

EU LEVEL

CLEARER GUIDANCE ON REPORTING

Provide a template
for evaluation reports
incl. templates for tables
to be included

Harmonisation of the reporting
systems. (APR's, SMR's, MTE, etc...)

"Cost-Effectiveness of System adopted"

Detailed guidelines & first hand info
to support the MAs, Evaluators
on adopting an effective methodology
that reflects the objectives of the
CMF outcomes.

A CLEAR STRUCTURE FOR EX-POST EVALUATION,
TO USE LESSONS-LEARNED FROM MTE.

SUPPORT ON DATA COLLECTION & IT-SYSTEMS

IMPROVE THE SHARE OF INFORMATION
BETWEEN MS AND ALSO SHARE
GOOD PRACTICES

-to simplify the
monitoring system
(data collection, more precise
guidelines on indicators)

Use data already
available

IT-SYSTEM
SUPPORT WHEN
SETTING-UP - IT-SYSTEM

MORE
FOLLOWING & GOOD PRACTICE

NETWORKING ^{MORE} & GOOD PRACTICE

Improve the sharing of
information among
MS towns in Good
Practices

EVALUATION
NETWORKS

EU should enable the exchange
of the best practice (evaluation methods)
between MSs.

3. Base on experiences of
Dit-tom $\Rightarrow$ present the
Good Practice and improvement
for On-going and Ex-post

BENCHMARKING
AND GOOD EXAMPLES

for On-going and

BENCHMARKING
AND GOOD EXAMPLES

Deutsch

PRINCIPLES FOR POST-2013

Simplification of CMEF

- Questions
- Indicators
- Cross-cutting/coherence with Structural Funds

SIMPLIFY THE CMEF, MAKE IT MORE FLEXIBLE

Simplification of CMEF (reducing of indicators)

Do not change the rules (like for HC) during the program period

Evaluation by objectives or by axis and not by measure

Better clearance of the evaluation purpose: is it for aggregation of results in EU level or not.

Integrated bottom-up approach

- Concentration of evaluation on key-actions/key objectives / not on measure level

CMEF Reorientation

Simplification
More Focus
Flexibility

Simplify CMEF

FLEXIBILITY

- on indicators
- on priorities

A COMMON "VISION" OF EVALUATION AMONG POLICIES

Proportionality on evaluation and the budget, programme level - measure level

align the expenditure for evaluation with the program budget

REDUCE

Less Indicators and CERs

REDUCED AMOUNT OF INFORMATION REQUIRED BY M.S.

Reduce n° of eval. quest

Minimize the number of evaluation questions

PRINCIPLES FOR POST-2013

Simplification of CMEF

- Questions
- Indicators
- Cross-cutting/coherence with Structural Funds

CMEF Restructuration

Simplification
More Focus
Flexibility

SIMPLIFY THE CMEF, MAKE
IT MORE FLEXIBLE

Simplify CMEF

Simplification
of CMEF
(reducing of indicators)

FLEXIBILITY
- on indicators
- on priorities

Do not change the rules
(like for HC) during the
program period

A COMMON "VISION"
OF EVALUATION
AMONG POLICIES

Evaluation by objectives or by axis and not by measure

Integrated
bottom-up approach

Proportionality of evaluation
and the budget, programme
level - measure level

Better clearance of the
evaluation purpose: is it
for aggregation of results in
EU level or not.

- Concentration of evaluation
on key-actions / key
objectives / not on measure
level

align the expenditure for
evaluating with the
program budget

Minim
evalua

Deutsch

PRINCIPLES FOR POST-2013

Simplification of CMEF

- Questions
- Indicators
- Cross-cutting/coherence with Struct Funds

SIMPLIFY THE CMEF, MAKE
IT MORE FLEXIBLE

CMEF Restructuration

Simplification
More Focus
Flexibility

Simplify CMEF

SIMPLIFY THE CNEF, MAKE
IT MORE FLEXIBLE

Simplify CNEF

Simplification
of CNEF
(reducing of indicators)

FLEXIBILITY
- on indicators
- on priorities

Do not change the rules
(the for HC) during the
program-period

A COMMON "VISION"
OF EVALUATION
AMONG POLICIES

Evaluation by objectives
or by axis and not by
measure

Integrated
bottom-up approach

Proportionality on evaluation
and the budget, programme
level - measure level

Better clearance of the
evaluation purpose: is it
for aggregation of results in
EU level or not.

- Concentration of evaluation
on key-actions / key
objectives / not on measure
level

align the expenditure for
evaluating with the
program budget

REDUCE ECQ & INDICATORS

Less Indicators
and CEQs

Reduce n° of questions
and indicators for ex-post E.
(Simplification)

REDUCED AMOUNT
OF INFORMATION / DATA
REQUIRED BY M.S.

Use only one set
of evaluation questions
(horiz. + measure level)
→ rel. questions

Reduce n° of eval. ques

Fewer CEQs

Minimize the number of
evaluation questions

LESS INDICATORS
AT EU-LEVEL

ation

ITY
H
TES

"VISION"
ATION
OLICIES

portionality on evaluation
and the budget, programme
level - measure level

sign the expenditure for
evaluating with the
programme budget

EX
2
an
(1

REDUCE ECQ & INDICATORS

Less Indicators
and CEQs

Reduce n° of questions
and indicators for ex post E.
(Simplification)

REDUCED AMOUNT
OF INFORMATION/DATA
REQUIRED BY M.S.

Use only one set
of evaluation questions
(horiz. + measure level)
→ rel. questions

REDUCED AMOUNT
OF INFORMATION / DATA
REQUIRED BY M.S.

Use only one set
of evaluation questions
(horiz. + measure level)
→ rel. questions

Reduce nb of eval. ques

Fewer CEQs

Minimize the number of
evaluation questions

LESS INDICATORS
AT EU-LEVEL

BETTER TIMING OF EVALUATION

Better Timing

- on ITE
- on Ex-post Evalut

better timing
for the ITE and
Ex-post

FLEXIBILITY IN THE TIMING
OF THE MTE

Flexibility in the timing
of Mid Term Evaluation

~~#~~ need
recommendations and
guidelines for ex-post
at least before 1.5 years.

- TIMING of MTE +
Guidelines
- Dispensing EIT-wide MTE
and instead conducted
RDP-specific

Ex ante + ongoing +
2/3 evaluation (2011)
are more important / useful
(timing)

Improve Timing

BETTER LINK BETWEEN EQ & INDICATORS

1. Explanation between indicators and evaluation questions

2. Clear definition of indicators

No link between indicators and evaluation questions.

Linking the evaluation questions with indicators.

FOCUS ON
EVALUATION
QUESTIONS

Improve consistency and consolidate indicators (from baseline to impact)

EVALUATION QUESTIONS
MORE CLOSELY
TIED TO INDICATORS
AND VICE VERSA

- Stronger definition of indicators + Baseline - indicators should be compiled by EU-level, at least up to NUTS -1 level

RECONSIDER THE ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS: methods, responsibility

Limitation of the
baseline context and obj
indicators

Impact indicators
should be comparable
with different funds

Focus on Establishment
of RDP and running,
less on impacts

- GVA should be
part of impact indica-
tor and not result
(gross effects, difficult to
collect data)

Manage impact indi-
at EU level.

Impact indicators
should be only in the
ex post level

- impact indicators
(common methodology
proposals, more precise)

RECONSIDER THE ASSESSMENT
OF IMPACTS: methods, responsibility

Limitation of the
baseline context and obj
indicators

Impact indicators
should be comparable
with different funds

Focus on Establishment
of RDP and running,
less on impacts

- GVA should be
part of impact indica-
tor and not result
(gross effects, difficult to
collect data)

Manage impact indi-
at EU level.

Impact indicators
should be only in the
ex post level

- impact indicators
(common methodology
proposals, more precise)