

ANNEX 3 – LIST OF PRIORITY AXIS AND KEY AREAS OF INTERVENTION

Priority Axis (PA)	Key Area of Intervention (KAI)
SOP Transport	
1. Modernization and development of TEN-T priority axes aiming at sustainable transport system integrated with EU transport networks	1.1. Modernization and development of road infrastructure along the TEN-T priority axis 7
	1.2. Modernization and development of railway infrastructure along the TEN-T priority axis 22
	1.3. Modernization and development of water transport infrastructure along the TEN-T priority axis 18
2. Modernization and development of the national transport infrastructure outside the TEN-T priority axes aiming at sustainable national transport system	2.1. Modernization and development of national road infrastructure
	2.2. Modernization and development of national railway infrastructure and passenger service
	2.3. Modernization and development of river and maritime ports
	2.4. Modernization and development of air transport infrastructure
3. Modernization of transport sector aiming at higher degree of environmental protection, human health and passenger safety	3.1. Promote inter-modal transport
	3.2. Improve traffic safety across all transport modes
	3.3. Minimize adverse effects of transport on the environment
4. Technical Assistance	4.1. Support for effective SOPT management, implementation, monitoring, and control
	4.2. Support for information and publicity regarding SOPT
SOP Environment	
1. Extension and modernization of water and wastewater systems	1.1. Extension/modernization of water and wastewater systems
2. Development of integrated waste management systems and rehabilitation of historically contaminated sites	2.1. Development of integrated waste management systems and extension of waste management infrastructure
	2.2. Rehabilitation of historically contaminated sites
3. Reduction of pollution and mitigation of climate change by restructuring and renovating urban heating systems towards energy efficiency targets in the identified local environmental hotspots	3.1 Rehabilitation of urban heating systems in selected priority areas
4. Implementation of adequate management systems for nature protection	4.1 Development of infrastructure and management plans to protect biodiversity and Natura 2000
5. Implementation of adequate infrastructure of natural risk prevention in most vulnerable areas	5.1 Protection against floods
	5.2 Reduction of coastal erosion
6. Technical Assistance	6.1 Support for SOP ENV management and evaluation
	6.2 Support for information and publicity

ANNEX 4 – LIST OF DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN THE EVALUATION

Strategic/programming documents

- Sectoral Operational Programme Transport
- Sectoral Operational Programme Environment
- Implementation Framework Document of the Sectoral Operational Programme Transport
- Implementation Framework Document of the Sectoral Operational Programme Environment
- National Strategic Reference Framework
- Ex-ante Evaluation SOP Transport
- Ex-ante Evaluation SOP Environment
- On-going Evaluation of the NSRF
- National Strategy for Waste Management
- National Strategy for the Sustainable Development. Romania 2013 – 2020 - 2030

Operational documents

- Master Plans:
 - on water in Covasna, Mures, Dambovita, Jiu Valley
 - on waste in Botosani, Olt, Suceava, Calarasi, Vaslui
 - on heating in Bacau and Timisoara
- Annual implementation reports 2007 – 2009 (both OPs)
- SOP Environment - project monitoring fiches for:
 - Priority Axis 1 (13)
 - Priority Axis 2 (5)
 - Priority Axis 3 (1)
- Situation of SOP Environment at the end of August and end of September 2010
- Monitoring Committee meetings' minutes for September 2007, May and October 2008, May and December 2009, June 2010
- Monitoring Committee meetings' minutes for November 2009 and May 2010
- Multiannual Evaluation Plan for both OPs
- Impact Evaluation Report of the SOP Environment Promotion Campaign
- Management Operational Procedures for both OPs
- Internal Bylaw of the Ministry of Environment and Forests
- Guidelines for the preparation and evaluation of projects under the SOP Environment 2007 – 2013
- Guidelines for applicants for both OPs.

In addition the MAs and ACIS' **websites** were browsed for more information:

- www.fonduri-ue.ro
- www.mt.ro
- www.posmendi.ro

ANNEX 5 – LIST OF INTERVIEWS

Institution	Representatives	Meeting date
SOP Environment		
AM SOP Environment	Florian Burnar, MA Director Valentin Simion, Public Manager, Programming and Evaluation Directorate Roxana Ifrim, Counsellor, Payment Directorate Mihai Constantin, Counsellor, Structural Funds Directorate	04/10/2010
	Lucia Popa, Cohesion Fund Directorate Catalin Gheran, Structural Funds Directorate	15/10/2010
	Florian Burnar, MA Director Gabriela Dugoiasu, Head of Office, Programming and Evaluation Directorate Valentin Simion, Public Manager Mălina Frăţeanu, Communication Officer, AM SOP Environment	25/10/2010
IB SOP Environment, Bucharest	Cristina Maruta, Financial Control Directorate Luminiţa Neagoe, Head of Programming Office	15/10/2010
IB SOP Environment, Cluj-Napoca	Marius Baican, IB Director	19/10/2010
Giurgiu County Council	Gabriela Petruş, Project Manager, PIU Simona Dumitrescu, Project Assistant	20/10/2010
S.C. Apa Service S.A.	Lucica Neagu, Project Manager, PIU	20/10/2010
IB SOP Environment Bacău	Anca Bostan, IB Director	22.10.2010
SOP Transport		
JASPERS - EIB	Tudor Radu, Transport expert Alexandra Stan, Transport expert	14/10/2010
MA SOP Transport	Cătălin Costache, Director, Programming Department Ada Debu, Head of the office, Monitoring Department Daniela Breazu, Evaluation expert	21/10/2010
SNCFR	Radu Irimia, Deputy General Director, Department for European Projects Constantin Onoiu, Deputy Director adjunct, Department for European Projects	22/10/2010
CNADNR	Andreea Olteanu, Head of the office for drafting project proposals Mihai Macrea, Head of the office for National Roads ISPA and Phare Nicoleta Şandru, Head of the office for Management of the Non-reimbursable Funds for Highways	26/10/2010
CNADNR	Claudiu Brânzan, Expert European Procedures' Implementation Office Ştefan Mihai, Project Manager Adelina Toculeţ, Project Manager	28/10/2010
EC, DG Regio	Eduardo Barreto, Desk Officer Unit I1 (Romania)	20/01/11

ANNEX 6 – INTERVIEW GUIDELINE

Relevance

1. Are there any changes in the socio-economic environment that have affected the relevance of the interventions under OP?
2. What do you consider to be the main socio-economic tendencies which could affect project implementation?
3. Are the identified needs (including investment needs) still relevant, as initially estimated?
4. Are the planned objectives relevant to the current needs?
5. Are the operations under the Priority Axes and subsequent KAIs still relevant?

Consistency

1. Is the implementation to date of the Priority Axes within the OP complementary with each other?
2. Are the OP and Priority Axes coherent with any recent major relevant national and international policy/strategy and investment programme, including strategies to deal with the economic crisis?
3. Are there overlaps in the implementation of the Priority Axes or operations within the OP and between these and other investment in the sector?

Effectiveness

1. What are the number and value of contracted projects? What is the difference between the planned and actual performance?
2. Which are the factors contributing to the difference between the planned and real performance (see also the attached SWOT analysis)?
3. What are the reasons for a low number of projects approved/contracted?
4. What are the delays in achieving the planned results and objectives? What are the reasons for such delays?
5. What are the internal and external factors affecting the progress of the Operational Programme?
6. Are there deviations in the programme implementation time-plan? What is the cause for such deviations?
7. To what extent each Priority Axis and subsequent KAI is implemented effectively (is contributing to reaching OP objectives)?

Efficiency

Implementation Architecture and processes

1. Is the management system functional and operating efficiently?
2. Are internal procedures in place and supporting the efficient implementation of the OP?
3. Are there inter-institutional procedures for the OP implementation?
4. What is the relationship of the MA with the beneficiary institutions? Is this a critical factor influencing the project implementation? How?
5. How has the economic crisis affected efficiency (resources, costs, supply of services etc.)?
6. What improvements can be made to increase the efficiency of the management system?

Information and advertising

7. Are you aware of any deficiencies / inconsistencies in relation to the guidelines for applicants? Have they been corrected? How?
8. How would you describe the operation of help-desks in respect to their usefulness for beneficiaries? What are the main problems in this respect?
9. Which are the main instruments used for publicity and promotion of the OP (events, information campaigns etc.)? What were the main problems that affected their efficiency?

Launch of the requests for project proposals

10. What is the quality of applications received up to the cut-off date?
11. What were the reasons for rejecting applications?
12. Was the evaluation and selection process transparent? Where the rejection reasons clearly justified?
13. Was the evaluation and selection process delayed? What were the reasons for such delays?
14. Were there any appeals submitted to projects approval decisions? Have there been any problems in solving the appeals?
15. What were the main problems in evaluation and selection quality of evaluators, evaluation grids, evaluation reports, etc.)?

Contracting and implementation

16. What are the main problems in contracting projects?
17. What have been the main problems in project implementation so far for the MA (e.g. approving contract addenda, elaborating progress reports, processing reimbursement claims etc.) and for beneficiaries (project design, feedback quality from the MA, ensuring co-financing, obtaining licences, permits, observing public procurement rules, etc.)?
18. What are the problems in projects monitoring (consistency of project indicators with the programme objectives, availability of documents, SMIS system, beneficiaries' capacity/preparation/attitudes etc.)?

Implementation Capacity/ Skill

19. Are the human resources sufficient and working efficiently? Is it difficult to find personnel with the necessary expertise?
20. Is the estimated budget sufficient for the current needs?
21. Do the results obtained in the programme implementation justify the budget used so far?
22. How do the TA Priority Axis and the OPTA funds have been employed for improving the implementation of the OP?

ANNEX 7 – WORLD BANK’S FUNCTIONAL REVIEWS

The Functional Reviews consultancy of the World Bank is a formal request from the EU in the joint on-going IMF/EU/World Bank loan and is included in a Memorandum signed by the Romanian Government with the EU in June 2009. The first phase of the Functional Reviews, finalized in mid-September 2010, contains detailed analysis and recommendations on 6 sectors (Centre of Government, Ministry of Public Finance, Ministry of Transport, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Ministry of Education and Competition Council). The recommendations are summarized in a series of **Action Plans** that will be formally approved by the Romanian Government in a Memorandum with the EU before the end of 2010. The integration and coordination of the Action Plans with the National Reform Program is also under discussion. The measures included in the Action Plan and formally assumed by the Romanian Government in the Memorandum will become EU conditionality for Romania.

It is very likely that the disbursement of future EU grants to Romania and possibly the next IMF/EU loan in 2011 will be conditioned on the implementation of the Action Plans. The implementation of the Action Plan for Transport is thus critical for the well-functioning of the SOP T, not only because it would improve the institutional setup in the Transport Sector, but also because the release of future EU funds could be conditioned on several key measures from this Plan, pending on EU and the agreement of the Romanian Government in the coming period. As ACIS is the key institution in coordinating the structural instruments, it is expected to be properly involved by the Romanian Government in all discussions on the potential conditionality for Romania with regard to the release of EU funds resulting from this Memorandum, in all the sectors included in the Review.

The second phase of the Functional Reviews (which will start in mid November 2010 and be finalized in mid-April 2011) will contain analysis and recommendations on other 6 sectors, including the Ministry of Environment. The 6 sectors are: Economy (Energy), Regional Development, Environment, Higher Education and Research, Health, Labour and Social Protection.