

Ex post evaluation of RDPs 2007-2013 Expectations and use

GPW "Methods for assessing impacts of RDPs 2007-13. Practices & solutions for the ex post evaluation"

Palermo, 4-5 July 2016

Fernando Fonseca

DG AGRI, Unit E.4 'Evaluation and studies'





Content

- Purpose of the ex post evaluation
- Lessons from the mid-term evaluation
- Expectations regarding ex post evaluation
- Use of ex post evaluation



- From the point of view of Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005
 - Degree of utilisation of resources: how funds have been spent
 - > Effectiveness: to what extent objectives have been achieved
 - > Efficiency: was value for money received
 - Socio-economic impacts and impacts on the six Community priorities (i.e. competitiveness, environment, quality of life, etc)
 - > Goals of the programme
 - Draw lessons regarding RD policy
 - Factors of success or failure of programme's implementation, including sustainability of results & impacts
 - Identify good practice



- From the point of view of the new 2014-2020 CMES
 - Demonstrate the progress and achievements of the programme
 - Assess the relevance of the programme: extent to which objectives are pertinent to needs and problems
 - Assess the results & impacts
 - Contribute to **better targeting** of support: allocate funds where they are most needed and where they will have the most impact
 - Support the learning process: building evaluation culture
 - ➤ Better understanding of methodological limitations
 - ➤ Identifying & disseminating good evaluation practices



Lessons from the mid-term evaluation

- Many MTEs were rather weak
 - Low expectations/insufficient importance given by MAs
 - Limited skills
 - Unavailable/hard to find data
 - Limited budgets
- Insufficient monitoring hindered data availability and quality
- Evidence of outcomes often very sketchy
- Hardly any MTE looked at value for money (efficiency)



Lessons from the mid-term evaluation

Assessment of RD impacts

- No, tentative or only basic assessment (with naïve methods)
- Very few assessments with advanced methods
- Impacts mainly assessed at measure level

Counterfactual/net effects

- Only a minority of MTEs assessed net effects
- Advanced methods for counterfactuals rather rare
- Weak analytical bases for conclusions & recommendations



- Data, indicators, evaluation questions
 - Sufficient data quantity, of high quality, collected in due time in a cost-effective way
 - Complement quantitative data with qualitative information
 - Baseline data used for 2014-2020 period may also be used in ex post evaluation
 - Use full set of common indicators and revised set of common evaluation questions
 - ➤ Indicators need to be linked to the programme strategies and actions and enable answering evaluation questions
 - Use programme-specific indicators and evaluation questions to capture a full picture of the impact of the programme



Evaluation methods

- > Assess programme impacts applying advanced, robust methods
- Choice of methods very important, as different methods bring different evaluation findings
- Triangulation of methods (cross-confirming qualitative and quantitative analysis)
- Use of counterfactuals and netting out of effects



Governance of funds

- > Evidence-based findings, conclusions and recommendations
- Show RDP achievements at all territorial levels: regional/national/EU
- Show clear link between programme actions/interventions and outcomes



- Communication of evaluation findings
 - Communicable to different target audiences
 - Presented in an interesting way to have a real impact (showcasing)
 - Managing authorities should learn from the evaluation findings and be familiar with programme outcomes
 - Evaluation reports should be comparable and allow aggregation of evaluation findings across the EU



- COM expects high quality reports
- Managing authorities & evaluators encouraged to follow the ex post evaluation guidelines
 - Indicative outline of ex post report
 - Quality assessment grid
- COM will also assess quality of ex post reports
- Quality assessment tool for desk officers under development
- Training for desk officers in Autumn 2016
- ➤ Observation letters will be sent in 2017



Transparency and accountability

Increased interest/pressure from taxpayers, stakeholders and general public to know what has been done and achieved with funds disbursed

Policy learning tool

- Evaluation findings shall be actively discussed/debated (i.e. within the Monitoring Committee but also more widely)
- > Identify areas for improvement, share good and bad practices
- Identify unintended and/or unexpected effects of programmes' interventions
- Effective use of evaluation findings with follow-up actions



- Improve quality and implementation of 2014-2020 programmes
 - Confirm needs assessment of programmes
 - Lead to modifications of programmes
 - Used in preparation of enhanced AIRs 2017 & 2019
 - Used to validate 2013 baselines



- Inform decision-making and political priority-setting
 - Commission applies the "Evaluate first" principle to make sure that any policy decisions take into due account lessons from past EU action
 - Ex post evaluation is an essential part of policy cycle and supports better decision-making
 - It contributes to strategic planning and to the design of future interventions
 - It contributes to identify opportunities for simplification and reduction of administrative burden
 - For instance, lessons learned from ex post evaluation could feed into impact assessment on post-2020 policy
 - Summary of ex post reports will be disseminated within Commission and to EP, Council & European Court Auditors



Increase evaluation culture

- Increase importance given to & understanding of evaluation process
- Shift focus from disbursing support (absorption) to achieving results/impacts & performance
- Increase ownership of results
- Focus on the programme in question
- Be more integrated in the policy cycle (=>tool for policy formulation)



THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!