0	8.0
Active employed population at the end of the year (%) (modification compared to the previous year)	1.0	-0.5	2.6	0.1
Average number of employees	393.0	399.9	421.0	428.6
Unemployment rate (%)	7.4	7.0	5.1	7.0
Average income/employee	734	853	1007	1176
Balance of FDI/region	745	938	1,379	-

Source: Statistic Yearbook, Territorial statistics - INS;2008,2009 - prognosis National Commission for Prognosis

South-West region is characterized by an important role played by the agriculture and industrial sector. From an economical point of view, the region has registered a good performance since 2005 from -1.8 to 8.1 in 2006 and an 8.0 in 2008 (estimated value).

From the point of GDP/capita, the values estimated for 2007 and 2008 are of 83.5% for the national level 2007 and 84.5% for 2008, both values placing the region above the average per economy. Within this region, except for Gorj county tha has a disparity index above the national average all the other counties are situated below the national level per country.

The unemployment rate in South-West region has registered the highest level among regions in 2005 of 7.4% and has had an oscialltory trend, registering after a slight decrease in 2006 and afterwards in 2007 at 5.1% to an increase of 7.0% in 2008. The areas with high unemployment rates (between 7 and 8%) are in Gorj and Valcea and Olt counties the first being in an economic decline and the latter being mainly agricultural.

Considering that the reduction of the occupied population has been a phenomena prsent at the level of the whole region in a differentiated way, for 2007 and 2008 there were foreseen slight increases as regarding this indicator. Also the avearge number of employees and the avearge income/employee have known a positive evolution in the period 2005-2008.

In terms of FDI, the region does not represent an attractive point for foreign investors, the balance of FDI in 2007 representing 3.2 from the total per country.

West Region

	2005	2006	2007e	2008e
West Region				
GDP/capita (euro)	4,223.5	4,929.3	5,563.2	6,204.9
GDP growth rate (%)	2.7	11.3	5.4	6.1
Active employed population at the end of the year (%) (modification compared to the previous year)	2.0	0.5	3.6	1.0
Average number of employees	484.1	501.8	522.1	538.3
Unemployment rate (%)	5.1	4.1	3.4	3.7
Average income/employee	718	816	978	1129
Balance of FDI/region	1,491	1,948	2,365	-

Source: Statistic Yearbook, Territorial statistics - INS;2008,2009 - prognosis National Commission for Prognosis

From the point of GDP/capita indicator, this region has the highest level after Bucharest_ilfov region (over the national GDP registering constant values of 114% especially through Arad and Timis counties that are above the national average).

One of the features of the West Region is the development of the industrial sector, at the level of the West Region being present nearly all branches of industry: machine construction, electronic parts, wood processing, mining industry, chemical industry, medicine production, textiles, food industry, ceramics and glassware, etc. Also in 2007 in West region there were 48,460 operational companies. Classified according to their size, the West Region had 87.3% of the Romanian microenterprises, 12.3% of the middle-sized companies, and 0.4% of the large companies in Romania.

As regarding the active employed population and the average number of employees, the period 2005-2008 shows a positive evolution of these indicators and also a decrease of the unemployment rate from 5.1 in 2005 to 3.7 in 2008.

The average income/employee has also registered significant increase from 718 lei in 2005 to 1129 RON in 2008.

As regarding FDI investments, West region has had slowly decreasing evolution as regarding the weight of FDIs from 6.8 in 2005 to 5.5 in 2008.

North - West Region

	2005	2006	2007e	2008e
North- West Region				
GDP/capita (euro)	3,422.4	3,975.3	4,495.0	5,022.9
GDP growth rate (%)	2.5	7.5	5.8	6.9
Active employed population at the end of the year (%) (modification compared to the previous year)	1.8	0.9	2.7	0.5
Average number of employees	580.1	594.6	632.5	645.2
Unemployment rate (%)	4.0	3.6	2.9	3.3
Average income/employee	679	777	935	1107
Balance of FDI/region	1,257	1,570	1,907	-

Source: Statistic Yearbook, Territorial statistics - INS;2008,2009 - prognosis National Commission for Prognosis

North-West Region relies on the agriculture and on the processing industry dominated by traditional sectors with intensive activity and on some new emerging sectors. North-West region has had a sustained growth of GDP/capita in the period 2005-2008 with a disparity index over the national average GDP (93.0% in 2005 and 92.0% in 2008) compared with the previous period when it was below the national average of 90%. It is important to mention that except Cluj whose disparity index is over the national average the other counties are below the total level per country.

In this region the services sector have an important role, contributing with over 45% from the regional GDP.

Annual increases can be seen also in the active employed population and average number of employees in the period 2005-2008. Also the unemployment rate has registered a descending trend from 4.0 in 2005 to 3.3 in 2008.

The average income/employee has also registered significant increase from 679 lei in 2005 to 1107 RON in 2008.

Centre Region

	2005	2006	2007e	2008e
Centre Region				
GDP/capita (euro)	3,935.5	4,590.8	5,195.0	5,799.5
GDP growth rate (%)	1.6	9.9	7.2	8.2
Active employed population at the end of the year (%) (modification compared to the previous year)	0.1	1.7	2.4	0.8
Average number of employees	576.1	590.6	612.5	626.1
Unemployment rate (%)	7.3	6.1	4.8	5.2
Average income/employee	661	778	937	1120
Balance of FDI/region	1,610	2,559	3,541	-

Source: Statistic Yearbook, Territorial statistics - INS; 2008,2009 - prognosis National Commission for Prognosis

The Centre Region has a complex industrial structure with traditional branches, the industry sector generating over 30% of the GDP in the region. Also this region has a GDP with a disparity index that exceeds the national level (106.3% in 2008 except for Harghita and Covasna counties whose GDP are above the national average). Within the region the most competitive counties regarding the GDP/capita are Brasov, Sibiu and Mures.

From a territorial point of view, Centre region is the second region after Bucharest Ilfov that benefited from significant FDI inflows.

Considering the GDP/capita, GDP disparity index and employment rate can be ranked on the third position after Bucharest Ilfov and West region in terms of regional competitiveness.

As regarding the active employed population and the average number of employees, the period 2005-2008 shows a positive evolution of these indicators and also a decrease of the unemployment rate from 7.3 in 2005 to 5.2 in 2008.

The average income/employee has also registered significant increase from 661 lei in 2005 to 1120 RON in 2008.

Bucharest Ilfov Region

	2005	2006	2007e	2008e
Bucharest-Ilfov Region				
GDP/capita (euro)	7,487.2	8,875.5	10,153.4	11,416.3
GDP growth rate (%)	15.1	7.6	8.2	6.4
Active employed population at the end of the year (%) (modification compared to the previous year)	8.3	6.4	7.2	1.1
Average number of employees	837.0	890.5	945.8	981.1
Unemployment rate (%)	2.4	2.2	1.7	1.7
Average income/employee	977	1129	1382	1727
Balance of FDI/region	21,885	34,512	42,770	-

Source: Statistic Yearbook, Territorial statistics - INS;2008,2009 - prognosis National Commission for Prognosis

The region presents a totally different structure compared to the other regions. Within the region, the weight of the agriculture sector is only 1%, industry less than 20%, the services sector having the highest contribution of over 60% from GDP (over the national average).

Bucharest Ilfov region is also the only region where the service sector at national level has approx 39% of the total occupation and generates most of the jobs. Most of the financial and banking activities are also concentrated in this region.

Bucharest-Ilfov region has the highest contribution to the GDP in the economy, the disparity index being twice over the national average. This also shows that Bucharest Ilfov region has registered the highest economic performances compared to the other regions.

From a territorial point of view, FDI went in the period 2005-2007 mainly to Bucharest-Ilfov region (64.3% from total FDI).

Considering that this region has registered the best economic performances this was also reflected in an increase of the active employed population over the period 2005-2008, of the average number of employees and average income/employee (over the national average). Also the unemployment rate has decreased significantly from the period 2000-2005, registering in the period 2005-2008 levels of 2% and below (1.7 in 2007 and 2008).

Annex 7: Review of Revised ROP Indicators

Priority Axis 1: Support to sustainable development of urban growth poles

Indicator	Unit	Baseline	Baseline Year	Source	Target (2015)	Core indicator?	Comment
OUTPUT							
Integrated urban development plans accepted	No	-	-	ROP Monitoring System - SMIS/IB/MA reports	30		
Projects ensuring the improvement of the urban infrastructure and urban services, including urban transport	No	-	-	ROP Monitoring System - SMIS	60		Can be a part of the core indicator 39
Projects promoting the development of sustainable business environment	No	-	-	ROP Monitoring System - SMIS	15	√	
Projects ensuring the rehabilitation of social infrastructure, including social housing and improvement of social services	No	-	-	ROP Monitoring System - SMIS	25		Can be a part of the core indicator 39
RESULT							
Inhabitants benefiting from the implementation of projects within integrated urban development plans	No	-	-	ROP Monitoring System - SMIS	400,000		
Companies established in the regional and local growth poles	No	-	-	ROP Monitoring System - SMIS	400		An extra Indicator could be considered to take account of core indicator 10 (investment induced)
Jobs created / saved	No	-	-	ROP Monitoring System - SMIS	1,500	√	The monitoring Indicator (but not the target) could be further developed to take account of core indicators 6, & 9.

Priority Axis 2: Improvement of regional and local transport infrastructure

Indicators	Unit	Baseline	Baseline Year	Source	Target (2015)	Core indicator?	Comment
OUTPUT							
Length of rehabilitated/modernized county roads (non TEN-T)	Km	-	-	ROP Monitoring System – SMIS	877		
Length of rehabilitated/modernized urban streets (non TEN-T)	Km	-	-	ROP Monitoring System-SMIS	411		
Length of rehabilitated /constructed by-passes (non TEN-T)	Km	-	-	ROP Monitoring System-SMIS	219		
RESULT							
Increase passengers traffic on the rehabilitated, constructed, modernized roads	%	-	-	Surveys	10		Should also consider aiming for core indicator 20 An additional indicator based on core indicator 22 should also be developed Baseline volume of passenger traffic at the start of projects should be known.
Increase freight traffic on the rehabilitated, constructed, modernized roads	%	-	-	Surveys	10		Should also consider aiming for core indicator 20. Baseline volume of freight traffic at start of projects should be known

Priority Axis 3: Improvement of social infrastructure

Indicators	Unit	Baseline	Baseline year	Source	Target (2015)	Core indicator?	Comment
OUTPUT							
Rehabilitated/ modernised/equipped health care units	No.	-		ROP Monitoring System - SMIS	50	√	
Rehabilitated/modernised/extended/equipped social services infrastructure	No.			ROP Monitoring System – SMIS	270		Can contribute to core indicator 41
Mobile units equipped for emergency interventions	No.	-		ROP Monitoring System - SMIS	510		
Rehabilitated/modernised/equipped educational units - pre- university education infrastructure ¹	No.	-		ROP Monitoring System - SMIS	130		
Rehabilitated/ modernised/extended/equipped campuses - pre- university educational infrastructure	No.	-		ROP Monitoring System-SMIS	30	√	
Rehabilitated/ modernised/ extended/equipped centers for continuous vocational training (CVT)	No.	-		ROP Monitoring System - SMIS	35	√	
Rehabilitated/ modernised/ extended/equipped campuses- university education infrastructure	No.	-		ROP Monitoring System - SMIS	15	√	

RESULT

Persons benefiting from the rehabilitated/ modernized/equipped health care infrastructure	No/day	-		Surveys	30,000		
Persons benefiting from the rehabilitated/ modernized/extended/equipped social services infrastructure	No	-		Surveys	10,000		
Average response time of mobile units in rural localities (communes) – infrastructure for emergency situations	Min.	Up to 30'–45' in rural area		Surveys	Up to 12' in rural area		
Average response time of mobile units in urban localities (towns) – infrastructure for emergency situations	Min.	Up to 20' in urban area		Surveys	Up to 8' in urban area		

Disadvantaged children benefiting from the rehabilitated / modernized /extended/equipped educational units - pre- university education infrastructure	No	-		Ministry of Education, Research and Youth/Surveys	5,000		
Pupils benefiting from the rehabilitated / modernized /extended/equipped pre-university education infrastructure	No.			Ministry of Education, Research and Youth/Surveys	40,000	√	
Persons benefiting from the rehabilitated/modernized/extended/equipped infrastructure for the continuous vocational training (CVT)	No	-		Ministry of Education, Research and Youth/Surveys	3,000	√	
Students benefiting from the rehabilitated/ modernized/extended university campuses	No	-		Ministry of Education, Research and Youth/Surveys	2,000	√	

Priority Axis 4: Strengthening the regional and local business environment

Indicators	Unit	Baseline	Baseline Year	Source	Target (2015)	Core indicator?	Comment
OUTPUT							
Business support structures assisted	No	-	-	ROP Monitoring System – SMIS	15		Contributes directly to core indicator 10 Data should also be collected to contribute to core indicator 8
Unused polluted industrial sites rehabilitated and prepared for new economic activities	Ha	-	-	ROP Monitoring System – SMIS	500	√	
Micro-enterprises supported	No	-	-	ROP Monitoring System – SMIS	1,500	√	
RESULT							
Occupation rate in business support structures (after 2 years since the project was finalised)	%	-	-	Surveys	50		Data should be collected to contribute to core indicator 7 (SME) 8 and 10.
New jobs created in the supported business structures	No/FTE	-	-	Surveys	4,000		Contributes to core indicator 1
New jobs created in the supported micro-enterprises	No/FTE	-	-	Surveys	3,000		Contributes to core indicator 9

Priority Axis 5: Sustainable development and promotion of tourism

Indicator	Unit	Basis value	Basis year	Source	Target (2015)	Core indicator?	Comment
Projects in tourism	No.	0		ROP Monitoring System - SMIS	400	√	
SMEs assisted	No.	0		ROP Monitoring System - SMIS	350		Data should be collected to contribute to core indicator 7
Promotional campaigns for advertising the tourism brand	No.	0		ROP Monitoring System - SMIS	10		
National Tourism Information and Promotion Centres supported	No.	0		ROP Monitoring System - SMIS	10		
Tourists arrived in rehabilitated / modernized / equipped accommodation structures	No.	0		Survey	400,000		
Overnights-staying in rehabilitated / modernized / equipped accommodation infrastructure /	No.	0		Survey	800,000		
Jobs created / saved	No.	0		Survey	1,000	√	Contributes to core indicator 1. Data should be collected to support core indicator 10 (SMEs)
Visitors at the Information and Promotion Centres	No.	0		SMIS – Ministry of Tourism	1,000,000		
Web site visits	No.	0		SMIS – Ministry of Tourism	1,500,000		

Priority Axis 6: Technical assistance

Indicators	Unit	Baseline	Baseline Year	Source	Target (2015)	Core indicator ?	Comment
Studies, analyses, reports, strategies	No	-	-	ROP Monitoring System/ Evaluation reports	40		
Participants in training courses (IB/AM staff, beneficiaries and potential beneficiaries)	No	-	-	ROP Monitoring System/ Evaluation reports	2,000		
Participant training days	No	-	-	ROP Monitoring System/ Evaluation reports	10,000		
Communication and publicity events	No.	-	-	ROP Monitoring System/ Evaluation reports	900		
Degree of population awareness on ROP	%	-	-	Evaluation reports	20%		

Annex 8: List of Persons Interviewed

Institution	Interviewed person	Date	
Ministry of Regional Development and Housing (MDRL) General Directorate for ROP Apolodor, nr. 17, Sector 5, Bucharest	Gabriel FRIPTU – Director – General Directorate Managing Authority ROP <u>Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Unit</u> Pompilia IDU – Chief of Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Eliza LUPASCU – Counsellor	6 April 2007 27 August	
	<u>General Directorate Authorization and Payments</u> Doina SURCEL – General Director Corina COSTEA – Chief of ROP Payments Service Luminita ZEZEANU – Chief of ROP Authorization Service	11 august 2009	
	<u>Directorate of Strategy and Programme Coordination</u> Gabriela FRENZ – Director Luiza RADU – Counsellor Mihaela GHERGUT – Counsellor Elena CRANGASU - Counsellor Eleonora GHEORGHE - Counsellor Diana HAGIU - Counsellor Daniel VOICU – Counsellor Raluca Gliga - Counsellor	11 august 2009 23 april 2009 23 april 2009 4 June 2009	
	<u>Directorate of Programme Management</u> Laurentiu CAPRIAN - Director Mihaela IONESCU – Chief of Service Valentin CORNILA – Counsellor Alina BOUROSU – Counsellor	24 april, 23 July 2009	
	Diana DANCUIULESCU - Counsellor Simona STANICA - Counsellor Veronica STANCU - Counsellor Catalina SOARE - Counsellor Ovidiu PANAITE - Counsellor Roxana NESA - Counsellor	28 april 2009 12 may 2009 13 may 2009 20 may 2009, 10 June 2009	
	Elena STANA – Counsellor - Directorate of Programme Management - (RDA South East; RDA South Muntenia)	5 May 2009	
	Shaun HENRY – Pre-accession Counsellor, Twinning, Phare CES 2006	7 May 2009	
	Dan NICULA – General Director ADRBI Emilia BALALAU – Executive Director IB Gina PAUN – Chief Department of Programme Planning, Programming,	8 May 2009	
	Regional Development Agency Bucuresti-Ilfov (ADRBI) Str. Leonida nr. 19, Sector 2, Bucharest		

	Monitoring and Project Portfolio Simona BANARU – Chief of Evaluation and Selection Unit Mihaela GHINDAR – Chief Project Monitoring Unit Florin DOBRISAN – Chief Project Verification Unit Claudia IONESCU – Chief Unit for Communication	11 Mai 2009 12 Mai 2009 17 Mai 2009
Ministry of Regional Development and Housing (MDRL) General Directorate for ROP Apolodor, nr. 17 Sector 5, Bucharest	Catalin TUDOR – Counsellor – Directorate of Programme Management (KAI 5.3)	22 Mai 2009 30 July 2009
	Carmen NECSULESCU - Counsellor – Directorate of Programme Management (KAI 5.1) Marius VOICU – Counsellor – Directorate of Programme Management (KAI 5.2)	25 Mai 2009
	Daniela SURDEANU – Counsellor – Directorate of Programme Management	6 April 2009 26 Mai 2009 26 August 2009
Tourism Ministry Directorate for Managing the Community Funds for Tourism Dinicu Golescu, 38, Sector 1, Bucharest	Gabriela BOSTANESCU - Director Adița STANCA – Chief Unit for Technical Assistance and Relation with MA ROP Anca MIHAILA – Chief Service of Evaluation and Selection Unit	27 May 2009 30 July 2009
Consiliul Judetean ILFOV Claea Victoriei 208, Sector 1, Bucharest	Gheorghe COTEA – Director – Service for Internal and International Cooperation George OANCEA – Counsellor	28 May 2009
Ministry of Regional Development and Housing (MDRL) General Directorate for ROP Apolodor, nr. 17, Sector 5, Bucharest	Aina BOUROSU – Counsellor – Directorate of Programme Management Orsolya SOFALVI – Counsellor – Directorate of Programme Management Bogdan ȚIGĂU – Counsellor – Directorate of Programme Management Cornelia MATEIU – Counsellor – Directorate of Programme Management	29 May 2009
Regional Development Agency Sud Est P-ta Independentei nr.1, etaj 5, camera 513, Braila, Braila County	Luminita MIHAILOV – General Director Jenica CRACIUN – IB Director Diana CUSTURA – Economic Director – Daniel DUMITRESCU – Chief Monitoring and Verification Unit Maria BURLACU – HR Specialist Dragos VASILE – Counsellor Communication Unit	2 June 2009 20 August 2009
Agentia de Dezvoltare Regionala Nord-Est Str. Lt. Draghescu nr. 9, Piatra Neamt, Neamt County	Gheorghe HARJA – Director IB Gabriela MACOVEIU – Director – Directorate of Regional Communication and Promotion Georgeta SMĂDU – Director – Directorate Planning, Programming Mirela ZLĂVOG – Chief Monitoring and Verification Unit Ionel POPA – Chief Evaluation, Selection and Contracting Unit	4 June 2009 5 June 2009
Consiliul Judetean Valcea Str. Gral. Praporgescu, nr.1 , Ramnicu Valcea, Valcea	Carmen ALEXANDRESCU – Executive Director - Directorate of Programmes and External Relations	16 June 2009
Centre Regional Development Agency	Maria IVAN – Director – IB Department OI Adriana MURESAN – Director –	17 June 2009

P-ta Consiliul Europei bl. 32D, Alba Iulia, judet Alba	Programmes and Public Relations Unit Gabriel MARIN – Chief Monitoring and Verification Unit Dan POPA – Chief Evaluation, Selection and Contracting Unit	
West Regional Development Agency Str. Proclamatia de la Timisoara nr 5, Timisoara, Timis County	Dan STEFANESCU – Director ROP Implementation Silviu ADAMUT – Director, Unit Selection and Contracting Nicolae MUNTEANU – Director, Directorate Support to ROP Implementation Miruna VITCU – Director, HR and Communication Department	16 June 2009
South West Regional Development Agency Str. Unirii nr 86, Craiova, Dolj County	Dorian DELUREANU – Chief Department for ROP implementation Marilena ALECU – Chief Department Regional Policies and Communication Monica BOTEANU – Chief Unit ROP Monitoring and Verification	15 June 2009
Regional Development Agency North West Sextil Puscariu nr. 2, Cluj-Napoca, Cluj County	Sanda CATANA –Executive Director Elena MUSTE –Executive Director Viorel BOCA – Chief of ROP Project Verification Department	18 June 2009
Regional Development Agency South Muntenia 1 Decembrie 1918, nr. 1, Calarasi	Liviu MUSAT –General Director Mariana VISAN – Deputy Director IB Mirela TACHE –Economic Director	13 July 2009
City hall Timisoara Bd C.D. Loga nr 1, Timisoara, Timis County	Adriana DEACONU – Counsellor, European Programme Office Daniela GHINEA – Counsellor, Local Development and European Integration	16 June 2009
City Hall Craiova Str A.I. Cuza nr 7, Craiova, Dolj County	Cristiana GHITALAU – Chief of Service Projects and Programmes Development	17 June 2009
Health Ministry – PIU Intr Cristian Popisteanu 1-3, Sector 1, Bucharest	Valentin ROSCA – Counsellor – PIU	5 August 2009
Ministry of Regional Development and Housing (MDRL) General Directorate for ROP Apolodor, nr. 17, Sector 5, Bucharest	Catalina PETRARU – Counsellor – Technical Assistance Unit	17 July 2009
Ministry of Regional Development and Housing (MDRL) General Directorate for ROP Apolodor, nr. 17, Sector 5, Bucharest	Lenuta BANCILA – General Director Adela VOICU – Internal Auditor (ROP Coordinator) Delia CRISTEA – Internal Auditor	20 July 2009
	Luminita ZEZEANU – Chief Service Authorization	20 July 2009
	Corina COSTEA – Chief Service Payments	9 June 2009 21 June 2009

	Laurentiu CAPRIAN – Director Directorate of Programme Management Roxana NESA – Counsellor - Coordinator of KAI 1-5 - Directorate of Programme Management Mihaela IONESCU – Chief Unit for TA and Relation with MAROP Alina BOUROSU – Counsellor - Directorate of Programme Management	21 July 2009
National Agency for Environmental Protection Splaiul Independentei, Sector 6 Bucharest	Teodor ȘILEAM – Chief Unit Soil and Subsoil	22 July 2009
Ministry of Regional Development and Housing (MDRL) General Directorate for ROP Apolodor, nr. 17, Sector 5, Bucharest	Delia CRACIUN – Counsellor – Unit Evaluation and Monitoring Unit (BEM)	23 July 2009
ISPE Bulevardul Lacu Tei nr 1-3 Bucuresti	Florin COJOCARIU – Expert – PHARE 2006	27 July 2009
Audit Authority Str. Stravropoleous nr. 6 Sector 3, Bucharest	Eugen TEODOROVICI – Director Luciana TOJESCHI – ROP Auditor	27 July 2009
Ministry of Regional Development and Housing (MDRL) General Directorate for ROP Apolodor, nr. 17, Sector 5, Bucharest	Cristina CHIRIACESCU – Chief of Service – Directorate for Strategy and Programming	3 July 2008 28 July 2009
	Ionut SANDU – Counsellor – Directorate for Strategy and Programme Coordination Catalin TUDOR –Contract Manager – (KAI 5.3)	30 July 2009
	Gabriel COSTACHE – Counsellor - Directorate for Programme Management (KAI 4.3)	4 July 2009
Competition Council Piata Presei Libere, nr. 1, corp D1, Sector 1, Bucharest	Cristina COBIANU – Director	4 July 2009
County Council Braila P-ta Independentei nr.1, Braila, Braila County	Gabriel IOAN – Executive Director – Directorate for Cooperation, Regional Development and External Relations	20 August 2009
County Council Gorj Piata Victoriei nr, 2-4 Targu Jiu, Gorj County	Claudia POPESCU – Executive Director – Directorate for Cooperation, Regional Development and External Relations Florinel ACHIM – Project Manager	27 August 2009

Annex 9: List of Documents referred to in the Evaluation

Name of Originator	Date	Title of Document
ROP MA	2007	Regional Operational Programme
ROP MA	March 2009	Framework Document for ROP Implementation (version 2)
ROP MA	2007	ROP Communication Plan 2007-2013
ROP MA	2008, 2009	ROP Annual Implementation Reports
ROP MA	2008	Project Monitoring Procedure
ROP MA	2008	ROP Monitoring and Reporting Procedure
European Commission	March 2009	Building Institutional Structures in order to achieve upon accession, sound and efficient management of EU Structural Funds.
Official Journal of the European Union	July 2006	COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) No 1083/2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999
ROP MA	June 2009	Report on the Ad-hoc Evaluation of the Key Area of Intervention 4.2 „Rehabilitation of unused polluted industrial sites and preparation for new activities” from the priority axis 4 of the Regional Operational Program 2007 - 2013
ROP MA	2008	Promotion and information documents
ROP MA	2008	Guidelines for applicants
ROP Intermediate Bodies	April, May, June 2009	Weekly reports
ROP MA	April, May, June 2009	ROP weekly overview reporting
ROP MA	Apr, May, June 2009	Weekly reporting on Major Field of Intervention
ROP MA	Mai 2009	Related documents to ROP MC of 14-15 May 2009
ROP MA	Oct 2008	ROP Monitoring and Reporting Procedure PO/II/AM/2
ROP MA	2007	The Regional Operational Programme
ROP MA	2007-2009	Minutes of ROP Monitoring Committee: 14-15 May 2009; 27 October 2008; 22 April 2008; 13 December 2007; 18 September 2007; 16 August 2007
ROP MA	2008	ROP Multi-Annual Evaluation Plan
Pieter van Run - Key Expert	January 2006	ROP Ex-ante Evaluation
ROP MA	2007-2008-2009	Guidelines for Applicants Axis 1-5
ROP MA	2007	Strategy for Technical Assistance

Name of Originator	Date	Title of Document
Romanian Parliament	July 2004	Law 346 /2004 regarding the stimulation of the set-up and development of SMEs
Romanian Government	July 2007	Decision 759/2007 regarding the eligibility rules for expenses
Romanian Government	May 2008	Decision 491-2008 regarding the completion of Decision 759/2007
Romanian Government	January 2007	Government Ordinance 29/2007 regarding the allocation of Structural Funds
Romanian Parliament	July 2007	Law 249/2007 regarding approval and completion of Government Ordinance 29/2007
Romanian Government	July 2007	Government Ordinance 19/2008 regarding completion of GO 9/2007
Ministry of Economy and Finance (MEF)	August 2008	Order 911/2007 methodological norms to OG 29 and Law 249/2007
MEF	October 2008	Order 3154/2008 for modifying and completing the methodological norms OG 29
Ministry of Public Finance (MPF)	March 2009	Order 469/2009 modification and completion of methodological norms OG 29
Romanian Government	December 2008	Government Emergency Ordinance 220/2008 regarding the modification of OG 29
MPF	July 2009	Order 2286/2009 regarding pre-financing in conformity with Government Emergency Ordinance 64/2009
Romanian Government	June 2009	Government Emergency Ordinance 64/2009 regarding the management of Structural Funds
Authority for Coordination of Structural Instruments	N/A	National Communication Strategy for Structural Instruments 2007-2013
European Commission	December 2006	EC Regulation 1828
Managing Authority for Regional Operational Program	March 2008	Communication Plan for ROP 2007-2013
Ministry of Regional Development and Housing	May 2009	2008 Annual Implementation Report on ROP
Ministry of Regional Development and Housing	N/A	Communication Guidelines
Ministry of Regional Development and Housing	November 2007	Order 1147 concerning the eligible costs for Technical Assistance Priority Axis of ROP
Ministry of Regional Development and Housing	March 2009	Instructions concerning request for funding for Priority Axis 6, Technical Assistance
Ministry of Public Finance/ MAROP	N/A	Revised indicators of ROP 2007-2013

Name of Originator	Date	Title of Document
Managing Authority for the Regional Operational Program	March 2009	Survey for measurement of impact of information and publicity activities
RDA Bucharest Ilfov	April 2008 N/A N/A 2008 2008 2009 N/A February 2009 April 2009	Communication Plan for ROP 2007-2013 of RDA Bucharest Ilfov Action Plan for implementation of CP in 2009, Bucharest - Ilfov Report on CP implementation (October-December 2007) Report on CP implementation(January-December 2008) Report on CP Implementation (January-June 2008) Report on CP implementation (January-June 2009) Report on Help Desk activity (October-December 2008) Progress report no.1 for 2008(6.2 KAI) Progress report no. for 2009(6.2 KAI)
RDA North-East	N/A N/A 2008 N/A 2008 2009	Communication Plan for ROP 2007-2013 of RDA North-East Action Plans for implementation of CP in 2007, 2008, 2009, North-East Study for measurement of the impact of implementation of information and publicity measures in North-East Region PC Implementation Report 2007 March -December 2007 PC Annual Implementation Report 2008 PC Implementation Report 2009 (January-June 2009)
RDA Central	N/A N/A N/A 2008 2008 2009 N/A N/A April 2009	Communication Plan for ROP 2007-2013 of RDA Central Action Plan for implementation of CP in 2009, Central PC implementation Report (March-December 2007) Annual Report on PC implementation , 2008 Interim Report on PC implementation (January-June 2008) Annual Report on PC implementation (2009) Progress Report no.1 (March 2007- December 2008) Progress Report no.4 (October-December 2008) Report on Help-Desk activity (January-March 2009)
RDA North-West	June 2009 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	Communication Plan for ROP 2007-2013 of RDA North-West Action Plans for implementation of CP in 2007, 2009, North-West Communication Strategy of RDA North-West PC Implementation Report 2007-2008 (March 2007-June 2008) Annual Implementation Report 2008 (January-December 2008) PC Implementation Report 2009 (January-June 2009)

Name of Originator	Date	Title of Document
RDA West	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	Communication Plan for ROP 2007-2013 of RDA West Action Plan for implementation of CP in 2009, West PC Implementation Report 2007 (March-December 2007) Interim PC Implementation Report 2008 (January-June 2008) PC Implementation Report 2008 (January-December 2008) PC Implementation Report 2009 (January-June 2009)
RDA South-West Oltenia	April 2008 N/A N/A N/A 2009	Communication Plan for ROP 2007-2013 of RDA South-West Action Plan for implementation of CP in 2009, South-West Oltenia PC Implementation Report 2007 PC Implementation Report 2008 (January-December 2008) PC Implementation Report 2009 (January-June 2009)
RDA South-Muntenia	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A July 2009	Communication Plan for ROP 2007-2013 of RDA South-Muntenia Action Plan for implementation of CP in 2009, South-Muntenia PC Implementation Report 2007 PC Interim Implementation Report 2008 (January-June 2008) PC Implementation Report 2008 (January-December 2008) PC Implementation Report 2009 (January -June 2009)
RDA South East	April 2008 N/A N/A 2008 August 2009	Communication Plan for ROP 2007-2013 of RDA South East Action Plan for implementation of CP in 2009, South East PC Implementation Report 2008 (January-December 2008) Interim PC Implementation Report 2008 (January-June 2008) PC Implementation Report 2009 (January-June 2009)
ROP MA	N/A	NCP Implementation Report (January-December 2008)

Annex 10: Evaluation Debriefing of Recommendations

The key recommendations in the interim evaluation report were debriefed on 26 October 2009 and a draft action plan, issued separately, was agreed. The completed recommendations table is shown below.

Executive Summary Paragraph Reference	Finding / Conclusion	Rec Num	Recommendation	Effect of Recommendation	Accepted by MAROP? Yes / No	Proposed Action
Paragraph 17	For PA 1, given the high number of projects per plan, and the experience of project evaluation for other PAs, the chances that all the feasibility studies and technical plans will be prepared and approved in due time to achieve the commitment target are quite low.	1	<p>The MAROP should adopt a medium term risk-countering management strategy for PA1.</p> <p>A detailed timetable, for the period up to the end of 2010, for the application, selection and contracting process for each of the sub-domains of PA 1 should be drawn up and discussed with the IBs and, where relevant, with the applicants expected to apply. Individual timetables for each growth pole and urban development pole should also be made.</p> <p>The progress made in preparing the project applications, selection and evaluation and preparation of technical plans should be regularly monitored and potential slippage detected. Corrective measures should be identified by the MAROP in co-operation with</p>	Increase the chances that the selection and contracting process for the whole of PA1 is finished according to the current prognosis, that is, the end of 2010.	Yes	<p>A detailed timetable with milestones will be prepared for each growth pole and urban development pole. The actual progress will be monitored jointly by the MAROP and the relevant IBs every month.</p> <p>The MAROP will report the progress made to the next MCROP for information.</p>

Romania

Executive Summary Paragraph Reference	Finding / Conclusion	Rec Num	Recommendation	Effect of Recommendation	Accepted by MAROP? Yes / No	Proposed Action
			the IB.			
Paragraph 19, 20 45	<p>Savings arising from public procurement in PA 2 are substantial and provide an opportunity to increase the overbooking rate.</p> <p>The system for preparing the payment prognosis is not adjusted for savings which may give a misleading indication of the n+3/ n+2 position.</p>	2	<p>4. The MAROP should increase the overbooking level from the current 110% to 130% for PA 2 as soon as practicable. The level of potential savings from other KAIs and the potential for further overbooking should be monitored closely by the MAROP and included in the monthly management reports.</p> <p>5. The PA 2 has a potential to secure cost-effective supply of a pipeline of road infrastructure projects for other Government initiatives for infrastructure investments. This proposal and possibilities for its extension to other ROP Priority Axes should be discussed at the Government level.</p> <p>6. The selection of the remaining projects should prioritise the strategic objectives of the national programme now that the regional absorption of the allocations under PA 2 is almost assured. More use of strategic selection should be considered.</p>	Ensure timely full absorption of ERDF for this priority and achieve the priority objectives.	Yes	<p>A proposal to increase the overbooking rate is made to the MCROP October meeting. The MAROP will include potential savings in its monthly ACP reports. The MAROP will produce a prognosis that takes account of the potential savings. The MAROP will review the guidelines for applicants for all remaining calls to ensure the strategic objectives are prioritised.</p>

Romania

Executive Summary Paragraph Reference	Finding / Conclusion	Rec Num	Recommendation	Effect of Recommendation	Accepted by MAROP? Yes / No	Proposed Action
24	<p>The evaluation has identified several areas where a change to the allocations should be made. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. re-allocation of KAI 4.1 funds in BI region d. Re-allocate the KAI 4.2 allocation to other KAIs (PA 1 and PA 5) 	3	<p>ROP Monitoring Committee based on the proposal formulated by MAROP in consultation with RDB of the BI Region, should decide on the re-allocation of funds in its next meeting.</p> <p>Two general decision rules for reallocation based on the strategic objectives of ROP should be established. We suggest that these should be:</p> <p><u>PA/ KAI perspective</u> - reallocation to other KAIs within the PA or to other PAs that complement the priority objective affected by the reallocation.</p> <p><u>Regional reallocation</u> - in order to respect the regional disparity containment objective, a reallocation from a regions should be made to only to those regions that are more disadvantaged, and in the proportion of the original regional allocation percentages.</p> <p>For the two specific reallocations we recommend:</p>	<p>Increase the early commitment of ROP funds while preserving a strategic focus on the priority objectives.</p>	Yes	<p>The proposed reallocations were taken to the MCROP meeting in October 2009 for consideration.</p>

Romania

Executive Summary Paragraph Reference	Finding / Conclusion	Rec Num	Recommendation	Effect of Recommendation	Accepted by MAROP? Yes / No	Proposed Action
			<p>Reallocate unused BI funds for KAI 4.1 to all other regions for KAI 4.1. This decision should be considered at the MCPOR meeting in Spring 2010.</p> <p>Reallocate the unused KAI 4.2 allocation to PA 1 and PA 5. The reason for this is that KAI 4.1 and KAI 4.3 have a full allocation and PA 1 and PA 5 are the other PAs in ROP that have a high job creation target. The reallocation should be in proportion to the job targets of the two potential benefiting PAs and follow the principle of the regional allocation percentages. This decision should be considered by the MCROP in October 2009.</p>			
28	The IBs have experienced serious cashflow difficulties due to delays in payments for their services from the MAROP. This has affected their capacity to operate, specifically in the organization of information and	4	<p>A more efficient contracting method for the IBs (lump sum / or another type of contracts) should be found in order to speed up processing of the reimbursement claims from the IBs.</p> <p>When the financial control system of the documents is well established, the level of checking applied by the MAROP should be reduced to the minimum required in the regulations.</p>	Payments to the IBs are made according to the deadlines set up in the procedure. IBs could focus efforts on the core ROP delegated activities and not on solving cashflow problems due to delays in	Yes	MAROP will agree timelines for the submission and processing of reimbursement claims and will strictly meet the agreed deadlines for the release of the funds.

Romania

Executive Summary Paragraph Reference	Finding / Conclusion	Rec Num	Recommendation	Effect of Recommendation	Accepted by MAROP? Yes / No	Proposed Action
	publicity events.		A risk analysis should be performed, to identify where the most frequent errors occur and in which type of documents and transactions, as a basis for improving the efficiency of expenditure without increasing the risk that a material error is undetected.	payments.		
4 12, 46	<p>Programme monitoring is severely affected by a lack of timely socio-economic data.</p> <p>The monitoring of results is proposed mainly through surveys but a survey plan has not been made. An arrangement to enter the survey data into SMIS has not been finalised.</p>	5	<p>4. MAROP needs more timely access to relevant statistical data to meet its commitment to monitor changes in the context regional indicators. A collaboration with the NIS at national and regional level and the National Commission for Prognosis should be reviewed to achieve this. If necessary, TA resources from KAI6.1 or from the OPTA or other sources should be used to improve the availability of monitoring information.</p> <p>5. A survey plan for 2010 to begin collecting data for results indicators should be made now and the requirements for funding under KAI 6.1 should be established.</p> <p>6. The MAROP should make an immediate review of the completeness and accuracy of the results information entered into the SMIS and the information which is missing. A collaboration with the SMIS team at ACIS should be made to clarify the system for</p>	<p>A reliable source of socio economic data for programme monitoring and to support the policy research for the next programming period is provided for the MAROP.</p> <p>Improved monitoring data and analysis of results to support the reporting on the performance of the ROP.</p>	Yes	<p>MAROP will coordinate with ACIS to improve its access to regional socio economic indicators. MAROP and the IBs will produce a survey plan by the end of November 2009 to collect data for results indicators. A working group in the MAROP will be established to liaise with the ACIS SMIS team and solve the issues for recording results indicators in SMIS no later than 31 March 2010.</p>

Romania

Executive Summary Paragraph Reference	Finding / Conclusion	Rec Num	Recommendation	Effect of Recommendation	Accepted by MAROP? Yes / No	Proposed Action
			capturing the results indicators in SMIS. Alternative arrangements for recording and maintaining relevant indicators that will not be entered into SMIS need to be established before the end of 2009.			
40	<p>Significant delays were recorded in the deployment of independent evaluators in the regions, for several of the KAIs.</p> <p>Aspects of the project evaluation, selection and commitment process under the direct control of the MAROP should be accelerated.</p>	6	<p>The MAROP should seek solutions to speed up those phases of the selection and commitment process which are under its direct responsibility, namely:</p> <p>Deploying independent evaluators; There are a number of alternative methods for the provision of independent expertise for project evaluation. It is important that this expertise should be developed in the regions and that the role of the MAROP in supplying evaluators should be phased out. Ideally, there should be a small cadre of internal expertise in the IBs to manage the project selection process. There will always be a need to partially outsource this function but a more efficient supply could be arranged, for example through the use of multiple contractors.</p> <p>Approving evaluation and selection reports;</p>	<p>The selection and contracting process is more efficient (reduced delays) contributing to meeting the n+3/n+2 deadlines for absorption of the funds.</p> <p>Regional evaluation capacity is developed, and due to better knowledge of the regional needs, there are increased chances that the most relevant projects are selected.</p>	Yes	MAROP has already undertaken steps in this direction after the cut-off date of the Report by launching a call of proposal for project evaluation services. The intention is to contract 3 Operators concomitantly

Romania

Executive Summary Paragraph Reference	Finding / Conclusion	Rec Num	Recommendation	Effect of Recommendation	Accepted by MAROP? Yes / No	Proposed Action
			<p>Final processing of contracting documents. To this end, a potentially useful measure would be setting up targets on the number of contracts to be concluded per month, for each KAI. The target can be calculated based on the values of the commitment prognosis (e.g. between now and the end of 2010), taking into account the average project values and should reflect the minimum number of contracts required to meet the commitment targets.</p>			
42	Duplication of procedures between project monitoring and verification is non-productive and contributes to delays in the MAROP inputs to the project acceptance and commitment processes.	7	When the monitoring system is firmly implemented (earliest - second half of 2010) an internal review should be made to consider the elimination of duplication of procedures between project monitoring and expenditure and operational verification. A common procedure could be drafted where current overlaps of the two activities are merged.	Saving time and operational costs both on the side of the IB and of the beneficiaries.	Yes	
48	The current levels of expenditure verification at		Based on the findings, measures should be taken to avoid bottlenecks in processing the reimbursement claims and payments to	Improved efficiency and timely	Yes	Rationalisation and simplification of the internal procedures

Romania

Executive Summary Paragraph Reference	Finding / Conclusion	Rec Num	Recommendation	Effect of Recommendation	Accepted by MAROP? Yes / No	Proposed Action
	MAROP level, is leading to a serious work overload for key MAROP staff and consequently to delays in processing the reimbursement claims from beneficiaries.		beneficiaries, by simplification of procedures to avoid overlapping that can influence the administrative capacity of the MAROP and IBs	management of the verification and payment processes, reducing the risks for cashflow problems at the level of the beneficiaries.		requirements, related to the 4 eye expenditure verifications.
43	The decision support capabilities of the SMIS system are not yet fully developed. Little use is made by the MAROP of the data held in SMIS.	8	The MAROP should elaborate its information systems needs to support routine management reporting and decision making. Practical solutions to the current over-dependence on excel spreadsheets for programme analysis should be identified and implemented as soon as possible but no later than the middle of 2010.	Improvement in the quality and reliability of management information in the MAROP and the IBs. Improved sharing of information. Lower risks to data integrity.	Yes	The MAROP will collaborate more intensely with the ACIS SMIS team in improve the availability of the reports it needs.
44	The MAROP relies heavily on the use of excel files for the transfer of data from IBs to the Directorates and within the Directorates. So far, the systems are working but		There are three options (not mutually exclusive): 4. Seek enhanced access to SMIS data for analysis purposes by negotiating with the SMIS team for regular downloads of the required parts of the database. 5. Wait for the promised enhanced SMIS reporting modules (using the Oracle			The MAROP will also work with the ICT professionals in the MDRL to develop a medium term information strategy to serve the workgroup and analysis needs of the MAROP and

Romania

Executive Summary Paragraph Reference	Finding / Conclusion	Rec Num	Recommendation	Effect of Recommendation	Accepted by MAROP? Yes / No	Proposed Action
	there is a high risk to data loss and to overdependence on the expertise of a small group of officers in the MAROP.		discovery analysis tool). 6. Investigate the feasibility of investing in tools, including business intelligence and workgroup applications complementary to SMIS in order to respond to the specific procedures and reporting needs of the MAROP and IBROP that go beyond the objective and coverage of SMIS.			IBROP.
57	The BI region has consistently underperformed to date. This is due to a number of unique factors, both internal and external, including the delay in funding the RDABI, the allocation in PA 1 of the entire regional allocation to Urban Centres, the possibility of deadweight in KAI 4.1, the reluctance of potential	9	The MAROP should make an urgent joint review with the RDABI of the current project portfolio for the BI Region with a cut-off date of the end of 2009. The potential for a reallocation of the funds to the region towards the areas of greatest need should be examined and a proposal for reallocation should be brought forward to the next MCROP in the Spring of 2010. An immediate set of information and publicity activities, targeted at the potential beneficiaries, should be implemented. These activities should be supported by the MDRL and the Government. The issue of the uncertain eligibility of some potential applicants should be clarified formally to the RDABI by the MAROP.	Improved impact of the ROP fund absorption in the BI Region	Yes	Joint review of the current project portfolio for the BI Region with a cut-off date of the end of 2009. Examination and proposal for potential reallocation of funds to the region should be presented to the next MCROP (Spring 2010). Implementation of targeted set of information and publicity measures. <i>i.</i>

Romania

Executive Summary Paragraph Reference	Finding / Conclusion	Rec Num	Recommendation	Effect of Recommendation	Accepted by MAROP? Yes / No	Proposed Action
	<p>beneficiaries to avail of the opportunities presented by the ROP, the potential inelegibility of some targeted beneficiaries.</p> <p>The RDABI cannot solve these problems on its own and needs more support from the MAROP, the MDRL and at the level of Government to resolve the issues that are preventing the BI region from deriving the intended benefits from the ROP.</p>					

